



POLISH JOURNAL
OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Volume 1 Issue 1 (2013)

Working Papers

Polish Journal of Political Science. Working Papers

Volume 1 Issue 1

Editorial Board

Clifford Angell Bates Jr., University of Warsaw
Stephen Brooks, University of Michigan
Paolo Pombeni, University of Bologna
Bohdan Szlachta, Jagiellonian University in Krakow
Tomasz Żyro, University of Warsaw

Editor:

Jarosław Szczepański

Associate Editors

Kamil Aksiuto
Przemysław Biskup
Aneta Marcinkowska (Statistics)
Iwona Miedzińska
Krystian Pałycka
Maciej Sadowski
Łukasz Smalec
Jan Szczepanowski
Marta de Zuniga

Original version: e-book

Visit our site: www.pjps.pl

Submit your paper: submit@pjps.pl

Table of Contents

Jarosław Szczepański

Introduction to John C. Calhoun Political Philosophy Studies.

Working paper p. 5

Tim Bale, Simon Blumer, Przemysław Biskup

State of the Union 2012: UK`s European Policy in the Time of Crisis. Report on first part p. 37

Przemysław Biskup

State of the Union 2012: UK`s European Policy in the Time of Crisis. Report on second part p. 57

Jarosław Szczepański

Faculty of Journalism and Political Science, University of Warsaw

Introduction to John C. Calhoun Political Philosophy Studies.
Working Paper¹

Abstract

John C. Calhoun is one of the most important American political philosophers. Yet, he is one of less known in polish political science society. This article is a working paper of future forward to “Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun. Source texts”. Its main goal is to present (in brief form) main concepts of Vice-president and his post important papers on political, social and legal thought. It is also an opportunity to present one of the greatest mind of Old South and maybe start some debate on connections of Polish Commonwealth and American South political thinkers.

Keywords: John C. Calhoun, political philosophy, confederacy, CSA, Old South

¹ This paper will be introduced as forward to Polish/English source book of John C. Calhoun letters and papers.

Introduction

Polish science is rich in texts on American constitutionalism at the beginning of functioning of the Union under the Constitution of the United States. This heritage is much poorer when we turn to the period prior to its enactment, i.e. the time of the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, or turbulent, the nineteenth-century clash between two conceptions of the state proposed by the North and South - the two great economic and cultural regions of the United States.

In the complex world of struggle between two regions of the United States lived and worked, born on March 18, 1782 John Caldwell Calhoun. Raised in a family of Scots-Irish he turned out to be one of the greatest statesmen of the nineteenth-century United States - creating (with Henry Clay of Kentucky and Daniel Webster of Massachusetts) Great Triumvirate that kept Union in peace in the first half of the nineteenth century.

John C. Calhoun in his early years obtained elementary education only (he attended the school several months of the year). He was to receive a higher level of education when he went to a private academy in Appling, Georgia, but the school was closed soon. It forced the young boy to start self-education, which lasted until the death of his father. It was then that John C. Calhoun had to make an effort to manage the family plantation. Intellectual abilities of the young man did not go unnoticed by his mother, who decided on his return to the academy.

From 1800, John C. Calhoun attended classes at Yale University. He graduated in 1802, joining the ranks of its illustrious alumni. The legal education he began after the stay in Newport, Rhode Island in

1804. Calhoun studied law in Litchfield in Connecticut Tapping Reeve school. The practice he began in 1806 after the return to South Carolina (Charleston and Abbeville). The period of adolescence, study and practice he crowned with a speech delivered in connection with the attack on the British American ship Chesapeake.

Political career of John C. Calhoun rolled out quickly. After two terms of office in the state legislature in 1810 he was elected to the House of Representatives. From that moment he climbed through the ranks of the federal legislature and the executive. The mandate of the representative held until 1817, when he was appointed as Secretary of War under President James Monroe. In the election of 1824 managed to win the office of Vice President of the United States with President John Q. Adams. After entering into the alliance with Andrew Jackson, he was able to repeat the success in the elections of 1828. Calhoun has never managed to get the presidential office.

During exercising the second vice-presidency debate on the possibility of entering the institution of nullification to the U.S. Constitution raged in the Senate. During the clashes between supporters and opponents of the possibility of denial of federal rights recognized by the states to be unconstitutional John C. Calhoun resigned as Vice President of the United States and took the office of South Carolina senator. At the same time he became the leader of the group advocating the introduction of the institution nullification.

The last period of his political career dedicated to the fight against distortions and misinterpretations in his ideas of nullification. John C. Calhoun, in his submission, saw it as an instrument to balance

intersectional policy, agrarian South and the industrialized North, not a tool for secession.

Calhoun Doctrine

Francis Ryszka in his theoretical considerations of the dependencies and relationships between concepts such as ideology, doctrine, and finally the political program proposed hierarchical classification. The professor pointed out that ideology is the broadest term, which contains in itself two more. In his description of the doctrine was the intermediate between ideology and political program. It was therefore concretization and refinement of ideology to express intellectual boundaries, while remaining sufficiently wide to on its basis it was possible to create flexible political agendas.

Assuming the division proposed by Franciszek Ryszka and applying it to John C. Calhoun's doctrine can be stated that it contains within the American conservative ideology, which referred to the terms of freedom - liberalism - and respect for the rights of the state. The key for the description of the legal and political thought of John C. Calhoun are his works *A Disquisition on Government* and *A Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United States*. Rich source of information remain the recordings of speeches and letters of vice-president.

In the first of these works the author describes the state of nature and the human condition living in it. Writing in the forties of the nineteenth century, John C. Calhoun certainly already know the work of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau and drew

from their works. He describes the man as torn on the one hand by selfish feelings, on the other hand the social feelings. Author of the work points out the fact that the more we feel that what affects us directly than that which applies to the society of which we are part. State of nature is a condition in which comes to clash of individualism. Way of settling disputes and conflicts is the establishment of the government. John C. Calhoun writes: " It follows, then, that man is so constituted, that government is necessary to the existence of society, and society to his existence, and the perfection of his faculties". He then points out that the government elected to protect and preserve society has a strong tendency to abuse its power. For this reason, necessary is to establish a constitution about which John C. Calhoun writes, " Having its origin in the same principle of our nature, *constitution* stands to *government*, as *government* stands to *society*";. Author of the work points out that a society without government is doomed to fall, but the government without a constitution is also not able to survive.

Constitutive difference to the way in which the government and the emerging of how the constitution is created that streamline the functioning of society and, therefore, affect the human condition is that the existence of the former is outside the sphere of the will of man. John C. Calhoun says that every society must create some form of government. Otherwise is with the Constitution, and the difference is in the fact that: "Constitution is the contrivance of man, while government is of Divine ordination. Man is left to perfect what the wisdom of the Infinite ordained, as necessary to preserve the race".

At this point, due to the nature of this work, one must skip the John C. Calhoun's reflections on the state of nature and the human

condition at the dawn of civilization. One should mention, however, that A Disquisition on Government introduced, in the course of the description of the proper functioning of limited government in the Constitution, the distinction between the rule of the numerical majority and the concurrent majority. Doctrine that assumes the functioning the doctrine of concurrent majority was coined by John C. Calhoun as a remedy for maintaining the stability of the political system of the United States divided into two increasingly hostile sections.

This design assumed the need for continuous efforts to reach a consensus. Decisions could not be taken by a simple majority at the national level. Individual sections have their delegates in the structures of sovereign powers have had the opportunity to veto the provisions striking in their particular interests. John C. Calhoun gives examples of countries that recognize the functioning of the institution of the veto by replacing successively the Confederation of Six Nations and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and finally the Roman Republic.

Thread of functioning national - federal - government has also been developed in the book A Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United State. This time, John C. Calhoun does not refer to how the exercise of power in abstracto, but is trying to explain how the federal government should function and the state governments in concreto in the Union. The matter raised in the book can be divided into three clearly divided parts: first - inquire about original intentions of the Founding Fathers regarding the creation and ratification of the Constitution of the United States, second - discussion on the risks of appropriation by the federal government the power reserved to the

states, thirdly call the restaurant most consistent doctrine, whether it was introduced in order to avoid dissolution of the Union.

Doctrine of social thought, and in particular the functioning and the impact that has on the people of the South a peculiar institution - slavery - can be reconstructed on the basis of public speeches and letters of John C. Calhoun. In contrast to the debate on the functioning of the government he attempted to write a disquisition entirely devoted to the issue of slavery. Defending it during his speeches in Congress seems to have always had particular regard to the political interests of his section, only later to maintain the validity of a peculiar institution, or its abolition due to economic reasons.

In the next two sections will be presented widely John C. Calhoun's views on the relationship of states and the federal government, and slavery. The last observation noted in this place let it remain that the seventh Vice President of the United States developed a comprehensive political and legal doctrine which has become dominant in the South.

Constitutional thought

The following analysis here constitutional thought will be limited to the analysis of the substance of the federal government of the Union and its relations with the state authorities. It will not be made however study on the various polemics of John C. Calhoun of articles issued in the pages of "The Federalist", or the validity of placing the doctrine of concurrent majority proposed in the third part of the book A Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United State.

The author describes the U.S. government as the federal and puts it in opposition to the national on the one hand, on the other hand, the confederated. The first distinction - federal versus national - was made to emphasize that it is the government of the States remain in a political union not a unitary country. Continuing this thought, it is the Government of the societies of each state not a single state or nation. Seeking justification for such an interpretation of the position government John C. Calhoun refers to General George Washington's letters from the period of writing the constitution. In one of them, the first president of the United States wrote, "General Government of the Union" in another and "federal government the of those States". Author of the book derives from this principle that the federal government was to be in its assumption the Government of states that have adopted the act that establishes it.

Following political changes John C. Calhoun indicates that in the period of the revolutionary government, the Declaration of Independence, in the part that relates to the nature of the former colony says: "These United Colonies are entitled to be free and independent states". The next act, which were Articles of the Confederation and Perpetual Union, asserted that "each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled". Referring to maintaining the same style of writing regulations at each stage of functioning of the state, the author of the discourse argues that the relationship between States and the federal government under the Constitution, as it was, has not changed. While in the Constitution of the United States of America, we find the

wording identical to those used on the previous two stages of the functioning of the American political system.

Leaving in this point issues on border of semantics and interpretation of the law John C. Calhoun gives argument purely legal. Bearing in mind that at the time of adoption and ratification of the Constitution, the states acting in their independent and sovereign character, it indicates the rules for the ratification of the Constitution. U.S. Constitution in the seventh article stipulated that "The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, Shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution Between the States so ratifying the same". It is clear, therefore, writes John C. Calhoun, that the states that have not ratified the constitution take the form of independent states. And those that ratification is taken, by the very act of confirmation of the Constitution or provisions lose their individual attributes of sovereignty and independence as long as it is national, not federal. As a result, the relationship between federal and state authorities will determine the answer to the question whether the act of ratification caused the ridding ourselves of states character of sovereign and independent community for the benefit of the larger community – the American people?

Looking for an answer to this question, the author of the book stresses that the recognition of the creation of one nation, in place of a coalition the societies of each state, would mean social, not a political unification. John C. Calhoun concludes that the merging of the individual communities in a mass revolution would be more radical than that preceded the Declaration of Independence. Referring once again to the history of the political system he points out that during the colonial period there were a separate societies with its own

governments and laws. The revolution broke out against the metropolis, which violated their rights. Acting under the label United Colonies, they announced declaration of independence, which allowed them to stand out on independence, but they still work as in colonial times, as individual entities, each in its own name. John C. Calhoun points out that the Declaration of Independence was adopted unanimously, because all the delegates voted for her. This was because most of the delegates in each delegation supported the joining the act. This meant that the declaration was adopted on behalf of the colonial communities assembled in Congress, not by a single, coherent American people.

At the time of the ratification of the Constitution, then, the states acted at all times as an independent confederated political entities. Furthermore, John C. Calhoun indicates that the usual formula used during the ratification process was: "We, the delegates of the State," (naming the State) "to, in Behalf of the people of the State, assent it, and ratify the said constitution. "Ratification was supposed to be so, the act of each individual State in its individual character.

Leaving sure what to who and on whose behalf has ratified, John C. Calhoun examines the preamble to the Constitution. Its purpose is to answer the question: by whom, for what and for whom the Union has been established.

Puzzle solution for the plaintiff will be deciphering the meaning of "We the people of the United States", on behalf of which the Union was founded. John C. Calhoun has no doubt that this could be the only one who has made ratification of the act. In his view, therefore, the preamble should read as follows - "We the peoples of the several States of the Union". Following this line of reasoning, you can say - "we the

peoples of the several States of the Union acting as a free, sovereign and independent states."

Responding to a question about the entity on whose behalf the constitution is established John C. Calhoun moves to solve the question "the whom?". Here the answer is obvious, because the preamble expressly indicates the United States of America. Similarly, a simple solution to the puzzle is the goal. The preamble was exhaustive calculation: "(...) in order to establish more perfect Union, establish justice, secure the peace in the country, provide common defense, improve overall well-being and protect blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity (...)," and then added "(...) ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America". John C. Calhoun reads the word "for" as an indication that it may be a constitution for the individual states in the Union, not for herself. Thus a blessing, happiness, etc. to be provided to individual states, and indirectly – their nations. He ends his argument about the possibility of carefully reading the people also, as nations in the plural, because the English language does not have another transcription for plural.

The answer to the key question posed above: "does the act of ratification, caused the getting rid of states the character of sovereign and independent community for the benefit of the larger community - the American people?" is so "states do not rid of their special character, and the goal is to enable better implementation of their particular purposes enumerated in the preamble".

This short exposition of John C. Calhoun in his opinion, the proper concern, and therefore consistent with the intentions of the Founding Fathers, how to read the Constitution. Another part of the

book is devoted to the analysis of the following the provisions of the U.S. Constitution. Because of the need to maintain work in the relevant frames, as well as the volume of content I suggest to follow the reasoning of the Seventh Vice President on example of only the provisions of the 10th Amendment and Article 1, paragraph 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people " - is the 10th Amendment John C. Calhoun sees the original of this provision in Article 2 Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, which stated: "Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled". Referring to the tradition believes that the amendment should be interpreted in the spirit that is present in the constitution of the confederation.

John C. Calhoun shows that reasoning is wrong, that the federal government had the authority referred to it in an absolute way, without the possibility of its recovery. Such reasoning, in conjunction with the thesis about the existence of a single political nation, which is an emanation of the federal government, as it allows to make unauthorized extensions *ponadstanowych* powers The seventh vice president, recalling the tradition of American constitutionalism suggests that the word "delegate" as used in the 10th Amendment does not mean getting rid of forever the the power their states The authority is granted and can only be received the federal government to individual states and their people.

The problem that faces advocated by John C. Calhoun's interpretation is related to the method of writing Article 1 paragraph 1 of the U.S. Constitution It provides: "All legislative power herein granted shall have the Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." It states that used the word "granted" does not rule out the interpretation, what's more it is the doctrine used interchangeably with the word "delegate".

As for the other branches, that is, the executive and judicative, John C. Calhoun notes that the provisions of the Constitution which are: "The executive Power Shall be vested in a President of the United States of America" and "The judicial Power of the United States, Shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in a dry inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish "means that they have been delegated to the President and the courts respectively.

Social Thought

John C. Calhoun did not create a comprehensive work treating of social thought. This does not, however, prevent the reconstruction of its desired vision of society on the basis of talks and speeches in the U.S. Congress Text to present the most valuable social thought of John C. Calhoun concerning his views on slavery's *Speech on the reception of Abolition Petitions* of February 6, 1837. This is where he introduced the first special institution noon, as a "positive good".

In his speech, John C. Calhoun points out that the South can not give up its institutions, including the abolition and the Union can not coexist Maintaining relations between the two races in the South will be,

what is more, the guarantor of peace and happiness for the whole country. Emotion basis of the social system of the South, in his opinion, will result in the blood wash in the country. Therefore, there is nothing else than to accept already established institutions, including slavery.

John C. Calhoun notes that the approval of the then state of things should be easier to the extent that slavery is good. The black race of Central Africa through the institution of slavery may be the first time in its long history, experience the benefits of civilization. It also lives not only in better conditions, but also has the opportunity to develop as a moral as well as intellectual. John C. Calhoun notes that Negroes came to America at low, degenerate and wild form. Living conditions, which have been provided to them in the South, let them in just a few generations to make leap. Finally Negroes as slaves, living in the civilized world, and acquire higher value. The measure of their happiness and benefits experienced, is also a high birth rate.

The argument for slavery would be that it does not lead to the degeneration of Caucasians. Moreover, the pace of development of civilization free and slave sections were identical. John C. Calhoun calculates that features as a virtue, intelligence, patriotism, courage, etc.. are shared by both the North and South. This last is second only to the so-called free states art acquiring. Differences in wealth are two sections, however, be due to the harmful effects of the Federal Government affecting the possibility of free trade in agricultural products from the south of the Union and by redistribution in favor of the North.

Describing the situation in which the two races with different skin color and other attributes of living together in society, slavery, John

C. Calhoun concludes that it is not a bad system but rather good - a "positive good." He points out that never in history has there existed a rich society in which one portion of it would not become richer at the expense of other work. Such accuracy was manifest in the ancient systems based on strength, as well as in the modern fiscal system. John C. Calhoun indicates that the slave system of the South is no different in their way of other management systems. On the other hand it is the only system in which so much attention is paid to the working class, and so little of it enforces. It shows the differences between the poor working-class neighborhoods in the developed countries of Europe and the orderly life of slaves in the cabins on the plantation. Cites the example of the poor, sick and elderly slum dwellers slaves, survivors of his days among family members in the care of his master and mistress.

In his speech John C. Calhoun indicates that the slave is the best system to create a stable political institutions. While not saying so explicitly, his argument is that the main arguments presented in the previous paragraph shows that the stability of the slave system is related to the lack of the presence of antagonism between capital and labor. Growers are both owners of capital and labor. As long as it functioned smoothly slavery, so long there will be no riots or social revolution. That's what John C. Calhoun says simply, is that the lack of social unrest and conflict in the southern states and the stable political situation relative to that in the North.

Concluding his speech he points out that the transition from the slave system to a free society does not improve the situation of the black population. Indeed freedmen will not be forced to work by the supervisor, but the one hand, they will have the bayonets of the army

together with the other - the rod magistrate. Thus, they become slaves of state coercion.

Calhoun today

Nowadays the political thought of John C. Calhoun is more current on the eastern side of the Atlantic than in his homeland. The problems faced by the European Union - the controversy regarding her shape; place of nation-states; sovereignty; creating a federal state, etc. 150 years ago, John C. Calhoun resolved these problems and pointed to one of the possible alternatives to pursue. The European Union standing at a crossroads can on the one hand look at the United States, on the other, at their Vice President's political thought, which, though unrealized is fully mature alternative. An alternative, which is closer to the heart of those Europeans who are thinking about creating the so-called the Europe of Nations.

Polish science is rich in texts on American constitutionalism at the beginning of functioning of the Union under the Constitution of the United States. This heritage is much poorer when we turn to the period prior to its enactment, i.e. the time of the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, or turbulent, the nineteenth-century clash between two conceptions of the state proposed by the North and South - the two great economic and cultural regions of the United States.

In the complex world of struggle between two regions of the United States lived and worked, born on March 18, 1782 John Caldwell

Calhoun. Raised in a family of Scots-Irish he turned out to be one of the greatest statesmen of the nineteenth-century United States - creating (with Henry Clay of Kentucky and Daniel Webster of Massachusetts) Great Triumvirate that kept Union in peace in the first half of the nineteenth century.

John C. Calhoun in his early years obtained elementary education only (he attended the school several months of the year). He was to receive a higher level of education when he went to a private academy in Appling, Georgia, but the school was closed soon. It forced the young boy to start self-education, which lasted until the death of his father. It was then that John C. Calhoun had to make an effort to manage the family plantation. Intellectual abilities of the young man did not go unnoticed by his mother, who decided on his return to the academy.

From 1800, John C. Calhoun attended classes at Yale University. He graduated in 1802, joining the ranks of its illustrious alumni. The legal education he began after the stay in Newport, Rhode Island in 1804. Calhoun studied law in Litchfield in Connecticut Tapping Reeve school. The practice he began in 1806 after the return to South Carolina (Charleston and Abbeville). The period of adolescence, study and practice he crowned with a speech delivered in connection with the attack on the British American ship Chesapeake.

Political career of John C. Calhoun rolled out quickly. After two terms of office in the state legislature in 1810 he was elected to the House of Representatives. From that moment he climbed through the ranks of the federal legislature and the executive. The mandate of the representative held until 1817, when he was appointed as Secretary of

War under President James Monroe. In the election of 1824 managed to win the office of Vice President of the United States with President John Q. Adams. After entering into the alliance with Andrew Jackson, he was able to repeat the success in the elections of 1828. Calhoun has never managed to get the presidential office.

During exercising the second vice-presidency debate on the possibility of entering the institution of nullification to the U.S. Constitution raged in the Senate. During the clashes between supporters and opponents of the possibility of denial of federal rights recognized by the states to be unconstitutional John C. Calhoun resigned as Vice President of the United States and took the office of South Carolina senator. At the same time he became the leader of the group advocating the introduction of the institution nullification.

The last period of his political career dedicated to the fight against distortions and misinterpretations in his ideas of nullification. John C. Calhoun, in his submission, saw it as an instrument to balance intersectional policy, agrarian South and the industrialized North, not a tool for secession.

Calhoun Doctrine

Francis Ryszka in his theoretical considerations of the dependencies and relationships between concepts such as ideology, doctrine, and finally the political program proposed hierarchical classification. The professor pointed out that ideology is the broadest term, which contains in itself two more. In his description of the doctrine was the intermediate between ideology and political program.

It was therefore concretization and refinement of ideology to express intellectual boundaries, while remaining sufficiently wide to on its basis it was possible to create flexible political agendas.

Assuming the division proposed by Franciszek Ryszka and applying it to John C. Calhoun's doctrine can be stated that it contains within the American conservative ideology, which referred to the terms of freedom - liberalism - and respect for the rights of the state. The key for the description of the legal and political thought of John C. Calhoun are his works *A Disquisition on Government* and *A Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United States*. Rich source of information remain the recordings of speeches and letters of vice-president.

In the first of these works the author describes the state of nature and the human condition living in it. Writing in the forties of the nineteenth century, John C. Calhoun certainly already know the work of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jeacques Rousseau and drew from their works. He describes the man as torn on the one hand by selfish feelings, on the other hand the social feelings. Author of the work points out the fact that the more we feel that what affects us directly than that which applies to the society of which we are part. State of nature is a condition in which comes to clash of individualism. Way of settling disputes and conflicts is the establishment of the government. John C. Calhoun writes: " It follows, then, that man is so constituted, that government is necessary to the existence of society, and society to his existence, and the perfection of his faculties". He then points out that the government elected to protect and preserve society has a strong tendency to abuse its power. For this reason, necessary is to establish a

constitution about which John C. Calhoun writes, " Having its origin in the same principle of our nature, *constitution* stands to *government*, as *government* stands to *society*". Author of the work points out that a society without government is doomed to fall, but the government without a constitution is also not able to survive.

Constitutive difference to the way in which the government and the emerging of how the constitution is created that streamline the functioning of society and, therefore, affect the human condition is that the existence of the former is outside the sphere of the will of man. John C. Calhoun says that every society must create some form of government. Otherwise is with the Constitution, and the difference is in the fact that: "Constitution is the contrivance of man, while government is of Divine ordination. Man is left to perfect what the wisdom of the Infinite ordained, as necessary to preserve the race".

At this point, due to the nature of this work, one must skip the John C. Calhoun's reflections on the state of nature and the human condition at the dawn of civilization. One should mention, however, that A Disquisition on Government introduced, in the course of the description of the proper functioning of limited government in the Constitution, the distinction between the rule of the numerical majority and the concurrent majority. Doctrine that assumes the functioning the doctrine of concurrent majority was coined by John C. Calhoun as a remedy for maintaining the stability of the political system of the United States divided into two increasingly hostile sections.

This design assumed the need for continuous efforts to reach a consensus. Decisions could not be taken by a simple majority at the national level. Individual sections have their delegates in the structures

of sovereign powers have had the opportunity to veto the provisions striking in their particular interests. John C. Calhoun gives examples of countries that recognize the functioning of the institution of the veto by replacing successively the Confederation of Six Nations and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and finally the Roman Republic.

Thread of functioning national - federal - government has also been developed in the book *A Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United State*. This time, John C. Calhoun does not refer to how the exercise of power in abstracto, but is trying to explain how the federal government should function and the state governments in concreto in the Union. The matter raised in the book can be divided into three clearly divided parts: first - inquire about original intentions of the Founding Fathers regarding the creation and ratification of the Constitution of the United States, second - discussion on the risks of appropriation by the federal government the power reserved to the states, thirdly call the restaurant most consistent doctrine, whether it was introduced in order to avoid dissolution of the Union.

Doctrine of social thought, and in particular the functioning and the impact that has on the people of the South a peculiar institution - slavery - can be reconstructed on the basis of public speeches and letters of John C. Calhoun. In contrast to the debate on the functioning of the government he attempted to write a disquisition entirely devoted to the issue of slavery. Defending it during his speeches in Congress seems to have always had particular regard to the political interests of his section, only later to maintain the validity of a peculiar institution, or its abolition due to economic reasons.

In the next two sections will be presented widely John C. Calhoun's views on the relationship of states and the federal government, and slavery. The last observation noted in this place let it remain that the seventh Vice President of the United States developed a comprehensive political and legal doctrine which has become dominant in the South.

Constitutional thought

The following analysis here constitutional thought will be limited to the analysis of the substance of the federal government of the Union and its relations with the state authorities. It will not be made however study on the various polemics of John C. Calhoun of articles issued in the pages of "The Federalist", or the validity of placing the doctrine of concurrent majority proposed in the third part of the book *A Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United State*.

The author describes the U.S. government as the federal and puts it in opposition to the national on the one hand, on the other hand, the confederated. The first distinction - federal versus national - was made to emphasize that it is the government of the States remain in a political union not a unitary country. Continuing this thought, it is the Government of the societies of each state not a single state or nation. Seeking justification for such an interpretation of the position government John C. Calhoun refers to General George Washington's letters from the period of writing the constitution. In one of them, the first president of the United States wrote, "General Government of the Union" in another and "federal government the of those States". Author

of the book derives from this principle that the federal government was to be in its assumption the Government of states that have adopted the act that establishes it.

Following political changes John C. Calhoun indicates that in the period of the revolutionary government, the Declaration of Independence, in the part that relates to the nature of the former colony says: "These United Colonies are entitled to be free and independent states". The next act, which were Articles of the Confederation and Perpetual Union, asserted that "each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled". Referring to maintaining the same style of writing regulations at each stage of functioning of the state, the author of the discourse argues that the relationship between States and the federal government under the Constitution, as it was, has not changed. While in the Constitution of the United States of America, we find the wording identical to those used on the previous two stages of the functioning of the American political system.

Leaving in this point issues on border of semantics and interpretation of the law John C. Calhoun gives argument purely legal. Bearing in mind that at the time of adoption and ratification of the Constitution, the states acting in their independent and sovereign character, it indicates the rules for the ratification of the Constitution. U.S. Constitution in the seventh article stipulated that "The Ratification of the Conventions of nine States, Shall be sufficient for the Establishment of this Constitution Between the States so ratifying the same". It is clear, therefore, writes John C. Calhoun, that the states that have not ratified

the constitution take the form of independent states. And those that ratification is taken, by the very act of confirmation of the Constitution or provisions lose their individual attributes of sovereignty and independence as long as it is national, not federal. As a result, the relationship between federal and state authorities will determine the answer to the question whether the act of ratification caused the ridding ourselves of states character of sovereign and independent community for the benefit of the larger community – the American people?

Looking for an answer to this question, the author of the book stresses that the recognition of the creation of one nation, in place of a coalition the societies of each state, would mean social, not a political unification. John C. Calhoun concludes that the merging of the individual communities in a mass revolution would be more radical than that preceded the Declaration of Independence. Referring once again to the history of the political system he points out that during the colonial period there were a separate societies with its own governments and laws. The revolution broke out against the metropolis, which violated their rights. Acting under the label United Colonies, they announced declaration of independence, which allowed them to stand out on independence, but they still work as in colonial times, as individual entities, each in its own name. John C. Calhoun points out that the Declaration of Independence was adopted unanimously, because all the delegates voted for her. This was because most of the delegates in each delegation supported the joining the act. This meant that the declaration was adopted on behalf of the colonial communities assembled in Congress, not by a single, coherent American people.

At the time of the ratification of the Constitution, then, the states acted at all times as an independent confederated political entities. Furthermore, John C. Calhoun indicates that the usual formula used during the ratification process was: "We, the delegates of the State," (naming the State) "to, in Behalf of the people of the State, assent it, and ratify the said constitution. "Ratification was supposed to be so, the act of each individual State in its individual character.

Leaving sure what to who and on whose behalf has ratified, John C. Calhoun examines the preamble to the Constitution. Its purpose is to answer the question: by whom, for what and for whom the Union has been established.

Puzzle solution for the plaintiff will be deciphering the meaning of "We the people of the United States", on behalf of which the Union was founded. John C. Calhoun has no doubt that this could be the only one who has made ratification of the act. In his view, therefore, the preamble should read as follows - "We the peoples of the several States of the Union". Following this line of reasoning, you can say - "we the peoples of the several States of the Union acting as a free, sovereign and independent states."

Responding to a question about the entity on whose behalf the constitution is established John C. Calhoun moves to solve the question "the whom?". Here the answer is obvious, because the preamble expressly indicates the United States of America. Similarly, a simple solution to the puzzle is the goal. The preamble was exhaustive calculation: "(...) in order to establish more perfect Union, establish justice, secure the peace in the country, provide common defense, improve overall well-being and protect blessing of liberty to ourselves

and our posterity (...)," and then added "(...) ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America". John C. Calhoun reads the word "for" as an indication that it may be a constitution for the individual states in the Union, not for herself. Thus a blessing, happiness, etc. to be provided to individual states, and indirectly – their nations. He ends his argument about the possibility of carefully reading the people also, as nations in the plural, because the English language does not have another transcription for plural.

The answer to the key question posed above: "does the act of ratification, caused the getting rid of states the character of sovereign and independent community for the benefit of the larger community - the American people?" is so "states do not rid of their special character, and the goal is to enable better implementation of their particular purposes enumerated in the preamble".

This short exposition of John C. Calhoun in his opinion, the proper concern, and therefore consistent with the intentions of the Founding Fathers, how to read the Constitution. Another part of the book is devoted to the analysis of the following the provisions of the U.S. Constitution. Because of the need to maintain work in the relevant frames, as well as the volume of content I suggest to follow the reasoning of the Seventh Vice President on example of only the provisions of the 10th Amendment and Article 1, paragraph 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people " - is the 10th Amendment John C. Calhoun sees the original of this provision in Article 2 Articles of

Confederation and Perpetual Union, which stated: "Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled". Referring to the tradition believes that the amendment should be interpreted in the spirit that is present in the constitution of the confederation.

John C. Calhoun shows that reasoning is wrong, that the federal government had the authority referred to it in an absolute way, without the possibility of its recovery. Such reasoning, in conjunction with the thesis about the existence of a single political nation, which is an emanation of the federal government, as it allows to make unauthorized extensions *ponadstanowych* powers. The seventh vice president, recalling the tradition of American constitutionalism suggests that the word "delegate" as used in the 10th Amendment does not mean getting rid of forever the the power their states. The authority is granted and can only be received the federal government to individual states and their people.

The problem that faces advocated by John C. Calhoun's interpretation is related to the method of writing Article 1 paragraph 1 of the U.S. Constitution. It provides: "All legislative power herein granted shall have the Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." It states that used the word "granted" does not rule out the interpretation, what's more it is the doctrine used interchangeably with the word "delegate".

As for the other branches, that is, the executive and judicative, John C. Calhoun notes that the provisions of the Constitution which are: "The executive Power Shall be vested in a President of the United States

of America" and "The judicial Power of the United States, Shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in a dry inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish "means that they have been delegated to the President and the courts respectively.

Social Thought

John C. Calhoun did not create a comprehensive work treating of social thought. This does not, however, prevent the reconstruction of its desired vision of society on the basis of talks and speeches in the U.S. Congress Text to present the most valuable social thought of John C. Calhoun concerning his views on slavery's *Speech on the reception of Abolition Petitions* of February 6, 1837. This is where he introduced the first special institution noon, as a "positive good".

In his speech, John C. Calhoun points out that the South can not give up its institutions, including the abolition and the Union can not coexist Maintaining relations between the two races in the South will be, what is more, the guarantor of peace and happiness for the whole country Emotion basis of the social system of the South, in his opinion, will result in the blood wash in the country. Therefore, there is nothing else than to accept already established institutions, including slavery.

John C. Calhoun notes that the approval of the then state of things should be easier to the extent that slavery is good. The black race of Central Africa through the institution of slavery may be the first time in its long history, experience the benefits of civilization It also lives not only in better conditions, but also has the opportunity to develop as a moral as well as intellectual John C. Calhoun notes that

Negroes came to America at low, degenerate and wild form. Living conditions, which have been provided to them in the South, let them in just a few generations to make leap Finally Negroes as slaves, living in the civilized world, and acquire higher value. The measure of their happiness and benefits experienced, is also a high birth rate.

The argument for slavery would be that it does not lead to the degeneration of Caucasians. Moreover, the pace of development of civilization free and slave sections were identical. John C. Calhoun calculates that features as a virtue, intelligence, patriotism, courage, etc.. are shared by both the North and South. This last is second only to the so-called free states art acquiring. Differences in wealth are two sections, however, be due to the harmful effects of the Federal Government affecting the possibility of free trade in agricultural products from the south of the Union and by redistribution in favor of the North.

Describing the situation in which the two races with different skin color and other attributes of living together in society, slavery, John C. Calhoun concludes that it is not a bad system but rather good - a "positive good." He points out that never in history has there existed a rich society in which one portion of it would not become richer at the expense of other work Such accuracy was manifest in the ancient systems based on strength, as well as in the modern fiscal system John C. Calhoun indicates that the slave system of the South is no different in their way of other management systems. On the other hand it is the only system in which so much attention is paid to the working class, and so little of it enforces It shows the differences between the poor working-class neighborhoods in the developed countries of Europe and the

orderly life of slaves in the cabins on the plantation. Cites the example of the poor, sick and elderly slum dwellers slaves, survivors of his days among family members in the care of his master and mistress.

In his speech John C. Calhoun indicates that the slave is the best system to create a stable political institutions. While not saying so explicitly, his argument is that the main arguments presented in the previous paragraph shows that the stability of the slave system is related to the lack of the presence of antagonism between capital and labor. Growers are both owners of capital and labor. As long as it functioned smoothly slavery, so long there will be no riots or social revolution. That's what John C. Calhoun says simply, is that the lack of social unrest and conflict in the southern states and the stable political situation relative to that in the North.

Concluding his speech he points out that the transition from the slave system to a free society does not improve the situation of the black population. Indeed freedmen will not be forced to work by the supervisor, but the one hand, they will have the bayonets of the army together with the other - the rod magistrate. Thus, they become slaves of state coercion.

Calhoun today

Nowadays the political thought of John C. Calhoun is more current on the eastern side of the Atlantic than in his homeland. The problems faced by the European Union - the controversy regarding her shape; place of nation-states; sovereignty; creating a federal state, etc. 150 years ago, John C. Calhoun resolved these problems and pointed to one of the possible alternatives to pursue. The European Union standing

at a crossroads can on the one hand look at the United States, on the other, at their Vice President's political thought, which, though unrealized is fully mature alternative. An alternative, which is closer to the heart of those Europeans who are thinking about creating the so-called the Europe of Nations.

Bibliography

1. John C. Calhoun, *Union and Liberty: The Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun*, ed. Ross M. Lance, Indianapolis 1992;
2. Tomasz Żyro, *Boża plantacja. Historia utopii amerykańskiej*, Warszawa 1992.
3. Tomasz Żyro, *Ideologia Americana. U źródeł przekonań politycznych*, Warszawa 2002

Tim Bale (materials)

Queen Mary University of London

Simon Blumer (materials)

University of Sheffield,

Przemysław Biskup (edition),

Faculty of Journalism and Political Science, University of Warsaw

*State of the Union 2012: UK's European Policy in the Time of
Crisis. Report on first part*

Two years after the General Election of May 2010, which has determined the shape of the UK government, and one year after the referendum and Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish, as well as English Local Elections, which have determined the face of the national, regional and local politics in different parts of the United Kingdom, and which have concluded the present stage of the electoral reform debate, it seems that these are the future of the British Union in the face of the Scottish independence referendum; the future of the European Union in the face of the Eurozone crisis; and the UK's European policy, as well as their consequences, which seem to shape the current political discourse in Britain. Therefore, after holding the 2010 panel and conference on the results of the General Election; and after devoting the 2011 panel to the referendum, national, regional and local electoral campaigns, the 2012 annual panel of the Research Group *BRITANNIA* focused on the UK's position in the face of the European Union, and on other major events setting this principal problem in a broader context.

To accomplish this task, the panel was organised around two parts. In the first, there were two keynote speeches presented by two distinguished members of the British academia: Professor Simon Bulmer of the Department of Politics, University of Sheffield and Professor Tim Bale of the Sussex European Institute, University of Sussex, followed by an extensive session of questions and answers. The second part was organised around five speeches of young researchers of considerable achievements representing Universities of Prague, Warsaw, and Szczecin, followed by a master-class session of questions and answers by Professors Bulmer and Bale.

The panel was inaugurated with a short address by Professor Janusz Adamowski, the Dean of the Faculty of Journalism and Political Science, University of Warsaw. The panellists and the other participants were also welcomed by Professor Franciszek Gołembski, the Chairman of the Research Group *BRITANNIA*. Professor Gołembski's speech was followed by a short presentation of research projects by Dr Wojciech

Lewandowski which were conducted by the Research Group *BRITANNIA* with a special focus on the project of the *Bibliography of British and Commonwealth Studies in Poland*.

The first part of the panel, which was chaired by Dr Przemysław Biskup (Chair of European Studies, University of Warsaw) consisted of two key-note speeches delivered by Professor Simon Bulmer and Professor Tim Bale.

Professor Bulmer's speech was devoted to the analysis of the UK coalition government, the EU and multi-level governance.

In his introduction, Professor Bulmer noted that the formation in May 2010 of a coalition government comprising Conservatives and Liberal Democrats brought together the most Eurosceptic and Europhile parties represented at Westminster. The Coalition Agreement promised a positive approach to the EU accompanied by new safeguards for British sovereignty and, more generally, a difficult balancing-act between the two coalition allies. In seeking to explore the coalition's performance over its first two years in office, it is possible, in his opinion, to see that its attentiveness to domestic backbenchers has increased over time, increasingly overshadowing the promise of a positive approach to the EU. In some ways this development represents a turn 'back to the future', as the backbench rebellions evoke the last years of the second Major Government (1992-1997), when the Conservative prime minister and his government were hostage to a relatively small number of his MPs. However, two decades on there is a distinct change of circumstances. In Professor's view, the Conservative Party is now overwhelmingly Eurosceptic (in various shades – see Professor Bale's contribution) but the government's majority in Westminster is larger than John Major's, thanks to the Lib Dems' support. This circumstance means that the European issue has become something of a flashpoint for Conservative backbenchers' resentment at being in a coalition and having to moderate their own policies. Against this backdrop the

government has pursued a policy of semi-detachment that is arguably more pronounced than any of its predecessors, even John Major's, and the explanation is predominantly to be found in domestic politics. In consequence, the attentiveness of the New Labour era to multi-level governance has been reversed, at least in non-metropolitan England. What will be interesting in the future is how the coalition will deal with the twin challenges of the growing wish on the Conservative backbenches for some kind of re-negotiation of the UK's relationship with the EU, while the Scottish National Party is seeking independence from the UK. The pattern of multi-level governance promoted by the Labour government of 1997-2010 is under strain as the legacies of its more positive (but utilitarian) approach to the EU and devolution of power within the EU are challenged.

Further Professor Bulmer analysed **the historical context of the UK-EU relations**. One of the most influential interpretations of the UK's relationship with the EU, although now dated, was Stephen George's study entitled *An Awkward Partner*.¹ It captured the way that the UK had had a series of diplomatic conflicts with European partners after its entry into the European Communities in 1973, at the third attempt. The conflicts were often exacerbated by domestic dissent within the ruling party, by strong criticism from the official Opposition within Westminster's adversarial political system, and, occasionally, by both simultaneously. Another study, more explicitly looking at a domestic politics explanation for British European policy explored its pattern of semi-detachment and highlighted the significance of national (external) and parliamentary (internal) sovereignty as eruptive factors that had never enabled the development of a permissive consensus towards integration in public opinion of the kind that had prevailed in most of the founding member states.² More recent interpretations have focused on the Europeanization of British politics, whilst recognising that this

¹ S. George, *An Awkward Partner: Britain in the European Community* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

² S. George (ed.), *Britain and the European Community: The Politics of Semi-Detachment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

process had been less successful in the political parties.³ Professor Bulmer recalled the study of the Europeanization of British central government which revealed that successive governments had tended to be well-organised to deal with the EU in reactive mode ('reception') but had often failed to make a major impact on debates in Brussels because the 'projection' of policy had been hampered at times by partisan division.⁴ During the New Labour period (1997-2010) greater projection was evident, especially in the early years of Tony Blair's premiership.⁵ Ian Bache has argued that the EU structural funds had promoted multi-level governance in Britain.⁶ At the same time, the Labour government's own policies had promoted multi-level governance through devolution to Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, as well as Greater London and English Regional Development Agencies.

Next, Professor Bulmer moved to analyse **the performance of the coalition government in the face of the European integration**. As noted above, the Coalition Agreement was a balancing act aiming to satisfy the Lib Dems' wish for the coalition to be a positive participant in the EU, exploiting the policy opportunities that it affords, while respecting the much more Eurosceptic policy that had been contained in the Conservatives' manifesto. Whilst committing the coalition to this positive orientation, much of the rest of the Agreement followed a different script promising: no further transfer of sovereignty under the current government; a 'referendum lock' to ensure future transfers would require public approval; and a sovereignty bill to make clear that

³ I. Bache and A. Jordan (eds), *The Europeanization of British Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006).

⁴ S. Bulmer and M. Burch, *The Europeanization of Whitehall: UK Central Government and the European Union* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).

⁵ S. Bulmer, *New Labour, New European Policy? Blair, Brown and Utilitarian Supranationalism*, "Parliamentary Affairs", Vol. 61, No. 4 (2008), pp. 597-620.

⁶ I. Bache, *Europeanization and Multilevel Governance: Cohesion Policy in the EU and Britain* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008).

Parliament in Westminster retains ultimate authority. Other commitments were more specific, such as not to join the Euro in the current parliamentary term; to defend British interests in the medium-term budgetary negotiations; to look at EU criminal justice legislation on a case-by-case basis; and not to be party to the establishment of a European Public Prosecutor. Thus, the coalition's European policy was not just about its diplomacy with partners but perhaps even more about domestic measures to entrench national and parliamentary sovereignty.

In some aspects the EU context promised less trouble for the Coalition Government in the aftermath of the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty in November 2009. EU treaty reform seemed to have reached an end; integration seemed to have reached a plateau; the Franco-German 'motor' of integration had lost momentum; provisions for differentiated integration gave options for British non-participation in some policy areas (the Schengen zone and the Euro); and the EU was entering an introspective as the Euro-zone crisis broke in early 2010. At the same time the Conservatives had had to abandon some of their manifesto promises that had suggested early conflict with EU partners, notably to repatriate powers from the EU on criminal justice, as well as on social and employment matters. However, the coalition's balancing act had to be attentive to backbench opinion in the Conservative Party, which had become overwhelmingly Eurosceptic by 2010 and some of its members were quite prepared to rebel. In the first six months of the new government there were 15 Conservative rebellions on Europe involving 60 different MPs, and with on one occasion 37 rebels. After 18 months the number of rebellions had grown to 22 rebellions.⁷ The most dramatic backbench revolt took place in October 2012, when no fewer than 81 backbench Conservative MPs voted for a referendum on EU membership, ignoring the government's position which was to oppose the motion (which originated from an on-line petition signed by over 100,000 people). Although defeated by a vote of 483 to 111, the Conservative rebellion fuelled Euro-scepticism still further with ramifications for the coalition's European diplomacy.

⁷ For more details on the rebellions, see: www.revols.co.uk.

The EU affects all the ministries and ministers of Her Majesty's government, so it is worth commenting briefly on the *dramatis personae* of European policy. It is Prime Minister Cameron who has had the highest policy profile because of the importance of the European Council meetings, particularly during the Euro-zone crisis. Although a modernizer within the party, his ambiguous politics seem to be that of a Eurosceptic modernizer. This posture is something of a contradiction in terms, since modernization issues like the environment can scarcely be pursued independently of the EU. Foreign Secretary William Hague has pursued a foreign policy of putting the EU in its place within a wider geographical framing of foreign policy. Europe Minister David Lidington, by contrast, has been pro-active within the EU but has scarcely had any public profile. Of the Lib Dem ministers Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg has occasionally acted as a multilingual fire-fighter after eruptions in British relations with the EU, while Christopher Huhne, who resigned as Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change in February 2012, was arguably the most active minister exploiting the EU as an opportunity structure, namely to combat global warming.

Internationally, European policy is not just a case of dealing with the EU, and it is worth mentioning that David Cameron forged good relations with President Sarkozy of France. This was reflected in joint initiatives in defence, although much more a matter of bilateral cooperation than the Blair-Chirac initiative of 1998 that led on to the European Security and Defence Policy. The relationship was also prominent in support for deposing Muammar Gaddafi in Libya: a policy where German reluctance weakened efforts at a collective EU approach. Other notable alliances with EU partners have been less consistent. A grouping of Cameron and his counterparts from France, Germany, the Netherlands and Finland came together to push for a frugal approach to the EU budget. A stranger grouping of prime ministers of Iceland, Norway, Latvia, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Lithuania and Estonia attended a January 2011 summit in London calling for a northern European alliance. Noticeably, relations with Chancellor Merkel have been

relatively cool. The reasons for this are various but one contributing factor has been another aspect of the Conservatives' alliance-building policy, namely David Cameron's withdrawal of his party from the European People's Party-European Democrats: the former, largely Christian-Democratic grouping in the European Parliament that was seen as too pro-integrationist. Instead, the Conservatives helped to create a new grouping, the European Conservatives and Reformists, which is smaller and much less influential in the EU institutions than the EPP-ED. Merkel was unimpressed by this move when Cameron was still leader of the Opposition, and little has changed since.

What have been the key features of British EU diplomacy? Apart from those mentioned above, they have largely been characterised by resistance to EU policy or by distancing the UK. The symbolic row over the annual budget in late 2010 enabled the government to "stand up to" Brussels (while still experiencing a backbench rebellion). On the Euro-zone crisis the government has not sought much constructive engagement to help broker a solution. Instead, it has tried to impress on the Euro-zone states that they need to get their house in order. The December 2011 veto of the Fiscal Pact underlined the government's position as an onlooker — rather than a participant — in this key area of European policy. Cameron was always conscious that British participation in any treaty might require approval by referendum, and in the aftermath of the largest backbench rebellion, he had limited flexibility, although lack of policy coordination was also seen as a cause of British isolation. And whilst some (including Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg) saw the veto as a failure of British diplomacy, the populist Euro-sceptic media managed to present it as a triumph and the government's opinion poll ratings improved as an apparent result. The repeated lecturing of Euro-zone partners about sorting out their problems at one and the same time cultivates the impression domestically that any break-up of the currency would have nothing to do with the UK even though the impact on the economy would be severe, while irritating Euro-zone states who are fully aware of the crisis without British advice. One of the few positive initiatives in connection

with integration arose when David Cameron expressed support for Turkey's accession on a visit to Ankara in July 2010.

Professor Bulmer made a remark that both Cameron and Hague had sought to widen British foreign policy influence beyond the EU with trips to India and China amongst others. Hague has given little support to Baroness Ashton and the EU's foreign policy role. The EU seems to lack prominence in Britain's new National Security Strategy and in the government's security and defence review. In foreign and security policy the government seems to be trying to unravel some of the slow progress made at EU level (and supported by previous British governments). The EU's significance in British foreign policy is being scaled back.

Finally, attention must be focused on the domestic cornerstone of the coalition's European policy, the European Union Act. It provides for a referendum throughout the UK on any proposed EU Treaty or Treaty change that would transfer powers from the UK to the EU. It ensures that an Act of Parliament would have to be passed before a "ratchet clause" or a "*passerelle*" (bridging clause) in the EU Treaty could be used. If the *passerelle* involved a transfer of power from the UK to the EU, approval by referendum would be required before the government could agree to its use. The Act also affirms that EU law takes effect in the UK only because Parliament wills that it should. In other words, Parliament is sovereign. The EU Act is therefore a potential obstacle to the EU's future evolution, although it does not bear upon Croatian accession or the Fiscal Pact; in the latter case due to the UK not being a participant.

In his evaluation of the relations between the UK and the EU, Professor Bulmer pointed out that many British governments have had problems balancing the need to play a cooperative game with EU partners while having to keep backbenchers content. The main exceptions to this rule were the early period of Mrs Thatcher's government, prior to the Bruges speech, and almost the entire New Labour period. The reversion to conditions comparable to those of John Major's latter period of government has become clear particularly in the second year of the coalition, as the October 2011 debate on a

referendum on Britain's membership of the EU has fuelled Eurosceptic opinion on the backbenches. And the balancing act is more complex than during Major's premiership because the Lib Dems must be appeased if the coalition is not to collapse, while the Conservative Party is now predominantly Eurosceptic in orientation. It is increasingly clear that the internal politics of the Conservative Party are a key driver of the coalition's European policy. Domestic political incentives in Westminster are trumping utilization of the EU as a means of achieving British national interests. In consequence, the UK is now once again semi-detached from the EU: absent from the Euro-zone and with the government preferring to be a critical spectator rather than playing an engaged role in helping to find solutions; absent from the Schengen zone; and with the EU downgraded in British foreign policy. The symbolism of sovereignty is clear both externally and, via the European Union Act, internally. Older interpretations of Britain's relations with the EU deserve re-reading.⁸

Within the UK the abolition of Regional Development Agencies in England has rolled back one of the manifestations of multi-level governance to which the EU structural funds had contributed, with cultivation by the Labour government. A new multilevel governance is practised by the coalition, characterised by a reduced commitment to the EU as a policy arena and a relaxed approach to the devolved nations while speaking in favour of the continuation of the United Kingdom. Euroscepticism is strongest where the Conservatives and, in European elections, the United Kingdom Independence Party are strong, i.e. England. Beyond England, multi-level governance continues in recognition of the different political constellations that prevail. The biggest test for the coalition is offered from Scotland, where the governing Scottish National Party is pushing for independence. Of course, Scottish First Minister Alex Salmond has a long way to go to convince Scottish public opinion to favour independence, with the

⁸ For instance, S. Bulmer, *Britain and European Integration: Of Sovereignty, Slow Adaptation and Semi-Detachment*, in: S. George (ed.), *Britain and the EC*, pp. 1-29.

polling organization YouGov reporting in May 2012 that only 33 per cent favoured this position. But as Salmond tries to increase this support and lawyers debate the modalities of Scotland obtaining/retaining EU membership in the event of a vote for independence in 2014, the Conservative Eurosceptics make the following connection: if Scotland can have the vote to leave the UK, why cannot the UK (or what remains of it) have a vote on leaving the EU? Labour's legacy of the Europeanization of British politics and the creation of multi-level governance could potentially face unintended outcomes.

In Professor Bulmer's view, while Cameron lectures EU leaders that the Euro-zone "either has to make-up or it is looking at a potential break-up", UK's EU partners might think this soundbite is equally applicable, first, to the United Kingdom itself and secondly, to the UK's forty-year relationship with the EU!

The second key-note speech was delivered by Professor Tim Bale of the University of Sussex and was entitled *On the way out? The party politics of UK membership of the European Union.*

In Professor Bale's opinion, the UK is on the road to leaving the EU. In his view, this does not mean that it will happen, but it does mean that it might. The reason lies not so much in the balance of power between Britain's political parties as the balance of power within one particular political party – the Conservatives. The Tories are moving, seemingly inexorably, from 'soft' Euroscepticism (a critique of the EU and how it currently functions) towards 'hard' Euroscepticism (the belief that membership of the EU is inimical to the national interest).

Path dependence⁹ is the idea that a *critical juncture* can occur which sets in motion a *self-reinforcing sequence* which locks in a *sub-optimal outcome*. In this case (according to supporters of European

⁹ See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Path_dependence.

integration at least), the sub-optimal outcome is the UK leaving the EU, while the self-reinforcing sequence is a series of postures and decisions adopted since May 2010 which have further widened the gap between Britain and its EU partners, all of which stem from a critical juncture which we can trace back to late September 2005. It was then that Liam Fox (who went on, albeit briefly, to become Defence Secretary in the British government¹⁰) was vying with David Cameron and David Davis to become the next Tory leader, and decided to promise publicly that, if elected, he would withdraw the Conservative Party from the EPP-ED group in the European Parliament. Davis – an old hand and a former Europe minister – refused to be drawn. Cameron, however, allowed himself to be rattled and rushed to match Fox’s promise, worrying that any failure to do so might result in melting support and increase in popularity of his young, right-wing rival.

It was a promise that those around Cameron, and he himself, probably came to regret. But it was not one he could renege on. In 2009 the Conservative Party detached itself from the EPP-ED and helped, along with the Law and Justice from Poland and the Czech Civic Democrats, to found the European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR)¹¹. It also set a chain of events that has led to worsening relationships with our European partners and an Act of Parliament which ensures that any substantial step forward towards EU integration will trigger a referendum on the issue or the treaty at hand that will probably result in a no-vote and all that that entails. The episode sent a signal to Tory Eurosceptics that their leader, when it comes to the crunch, can be pushed around. Moreover, it suggested that, if it comes to a choice between, on the one hand, what the Party (and a substantial part of the electorate) wants and, on the other, what the country (in the view of most experts) needs, then Cameron – in marked contrast with most of his predecessors as Prime Minister – may actually choose the latter rather than the former.

¹⁰ *Defence Secretary Liam Fox Quits*, BBC News, October 14, 2011: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-15300751>.

¹¹ See: <http://ecrgroup.eu/>.

So what does the Conservative Party actually want? At a minimum, it wants no further transfers of sovereignty from the UK to the EU and it wants no explicit large scale contribution to any Eurozone bailout arrangements. But most members of the Party want rather more than that. They want a repatriation of powers from Brussels back to London, focusing first on labour market / health and safety regulation but with the eventual aim of relegating membership to some sort of glorified free trade agreement – the “common market” that, according to Eurosceptic lore, was all the British ever signed up to in the first place. For a growing minority within the Conservative Party, however, simply stopping the rot and supposedly winding back the clock is not enough. Instead, it wants an in/out referendum on the UK’s membership of the European Union. It also wants the Conservative Party, or at a minimum its individual members, to be allowed to campaign for Britain being ‘better off out’.

To estimate the size of that minority within the parliamentary Conservative, we need only to go back to October 24, 2011, the day the House of Commons voted on a motion which proposed that the UK should hold a referendum on British membership of the EU. The government’s official position was that it was opposed to the idea and that Conservative MPs should vote against it. Yet, in spite of a three-line whip to that effect, some 81 Conservative MPS voted in favour of the referendum, while (according to expert estimates¹²) some 14-19 abstained instead of voting against it. Undoubtedly, the rebellion would have been smaller if the vote had been on a piece of legislation rather than a motion. On the other hand, had those with government jobs been allowed to vote according to their consciences, it might have been bigger. Accordingly, the figures give us good reason to believe that there are around one-hundred Tory MPs who, at the very least, are located towards the hard end of the hard-soft sceptical continuum. This

¹² *The Conservative Euro Revolt: 10 Points to Note*, Ballots and Bullets: Blog of the School of Politics and International Relations, University of Nottingham: <http://nottspolitics.org/2011/10/25/the-conservative-euro-revolt-10-points-to-note/>.

represents just over 30 per cent of the parliamentary Conservative party.

If we put this into a historical context, we can see the significance of this vote. The biggest single parliamentary rebellion that Margaret Thatcher faced on European policy (on the Single European Act) was made up of 10 MPs, constituting just 3 per cent of the parliamentary party. John Major and his government faced a big rebellion of 41 Conservative MPs (12 per cent) during the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty in 1993. Moreover, six out of every ten rebels in October 2011 had been newly elected to Parliament at the previous year's general election. This suggests that hard Euroscepticism is not a thing of the past, but the wave of the future, predicated on the fact that it has, since the 1990s, been all but impossible to gain selection as a Conservative candidate for a winnable seat unless one is a declared Eurosceptic (and the harder, the better).

That vote in the House of Commons was one reason why Cameron **torpedoed the idea of the EU's Fiscal Compact to become a full-blown treaty two months later in December 2011**¹³. There were, of course, other reasons why he refused to sign it, such as his inexperience in international negotiations, lack of preparedness, his desire to protect the City of London from excessive European supervision, and even his own (and his Chancellor's) Euroscepticism. But it is, undoubtedly, the case that domestic politics came into it: the need to appease and assuage Conservative backbenchers was certainly prominent if not uppermost in Cameron's mind.

Worse (if one supports the UK's membership of the EU) was to follow: Cameron returned from the bust-up in Brussels as a hero – at least as far as most Conservative MPs and most Conservatives in the country were concerned. He became even more of one when the Party's opinion poll ratings suddenly improved – not only, it seemed, had he done the right thing but was rewarded by voters for doing it. This was exactly

¹³ *David Cameron Blocks EU-Wide Deal to Tackle Euro Crisis*, BBC News, December 9, 2011: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-16104275>.

what many Eurosceptic Conservatives had always argued: the harder the line the government took, the more the Party would get credit for it from the public. In fact, the spike in Tory fortunes turned out to be a temporary blip. But Euroscepticism is a mindset and therefore either impervious to evidence or highly selective in its use of it. Calls for hardening the line against Europe are always accompanied, for instance, by claims that, unless it does so, the Conservative Party will sacrifice sufficient support to the UK Independence Party (UKIP) to see it lose large numbers of seats to Labour at the next election – something which is **theoretically possible**¹⁴ but **practically pretty unlikely**.

Conservative Eurosceptics are now focusing on committing their party to include the promise of a referendum on UK membership of the EU in its manifesto. It is unclear whether they will succeed, but **there is some evidence to suggest that the Chancellor of the Exchequer (who is also supposedly still the government's chief strategist) is minded to agree**¹⁵. Even more interestingly, there are some in the opposition Labour Party who argue, **wisely or otherwise**¹⁶, that, before he does so, Labour should steal a march on him and declare its support for a referendum.

If there is to be one, runs their argument, better that Labour look brave enough to take the initiative and, in so doing, potentially create problems for the Conservatives by exposing divisions not between

¹⁴ *With all this talk about UKIP....*, Blog of Professor Matthew Goodwin, School of Politics and International Relations, at the University of Nottingham: <http://www.matthewjgoodwin.com/2012/04/with-all-this-talk-about-ukip.html>, and: R. Ford, M.J. Goodwin & D. Cutts, *Strategic Eurosceptics and Polite Xenophobes: Support for The United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) in the 2009 European Parliament Elections*, “*European Journal of Political Research*”, Vol. 51, 2012, pp. 204-234.

¹⁵ M. Hall, *EU Vote Is a Step Closer as Osborne Backs Call for Referendum*, Express.co.uk, June 1, 2012: <http://www.express.co.uk/posts/view/323762/Now-EU-vote-is-a-step-closer>.

¹⁶ A. Painter, *Indecision in the National Interest*, LabourList.org, May 20, 2012: <http://labourlist.org/2012/05/indecision-in-the-national-interest/>.

Eurosceptics and Europhiles (for there are virtually none of the latter left) but between those Tories who, at the moment at least, still only want reform of the EU and those who actually want to leave it.

The Labour Party is not Europhile, in the sense of being obviously federalist. It is aware of the dangers of being seen as too euro-friendly and whenever possible tries to avoid the subject. This is obviously increasingly difficult: given the troubled times we live in, not talking about the EU at all is almost impossible. Labour, therefore, does its utmost not to be seen as a soft touch, primarily by stressing that it was a Labour government that kept the country out of the single currency. It also declares whenever it gets the chance that it has no more desire than the Conservatives to contribute to any bailouts.

As it has been already mentioned, the Labour Party is overwhelmingly reconciled to British membership of the EU. Some 19 Labour MPs voted for a referendum in October 2011 – around 7 per cent of the parliamentary party. Moreover, some of those voting for one did not do so because they want the UK out of the EU but because they believe in giving people a say on the issue. And none of those 19 Labour MPs was from the new intake in 2010, suggesting that whatever Euroscepticism still lingers in the Labour Party belongs to history, not to the future. In short, the idea that Europe divides both main parties is an outmoded cliché. It now divides them more strongly from each other than it has done for years.

As for the Liberal Democrats, they remain theoretically the most Europhile party, but their credibility on this issue (as on most others) is shot to pieces. According to Professor Bale, the leadership seems practically unwilling or unable to prevent its coalition partner pulling the UK away from Europe and alienating its European partners. However, this does not mean the Liberal Democrats can be ignored. If the next election produces another hung Parliament, however much their parliamentary contingent is reduced, the Liberal Democrats could still be “Kingmakers”, choosing whether it will be the Conservatives or Labour that leads another coalition government or perhaps forms a minority administration.

Yet, according to Professor Bale, whichever party takes over in 2015, the prospect of the British public getting a say on the UK's membership of the EU seems likelier now than it has been for a long time. If there is a Conservative government, either because the Liberal Democrats choose to renew the coalition or because the Conservatives get a small majority, Cameron (or his successor) will find it difficult to resist internal pressure – even assuming for the moment that the promise to hold a referendum fails to make it into the Tory manifesto. If that promise does, in fact, become part of the Conservative's platform, then it will almost certainly appear in Labour's manifesto, too, meaning that even a defeat for Cameron will not prevent a vote. For Europhiles this is the nightmare scenario – a vote on Europe under a possibly unpopular Labour government facing a Conservative Party which, if past form is anything to go by, will be even more sceptical in opposition than it already is in office.

If there is an in/out referendum on membership, **the smart money still says that a strong campaign focusing on the economic consequences of exit could still win the day for supporters of the EU**¹⁷. But the result is far from guaranteed. In other words, while the UK leaving the EU is not yet inevitable, and perhaps not even probable, it is now a serious possibility – one that all those who still believe that Britain belongs in Europe have to acknowledge and for which they need to plan accordingly.

The first part of the panel was concluded by a lively discussion open to members of the public.

The panel report was prepared by Dr Przemyslaw Biskup on the basis of his notes and the extended abstracts prepared by the speakers. The Organising Committee wishes to express their

¹⁷ P. Kellner, *Will Britain Vote to Leave the EU?*, YouGov, May 21, 2012: <http://yougov.co.uk/news/2012/05/21/will-britain-vote-leave-eu/>.

gratitude to Mrs. Katarzyna Ochman M.A. for the most valuable assistance offered in the course of preparation of the Panel Report.

Przemysław Biskup (edition),

Faculty of Journalism and Political Science, University of Warsaw

***State of the Union 2012: UK's European Policy in the Time of
Crisis. Report on second part***

The second part of the panel, chaired by Dr Wojciech Lewandowski (Chair of European Studies, University of Warsaw) was divided into five speeches delivered by Mr. Jiří Koubek (Charles University, Prague), Dr Przemysław Biskup, Dr Małgorzata Kaczorowska (Institute of Political Science, University of Warsaw), Dr Krzysztof Winkler (Research Group *BRITANNIA*) and Dr Tomasz Czapiewski (Szczecin University). The contributions did address the key political developments in British politics in the second year of the Coalition Government.

The first contribution, presented by Mr. Jiří Koubek of the Charles University in Prague, was devoted to the analysis of the British inspirations from Václav Klaus to Petr Nečas for identity, ideology and image of the ODS.

In the introduction to his speech, Mr. Koubek argued that the Civic Democratic Party of the Czech Republic (*Občanská demokratická strana*, ODS) has probably been the most successful right-wing political party in the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). It has been the only case in this region that a single political party has persisted, without changing its name and with full organisational continuity, as the main right-wing party in its country for the whole post-communist history. The ODS has, indeed, played the role of the right-wing leader since the concept of right-left competition was established in the Czech Republic in the early 1990s.

According to Mr. Koubek, this success is not coincidental. As several authors have noted (Hanley, Szczerbiak, etc.), right wing parties in CEE have been strongly ideological ones. And this is particularly a case of the ODS. Founded in 1991 and lacking any historical tradition (unlike the other core parties of the Czech party system, i.e. Social Democrats, Communists and Christian Democrats), this party needed something substantially more than a strong leadership to survive its own foundational period. And it has been a distinct ideology to constantly provide this integrative power.

The role of party's founder Václav Klaus was crucial in articulating and "selling" this ideological mix. And, in doing so, some British inspirations (notably his ties to the then Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher) had an extremely important impact. The ideology became such a significant feature of the party that it has even become a matter of political identity, with its "British factor" quite indispensable.

Over last decades, and quite in line with an almost global trend, the Czech party system has been undergoing a shift towards more fragmentation, with increasing voter volatility, decreasing party stability, erosion of party-society linkages and even more personalised politics. As a part of this, ideologies have obviously become vaguer and shallower. In the case of ODS, this is when the "image aspect" comes into forefront. Images and self-images become continuations and functional substitutes of weakening ideologies and identities (or at least their supplements). And again, the British colours in this ODS's image-making are easily discernible.

What specifically are the British inspirations in the politics of ODS? In addition to leaders' examples and emulation (Klaus-Thatcher, Topolánek-Cameron) there is obviously the European issue to unify the parties. Moreover, these are British political institutions, particularly the "first-past-the-post" electoral system and the Westminster system tradition of single-party cabinets, which the ODS has been strongly attracted by since the party's very foundation. Last but not least, Britain has become a highly symbolic visualisation for one of the ODS's main foreign policy principles, i.e. its strong Atlanticism. In this, and without much exaggeration, for the ODS the UK has always played a role of a window to the USA.

Therefore, Mr. Koubek undertook in his paper to identify the British inspirations over the various stages of ODS's development and to follow the changing interplay in the "triple I" triangle of ideology-identity-image.

In the period of up to mid 1990s, which Mr. Koubek described as the Age of Ideology, the keys to centre-right party success in post-

Communist CEE constituted “(a) the presence of cohesive elites able to act as the nucleus of new centre-right formations, and (b) the ability of such elites to craft broad integrative ideological narratives that can transcend diverse positions and unite broad swathes of centre-right activists and voters”¹.

Mr. Koubek emphasised that he intended to focus on and explore especially the second half of the abovementioned assertion of Hanley, Szczerbiak, Haughton and Fowler. As for the first part, the case of the ODS founded in 1991 basically as a “one-man-party”, and dominated by strong Václav Klaus’s leadership at least until the first intra-party tensions in the mid-1990s, is a particularly good example of an extraordinarily cohesive nucleus (unlike, e.g., fragmented and highly competitive Polish right-wing post-Solidarity elites).

Coming back to ideology, Hanley, Szczerbiak, Haughton and Fowler are emphasising the aspect of breadth, defined as “the ability to construct an inclusive electoral entity that encompasses a socially and ideologically broad range of voters and subgroups”². In their account, the success of Hungary’s Fidesz (“high breadth, medium durability”³) is ranked higher than Czech Republic’s ODS (“medium breadth, high durability”⁴).

In his rather durability-centred approach, stressing the ODS’s *continuous* right-wing hegemony in 1991-2012 (as compared to Fidesz’s “late takeover” only after 1998 election), Mr. Koubek focused on some aspects of surprisingly successful *narrowness* in the right-wing parties’ ideological arsenal. Hanley, Szczerbiak, Haughton and Fowler are correct in pointing out that ODS’s ideological message based on “imported Anglo-American New Right ideas”⁵ and on clearly profiled

¹ S. Hanley, A. Szczerbiak, T. Haughton and B. Fowler, *Sticking Together. Explaining Comparative Success in Post-Communist Central and Eastern Europe*, “Party Politics”, Vol. 14, No. 4 (2008), p. 407.

² Ibidem, p. 409.

³ Ibidem, p. 429.

⁴ Ibidem, p. 429.

⁵ Ibidem, p. 429.

neo-liberalism has been significantly narrower than Orbán's mixture of citizenship (*polgár*) principles and national-conservative-populist ideas.

Over two decades, ODS has undergone, similarly to Fidesz, considerable development and shifts as far as its ideological profile is concerned. After all, it is exactly this ideological *flexibility* in time (which is not incompatible with *narrowness*) that will be explored in this paper.

On the other hand, even if we stick to the ODS's ideological narrowness in the initial phase of the Age of Ideology, there was some crucial overlap between (a) this very limited ideological base and (b) that time context and setting. By this context and setting, Mr. Koubek meant the prevalent Czech post-Communist mindset and (post)-transformational aspirations consisting in an almost total rejection of the legacy of Communism (and, together with this, also socialism, or, broadly speaking, left) and the call for a rapid and unconditioned "return to the West" and "return to Europe".

As Czech social scientist and philosopher Pavel Barša put it, for Czechs during the late Communism, "West" was a dreamt concept, a myth, a utopia, a "non-place" into which they were projecting their hopes⁶.

Mr. Koubek's point was that for a newly established right wing political party, lacking any historical tradition or continuity, it would be extremely promising to connect this highly abstract notion of the West with a more specific representation of this ideal. And it is no coincidence that in the first place (at least in the European context) it was Great Britain which was most preferred and best available.

There was not only the well-known personal-ideological linkage in the form of Václav Klaus's admiration for Margaret Thatcher. Notably, it have seemed to be reciprocal: "It is equally

⁶ *How To Kill a Dream: Our Life after 1989 in the Limbo of the End of History* - available at: <http://monumenttotransformation.org/atlas-of-transformation/html/u/utopia/how-to-kill-a-dream-our-life-after-1989-in-the-limbo-of-the-end-of-history-pavel-barsa.html>.

flattering to be asked to perform a kind of duet with Mr. Václav Klaus. I suspect it will even be quite harmonious, since he is in a way one of my heroes. Mr. Klaus will be remembered for many achievements during his immensely creative and successful term as Czech Prime Minister”⁷).

Attention shall be paid also to some structural factors. Firstly, in searching for foreign (Western) examples to follow, very clearly profiled right-wing parties were needed. Softer, more centrist, Christian Democratic options were not available for several reasons: a strong anti-third-way bias of that time (a political discourse constructed primarily by ODS and Václav Klaus; thus the foreign example had to be compatible with this campaign), secular character of ODS and, related to this, the fact that the Christian Democratic option had already been taken by another Czech party (People’s Party with its continental European linkages):

“As some of you may know, the Civic Democratic Party was founded in 1991 as a first broad-based, not exclusive, not just a single, narrow constituency representing political party in the Czech Republic as well as in Central and Eastern Europe which **clearly, without hesitation and without any qualifications declared its position on the right of the political spectrum**, a party which admired Margaret Thatcher and British Conservative Party, a party which originally wanted to use the same name. Our intention was to demonstrate that we did not

⁷ M. Thatcher, *Re-Learning Old Lessons: Speech to the American Enterprise Institute*, Beaver Creek, Colorado, 1998, available at: <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/108377>.

want to belong to the predominantly Christian Democratic Central Europe. We looked for inspiration to the Anglo-American political style and ideas and this is where we keep staying”⁸.

Secondly, Britain was also the only European country into which ODS could project its strong Atlanticism. In this sense, UK played a role of a symbolic bridge to the USA. According to Mr. Koubek, it was a part of the then popular story about Reagan’s and Thatcher’s almost personal victory over Communism. “It is not an exaggeration to say that the melting down of communism in Central and Eastern Europe was initiated in Great Britain in the year 1979 by the election victory of the Conservative Party and Margaret Thatcher”⁹.

In a way, Great Britain was even “a more perfect mirror” of the U.S. The “concentrated” Westminster system (i.e., a parliamentary regime with executive power predominance) and its competitive democracy was much closer to the majoritarian style of Václav Klaus as the Czech prime minister than the American “checked and balanced” *presidentialism* with much more fragmented and multi-level pattern of power. Also the fresh Czech memory of a failed federation was more compatible with British unitary (and that time still centralised) government than the complex American federalism. (In connection to this, it should be added that later in 2000, the ODS was strongly opposed to introducing the regional self-government and staunchly in favour of having the municipalities as the only level.) And to add one

⁸ V. Klaus, *Speech at British Conservative Party Conference*, Bournemouth, October 9, 2002, emphasis in original, available at: <http://www.klaus.cz/clanky/2050>.

⁹ V. Klaus, *The politician I admire*, “The Times”, November 13, 2006, available at: <http://www.klaus.cz/clanky/2060>.

common feature of nearly all Anglo-Saxon democracies, the ODS has always pushed and supported introducing a “British” single-member plurality electoral system, dreaming of a two-party system and one-party cabinets.

Thirdly, and more specifically, in the early 1990s Thatcherism was an ideal referential framework for the Czech(oslovak) neoliberal architects of a thorough and rapid economic transformation from central planning to the market economy “without adjectives” (as opposed to the Social-Liberal, Social-Democratic and Christian-Democratic ideal of “social market” economy). Moreover, and luckily enough for Czech-British reference making, some quite similar issues and challenges were on agenda: large-scale privatization, deregulation of economy, dealing with mining industry, railways, health care system, etc.

Nothing illustrates the significance of the British inspiration in constructing the Czech right-wing political discourse in the early 1990s better than the following quote. “Influenced by Margaret Thatcher, I succeeded in persuading the Czech people in the early nineties that we had to restore capitalism. I was proud to say that I was a Thatcherist. I founded a party which admired Margaret Thatcher and British Conservative Party, a party which originally wanted to use the same name”¹⁰.

Next, Mr. Koubek moved to analyse the Age of Identity in ODS’s history (from “Sarajevo” to the end of Klaus’s leadership). The previous, highly ideological phase coincided with the initial Czech transformational optimism and enthusiasm, amounting even to a peculiar kind of Czech exceptionalism. These feelings of Central European primacy, at times even superiority and “not belonging” to the rest of post-Communist countries, were underpinned by a self-image of a Central European tiger, which seems to have been acknowledged even by “British teachers” themselves who, thus, participated, in turn, in crafting this success story image. “It is in keeping with that tradition of industrial prowess that the Czech Republic today is the outstanding

¹⁰ Ibidem.

economic success story of central Europe: where others have flinched under the pressures of free enterprise reform, Václav Klaus — my other favourite Prime Minister — has kept going down the right track. And the results are internationally recognised and admired”¹¹.

By mid-nineties, however, this optimism had faded in the Czech Republic and after 1997 it was entirely swept by a deep crisis, dramatic disillusionment, famously called by the then president Václav Havel as “depressed mood” (“*blbá nálada*”).

From the point of view of ODS as then governing party, the crisis was triple. Firstly, there was economic slowdown which resulted in Prime Minister Klaus having to admit publicly the existence of some serious problems and respond to them by a series of austerity steps, “packages of economic measures”. This was an unpleasant shock right after the official doctrine of transformational success and optimism.

Secondly, there was a first serious intraparty crisis in ODS, leading to a split after so-called “Sarajevo Coup” when a group of challengers publicly called Václav Klaus to resign due to the party’s funding scandal at the time when he was on a state visit to Bosnia. The conflict had been preceded by increasing tensions within the ODS’s leadership concerning, among others also the European policy of the party. Klaus’s ever stronger Euroscepticism clashed with more pro-European attitudes of his minister of foreign affairs, Josef Zieleniec whose ambitions had been to participate more actively on the formulation of foreign policy. Zieleniec’s views were also shared by the “Sarajevo group” who eventually left the party to found clearly Eurooptimist Freedom Union.

Thirdly, a more hidden, underlying crisis was caused by a gradual awakening, leading to perception of Europe as a really existing place rather than utopia. Obviously, this almost Weberian process of *Entzauberung* was accelerating exactly at time of intensive access negotiations between the Czech Republic and the EU.

¹¹ M. Thatcher, *The Common Crisis: Atlantic Solutions: Speech at the New Atlantic Initiative*, Prague, 1996, available at: <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/108361>.

The change of mood was reflected especially in the unified, ever more centralised post-Sarajevo ODS in which the personal Klaus's Euroscepticism came fully into the forefront. Sean Hanley characterises this change as "a shift from a Euroscepticism stressing neo-liberalism and Czech and Central European distinctness to one stressing the defence of 'national interests' against German inspired Eurofederalism"¹².

British inspirations are obvious. Firstly and most significantly, it was the matter of re-framing the political discourse. The vocabulary of British Euroscepticism was adopted and concepts almost never used before in our country, such as *superstate*, *national interest*, *national identity*, *state sovereignty*, were domesticated in the Czech political language.

In addition to this, one of the most representative and best profiled party documents of that time, *The Manifesto of Czech Eurorealism*, comes up with a weird and completely implausible construct of a linkage between "the main stream of modern Czech politics, embodied by the continuity of efforts of Palacký, Havlíček and Masaryk" and "the Anglo-Saxon traditions of liberal conservatism"¹³.

Furthermore, Mr. Koubek analysed the Age of Image, as he described the ODS under Topolánek (2002-2010). The previously described period, in which the initial ideological input spilled over to another level and was socialized within the party as a matter of identity, was marked by hardening euro-scepticism, rising nationalism and conservatism. The peak of this period was the failed 2002 parliamentary election in which this new ODS's ideological brand proved highly incompatible with its voter profile. The party's aggressive campaign demobilised its typical young urban well-off supporters. The unsuccessful leader, Václav Klaus, was successfully launched to the

¹² S. Hanley, *From Neo-Liberalism to National Interests: Ideology, Strategy and Party Development in the Euroscepticism of the Czech Right*, in: "East European Politics and Societies", Vol. 18, No. 3 (2004), p. 513.

¹³ *The Manifesto of Czech Eurorealism*, p. 4, available at: http://www.jan-zahradil.cz/assets/files/publikace/JanZahradil_aj_manifest.pdf.

Czech presidency in 2003 and replaced by Mirek Topolánek as party leader.

The new chairman's repositioning of ODS resembled in some aspects to David Cameron's efforts in the leadership of the Conservative Party. Both leaders moderated their parties and moved them slightly to the centre (or, at least, highlighted their catch-all character). In consequence, they succeeded in leading them out of isolation (in both cases resulting in a coalition government). The ideological purity was replaced – or at least supplemented – by a pragmatic stress on change and reform. Flexibility and modernity, facing global challenges – these were the new mottos. In the Czech case, such a “new-ism” and “change-ism” was, however, not incompatible with the older layer of reformism and transformational ethos from the early 1990s.

As a part of above mentioned shifts, the parties entered some unorthodox domains. “The environment does not respect national boundaries and it is right that the EU should take a lead. Yet we are failing to meet that challenge. Europe's Kyoto target is to reduce carbon emissions by 8 per cent by 2012. But with just six years to go, carbon emissions are down by less than 1 per cent. Twelve member states have actually gone backwards and increased their emissions. The EU as a whole is set to miss its Kyoto target. That is not good enough and it has got to change”¹⁴. Whereas Cameron opened up the environmental issues, Topolánek's ODS even opened up the Green Alliance, having formed a three-party governing coalition in 2006. For Klaus this would have been an anathema, which he let publicly known bitterly and repeatedly.

The originally narrow Thatcherism-inspired ODS's ideology, later solidified by the party's “Eurorealist” identity, now gradually became much more eclectic, vaguer and shallower. Formerly so authentic and intensive ideological formulas eroded over time, being deliberately

¹⁴ A quote from David Cameron statement following the Joint Cameron-Topolánek Declaration, 2009, available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/5175708.stm.

neglected by the new leadership, until they became completely a matter of routine. And in an ever more media centred and personalised Czech politics, these were *images* that replaced and functionally substituted the ideological or identity-based messages.

This softening of ideology led to conflicts within the party (concerning, e.g., the Lisbon Treaty) in which the implicit player increasingly involved was the honorary chairman of the party, the Czech President, Václav Klaus. Eventually, his role was also crucial in overthrowing the Topolánek's cabinet in 2009.

Topolánek was aware of the risks of his new pragmatism. His British partnership, the frequency of showing publicly together with Cameron, the MER initiative, and later, leading ODS out of the EPP-ED alliance and the establishment of the ECR group, this all can be interpreted as an image-making strategy aimed at pre-empting Klaus's (and his followers' in ODS) attacks on Topolánek's "heretic" leadership. Another part of this pre-emption was a re-emphasis on neo-liberalism, leading, inter alia, to the flat tax introduction.

Contemporary Nečas's leadership can be understood as a kind of middle way: partial return to Klaus's heritage, but without completely abandoning Topolánek's achievements. However, it is primarily the weakness of both the party and its leader which best characterises the current period.

In conclusion to his contribution, Mr. Koubek pointed out that broadly speaking, the Age of Image continues under Nečas's leadership despite some half-hearted attempts of ideological revival. What definitely continues, however (and is a continuous link over all three periods of ODS's short history), are the British inspirations and linkages. The most recent development, the British-Czech attitude to the EU Fiscal Compact, is another example of this evergreen feature of ODS's politics.

Mr. Koubek emphasised that he was trying to interpret the success of the ODS in terms of a "triple I" sequence: (1) a strong British inspired

ideological input in the initial phase, which (2) later spilled over onto a deeper level and was solidified / socialised as a matter of identity (accompanied with re-discovering the Eurosceptic part of the Thatcherite ideological mix), and which (3) yet later eroded and mutated into a matter of political image serving partly as a cover for blunt pragmatism, partly as a shield of pre-emption against the ideologues' attacks.

It is probably the lack of ODS's own historical traditions which motivated the party to search for Western political examples. And among those available, the UK and its Conservative Party have been the most suitable choice for several reasons.

The second paper in the second part of the panel was presented by Dr Przemysław Biskup, who elaborated upon the Coalition Government's agenda in the light of the Queen's Speech 2012.

The Queen's Speech of 2012¹⁵ is interesting for a few reasons. First of all, everybody who visited Britain in May 2012 could see how beautifully the official pomp of the State Opening of the Parliament did compliment the celebrations of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee held this year, which are only to be concluded with the opening and closing ceremonies of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games¹⁶. Second of all, the last Speech from the Throne concluded an exceptionally long parliamentary session of almost two years. Third of all, it was in a way a summary of the accomplishments of the Coalition

¹⁵ *The Queen's Speech 2012: Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech to both Houses of Parliament on 9 May 2012*: <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/queens-speech-2012>.

¹⁶ *The Queen's Speech 2012*: "In the year of the Diamond Jubilee, Prince Philip and I will continue to take part in celebrations across the United Kingdom. The Prince of Wales and other members of my family are travelling widely to take part in festivities throughout the Commonwealth. Prince Philip and I look forward to the London Olympic and Paralympic Games and to welcoming visitors from around the world to London and venues throughout the country."

Government so far, and a symbolical occasion for the HM Government to reset its priorities for the second half of the present Parliament. What is also interesting in respect of this speech is not just what was contained in it, but also what was lacking.

In brief, **in the Speech from the Throne there were specified 19 Public General Bills** to be introduced into the Parliament in the newly opened session. They cover broad range of topics, from banking reform, through social and child care, electoral reform, to water supplies¹⁷. **On the top of the legislative programme of the Coalition Government there were also indicated 12 priorities**, such as reducing the deficit and restoring economic stability; reforming the rules governing succession to the Crown; building strategic partnerships with the emerging powers; the United Kingdom's assumption of the Presidency of the G8 in 2013, and strengthening of the UK's international position in relation to different regions of the globe.¹⁸ Nonetheless, it was a much smaller number of issues which effectively have been dominating the coalition's attention and setting the limits of policy bargaining.

¹⁷ *The Queen's Speech - 9th May 2012* (<http://number10.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/engage/queens-speech-2012/>): Banking Reform Bill, Care and Support Bill, Children and Families Bill, Communications Data Bill, Crime and Courts Bill, Croatia Accession Bill, Defamation Bill, Electoral Registration and Administration Bill, Energy Bill, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill, European Union (Approval of Treaty Amendment Decision), Groceries Code Adjudicator Bill, House of Lords Reform Bill, Justice and Security Bill, Local Audit Bill, Pensions Bill, Public Service Pensions Bill, Small Donations Bill, Water Bill.

¹⁸ *The Queen's Speech - 9th May 2012*: Reducing the deficit and restoring economic stability; Reforming the rules governing succession to the Crown; Working cooperatively with the devolved administrations; Afghanistan; Reducing the threat of nuclear proliferation and Iran; Horn of Africa; Middle East and North Africa; International development spending from 2013; Building strategic partnerships with the emerging powers; The United Kingdom's assumption of the Presidency of the G8 in 2013; The Diamond Jubilee; The London Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Dr Biskup underlined also that the main theme of the HM Speech had been set on the economic growth, and on development of the select social policies, which were aimed at softening the government's image dominated so far by the need for austerity. Such an image did undermine the Conservatives' chances for majority government in May 2010 and has finally struck both the governing parties during the last Local Elections of May 3, 2012. Notably, these were not only the Liberal Democrats who suffered considerable losses in the council seats, as in the last year's vote, but also the Tory party¹⁹.

The problems of economic growth and social policies aimed at softening the blow of the cuts introduced so far in result of the recession, and public debt, and fair distribution of the austerity measures in the society, were addressed by a number of measures. The Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill would “create the right conditions for economic recovery” and “reduce regulatory burdens and improve business and consumer confidence”, while the Banking Reform Bill would undertake to strengthen regulation in the financial services industry. The Banking Reform Bill would “foster financial stability and a more resilient banking sector” by giving the HM Treasury the power to ring-fence retail operations from investment divisions of big banks, and to ensure that depositors are paid out before unsecured creditors in the case of bank insolvency. It is intended that this solution would reduce the potential burden on the taxpayers. The measures included in the bill are based on recommendations made by the Independent Commission on Banking, set up by the government in 2010 to look at reforms in the banking sector in the wake of the financial crisis. The Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill would also increase shareholders' powers, particularly regarding executive pay. The government has also announced plans for the Energy Bill, designed to boost investment in low carbon energy and help in increasing security

¹⁹ *Vote 2012: Labour Are Back Throughout Country, Says Ed Miliband*, BBC News, May 4, 2012: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-17920848>.

of supply. Similar aims are connected with the pledge to launch a Green Investment Bank to provide investment in environmental initiatives²⁰.

There were also some other initiatives declared in the Queen's Speech, which may be interpreted as creating successful reforms without committing the Government to general withdrawal from its previous policies. This tendency is best exemplified by the House of Lords Bill²¹. This is a particularly interesting issue for a few reasons. Firstly, the Bill will be aimed at concluding the upper chamber's reform initiated in the years of constitutional crisis of 1909-1911 (Parliament Act 1911, and the proposals of the Bryce Commission of 1917). Second of all, because what we call the contemporary Lords' reform, initiated by the House of Lords Act 1999, has been mostly the Labour project. Thirdly, because it is a kind of pledge made by the Government from which it seems it has cut itself off almost instantly, the Conservative members of the Cabinet and their parliamentary colleagues in particular. Therefore, Dr Biskup stated that we might expect a very interesting discussion in the Parliament in the course of the next year, but not necessarily a particularly intense action on the side of the Cabinet on this issue. It was also confirmed in the Queen's Speech that the discussion over the alterations to the Royal Succession shall be continued with the heads of governments of the Commonwealth Realms, and other Commonwealth countries²². It has been already initiated and it centres on the right of women to inherit the throne on the same conditions as men (breaking the rule of male

²⁰ *Queen's Speech: New Measures to Boost Economy*, BBC News, May 9, 2012: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-18005246>.

²¹ *The Queen's Speech 2012*: "A Bill will be brought forward to reform the composition of the House of Lords".

²² *The Queen's Speech 2012*: "My Government will continue to work with the fifteen other Commonwealth Realms to take forward reform of the rules governing succession to the Crown."

primogeniture), and additionally on the elimination of the exclusion of the Catholics from the succession²³.

Importantly, **there is a law on defamation to be introduced**²⁴. It is intended to protect the freedom of speech and reform libel law in England and Wales. The Bill is intended to ensure a “fair balance” between freedom of expression and protection of reputation. Currently, a person suing for defamation does not have to prove the words they are complaining about have caused them actual damage, it is enough for the courts that they might. Under the new law, once it is passed, the claimants will have to show they have suffered serious harm before suing for defamation. The presumption in favour of a trial by jury will also be removed. There will also be a protection for “responsible publication on matters of public interest”. The bill will provide greater protection to operators of websites hosting user-generated content, as long as they are in compliance with the necessary procedure to “resolve any dispute” directly with the author of the material concerned. The draft bill, published in March last year, also aims at addressing “libel tourism” by tightening the test to be applied by the courts in relation to actions involving people who are not domiciled in the UK, or in the EU member states²⁵.

There also was announced an introduction of the **European Union** (Approval of Treaty Amendment Decision) Bill in order to enable the creation of the European Stability Mechanism as a permanent means to support Eurozone Member States facing gross problems. Importantly, the ESM will exempt the UK from a new European bailout agreement

²³ *Rules of Royal Succession: Eleventh Report of Session 2010–12*, House of Commons Political and Constitutional Reform Committee, HC 1615 (London: The Stationery Office Ltd., 7 December 2011).

²⁴ *The Queen’s Speech 2012*: “Legislation will be introduced to protect freedom of speech and reform the law of defamation”.

²⁵ *New Defamation Bill ‘to protect freedom of speech’*, BBC News, May 9, 2012: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-18005317>.

between Eurozone countries²⁶. The other bill concerning EU policies that was announced in the Queen's Speech was of even more technical character and is to complete the ratification of the Croatia's accession treaty, although the bill also provides for new measures enabling tighter control of the immigration to the UK from EU's new Member States. However, observing activities of the backbench MPs from both the Tory and the Labour parties, it might be expected that the debates concerning UK's continued membership in the EU and its conditions will become very much heated²⁷.

The announced priorities concerning Britain's international position may be judged as continuing already well established trends, with special emphasis on building of the strategic partnerships with the emerging powers.

As long as successes of the Lib Dems are concerned, we may point at two issues. First, there is a government pledge that the level of the foreign development aid will be set in actual spending at 0.7% GNI²⁸, which was originally the Lib Dems' manifesto pledge and which became now part of Government's agenda. Importantly, however, this

²⁶ *The Queen's Speech 2012*: "My Government will seek the approval of Parliament relating to the agreed financial stability mechanism within the euro area."

²⁷ See: *European Communities Act 1972 (Repeal) Bill* [Conservative]; *European Union Act 2011 (Amendment) Bill* [Conservative]; *Human Rights Act 1998 (Repeal and Substitution) Bill* [Conservative]; *Referendum (European Union) Bill* [House of Lords - Labour], available at: *Bills before Parliament 2012-13*, <http://services.parliament.uk/bills/>.

²⁸ *The Queen's Speech 2012*: "My Government has set out firm plans to spend nought point seven per cent of gross national income as official development assistance from 2013. This will be the first time the United Kingdom has met this agreed international commitment". *Liberal Democrat Manifesto 2010: Change that Works for You. Building a Fairer Britain*, London 2010 (http://network.libdems.org.uk/manifesto2010/libdem_manifesto_2010.pdf): "We will meet the UK's obligations to the developing world by committing to spending 0.7 per cent of GNI on aid." (p. 57).

pledge came short of being set in law, which was Lib Dems' intention²⁹. Secondly, there is a pledge to create a Green Investment Bank³⁰, which, on one hand, is to promote protection of the environment and investment into technologies aimed at gaining this objective, and, on the other hand, however, it is also intended to promote development of new, more efficient technologies, and through this means the general economic growth and competitiveness of Britain. What was expected to be on Government's agenda, and what was missing in the last Queen's Speech, is the issue of gay marriages, which was quite important for the Lib Dems, but which was clearly opposed with success by the Conservatives.

Interestingly in light of the Scottish independence referendum, there was also a pledge of close cooperation of HM Government with the devolved administrations³¹. This was intended as a counterbalance to the SNP's tactics of turning the referendum into a plebiscite on the current UK Government, and on the Conservative agenda, which remain highly unpopular in Scotland, with the Conservatives holding after the 2010 General Election just a single seat out of Scotland's 59 ones³². There is, therefore, a general feeling that if the Conservative-led UK Government interfered more actively with the

²⁹ C. Mason, *Queen's Speech: What It Means - and What's Been Left Out*, BBC News, May 9, 2012: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-18002992>.

³⁰ *The Queen's Speech 2012*: "My Government will introduce legislation to establish a Green Investment Bank". *Liberal Democrat Manifesto 2010: Change that Works for You. Building a Fairer Britain* (London 2010), Priority No. 2 (p. 7); "To help the transition to a green economy over the longer-term, we will set up a United Kingdom Infrastructure Bank (UKIB) to attract private finance – essential to delivering the much-needed expansion of Britain's transport and energy infrastructure when public finances are tight." (p. 24).

³¹ *The Queen's Speech 2012*: "My Government will continue to work constructively and cooperatively with the devolved institutions".

³² See: *Election 2010*, BBC News: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/election2010/results/region/7.stm>.

referendum, this would actually play into the hands of the SNP and bring the anti-unionist cause more and more popular support.

In the conclusion of his speech Dr Biskup stated that the last Queen's Speech seems conservative, not by its party affiliation, however, but rather due to the self-limitation of the Government. It still focuses on the economy, which was confirmed on many occasions by the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and a number of Cabinet Ministers, who made absolutely clear that it is still the balancing of the budget deficit, reducing the public debt, and making the economy grow again which is absolutely the UK's principal problem and the Government's top priority. Second of all, there were very few things on this agenda that would be openly divisive for the Conservative Party, or for the governing coalition. Even such potentially divisive issues as the House of Lords reform proved to be presented in the form that has been acceptable to the Tory backwoodsmen. This leads to a conclusion that the continuance of the coalition is still of considerable value to both of the Tory party and to the Lib Dems, despite all the differences between their programmes and agendas. As the last Local Elections have demonstrated, both parties are held responsible by the electors for the austerity programme, and they are bound together for next three years in hope that their economic programme will finally bring the Britons steady growth before the next General Election of 2015.

The third presentation during the second part of the panel was presented by Dr Małgorzata Kaczorowska, who analysed the balance of the two years of the Coalition Government in the light of the Local Elections 2012.

At the beginning of her presentation, Dr Kaczorowska said that she would not analyse all aspects of the Local Elections which were held this year and that she would rather focus on their impact on the balance of two years of the Coalition Government. Since the election took place

two years after the start of the coalition, it was the so-called *mid-term election*.

According to Dr Kaczorowska, after the Local Elections 2012 we can see that there is a little rise in support for the Labour Party (around 1 point) in comparison to the previous election of 2011. In fact, the Labour Party became the winner of the elections, thanks to obtaining more seats in the councils and winning majority in two of them. They have got 39 per cent of votes cast, while the Conservative Party have got 31 per cent of the votes, and Liberal Democrats got about 16 per cent. Dr Kaczorowska stated that when we compare the results of Local Elections 2012 in greater detail, they become even more interesting. For example, in London the Liberal Democrats took the fourth place after the Green Party. She recalled also the contribution of Professor Bale who was talking about the Green Party which appeared after last general elections in the House of Commons.

Dr Kaczorowska's opinion, Local Elections are like a barometer which helps to check a level of popularity of political parties and level of support for the politics in general. Of course, it is different when we look at a local aspect and we should remember about a few things when we want to talk about assessment of the Coalition Government in the United Kingdom. Local Elections are a kind of political event which is very important for researchers, which allows them to assess last two years but, in her opinion, it is not a perfect tool to predict the composition of the next Parliament after the General Election of 2015.

Dr Kaczorowska said that it was clear from the very moment of the Coalition Government's formation that there would be a big question concerning its efficiency and stability. Many people in Britain expected that government will stay in the office maybe for a year, maybe for a shorter time, and that the General Election will follow soon. There was also a big question what will be the future of such a structure. When we try to compare the two government parties and we look at them after two years of their cooperation, we still see many differences. Naturally, both parties share also some characteristics, e.g., the leaders of the same age.

Dr Kaczorowska pointed also out that from the very beginning of the Coalition Government we could see some key problems endangering the Coalition Government's survival. One of the biggest original differences between the Tories and the Lib Dems has been their approach to the European Union and the role of Britain in this organisation. Dr Kaczorowska expressed her belief that this problem was a real obstacle during the coalition negotiations. Then, there were the issues of the economic crisis and the budget proposed just after the General Election 2010. The budget contained major restrictions concerning the public spending and it was very difficult for everyone in the United Kingdom to accept the proposed cuts. There was also the issue of the electoral reform based on introduction of the Alternative Voting System.

According to Dr Kaczorowska, the referendum on the AV voting system demonstrated how to play the partner in the coalition. Despite the fact that the concept of the referendum was the Lib Dems' brain child, it was on the initiative of the Conservatives that the actual vote took place in just one-year's time after the General Election 2010, without time left for a thorough political campaign. The referendum demonstrated also the Liberal Democrats' weakness deriving from this party's short "institutional memory" of government. The Liberal Democrats, who did not held power in the UK since the beginnings of the 20th century, seemed to forget how it is to be in government.

Dr Kaczorowska said that when she was in London the day after vote, she noted very important and very interesting reaction of the media. Experts and journalists discussed whether it was possible that results of Local Elections 2012 could cause the end of the coalition. Then, at the same time, on the front pages of newspapers there was information about the consensus within the coalition upon the reform of the National Health Service.

In the conclusion of her presentation, Dr Kaczorowska commented upon the popularity of the Conservatives and eventual chances of Mr. Cameron to win the second term in 2015. She said that the Conservative Party has had about 10-point advantage over the Labour Party. According to her, this advantage is not significant and it will change.

When one wants to assess the past two years, one should remember that many reforms undertaken by the Coalition Government are still under realisation. When we talk about Tony Blair's government, we remember him as a reformer of the Constitution. Many specialists say that this coalition attempts to do much more because it has a stronger mandate and is forced by very tough economic situation. Dr Kaczorowska expressed her partial agreement with these assessments, but she also said the one still must remember about the difference between the Blair-Brown and the Cameron-Clegg governments, especially about economic situation and the fact that the present British government is a coalition government.

The fourth contribution in the panel's second part was presented by Dr Krzysztof Winkler of the Research Group *BRITANNIA* and treated on Queen's Diamond Jubilee as a Commonwealth event.

In 2012 the United Kingdom had only the second opportunity in its history to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee of its monarch. Queen Elizabeth II has reigned for sixty years and during this time she has been a symbol of changes taking place in Britain and in the world. When the Queen took the throne in 1952, Britain still had a great empire and was one of the leading global powers. Now, the United Kingdom remains an important part of the European Union, but it has lost most of its prominence in the world. After the Second World War the UK had to acknowledge the role of the United States as the global leader. Nowadays, there are new challenges to be faced by the UK, like the growing role of China and India. The Jubilee takes place when Britain has to fight against another wave of economic crisis and when the Coalition Government is trying to impose austerity measures to fix British economy.

Dr Winkler stated that events planned for Jubilee could be seen as a way to give some kind of entertainment for the British

people in the time of austerity. This is also an occasion for the Royal Family to gain more popularity after years of failures and problems. These events are taking place one year after the wedding of the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge. That event was very successful for the Royal Family and has shown its new face, proving that the British monarchy is prepared for the challenges of the 21st century. As in case of the wedding, the Diamond Jubilee events were covered not only by the British media but by foreign too, including the leading Polish ones. The members of the Royal Family have good press in the world media in the recent time and it is their merit that the Royal Family and the Jubilee have such a good appeal among the people. In Dr Winkler's opinion, a significant part of interest in the Jubilee and the Royal Family is being driven by tabloids and women's magazines, and is connected not only with Her Majesty, but also with the Duchess of Cambridge. Nonetheless some articles covering the Jubilee appeared also in the newspapers. That shows that in Europe the Jubilee is the event too. We, who live on the Continent, know that something unique is happening across the English Channel.

According to Dr Winkler, from the very beginning of 2012, members of the Royal Family have been travelling around the world and they have visited most of the countries belonging to the Commonwealth. On their path there have been such countries as: India, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, New Guinea, Singapore, Malaysia, South Africa, the Falklands Islands and, in Europe, Malta and Gibraltar. The Royal Couple have been travelling only around Britain, while other members of the Royal Family have travelled across the Commonwealth. In Britain, the events participated by the Queen, have been also attended by representatives from many parts of the world, including Asia, Africa and America. Dr Winkler stated that this is a visible sign that the Queen is still present in many countries as the Head of the Commonwealth or head of state (e.g., Canada, Australia).

The Commonwealth of Nations is an interesting institution which was born from the colonial rule but which still exists on changed rules nowadays. It was established in 1926-1931 upon the

Statutes of Westminster. It was an answer to raising position of the Dominions within the Empire. In the aftermath of the Second World War and decolonization it became an international organisation in which most of the former British colonies are associated. Designed as an embodiment of Britishness, it is now one of the most multinational organisations of the world, second only to the UN. The British heritage still plays an important role in cementing the organisation, together with the English language, because contacts between politicians are much easier when they share the same language, and the Queen.

Her Majesty is the Head of the Commonwealth. The London Declaration of 1949 stated that the British monarch is the symbol of a free association of independent countries. The Queen is the head of state in 16 out of 54 countries belonging to the Commonwealth. If the Queen dies or abdicates, her heir will not automatically become the new head of the Commonwealth however. It will be up to the Commonwealth heads of government to decide what to do about this symbolic role³³. The Queen's role now includes, owing to the developing tradition, a number of symbolic functions which enhance the sense of the family ties within the Commonwealth. She holds discussions with the Commonwealth leaders in their national capitals, in London and during the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meetings (CHOGM). She visits the host country during each CHOGM summit, meets the leaders at individual audiences and at larger formal receptions. The Queen plays a very important role in preserving the unity of the Commonwealth. The Queen is one of few official institutions existing in this organization, even as the symbolic Head of the Commonwealth. Because the Commonwealth does not have a strict formula, it is possible that republics, which are its members, accept the Queen in her capacity of the Head of the Commonwealth.

³³

Head of Commonwealth:
http://www.thecommonwealth.org/Internal/191086/150757/head_of_the_commonwealth/.

From the very beginning of her reign, the Queen has known much about Commonwealth activity. She also acknowledged the changes which happened in this organisation. Until 1955, in every speech delivered by the Queen on the Commonwealth appeared the words: "Empire" and "Commonwealth". After this date, the word "Empire" has never been used. The Queen has her own view on how this organisation should work. Her speeches are not written with advice of any head of the Commonwealth or the United Kingdom Prime Minister. This part of the prerogative is one of the most freely exercised by the Queen. The speeches are, however, customarily sent to the UK Prime Minister.

Dr Winkler pointed out that the Queen has made almost 300 journeys abroad, most of them to the Commonwealth states (above 200 visits). As a consequence she has visited all member countries of the Commonwealth apart from Cameroon and Mozambique. She is trying to participate in every important event taking place in the Commonwealth countries. She also opens the Commonwealth Games. During her Silver Jubilee in 1977 she made the trip around the world and took part in the celebrations which remarked this events. In the same year there was the CHOGM summit held in London. Now, unlike in 1977, she cannot go herself to all Commonwealth states. Therefore, as it was mentioned above, she is represented by other members of the Royal Family

Since the post of the Secretary General of the Commonwealth Secretariat was established the Queen has been receiving reports from his activities. When the additional information is required, the royal staff is sending questions concerning detailed issues. In many documents preserved in the archives of Commonwealth institutions there are signs of Queen's vital interest in their activities. Many politicians who took positions in the Commonwealth Secretariat emphasise value of the monarch in continuing intergovernmental cooperation and keeping the Commonwealth together. Likewise many authors indicate that Queen have played an important role in decolonisation process, not least because of her position as a symbolic Head of the Commonwealth.

Besides these symbolic roles, the Queen may use three mechanisms by which she can influence the situation in the Commonwealth. These are: (1) direct consultation between the Queen and the key politicians (this kind of meeting usually takes place during the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting); (2) official Queen's speeches (she may indicate the directions in which this organisation should direct its efforts); (3) decisions and communicates (the best-known case was the announcement that Queen would take part in the CHOGM meeting in 1979 in Lusaca, which forced Prime Minister Thatcher to take part in this meeting too).

The Queen is also the head of the Anglican Church, both in the Isles and globally, as the Church of England remains the Mother Church of the Anglican Communion. According to the latest research made by BBC, most of the British citizens support this position. The hierarchy of the Anglican Church strongly supports her due to the deep crisis in the Church in recent years. The main issue is the clash between "conservative" and "liberal" wings. Many members of the Anglican Church are converting to Roman Catholicism because of changes made in recent time in the Church of England. The number of worshippers in the UK is declining, so the role of the monarch has become more important as a symbol of faith. Royal commitment to the Church of England can be an important example for the rest of believers to stay in the Church and to rejuvenate it.

The Queen plays also an important role in the domestic politics. Dr Winkler made a remark that she is the symbol of British unity. Even Mr. Salmond took part in the Jubilee celebrations. According to Dr Winkler, it is a truism that in Britain monarch reigns but not rules, but as the Queen has such a long experience, she could deliver a valuable advice for the government.

The peak of the Jubilee celebrations in Britain took place on June 3-5, 2012. There was the pageant of many vessels sailing down the Thames, parading before the purpose-designed Royal Barge. There were also street parties, military parades and music concerts. On the

final day there was also a special service in St. Paul's cathedral. They were all a vigorous demonstration that the British monarchy is still alive.

The last presentation in the second part of the panel was made by Dr Tomasz Czapiewski who provided an analysis on the Scottish National Party and the Scottish Executive leadership of Alex Salmond. Dr Czapiewski started from making remark that we know little about Alex Salmond's private life although he is of a celebrity. According to Dr Czapiewski, Salmond is often accused of being a spinning machine. One of the Scottish journalists, J. Sillars wrote: "He was only a spin machine, spinning in a policy vacuum". One side of his celebrity image is his friendship with Sean Connery, who promotes the idea of Scotland's independence. Connery was also a financial supporter of the SNP. Then, Salmond, is ironically called by some people "*el presidente Salmondo*", in comparison to dictators in South America. Dr Czapiewski recalled also the statements of Salmond who said that he had been the first one who had started the process of depriving Margaret Thatcher of power. According to Dr Czapiewski, the Lockerby Affair was one of the key moments in the relationship between Blair and Salmond. Salmond did not call him after winning the election. However, Salmond and Cameron called each other.

Dr Czapiewski raised also the issue of conflict over the Scottish independence referendum. He said that question for referendum proposed by the SNP was: "Do you think Scotland should be an independent country?". In his opinion, the Tories and the UK government will not agree for such question because it promotes "yes" answer. According to Dr Czapiewski, without Alex Salmond in the UK politics, the fate of the UK would be very different. Dr Czapiewski does not see an alternative leader in the SNP who could take Salmond's place successfully. Without Alex Salmond, Scottish independence would be much further away.

Dr Czapiewski said that Alex Salmond presents himself as a business-friendly politician. As he pointed out, Salmond maintains that he wants to bring new jobs to Scotland. He presented himself as a friend of Robert Murdoch and Donald Trump because the latter one wants to create a big leisure and golf centre in Scotland. The friendship with Trump has come to an end in last few months because of the decision to build windmills in Scotland which will destroy these hopes of Trump to build the leisure centre. On the other hand, in the last few years Mr. Murdoch has become a controversial person in the UK due to the “News of the World” phone hacking scandal. In Scotland Mr. Salmond was seriously accused of lobbying in favour of Mr. Murdoch.

Dr Czapiewski also pointed out that Salmond likes to describe himself as the “Celtic Lion”. Dr Czapiewski recalled that the worse moment of Salmond’s career was in 1982, when he was banned from the SNP for 6 months because of left-wing sectarianism. Lost elections in 1999 and 2000 were another tough moments for Salmond. Dr Czapiewski mentioned also Salmond’s critic of intervention in Kosovo and campaign of “Penny for Scotland” which turned out to be a total failure. After that Salmond decided to resign from the leadership of the SNP for four years. Fortunately for him, the SNP decreased in popularity and election votes in that time, which cleared his return path to power.

In the conclusion of his presentation, Dr Czapiewski said that Alex Salmond sees independence not as a revolution and one moment in time but rather as a journey, or a process, because in the 21st century notion of independence is not so clear as it was, e.g. 100 years ago.

The second part of the panel was concluded by a lively discussion open to members of the public.

The panel was concluded by a short address by Professor Franciszek Gołembski, who thanked all the speakers and other

participants for their contributions, for the questions and the following discussion.

* * *

In the course of the panel there were presented the findings and the data collected within the framework of the research projects sponsored by the National Science Centre: *Influence of Devolution on the United Kingdom's European Policy: From Imperial to Post-Imperial Solutions* (research grant No. N N116 712540, project leader: Professor Franciszek Gołemski) and *Influence of British Political Identity on the United Kingdom's Participation in European Integration Projects* (research grant No. N N116 434237, project leader: Dr Przemysław Biskup).

The panel report was prepared by Dr Przemysław Biskup on the basis of his notes and the extended abstracts prepared by the speakers. The Organising Committee wishes to express their gratitude to Mrs. Katarzyna Ochman M.A. for the most valuable assistance offered in the course of preparation of the Panel Report.

THE ORGANISING COMMITTEE

Chairperson of the Organising Committee: Dr Przemysław Biskup (Chair of European Studies).

Committee Coordinator: Dr Wojciech Lewandowski (Chair of European Studies).

Committee Members: Dr Małgorzata Kaczorowska (Institute of Political Science), Dr Krzysztof Winkler (Research Group *BRITANNIA*), Mrs. Anna Krawczyk M.A. (Faculty of Journalism and Political Science), Mr. Jarosław Szczepański M.A. (Faculty of Journalism and Political Science).

Supporting Members: Mr. Rafał Kamiński M.A. (Research Group *BRITANNIA*), Mr. Grzegorz Gogowski M.A. (Research Group *BRITANNIA*).

Polish Journal of Political Science. Working Papers

www.pjps.pl