

Table of Contents

1	A momentum of double politicisation	9
1.1	A parliamentary alternative for European integration	9
1.2	The Ad Hoc Assembly	10
1.3	Politicisation as a perspective on Europeanisation	12
1.4	Supranational politicisation	14
1.5	Parliamentary politicisation	16
1.6	Research agenda and practices of analysis	20
1.7	Plan of the book and acknowledgements	23
2	Parliament in post-war European projects	25
2.1	Post-war pro-European projects	25
2.2	The Hague Congress	27
2.2.1	The ‘Political Report’ and the ‘Political Resolution’	27
2.2.2	‘European Deliberative Assembly’	32
2.3	‘European Parliamentary Union’	34
2.4	A professorial draft for the European Constitution	35
3	The Council of Europe	38
3.1	The Concept of Europe in the Treaty of London	39
3.2	The Consultative Assembly	40
3.3	A federalist critique: André Philip	44
3.4	Committee plans for supranationalism	46
4	European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC)	48
4.1	From the Schuman Declaration to the ECSC	48
4.2	The Paris Treaty	51
4.2.1	The High Authority	52
4.2.2	The Common Assembly	54
4.2.3	The Council of Ministers	57
4.3	The Common Assembly plenum in September 1952	59
4.3.1	Opening declarations	60
4.3.2	The Rules of procedure	63

4.3.3	Parliamentary powers of the Common Assembly	66
5	Setting up the Ad Hoc Assembly	68
5.1	The political impulse	68
5.2	Remarks on studies on the Ad Hoc Assembly	71
5.3	The Ad Hoc Assembly debate in the Common Assembly	74
5.4	Constitution-writing by parliamentarians	77
5.5	The members of the Ad Hoc Assembly	79
5.6	The organisation of the Ad Hoc Assembly	84
5.7	The Ad Hoc Assembly as a parliamentary institution	89
6	The Politics of Naming	90
6.1	Naming rhetoric	90
6.2	Naming disputes	91
6.2.1	European Political Community	91
6.2.2	Self-naming of the Ad Hoc Assembly	95
6.2.3	European Parliament	97
6.3	Naming the polity	102
7	A supranational polity	105
7.1	A colourful conceptual history	105
7.2	Supranationalism in early European integration	107
7.3	Supranationalism in the Ad Hoc Assembly	108
7.3.1	Against nationalism	108
7.3.2	Supranationalism vs. intergovernmentalism	110
7.3.3	The delegation paradigm	114
7.3.4	The parliamentary condition	117
7.3.5	Europeanisation as freedom from dependence	119
7.4	Supranational policies	121
7.4.1	Economic policies	121
7.4.2	Foreign policy	124
7.4.3	Full and associated members	126
7.5	Supranational politicisation	127

8	The European Parliament	131
8.1	Histories of parliamentarisation	131
8.2	The Parliament of the Community	132
8.2.1	The organisation of Parliament	133
8.2.2	The bicameral system	140
8.2.3	Legislation and initiative	142
8.3	The Peoples' Chamber	145
8.3.1	Direct elections	145
8.3.2	Proportional or majority representation	151
8.3.3	The distribution of seats	155
8.4	The Senate	158
8.4.1	A parliamentary chamber	158
8.4.2	Parity or balancing of seats	162
8.4.3	Membership and term length	164
8.5	Towards a supranational parliament	168
9	The European government	170
9.1	Council of National Ministers	170
9.2	The European Executive Council	176
9.2.1	Composition, powers, activity	176
9.2.2	Election and parliamentary responsibility	178
9.3	A draft for a European parliamentary government	185
10	Towards a supranational and parliamentary Europe	190
10.1	Parliamentary virtues of the Ad Hoc Assembly	190
10.2	Proposals for empowering the Parliament	192
10.2.1	The Vedel Report	192
10.2.2	The Spinelli Project	200
10.3	The legacy of the Ad Hoc Assembly	205
	References	210
	Index of actors	219
	Index of concepts	221

1 A momentum of double politicisation

This book analyses a historical momentum that combines two projects for politicising the European order – supranationalism and parliamentarism – which were joined in the debates of the so-called Ad Hoc Assembly from September 1952 to March 1953. The Ad Hoc Assembly, formally the ‘Ad Hoc Assembly Instructed to Work Out a Draft Treaty Setting up a European Political Community’ drafted a Constitution for the European Political Community (EPC) and, in doing so, combined the two politicisation projects in a unique way to propose a supranational parliamentary government for six European countries. My aim is to write the history of this double politicisation project for European integration and to discuss the political theories included in it.

1.1 A parliamentary alternative for European integration

The European Parliament (EP) is today regarded as the most important supranational parliamentary institution in the world. For parliamentary scholars, the EP is still lacking many criteria of a parliamentary government, although it has gained new powers in the European Union (EU). My point is to recover a parliamentary alternative from the past for West European integration, one originally proposed by parliamentarians from the ‘Europe of the Six’ (member states of the European Coal and Steel Community) when debating a constitutional draft for the EPC in the Ad Hoc Assembly’s plenum and committees.

Applying parliamentary principles to a supranational polity was an unprecedented objective. Acting as a parliamentary-style institution, the Ad Hoc Assembly members sketched out different ideas as well as specific proposals on how to realise a supranational parliamentarism for the EPC. Many of the proposals were not included in the Assembly’s Draft Treaty of 10 March 1953, although some of them were realised later, and others remain on the agenda for parliamentarising the present EU. The parliamentary character of the debates is shown in the willingness of the Ad Hoc Assembly members to listen to the arguments and occasionally to change their stands, largely independently of the party affiliation or nationality of the members.

In his *Liberty before Liberalism* Quentin Skinner reminds us of the value of ‘bringing buried intellectual treasure back to the surface’ (1998, 112). The Ad Hoc Assembly’s debates on the constitutional draft offer me an excellent case of lost treasures in parliamentary and supranational politics. Max Weber emphasises that, among the unrealised possibilities, there are what he calls ‘objective possibilities’ which could have been realised (esp. Weber 1906, 269–

275), and historians should always include them in their judgements about the past. For politicians, the situation is always open for *Chancen*, that is, for possibilities, opportunities, occasions or options (see Weber 1904, 145–146; Palonen 2010 and Tribe 2023), and these existed also for the parliamentarians debating in the Ad Hoc Assembly. This study of unrealised ‘objective possibilities’ analyses not merely abstract constructions, but a thoroughly debated project for choosing a parliamentary alternative for a supranational Europe.

The debates of the Ad Hoc Assembly contain a range of ideas and proposals worth considering for the parliamentarisation of the EU today. The *Wertbeziehung* (in the sense of Weber 1917a) of this study consists of the superiority of the parliamentary style of politics over others, such as presidential regime, government by experts, intergovernmental negotiation assembly or plebiscitarian populist movements. Besides a system of government, the parliamentary way of doing politics (see Palonen 2018) includes procedural, rhetorical and temporal aspects of debating politics based on members who are free from dependence (in the sense of Skinner 1998). These wider aspects of parliamentary politics were rather implied, if not made explicit, by the Ad Hoc Assembly.

1.2 The Ad Hoc Assembly

The first supranational institution in Europe after the Second World War was the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), based on the Treaty of Paris from 1951. Its parliamentary angle was the Common Assembly, which could, by a qualified majority, dismiss the executive High Authority by a vote of no confidence when debating the annual report. As marginal as this possibility appeared, it nonetheless opened a perspective on extending parliamentary government to a supranational level. When the Common Assembly met in September 1952, it immediately attempted to act like a real parliament, seeking to increase its own powers within the ECSC.

The Ad Hoc Assembly was a proto-parliamentary institution, set up by the Council of Foreign Ministers of the six ECSC member states (France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands). It was composed of members of the Common Assembly, complemented with a few additional parliamentarians from France, West Germany and Italy as well as observers from Council of Europe member countries outside the ECSC.

The ECSC ministers gave to the Ad Hoc Assembly the task of drafting a Constitution for the European Political Community (EPC). This new political community would serve as a political backup for the ECSC and the European Defence Community (EDC), which the six governments had agreed to launch.

The point was to avoid the weaknesses of the still-intergovernmental Council of Europe with its merely advisory Consultative Assembly, and of the ECSC, in which the supranational executive, High Authority, was not a government of politicians and was exposed only to weak parliamentary control. After thorough debates, the Ad Hoc Assembly's majority agreed that the Constitution of the European Political Community should be based on a supranational parliamentary system, on a European Government responsible to a European Parliament.

For instituting a supranational parliamentary government, no direct historical or theoretical models were available. For writing the Draft Treaty for the European Political Community, the Ad Hoc Assembly was obliged to be politically innovative. A solution as to how to apply the principles, institutions and practices of parliamentary government at the supranational level had to be invented and deliberated. The Ad Hoc Assembly members created an agenda for debating the setup of such a system of government, and the debate itself saw moves put forward for different alternatives regarding the parliament, the electoral system and the election and dismissal of the European government; ultimately, institutions and procedures were chosen for establishing a parliamentary government for Europe.

The Ad Hoc Assembly, with its debates and the Draft Treaty of 10 March 1953, marks a unique event in the history of the European integration. The details of its work never attracted much interest among European integration or parliamentary scholars. Nonetheless, the debates and documents of the Ad Hoc Assembly have been collected and are available in a digitised form at the website of the European University Institute in Florence. The EUI archive is, of course, a sign that a scholarly interest in the politics of the Ad Hoc Assembly could be expected (see section 5.2).

With this background knowledge, I decided to write a book on the politicisation of the concept of Europe – restricted to the six ECSC member states – based on debates and documents of the Ad Hoc Assembly. As a Weberian style of political theorist willing to speculate with my own political imagination, I want to study the Ad Hoc Assembly's work as an exemplar of parliamentary debate and to interpret its debates and documents as an extraordinary application of the idea of parliamentary government to a supranational polity. With this study, I hope to contribute to the conceptual history and political theory of supranational and parliamentary politics, analysing the debates and documents of the Ad Hoc Assembly as the still most comprehensive full-scale project for a European parliamentary government.

1.3 Politicisation as a perspective on Europeanisation

The guiding conceptual principle of this book lies in the claim that Europeanisation is to be understood as a politicisation of an existing order, of a regime based on nation-states and intergovernmental relations between them. The alternative proposed by the Ad Hoc Assembly was for the creation of a supranational parliamentary polity. I consider this double, parliamentary-cum-supranational momentum to be an exemplar of politicisation of the European integration.

Since the 1980s, I have written extensively on the conceptual history of politics as an activity-concept (versus politics as a sphere-concept, see esp. Palonen 2006, 2021) and on ideal-typical reflections on the aspects of this concept (esp. Palonen 2003). From this perspective, politicisation does not signify extending ‘the boundaries of the political’, as Charles S. Maier (1987) put it, in relation to other sphere-concepts, such as law, economy or religion. When politics is considered as an activity, as in ‘dealing with the contingent event’, to quote John Pocock (1975, 156), then politics can also be found elsewhere than in what is traditionally considered politics, or ‘polity’ in the sense of Karl Rohe (1978/1994). The conceptual history of politics in connection with the democratisation and parliamentarisation of polities (see Steinmetz 2018), especially since the second half of the nineteenth century in Europe, can be written in terms of rhetorical *topoi* concerning politics as an activity (see Palonen 2006, 2012, 2021).

Rohe interpreted the German concept of *Politik* with three English nouns, to all of which the adjective ‘political’ was related, namely ‘politics’, ‘policy’ and ‘polity’ (1978/1994, 61–81). I revised his triad by interpreting the activity of politics in terms of a concept of contingency corresponding to Max Weber’s concept of *Chance*, related to opportunities, occasions or options as well as realisable ‘objective possibilities’ (see Palonen 1998, 2010). My interpretation includes the aspect of *politicking*, as a rhetorically neutralised expression à la W.B. Gallie (1973). With these moves, I understand the activity of politics as an umbrella concept for a typology consisting of four aspects: politicisation, polity, politicking and policy (Palonen 2003; on applying this scheme to Weber’s *Politik als Beruf*, see Palonen 2019a).

In this scheme, I understand *politicisation* as initial move that qualifies an action as political. From the activity perspective, politics is not ‘already there’ as a part of the ‘nature’ of an object or as a distinct parcel in the garden of concepts. On the contrary, what is called politics will be seen as the result of politicisations, that is, of a variety of contingency-opening moves of the actors as well as of contingency-identifying and -legitimising interpretations of existing states of affairs or trends.

In my 'Four Times' article (2003), I also discussed the relationship of the other aspects of politics to politicisation. To put it shortly, *polity* is a result of combining past moves and experiences of politicisation into what appears as a legitimate range of contingency; this can, however, be challenged by new politicising projects, which can gain legitimacy and thereby alter the polity. Each politicising move opens specific *Chancen* for *politicking*, or playing with these *Chancen* in actual use of the occasions and opportunities for action. *Policy* refers to a distinct normative-finalistic form of politicking, aiming at a coherent line, plan or programme, which is not always better than an opportunistic use of situations.

An exemplary and explicit form of moves for politicisation lies in setting a question onto a parliamentary agenda as a contingent and controversial item to be debated *pro et contra*; the debate follows specific procedures, for example, going through different debating rounds in plenary and committees, concluding in a vote on a resolution, which can be regarded as the final step in the debate. Agenda-setting might require specific procedures, time schedules and ways of formulating the question. The politicising potential of moving an item depends on its novelty and scope or reach as well as the ambition level of the item. Parliamentary agenda-setting provides the model for the less-regulated politicisation of new topics onto the agenda of debate in different contexts.

Politicisation can also occur less intentionally, as a politicising interpretation of some realised or ongoing changes of phenomena, including changes in the modes of thinking. Such an identification and judgement of an existing situation or historical trend opens new ways of politicking for the participating actors. A politicising interpretation of changes can dispute what is legitimate or practicable in the polity in question. In this sense, we can also speak of the politicisation of the experience or imagination of persons.

With this conceptual perspective, it is easy to understand how both the introduction of a supranational level and the parliamentarisation of supranational forms of politics are politicising moves. Supranationalism brought the political acting and thinking of European institutions to a new level, delimiting the powers and competence of the nation-states and creating new complex relationships between them and the European level. 'Level' can be understood both in the sense of a spatial metaphor of a broader or higher range for doing politics, and as a temporal concept of a demand to give to the European way of acting politically a different quality than the established practices of the member states. The question is not merely of a greater complexity, but of replacing the identity rhetoric of a nation-state by opening debates on what a politicised concept of Europe would be like and how it could be realised in different types of debates on institutions, procedures and practices.

The history of the parliamentarisation of government in Europe (see, for example, Turkka 2007; Selinger 2019; Ihalainen, Ilie and Palonen eds 2016; Benoit and Rozenberg eds 2020) itself marks a history of politicisation of the

ways of dealing with issues in an openly contingent and controversial manner. The setting up of a representative assembly is already a major step towards parliamentarisation of the polity and empowering it to elect and dismiss government is decisive for being able to speak of a parliamentary form of government (see Bagehot 1867/72, Weber 1918). The democratised form of parliamentarism presupposes the election of parliament by universal suffrage of all citizens. The parliamentary character of an assembly also depends on criteria such as fair procedures for thorough debates, the existence of a rhetorical culture capable of weighing the strengths and weaknesses of items for debate, the freedom of members from dependence (free mandate, free speech, freedom from arrest, free and fair elections) as well as enough of fair distribution of parliamentary time (see Palonen 2018).

This analytical and conceptual historical perspective on European politicisation has hardly anything to do with current studies of specialists on the EU's 'politicisation' since the 1990s, which have been marked by the rise of right-wing populist parties turning against the pro-European 'permissive consensus' (see, for example, De Wilde and Zürn 2012; Zürn 2016). Cécile Robert also contests the view by emphasising the expert powers of the European Commission as a form of de-politicisation, regarding their 'expertise as a way of doing politics [while] pretending not to' (2021, esp. 205–206). In more general terms, some of my close colleagues have also highlighted how European integration has, from its origins, been a political project (see Kauppi, Palonen and Wiesner 2016; Wiesner ed. 2019 and 2021; Haapala and Oleart eds 2022). This perspective on politicisation unifies the topics of supranationality and parliamentarism in a way that has very seldom been discussed in the scholarly literature (see, however, Guerrini 2014 on the ECSC's Common Assembly).

1.4 Supranational politicisation

The project for the European Political Community marked a politicisation through the challenge it posed to the nation-state paradigm by aiming at institutionalising a supranational European polity (for the six ECSC member states). It is an excellent example of a radical agenda-setting project that was shifting the unit of the polity itself. The idea of a supranational European polity with its own governmental and parliamentary institutions was new, and for the founders, it was unclear to what extent the citizens were ready to such politicising shifts in their thoughts and opinions in order to convincingly legitimise the new polity-level.

A supranational polity requires of institutions and procedures independent of those of the nation-state. Even if the ministers and officials of a supranational

parliament are also citizens of the member states, they must not be bound by an imperative mandate or by a veto power on the part of the member states, for only then may they enjoy a freedom from dependence corresponding to Skinner's concept of neo-Roman liberty (1998). Only such freedom enables the members of supranational institutions to think in 'European' terms.

In an ambitious sense, supranationalism aims at a de-nationalisation of politics and at de-legitimisation of the nation-state as the primary and quasi-natural polity. Supranational Europeanisation has required a constant struggle not only with nationalist thinking, but also with the inertia of vested interests, routines and conventions in existing polities, which must be overcome or neutralised. The point lies in the moment of break with the past, with the 'mythology of parochialism', to quote Quentin Skinner (1969) again, with a willingness to face an unknown future when institutionalising a supranational polity-level.

This politicising perspective on Europeanisation is not teleological: it dispenses with the projection of a future European unity. Europeanisation neither requires a consensus between political actors but presupposes procedures and rhetorical practices for dealing with the disputes regarding the dimensions of politicisation. The different styles or degrees of de-nationalisation can in principle be dealt by the parliamentary style of raising objections and making revisions.

My approach comes close to the view of Ulrich Beck and Edgar Grange on opening a new level of power struggle, implying the loss of many of those valid at the national level:

Mit der Europäisierung ist ein neues Machtspiel eröffnet worden, mit dem die alten, nationalen Machtspiele ihre Regeln und Grundbegriffe, ihre Substanz verloren haben, auch wenn einige politische Akteure sie immer noch weiterspielen. Kurz gesagt: Die Dauerkonflikte, die mit der Europäisierung zugleich geschürt wurden und gezähmt werden sollen, beziehen ihre politische Brisanz gerade darauf, dass die politischen Akteure gezwungen sind, ein neues Spiel zu spielen. (Beck and Grange 2004, 208–209)

The Ad Hoc Assembly hardly ever spoke about politics in the language of playing games. However, when facing the task of constructing supranational parliamentarism, playing with the political imagination was required from them, even if this was presented as a concern for stability and security.

When understood as politicisation, Europeanisation was moved from ideas and identities to procedures, practices and institutions. The forms of European de-nationalisation have not been settled into classical models such as federalism. A European 'we-consciousness' should not be understood as a common ground for action, but as a regulative idea, for which different options and institutional settings could be possible and worth debating. The political idea of Europe presupposes multiple and contested visions and interpretations.

The supranational organising principle is opposed to the inter-governmentalism characteristic of the ‘Westphalian’ order of great powers. The intergovernmental principle still shaped the League of Nations, the United Nations and their suborganisations, the OEEC, the NATO and, as mentioned, the Council of Europe. The European Political Community was intended to be supranational also in the legal sense of a unit that can sign international treaties and agreements.

Supranational Europeanisation still left important powers to the member states. The most common justification for the supranational polity in this context was member states’ agreeing to transfer a part of their sovereignty to the supranational polity. This required a demarcation of powers and competence as well as a procedure for dealing with disputes concerning them between the member state and European polity levels. The ‘question of Europe’ was expected to be a part of the domestic controversies of the member states.

1.5 Parliamentary politicisation

Historically, the parliamentary element played at most a secondary role in the post-war European movement. The supranational element in the European Coal and Steel Community was the High Authority, initially without a controlling parliamentary institution: the Common Assembly was only introduced after negotiations with the member states. In the later stage of European integration, the increased powers of the European Commission, a successor of the High Authority, have also been repeatedly defended against the Parliamentary Assembly, later renamed the European Parliament (see Schorkopf 2022; Robert 2021). For this reason, the work of the Ad Hoc Assembly, combining the parliamentary momentum with the supranational one, was exceptional.

To speak of the parliamentarisation of a new type of polity is to refer to a different politicisation than that of changing the political system of a country from a constitutional monarchy, a presidential system or a rule of officialdom (*Beamtenherrschaft*) to a parliamentary system (Weber 1918, 235–258). The immediate objective of European parliamentarisation was to overcome the intergovernmental model of most international institutions as well as the model of a non-partisan expert government.

A difficulty with the Europeanisation of the parliamentary style of politics was the historical link between parliament and national representation both in Westminster and in the continental European polities. Parliament in such a view refers not to a political practice of debating *pro et contra* but to a unified ‘people’ behind it. Edmund Burke’s strong defence of parliamentary autonomy in his speech to the electorate in Bristol rendered the deliberative assembly in a

‘national’ context: ‘Parliament is a deliberative Assembly of one Nation, with one Interest, that of the whole’ (Burke 1774, §105). In France, the representing *la nation une et indivisible* was even stronger, which has made deliberation *pro et contra* à la Westminster difficult to accept (see Gunn 2009), even the parliament’s name was Assemblée Nationale, and the Frankfurt Parliament of 1848 was officially called Nationalversammlung.

The assumption of the parliament as only a national institution was also a major obstacle for Britain to join supranational institutions, including the ECSC. In the British concept of representation, there have been strong ‘mimetic’ features (see Conti 2019). An alternative vision, as it is formulated by Frank Ankersmit, understands that representation itself is a political act that creates the represented and the representatives (see esp. Ankersmit 2002, 115), which can be regarded as a condition for an independent debating parliament. In this sense, ‘parliament’ refers to a way of doing politics in a ‘parliamentary’ manner, independently of whether on national, subnational or supranational level.

A supranational parliamentary government could not simply imitate the forms, practices and historical experiences of parliamentarisation. The route to parliamentary government has varied radically from country to country, and there exists no single set of criteria for judging whether a government fulfils to a sufficient degree the requirements for parliamentary government. It would be necessary to consider the given criteria in order to distinguish the parliamentary way of doing politics from other ways (see Palonen 2018).

There are some political criteria to distinguish an estate diet from a parliament. Historically, they refer to how the British Parliament lost its estate character in the late Middle Ages and how the revolutionary French parliament broke with the preceding assemblies. They are marked by the freedom of members from dependence, or Skinner’s neo-Roman concept of liberty (1998, 2002). The free, as opposed to imperative, mandate was a major dimension in these breaks (see Müller 1966, for France Tanchoux 2004), as well as freedom of speech in parliament (see Colclough 2005), freedom from arrest (parliamentary immunity) and free and fair elections (see Hexter 1992). Since the First World War free and fair parliamentary elections included universal male and female suffrage.

The parliamentary way of doing politics is characterised by its rules of procedure. These have been developed in Westminster since the seventeenth century and codified since the eighteenth century in the works of John Hatsell, Jeremy Bentham and Thomas Erskine May (see Redlich 1905 and Palonen 2014a). The Westminster style of parliamentarism has a multi-stage debate in plenum and in committees as the core of parliamentary process of politics, with the last step in debate being the final vote itself (see Griffith and Ryle 2003, 86).

The Francophone procedure, despite many similarities (see Pierre 1887), has always regarded debate merely as a preparation to the final decision by vote

(see the discussion in Palonen 2019b). Complementary to this procedural aspect lies parliamentary rhetoric, in which aesthetic eloquence is subordinated to political judgement, and the unit of rhetoric is not a speech, but a debate (see Palonen 2016).

Furthermore, parliamentary politics is also that of playing with time as a key element of political action. Time is built into the key parliamentary moves, from agenda-setting via presenting a motion to debate in multiple regulated stages, through interrupting the smooth advance of a motion by amendments, adjournments, raising questions of order, later the *clôture* for terminating the debate, and so on. From early on, Westminster has recognised the limits to parliamentary time, and it has proposed different regulations to deal with it. With parliamentary powers over everyday questions and with the democratisation of suffrage and membership, the scarcity of parliamentary time tended to paralyse parliaments, and new rules for distributing parliamentary time more fairly were required (See Redlich 1905; Vieira 2015; Palonen 2014a and 2018). The length of parliamentary sessions and the restrictions on speech and debate times radicalised the government vs. opposition divide in parliament, more recently with provisions in Westminster to strengthen the cross-party initiatives of backbenchers (see Wright 2012, Evans ed. 2017). An important consequence of the longer and more intensive parliamentary time after the Second World War was the professionalisation of the practices of parliamentary politics (See Borchert 2003, Palonen 2023).

Parliamentary-style politics contains other questions of how parliamentary government should be applied to a supranational polity. One of the lessons of the revolutionary parliament in the English Civil War was that a parliament itself cannot govern – such attempts have later in French been called pejoratively *régime d'assemblée* – but instead, parliament must appoint from among its members an executive committee, a government or a cabinet, as the political core of government is called in Britain (see Bagehot 1867/1872).

British history in the decades after the Glorious Revolution of 1688/89 contains a number of political innovations which together provided necessary conditions for the parliamentary government of Westminster. The monarch and the court retained a 'dignified' part in government, whereas the cabinet formed the 'efficient' part of it (Bagehot 1867/72, 9–10). The cabinet included the appointment of a Prime Minister and cabinet ministers from among the members of the Houses of Parliament (Selinger 2019), the formation of parties and, through them, the government versus opposition divide in parliament (Kluxen 1956; 1983, Skinner 1974). For the latter, a decisive feature were the first attempts to dismiss government by purely political grounds, as manifested in Sandys' Motion in 1741 (Turkka 2007); however, the principle that a cabinet that has lost the confidence of the parliamentary majority must resign or dissolve the parliament was finally affirmed only after the First Reform Act in 1835 (Andrén 1947). Only after that did the term 'parliamentary government'