

**CENTRAL EUROPEAN  
POLITICAL SCIENCE  
REVIEW**

**2020  
Fall**

**Quarterly of Central European Political Science Alliance**

**Volume: 21  
Number: 81**

# CONTENTS

## National Sovereignty and Social Welfare

<b>Introduction</b>	9
<b>Josep M. Colomer:</b> National Sovereignty is Over	11
<b>Gyöngyvér Hervainé Szabó:</b> Comparative Indicators of Economic and Social Welfare	17
<b>Anu Toots:</b> Saying Goodbye to Bismarck? – Transformation of the Estonian Welfare State in 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	35
<b>Károly Lóránt:</b> The Future of European Integration	55
<b>Imre Boros:</b> Romania and Geopolitical Questionmarks of Central Europe	77
<b>László Bogár:</b> An Unknown Protagonist: The Regime Change	87
<b>Ferenc Gazdag:</b> Three Decades of Hungarian Foreign Policy	99
<b>Américo Saldívar V.:</b> Exemplary People in Mexico and Hungary – Brief Comparative History from the Mexican Eye	121
<b>Tamás Hajnóczky:</b> Trianon and Revisionist Gypsy Musicians	129
<b>Reports and Conferences</b>	
UNITED Conference - <b>online conference in Oct. 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup></b>	143
12 <sup>th</sup> Roma Life Docfilm Fest - <b>Budapest, Hungary</b> <b>21 of Nov. 2020.</b>	145
<b>Book Reviews</b>	
Conversations About Leftism - with <b>Ágnes Heller</b> and <b>Miklós Gáspár Tamás</b> by <b>János Simon</b>	147
<b>Abstracts</b>	151
<b>About the contributors</b>	157

## INTRODUCTION

Our pleasure is to present to our readers the Vol. 21. No. 81 of **Central European Political Science Review** (CEPSR), whose the main topic is: NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY AND SOCIAL WELFARE. Three studies are dealing with the problem of sovereignty (J.M. Colomer, K. Lóránt, I. Boros) and two with the welfare (Gy. Hervainé and A. Toots).

In March 2020, we organized the great international conference: 30 Years in Freedom with 70 social scientists from all over the world, but unfortunately, we had to cancel the meeting because of the COVID in the last minute. In the current issue of **CEPSR**, we published several papers prepared to for the 30 Years in Freedom Conference.

The other studies of No. 81 of **CEPSR** are dealing with the consequence of regime change and the influence and political consequence of the past. The most of the studies is about the rule of the cultural and political dimensions in the present political life of Central European countries.

One of the main goals of the journal editorial board of the **Central European Political Science Review** is to make it available to the broadest circle of readers from among experts and persons with a serious interest in the issues of the unique space of Central Europe, from the different perspective of history, international relations, political science, sociology, anthropology, art-sociology and data-analysis respectively. One of the main reason for publishing the **CEPSR** is to serve and enhance the values of Central Europeanism, and Europeanism.

We suggest you to visit our website or contact with the assistant our editor: [www.cepsr.eu](http://www.cepsr.eu), [www.cepsr.hu](http://www.cepsr.hu), [kossuth.borbala@gmail.com](mailto:kossuth.borbala@gmail.com)

**János Simon**  
Editor-in-chief

## **National Sovereignty is Over**

### **Introduction**

To make the complexity of the current globalized world governable, the processes of decision-making must be simplified. Each of the multiple levels and sectors of government should deal with specific policy issues. None of them should claim jurisdiction over all policy and collective issues.

The model of multiple levels of government militates against the claim of unity of powers or “sovereignty,” which has become one of the most obsolete political concepts in the current world. The concept of sovereignty was coined long ago, by the mid-seventeenth century, by such luminaries like the English Thomas Hobbes and the French Jean Bodin, with the intention of justifying the strengthening of the central powers of the monarchy. The root “sover-” comes from the Latin “super,” or supreme. The monarch’s sover-eignty or supre-macy was conceived as “absolute” and the subsequent political regime as “absolutism.” That is why we still call –sometimes-- a current king or queen the “mon-arch,” that is the only or “mono-” holder of decision power, or “the sove-reign,” even if almost nobody enjoys such monistic or absolute powers nowadays.

### **Sovereignty**

Many currently existing constitutions enshrine “sovereignty” of the “people,” the “parliament,” the “nation” or the “state,” but the concept is the same as it was created centuries ago for the monarchs, only allocated now to somewhat different subjects. Sovereignty continues to be conceived as “absolute.” It implies that one single political body has the prerogative to make final decisions on all public issues within a clearly-bordered territory. In reality, almost no monarch, dictator, president, parliament, people, state or nation has this power nowadays.

Sovereignty is not what it was nor what it was assumed it would be. Today, international law is claimed to have direct effect on the citizens of every country; the global institutions’ work consists precisely in coordinating, shaping, approving and making public policies enforceable by the states, for which tasks they frequently

interfere in domestic affairs; almost all the states are deprived from the unlimited power to produce laws, which was implied by the notion of sovereignty.

The current world is not one in which states interact as independent entities but one of interdependence. When the campaigners for the United Kingdom to leave the European Union or Brexit spread the slogan “take back control” they implicitly acknowledged that the British government had lost the absolute control of its internal affairs, mainly although not only at the hands of the European Union. But the Brexiters discovered very soon that in a globalized world the government cannot control many public issues as it was presumed it would be.

Some politicians talk of “limited,” “shared,” “divided” or “partial” sovereignty when they face undeniable international memberships and commitments. Similar expressions are used sometimes to deal with internal divisions of powers between central and territorial governments in federal-type countries. Yet those expressions are an oxymoron. Sovereignty is absolute or it is not sovereignty; it cannot be shared or divided. The president of the European Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker, as well as the president of France Emmanuel Macron, sometimes encouraged a “European sovereignty.” With this, they acknowledged the erosion of nation-states’ sovereignty. But obviously, they did not mean that the states of Europe should submit all public policies to final decisions by the EU. What these and similar expressions by politicians at different levels intend to transmit is the wish that some level of government—local, national, continental or global—should be able to make final decisions on some issues. They are different issues for each level of government --which is the opposite of sovereignty as traditionally and legally conceived as the power to make final decisions on everything.

Most states of the world have exerted their legal sovereignty to give up the actual exercise of their sovereignty on many policy issues. Yielding some part of sovereignty to an international power destroys the very meaning of sovereignty. Formally, once inside an international institution, each state keeps the legal right to exert its formal sovereignty and leave. But this rarely happens. Indonesia withdrew from the United Nations, but only for 20 months in 1965–66, its absence being registered as a “cessation of cooperation.” The United States left the UNESCO in 1984 after accusing it of advancing Soviet interests; it returned, only to leave again, together with Israel, in 2017

after Palestine was voted in full membership. The United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union in 2016 with catastrophic consequences. As these few experiences suggest, the costs of leaving or backing away from international organizations or commitments are very high. In federal countries, attempts by central governments to regain their sovereignty by taking back powers that are in the hands of local governments also tend to involve bitter political crises. As long as the economic, technological and human trends keep developing as they have done for decades, the loss of sovereignty of any single unit will become irreversible.

### **Multiple level unions**

The member states of the largest continental or multi-state unions, such as the United States of America and the European Union, have largely given up their sovereignty even in legal terms.

Let us look at the evolution of the concept over time. During the campaign for the initial thirteen independent states to ratify the U.S. Constitution in the late eighteenth century, one of its main authors, James Madison, argued that “each State, in ratifying the Constitution, is considered as a sovereign body, independent of all others.” He assured that “the States will retain under the proposed Constitution a very extensive portion of active sovereignty,” and upheld that “the power delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined, [while] those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite.”

Yet when the Constitutional Convention submitted the constitutional text to Congress, it noted that “It is obviously impracticable to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to state, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all.” An early Amendment clarified that “the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States.” But the word “sovereignty,” which was initially associated with the states, does not appear in the Constitution of the U.S. It holds, rather the other way around, that “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States... shall be the supreme Law of the Land.”

The tension between the two levels of government was durable. By the early nineteenth century, the Supreme Court confirmed that “the Constitution and the laws made in pursuance are supreme, they control the Constitution and laws of the respective states, and cannot be controlled by them.” In reaction, several

states defended their rights to enforce their own rules on numerous issues, much beyond the basic affairs related with taxes, police or the expropriation of private property for public services—including, most ominously, the right to own slaves—. This strain triggered the Civil War in 1860.

The European Union was initially conceived in the aftermath of the bloodbath of the Second World War in the aim of the “definitive abolition of division of Europe into national, sovereign states,” in the words of Altiero Spinelli, one of its Founding Fathers. Since then, the EU has been following several steps which mirror the historical process of building the United States of America.

The EU has greatly expanded its powers over time. It has approved thousands of regulations which are directly binding on all the European citizens, as well as high numbers of directives which are confirmed by the state parliaments. The European Court of Justice early affirmed the primacy of European Union law over the law of the member states; when there is conflict between them, the European law prevails and the norms of national law, including the constitutions of member states, have to be set aside. The Treaty of Lisbon, enforced since 2009, confirmed that “the Treaties and the law adopted by the Union on the basis of the Treaties have primacy over the law of Member States.”

In the EU’s multi-level structure of governance, nobody is actually sovereign anymore: neither the traditional states, which are “member”-states of the Union, are deprived of competence on important policy issues, and are submitted to the primacy of European law, nor any local or regional government that might claim such an ambition. The member-states of the EU have pooled powers derived from their previous sovereignties, but they have not created a new European sovereignty either. The citizens of Europe live under multiple jurisdictions of different scopes and breadths.

### **Summary notes**

In the written constitutions of ten EU member states, the word “sovereignty” is not even mentioned (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Sweden). Rhetorical references to the sovereignty of “the people” are made, as a simple synonym of democracy, in seven states (Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Portugal). The sovereignty of the “nation” is affirmed in only five countries

and that of the “state” on another four (Bulgaria, Croatia, Lithuania, Romania and Spain for the former, and Ireland, Malta, Poland and Slovakia for the latter).

Lending further support to EU power, the Constitution of Ireland asserts that: “No provision of this Constitution invalidates laws enacted, acts done or measures adopted by the State which are necessitated by the obligations of membership of the European Union or of the Communities.” The Constitution of Slovenia, which is a more recent democracy that aimed from the beginning to become a member of the EU and took the issue as a leitmotif, proclaims no less than eight times that the republic will “transfer the exercise of sovereign rights to international organizations.” The notion of sovereignty is also alien to many other countries. In the constitutions of Commonwealth members such as Australia, Canada, Jamaica or New Zealand, the words “sovereign” or “sovereignty” are not even written.

These examples could provide new inspiration to move further on towards --to paraphrase Spinelli-- the definitive abolition of division of the world into national, sovereign states.

## Literature

**Colomer, J.M.** 2014 *How Global Institutions Rule de World*. Palgavre-Macmillan.

**Colomer, J.M.** 2010. *The Science of Politics*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.

**Colomer, J.M.** 2001. *Political Institutions. Democracy and social choice*. Oxford University Press.

This text is adapted from the book by Josep M. Colomer and Ashley L. Beale 2020. *Democracy and Globalization: Anger, fear, and hope* (Routledge, New York pp.163 ISBN 9780367-46192-8). We published the chapter with permission of the authors. Read more about the book in the next issue of CEPSR (Vol. 21 No 82).

*Gyöngyvér Hervainé Szabó*

## Comparative Indicators of Economic and Social Welfare

### Economic Performance of the Last 30 Years

From 1989, Hungary became a member of the Western Regional Economic Center, and from 2004 it became a member of the European Union. The country has partially become a border region of the EU in the South and East. The lack of East-Western and Southern relations posed a strategic disadvantage. Based on the chart below, we can see that the great powers of the region have produced amazing growth, of which there were only 3, which started with a GDP of almost 1,000,000 million; and by now the proportion of economies over 500,000 million has increased to 10. Poland and Ireland also perform well. The era can rightly be considered the golden age of European economy, and we can say that corporatist Christian welfare systems have performed particularly well in economic development. Northern welfare models are also successful.

### Growth of Economic Welfare Between 1989-2018

GDP	1989	2018	GDP	1989	2018
Germany	1257393	3951340	Portugal	59806	240901
UK	1005574	2828833	Romania	54236	239552
France	1026179	2780152	Greece	79250	218230
Italy	938273	2075856	Hungary	30319	161182
Spain	411571	1427533	Slovakia	9770	106573
The Netherlands	260508	914519	Bulgaria	44835	65197
Poland	66895	585816	Croatia	24782	60382
Sweden	212910	556073	Slovenia	18198	54059
Belgium	160672	532268	Lithuania	10507	53302
Austria	133263	446325	Latvia	7690	34882
Ireland	38017	382754	Estonia	5618	30761
Denmark	112410	329866	Cyprus	4901	24493
Finland	119106	274210	Malta	2119	14560
Czech Republic	40477	245226			

Source: <https://countryeconomy.com/gdp>