



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 Pałyska
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 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 on 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-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 I 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 on 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 a 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