



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**Central European Constitutional Courts in the face of EU membership :  
the influence of the German model of integration in Hungary and Poland**  
Tatham, A.F.

**Citation**

Tatham, A. F. (2011, November 1). *Central European Constitutional Courts in the face of EU membership : the influence of the German model of integration in Hungary and Poland*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/18011>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/18011>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Central European Constitutional Courts in the Face of EU  
Membership:  
The Influence of the German Model of Integration in Hungary and  
Poland

by

Allan F. Tatham

A dissertation submitted in fulfillment of the requirements

of the Doctor's Degree of Philosophy

Faculty of Law, University of Leiden

November 2011

# Central European Constitutional Courts in the Face of EU Membership: The Influence of the German Model of Integration in Hungary and Poland

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van  
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. P.F. van der Heijden,  
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties  
te verdedigen op dinsdag 1 november 2011  
klokke 16.15 uur

*door*

Allan Francis TATHAM

geboren te Southport, Verenigd Koninkrijk

in 1965

Promotiecommissie:

Promotor: Prof. dr. Christa Tobler, LL.M.

Overige leden: Prof. Dr. Judge Katalin Gombos (University of Szeged, Hungary)  
Prof. Dr. András Jakab (Pázmány Péter Catholic University,  
Budapest, Hungary)  
Prof. Dr. iur. habil., Dr. iur. h.c., Dr. phil. h.c., Peter-Christian  
Müller-Graf (Ruperecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg,  
Germany)  
Prof. dr. Stefaan Van den Bogaert, LL.M.  
Prof. dr. W.J.M. Voermans  
Prof. Dr. Mirosław Wyrzykowski (University of Warsaw, Poland)

## SHORT TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                          |        |
|------------------------------------------|--------|
| Detailed Table of Contents .....         | iii    |
| Summary of thesis (English) .....        | xi     |
| Samenvatting scriptie (Nederlands) ..... | xvii   |
| Curriculum vitae .....                   | xxv    |
| Propositions .....                       | xxxi   |
| Dedication/Quote .....                   | xxxiii |
| Acknowledgements.....                    | xxxv   |
| Abbreviations .....                      | xxxvii |
| Cases Cited .....                        | xli    |
| Legislation Construed.....               | lv     |
| Introduction .....                       | 1      |
| Chapter One .....                        | 11     |
| Chapter Two .....                        | 37     |
| Chapter Three .....                      | 57     |
| Chapter Four .....                       | 117    |
| Chapter Five .....                       | 175    |
| Chapter Six .....                        | 231    |
| Bibliography .....                       | 277    |



## DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>Introduction .....</b>                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>1</b> |
| A. OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH .....                                                                                                                                                                                     | 1        |
| 1. Introducing the main objective .....                                                                                                                                                                             | 1        |
| 2. Why a study of two Central European judiciaries and their responses to EU law? .....                                                                                                                             | 2        |
| 3. Why look at the model created by the German constitutional judiciary vis-à-vis European integration? .....                                                                                                       | 4        |
| 4. The main research questions .....                                                                                                                                                                                | 4        |
| a. Why would Hungarian and Polish constitutional justices be predisposed towards following the example of the German Federal Constitutional Court in developing their own approaches to European integration? ..... | 5        |
| b. Have these courts in fact followed the German Court and to what extent is this reflected in case-law? .....                                                                                                      | 5        |
| c. How can this development be used constructively in order to deepen the dialogue between national constitutional courts and the ECJ? .....                                                                        | 5        |
| B. METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH .....                                                                                                                                                                                | 6        |
| 1. An analysis based on case-law .....                                                                                                                                                                              | 6        |
| 2. A note on materials and language .....                                                                                                                                                                           | 8        |
| C. STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH .....                                                                                                                                                                                  | 9        |
| 1. Elementary structure of the study .....                                                                                                                                                                          | 9        |
| 2. Set-up of the study .....                                                                                                                                                                                        | 9        |

## Chapter One: The General EU Constitutional Context ..... 11

|                                                                                |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| A. JUDICIAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE EU CONSTITUTION .....                          | 11 |
| 1. Constitutionalisation of the Treaties.....                                  | 11 |
| 2. Constitutional basis of EU integration .....                                | 14 |
| B. FRAMEWORK FOR CONSTITUTIONAL COURT RETICENCE VIS-À-VIS EUROPEAN INTEGRATION | 15 |
| 1. Introduction .....                                                          | 15 |
| 2. The “individuality” of national constitutions .....                         | 16 |
| a. Legal culture and constitution: separate mentalités .....                   | 16 |
| b. National legal identity: constitution and sovereignty.....                  | 18 |

|                                                                                                      |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| c. Dilemma of constitutional justices faced with European integration.....                           | 19 |
| 3. Verfassungskern .....                                                                             | 20 |
| a. Core principles of sovereignty.....                                                               | 20 |
| b. The essential core in the face of EU integration.....                                             | 25 |
| C. TRANSJUDICIAL COMMUNICATION IN THE EU .....                                                       | 27 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                                                                 | 27 |
| 2. Reception of constitutional concepts mediated through constitutional court<br>jurisprudence ..... | 28 |
| a. Brief overview of the theoretical comparative context of reception and transfer.....              | 28 |
| b. Reception and transfer through judicial decision-making .....                                     | 30 |
| c. The practice of constitutional migration and transjudicial communication .....                    | 32 |
| D. CONCLUSION.....                                                                                   | 35 |

## Chapter Two: The Predominance of the German Model in Central Europe – Migrations of Legal and Constitutional Ideas ..... 37

|                                                                                                |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| A. RELEVANT LEGAL MODELS FOR CENTRAL EUROPE .....                                              | 37 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                                                           | 37 |
| 2. The kaleidoscope of national judicial approaches to EU law .....                            | 37 |
| 3. Choice of national constitutional courts .....                                              | 38 |
| 4. Choice of approach to EU Law .....                                                          | 38 |
| B. RELEVANCY OF THE GERMAN MODEL IN CENTRAL EUROPE.....                                        | 41 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                                                           | 41 |
| 2. Historic and legal cultural affinities.....                                                 | 41 |
| a. Middle Ages.....                                                                            | 41 |
| b. Renaissance.....                                                                            | 44 |
| c. Nineteenth and early twentieth centuries .....                                              | 44 |
| d. The interwar period 1920-1940 .....                                                         | 45 |
| 3. Linguistic ability and intellectual stimulus .....                                          | 47 |
| 4. Constitution drafting and constitutional jurisdiction formation in the post-Communist era48 |    |
| a. Influences on the new constitutions .....                                                   | 49 |
| b. Strengths of the German and French models.....                                              | 50 |

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| c. German fundamental rights supreme .....                        | 52 |
| d. German model of constitutional adjudication also supreme ..... | 53 |
| 5. Resultant influences on constitutional judicial practice ..... | 55 |
| C. CONCLUSION .....                                               | 56 |

## Chapter Three: The German Federal Constitutional Court and European Law – A Case of “Thus Far, and No Further”? .....57

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| BACKGROUND .....                                                  | 57 |
| A. CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW .....                                    | 59 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 59 |
| 2. Types of constitutional review .....                           | 60 |
| 3. Constitutional complaints (Fundamental rights protection)..... | 61 |
| B. ESSENTIAL CORE OF SOVEREIGNTY.....                             | 62 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 62 |
| 2. State based on the rule of law (“Rechtsstaat”) .....           | 63 |
| 3. Democracy.....                                                 | 65 |
| 4. Protection of fundamental human rights .....                   | 66 |
| C. TRANSFERS OF SOVEREIGNTY AND EUROPEAN INTEGRATION .....        | 68 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 68 |
| 2. Transfers of the exercise of sovereignty .....                 | 69 |
| a. Pre-1992 constitutional provisions: EEC membership .....       | 69 |
| b. Constitutional amendments post-1992: the European Union.....   | 72 |
| D. NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL COURT ACCEPTANCE .....                 | 76 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 76 |
| 2. Supremacy/Priority of application .....                        | 76 |
| 3. Direct effect.....                                             | 80 |
| 4. References to the European Court of Justice.....               | 83 |
| a. Lawful judge .....                                             | 86 |
| b. ECJ ruling priority .....                                      | 89 |
| E. LIMITS TO NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL COURT ACCEPTANCE .....       | 91 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 91 |

|                                                                            |     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 2. Essential core as limitation to integration .....                       | 91  |
| a. Fundamental rights .....                                                | 91  |
| b. Democracy .....                                                         | 93  |
| c. Bananas II: fundamental rights protected? .....                         | 95  |
| d. Lisbon: democracy, constitutional identity and ultra vires review ..... | 97  |
| 3. Review of national transposing law .....                                | 105 |
| 4. Refusals to refer .....                                                 | 109 |
| F. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.....                                            | 112 |

## Chapter Four: The Hungarian Constitutional Court and European Law – A Case of “Slow and Steady wins the Race”? ..... 117

|                                                                   |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| BACKGROUND .....                                                  | 117 |
| A. CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW .....                                    | 119 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 119 |
| 2. Types of constitutional review .....                           | 120 |
| 3. Constitutional complaints (Fundamental rights protection)..... | 121 |
| B. ESSENTIAL CORE OF SOVEREIGNTY.....                             | 122 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 122 |
| 2. State based on the rule of law .....                           | 123 |
| 3. Democracy.....                                                 | 125 |
| 4. Protection of fundamental human rights .....                   | 127 |
| C. TRANSFERS OF SOVEREIGNTY AND EUROPEAN INTEGRATION .....        | 129 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 129 |
| 2. Transfers of the exercise of sovereignty .....                 | 129 |
| a. Constitution and HCC interpretations.....                      | 129 |
| b. Europe clause .....                                            | 132 |
| D. NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL COURT ACCEPTANCE .....                 | 134 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 134 |
| 2. Supremacy/Priority of application .....                        | 134 |
| 3. Direct effect.....                                             | 140 |
| 4. References to the European Court of Justice.....               | 143 |

|                                                             |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| a. Lawful judge .....                                       | 145 |
| b. ECJ ruling priority .....                                | 146 |
| E. LIMITS TO NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL COURT ACCEPTANCE ..... | 152 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                        | 152 |
| 2. Essential core as limitation to integration .....        | 152 |
| a. Pre-accession.....                                       | 152 |
| b. Conferral of powers under Constitution Art. 2/A .....    | 154 |
| c. Exercise of constitutional review .....                  | 158 |
| d. Constitutional identity .....                            | 160 |
| 3. Review of national transposing law .....                 | 163 |
| 4. Refusals to refer .....                                  | 170 |
| F. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.....                             | 172 |

## Chapter Five: The Polish Constitutional Tribunal and European Law – A Case of “Sovereignty Regained”? ..... 175

|                                                                   |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| BACKGROUND .....                                                  | 175 |
| A. CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW .....                                    | 177 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 177 |
| 2. Types of constitutional review .....                           | 178 |
| 3. Constitutional complaints (Fundamental rights protection)..... | 179 |
| B. ESSENTIAL CORE OF SOVEREIGNTY .....                            | 181 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 181 |
| 2. State based on the rule of law .....                           | 182 |
| 3. Democracy.....                                                 | 186 |
| 4. Protection of fundamental human rights .....                   | 188 |
| C. TRANSFERS OF SOVEREIGNTY AND EUROPEAN INTEGRATION .....        | 191 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 191 |
| 2. Transfers of the exercise of sovereignty .....                 | 193 |
| D. NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL COURT ACCEPTANCE .....                 | 197 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                              | 197 |
| 2. Supremacy/Priority of application .....                        | 197 |

|                                                      |     |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 3. Direct effect.....                                | 200 |
| 4. References to the European Court of Justice.....  | 202 |
| a. Lawful judge .....                                | 205 |
| b. ECJ ruling priority .....                         | 207 |
| E. LIMITS TO NATIONAL COURT ACCEPTANCE.....          | 209 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                 | 209 |
| 2. Essential core as limitation to integration ..... | 209 |
| a. Pre-accession.....                                | 209 |
| b. 2003 Accession Treaty .....                       | 210 |
| c. Lisbon Treaty case .....                          | 217 |
| 3. Review of national transposing law .....          | 224 |
| 4. Refusals to refer .....                           | 228 |
| F. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.....                      | 228 |

## Chapter Six: Conclusion ..... 231

|                                                                                                               |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| A. OVERALL CONTEXT OF THE CONCLUSION .....                                                                    | 231 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                                                                          | 231 |
| 2. Role of constitutional courts in the face of deepening European integration.....                           | 231 |
| a. European constitutional justices as “veto-players” .....                                                   | 231 |
| b. Constitutional justices as “guardians of the State” in the face of EU<br>integration.....                  | 233 |
| c. Constitutional adjudication: European integration and value choices .....                                  | 234 |
| d. Judicial deliberation and decision-making vis-à-vis European integration.....                              | 235 |
| 3. Evolution of Central European judicial approaches to the EU .....                                          | 237 |
| a. Importance of the German model on the essential core of sovereignty.....                                   | 238 |
| b. Impact of model on European law priority .....                                                             | 239 |
| c. Lawful judge and ECJ references .....                                                                      | 240 |
| B. THE ISSUE OF CONSTITUTIONAL PLURALISM FOR CONSTITUTIONAL<br>COURTS: THE CURRENT SITUATION EXPLAINED? ..... | 242 |
| 1. Brief recapitulation of the current constitutional stand-off .....                                         | 242 |
| a. Constitutional courts v. ECJ .....                                                                         | 242 |

|                                                                                                                                |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| b. Dialogue and co-operation – not hierarchy .....                                                                             | 243 |
| 2. The constitutional stand-off explained as “normal” .....                                                                    | 244 |
| a. Pluralist constitutionalism as an explanation.....                                                                          | 244 |
| b. The European constitutional area as complementary not competitive .....                                                     | 245 |
| c. Co-operative constitutional adjudication .....                                                                              | 247 |
| d. “Contrapunctual,” “best fit” or “co-ordinate”? .....                                                                        | 248 |
| e. Outwith the hierarchy .....                                                                                                 | 250 |
| 3. The pivotal nature of Art. 4 TEU .....                                                                                      | 251 |
| a. Constitutional co-operative adjudication – a Treaty basis? .....                                                            | 251 |
| b. The ECJ affirmation of co-operative constitutional adjudication .....                                                       | 253 |
| c. Declaration 17 of the Lisbon Treaty: reaffirmation of the past and brake on<br>pluralist constitutional adjudication? ..... | 254 |
| 4. The ECJ ship continues on its voyage from Lisbon .....                                                                      | 256 |
| a. Past flexibility in ECJ approach .....                                                                                      | 256 |
| b. Impact of Lisbon Treaty on ECJ and national constitutional courts<br>relationship .....                                     | 256 |
| c. Further strains or a welcome catalyst for change in the relationship.....                                                   | 257 |
| d. The need for a new institutional matrix? .....                                                                              | 258 |
| e. Deliberative judicial supranationalism and ECJ references .....                                                             | 259 |
| f. Transjudicial communication in the era of Lisbon .....                                                                      | 261 |
| C. A CONTROVERSIAL PROPOSAL .....                                                                                              | 262 |
| 1. Introduction.....                                                                                                           | 262 |
| 2. Proposed mechanism .....                                                                                                    | 263 |
| a. Background.....                                                                                                             | 263 |
| b. Stakeholder participation.....                                                                                              | 265 |
| 3. The actio popularis europae.....                                                                                            | 266 |
| a. Basis of the idea .....                                                                                                     | 266 |
| b. Prior filtering out – and a green light.....                                                                                | 267 |
| c. Before the ECJ.....                                                                                                         | 270 |
| 4. Establishment of the principle of lawful judge by the ECJ .....                                                             | 271 |
| a. “Plan B” – a weaker form of judicial co-operation.....                                                                      | 271 |
| b. Köbler .....                                                                                                                | 271 |
| Lawful judge – a strong possibility .....                                                                                      | 273 |
| D. FINAL REMARKS .....                                                                                                         | 275 |

|                                                  |     |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Steps forward and the effects of Lisbon ..... | 275 |
| 2. <i>Ende, Végül, Koniec</i> .....              | 276 |

