

2002

C) Compare and contrast the extent to which the Cabinet has an important part to play in the respective Executives of the UK and USA.

The extent to which the Cabinet has an important part to play in the executives of the UK and USA can be assessed by looking at what is suppose to be the case in theory of the role of the Cabinet's within the Executives and what they actually are in practices.

In the UK the entire Cabinet is collectively suppose to make decisions and decide on policy. The Prime Minister originally was the Chair of Cabinet meetings, and 'Primus Inter Pares', meaning first among equals. Many will argue however that this is not the case in practice as the PM in recent decades has developed a 'Presidential style' of governing, and a singular executive, similar to that of the President of the United States. The President of the U.S. has 'ministers' to advise him, in other words a Cabinet, however he is suppose to over see everything and make decisions, and policy by himself/herself.

The fact that the Cabinet in the UK is drawn from the legislature means that it has a major role to play in the legislature, not least in the organisation of legislation. The PM however some would claim has been seen to override the rights of the Cabinet and thus lower the importance of the Cabinet while making decisions on legislation and policy in recent years. This was seen in the Thatcherite era when on average she only held 35 Cabinet meetings per annum and carried out 'Kitchen Cabinet' meetings in which she pre-cooked ideas with individual ministers before the actual full Cabinet meeting and steam rolled their decision and policy through the Cabinet meetings, this was due to the fact that Ministers were too involved in their own departments to worry about other one's, especially after there wasn't much to be discussed because the PM and individual Minister had already decided policy/decision.

The U.S. Executive due to it been singular in nature, means the President is responsible for decisions and policy, including the executives role in legislation making. However infact the President is not suppose to have any role in legislation as "all legislative powers" were given to the Congress in Article 1, Section 1, however the President has been able to claim a legislative role through the duties of the President outlined in Article 2, section 2, which include the fact he can recommend measures which he considers to be "necessary and expedient" in nature to Congress. This is unlike the UK where the executive is responsible for nearly all legislation and controls the agenda except on 17 days when the opposition can and when time is set aside for PMB's. The President is suppose to have his legislative proposals given priority by the House Rules Committee who decides the agenda of legislation to be passed through Congress. In some instances we have also seen the Cabinet members having a role in legislation making of the Executive showing the importance of the Cabinet. This was the case for the Civil Rights Bill in the early 1960's, in which Bobby Kennedy as Attorney General played a major role in drafting the legislation passed under Johnson in 1964. Many would also argue that the executive is too much for one person to control and therefore it could not be the case that the President does infact carry out every function of the Executive, rather he heavily

relies on research and ideas of his Cabinet. This could be seen to be the case in Reagan's time when it was found that the USA had sold weapons to Iran, Reagan said he didn't know about it, and the blame was shifted to others.

Nevertheless however Congress is the only place in which legislation can be introduced and passed and therefore all legislative powers truly do lie with Congress thus in terms of legislation the Cabinet do not have a major role to play as the Executive doesn't. This was seen in 1995 when the Clinton White House couldn't get its budgetary proposals passed by Congress because it was Republican controlled, and they'd won a majority on the basis that they wouldn't allow for a Budget deficit to occur (Contract with America) which is what would of happened had Clinton's budgetary proposals been passed. This led to the infamous 'government shutdown.'

The PM is also able to keep the Cabinet in line and support his policy through what Tony Benn described as the most important power of the PM, the power of Patronage. This means the threat of demotion from the Cabinet, it can also be followed through on and could mean ruining a politicians career by giving them a poor position. This was seen under Thatcher as PM when she sent James Prior to the 'graveyard' for British politicians, N.I.

The President meanwhile does not have the same power in appointing his Cabinet as they are not and cannot be members of the legislature, infact some would state being called to the Cabinet is a demotion over a position such as senate majority leader. This would support the claim that the Cabinet is not a very important part of the Executive in the U.S. However we have seen instances were appointees to certain Cabinet positions have been able to influence Presidential policy due to their expertise in a certain area, for example Colin Powell as Secretary of State in Bush's first term in office had a major bearing on foreign policy.

The founding Fathers of the U.S. didn't think the President and therefore his Cabinet would have a role to play in Foreign affairs however over time and today especially it has become the most important office in the World that concerns every nation in the World, something that happens in the UK to the Middle East to North Korea all effect the U.S. We have seen the role of the Cabinet member for foreign affairs being undermined, when Powell had no input in the decision to invade Iraq, Bush did his own thing, re-asserting the judicial decision of 1936 'United States vs Curtiss-Wright Co-Operation' which declared that the "President alone has power to speak/listen as a representative of nation."

The importance of the Cabinet in foreign policy in the UK has also been undermined under Blair, seen when the policy to join the U.S. led coalition and invade Iraq was decided upon by the PM despite the annoyance to the person appointed to the Foreign Ministry post who was suppose to develop expertise for making decisions in that area, Robin Cook, who resigned due to the PM's taking control of Foreign policy and making policy on his own.