The Same Ol' Story...or Not? Patterns of (Dis)continuity in David Cameron's European Policy

Monika Brusenbauch Meislová[1]

Abstract: With its profound implications, Brexit is set to be the defining issue for the United Kingdom (UK) and one of the most unique challenges that the European Union (EU) and its member states have ever faced. It was under the premiership of the former Prime Minister David Cameron that Britain's relationship with the EU took such a dramatic turn. As it is essential, now more than ever, to understand the intriguing issue of Cameron's European legacy, this article aims to deepen our understanding of his EU policy and provide key insights into the logic of his European dilemmas. As such, it explores how Cameron's EU policy evolved under his Conservative Party leadership and investigates patterns of continuity and discontinuity in his EU discourse. More specifically, the inquiry compares three stages of Cameron's EU policy corresponding with his three cabinets 1) shadow cabinet (2005-2010); 2) first cabinet (Cameron–Clegg coalition; 2010-2015); and 3) second cabinet (single-party ministry; 2015-2016). In each of these stages, attention is primarily given to trends, hallmarks and strategies of his European policy. The article concludes that whilst continuity can be detected in David Cameron's EU policies throughout the whole tenure of his Conservative Party leadership, his EU strategies and tactics were marked by substantial discontinuity.

Introduction

United Kingdom's (UK) involvement in the European integration project has always been problematic, with the country being long-term dubbed as a "*troubled partner*" and "*reluctant European*" (Diez, 2001: 7; Menon, 1998). Yet, it was, ultimately, under the premiership of the former Prime Minister David Cameron (2010-2016) that the mutual relationship took a dramatic turn. In 2013 Cameron made a commitment to renegotiate a better settlement for the UK's membership in the EU and hold an in/out EU referendum, should the Conservative Party win the 2015 general election. What followed was the momentous decision of 23 June 2016, which saw the British citizens' vote in favour of quitting the EU. In the wake of the referendum results, Cameron resigned and in March 2017 his successor Theresa May triggered Article 50 of Lisbon Treaty, thereby officially launching the formal process of withdrawal. With its profound implications, Brexit is "*set*

---

[1] Mgr. **Monika Brusenbauch Meislová**, Ph.D., is a lecturer and researcher based at the Department of Politics and European Studies at Palacký University Olomouc in the Czech Republic. Her long-term research interests include British politics, especially British European policy and British foreign policy. E-mail: brusenbauch.meislova@email.cz.

to be the defining issue for Britain and one of the most unique challenges to ever face the EU" (Oliver and Booth, 2017).

Arguably, David Cameron has placed a more substantive imprint upon the British relationship with the EU than any previous British Prime Minister since the UK joined the European Community in 1973, plunging UK's position in Europe into the greatest uncertainty in a generation. For Byrne, Randall and Theakson, Cameron bore responsibility "*for initiating the referendum, for failing to manage expectations regarding the renegotiation, for agreeing a deal which failed to satisfactorily address key Eurosceptic concerns and, at least in part, for a lacklustre remain campaign*" (Byrne, Randall and Theakson, 2017: 217). It is, after all, the British Prime Minister who fundamentally shapes the content and direction of the British EU policy, "*instigat[ing] and espous[ing] government policy towards European integration*" (Daddow, 2015a: 72; further on this account, for instance, Allen and Oliver, 2006; Heffernan, 2005; O'Malley, 2007).

To understand the intriguing issue of David Cameron's European legacy, it is essential to have a clear vision of his EU policy, which, with hindsight, has always been an extremely complex issue. His EU policy record in office has been often interpreted as inconsistent and ambiguous (for example, Jennings, 2013; Lynch, 2011: 229; McTague, 2016; Oliver, 2017: 2; Vasilopoulou, 2015), or even "*schizophrenic*" (Brown and John, 2013; Mates, 2012). Likewise, his stance towards the EU has been given different labels (apart from the variance along the soft/hard Eurosceptic scale[2]), ranging from "*technocratic form of Euroscepticism*" (Tournier-Sol, 2015: 147) and "*elite-based Euroscepticism*" (Tournier-Sol, 2015: 148) to "*reluctant euroscepticism*" (Vail, 2015: 112). Cameron himself used to describe his position as "*a eurosceptic albeit a practical and sensible one at the same time*" (Lynch, 2011: 220–222; Kirkup, 2010).

This article focuses on what lies behind these labels, drawing its attention to the EU policy developments under Cameron's leadership of the Conservative Party. It aims to explore how his EU policy evolved over time and evaluate patterns of its continuity and change as well as the reasons underneath the developments. The central research question that this survey seeks to answer is: what were the patterns of continuity and change in David Cameron's EU policy? The inquiry addresses this question by surveying three stages of Cameron's EU policy corresponding with his three cabinets: 1) shadow cabinet (the term in opposition; 2005-2010); 2) first cabinet (Cameron–Clegg coalition; 2010-2015); and 3) second cabinet (single-party ministry; 2015-2016). As such, it helps deepen our understanding of Cameron's European policy and provides key insights into the logic of his European dilemmas.

Significance of this inquiry has been highlighted by the present period of extraordinary turbulence in the UK's relationship with the EU. It is important now more than ever to explore British European policy and its underlying drivers. Cameron's EU policy with its far-reaching implications makes it a compelling focus for academic attention, which

---

[2] In basic terms, the study of Euroscepticism has originally focused largely on research of political parties and public behaviour. Yet, in recent times, with Euroscepticism having become a "*persistent phenomenon*" within the EU (Usherwood and Startin, 2013), more attention has been devoted to the concept of Euroscepticism in relation to individual politicians (Hloušek and Kaniok, 2014: 35-36). This article is in keeping with this modern trend.

is reflected in the growing number of empirically rich academic and policy studies on his EU agenda (see, for instance, Alexandre-Collier, 2015a, 2015b; Daddow, 2015b; Glencross, 2016; Lynch, 2012; Matthijs, 2013; Smith, 2016). As it stands now, however, the extant literature does not cover the full scope of his tenure as a party leader (with the exception of Andrew Glencross' [2017] book). Instead, it tends to focus separately either on his term as the Leader of the Opposition, or on his tenure as a Prime Minister (and even in that case, not the whole Downing Street tenancy, but usually just a limited period of time there within, which is, of course, not surprising, given that he only stepped down as a Prime Minister in July 2016). Out of the three, it is especially his first, coalition cabinet that has enjoyed extensive scholarly coverage (see, for example, Copsey and Haughton, 2014; Dadow 2015a; Daddow, 2015b; Gifford, 2014; Heppel, 2013; Lynch, 2011; Lynch, 2012; Lynch, 2015; Matthijs, 2013 and Smith, 2016, amongst others). This article, by contrast, covers Cameron's EU policy record during a longer time span in a bid to provide the most complex picture possible. As a result, it analyses the full scope of his leadership of the Conservative Party (both in the role of a Leader of the Opposition and a Prime Minister), helping address the gap in existing research and contributing to the developing literature on David Cameron's European legacy. In terms of broad research categories, the study is located within the qualitative research tradition, applying the process-tracing method in order to track and trace the points of continuity and change in David Cameron's EU policy.

The article unfolds in the following manner. It begins by outlining the background and situating Cameron's EU policy into a broader context of British party politics and partisan traditions vis-à-vis the European integration project. The subsequent empirical analysis provides investigation of the three stages of Cameron's EU policy, with the attention being primarily directed to its trends, hallmarks and strategies. Drawing on this analysis, the final part considers how Cameron's EU policy compares among the three distinct phases of his tenure and sums up the main elements of its continuity and discontinuity.

1. Background

For Vail (2015: 109), any discussion of Cameron's approach towards the EU must start with an account of the Conservatives' "*historical sense of Britain's place in Europe*". In fact, there are only a few other member states in which the EU membership has been as controversial and emotionally charged amongst mainstream parties as in the UK (Hertner and Keith, 2016: 2). As time went by, the political base of British Euroscepticism gradually shifted from left to right. It is therefore the Conservative Party, one of the main parties, that since the end of the 1980s has replaced Labour as the party of Euroscepticism, with Euroscepticism "*hardwired into* [its] *ideology and identity*" (Lynch, 2015: 188). In the 1970s, fissures within the Conservative Party over Europe were minor when compared to Labour. Yet, gradually, the party became increasingly divided over Britain's EU membership, with the rifts becoming apparent mostly in the latter years of the Margaret Thatcher premiership – especially the time of her Bruges speech of September 1988 (Daddow, 2015b: 4; Schnapper, 2009: 58). These deep rifts widened when Thatcher was deposed in 1990, for the most part at the hands of Conservative Cabinet pro-Europeans.

The party was then almost devastated by the revolts of backbench Conservative Members of the Parliament (MPs) against the Government's willingness to commit the UK to closer integration that accompanied ratification of the Maastricht Treaty under Prime Minister John Major in 1991–1993 (this point is well covered in Daddow, 2015b: 4; Lewis, 2014:47).

With large sections of the Conservative Party having started to call for Britain's exit from the EU, the Maastricht Treaty became a decisive moment in the referendum debate in Britain as it firmly established a modern Eurosceptic referendum movement on the British political scene (Gifford and Wellings, 2017): "*The formation of a European Union was considered to be such a step change in European integration that the 1975 referendum result was no longer considered legitimate. While not successful in its immediate goal of a referendum on the Treaty, the movement's significance lay in its longer-term impact on British parliamentary democracy and the Europe issue. By the time that the Maastricht battles had been played out, the principle of a referendum, underpinned by the notion of popular sovereignty, was firmly established across the political class as a legitimate facet of the British political process*" (Gifford and Wellings, 2017).[3]

During the long opposition span between 1997 and 2010, the Conservative Party, deeply divided over the European question, hardened its position on the EU, shifting to the right on this issue and persistently criticising "new" European policies of the serving Labour government. Fontana and Parsons even assert that as early as by 2005 the Conservatives were a thoroughly Eurosceptical party (Fontana and Parsons, 2015: 102). Therefore, by 2005, there seemed "*no longer to be a compelling Conservative narrative about the state, nation and Britain's place in the world that includes the European Union (EU) as currently constituted*" (Geddes, 2005: 113). Cameron thus inherited a party, where - in contrast to other political parties - opinion on Europe was "*more deeply, and more publicly, riven by factionalism and in-fighting*" (Daddow, 2015b: 4).

2. Three Stages of David Cameron's EU Policy

The analysis proceeds on the basis of the tripartite periodization of David Cameron's EU policy. Its dynamics is traced through three periods corresponding with his three cabinets 1) shadow cabinet (2005-2010); 2) first cabinet (2010-2015); and 3) second cabinet (2015-2016).

David Cameron was elected Leader of the Conservative Party in December 2005. In May 2010, after spending five years as the Head of the Opposition, he became Prime Minister, bringing the Conservative Party back into government after 13 years in opposition. Yet, the general election (which was otherwise a triumph for Cameron) failed to produce an overall majority in the House of Commons, resulting in the first hung parliament in the country in 36 years. After a series of negotiations with the Liberal Democrats, traditionally more pro-European than the Tories, Cameron and Nick Clegg, the Liberal Democrats' leader, announced a deal to form a government. As a result, the

---

[3] It is in this sense that David Cameron's 2013 referendum commitment is often viewed as "*the culmination of a Eurosceptic referendum campaign that had been underway since the Maastricht negotiations, with 1975 as the key point of historical and rhetorical reference*" (Gifford and Wellings, 2017)

first coalition government since the Second World War was formed. After unexpectedly serving the full length of the five-year Parliament, the Conservatives won the general election in May 2015, this time with an outright (if narrow) majority in parliament and no need for a coalition. Cameron returned to Downing Street 10 and formed a majority Conservative government. Yet, the Brexit vote brought his premiership to an abrupt end, with Cameron resigning the office of Prime Minister in July 2016.

2.1 Cameron's Shadow Cabinet (2005-2010)

As a prospective Tory leader, Cameron represented "a smooth combination of Euroscaptical credentials and modernizing centrism" (Fontana and Parsons, 2015: 102). During the party leadership contest to succeed Michael Howard, he came across as a strong, long-standing sceptic and advocate of returning powers from the EU, signalling to Tory traditionalists that he was loyal to their cause (Lewis, 2014: 48). Simultaneously, however, to increase his chances of being elected, he consciously toned down Europe as an issue (Fontana and Parsons, 2015: 102; Matthijs, 2013). This agrees with Kettle's (2016) assessment for whom the young Cameron "*was never one of those Tories who ate, drank and slept Europe; but nor was he an heir to the pro-European generation of liberal Tories such as Michael Heseltine and Kenneth Clarke*." It was this pragmatic Euroscepticism that helped him "*bridge the divide between modernisers and the Conservative Right*" in opposition (Lynch, 2015: 193).

As part of his leadership campaign, Cameron promised to withdraw Conservative Members of the European Parliament (EP) out of the centre-right pro-integrationist European People's Party–European Democrats (EPP–ED) group in the European Parliament on the grounds of a principled objection to the group's formally federalist aspirations. According to many, it was this pledge that helped him gain essential support of some Eurosceptic MPs (Copsey and Hauhgton, 2014: 83; Lynch and Whitaker, 2008; Lynch, 2012: 74–5). In Kettle's (2016) words: "*He did it because he wanted to siphon votes from his rivals David Davis and Liam Fox by burnishing his own Eurosceptic credentials*". In a move sometimes criticised as "*verging on populist*" (Alexandre-Collier, 2015a: 5) and "*low on substance and high on opportunism*" (Gardner, 2010), Cameron delivered on his pledge, pulled out Conservative MEPs from the EPP-ED after the 2009 EP elections and set up, along with a few allies, a fringe Eurosceptic European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR) group. While appeasing Conservative Eurosceptics, this step cost Cameron political capital with his European counterparts, as it significantly weakened his access to the influential caucus of EPP-ED-based fellow members of the centre-right, including German Chancellor Angela Merkel or French President Nicolas Sarkozy (Gardner, 2010; Garret, 2011; Smith, 2012: 1291)

Cameron pursued also other, no less important, measures during his tenure in opposition that epitomized his lukewarm stance towards the EU. For instance, he made it repeatedly clear that the powers ought to be repatriated from the EU to Westminster (Lewis, 2014: 48). Moreover, in September 2007, he gave a "*cast-iron guarantee*" (in his article for *The Sun*) that he would call a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty. Two years later, however, he made a complete U-turn on his guarantee, declaring his decision not

to pursue a public vote on the Lisbon Treaty (as the treaty had been already incorporated into the law of the European Union and could not be reopened): "*We cannot hold a referendum and magically make those posts – or the Lisbon treaty itself – disappear, any more than we could hold a referendum to stop the sun rising in the morning*" (Cameron, 2009). As a consequence, he managed both "*to fire up the hardliners and to outrage them*" (Kettle, 2016). What is important to note in this context is that it was, indeed, the signing of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009 that further consolidated the Eurosceptic bloc within the Conservative Party. As a case in point, a survey carried out in that year revealed that 47 per cent of Conservative Party candidates wished for repatriation of powers from Brussels and further 38 per cent desired radical renegotiation of the UK's membership in the EU (Lewis, 2014: 46-47).

At this point it is also worth mentioning that Cameron was well aware of the danger resulting from party's disunity on the EU question, as exemplified by his famous and oft-cited quote in which he urged his party to "*stop banging on about Europe*"[4] if it wanted to get back to power after three successive electoral defeats.

2.2 Cameron's First Cabinet (2010-2015)

2010 election campaign reflected Cameron's cautiously pragmatic approach towards the EU issue. On the one hand, the Conservative Party promised never to adopt the euro and never to ratify a European treaty without a prior referendum as it had happened in the case of the Lisbon Treaty (Garret, 2011). On the other hand, Cameron pledged to be a "*practical, sensible*" Eurosceptic, promising, in the words of his Foreign Secretary William Hague, "*not to seek confrontation with the EU and to remain active and activist in the European Union, energetically engaging with our partners*" (Lynch, 2011: 222).

Cameron's initial post-election EU policy with its conciliatory rhetoric towards the EU can be best described as soft Euroscepticism (Beech, 2011: 348), as opposed to the harder, less centrist and more emotional Euroscepticism of some Conservative politicians (Fitzgerald, 2010: 8). It was also dubbed as a scepticism born of ignorance: "*while an older generation of Tory Eurosceptics were very familiar with the EU treaties, and could argue for hours over legalistic minutiae, Cameron* [did not] *seem comfortable talking about Europe in any depth*" (Fitzgerald, 2010: 8). The early part of his tenure was thus marked by a pragmatic approach to the EU policy that for the most part downplayed the issue of Europe, adopting "*a best not mentioned strategy*" (Bale, 2006: 388). Put another way, until 2013 his EU policy was characterized to a great extent as passive (see Garret, 2011 as an example), with Cameron deliberately choosing to remain more or less silent on the issue in a bid to limit its public salience. This was in part due to the fact that "*the virulence of Euroscepticism, and the divisiveness of Europe as an issue, was increasingly viewed as a barrier to widening the party's electoral appeal*" (Gifford, 2014: 512).

Moreover, early into the first term, his EU policy mirrored a strategy of "*compromise and pragmatism*" (Baldini, 2012: 169). Certain EU-related tensions notwithstanding, the

---

[4] As Gamble (2012: 468) aptly acknowledges, however: "*The problem is that there is a large element of the Conservative party which cannot imagine anything more important than banging on about Europe. It is what they came into politics to do.* […] *asking these Conservative MPs to stop banging on about Europe is like asking a philatelist to stop collecting stamps. It will not happen*".

coalition government with the pro-European Liberal Democrats seemed to have found a working compromise (Gifford, 2014: 512), prompting predictions of moderation in terms of Britain's attitude vis-à-vis the EU (Smith, 2012: 1290; Vail, 2015: 113). Indeed, Cameron's initial moderation suggested that the Liberal Democrats did succeed in "*tempering some of the Conservatives' harder-edged Euroscepticism*" (Vail, 2015: 113-114) and constraining their Eurosceptic aspirations (Oppermann and Brummer, 2014: 566). [5]

Cameron took a host of pragmatic (and often discrete) steps towards Brussels that made a large number of his fellow Conservatives question his Eurosceptic credentials. In substantive terms, the examples included instalment of two openly pro-European Liberal Democrats into the coalition government, appointment of a centrist Europe Minister (as opposed to the hard-line Eurosceptic Cameron's EU spokesman in the shadow cabinet), the British Civil Service's European Fast Stream aimed at people who wanted to work for the EU institutions, or his commitment to bailout loans to Ireland, to name but a few (Fitzgerald, 2010: 7; Garret, 2011). Equally important was Cameron's repeated refusal to back an in/out vote on Britain's membership of the EU (Brusenbauch Meislová, 2017: 44).

At the same time, however, given the Liberal Democrats' junior status in the coalition, it was the Conservatives who did drive the coalition's EU policy (Goes, 2014: 50). Indicative of this was, for instance, the fact that Liberal Democrats' support for the euro did not turn into any concrete policy commitments (Vail, 2015: 114), or the fact that they did not manage to secure any of the crucial ministerial portfolios that would enable them to shape Britain's EU policies directly (with the possible exception of the Energy Secretary post) (Fitzgerald, 2010: 7). Alongside this, trying not to alienate his more Eurosceptic party colleagues, Cameron was keen to emphasize the Conservative's opposition to the euro and plans to pass power from Brussels back to London in some policy areas (Vail, 2015: 113). Relatedly, he stood firm on the ECR membership and economic governance and despite continuing to defend Britain's EU membership, he increasingly tied such support to EU's radical reform. Last but not least, the so-called Referendum Lock was adopted in 2011 which required that any future amendments to the EU Treaties transferring additional "significant" powers to the European level be subject to a national referendum.

Another defining feature of Cameron's EU policy at this stage was Britain's piecemeal and ever more obvious isolation within the EU which reached a climax during the EU Brussels summit in December 2011. Here, during the height of the euro crisis, Cameron refused to sign a new fiscal pact intended to enforce budget discipline within the bloc. By standing back he forced the EU to go ahead with an intergovernmental agreement without the UK's participation and radically changed the hitherto Conservative tradition (see Matthijs, 2013 on this), claiming that: "*Margaret Thatcher never vetoed a treaty – I vetoed a treaty upstairs on the eighth floor of this building*" (Dominiczak and Waterfield, 2014).

In June 2012, Cameron said, for the first time, that a referendum on UK's membership in the EU might be necessary, stating that "*For me, the two words 'Europe' and 'referendum' can go together*" (Helm, 2012). From that moment on, the issue became "*when, not whether,*

---

[5] As will be seen shortly, though, their influence gradually waned (Hertner and Keith, 2016: 3).

Cameron would pledge a referendum as Tory policy at the next election" (Kettle, 2016). Ultimately, this shift in Cameron's posture vis-à-vis the EU culminated, after a long build up, with his Bloomberg speech, in which he spelled out his vision of Britain's reformed relationship with the EU and conceded the principle of an in/out referendum. Delivered on Wednesday, 23 January 2013 at Bloomberg's headquarters in London, this address is deemed one of his most important speeches ever. Being branded as a "*crucial moment in the British Eurosceptic debate*" (Startin, 2015), "*dramatic transformation*" (Copsey and Haughton, 2014: 74), "*the watershed moment in the evolution of the UK debate on Europe*" (Startin, 2016: 7), or "*a major shift in Britain's relationship with the EU*" (Lewis, 2014: 8), this speech "*changed the terms of the British debate on the EU decisively*" and marked "*the most radical change in Conservative policy towards the EU since the referendum of 1975*" (Copsey and Haughton, 2014: 75). As a matter of fact, "*not since 1983 had a major British political party proposed a policy that could result in Britain leaving the EU*" (Lewis, 2014: 8). Some commentators therefore viewed it as the most radical European strategy imaginable, signalling an entirely new phase in UK-EU relations (Gifford, 2014).

The period from 2010 to 2013 was thus marked by a gradual (and tentative but nonetheless obvious) shift in both the tone and substance of Cameron's EU policy. In the words of Gifford (2014: 512-513): "*Perhaps unsurprisingly in the context of a fragile governing coalition established during a major crisis for the Eurozone, Europe once again emerged as a significant fault line in United Kingdom politics yet the extent and speed with which this occurred could not have been predicted*". From the "*early moderate, mollifying*" approach, Cameron's rhetoric shifted more towards Euroscepticism (Vail, 2015: 119). Also, he adopted chiefly populist anti-EU rhetoric (Vail, 2015: 115), increasingly painting the EU "*as a menacing foreign entity*" and entirely marginalizing the pro-EU posture of his coalition partners (Vail, 2015: 115). In the end, his approach to the EU amounted to "*full-throated populist embrace of a position that had previously been the province of one wing of his party*" (Vail, 2015: 114-115), becoming "*largely indistinguishable from those adopted by the most intransigent Tory Eurosceptics*" (Vail, 2015: 119). How to explain this turn in Cameron's posture vis-à-vis the EU?

Most importantly, this shift reflected the trend of hardening the anti-EU sentiment within the Conservative Party (the support of whose MPs was critical to his fragile coalition government [Vail, 2015: 120]) and was driven by the demands of its increasingly assertive and restive Eurosceptic faction to make a binding commitment to a vote on the EU. It was the new intake of young Conservative MPs after the 2005 and 2010 general elections and the growing number of the party grassroots, for whom Euroscepticism was a matter of political faith (Gifford, 2014: 512), which significantly altered the balance within the party. For instance, only seven Conservative MPs elected in 2010 could be described as pro-Europeans, which makes it only 2.3 per cent of the parliamentary Party (Heppell, 2013: 349). In 2011, senior Conservative Party members estimated that more than 100 backbenchers were unhappy with coalition's consensual EU policy, feeling that Cameron drifted too far away from a hard line on the EU. One MP even complained that Cameron's government was "the most pro-integrationist administration since Ted Heath's" (Lynch, 2012: 85-86). As Lynch (2012, 86) accurately observed, such positions became the norm in the Conservative Party, with the divisions reflecting "differing

degrees of Euroscepticism within the party", as opposed to the "clear fault-line in the party between pro- European and Eurosceptics" of the 1990s.

As a result, the coalition was disturbed by frequent rebellions and disputes over Europe. Notably, from 2010 to 2015, coalition MPs rebelled in 35 per cent of divisions, making it the most rebellious parliament of the post-war era (Cowley, 2015). This was twice as much as the rate during the previous Labour government and almost nine times higher than the post-war average, suggesting that "*rebellion has become the norm and cohesion the exception*" (Cowley, 2015; cf. Wintour, 2010). In one vote alone in October 2011, 81 Conservative MPs defied Cameron to call for a referendum on Britain's EU membership, in what was "*the largest rebellion against a Tory prime minister over Europe*" ever (BBC, 2011; cf. Cowley and Stuart, 2012).

In need of support of his parliamentary party, Cameron's government took a host of steps (such as, the aforementioned Referendum Lock, veto of the Eurozone rescue plan, or launching the Review of the Balance of Competences in 2012) to depoliticize the EU-related issues and placate the mounting pressure, not least from Cameron's own backbenchers and Conservative supporters. These, to be sure, usually provided a respite, temporarily quietened (but not silenced) the intense criticisms and scored him some political points, as evidenced by his 2011 veto which was much celebrated and extensively congratulated by his hard-sceptic backbenchers. Yet, in the end, they seem to have merely fuelled the defiant backbench's desire for more concessions (on that matter, see, for instance, Lynch, 2015 and Smith, 2016). As Vail avers, even Cameron's pledge to hold a public vote in case of any significant treaty-based provisions for transfers of power from Westminster to Brussels was considered unsatisfactory by many MPs, who increasingly required that the Conservative leadership pressed ahead with a referendum regardless of any prior EU action (Vail, 2015: 113). Hence, the tendency to interpret Cameron's commitment to a referendum on renegotiated terms of membership as "*a clear victory for British Eurosceptics*" (Gifford, 2014: 513).

Simplifying slightly, three main reasons help explain the Conservative (and thereby also Cameron's) radicalisation on the EU issue. First of all, it was paralleled and to a large extent reinforced by the steady rise of Nigel Farage's United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), a right-wing populist party campaigning for EU withdrawal (on this, see, for instance, Ford and Goodwin, 2014; Goodwin, 2015; Hayton, 2010; Hayton, 2016; Usherwood, 2016; Webb and Tim, 2014), and fears of the Conservative Party's members', voters' and supporters' outflow to UKIP. In fact, by early 2013 (i.e. the very time of Cameron's Bloomberg speech), UKIP attracted a considerable number of seats at local council and European elections, starting to overtake the Liberal Democrats in poll ratings and putting Conservative backbenchers at risk of losing their marginal seats (Erlanger and Castle, 2016; Lynch and Whitaker, 2013: 286). Secondly, adding into this "*toxic combination of factors*" (Lynch, 2015: 193) was an increasingly EU-hostile rhetoric of the British (particularly print, tabloid) media (Daddow, 2015b: 4). It was especially The Telegraph and The Daily Mail that escalated the pressure, supporting calls for an in/out referendum, while The Daily Express pursued its own populist campaign to get Britain out of the European Union (Gifford and Wellings, 2017; Startin, 2015: 319). Notably,

also the November 2012 Leveson inquiry into press standards confirmed the inaccurate, misleading and distorted information characteristic for the reporting about the EU (The Leveson Inquiry, 2012: 687-688). Last but not least, hardening of Cameron's anti-EU sentiment also reflected trends in public opinion which became increasingly anti-European in the wake of the financial and Eurozone crises (Byrne, Randall and Theakson, 2017: 216-217; Vail, 2015: 113).

If we turn towards the end of Cameron's first prime ministerial term, also here – and in line with the previous trend – Cameron increasingly demonized the EU, reacting partly to UKIP's further insurgency. That is, Conservative voters' shift to UKIP did not stop altogether with his referendum pledge, as demonstrated by UKIP's 2013 local elections results. This radicalisation on the EU was accompanied by his right-wing shift on other issues such as immigration or welfare (Tournier-Sol, 2015: 148). The latter years of his first cabinet saw further detachment of the UK from the rest of the EU, as exemplified by the opt-out (and later partial opt-in) from pre-Lisbon EU policing and criminal law, tensions over the UK contribution to the EU budget, Cameron's attempts to block a number of initiatives that aimed to strengthen EU's common foreign policy and, most importantly, his unsuccessful endeavour to prevent Jean-Claude Juncker from becoming EU Commission President. Moreover, as it turned out, Cameron's commitment to a referendum served only as a short-term basis for uniting his party, as the clashes over the European issue soon resurfaced again.

2.3 Cameron's Second Cabinet (2015-2016)

In his second cabinet, Cameron honoured his 2013 pledge and put the strategy of staging a renegotiation and advancing the result to a referendum into practice. As a consequence, the EU agenda in his second cabinet was inevitably dominated by the referendum debate and, later, also the renegotiations and the referendum campaign. This effectively prevented Cameron from developing any broader EU policy vision in his second term (cf. Byrne, Randall and Theakson, 2017: 217).

Cameron's second cabinet was broadly stigmatized by the challenge of fulfilling the expectations he had generated on the issue of EU renegotiation (Byrne, Randall and Theakson, 2017: 218). In 2013, Cameron promised "*fundamental, far-reaching change*", yet with no guarantee that he could secure them. Indeed, the reform proposals revealed in November 2015 were far below the stated ambition (Byrne, Randall and Theakson, 2017: 217). Throughout late 2015 and early 2016, he bargained to win concessions from EU partners, but his approach towards renegotiation was widely criticized as lax and unconvincing (for instance, Greenslade, 2015; Foster, 2016; Miller, 2016; Pickard and Parker, 2016). The new settlement that was approved in February 2016 and which Cameron claimed would give the UK "special status" in the EU fell short of even the November 2015 proposals, mainly when it came to free movement and access to benefits (Byrne, Randall and Theakson, 2017: 217).

During the divisive referendum campaign, Cameron adopted a softer version of Euroscepticism, persuading British voters to vote in favour of remaining in the reformed

EU.[6] His campaign rhetoric was primarily driven by rational arguments, evaluating the costs and benefits of EU membership and legitimizing UK's membership in the EU mainly through the economic output. Yet, according to many commentators, he "*failed to make the case for UK membership until almost the last minute*" (Kettel, 2016). At this stage, too, his rhetoric mirrored his efforts to mollify the divisions within Conservative ranks, with as much as a one-fifth of the Cabinet and two-fifths of Conservative MPs having refused his renegotiation (Byrne, Randall and Theakson, 2017: 217). Indeed, it was not only the populist appeal of Nigel Farage and UKIP that he had to stand up to, but also that of other high-profile figures (and Conservative politicians) of the Leave camp, such as, for example Boris Johnson (Byrne, Randall and Theakson, 2017: 217). In order to address the discontents in his own government, Cameron even granted the "agreement to differ" which suspended the principle of Cabinet collective responsibility by allowing individual ministers to hold and express personal views on the UK's EU membership, different from the official governmental position.

Conclusions

It is, of course, highly paradoxical that, despite famously urging the Conservative Party to "*stop banging on about Europe*", the European issue eventually did become a defining issue of David Cameron's party leadership and he was himself brought down by that very same party over the very same issue. The analysis demonstrated that the European question resonated very strongly in the period under review here. With the ascending length of Cameron's leadership, a dramatically growing prominence of the European issue can be detected. Its significance seems to be well illustrated by Cameron's statement that the "*crucial point about Britain*" was "*our attitude to Europe*" (Cameron, 2013). It was especially his first cabinet (2010-2015) that was the most decisive one when it comes to the impact on the overall British EU policy (which also partly explains the certain disproportion in coverage of the three terms).

Taken together, Cameron did have a full-time job "*juggling (party) politics about Europe with a (government) policy towards Europe*", as predicted by Gardner (2010) in 2010 – very accurately considering how things were to turn out. Inevitably, he was confronted by the same dilemma as previous British Prime Ministers – the dilemma acute to the point of ridiculous, as eloquently formulated by Tony Blair: "*Basically, you have a choice: co-operate in Europe and you betray Britain; be unreasonable in Europe, be praised back home, and be utterly without influence in Europe. It's sort of: isolation or treason*" (Schnapper, 2009: 56).

Though one should caution against generalisation, the analysis suggests that there was more continuity than discontinuity in David Cameron's EU policy across the three cabinets. Each of his cabinets was marked by a distinct dynamic, in which his policy towards the EU unfolded. The inquiry pointed to the instrumental disposition of Cameron's EU policy and a relatively continuous character of his Eurosceptic stance. Despite the

---

[6] Interestingly, his endorsement of the UK remaining in the EU also correlated with rising public support for the Remain option (Vasilopoulou, 2016: 221).

fluctuating degree of his anti-Europeanism, the substance and underlying geometry of his EU approach remained more or less unchanged. It was, indeed, Cameron's lifelong articulate soft Euroscepticism which provided him with "*no answer to the hardliners on Europe once the issue had become turbocharged by austerity and immigration*" (Kettle, 2016). As Kettle (2016) further points out, Cameron was "*being consistent with his own soft Euroscepticism, not innovative in the way that might have equipped him to fight his corner more effectively when the referendum came in 2016.*"

In principle, David Cameron was critical of the EU since he became the Head of Opposition (and long before, but this already goes beyond the scope of this article), expressing severe doubts about it (not least in terms of its functionality, effectiveness, competitiveness, and democratic accountability), attacking excessive EU interference and finding many aspects of EU institutions and policies uncongenial. Parallel to this, however, he was consistently supportive of Britain's membership in the EU, believing that its withdrawal would be harmful. While doing so, he advocated predominantly (but not exclusively) the economic case for membership, perceiving advantages of mutual cooperation in pragmatic and essentially transactional terms. Put differently, he was consistently legitimizing UK's membership in the EU predominantly through the economic output. Moreover, he also tied his support for Britain's membership to EU's far-reaching reform – increasingly so with the growing length of his mandate.

Another continuity in Cameron's EU policy was his gradual distancing of Britain from the EU. His EU policies oriented the UK away from the bloc, promoting the semi-detached politics of disengagement, and, by extension, also UK's isolation and marginalisation in the EU affairs. Besides, well-aware all along of the inherent divisiveness of the EU issue and the danger stemming from intra-party divisions on this topic, Cameron was determined not to let the Conservative Party slide back into the destructive introspection over the EU (cf. Gardner, 2010). With Cameron treating the EU question mainly as a party management problem, he tried to contain its salience and neutralize it. More often than not, he "*put tactics before strategy in his handling of Europe*" (Kettle, 2016). Therefore, his EU policy was, to a great extent, driven by attempts to assuage mounting rebellions of the Eurosceptic Conservative benches over the EU and mitigate their damaging effect. Crafted with these intra-party concerns in mind, his EU policy tended to be reactive and largely defensive, illustrating the underlying weaknesses of his governing approach to Europe and giving the impression that Cameron was following his party, rather than leading it.

By contrast, the research found considerable discontinuity in terms of Cameron's opinion on using the tool of an in/out referendum on Britain's membership of the EU. He was, indeed, highly inconsistent in this respect: originally refusing it profoundly only to make a dramatic U-turn within a matter of nine months, reverse his previous position and become a staunch supporter of this policy instrument. Besides, as already hinted at, discontinuity manifested itself also in his strategic outlook on the EU which was far from stable, ranging from cautious pragmatism to enthusiastic Euroscepticism at various points of time. The three cabinets gradated by changeable degrees of his anti-Europeanism, fluctuating over the whole period of Cameron's leadership. Relatedly, the

inquiry identified discontinuity in usage of populist aspects in his anti-EU stance, with increasingly growing populism in his anti-EU rhetoric at later stages of his tenure. In light of these findings, the author comes to a conclusion that whilst continuity can be detected in David Cameron's EU policies throughout the whole tenure of his Conservative Party leadership, discontinuity pertained to his EU strategies and tactics.

REFERENCES:

- Alexandre-Collier, A. (2015a). *Euroscepticism under Margaret Thatcher and David Cameron: From Theory to Practice.* Observatoire de la societe britannique, La Garde: UFR Lettres et sciences Humaines. [Observatory of the British society, La Garde : UFR Letters and Human Sciences].
- Alexandre-Collier, A. (2015b) The Temptation of Populism in David Cameron's Leadership Style. In: A. Alexandre-Collier and F. De Chantel, eds., *Leadership and Uncertainty Management in Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 141–156.
- Allen, D. and Oliver, T. (2006). The Foreign and Commonwealth Office. In: I. Bache and J. Andrew, eds., *The Europeanization of British Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 52–66.
- Baldini, G. (2012). Between Europe and America: The Coalition and Britain's Changing International Role. In: G. Baldini and J. Hopkin, eds., *Coalition Britain: The UK Election of 2010.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 163–180.
- Bale, T. (2006). Between a Soft and a Hard Place? The Conservative Party, Valence Politics and the Need for a New "Eurorealism". *Parliamentary Affairs*, 59(3), pp. 385–400.
- BBC (2011). *EU referendum: Rebels lose vote in Commons.* [online] BBC News, 25. 10. 2011, http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-15425256 [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Beech, M. (2011). British Conservatism and Foreign Policy: Traditions and Ideas Shaping Cameron's Global View. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations,* 13(3), pp. 348-363.
- Brown, S. and John, M. (2013). *Selfish, ignorant, dangerous: Europe's verdict on Cameron speech.* [online] Reuters, 23 January 2013. Available at: http://www.reuters.com/article/us-britain-europe-reaction-idUSBRE90M0MY20130123 [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Brusenbauch Meislová, M. (2017). Strategický kontext referend o setrvání Velké Británie v ES/EU: analýza motivace politických elit. *Mezinárodní vztahy,* 52(2), pp. 29-56. [The Strategic Context of the British Referenda on Continued Membership in the EC/EU: An Analysis of the Political Elite's Motivation].
- Byrne, C, Randall, N and Theakston, K (2017). Evaluating British prime ministerial performance: David Cameron's premiership in political time. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations,* 19(1), pp. 202-220.
- Cameron, D. (2009). *Cameron speech on EU.* [online] BBC, 4 November. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/8343145.stm [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Cameron, D. (2013). *EU speech at Bloomberg.* [online] Government of the United Kingdom, 23. 1. 2013, https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/eu-speech-at-bloomberg [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Copsey, N. and Haughton, T. (2014). Farewell Britannia? 'Issue Capture' and the Politics of David Cameron's 2013 EU Referendum Pledge. *JCMS Annual Review,* 51(1), pp. 74–89.
- Cowley, P. (2015). *The most rebellious parliament of the post-war era.* [online] Political Insight, 28 March 2015. Available at: https://www.psa.ac.uk/insight-plus/blog/most-rebellious-parliament-post-war-era [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Cowley, P. and Stuart, M. (2012). The Cambusters: The Conservative European Union Referendum Rebellion of October 2011. *Political Quarterly*, 83(2).

- Daddow, O. (2015a). Interpreting the Outsider Tradition in British European Policy Speeches from Thatcher to Cameron. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 53(1), pp. 71–88.
- Daddow, O. (2015b). Strategising European Policy: David Cameron's Referendum Gamble. *The RUSI Journal*, 160(5), pp. 4–10.
- Diez, T. (2001). Europe as a Discursive Battleground. Discourse Analysis and European Integration Studies. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 36(1), pp. 5–38.
- Dominiczak, P. and Waterfield, B. (2014). *Cameron styles himself as the heir to Thatcher.* [online] The Telegraph, 27 June. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/10932162/Cameron-styles-himself-as-the-heir-to-Thatcher.html [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Erlanger, S. and Castle, S. (2016). *In 'Brexit' Vote, David Cameron Faces Problem of His Own Making.* The New York Times, 21. 6. 2016, http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/22/world/europe/david-cameronbrexit-european-union.html.
- Fitzgerald, S. (2010). *Coalition in Britain – Coalitions in Europe? An Analysis of the UK's European Policy.* Dublin: The Institute of International and European Affairs.
- Fontana, C. and Parsons, C. (2015). 'One Woman's Prejudice': Did Margaret Thatcher Cause Britain's Anti-Europeanism? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 53(1), pp. 89-105.
- Ford, R. and Goodwin, M. (2014). *Revolt on the Right: Explaining support for the Radical Right in Britain.* London: Routledge.
- Foster, P. (2016). *EU deal: What David Cameron asked for... and what he actually got.* The Telegraph, 14. 6. 2016, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/05/19/eu-deal-what-david-cameron-asked-for-and-whathe-actually-got/.
- Gamble, A. (2012). Better Off Out? Britain and Europe. *Political Quarterly*, 83(3), pp. 468–477.
- Gardner, D. (2010). *Cameron needs red meat to feed Eurosceptic Tory backwoodsmen.* [online] Financial Times, 17 March 2010. Available at: http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/8bbb16b4-3163-11df-9741-00144feabdc0.html?ft_site=falcon&desktop=true#axzz4ooqpMK96 [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Garret, M. (2011). *Will Cameron's "No" At EU Summit Lead To Bigger British Break With Europe?* [online] The European Institute. Available at: https://www.europeaninstitute.org/index.php/138-european-affairs/ea-december-2011/1496-will-camerons-no-at-eu-summit-lead-to-bigger-british-break-with-europe [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Geddes, A. (2005). Europe. In: K. Hickson, ed., *The Political Thought of the Conservative Party since 1945.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 113-132.
- Gifford, C. (2014). The People Against Europe: The Eurosceptic Challenge to the United Kingdom's Coalition Government. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(3), pp. 512–528.
- Gifford, C. and Wellings, B. (2017, forthcoming). Referenda and European Integration: The case of the United Kingdom. In: Startin, N., Usherwood, S. and Leruth, B., eds., *Routledge Handbook of Euroscepticism.* London: Routledge.
- Goes, E. (2014). The Coalition and Europe: A Tale of Reckless Drivers, Steady Navigators and Imperfect Roadmaps. *Parliamentary Affairs* 67(1), pp. 45–63.
- Goodwin, M. (2015). UKIP, the 2015 General Election and Britain's EU Referendum. *Political Insight,* (6)3, pp. 12–15.
- Greenslade, R. (2015). *Press turns on David Cameron over his 'pathetic' EU negotiations.* The Guardian, 14. 12. 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/media/greenslade/2015/dec/14/press-turns-on-david-cameron-over-his-pathetic-eu-negotiation [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Hayton, R. (2010). Towards the Mainstream? UKIP and the 2009 Elections to the European Parliament. *Politics*, 30(1), pp. 26–35.

- Hayton, R. (2016). The UK Independence Party and the Politics of Englishness. *Political Studies Review,* 14(3), pp. 400–410.
- Heffernan, R. (2005). Exploring (and Explaining) the British Prime Minister. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 7(4), pp. 605–620.
- Helm, T. (2012). *David Cameron pledges referendum if EU demands more powers*. [online] The Guardian, 30 June. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2012/jun/30/david-cameron-referendum-eu [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Heppell, T. (2013). Cameron and Liberal Conservatism: Attitudes within the Parliamentary Conservative Party and Conservative Ministers. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 15(3), pp. 340–361.
- Hertner, I. and Keith, D. (2016). Europhiles or Eurosceptics? Comparing the European policies of the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats. *British Politics*, 12(1), pp. 63–89.
- Hloušek, V. and Kaniok, P. (2014). Strategic or Identity-Based Euroscepticism? the Euro Discourse of Vaclav Klaus. *Romanian Journal of Political Science*, 14(1), pp. 35-60.
- Jennings, S. (2013). *Cameron's EU dilemma*. [online] The International Interest, 24 December, 2013. Available at: https://intlinterest.com/2015/12/24/camerons-eu-dilemma/ [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Kettle, M. (2016). *The downfall of David Cameron: a European tragedy*. [online] The Guardian, 24 June. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/jun/24/david-cameron-downfall-european-tragedy [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Kirkup, J. (2010). *David Cameron says he is a 'Eurosceptic' following EU 'deal'*. Daily Telegraph, 29 October 2010.
- Lewis, O. (2014). *Lessons from the 1975 EU Renegotiation*. [online] Business for Britain. Available at: http://forbritain.org/bfb060-historians-report-mr_r.pdf [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Lynch, P. (2011). The con-lib agenda for Europe. In: S. Lee and M. Beech, eds., *The Cameron-Clegg Government: Coalition Politics in An Age of Austerity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 218–236.
- Lynch, P. (2012). European Policy. In: T. Heppel and D. Seawright, eds., *Cameron and the Conservatives: The Transition to Coalition Government*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 74-88.
- Lynch, P. (2015). Conservative Modernisation and European Integration: From Silence to Salience and schism. *British Politics*, 10(2), pp. 185–203.
- Lynch, P. and Whitaker, R. (2008). A Loveless Marriage: The Conservatives and the European People's Party. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 61(1), pp. 31–51.
- Mates, J. (2012). *David Cameron's Euro-schizophrenia*. [online] ITV, 8 June. 2012. Available at: http://www.itv.com/news/2012-06-08/david-camerons-euro-schizophrenia/ [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Matthijs, M. (2013). David Cameron's Dangerous Game: The Folly of Flirting with an EU Exit. *Foreign Affairs* 92(5), pp. 10–16.
- McTague, T. (2016). *David Cameron, the accidental European*. Politico, 20 May 2016, http://www.politico.eu/article/david-cameron-accidental-european-brexit-referendum-conservative-tory-euroskeptic [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Menon, A. (1998). The Paradoxes of 'Failure': British EU Policy Making in Comparative Perspective. *Public Policy and Administration,* 13(4), pp. 46–66.
- Miller, V. (2016). *UK's EU Reform Negotiations: The Tusk Package*. House of Commons Briefing Paper no. 7497, 9. 2. 2016, http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/CBP-7497#fullreport.
- O'Malley, E. (2007). The Power of Prime Ministers: Results of an Expert Survey. *International Political Science Review*, 28(1), pp. 7–27.

- Oliver, T. (2017). Fifty Shades of Brexit: Britain's EU Referendum and its Implications for Europe and Britain. *The International Spectator*, February 2017.
- Oliver, T. and Booth, A. (2017). *Brexit is a fascinating case study for students and teachers of UK and EU politics.* The Brexit blog, 14 July. http://thebrexitblog.ideasoneurope.eu/2017/07/14/brexit-fascinating-case-study-students-teachers-uk-eu-politics/.
- Oppermann, K. and Brummer, K. (2014). Patterns of junior partner influence on the foreign policy of coalition governments. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations,* 16(4), pp. 555–571.
- Pickard, J. and Parker, G. (2016). David Cameron endures barrage of criticism from own MPs. *The Financial Times*, 22. 2. 2016, https://www.ft.com/content/624a9730-d98e-11e5-a72f-1e7744c66818.
- Schnapper, P. (2009). The British Party Leaders' Discourse on Europe, In: L. Maguire, ed., *The Foreign Policy Discourse in the United Kingdom and the United States in the New World Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 56-77.
- Smith, J. (2012). The European Dividing Line in Party Politics. *International Affairs*, 88(6), pp. 1278–1295.
- Smith, J. (2016). David Cameron's EU renegotiation and referendum pledge: A case of déjà vu? *British Politics*, 11(3), pp. 1–23.
- Startin, N. (2015). Have we reached a tipping point? The mainstreaming of Euroscepticism in the UK. *International Political Science Review,* 36(3), pp. 311–323.
- Startin, N. (2016). 'To be or not to be?' 'Should I stay or should I go?' and other clichés: The 2016 UK referendum on EU membership. In: *'What country, friends, is this?' A guide to the EU referendum debate*. Bath: University of Bath/Institute for Policy Research, pp. 7–15.
- The Leveson Inquiry (2012). *An Inquiry into the Culture, Practices and Ethics of the Press*. Volume II. London: The Stationery Office. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/270941/0780_ii.pdf.
- Tournier-Sol, K. (2015). Reworking the Eurosceptic and Conservative Traditions into a Populist Narrative: UKIP's Winning Formula? *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 53(1), pp. 140–156.
- Usherwood, S. (2016). Did UKIP win the referendum? *Political Insight*, 7(2), pp. 27–29.
- Usherwood, S. and Startin, N. (2013). Euroscepticism as a Persistent Phenomenon. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 51(1), pp. 1-16.
- Vail, M. (2015). Between One-Nation Toryism and Neoliberalism: The Dilemmas of British Conservatism and Britain's Evolving Place in Europe. *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 53(1), pp. 106–122.
- Vasilopoulou, S. (2015). *David Cameron, Europe and the politics of ambiguity*. [online] The Conversation, 17 March. Available at: http://theconversation.com/david-cameron-europe-and-the-politics-of-ambiguity-38879 [Accessed 1 August 2017].
- Webb, P. and Bale, T. (2014). Why Do Tories Defect to UKIP? Conservative Party Members and the Temptations of the Populist Radical Right. *Political Studies*, 62(4), pp. 961–970.
- Wintour, P. (2010). *Backbench rebellions at postwar high for coalition*. [online] The Guardian, 8 November. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2010/nov/08/backbench-rebellion-postwar-high-coalition [Accessed 1 August 2017].