EUROSCEPTICISM OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN POLAND AND CZECH REPUBLIC

A Master's Thesis

by

DENİZ AKSOY

Department of International Relations

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

Ankara

September 2011

To *2009-2011 Bilkent IR Graduate Students*

EUROSCEPTICISM OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN POLAND AND CZECH REPUBLIC

Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

of

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

DENİZ AKSOY

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

September 2011

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assist. Prof. Dimitris Tsarouhas

Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assist. Prof. Ali Tekin

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assist. Prof. Zeki Sarıgil

Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

----

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel

Director

ABSTRACT

EUROSCEPTICISM OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN POLAND AND CZECH
REPUBLIC

Aksoy, Deniz

M.A., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Assist. Prof.Dimitris Tsarouhas

September 2011

This study is an attempt to explore the distinctive character of Europeanization of the Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs) and seeks to contribute to the development of the literature on Europeanization of political parties. The main inquiry is to analyze the relationship between Europeanization of political parties and party-level Euroscepticism. The study argues that party-level Euroscepticism is not merely an effect, but also a clear manifestation of Europeanization process.

Keywords: Europeanization of political parties, party-level Euroscepticism

ÖZET

POLONYA VE ÇEK CUMHURİYETİ'NDEKİ SİYASAL PARTİLERİN AVRUPA-KUŞKUCULUĞU

Aksoy, Deniz

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd.Doç. Dimitris Tsarouhas

Eylül 2011

Bu çalışma Orta ve Doğu Avrupa ülkelerinin Avrupalılaşma sürecinin ayırd edici özelliklerini belirlemeye ve siyasi partilerin Avrupalılaşması literatürüne katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Siyasi partilerin Avrupalılaşma süreci ile partilerin avrupa kuşkucu politikaları arasındaki ilişki çalışmanın temel araştırma odağını oluşturmaktadır.Bu çerçevede, çalışma Avrupa kuşkucu parti politikalarının Avrupa Bütünleşme sürecinin sadece bir sonucu olmaktan ziyade, Avrupalılaşma sürecinin açık bir göstergesi olduğu fikrini savunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Siyasi partilerin Avrupalılaşması, siyasi partilerin Avrupa kuşkuculuğu

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AWS   Solidarity Electoral Action

CEE   Central and Eastern Europe

CEECs   Central and Eastern European Countries

CSSD   Czech Social Democratic Party

ECT   European Constitutional Treaty

KSCM   Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia

LPR   League of Polish Families

ODS   Civic Democratic Union

PİS   Law and Justice

PO   Civic Platform

PSL   Polish Peasant Party

Samoobrona   Self-Defence

SLD   Democratic Left Alliance

UP   Labour Union

UW   Freedom Union

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Euroscepticism is not a new, nor a threatening phenomenon in the history of European integration. From the famous 1988 Bruges Speech of Margaret Thatcher to Vaclav Klaus's speech to the European Parliament on 12 February 2009 at the beginning of the Czech EU Presidency, nothing much has really changed in terms of the source of opposition to European integration. In both cases, Euroscepticism serves as an outright manifestation of the concerns and reservations of those who oppose further integration beyond economic cooperation, and the transformation of the EU into a supranational political entity. However, what has dramatically changed is that Euroscepticism can no longer be conceived of as a marginal political attitude towards European integration which can be described with reference to a singular "Thatcherite" rhetoric. "The Bruges Speech" by Margaret Thatcher was the first outright manifestation of a Eurosceptic political discourse, which expressed the concerns of those who oppose further integration beyond inter-state economic cooperation and the transformation of the Union into a supranational political entity.

The politics of Euroscepticism and its discourse have become one of the defining characteristics of the European political landscape. As Leconte (2010: 12) describes: "what was considered a Eurosceptic discourse in the Thatcher era has

now become common parlance in relation to the EU." Euroscepticism has always accompanied the development of European integration. Its size and salience grows as the scale of European integration becomes wider, bigger and deeper. In this sense, Euroscepticism has acquired importance more than ever as the Union has become a supranational political entity and reached its greatest size yet with twenty seven members. In light of these developments, the issues of Europe and European integration become the major themes of domestic political discussion and contestation.It is in this context that the salience of the politics of Euroscepticism dramatically increased in terms of its impact on party politics of member, new member and candidate states.

It is no longer possible to assume the existence of a permissive consensus, which had been widely endorsed throughout the post war era, concerning the direction and nature of European integration at the political level. The end of the elite consensus on the limits and nature of European integration reached its peak with the controversies surrounding the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1991 (Leconte, 2010: 45). Since the 1990s, the age of the 'permissive consensus' about the European integration was started to be replaced by the age of a 'constraining dissensus' (Steenbergen et al., 2007: 14). In this process, the national governments and political parties have become the central actors as the most direct channels of influence for the expression of public and party political Euroscepticism both at the national and EU levels. In all these respects, Euroscepticism has become "a corollary of increasing European integration" (Taggart, 1998: 363), and the increasing academic interest in the study of Europeanization of political parties, party politics and party-level Euroscepticism

owes its existence to the growing salience and impact of the issue of 'Europe' and the EU on national political structures.

According to Mair (2008: 154), there are three main research strands in the European integration and political parties literature. First, the study of transnational party federations and their potential to create substantial party activity at the European level; secondly the study of the nature and dynamics of the parties and party systems in the European Parliament and finally the study of the impact and role of Europe in shaping party programs, party ideology, party systems and party competition at the national level. The present study belongs to third strand of research and seeks to contribute to the development of the literature on the Europeanization of political parties. It does so by focusing on the impact of European integration on domestic party politics. In doing so, it also recognizes the limits to which West European party based concepts and analytical tools can contribute to our understanding of the Europeanization of party systems and party politics in Central and Eastern Europe. It also highlights the necessity for the further development of the Europeanization framework, which can account for the differences between the Western and Eastern European party systems and their effects on the countries' respective extent of Europeanization.

The study of party-based Euroscepticism in two countries of Central and Eastern Europe demonstrates the multifaceted nature of Euroscepticism. Euroscepticism is not conceived as a stable position and attitude towards the issues of Europe and European integration on the basis of a particular party political ideology. It features across the left-right political spectrum and cuts across the mainstream dimensions of political competition. This study further seeks to demonstrate that, in contrast to the rational institutionalist accounts of Europeanization, the politics

of Euroscepticism is not necessarily evident only in marginal political parties that are located at the fringes of their national party system. In terms of its concrete application, this study analyzes the political discourses, positions and attitudes of mainstream political parties, which manifest varying degrees Euroscepticism. In this vein, the chapters on Poland and the Czech Republic will show that Euroscepticism is not necessarily a feature of marginal party politics. Furthermore, through the comparative analysis of the politics of Euroscepticism in the Czech Republic and Poland, this study attempts to strengthen the argument that Euroscepticism has differential levels and functions in different national settings. The broad range of political parties and different Eurosceptic positions all point to the fact that Euroscepticism has a multi-faceted nature.

In light of all these, this study asks three major interrelated questions: First, how do mainstream political parties problematise the issue of Europe and European integration within their national party politics and discourse? Secondly, why do mainstream political parties make use of a Eurosceptic political rhetoric? Thirdly, how can we account for different levels and forms of Euroscepticism employed by mainstream political parties?

The organization of the chapters is as follows. After the introduction, the second chapter offers a detailed literature review on Europeanization. It also sets the theoretical framework used in this study. It does so by unpacking Europeanization both as an analytical concept and as a theoretical framework. It then proceeds to reveal the differences between "Europeanization West" vs. "Europeanization East" and locates the research design of this study within the latter category. The chapter then introduces the Europeanization of political parties literature as well

as the main research questions and concludes with a discussion on how political party Europeanization is, and should be, approached.

The third chapter establishes the link between Europeanization and Euroscepticism, unpacks the concept of Euroscepticism and introduces methodological insights to the study of party-based Euroscepticism. It does so by presenting a detailed overview of earlier studies on general party attitudes towards European integration, paying attention to the differences between the Western and East European contexts. The chapter then moves from the study of party attitudes in general to the study of party-based Euroscepticism in particular in the context of Central and Eastern European countries. It introduces different conceptualizations of Euroscepticism and arrives at some conclusions explaining which definitions are operationalized in this study.

The fourth chapter offers an empirical analysis of party-based Euroscepticism in Poland. The chapter begins by introducing the objectives of conducting an empirical analysis and proceeds by offering the main features of the Polish party system. Then follows an analysis of primary and second order elections in order to show how Europe plays a role in shaping national party politics, the structure of national party competition and correspondingly how mainstream political parties problematise Europeanization by looking at their election campaigns, manifestos and discourses.

The fifth chapter analyzes the effects of Europeanization on Czech political parties and party system through examining the changes in party programs of the three major political parties (social democrats, communists and the centre-right). This chapter aims to provide a respective focus on Czech party system and

politics in the pre-accession and post-accession periods and to demonstrate that the politics of Euroscepticism can offer a viable ground for domestic party opposition. It can be utilized as a powerful party strategy for electoral competition, although the issue of Europe does not become a new political cleavage in the party systems of candidate and new member states at the domestic level.

Finally, the concluding chapter brings Europeanization and the politics of Euroscepticism together in light of the study's theoretical and conceptual framework and main empirical findings. Thus the thesis concludes with an evaluation of the extent to which mainstream understandings of Europeanization can help our understanding of the relationship between European integration and party-based Euroscepticism in CEECs.

CHAPTER II

EUROPEANIZATION AS A FRAMEWORK

2.1 A Review of the Literature on Europeanization

This chapter will review the literature on Europeanization in order to demonstrate the contested nature of the concept of Europeanization, which generates much controversy concerning its precise definition and theoretical application within the field of European integration studies. The lack of a shared definition of the concept has been a source of severe criticism, and has been described as "a fashionable concept", regarding its usefulness understanding European transformations (Olsen, 2002: 921). However, the multiplicity of its definitions and applications enriches the conceptualization of Europeanization, which leads to a distinctively broad research agenda for studies concerning the domestic politics of the European Union.

Cini et al. (2007), acknowledge four commonly accepted definitions of Europeanization. The first definition adopts a top-down perspective which focuses

on the impacts of the European Union on the member states. The main object of analysis is the impact of EU level institutions, policies and policy-making at the national level. This approach is concerned with the changes and transformations in the national level of governance as a result of European integration. The second definition entails both a top-down and a bottom-up approach, which analyzes the interaction between policies, institutions and policy making at the EU and national levels. From this perspective, Europeanization is a two-dimensional process through which member states shape the EU level by uploading their own policies, institutions and policy-making. At the same time they are constantly shaped by the EU's influence through downloading EU policies and institutions into the domestic arena (Börzel, 2002: 193). The third definition offers a more horizontal approach to Europeanization whereby the changes in the institutions, policies and policy making in one member are exported to other member states without necessarily this being an outcome of involvement by EU institutions. Hence, the central focus is on the role played by institutions regarding policy transfer and policy-making from one member state to another. Finally the fourth definition views Europeanization as a process of institution-building and policy-making at the EU level. This classification of the different approaches to Europeanization carries a crucial task for the purposes of this study which will incorporate both a top-down and a bottom-up approach to Europeanization. Given the lack of conceptual precision in the literature, first it is necessary to trace the development of existing definitions so as to comprehend their meaning. Secondly, we ought to analyze them in light of the fourfold typology mentioned above to identify which definitions prove to be useful within the conceptual framework of this study.

Europeanization studies, which adopt a particular view of the concept as the impact of the EU on domestic politics, consist of a multitude of alternative definitions; yet share some degree of commonality in their analysis.

Ladrech (1994: 69) defined Europeanization as "an incremental process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making". Radaelli (2000) considers this definition a significant advancement on the grounds that it views Europeanization primarily as an "incremental process", which highlights the role played by the organizational logic of the member states. From Ladrech's (1994: 71) perspective, the re-orientation of the national organization logic, described as "the adaptive processes of organizations to a changed or changing environment", appears as an output of the Europeanization process. In this sense, Ladrech introduces a bottom-up approach to Europeanization, which prioritizes the role of domestic structures in the process of national adaptation.

Although Ladrech (1994) points to the convergence effect of Europeanization by underlining the reorientation of the organizational logic of domestic structures, he underestimates the role played by individuals and policy entrepreneurs. Furthermore, Ladrech's definition was subject to criticism on the grounds that its scope of analysis was restricted to national politics and policy-making, whereas "one could add identities and the cognitive component of politics" (Radaelli, 2000: 3).

Bulmer and Burch (1998: 602) conceptualized Europeanization as:

> The extent to which EC/EU requirements and policies have affected the determination of member states' policy agendas and goals' and 'the extent to which EU practices, operating procedures and administrative values have impinged on, and become embedded in, the administrative practices of the member states.

Radaelli (2000) and Bache (2003) assert that the historical institutionalist perspective of Bulmer and Burch (1998) articulates the importance of how European integration was perceived and constructed in shaping Britain's adjustment process to the EU. To put it more clearly, rather than endorsing the idea of "a clash of administrative traditions", their study advocates that the maintenance of pre-existing features of the "national governmental machinery" both mediated and facilitated the national adjustment process (Bache, 2003: 3; Radaelli, 2000: 7). In this framework, Europeanization takes place within the political realm whereby member states are capable of incorporating the prevailing administrative traditions to those of the EU. In short, Europeanization is conceived as an outcome of an interactive process between the two separate levels of governance, national and European.

Börzel (quoted in Radaelli, 2000:3) defines Europeanization as a "process by which domestic policy areas become increasingly subject to European policy-making." This definition draws on the transfer of power and competencies of the member states to the EU level of decision-making. Taking into account the criticisms concerning the reductionist understanding of Europeanization solely as change in policy and policy-making practices (Vink, 2002: 4), in a later study, Börzel (2002: 193) expands her previous conceptual definition as:

> Europeanization is a two-way process. It entails both a bottom-up and a top-down dimension. The former emphasizes the evolution of European

institutions as a set of new norms, rules and practices, whereas the latter refers to the impact of these new institutions on political structures and processes of the member states.

On the basis of the above, it is possible to claim that a broader and more useful definition of Europeanization, which highlights the "ways in which member state governments both shape European policy outcomes and adapt to them", is introduced (Börzel, 2002: 195). This allows the researcher to include the interplay between the EU and domestic levels of governance in the analysis of the Europeanization process.

Cowles et al. (2001), offer an alternative definition of Europeanization, which perfectly illustrates the fourth approach discussed within the fourfold distinction offered by Cini et al. They refer to the institution-building and policy-making processes at the EU level. Their definition is as follows (Cowles et al., 2001: 3):

> We define Europeanization as the emergence and development at the European level of distinct structures of governance, that is, of political, legal and social institutions associated with political problem-solving that formalize interactions among the actors, and of policy networks specializing in the creation of authoritative rules. Europeanization involves the evolution of new layers of politics that interact with older ones.

In light of Börzel's distinction between bottom-up and top-down dimensions of Europeanization, it can be argued that although Cowles et al. (2001) view Europeanization as a two-way process and are cognizant of the interaction among different actors and policy networks from the national and EU levels, their definition is more heavily oriented towards a bottom-up approach. This is because the primary focus is on the evolution of European institutions as a set of new norms rules and practices as opposed to the feedbacks of this new institutional

building by the member states whose activities affect the European level. Another important remark to be made concerns the common element between Cowles et al. (2001) and other conceptualizations discussed above regarding the emphasis on the "domestic adaptation with national colors", one of the most central themes within Cowles et al. (2001: 1) framework, which implies that "national features continue to play a role in shaping the outcomes" of Europeanization. A final point relates to the central contribution of their study, which explores the mechanisms of Europeanization in the attempt to explain "why, how and under what conditions Europeanization shapes a variety of domestic structures in a number of countries" in a differential way (Cowles et al. 2001: 3). Their volume introduces a three-step approach to Europeanization, which introduces "the goodness of fit" argument, the notion of adaptation pressures and mediating factors in the attempt to offer a framework of domestic adaptational change. According to their argument, the so- called goodness of fit (or misfit) between the EU rules and regulations and the domestic politics, the Europeanization process generates differential adaptational pressures on domestic structures of the member states, which might consequently lead to adaptational change depending on the "presence or absence of mediating factors" (Cowles et al., 2001: 9). Drawing upon this framework, Börzel and Risse (2003) identify domains of Europeanization as policies, politics and polities, along which the domestic impact of Europeanization can be analyzed. The reason behind this three-fold distinction is to provide an analytical framework through which the differential impact and asymmetrical character of Europeanization can be studied under the different domestic domains of member states.

In a similar attempt to identify the mechanisms of Europeanization, Olsen (cited in Cini et al., 2007: 409), indicates five dimensions to respond to the question of "how Europeanization as a process of change operates." The first dimension, which is defined as changes in the external boundaries, is concerned with the extent to which Europe as a territorial form of political organization acts as a single political space. In this perspective, Europeanization is conceptualized as a feedback effect of European enlargement. The second dimension uses Europeanization to denote a process of developing institutions at the European level. In addition, it emphasizes the institutionalization of a distinct form of governance, which provides a collective action capacity to the member states by facilitating the co-ordination and coherence between the EU and national levels of governance. The third dimension conceptualizes Europeanization as a process through which national and sub-national levels are adapted to the EU level of governance. The fourth dimension focuses on the export of the EU form of political organization and governance beyond the member states. This particular perspective is interested in finding out how Europe plays a role in terms of shaping and influencing the actors, institutions and systems of governance in the non-member states. The final dimension in Olsen's schema uses Europeanization to examine the extent to which a unified political entity sharing a common territory, the processes of institution building and domestic adaptation, and the transfer of EU-level policy and policy-making contribute to a political unification project.

Finally on the basis of Ladrech's definition, Radaelli (2000: 3) formulates Europeanization as:

Processes of (a) construction (b) diffusion and (c) institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things' and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the making of EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies.

Recalling the critique of Ladrech's conceptualization of Europeanization (Radaelli, 2000: 3), which underlines the neglect of the role of individuals and policy entrepreneurs, Radaelli (2000) fills the gap by paying considerable attention to informal rules, procedures, beliefs, discourse and identities as well as formal rules and practices. Contrary to the notion of a change solely in the organizational logic (Ladrech, 1994), Radaelli's definition underlines a change in the logic of political behavior too. In Radaelli's (2000: 3) words, a change in the logic of political behavior occurs "through a process leading to the institutionalization in the domestic political system of discourses, cognitive maps, normative frameworks and styles coming from the EU." Another contrasting point with Ladrech's conceptualization is the equal attention paid to organizations and domestic actors, rather than prioritizing the former at the expense of neglecting the latter. According to Radaelli and Pasquier (2008: 38), domestic actors are "the filters and users of European norms and rules", who can "re-appropriate European norms and policy paradigms to implement their own policies" and "draw on the EU as a resource without specific pressure from Brussels."

Another crucial point relates to a distinction between the first and second generations of Europeanization research claimed by Dyson and Goetz (2002). The second generation is characterized by a greater emphasis on politics, identities and interests, beliefs, values, ideas and "political dynamics" of misfit as opposed to

changes in policy and polity dimensions and the "assumed mismatch between European and domestic levels" (Bache, 2003: 6). In this sense, Radaelli's (2000) conceptualization illustrates the features of the second generation, which incorporates ideas, institutions and interests as evidently central elements.

Although there can be contrasting elements in the conceptualizations of Europeanization, each of them complements a wider picture of the Europeanization literature, which is considered to be a "set of contested discourses and narratives about the impact of European integration on domestic change" (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2008: 35). Europeanization is "what political actors make of it" (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2008: 35). However, it is possible to identify common themes that are observable in all of its conceptualizations: first, an emphasis on the distinction between European integration and Europeanization, which implies that the two are not synonymous. Second, the impact of Europe differs trans-nationally, trans-historically and even among different dimensions- policy, politics and polity-within a country. Finally, the recognition of differential adaptational pressures and responses emanating from the member states can be listed as shared domains of agreement within Europeanization studies. Similarly to the existence of a plurality of approaches, the term Europeanization can hardly be used to denote a common field of research and a unified research agenda.

In response, Cini et al. (2007) identifies three domains of Europeanization research: Europeanization of (1) member state institutions, (2) policies, and (3) national politics meaning party politics, party systems and structures of political representation. When it comes to locating Europeanization within the study of European integration, it goes without saying that Europeanization studies had a

profound effect on integration studies in terms of raising the issues that had previously remained untouched. Particularly the implementation of European policies in the member states gained particular importance. Furthermore, several domains of national politics such as political parties (Ladrech, 2002), party systems (Mair, 2000) and citizenship (Checkel, 2001) that had been given less attention within integration studies gained an increasing empirical focus.

Finally, given the purposes of this study the most important advancement concerning the content of the research agenda is its expansion of the Europeanization framework to include candidate states, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe (Vink, 2002: 4). Indeed, the Europeanization of candidate countries, which originally emerged in the context of Eastern enlargement, is considered to be a particular sub-field of a broader research agenda called "Europeanization East" (Heritier, 2005) within Europeanization research. At this stage, it is necessary to unpack the concept "Europeanization East" and present its defining features in comparison with the "Europeanization West" literature.

2.1.1 Conceptualizing the Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe

The impact of the EU has been the most influential, comprehensive and explicit in the case of Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries (Sedelmeier, 2006: 4), where the legacy of communism in the social, political and economic domains created additional adjustment costs and requirements on the road to membership. The introduction of political and social conditionality besides the obligation of adopting the *acquis communitaire* resulted into a comprehensive transformation of the domestic politics and policy regimes of CEE countries and completely differentiated their Europeanization process from the Europeanization of Western

member states (Kopecky and Mudde, 2002). Thus, the literature on the Europeanization of candidate states "as a distinctive research area" emerged in the context of Eastern enlargement (Sedelmeier, 2006: 6). In this respect, the study of the unique experiences of CEE candidate countries provides a rich empirical material, which further expands the scope of the Europeanization literature (Schimmelfenning and Sedelmeier, 2005: 5).

In the attempt to conceptualize the Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe, Schimmelfenning and Sedelmeier (2005) define Europeanization primarily as a process in which states adopt EU rules. Within the framework of Europeanization East, the existence of EU rules and regulations is the independent variable, whereas rule adoption is the dependent one. In their top-down understanding of Europeanization, which focuses on the institutionalization of EU rules at the domestic level, they identify three different forms of rule adoption and the mechanisms through which candidate states adopt EU rules, norms and regulations from the perspective of institutional theory.

According to their framework, candidate states can follow three different forms of rule adoption which are the formal, the behavioral, and the discursive conception. According to the formal conception, the adoption consists of the transposition of EU rules into national law or in the establishment of formal institutions and procedures in line with the EU rules. According to the behavioral conception, adoption is measured by the extent to which behavior is rule conforming. On the contrary, the discursive conception of norms suggests that "adoption is indicated by the incorporation of a rule as a positive reference into discourse among domestic actors" (Schimmelfenning and Sedelmeier, 2005: 8). In the absence of such an incorporation of a particular EU norm, a situation may arise on the

political scene in which domestic actors instrumentalize the discourse of rule adoption simply for the sake of "rhetorical action".

Regarding the mechanisms of rule adoption, Sedelmeier and Schimmelfenning (2005) propose two different logics of action; the logic of consequence and the logic of appropriateness, which are drawn from the distinction between rational and sociological institutionalism. Rationalist institutionalism treats actors as rational and goal oriented, who engage in strategic interactions using their resources to maximize their utilities on the basis of given, fixed and ordered preferences by following an instrumental rationality. From this perspective Europeanization is largely conceived of as an emerging political opportunity structure which offers some actors additional resources to exert influence, while severely constraining the ability of others to pursue their goals.

On the other hand, sociological institutionalism emphasizes that actors are guided by collective understandings of what constitutes proper, that is, socially acceptable behavior in a given rule structure. These collective understandings and inter-subjective meanings influence the ways in which actors define their goals and what they perceive as "rational" actions. Rather than maximizing their subjective desires, actors strive to fulfill social expectations. From this perspective Europeanization is understood as the emergence of new rules, norms, practices and structures of meaning to which member states are exposed and which they have to incorporate into their domestic practices and structures. In contrast to the rationalist assumption, the sociological perspective emphasizes arguing, learning, and socialization as the main mechanisms by which new norms and identities emanating from Europeanization processes are internalized by domestic actors and lead to new definitions of interest and of collective identities. Although the

rational and sociological perspectives entail sharply contrasting features, Sedelmeier and Schimmelfenning (2005) strongly endorse the idea that the two logics of change are not mutually exclusive and they often operate simultaneously or dominate different phases of the adaptational process.

Another important point concerning Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier's (2005) conceptualization of Europeanization of the CEE is the three different models of rule adoption: first, the external incentives model; secondly the social learning model, and finally the lesson drawing model. The classification of these models depends on two main criteria. First, whether the principal actor is defined as the EU or the CEE. In other words, whether the import of EU rules is EU –driven or CEE driven. Second, whether the logic of rule adoption follows logic of consequences or logic of appropriateness. On the basis of this schema, the external incentives model appears as an outcome of the intersection between the EU as a principal actor and logic of consequences as the adopted logic of rule adoption. This model is "a rationalist bargaining model" (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 10), which is based on the asymmetrical distribution of bargaining power between different actors. The relative bargaining powers of the actors determine the outcomes of the bargaining process. In this context, the external incentives model views the adoption of EU rules as the main condition that "the CEEs have to fulfill in order to receive the rewards from the EU" (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 10). Scholars argue that within the external incentives model, conditionality may directly impact the target government, through an *intergovernmental bargaining* process, which calculates whether the domestic adjustment costs of adopting the EU rule does or does not outweigh the benefits of the promised EU rewards. Alternatively, conditionality

may work indirectly, through the *differential empowerment of domestic actors,* which creates additional incentives for some domestic actors "to utilize EU rules in solving certain policy problems". Thus the process empowers those actors, who previously "did not have sufficient power to impose their preferred rules" in the political system (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 11). As a result, the use of conditionality upsets the previous domestic opportunity structure "in favor of those domestic actors, whose bargaining power has been strengthened vis-a-vis their opponents in society and government" (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 12). A final remark concerns the four factors upon which an effective policy of EU conditionality depends: (1) the determinacy of conditions, (2) the size and speed of rewards, (3) the credibility of conditionality, and (4) veto players and adoption costs.

In contrast to a rationalist understanding of conditionality, the social learning and lesson drawing models are derived from the logic of appropriateness, yet they differ in terms of their principal actors. In the social learning model, the principal actor is the EU, whereas in the lesson drawing model it is the CEE. From the perspective of the social learning model "whether a non-member state adopts EU rules depends on the degree to which it regards EU rules and its demands for rule adoption as appropriate in terms of collective identity, values and norms" (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 18). In this model three factors, which empower EU conditionality, are identified: (1) the legitimacy of rules and process, (2) identity, and (3) resonance. Alternatively, non-member states may adopt EU rules independently from an EU policy demand. This situation is described as policy transfer, "in which knowledge of EU rules is used in the development of

rules in the political systems of the CEECs" (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005: 20).

Regarding the discussion on the differences of the Europeanization process depending on the Eastern and Western context, Heritier (2005) puts forward the basic features of the literature on Europeanization West. First, this involves three major theoretical strands: (1) rational institutionalism, (2) historical institutionalism and (3) sociological institutionalism. Secondly, in addition to institutionalisms, several analytical factors are assumed as the explanatory variables for the analysis of the outputs of Europeanization West. The first factor is the assumption of "identical EU policy demands and pressure for all countries under investigation". The second is the assumption of rational strategic actors". The third is the study of the prevailing domestic policy and policy-making practices through the lenses of a goodness of fit approach. The fourth is the conceptualization of the national administrative, institutional and political structures within the context of veto players and finally the proposition that "national colors" behind the policy practices of the member states determine their "distinctiveness or similarity to EU policy demands" (Heritier, 2005: 201). On the other hand, regarding the ways in which the outcomes of Europeanization are studied, research on Europeanization West has mainly focused on the policy level outcomes in terms of "short-term implementation" or "mid-and long-term behavioral adjustments" (Heritier, 2005: 201). Policy transformations are viewed as patterns of change which are measured in terms of "absorption, patching-up, substitution and innovation". Finally the central question in the Europeanization West research agenda appears as (Heritier, 2005: 201):

How EU policy demands, by creating new needs for administrative processes and organizational measures or by favoring some national political actors over others have brought about changes in existing administrative and political structures and processes.

On the other side of the spectrum, "Europeanization East" substantially differs from "West" in terms of their point of departure. To begin with, the Europeanization process in CEE countries coincides with their transition to democracy and market economies. Moreover, Europeanization East begins under the "shadow" of the accession negotiations, which exerts high pressures on the candidate states due to conditionality. Under these circumstances, the research agenda of "Europenization East" literature has reached a wider scope compared to its Western counterpart. In contrast to the restricted focus of "Europeanization research West" on narrow policy issues, the changes in policies and policy-making in Europeanization East is viewed within the context of the implementation of the overall *acquis*. Another point concerns the effects of EU policy demands, which require substantial changes in national political, administrative and judicial structures. In contrast to such type of EU policy demands in the Western context, institutional reform is almost a by-product of any policy requirement directed at the CEEs by the EU (Heritier, 2005: 206).

The final but most crucial point to be made concerns the character of the Europeanization process that the member states and candidate states in the CEE went through. "Europenization West" is accepted as a "two-way street" whereby member states shape EU level policies and policy-making by uploading their own policy measures and preferences. However, on the basis of the fact that the Europeanization of the CEEs starts with the accession process, the CEECs lack the capability to actively shape the EU policy measures. Thereby,

"Europeanization East" is considered to be a one-way street of influence (Heritier, 2005: 207).

In a similar vein, Grabbe (2002) puts forward three factors which substantially differentiate the experiences of Europeanization of the CEECs from Europeanization West. The first factor is 'the speed of adjustment'. According to Grabbe (2002: 4) "the formal accession process sets out to adopt CEE institutions and policies to the EU much faster and more thoroughly than the adaptation of current EU-15 members". The second factor is the wide openness of the CEECs to EU influence. The process of post-communist transformation generated less institutional resistance to EU policies in comparison to the Western member states. The third factor is "the breadth of the EU's agenda in CEE", which refers to the commitment of the applicant countries of the CEE to adopt "a maximalist version of the EU's policies", without necessarily offering the "possibility of opt-outs from parts of the agenda" (Grabbe, 2002: 4).

2.2 Political Parties and Europeanization

2.2.1 Evolution of Modern Political Parties

Giovanni Sartori (2005) starts his extensive discussion on the concept and rationale of the political party in his hallmark volume, *Parties and Party Systems: a framework for analysis*, by unpacking the etymological roots of the term 'party'. The central focus in Sartori's analysis is the transition from the word 'faction' to 'party' in the domains of both ideas and facts. Etymologically speaking, the term party derives from the Latin verb 'partire' meaning 'to divide', which did not have

a political meaning until the eighteenth century when the term entered the political discourse. In 1770 Edmund Burke offered one of the most quoted definitions of a political party: "Party is a body of men united, for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest, upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed" (Burke cited in Sartori, 2005: 8).

According to Burke, political parties are "the proper means" to "carry their common plans into execution, with all the power and authority of the State". In his framework, parties are the real agents of governance which consist of a "group of parliamentary representatives who agreed to cooperate upon a certain principle" (Burke cited in Krouwel, 2006: 250).

Anthony Downs' (1957) definition of a political party is similar to Burke's in terms of emphasizing the legitimacy of the executive function of political parties and their view of political parties as 'coalitions', which are central organizing features of politics (Downs cited in White, 2006: 6).

> In the broadest sense a political party is a coalition of men seeking to control the governing apparatus by legal means. By *coalition*, we mean a group of individuals who have certain ends in common and cooperate with each other to achieve them. By *governing apparatus*, we mean the physical, legal and institutional equipment which the government uses to carry out its specialized role in the division of labor. By *legal means* we mean either duly constituted or legitimate influence.

An alternative definition of a political party is proposed by Robert Huckshorn (Huckshorn cited in White, 2006: 5), in his textbook entitled *Political Parties in America*. It follows a pragmatic line of thought in terms of explaining the *raison d'etat* of political parties:

A political party is an autonomous group of citizens having the purpose of making nominations and contesting elections in hope of gaining control over governmental power through the capture of public offices and the organization of the government.

Acording to this view, political parties are the necessary means to direct government actions, whose main purpose is to win elections. In contrast to this view, Sartori (2005) argues that while political parties have representative and expressive functions that are both essential to their existence, it is the latter which is the most qualified feature of political parties.

On the basis of this argument, Sartori (2005) defines three elements of a political party based on its expressive functions as follows: (1) parties are not factions, (2) a party is part of a whole, and (3) parties are channels of expression.

According to Sartori (2005), a political party is different from a faction on the grounds that it links people to a government. It is a part of a "pluralistic whole", which implies that a political party exists within a party system and is characterized by its capacity to govern for the pursuit of public interest; for "the sake of the whole". Finally political parties are understood as "channels for articulating, communicating and implementing the demands of the governed" (Sartori, 2005: 24). The expressive function of political parties is fundamental to their performance as means of communication. In conclusion, the role of political parties in terms of their two major functions: channeling and expressing mass preferences and demands is more fundamental than their representative function.

2.2.2 The Classification of Party Models

The literature consists of a variety of party models based on different dimensions that aim to explain the genesis, development and transformation of political parties. Some scholars acknowledge that the majority of party models are characterized by a one-dimensional approach, exclusively based on the organizational aspects of political parties (Duverger, 1954; Krouwel, 2006). The lack of the study of multiple dimensions results into a narrow understanding of party models, which neglects the multilayered functions of political parties. Gunther and Diamond (2003) refer to the problem as "a lack of conceptual and terminological clarity and precision" in the literature as a consequence of the multiplicity of party models. To address this problem, five generic definitions of party models will be introduced.

The first modern political parties emerged before the introduction of the mass suffrage in the late 19th century (Scarrow, 2006: 16). The first modern parties are described in the literature as "elite, caucus and cadre parties" that are "led by prominent individuals, organized in closed caucuses which have minimal organization outside the parliament" (Krouwel, 2006: 250). Sartori (2005: 17) describes the first political parties in eighteenth century Britain as "aristocratic, in-group, parliamentary" parties which were formed in "a very loose sense" of an existing parliamentary system. The second party model covers the mass parties whose fundamental features are "extra-parliamentary mass mobilization of politically excluded social groups on the basis of well articulated organizational structures and ideologies" (Krouwel, 2006: 250).

The third party model is called the "catch-all" parties which "originate from mass parties that have professionalized their party organization and downgraded their ideological profile in order to appeal to a wider electorate than their original class or religious social base" (Krouwel, 2006: 250). Kirchheimer (1954) was the first to introduce the concept of the catch-all party. According to Kirchheimer (cited in Krouwel, 2006: 256), the transition from the mass party to catch-all party type was a result of the emergence of a substantial new middle class consisting of "skilled manual workers, white-collar workers and civil servants" whose interests "converged and became indistinguishable." According to Kirchheimer's framework, a decrease in social polarization among different classes "went hand in hand" -to quote Krouwel (2006: 256)-with a decrease in political polarization among different mass political parties, which rendered their differing ideological doctrines interchangeable. Thereby, a reduction of the "party's ideological baggage" and of "politics to the mere management" of the state is a defining element in the conceptualization of the catch-all party.

The fourth party model is the cartel party defined as "the fusion of the party in public office with several interest groups that form a political cartel, which is mainly oriented towards the maintenance of executive power" (Krouwel, 2006: 256). Katz and Mair (1995: 5) propose a definition from a state-party cartel approach as "colluding parties that become agents of the state and employ the resources of the state to ensure their own collective survival".

The final party model is the business-firm party which is characterized by a flexible ideological orientation and replacement of social objectives with policy products. In a business-firm party, the policy positions emerge neither from an ideological stance nor from social objectives. They are developed rather "on the

basis of 'market research' with focus groups, survey research and local trials to test their feasibility and popularity" (Krouwel, 2006: 261).

In addition to the presentation of party models, it is necessary to offer how mainstream and marginal political parties are conceptualized. Mainstream parties can be conceptualized "in terms of votes, left/right position, or government participation" (Marks et al., 2002: 588). Accordingly, this study conceptualizes mainstream parties as those parties, which gain sufficient amount of votes to enter the parliament. Secondly, those parties, which participate in the government or have the chance of participating, are classified as mainstream parties. On the other hand, those parties, which fail to enter the parliament and do not have the chance of participating in the government, are conceptualized as marginal political parties.

2.3 The Europeanization of Political Parties Literature

In the literature that addresses the relationship between European integration and political parties, Mair (2008) identifies three main strands of research. The first strand studies the formation of transnational party federations and their potential to create substantial party activity at the European level (Ladrech, 2001: 390; Mair, 2008:154). The second strand focuses on the nature and dynamics of the parties and party systems in the European Parliament. The third strand of research is the most recent, studying the impact and role of Europe in shaping party programs, party ideology, party systems and party competition at the national level (Mair, 2008: 154). From this approach national political parties are viewed as key actors which can influence "the nature and direction" of the Europeanization of domestic politics and policy-making (Ladrech, 2001: 390).

The central research questions in the party Europeanization literature are concerned with the extent to which the process of European integration creates opportunities or poses difficulties for national actors, the politics of Euroscepticism, and the extent to which 'Europe' plays a role in national political parties and party systems (Mair, 2008: 155).

According to Mair (2008: 156), the Europeanization of party politics at the national level operates through two different mechanisms. The first mechanism, derived from Cowles et al. (2001) definition of Europeanization, is "the institutionalization of a distinct European political system." In contrast to the bottom-up approach of the former, the second mechanism, which views Europeanization as an external and independent factor, adopts a top-down understanding, as in "the penetration of European rules, directives and norms into the domestic sphere" (Mair, 2008: 156). The second step in this framework is to classify the impact of Europeanization on national political party politics into two categories: (1) direct, and (2) indirect. From this two-dimensional typology, four outcomes are derived. To begin with, European norms may directly penetrate into the domestic arena which will lead to the formation of new anti-European parties or factions within existing political parties (Mair, 2008: 157). The second outcome is Europeanization as penetration with an indirect impact, which leads to an alteration of national party competition and a devaluation of national electoral competition (Mair, 2008: 158). The third outcome is Europeanization as institutionalization with a direct impact on national party politics, which results into the formation and consolidation of pan-European party coalitions (Mair, 2008: 159). Finally, Europeanization as institutionalization with an indirect impact is the fourth outcome, which results into the creation of non-partisan

channels of representation (Mair, 2008: 161). These four outcomes are described as the direct effects of Europeanization on political parties and party systems. For the purposes of this study the indirect effects of Europeanization on party systems and political parties will be examined.

Following Mair's argument that indirect effects of Europeanization lead to more profound and decisive changes in the party systems of individual member states, the focus of analysis is on the relation between Europe and the patterns of political competition at the domestic level. Mair (2008: 159) identifies three distinct processes through which the development of a European level of policy making leads to "the 'hollowing out' of policy competition between political parties at the national level." Firstly, Europe limits the policy space that is available to competing parties. The development of a European level of policy making results into a situation in which national governments and parties face a more or less forced convergence in the development of their policies and decision-making. This process is described by Mair (2008: 159) as follows:

> National governments and the parties in those governments may still differ in how they interpret these demands for convergence, and in this sense there may still remain a degree of variation from one system to the next. When one of the member states does seek to opt out of a particular policy, this usually happens by agreement between government and opposition, and hence the policy remains foreshortened and the issue in question rarely becomes politicized.

Secondly, it is argued that Europeanization limits the capacity of national governments and hence the political parties in those governments by "reducing the range of policy instruments at their disposal" (Mair, 2008: 159).

Finally, Europeanization "reduces the ability of parties in national governments to compete by limiting their policy repertoire" (Mair, 2008: 160). In light of all these Mair (2008: 160) posits that Europe indirectly leads to de-politicization of national party competition. However, this study aims to demonstrate that empirical data from Central and Eastern Europe does not necessarily confirm this. As the chapters on Poland and the Czech Republic will show, the Europeanization of political parties is not restricted to a limitation of national governments and political parties' capacity for mobilizing mass opinion on their political agenda. In this sense, although it is an undisputable fact that Europeanization generates a certain level of convergence, political parties as both institutional and social actors differ in the ways in which they construct and filter the issue of Europe. Thereby, the political actors' different ways of incorporating the European norms into "the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies" (Radaelli, 2000:3) becomes a significant source for the politicization of EU related policy issues in particular, and the issue of Europe in general.

On the other hand, to highlight the process through which political parties adapt to the pressures of Europeanization through re-constructing and re-shaping their

political identities around the issue of Europe and European integration, this study adopts Robert Ladrech's framework on the Europeanization of political parties. According to Ladrech (2002: 396-400), although the Europeanization process does not necessarily accomodate all political parties, it is possible to delienate five interrelated areas in which the evidence of political party Europeanization are most evident. The first area entails the analysis of programmatic changes of political parties. The focus of this is on analysing the extent to which the issues of Europe and European integration affect the modification of party programs. The

second area relates to organizational change, which refers to the transformation of the statutes and organizational models of party functions so as to take account of the European level of representation. The third area relates to the analysis of patterns of party competition, which explores the extent to which the issue of European integration becomes a relevant domestic issue with the capacity to effectively determine the major themes of domestic party competition and potentially to become a new cleavage in domestic party systems. The fourth area concerns the analysis of party- governmet relations, which primarily focuses on the effects of the participation of government officials in the European forums on the domestic parties' positions and attitudes on certain issues. The final area examines the extent of Europeanization of political parties by looking at the transnational cooperation between the supranational parties in the European Parliament and national parties of the individual member states.

Ladrech's differentiation of five distinct areas facilitates our analysis of the Europeanization of political parties in Poland and Czceh Republic. However, it needs to be underlined that a comprehensive analysis of Europeanization of political parties on the basis of all of the aforementioned areas is not the aim of this study and hence the scope of our analysis necessitates a restricted focus on particular dimensions. Hence, the empirical analysis of this study will focus on the first and third areas. In other words, the analysis aims to manifest the extent to which there is evidence of Europeanization of party programs, and whether the issues of Europe and European integration become a major theme of political competition. This carries the potential to determine the patterns of domestic party competition in the context of Central and Eastern Europe.

CHAPTER III

EUROPEAN INTEGRATION AND THE POLITICS OF

EUROSCEPTICISM

The European Community is a practical means by which Europe can ensure the future prosperity and security of its people in a world in which there are many other powerful nations and groups of nations…Working more closely together does not require power to be centralized in Brussels or decisions to be taken by an appointed bureaucracy…We do not want a European super-state exercising a new dominance from Brussels…Our aim should not be more and more detailed regulation from the centre: it should be to deregulate.

Margaret Thatcher, "The Bruges Speech", 22 September1988.

Margaret Thatcher's famous speech to the College of Europe was an outright manifestation of a radical Eurosceptic discourse which stimulated an extensive debate between the competing views of supranationalism and intergovernmentalism within the political landscape of the European Community concerning the nature and direction of European integration. "The Bruges Speech" gains additional significance when it is read in light of the impact of the Single European Act (SEA) signed in 1986. The main objective of the SEA, which 'incorporated into the Rome Treaty the concept of cooperation in economic and monetary policy' (Tsarouhas, 2006: 94), was to complete the common market by eliminating non-tariff barriers to free trade and thereby create the internal

market. Furthermore, it introduced the extension of the QMV in the Council of Ministers, enlarged the scope of the EEC's powers in policy areas -such as regional cohesion, health and safety at work and environmental protection, and enhanced the role of the Commission, 'implied by the ambitious goal of completing the common market' (Leconte, 2010: 45). As a consequence of all these new major institutional arrangements, the SEA stimulated an intense debate concerning the limits of European integration on the basis of two main issues: first the extent to which the internal market should be regulated, and secondly the transformation of the EEC into a political union.

In this respect, the signing of the SEA is considered to "mark the beginning of the end of the pro-integration consensus among national political elites", which was won during the 1960s and 1970s (Leconte, 2010: 45). In this respect, "the Bruges Speech" by Thatcher represents the most radical manifestation of the division within the elite of the former consensus regarding the nature, direction and objectives of European integration. As can be seen in the passage of the Bruges Speech quoted above, the concerns of those who opposed further integration beyond the SEA and the transformation of the EEC into a political union were spelled out by use of a Eurosceptic political discourse. Moreover, the Bruges Speech defined the cornerstone of a Eurosceptic discourse in the form of non-acceptance of the *sui generis* character of the EU as *a* union 'of states *and* citizens' as opposed to mere interstate cooperation (Leconte, 2010: 8). Since the 1990s, the age of the 'permissive consensus' about European integration started to be replaced by the age of a 'constraining dissensus' (Steenbergen et al., 2007: 14). In this process, national governments and political parties have become central actors as the most direct channels of influence for the expression of public and

political Euroscepticism both at the national and EU levels. In all these respects, Euroscepticism has become "a corollary of increasing European integration" (Taggart, 1998: 363), and increasing academic interest in the study of Europeanization of political parties, party politics and party-level Euroscepticism owes its existence to the growing salience and impact of the issue of 'Europe' and the EU on national political structures.

On the basis of Radaelli's (2003) definition of Europeanization mentioned in the previous chapter, it is possible to approach party-level Euroscepticism from a prism which displays how the rules, procedures, norms, shared beliefs and 'ways of doing things' at the European level are perceived, filtered and diffused within national politics. In this respect, party-level Euroscepticism is not only a political response to the EU and European integration, but can also be interpreted as a domestic lens through which the issue of Europe is constructed and manipulated by political parties either for the purpose of shaping the policies, institutions and governance at the EU level or the structure of political party competition at the national level.

Thus, Euroscepticism is understood as a multi-faceted phenomenon. It is not only a direct effect of Europeanization on national parties and party systems, but is also a significant independent variable. As such, it impacts upon political parties by restricting the arena in which political competition is played out and limits political actors' decision-taking by limiting the range of policies that political parties can implement (Cini et al., 2007: 417).

In all these respects, Euroscepticism requires both a conceptual/ theoretical and an empirical analysis in order to reveal its multi-faceted nature and to understand

how it functions differently in different national settings. In order to achieve this aim, this chapter offers a conceptual analysis of Euroscepticism, which will be discussed within a broader comparative framework of party attitudes to European integration. The review of the study of party attitudes to European integration in Western and Eastern contexts reveals significant preliminary insights as to the distinctive nature of party-based Euroscepticism in CEE, which will be subject to an empirical analysis in the following chapters. Nevertheless, within the scope of this chapter, a literature review of Euroscepticism and party attitudes toward European integration in Western and Eastern context will be offered. This will be followed by a similar section on Euroscepticism in Central and Eastern Europe. Finally, the chapter will conclude by discussing how this study attempts to understand party-based Euroscepticism.

3.1 Euroscepticism and Party Attitudes toward European Integration in Western Europe

Taggart (1998) illustrates the first systematic study of party –based Euroscepticism at the domestic level by providing an overview of party based Euroscepticism in Western Europe. Secondly, he analyses Euroscepticism in relation to party ideology and positions within their party systems. Taggart's fundamental contribution is to introduce a conceptual definition of Euroscepticism within the scholarly literature apart from its popular usage. Euroscepticism is defined as "the idea of contingent or qualified opposition, as well as incorporating outright and unqualified opposition to the process of European integration" (Taggart, 1998: 366).

Furthermore, Taggart argues that Euroscepticism entails three different positions towards the European Union. First of all, there is an anti-integration position of party elites who oppose European integration in ideational terms and hence oppose EU membership and integration. A second position refers to those that do not oppose the idea of European integration, but are skeptical that the EU is the best form of integration because it is perceived to be too 'inclusive', which implies that "the EU is trying to force together elements that are too diverse to be compatible" (Taggart, 1998: 366). Finally, the third position relates to those who do not oppose the idea of European integration, but retain their skepticism towards the EU as the best mechanism of integration as similar to the former position. This last position problematizes the EU on the grounds that it is conceived as too exclusive. In contrast to the second position, those actors who argue against the EU as the best form of integration express a sense of exclusion, which can be based on either geographical or social grounds.

A second crucial contribution to the study of party based Euroscepticism is the classification of national political parties according to different forms of manifesting their opposition. The fundamental logic behind this classification is the idea that political parties manifest Euroscepticism in different ways with different objectives. On the basis of this logic, Taggart argues that there are four different ways in which Euroscepticism can be manifest in political parties. The first type of opposition comes from "single issue" Eurosceptic parties who are founded on the principle of opposition to the European Union. Their sole objective is to politicize the European issue and mobilize electors by holding on to Euroscepticism. In addition ad hoc coalitions that unite anti-EU movements in the face of an EU related 'galvanizing event', such as the June Movement in Sweden,

People's Movement and Against EC-Union Movement in Denmark, are included in this category (Taggart, 1998: 369). Secondly, there are protest based parties with Euroscepticism whose *raison d'etre* is to protest the functioning of political systems and adopt an anti-EU position alongside their general opposition to the existing system of political representation. In Taggart's (1998: 368) words:

> Protest parties are defined as parties whose appeal stems either partly or wholly from being parties that both reject and stand outside the established group of (usually governmental) parties. Some parties make a virtue of their exclusion while others strive to play down their exclusion.

Different terms such as 'anti-establishment parties' or 'discontent parties' have been applied to express the same phenomena that protest parties' defining element is their distance from the incumbent parties, while they may have completely different ideological affiliations. The French Communist Party and Greek Communist Party are examples of such parties. The third type of party that manifests Euroscepticism is an established party which adopts a Eurosceptical position on the grounds of either strategy for political contestation or ideological reasons. In other words, these are the mainstream parties "that have attempted to promote themselves as worthy of support because of their proximity to the governmental parties" (Taggart, 1998: 368). The most widely known examples in this category are the Centre Party in Norway, the Centre Democrats in Portugal, the Left Party in Sweden and the Democratic Unionist Party in UK. The final form of opposition comes from Eurosceptic factions of existing parties. In this form, Euroscepticism is expressed by a faction of an existing party which expresses support for European integration. However it is strongly emphasized that it is possible to talk about the existence of Eurosceptic factions to the extent

that factionalism can be observable within a party as 'an organized activity of a group of individuals with a collective identity and a shared agenda' (Taggart, 1998: 373). From this perspective, this form of Eurosceptic factionalism is claimed to exist in governing parties. The Eurosceptical wing of the British Conservative Party is an obvious example of this type.

In comparison with the Euroscepticism of marginal parties, it is argued that Eurosceptical factionalism within major governing parties is viewed as a substantial cost to the party as it threatens the unity of the party's official stance and "the degree of certainty that electors can have about parties" trajectories and is therefore something that governing parties try to avoid (Taggart, 1998: 373). On the other hand, adopting a Eurosceptical line by marginal parties is seen as strategically advantageous to the party's overall scepticism towards existing domestic political structures. In this sense, marginal parties can instrumentalize Euroscepticism successfully as long as this contributes to mobilizing electoral support. The final crucial point regarding Taggart's analysis of party based Euroscepticism is the emphasis on the ideological diversity of Euroscepticism. Accordingly, locating political parties within their party families such as Conservative, Christian Democratic/ conservative parties, social democratic/ socialist parties and liberal parties, does not predetermine whether those parties will be Eurosceptical or not. In a similar vein, Featherstone (1988: 307) argues in his study on Socialist parties' attitudes towards European integration that "there has been no clear, consistent, cross-national correlation between left/right attitudes and policy towards European integration."

Marks et al., (2002), analyze national party attitudes to European integration without referring to the concept of Euroscepticism. In contrast to Taggart's

argument that party ideology does not predict levels of Euroscepticism, they suggest that cleavage theory best explains the range of likely responses of political parties to new issues emerging on their agenda. According to cleavage theory, divisions among political parties are reflections of existing divisions in the social structure and political ideology. From this perspective, political parties do not re-constitute themselves with each electoral pressure but are already embedded within and constituted by their established political ideologies, which have developed historically. On the basis of this argument, the main hypothesis is that "these historically grounded ideologies constitute prisms through which political parties respond to the issue of European integration" (Marks et al., 2002). In their analysis, the strength of the explanatory power of cleavage theory is tested against three alternative explanations. The first of these is the argument that the positions taken by political parties on a new issue depend on the national context. From this perspective European integration is conceptualized as "the product of bargaining among governments representing the national interests of each member state". Hence, a political party's position on European integration is determined by its national context, not by its ideology or electoral pressures. The second argument against cleavage theory studies party positions as a response to voting behavior, whereas the third alternative argument explains party positioning in relation to party competition. As Egea-de Haro (2003: 6) indicates:

> Mainstream parties attempt to protect the status quo by suppressing the salience of a new issue that cuts across existing dimensions of party competition, while small or excluded parties try to raise the salience of such issues and then reallocate the parties dimensions of competition.

The third explanation resonates with one of the core pillars of Paul Taggart's argument that a position of a political party within its national party system impacts upon its likelihood of adopting a Eurosceptical line. In contrast to the argument that party ideology is not a pre-determinant of party-based Euroscepticism (Taggart, 1998), cleavage theory posits that political party positions on European integration are bounded by historically developed political cleavages. In this sense, the issue of European integration is encapsulated and filtered by parties' preexisting political ideologies. However, the political cleavages argument is not without weaknesses either. Although the ideological position of a political party may be a valid point of departure for hypothesizing about the likelihood of a party's Eurosceptical stance, it is not a sufficient variable on its own in order to deduce its position on the European Union in general and European integration in particular. Taggart (1998) underlines the priority of national political structures and party systems in his cross-country comparative study of party Euroscepticism by arguing that Christian democratic, new politics, agrarian, new populist and neo-fascist parties adopt different positions towards the EU and European integration in different national settings.

As an alternative line of inquiry, Simon Hix (2007) analyses party-based Euroscepticism from a rational choice institutionalist perspective, which conceptualizes Euroscepticism as 'a set of preferences by citizens, parties and interest groups about institutional design in Europe' (Hix, 2007: 131). Hix (2007) starts with a basic rational choice institutionalist argument: since institutions determine policy outcomes and actors' preferences derived from their expectations of the institutions' performance, then it follows that actors will support European integration for as long as their own policy preferences are well

served by it. The main logic behind this argument is the primacy assigned to institutions 'on the basis of solving collective action problems serving a functionalist purpose of utility maximization' (Tsarouhas, 2006: 91). Actors formulate their institutional preferences according to the expected outcomes of their policy choices, which are informed by material calculations of utility. In addition to the instrumental function of institutions in determining actors' desired set of policy preferences, they also play a crucial role in shaping actors' behavior. To clarify the point further, Tsarouhas (2006: 91) outlines the character of rational choice perspective over the relationship between institutions and actors' behavior as follows: "Institutions play an important role to the extent that they allow for the conceptualization of a complex matrix consisting of sanctions, rewards and eventual outcomes around which behavior is centred".

Hix (2007) builds his rational choice institutionalist argument regarding party-based Euroscepticism on the basis that institutions provide actors with a cognitive map by which they define their interests and form their policy preferences based on expected rewards and outcomes. Accordingly, if institutional policy outcomes correspond to the set of policy preferences and outcomes desired and expected by policy actors, then they are likely to be Euro-enthusiastic. On the other hand, if policy outcomes upset actors' domestic policy status quo they are likely to be Eurosceptic (Hix, 2007: 133). Hix's study makes a significant contribution by complementing the rational choice analysis of actors' preference formation with the political parties positioning along a center – periphery axis. The argument is formulated as follows: political parties that are located at the center of their national party systems tend to be Euro-enthusiastic, whereas party-based Euroscepticism remains a marginal phenomenon.

This rational choice institutionalist assumption regarding the connection between center / (periphery) and euroenthusiasm / (euroscepticism) is supported by the mass cues to elites argument, which suggests that "party leaders are better informed about the policy consequences of a particular action at the EU level" and hence "voters rely on 'cues' from political parties regarding the impact of EU actions on their own preferences" (Hix, 2007: 136). On this basis, it is argued that "the parties of the extreme left and extreme right will be more Eurosceptic than mainstream parties" (Hix, 2007: 136). As long as the political parties located at the center of national party politics form a pro-EU coalition, those voters who support European integration tend to support mainstream policies and vice versa. Hence an opposition to the policies of the established parties implies an opposition to European integration, which manifests itself in the form of party-based Euroscepticism. In this vein, Hix (2007) describes Euroscepticism not only as a peripheral issue but also as a political strategy which functions as anti-centralization. This argument is similar to Taggart's (1998: 368) discussion of anti-EU politics of anti-establishment parties, which 'promote themselves on the basis of distance from the parties of government.'

Secondly, it is argued that citizens who support governing parties are less likely to be Eurosceptic than the electorate of the parties of the extreme left and extreme right (Hix, 2007: 136). Political parties in government are viewed as central actors not only because they shape and control the policy agenda at the domestic level, but also because they set the long-term agenda in the European Council, pass legislation in the Council, and pick the Commissioners (Hix, 2007: 137). In this sense, governing political parties are considered to be more powerful in terms of directing the domestic policy agenda according to policy outcomes at the EU

level. Hence, in Hix's terms (2007: 137): "voters for governing parties, and interest groups who are close to parties in government, are less likely to be Eurosceptic than are voters for opposition parties and interest groups who are close to opposition parties".

A final important point to be made regarding Hix's rational institutionalist analysis concerns the correlation between domestic institutional designs and party-based Euroscepticism in order to offer an explanation for variations in Euroscepticism in different national settings. It is basically argued that political parties in majoritarian systems of government are more likely to be Eurosceptic than parties in consensus systems of government (Hix, 2007: 138).

Hooghe (2007) underlines two major factors which generate political space for the articulation of anti-EU politics. The first factor entails the issues of strategy and ideology, which both enable and constraint political party behavior in the context of national electoral competition. Hence, within this framework the main line of inquiry is to understand to what extent political parties express Euroscepticism as a function of their strategic incentives, and to what extent anti-EU politics manifests itself as part of a political party's ideological commitments (Hooghe, 2007: 6). The second factor concerns the linkage between public opinion and political parties. Cueing theory assumes that Euroscepticism is cued by political party elites and thereby posits that 'external influences may be decisive in priming or framing attitudes towards a particular object' (Hooghe and Marks, 2007: 121). Hence the question of the extent to which political parties and voters cue each other presupposes a mutually constitutive relation between voters and parties in the formation of attitudes towards European integration.

In this sense, Hooghe (2007) makes a significant contribution to party-based Euroscepticism, regardless of its national context, by introducing two different lenses. First, one can approach party-based Euroscepticism from a rational choice perspective as a product of bottom-up process of preference formation. From this perspective, it is assumed that there is 'at least a minority of voters with stable and transparent attitudes that affect their vote choice' (Hooghe, 2007: 6). The voters' preferences provide incentive structures, which determine the positioning of political parties toward a particular issue in the context of electoral competition. In that sense party-based Euroscepticism responds to and indeed originates from public Euroscepticism. This bottom-up approach to mass-elite linkages is based on a bottom-up 'electoral connection'- to quote Carrubba (2001) - which presupposes a "correspondence between masses and elites through a process of representation" (Steenbergen et al., 2007: 14).

In contrast with this rational, bottom-up perspective of preference formation, a second argument emphasizes the decisive role of the structure of party competition in shaping party positioning. In this view, political parties do not mechanistically respond to public opinion; rather, they function as "organizations with historically rooted orientations that guide their response to new issues" (Hooghe, 2007: 6). According to this top-down perspective of preference formation, political party elites, not the masses, have coherent ideological maps which shape party positioning. This second perspective, which highlights the role of the ideological commitments of political parties, is similar to the cleavage theory hypothesis advocated by Marks et al. (2004: 585) as follows: "The response of a political party to an issue arising on the agenda is conditioned by the

bounded rationalities of party leaders and the reputational constraints imposed by prior policy decisions."

From this perspective, 'the bounded rationalities' of political party elites shape the structure of party competition, which significantly constraint attitudes toward European integration and hence determine the political space for the expression of party-based Euroscepticism. In contrast to the bottom-up perspective of mass-elite linkages, this top-down perspective presupposes that the public adopts the position of political elites and 'assures correspondence between masses and elites through a process of information and persuasion' (Steenbergen et al., 2007: 14).

3.2 Impact of the European Issue on the National Politics of the CEECs: "Return to Europe"

The end of the communist rule and the transition of CEECs to democracy were marked by the revolutions of 1989. The disengagement of Central and Eastern European countries from communist rule brought an end to authoritarian patterns of politics. However, the successful democratization of former Soviet-ruled countries of Central and Eastern Europe was hindered by the persistence of post-communist legacies in Eastern Europe. These were manifest in the form of social disintegration, atomization, psychological disorientation, economic crisis and a severe disruption caused by the transition from centrally-planned socialism to the market economy (Dellenbrant, 1993: 147).

Correspondingly, the end of the communism in Central and Eastern Europe aroused great enthusiasm among West European states and it provided the EC with an opportunity to realize its pan-European objectives, which were defined in terms of overcoming the divisions of Europe (Schimmelfennig, 2001: 68). For the

Western European states, the transition of Central and Eastern European states' political and economic structures in accordance to the Western model served to strengthen the legitimacy of the EC model at both national and international levels. The official declarations made by the heads of state and government of the EC during the Strasbourg Summit of 1989 expressed the EC's willingness to contribute to the CEEC's transition to liberal democracy and market economy (quoted from Schimmelfennig, 2001: 67):

> The current changes and the prospects for development in Europe demonstrate the attraction which the political and economic model of Community Europe holds for many countries. The Community must live up to this expectation and these demands: its path lies not in withdrawal but in openness and cooperation, particularly with other European states. The objective remains that of overcoming the divisions of Europe

Although the EC never explicitly mentioned the promise of full membership in its post- Cold War declarations, the 1990s were marked by a great enthusiasm for 'Return to Europe', which was strongly used as a normative argument by the states of the Central and Eastern Europe. This generated 'Euro-optimism', which coupled with the prospects of full membership, became a concrete reality with the opening of the accession negotiations for five CEE countries: Czech Republic, Estonia, Poland, Hungary and Slovenia in March 1998 (Riishoj, 2004: 2). The normative implications of 'Return to Europe' were fundamentally based on the idea of a shared identity between Eastern and Western Europe. However, for the CEE states, which had been living under communism for four decades, this notion of a shared European identity, required the adoption of EU norms and rules in addition to the transition process. The euro-optimism of the 1990s which generated a widespread 'consensus without discussion' on the European issue

started to show signals of decline as EU membership became a realistic option and the costs of EU membership became more visible and tangible. Soren Riishoj (2004: 7) illustrates the point as follows:

> After the opening of negotiation about EU-membership, the populations and the political leaders also gained a more realistic picture of what the EU is really about. Thus coming closer to paradise many people changed their attitudes from being 'euro-naives' to becoming 'euro-realists', maybe even euro-sceptics.

In a similar vein, Henderson (2002) argues that as the normative rhetorical argument of 'Return to Europe' was finalized with the prospect of membership, the so called 'permissive consensus' or the 'consensus without discussion' started to erode both at the mass and party elite levels. In her words (2002: 2):

> CEEC reactions to the EU membership, in both public and elite opinion, became more complex as general aspirations to Return to Europe were superseded by the more nuanced appreciations of the advantages and disadvantages of membership which accompanied the later stages of the negotiation process.

Although Taggart and Szczerbiak (2002: 22) argue that the issue of European integration has very limited influence among voters in any country, Mudde argues that the question of EU accession 'further increases the salience of the EU as a political issue in the party politics of Central and Eastern Europe' (Mudde, 2000: 2).

In a similar vein, Hooghe et al. (2002: 985) stress that 'European politics is domestic politics by other means' in the context of CEE states. In this respect political parties play the most crucial role in instrumentalizing EU issues

according to their political agenda because the objective of membership becomes a central political issue especially in post-communist states.

According to Mudde (2003) the issue of Europe becomes more salient in the CEE context. In his words (2003: 3): "the potential for political conflict over the EU is higher in the new member states of Central and Eastern Europe than in the old member states". This argument is supported by three major reasons. First, elites and masses in the new member states have been less involved in the whole process of European integration. Second, the EU has been more politicized in the new member states, most notably through recent accession referendums in all eight countries, and finally a large section of the CEE population, including parts of the elites, have accepted EU accession mainly because it provided the best mechanism to be integrated into Europe and consolidate democratization processes at home. Finally, the EU forms a central topic of debate and political discourse among political parties in the candidate states, and the views of political actors, structured by different party systems, are relevant not only to the success of the enlargement project, but also to the future of the Union after their accession.

On this basis, Mair's (2000) argument that Europe has a limited impact on national party systems and inter-party competition in member states of the European Union is not applicable to CEE. In the CEE context, the politicized issue of 'Europe' and the question of European integration play a central role in structuring patterns of party competition and determining the positions of political parties on the question of EU membership and the future shape of the European project. Therefore, the study of how Europe plays a role in national political discourse, how political parties position

themselves regarding European integration, and how those positions affect party competition at the national level is of crucial importance.

In order to understand these questions better, it is first necessary to plot the dimensions which structure parties' positions within their national party systems. This will then be followed by an analysis of whether parties' positions in their national systems determine their attitudes regarding the issue of Europe and European integration. However, it should be underlined that the primary focus is on the analysis of anti-EU politics, that is, the study of the mechanisms which lead to the formation of party level Eurosceptisim within the national party politics is the primary objective. The identification of these mechanisms will be followed by an attempt to understand the role played by party-based Euroscepticism within party competition and party politics.

In order to achieve these objectives the chapter will offer a discussion of the major dimensions which are used to classify the political parties' positions in their party systems in the case of CEECs. This discussion will then be followed by a presentation of party-based Euroscepticism as an analytical concept.

3.2.1 Euroscepticism and Party Attitudes toward European Integration in Central and Eastern Europe

The literature on Western European political parties adopts two main dimensions in order to explain change and adaptation in political parties and map their political positions. These two dimensions are ideology and organization (Duverger, 1954). On the other hand, cleavage theory assumes that divisions among political parties are reflections of the existing divisions in the social

structure and political ideology. The main hypothesis is that 'historically grounded ideologies constitute prisms through which political parties respond to the issue of European integration' (Marks et al., 2002: 585). However, neither of these approaches is likely to be applicable in the CEE context. The main reason is that political parties in CEE do not have stable constituencies divided on the basis of historically rooted social cleavages. Political parties in CEE do not act "according to bounded orientations that have historically provided a link between publics and elites" (Linden and Pohlman, 2003: 312). The essential reason is obvious given the fact that these countries started their transition to multi-party only at the start of the 1990s.

Mudde (2000: 3) argues that the urban-rural cleavage appears to be a more important factor than the left-right ideology spectrum in terms of determining positions of political parties. The center, both economically and culturally, appears to be more integrated with the Western states of Europe, while the periphery remains isolated and marginal both in terms of its contribution to the international economy and cultural integration with the Western parts of Europe. Hence on the basis of this argument, the conclusion is drawn that in CEE, parties which represent the urban center are more likely to express support for European integration, while parties that represent the electorate at the rural periphery are more likely to be in the Euro-realist or Euro-sceptic camp. The main contribution of this argument is that "the question of EU accession adds an additional dimension in the patterns of party competition by transforming the prevailing urban-rural divide into an anti-EU center-periphery cleavage" (Mudde, 2000: 2).

Alternatively, Marks et al. (2006: 157) argue that there are two major dimensions which structure party competition that can be adopted both in the Western and

Eastern contexts. The first one is the economic right-left dimension, and the second is the 'non-economic, cultural, new politics' dimension. The economic dimension is concerned with the redistribution of wealth and the regulation of the economy by the government. The left pole prioritizes economic equality, whereas the right prioritizes individual economic freedom. Including Marks et al. (2006), many scholars agree on the fact that the left-right spectrum in terms of economy rather than political ideology serves as a main dimension of party competition in Central and Eastern Europe too (Evans & Whitefield, 1993; Kitschelt et al., 1999).

On the other hand, the second dimension, which has started to have a significant impact on the structuring of party competition in Western Europe since the 1970s, is the new politics dimension. This cultural, new politics dimension addresses several non-economic issues which belong to a broader range of spectrum than those of the economic left-right dimension. The new politics dimension is strongly determined by the national context. In some countries it may represent environmental protection and sustainable growth, while in others it may address traditional values and represent the religious vs. secular divide. Alternatively, it may prioritize the defense of the national community.

On the basis of this variation, Marks et al (2006: 167) classify the new politics into two poles, which are identified as: green/alternative/libertarian (Gal), and traditionalism/authority/nationalism (Tan). Political actors position themselves in relation to these dimensions regarding the issue of European integration.

According to their findings, Euroscepticism in CEE is prevalent among the radical left and radical Tan parties. They strongly support the argument that the positions of parties on European integration determine the main axis of party competition in

CEE. They assert that Right-Gal parties support European integration, while Left-Tan parties express Euroscepticism. Their conclusion is verified in light of empirical findings. Szczerbiak (2001) demonstrates that in Poland opponents of European integration vote for the Peasants Self Defence Party or the League of Polish Families, a Catholic and a nationalist political party respectively. Marks et al. (2006) advocate that the issue of European integration structures the axis of party competition on the basis of Left-Gal/ Right-Tan axis in Western Europe, whereas in Central and Eastern Europe it is the Left-Tan/ Right-Gal axis which determines how parties position themselves on the issue of European integration.

This identification offers a better understanding of how economic policy preferences of the political elites and masses overlap with cultural differences. In Szczerbiak and Taggart's (2002:17) understanding this analytical differentiation does not exist. On the contrary they point out to the fact that "parties taking Eurosceptical positions in Central and Eastern European candidate states are predominantly on the right of the ideological spectrum."

3.2.2 Conceptualization of Party-Based Euroscepticism in the Context of Central and Eastern European Countries

The study of party-level Euroscepticism in Central and Eastern Europe is less common compared with the study of Euroscepticism in Western Europe. Taggart and Szczerbiak (2001) advance a conceptual definition of Euroscepticism. Although they adopt Taggart's earlier understanding of the term defined as "the idea of contingent or qualified opposition, as well as incorporating outright and unqualified opposition to the process of European integration" (Taggart, 1998: 366), they introduce a differentiation between "Hard" and "Soft" Euroscepticism

in the context of the national party politics and party systems of CEECs. Their definition of Hard Euroscepticism is as follows (Szczerbiak and Taggart, 2002: 7):

> Hard Euroscepticism is where there is a principled opposition to the EU and European integration and therefore can be seen in parties who think that their countries should withdraw from membership, or whose policies towards the EU are tantamount to being opposed to the whole project of European integration as it is currently conceived.

There are two basic implications of this definition. The first one is that a political party expresses hard Euroscepticism if it is a single-issue anti-EU Party, which mobilizes its electorate base on the basis of a principled rejection of European integration. The second implication is that a political party can be classified as hard Eurosceptic if it fundamentally questions the terms of its country's membership and comprehensively opposes the European integration project on the basis of its ideological position. Accordingly, hard Euroscepticism is defined as an 'outright rejection of the entire project of European political and economic integration and opposition to their country joining or remaining members of the EU' (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2001: 10).

On the other hand, Soft Euroscepticism is defined as follows (Szczerbiak and Taggart, 2002: 7):

> Where there is not a principled objection to European integration or EU membership but concerns on or a number of policy areas lead to the expression of qualified opposition to the EU, or where there is a sense that national interest is currently at odds with the EU's trajectory.

Hence soft Euroscepticism is conceptualized as a 'contingent opposition', which implies that an alteration either to a particular policy area or a shift in the national interest can lead to a support or even an encouragement of the project of European integration in its current form. On the basis of this, Soft Euroscepticism is further sub-divided into 'policy' and 'national interest' Euroscepticism which function as the main indicators of a Soft Eurosceptic position of a political party (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2001: 10).

It is argued that policy Euroscepticism exists to the extent that a political party expresses opposition either to measures designed to deepen European political and economic cooperation or an existing particular policy often framed within the debate over the policy competencies of the EU vs. national government. On the other hand, national interest Euroscepticism entails the defense of the national interest against EU competencies. This form of soft Euroscepticism does not necessarily have to reject the project of European integration in principle. On the contrary, it may be supportive of further deepening under the rubric of a national-interest Eurosceptic rhetoric designed for boosting political support at the domestic level. To put it more clearly, soft Euroscepticism exists to the extent that "a political party uses the rhetoric of contestation over the European issue as part of its political repertoire" (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2002: 7).

Although the theoretical framework by Taggart and Szczerbiak (2002) has been extensively used by scholars when analyzing Euroscepticism, it generated a variety of definitional controversies and has become a subject of critique. Richard Katz (2008: 155) addresses the possibility of alternative conceptualizations of Euroscepticism by referring to definitional problems with the use of Euroscepticism within the academic discourse.

Firstly, although Euroscepticism is operationalized in terms of opposition to the European project whether in contingent – *soft*- or principled- *hard*- forms, it needs to cover 'those who merely want to make haste more slowly or who express uncertainty about the wisdom of some or all of the proposed "advances"', on the grounds that 'scepticism' linguistically denotes doubts or reservations instead of an outright opposition. Secondly, although Katz (2008: 155) agrees that Hard Euroscepticism denotes wholesale opposition to the process of European integration, he addresses what it is that soft eurosceptics oppose.

Thus, Katz (2008) identifies several objects of Euroscepticism, which include the development of any form of supranational European institutions that would impinge on national sovereignty; the widening of the EU, which implies the expansion of the Union to include more members; the deepening of the EU, which would increase competencies of the Union; specific institutional arrangements, which would shift the balance of power between the Union and member states in favor of the former; and specific EU policies such as the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU).

Katz (2008: 156) argues that pro-EU coalitions frame any opposition to one of the objects of Euroscepticism in terms of Hard Euroscepticism as a strategy to marginalize soft Eurosceptics from the established pro-EU consensus and discourse within the national politics. Given the fact that soft Euroscepticism can express opposition to different objects of skepticism simultaneously, it becomes harder to avoid the association of soft Euroscepticism with its hard form. In a similar vein, Henderson (2002: 7) points to the lack of precision within the definition of Soft Eurocepticism as follows:

> Unfortunately, 'soft' Euroscepticism becomes a rather broad catch-all category, embracing both mainstream parties, which have been largely successful in pursuing their states' ambitions to join the EU, such as Orbán's Fidesz in Hungary or Klaus's Civic Democratic Party (ODS) in the Czech Republic, as well as more extremist parties such as the Czech Republicans, the Greater Romania Party and the Slovak National Party.

Henderson (2002) rightly points to the lack of explanation concerning party position and the form of Euroscepticism within the framework offered by Taggart and Szczerbiak (2001). Although it is argued that "soft Euroscepticism seems to be expressed by some mainstream parties" (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2001: 22), they assume that mainstream parties do not express Euroscepticism. Even if it is accepted that soft Euroscepticism can be manifest both in mainstream and marginal parties, the proposition that "hard Eurosceptic parties are peripheral to their party systems" (Taggart and Szczerbiak, 2001: 23) becomes questionable as mainstream political parties can adopt a hard eurosceptic discourse or may shift towards a 'softer' eurosceptic position as a strategy for party competition. In this way, soft euroscepticism becomes a political and discursive device for mainstream parties in their party systems.

Kopecky and Mudde (2002) make a significant contribution to the literature by offering a constructive critique of the Taggart and Szczerbiak framework, introducing a two-dimensional typology to the analysis of party-based Euroscepticism. While Taggart and Szczerbiak (2002) view party-based Euroscepticism as a consequence of party strategy for electoral competition, Kopecky and Mudde (2002) assert the centrality of ideology, rather than strategy, as the main explaining factor. Instead of conceptualizing the ideology-strategy debate as two separate poles, Kopecky and Mudde (2002) argue that in the context of Central and Eastern Europe, ideological orientation to the issue of European

integration "is not wholly unassociated with party competition" (Kopecky and Mudde cited in Gaisbauer, 2007: 59).

Kopecky and Mudde (2002: 300) conceptualize Euroscepticism by differentiating between *diffuse* and *specific* support for European integration, which generates four different sub- categories: europhiles, europhobes, EU-optimists and EU-pessimists. Before proceeding, a description of the two dimensions is important. The first dimension expresses 'support for the ideas of the European integration, while the second refers to a 'support for the European Union'. The first dimension, that is diffuse support, involves a distinction between two sub-categories: the europhiles and europhobes. The europhiles substantially support the principles of European integration which can be described as 'institutionalized cooperation on the basis of pooled sovereignty'. On the contrary, europhobes reject the underlying principles of European integration due to their ideological positioning. The second dimension, specific EU support, generates the sub-categories: "EU-optimists" and "EU-pessimists".

The first reflects its position in terms of supporting the EU as a holistic project and holding an optimistic belief towards the direction of its development. EU-pessimists hold the opposite view, which entails pessimism towards the direction of the development of the Union and its current state of evolution. Having clarified the typology of party positions which is developed and utilized by Kopecky and Mudde (2002: 302) in the study of the relationship between Europeanization and Euroscepticism, an explanatory synthesis is warranted in order to explore the roots of Eurosceptical positioning among parties.

Euroscepticism originates from the intersection of a Europhile and EU-pessimist attitude towards European integration in particular and the EU in general.

Following this logic, the Eurosceptical position involves a support for the underlying principles of European integration notwithstanding pessimism towards the "current state and future reflections of these ideas."

On the other hand, Euro-enthusiasts can be described as "parties that support the general ideas of European integration (Europhile) and believe that the EU is the institutionalization of these ideas" (Gaisbauer, 2007: 60). Euro-pragmatists combine the Europhobe and EU-optimist positions. They do not support the general ideas of European integration, yet they believe the EU is the best form of integration. In Kopecky and Mudde's (2002: 303) terms Europhobes "do not support the general ideas of European integration underlying the EU, nor do they necessarily oppose them, yet they do support the EU. In general this group will contain parties that do not hold a firm ideological opinion on European integration, and on the basis of pragmatic (often utilitarian) considerations decide to assess the EU positively because they deem it profitable for their own country of constituency." Finally Euro-rejects combine Europhobe and EU-pessimist attitudes; they 'neither subscribe to the ideas underlying the European integration, nor to the EU' (Gaisbauer, 2007: 60). On this basis, Gaisbauer (2007: 60) advocates the hypothesis that change of party positions in European orientation is mainly to be expected on the support for EU axis and to a significantly less extent on the 'support for European integration axis.'

This argument has two main implications. Firstly, political parties' support for the general ideas underlying European integration is a consequence of the dynamics of national party competition and hence it functions as a political strategy. Their support for, or opposition to, the EU on the other hand stems from their ideology. Secondly, changes in the levels of political parties' support for the EU determine

whether they will be Euroenthusiasts or Eurosceptics, while they will retain their position towards support for the ideas underlying European integration. It is argued that specific support, that is "support for the general practice of European integration and the EU as it is developing" (Kopecky, 2004: 231), is bounded by party ideology; whereas, diffuse support, that is support for the general ideas of European integration, is bounded by political strategy (Kopecky and Mudde, 2002: 230). Therefore Euroscepticism does not have different variants with different qualities as in Szczerbiak and Taggart's understanding. Moreover, Kopecky concurs with the fact that "all Eurosceptics are essentially in favor of European integration" (Kopecky, 2004: 232). This claim is justified within a framework as political parties that do not express neither diffuse nor specific support, are classified as "Eurorejects", which corresponds to Szczerbiak and Taggart's conceptualization of hard Euroscepticism.

This study attempts to utilize both Kopecky and Mudde's two-fold typology on the one hand; Taggart and Szczerbiak's differentiation of hard and soft Euroscepticism on the other. Kopecky and Mudde's framework contributes to our understanding of soft and hard versions of Euroscepticism on the basis of a differentiation between strategy and ideology. In this manner, it becomes possible to explain changes in the levels of political parties' support of Europe and European integration. However, it is not the aim of this study to relate the varying degrees of support and opposition to the EU and European integration to political parties' ideology and strategy for electoral competition.

The main objective of this study is to understand how Europe plays a role in shaping national party politics and political discourse, and how domestic political actors construct collective understandings of the EU and European integration

either in pro- or anti-EU forms. In order to examine this process, this study investigates how political actors problematise the issue of Europe and European integration and why. Hence, in terms of research focus it asks how anti-EU politics shapes national party politics. To understand that, pro-EU positions are also taken into account. In this sense, Kopecky and Mudde (2002) provide us with a conceptual framework through which pro- and anti-EU positions can be examined on a continuum. However, their uniform understanding of Euroscepticism, which does not entail a differentiation between its hard and soft versions, limits our understanding of Euroscepticism as a multi-faceted phenomenon. Furthermore, Kopecky and Mudde's two-fold typology frames the positions of political parties and any changes to them within a strategy-ideology debate, which is not the aim of this study. As mentioned earlier, our central research focus is not to examine the whole range of political party positions on the issue of Europe and European integration, but mainly anti-EU positions in the form of hard and soft Euroscepticism. The latter's impact on national party politics cannot be understood in isolation from Europhile positions of political parties in the countries' respective party systems.

On this basis, Kopecky and Mudde's two-fold typology will be employed to the extent that the examination of pro-EU positions of mainstream political parties becomes a necessary component in our understanding of the role of party-based Euroscepticism in national party systems and politics. On the other hand, to understand the differing levels and manifestation of party-based Euroscepticism, Szczerbiak and Taggart's conceptualization will be employed. It is preferred over Kopecky and Mudde's definition of Euroscepticism on the grounds that it provides us with a framework which recognizes the differing levels and types of

party-based Euroscepticism in soft and hard forms. In this manner, it becomes possible to reveal the multi-faceted nature of party-based Euroscepticism. Moreover, this framework helps us uncover the role of agency by showing how different political actors (parties) problematise the issue of Europe and European integration differently through different levels and manifestations of party-based Euroscepticism. On these grounds, this study adopts a combined approach to the study of party-based Euroscepticism in order to have an enriched understanding of the role anti-EU politics plays in national party politics, as well as the significance of understanding political parties as political agents with the ability to construct the issue of Europe and European integration in different ways by endorsing different positions and attitudes.

CHAPTER IV

EUROSCEPTICISM AS A REALIGNING ISSUE IN POLISH PARTY POLITICS

By the late 1990s, the CEECs began to distance themselves from the euro-idealism of the early post-communist years, when accession to the European Union was framed within the 'Return to Europe' argument. Realistic evaluations of the advantages and disadvantages of membership became a major theme of political debate at the mass public opinion and party elite levels. The Central and Eastern European countries' decade of experience with the trials of transition to liberal political and economic structures resulted into a gradual decline of the idealism of the early post communist years (Hughes et al, 2008: 181). Prior to the second half of the 1990s, the debate on the EU's Eastern Enlargement was concerned with the adoption of the Copenhagen Criteria, which were formulated at the Copenhagen European Council in June 1993, and the implementation of the pre-accession strategy, which was introduced by the Essen European Council in December 1994 (Henderson, 2002: 2). However, in the aftermath of the opening of accession negotiations in March 1998, the CEECs went through a process of transition from being merely passive objects, who uncritically endorsed the prospect of EU membership, to active subjects of European integration, who

critically engaged with the issue of EU membership by evaluating the potential costs and benefits of accession (Henderson, 2002: 3; Szczerbiak, 2005: 5).

In order to evaluate the impact of European integration in particular, and the salience of the European issue in general, this chapter analyzes the results of the 1997, 2001 and 2005 Polish Parliamentary elections in light of the impact of the EU on inter-party competition by examining the extent to which Polish political parties refer to the European integration and the EU in their elections programs and campaigns. In addition, the October 2000 Presidential election will be analyzed due to the fact that this was the first major election to be held in Poland after the start of accession negotiations, and the candidates' campaigns paid high attention to the EU and European integration (Szczerbiak, 2001: 8). Before the presidential election of October 2000, the question of EU membership, alongside NATO membership generated an overwhelming consensus both among the public and the established political parties, which was due to two major reasons. First, until the start of accession negotiations neither parties nor party elites engaged in an active discussion over the potential costs and benefits of accession. Secondly, the 2000 October elections reflected the insights of the newly emerging political debate concerning EU membership and its potential costs, which shifted the axis of political competition from traditional party cleavages to attitudes towards European integration.

In addition to the analysis of primary order elections, the 2003 Polish Accession Referendum and the 2004 EP election, as a case of a second-order election, will be examined. The analysis of a second-order election is warranted to show how the issue of Europe and European integration forms a bridge between national and supranational elections in accordance with Reif and Schmitt's perspective of the

second-order election model. According to Reif and Schmitt, "the national arena is the most important one in European nation states, and elections for national public office are the most salient both for the public and political parties" (cited in Marsh, 1998: 591). Hence, they are called first-order elections. On the other hand, "elections other than general elections to the Parliament, such as elections for local government bodies are second order elections, in which EP elections are also included" (cited in Marsh, 1998: 592). Reif and Schmitt argue that second order elections cannot be separated from first order elections as "concerns which are appropriate to the first order arena will affect behavior in second order elections" (cited in Marsh, 1998: 592).

In this sense, a combined analysis of national and EP elections will contribute to our understanding of the relation between political and electoral dynamics of primary and second order elections. Secondly, it will be possible to explore how the issue of Europe and European integration becomes a new yet important dimension of inter-party competition in supranational as well as national elections.

Moreover, the analysis of the 2003 Accession Referendum enables to observe the extent to which support for the issue of Polish EU membership is consolidated and de-coupled from the national political discussions concerning the issue of Europe and European Integration in the eyes of the mass public. A combined analysis of elections and referendums will demonstrate how domestic political campaigns shape and influence voters' preferences and positions regarding the question of Polish accession in particular and European integration in general. Moreover, the analysis of the 2004 European Parliament election results will demonstrate how strong Eurosceptic tendencies in the 2001 Polish parliament

were not silenced and influenced electoral dynamics in the run up to the 2004 EP election.

In light of Ladrech's (2008) framework for political party Europeanization, this chapter will analyze the impact of Europe and European integration on Polish party politics by focusing on the role of the politics of Euroscepticism in shaping patterns of party competition and party politics. Ladrech's (2008) framework, in which five interrelated areas manifest evidence of political party Europeanization, is used. Recalling our discussion of five areas: (1) programmatic change, (2) organizational change, (3) patterns of party competition, (4) party-government relations, (5) transnational party cooperation, the focus is here on the analysis of the first and third dimensions. The analysis of the politics of Euroscepticism and Europeanization of political parties examines the extent to which mainstream political parties change their party programme and whether the issue of Europe becomes an issue of domestic political constellation. This chapter will study the Europeanization of Polish political parties by concentrating on whether the issue of Europe and European integration becomes a major theme in national inter-party competition. To do so, thechapter will make use of the mainstream parties' election programs to observe how mainstream political parties integrate the issue of Europe and European integration into their political discourse.

4.1 The Main Features of the Polish Party System

The objective of accession to the European Union and NATO formed the core pillars of Polish foreign policy since 1989, gaining the support of the majority of political parties, although they differed in terms of their enthusiasm and

approaches as to how to attain those objectives (Szczerbiak, 2001: 5). On the mass public opinion level, Polish support for EU membership was very high; 72% in March, April and June 1997. It declined to 66 % in May 1998, two months after the start of accession negotiations, and support for EU membership suffered a steady decline reaching a low of 55% in September 2000 (Szczerbiak, 2001: 7).

Nevertheless, before interpreting the impact of the issue of Europe and European integration in Polish party politics in light of our electoral results, it is necessary to briefly mention the nature of the Polish party system in the aftermath of 1989. The Polish party system is characterized by an extraordinary fluidity since its democratic rebirth in 1989 (Markowski and Tucker, 2008: 5). Although Poland is described as "one of the few unquestionable success stories among the post-communist countries" due to its political, economic and social transformation (Smolar, 1998: 122), the Polish political party system has remained largely unconsolidated in comparison to the Czech Republic and Hungary (Markowski and Tucker, 2008: 5; Smolar, 1998: 122). In the aftermath of the collapse of communism, Poland was " run by the various parties and groupings that emerged from the Solidarity opposition movement, which had precipitated the demise of the communist system following its overwhelming victory in the elections of 1989" (Szczerbiak, 2002: 2). However, during the 1989-1993 period Solidarity, which was always an ideologically heterogeneous political construct, faced the serious challenge of rapid fragmentation and was eventually disintegrated. The political vacuum in the Polish party system left by the disintegration of Solidarity resulted in the electoral victory of the ex-communist political forces in the 1993 Parliamentary elections, which brought the Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) and the Polish Peasant Party (PSL) in power.

The SLD, which was formed in the early 1990s, comprised a variety of political parties and factions 'clustered around Social Democracy of the Polish Republic (SdRP), the direct organizational successor to the Polish communist party' (Szczerbiak and Bil, 2008: 6). On the other hand, the PSL was formed in 1990, as a successor to the former communist satellite United Peasant Party (ZSL). As a result, the 1993-1997 SLD-PSL government represented "the former communists' comeback" to the Polish political scene, which was consolidated by the electoral victory of the SLD-backed Aleksander Kwasniewski over the "legendary Solidarity leader" Lech Walesa in the 1995 Presidential election (Szczerbiak, 2002: 2). The electoral success of the SLD in the 1993 Parliamentary elections had two major implications for Polish party politics. First, in addition to the hegemonic impact of Solidarity on its successor, fragmented groupings, the formation of the Democratic Left Alliance (SLD), impeded the rise of modern, autonomous political parties in Poland (Szczerbiak, 2002: 2; Smolar, 1998: 124). Secondly, these two strong political forces led to the emergence of a bipolar structure of party competition mainly on the basis of differences in

attitudes toward the communist past. In this way, the main axis of political competition and hence the major cleavage dividing political parties in Polish party politics emerges on the basis of attitudes toward Poland's communist past. In this sense, the cleavage between *the winners and losers of transition* becomes the main political cleavage and Polish political parties are established and develop their ideologies on this basis. This is very significant for the analysis of party-based Euroscepticism in Polish party politics. Party-based Euroscepticism in Poland emerges hand in hand with the process of Europeanization. As the analysis will show, the Europeanization of Polish political parties does not create an

autonomous 'European' cleavage, but rather political parties filter the issue of Europe and European integration with respect to the prevailing dimension of political competition. What changes as a result of the Europeanization of Polish party politics is the fact that political parties frame the prevailing cleavage on the basis of their differences in attitudes toward the issue of Europe and European integration. In this way, the politics of Euroscepticism becomes a powerful political and to some extent an ideological mechanism through which Polish political parties position themselves in the party system and re-frame the existing political cleavage by adding a European dimension.

4.2 The Analysis of Polish Parliamentary Elections and Presidential Elections

The September 1997 Parliamentary Election

The 1997 parliamentary election, Poland's third parliamentary election since the fall of communism, resulted into a major defeat for the previous coalition government, led by the Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) and its coalition partner, the Polish Peasant Party (PSL) (Szczerbiak, 1998: 58). The 1997 parliamentary election is considered to be of significant importance due to the fact that it was the first election in post-communist Poland to be held after a parliament had run its full four-year term (Szczerbiak, 1998: 59). However, in terms of voter turnout, only 42.92 % of eligible voters went to the polls, less than half of the electorate. In comparison to the previous 1993 parliamentary election turnout, a significant decline was registered: from 52.06 % to 42.92 % (Szczerbiak, 2001: 5; Szczerbiak, 1998: 59).

While the Polish right was virtually excluded from the 1993- 1997 Polish Parliament, it won the 1997 election. In total ten political parties competed in those elections, and five of them managed to pass the 5% threshold to enter Parliament. These were the Solidarity Electoral Action (AWS), the Democratic Left Alliance (SLD), the Freedom Union (UW), the Polish Peasant Party (PSL), and the Movement for Poland's Reconstruction (ROP).

The AWS was formed by post-Solidarity center-right parties and groupings in June 1996, comprising '22 parties and other groupings spearheaded by the Solidarity Union' (Szczerbiak, 1998: 64). Similar to its predecessor, the AWS is internally characterized as a heterogeneous grouping, which "encompasses liberals, Christian Democrats, conservatives of varying stripes including even radical nationalists and Catholic integralists" (Smolar, 1998: 126).

Table 1: Political Parties in the 1997 Polish Parliament

	Votes	%	Seats
Solidarity Electoral Action (AWS)	4,427,373	33.83	201
Democratic Left Alliance (SLD)	3,551,224	27.13	164
Freedom Union (UW)	1,749,518	13.37	60
Polish Peasant Party (PSL)	956,184	7.31	27
Movement for Poland's	727,072	5.56	6

Reconstruction (ROP)			

The AWS finished the 1997 election first and formed a government with the Freedom Union as its minor coalition partner. The AWS victory represented the return of the Polish right in the form of a united bloc. The Polish right, which lost the 1993 elections because of its disunity and extensive fragmentation, made a crucial impact on the Polish political landscape through the electoral victory of the AWS, which proved to be the only successful right-wing unity initiative in terms of building a coherent electoral right-wing bloc with the capacity to effectively challenge the SLD.

The key dimension of political party competition in the 1997 elections was framed in terms of a battle between the post-Solidarity and post-Communist groupings, which had previously emerged with the presidential elections of 1995. The two major competing candidates were Lech Walesa, who represented the post-Solidarity group, and Aleksander Kwasniewski, who was the leader of the SLD. The 1995 presidential elections resulted into a victory for Kwasniewski, and "the battle between Walesa and Kwasniewski developed into a contest between the representatives of the two historic formations: post-Solidarity and post-Communists" (Szczerbiak, 1998: 62).

The AWS can be described as a liberal-conservative right party, advocating the kind of free-market reforms, introduced under the rubric of the 1990 Balcerowicz Plan by the Solidarity governments of 1989-1993. On the other hand, the

ideological profile of the post-communist right can be described as traditionalist-conservative, which associates itself more with traditional values and puts heavy emphasis on traditional notions of family, religion and nation. Within this context, Szczerbiak (1998) argues that the line of demarcation between the post-Solidarity and post-communist right-wing political elites is fundamentally based on attitudes towards the communist past, which has become the key dimension that determines patterns of party competition in the Polish party system. The AWS owes its 1997 victory mostly to its successful "attempt to draw an analogy between the new-spirit right-wing "political unity" represented by the formation of AWS and the "societal unity" which had characterized Solidarity's previous anti-communist struggles in 1980-81 and 1989" (Szczerbiak, 1998: 65). Therefore, the overarching theme in the AWS' election campaign was defined in terms of anti-communism, and opposition to post-communist representatives headed by the SLD. In the context of the 1997 elections, the key dimension of political party competition was the attitudes towards the past, rather than any discussion of Polish accession to the EU in particular, and the issue of Europe in general. Although the end of the 1990s marks the beginning of the decline of Euro-enthusiasm, there is still a lack of political discussion concerning the costs and benefits of Polish EU entry and the issue of Europe within the ideological and policy profiles of Polish political parties, all of which viewed the issue of Polish membership as a foreign policy objective.

The October 2000 Presidential Election

Until the October 2000 Presidential elections, attitudes towards the past and moral-cultural issues formed the structure of party competition. However, the examination of the presidential campaigns of the four main candidates, all of

whom had pro-EU profiles, reveals that Polish party competition is re-structured on the basis of socio-economic divisions between the winners and losers of the transition (Szczerbiak, 2001: 8). In this respect, the salience of the socio-economic differences between the winners and losers increases and the issues of Europe and European integration are assimilated into the transition arguments.

The four main candidates are Aleksander Kwasniewski; Andrzej Olechowski,an independent liberal-conservative; Marian Krzaklewski, the leader of the AWS and the Solidarity Trade Union; and finally Jaroslaw Kalinowski, the leader of the Polish Peasant Party (PSL). Among the four candidates, Kwasniewski and Olechowski were the most supportive of Polish membership to the EU and they gained the highest share of votes as can be seen in Table 2 below.

Although the issue of Polish EU membership was not the major theme of the candidates' presidential election campaigns, Kwasniewski and Olechowski expressed strong support for Polish membership without touching upon the social and economic costs of accession. The other two candidates, on the other hand, paid attention to the potential costs of Polish membership, while retaining their pro-EU stance.

Table 2: Four Main Candidate in October 2000 Polish Presidential Elections

Candidate	Votes	Percentage (%)
Aleksander Kwasniewski (SLD)	9,485,224	53,90

Andrzej Olechowski (Independent)	3,044,141	17,30
Marian Krzaklewski (AWS)	2,739,621	15,57
Jaroslaw Kalinowski (PSL)	1,047,949	5,95

Source: Polish State Electoral Commission, http://www.pkw.gov.pl/

President Kwasniewski framed the question of EU membership as an opportunity for Poland on pragmatic reasons in the form of security and economic gains. Kwasniewski's pragmatic approach to the EU neglected any concerns over the potential costs of accession. With regards to the possible benefits that Poland could gain, he stated that EU membership "is an opportunity for Poland. Both for our security and sovereignty" (Szczerbiak, 2001: 9). His pragmatism based on economic gains can be best illustrated by the following statement: "the EU is a way of modernizing our economy. It gives us the chance of broader participation in European markets. Our economy will also gain from overseas investment. We won't be the pariahs of Europe" (Szczerbiak, 2001: 9).

Kwasniewski's approach to Polish membership is based on the conviction that the integration of the Polish market to European markets through its integration in a free-market, liberal economy would be best achieved and consolidated through EU membership, preventing Poland from remaining on the fringes of the

European economy. Hence, the issue of Polish membership to the Union is not discussed within the frame of the overall evaluation of the workings of the Union or the cost associated with membership, but is framed within an instrumental logic, which perceives EU membership as a means to achieve a broader end, which is the enhancement of the Polish national interest. Based on Kopecky and Mudde's definitions, Kwasniewski adopts an EU-optimist and Europhile position, which makes him a Euroenthusiast. In line with Kopecky and Mudde's definition of Euroenthusiast, Kwasniewski does not express any concerns regarding the general ideas of European integration and believes that the EU is the best way to further national interest.

Olechowski shared Kwasniewski's arguments concerning EU membership as an opportunity for Poland to consolidate and further its security and economic gains. However, Olechowski paid more attention to the normative value of EU membership. As opposed to the pragmatic approach of Kwasniewski, Olechowski adopted a normative stance towards the issue of membership, framed in terms of a "civilisational necessity", rather than as a means to modernize the Polish economy and further its national security.

Krzaklewski, the AWS leader, failed to receive the highest share of votes in the presidential election, despite the fact that the party had defeated the SLD in the 1997 parliamentary election. Krzaklewski's stance on Polish EU membership is significant as he developed his position on the basis of the prevailing battle between the post- Solidarity and post-communist camps. This indicates how the issue of Europe is filtered and incorporated into the prevailing dimension of political competition, based on the differences in attitudes towards Poland's communist past.

Krzaklewski advocated the argument that Poland needed to be on equal grounds with other member states in the Union, composed of 'free states', who retained their national identity and sovereignty. In this sense, Krzaklewski described the clash between the AWS stance on Polish membership and Kwasniewski' approach as a "civilisational battle", which will determine in what way Poland 'will unite in the uniting of Europe'. In this sense, post-Solidarity elites adopted an intergovernmentalist approach, which expressed support for the EU as a union of free states with each retaining its national identity and sovereignty. On the other hand, the post-communists adopted a supranational approach, which framed Polish membership as a necessity to become part of a broader European nation. Rather than adopting a normative approach to the issue of EU membership, Krzaklewski viewed Polish EU membership as "a condition of the better solution of the economic and social problems faced by Poland and as the road to a fuller realization of the national interest and to the strengthening of Polish identity" (Szczerbiak, 2001: 10). Although Krzaklewski sounds similar to Kwasniewski by framing the benefits of EU membership as the best means to solve Poland's economic and social problems, his emphasis on the potential costs to Polish sovereignty and national interest positions him close to a soft Eurosceptic attitude.

Consequently, the 2000 Presidential election is significantly important in terms of transforming both the discourse of political elites and the key dimension in determining the dynamics of party competition.

The September 2001 Parliamentary Election

Following the results of the September 2001 Parliamentary election; the Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) gained the highest share of votes and formed a

coalition government with the Labour Union (UP). Still, they could not obtain an absolute parliamentary majority and formed a minority government with the participation of the agrarian, soft- Eurosceptic, Polish Peasant Party (PSL). Initially, the SLD-UP coalition invited the pro-EU Civic Platform (PO) to join the coalition. Although the Europhile SLD-UP coalition invited the center-right, pro-EU Civic Platform (PO), the PO refused the invitation, which led to the eventual participation of the Polish Peasant Party, a soft-eurosceptic party.

The Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) is the strongest Europhile political force in Polish party politics alongside the Freedom Union (UW) and the Social Democrats (SdPL). From the perspective of Kopecky and Mudde, the SLD is a Euro-enthusiast party given its unconditional support both for the EU and the general ideas underlying the European integration in particular. Gaisbauer (2007: 64) confirms the point by assessing the voting behavior of the MEPs of parties in the 2004 European Parliament on the issue of the European Constitutional Treaty (ECT). Accordingly, MEPs of the Democratic Left Alliance, the Freedom Union and the Social Democrats (SdPL) voted in favor of the ratification of the ECT.

The party receiving the second highest number of votes was the Civic Platform (PO), formed in January 2001 as a liberal-conservative pro-EU party. Although the Civic Platform adopts a pro-EU approach, in contrast to the pro-EU, euro-enthusiast Polish parties, the PO does not express unconditional support and hence cannot be classified among the list of euro-enthusiast parties. As Gaisbauer (2007: 64) indicates, fourteen MEPs from the PO voted in favor of "Abstention" in the European Parliament on the ratification of the ECT, while only one MEP voted in favor. In this sense it is possible to argue that "abstention is clearly a

divergence from the pro-European 'Yes' as well as the anti-European 'No'" (Gaisbauer, 2007: 64).

Recalling that euro-enthusiast political parties are defined as those parties, which "support the general ideas of European integration and also believe that the EU is/will soon become the institutionalization of these ideas" (Kopecky and Mudde, 2002: 231), it is possible to argue that the PO distances itself from a Europhile position. The voting behavior of the MEPs of the PO demonstrates that the party clearly distances itself from a position of unconditional support, while it does not oppose to European integration in principle.

The PO formed the major opposition group in the 2001 Polish Parliament with the Law and Justice Party (PİS). Similar to the PO, the PİS was formed in April 2001, as a right-wing conservative party by Jaroslaw Kaczynski (Szczerbiak, 2001: 6). Although both parties had a pro-EU orientation, they criticized the government's soft negotiating stance towards the EU. In the words of the PO's leader:

> it would be safer if, in exchange for agreeing to the EU's position when it comes to access to EU labor markets, we could have obtained advantages in other areas such as structural funds, regional policy or agriculture. The government's position will certainly speed up the negotiations, but it is not just a case of being in the Union in 2004, but to be in it on the best possible conditions. As a Polish citizen I would prefer to be sure that our concessions are in exchange for their concessions. And I would also like to know what they are (cited in Szczerbiak, 2002: 10).

Although Gaisbauer (2007:67) classifies the Civic Platform (PO) as a Euroenthusiast party according to Kopecky and Mudde's framework, its pro-EU profile does not necessarily prevent the party from expressing soft-Euroscepticism. The PO shared the criticisms of the hard eurosceptic Self-Defence and the League of Polish Families (LPR) that the government's

negotiating strategy with the EU risked Poland's national interest on a broad policy front (Szczerbiak, 2002). In this respect, the PO can be seen as a soft-eurosceptic party.

The Civic Platform's position on the issue of Europe and European integration conforms with Kopecky and Mudde's conceptualization of Eurosceptic parties, as "those parties and groups who support general ideas of the European integration underlying the EU, but are skeptical about the EU as a system that is developing in the direction that best embodies these ideas" (Kopecky and Mudde, 2002: 231). However, this definition does not help us understand the differences between the Euroscepticism of League of Polish Families, Self Defence and the Polish Peasant Party, which express different- hard and soft - versions of Euroscepticism. In this sense, the logic behind employing Szczerbiak and Taggart's conceptualization of Euroscepticism becomes evident.

To begin with, The League of Polish Families (LPR) is a catholic, nationalist right –wing political party, which expresses opposition to both the EU and the idea of European integration. It fundamentally opposes Polish EU membership and accuses the EU of "conducting a policy of economic colonialism towards Poland" (Szczerbiak, 2002). The issue of European integration was heavily addressed by the party in its election program and was framed in terms of 'colonization', through which the national assets of Poland would be colonized by EU countries. In the words of the vice-chairman of the LPR, Roman Giertych: "we did not fight for our independence for all those years only to now give away a portion of our sovereignty to some kind of a supranational organisation" (cited in Szczerbiak, 2002). In this sense the LPR is a hard-eurosceptic party in Szczerbiak and Taggart's terms. From Kopecky and Mudde's perspective, on the other hand, the

LPR is a Euro-reject party with a clearly Europhobe attitude as it fundamentally opposes the EU, European integration and perceives the EU as a threat to Polish economic and political sovereignty.

Self-Defence is a radical-populist, agrarian party, which can be listed among the strong Eurosceptic forces in party politics. It emerged as the third largest grouping in the 2001 Parliament with a 10.2 % share of the vote. In contrast with the LPR, Self Defence did not state explicitly that it was against Polish EU membership but displayed strong Eurosceptic elements in its political rhetoric.

In its 2001 election program Self Defence argued that "the SLD, PSL, AWS, UW and PO are implementing the same program of making Poland dependent on the West, selling out our national assets together with the liquidation of jobs. They have all gone mad about Brussels. But the truth is brutal; no one will give us something for nothing" (cited in Szczerbiak, 2002). The 2001 election program further stated that "Self Defence is opposed to integration with the European Union in the current form it exists today" (cited in Szczerbiak, 2002). Hence, in the case of Self Defence, it is possible to locate the position of the party between a soft and hard Eurosceptic stance since it does not explicitly rule out Polish EU membership as the League of Polish Families (LPR).

Table 3: Political Parties in the 2001 Polish Parliament

Party	Votes (%)	Seats
Democratic Left Alliance (SLD- UP)	41.04	216
Civic Platform (PO)	12.68	65

Self-Defence (Samoobrona)	10.20	53
Law and Justice (PİS)	9.50	44
Polish Peasant Party (PSL)	8.98	42
League of Polish Families (LPR)	7.87	38

Source: Polish State Electoral Commission, http://www.pkw.gov.pl/

On the other hand, although the Polish Peasant Party used to be a coalition partner during the 1993-1997 SLD-UP led government, its participation in the 2001-2005 SLD-UP led coalition generated further obstacles to the working of the pro-EU SLD-UP coalition, given the fact that the PSL advocated a hard stance on the accession negotiations, reflected in Kalinowski's election campaigns in the run-up to the 2000 Polish presidential election.

Although a minor coalition partner, the impact of the PSL on the pro-EU SLD-UP coalition, which adopted a soft negotiating strategy, proved to be more influential than expected. The SLD-UP coalition faced serious constraints on its freedom of maneuver concerning specific policy negotiations and concessions. The government had to change its negotiation policy package concerning specific policy chapters on agriculture, which carried crucial importance for the rural-agrarian constituency of the PSL. In this sense, the PSL's politics of Euroscepticism is mainly a national interest and policy based Euroscepticism, which makes it possible to classify this party as soft Eurosceptic.

As a result, the most striking feature of the 2001 parliamentary election is the interpretation of the electoral results 'as representing some kind of a " Eurosceptic

backlash" ' (Szczerbiak, 2002). The argument is reasonable, given the fact that it marks the first instance of the salience of the politics of party-based Euroscepticism in post-communist Polish party politics. It is of crucial importance to stress that out of the six parties that entered Parliament four of them; (the Self-Defence, the Polish Peasant Party (PSL), the League of Polish Families (LPR) and the Civic Platform) made use of a Eurosceptic discourse and expressed party-based Euroscepticism in their hard and soft versions.

Hence, the 2001 Polish Parliamentary elections provide a counter case for Taggart's argument that mainstream parties do not express Euroscepticism. Although Szczerbiak and Taggart (2002) reformulated this argument in later years arguing that mainstream parties *can adopt* soft Eurosceptic positions, the Polish case clearly shows that the politics of Euroscepticism, even its hard form, is not a feature of political parties that are peripheral or marginal to their party systems. The 2001 election results show that mainstream agrarian parties express harder versions of Euroscepticism; mainly the League of Polish Families and Self Defence. On the other hand, national –interest based Euroscepticism brings together political parties from different ideologies as well as different positions on the issue of Europe and European integration. The Civic Platform, which was founded as a liberal conservative, pro-EU party shared the same concerns with anti-EU political forces on the issue of the government's negotiating strategy with the EU.

 The 2005 Parliamentary Election

The 2005 parliamentary election results led to the formation of a coalition government composed of the Law and Justice Party (PİS) and the Civic Platform

(PO), who had gained 27% and 24.1% of the votes respectively. The dissatisfaction with the previous SLD-UP government and its minor coalition partner, the PSL, was reflected in the voters' electoral preferences in the 2005 contest. Although the Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) took over office with the objective of accelerating Poland's accession negotiations, the government lost popularity and suffered a significant decline in its vote share in 2005 parliamentary elections. According to Szczerbiak (2005: 2), the root causes of the failure of the SLD-UP government were 'due to an accumulation of problems', identified as follows:

> Stubbornly high levels of unemployment meant that, when it came, economic recovery did not filter down to ordinary Poles and produce a tangible 'feel good'; continued in-fighting within the government and between premier Miller and the Democratic Left Alliance- backed president Aleksander Kwasniewski; and the government's incompetent handling of certain key policy areas.

Table 4: Political Parties in the 2005 Polish Parliament

Party	Votes	Seats
Law and Justice (PİS)	27.0	155
Civic Platform (PO)	24.1	133
Self-Defence (Samoobrona)	11.4	56
Democratic Left Alliance- Labour Union (SLD- UP)	11.3	55
League of Polish Families (LPR)	8.0	34

Polish Peasant Party (PSL)	6.7	25

Although the public did not elect hard-eurosceptic forces to the government,the 2005 electoral results brought Parliament two parties; the Law and Justice and the Civic Platform, which strongly criticized the previous government's handling of the negotiations in particular and European policy in general. They also made use of national interest based rhetoric, without damaging their pro-EU profiles. On the other hand, hard Eurosceptic political parties did not face a decrease in their electoral support. This is significant because the Self Defence and especially the League of Polish Families are both hard eurosceptic parties and particularly the latter strongly campaigned by opposing Polish EU membership. The 2005 parliamentary election results revealed voters' disapproval with the government's performance and reflected the significant influence of national –interest based Eurosceptic rhetoric on voters' preferences in the context of post-accession.

The two main centre-right parties, the Civic Platform (PO) and the traditionalist-conservative Law and Justice (PİS), which strongly campaigned by defending the Polish national interest in the context of pre-accession while retaining their pro-EU profiles, seized the opportunity to raise their electoral strength in the 2005 parliamentary election, and formed the government.

The Law and Justice Party (PİS), which was in opposition during the 2001-2005 SLD-UP government, heavily addressed the issue of Europe and Poland's membership in the run up to 2005 parliamentary elections in its election campaign. The party published a comprehensive 144-page document in 2005, in

which the issue of Europe was addressed by a total of twenty-eight paragraphs (Szczerbiak and Bil, 2008: 15). On the other hand, the Civic Platform did not publish an updated election program for the 2005 parliamentary elections.

Although Szczerbiak and Bil (2008) argue that, in comparison to previous election programs of Polish political parties, there is a significant increase in the space devoted to the issue of Europe in the 2005 parliamentary elections (Szczerbiak and Bil, 2008: 16), the case of the Civic Platform requires deeper attention on the grounds that the discussion of EU policy did not exist in its party election manifesto in 2005. With regards to the policy sections of the Civic Platform party program, 'there was an increase from only two policy sections, where the EU was mentioned in 2001, to four sections in 2005' (Szczerbiak and Bil, 2008: 18), which included security policy, economic policy, transport and agriculture. On the other hand, Szczerbiak and Bil (2008: 18-9) point to the fact that the Law and Justice party devoted more space than any other party in both the 2001 and 2005 parliamentary elections. The major campaigning theme in the party election manifestos of Law and Justice has been Poland's economic and foreign policy priorities and directions (Szczerbiak and Bil, 2008: 18-9).

4.3 The June 2003 Polish EU Accession Referendum

Despite the existence of a strong Eurosceptic representation in the Polish parliament, and the significant disapproval of the SLD-UP government's performance in the eyes of the voters, the referendum for Polish EU accession was concluded in June 2003 with an overwhelming majority, 77.45 %, voting in favor of accession (Szczerbiak, 2003: 2).

As Table 5 indicates below, the criterion of at least 50 % of voter turn-out to make the referendum valid was reached. Although only a little more than half of Polish voters went to the polls, 45.25 % out of 58.85 % of registered voters voted YES in the referendum, despite the fragile domestic political climate in the aftermath of the recent collapse of the SLD-UP and PSL coalition just a few months before the accession referendum.

Table 5: The 2003 Polish EU Accession Referendum

	Total	% of Registered Votes	% of Valid Votes
Yes	13 516 612	45.25	77.45
No	3 936 012	13.18	22.55

Source: Polish State Electoral Commission, http://www.pkw.gov.pl

President Kwasniewski started a Yes campaign under the title of 'Yes for Poland'. The SLD-UP coalition government also called for a Yes vote. Although the PSL and the PİS strongly criticized the SLD-UP coalition government for its weak negotiating strategy and inability to protect the Polish national interest against the costs of membership, they supported a Yes campaign by using the slogan 'A strong Poland in the European Union' (Szczerbiak, 2003: 5).

On the other hand, the No campaigners included the most hard-eurosceptic political party, the League of Polish Families (LPR) and Self-Defence, whose leader is the best known critic of Polish EU membership, Andrej Lepper

(Szczerbiak, 2003: 6). The LPR viewed the issue of membership as a tangible threat to Polish independence and sovereignty and coined the slogan 'Yesterday Moscow, Tomorrow Brussels' (Szczerbiak, 2003: 6). On the other hand, the Self Defence did not rule out Polish EU membership in principle, but maintained a neutral campaign under the slogan 'The Choice is Yours' (Szczerbiak, 2003: 6). Although the SLD-UP government faced a strong opposition from both pro-EU and Eurosceptic political parties, the Civic Platform (PO) and the Law and Justice (PİS) allied themselves with the SLD-UP government attempting to generate mass support for Polish membership.

As a result, the most prominent features of the 2003 Polish Accession Referendum appear to be two-fold. Firstly, the referendum results and the overwhelming majority of the "Yes" vote highlighted that the mass public is able to decouple the issue of membership from disapproval with the government's performance. Secondly, the battle between the Yes campaigners and No campaigners resulted in favor of the former, which framed the Polish accession to the EU in terms of an inevitable historical process of ending the Cold War divisions. Hence the distinction between voting for a YES or a NO vote became a matter of 'a civilisational choice'. On the other hand, the NO campaigners framed Polish accession within the limited scope of the negative consequences of EU membership on Polish national interests, and heavily drew upon the economic costs of accession. The No campaigners could not provide a united front in terms of representing their strong arguments, which consisted of reservations towards the future trajectory of the EU and the negative costs associated with the membership.

4.4 The June 2004 European Parliament Election

The 2004 European Parliament election resulted into an extremely low turn-out rate, %20.87, the second lowest turn-out in the EU (Szczerbiak, 2004: 1). The 2004 EP elections were overshadowed by the domestic political crisis over the formation of a new government, and electoral campaigns in the run up to the EP elections did not display an overarching European dimension, as " voters were asked to cast their ballots on the basis of national manifestos" (Chan, 2004 : 12). In this respect, voters' preferences in the 2004 EP elections were shaped on the basis of the performance of national governments, which explains the failure of the 2001 government in the 2004 EP election.

Table 6: The June 2004 Polish Election to the European Parliament

Party	Votes	%	MEPs
Civic Platform	1 467 775	24.10	15
League of Polish Families	969 689	15.92	10
Law and Justice	771 858	12.67	7
Self-Defence	656 782	10.78	6
Democratic Left Alliance-Labour Union	596 311	9.35	5
Freedom Union	446 549	7.33	4
Polish Peasant Party	386 340	6.34	4

Polish Social Democracy	324 707	5.33	3

Source: Polish State Electoral Commission,

http://www.pkw.gov.pl/gallery/10/17/10174.pdf

The European element in the party campaigns was restricted to the aim of mobilizing voters around the issue of "who would best represent Poland's interests, either in general terms or by referring to specific policy areas" (Szczerbiak, 2004: 5).

Polish political parties did not run a separate political campaign for the EP elections. However, the Constitutional Treaty was the issue through which political parties displayed a European dimension in their campaigns. They acted as channels of political mobilization over the issue of the ratification of the Constitutional Treaty and a Eurosceptic political discourse was the main feature underlying the parties' mobilization strategy.

Even the most pro-EU political parties, such as the Civic Platform (PO), used the slogan "Nice Treaty or Death". The PO called for "the retention of the Council of Ministers voting system under the Nice Treaty, which has given Poland a stronger role in the decision making process than it will be under the terms of the draft Constitutional Treaty" (Chan, 2004: 17).

On the other hand, the League of Polish Families, Self-Defence and the Law and Justice Party employed a strong Eurosceptic rhetoric. Self –Defence "called for a complete re-negotiation of the accession terms and eventual withdrawal from the EU is the new terms were still unsatisfactory" (Chan, 2004: 18). The Law and Justice, whose EP election campaign was entitled "Honourable Representation in Europe", made use of a soft eurosceptic political discourse. This was manifest in

its strong support for an intergovernmentalist approach to European Integration and concerns about the EU's future trajectory.

In a similar vein, the League of Polish Families (LPR) expressed its rejection of Polish EU membership on nationalist and ideological grounds, which was manifest through its slogan for the 2003 referendum as 'Yesterday Moscow, Today Brussels'. The LPR used the same slogan for its EP election campaign and strongly advocated hard euroscepticism by asserting that the EU is the biggest threat to Poland. Despite its hard euroscepticism, it needs to be underlined that this party is not peripheral to Poland's party system. Furthermore, given the fact that 77.45% voted Yes for Poland's EU membership in the 2003 accession referendum, the LPR received the second highest share of votes in the EP election, followed by other hard and soft Eurosceptic parties, the Law and Justice and Self-Defence, whose positions are also mainstream parties.

CHAPTER V

EUROSCEPTICISM AS A FEATURE OF MAINSTREAM CZECH PARTY POLITICS

The Europeanization of Czech party politics reveals significant insights concerning the diversity of the responses of political parties to the Europeanization pressures and their attitudes towards European integration. This chapter focuses on the Czech party system and politics in the pre and post-accession periods with the objective of exposing how 'nationally unique conditions and factors' lead to divergent forms of Europeanization of national party politics (Baun et al. 2006: 254). Secondly, the chapter aims to demonstrate that the politics of Euroscepticism can offer viable ground for domestic party opposition and can be utilized as a powerful strategy for electoral competition, although the issue of Europe does not have to become a new political cleavage in the party systems of candidate and new member states at the domestic level.

The chapter analyzes changes in party programs of three major political parties in the run up to the 1998, 2002 and 2006 parliamentary elections. Thus, it will be possible to observe the role played by Czech political parties in framing the issue of Europe and constructing the national discourse on the question of Czech

membership to the EU in particular, and European integration more generally. Secondly, in addition to the analysis of the changes in the party programs of the major Czech political parties, the analysis of three national parliamentary elections will demonstrate how further commitment to EU integration, which "exposes mainstream parties to charges of abandoning the national interest or sovereignty" (Ladrech, 2004: 54), opens up political space for the emergence of anti-EU political parties or anti-EU politics within the established political parties.

In this respect, the chapter explores the origins and development of three mainstream political parties' positions on Europe and European integration, the Civic Democratic Party (ODS), the Czech Social Democrats (CSSD) and the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSCM). It does so by paying attention to their soft vs. hard Eurosceptic or Europhile political rhetoric, and the extent to which there is evidence of Europeanization on their party election programme in light of their electoral results in the 1998, 2002 and 2006 Czech parliamentary elections. The classification of the main Czech political parties according to their positions on the issue of Europe and European integration can be described as follows:

Support for European Integration

	Europhobe	Europhile
Support for the EU EU-optimistic	*Euro-enthusiasts* The Czech Social Democratic Party (CSSD)	*Euro-pragmatists*
EU-pessimistic	*Soft-Eurosceptics* The Civic Democratic Union (ODS)	*Hard- Eurosceptics /Eurorejetcs* The Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSCM)

5.1 The Analysis of Czech Parliamentary Elections

The June 1998 Czech Parliamentary Election

The June 1998 Parliamentary election marks the beginning of the development of Czech political parties' positions on the issue of Europe and European integration. The issue of European integration in general and the question of Czech EU membership in particular were not the major themes of Czech political discussion until the late 1990s (Kopecky, 2004: 226). Until the 1998 election, Czech political parties' discourse on the issue of European integration was characterized with the

"Return to Europe" spirit and the Czech EU membership was widely accepted as the main foreign policy goal by all political parties since the first democratic elections in June 1990 (Baun et al., 2006: 256).

Table 7: 1998 Chamber of Deputies Election Results

Party	Votes	%	Seats
Czech Social Democratic Party (ČSSD)	1,928,660	32.3	74
Civic Democratic Party (ODS)	1,656,011	27.7	63
Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSČM)	658,550	11.0	24
Christian and Democratic Union - Czechoslovak People's Party (KDU-ČSL)	537,013	9.0	20

Source: Czech Statistical Office,

http://electionresources.org/cz/chamber.php?election=1998

As Table 1 indicates, the Czech Social Democratic Party (CSSD), which used to be a marginal political force in the aftermath of 1989, outpolled the ODS and established itself as a party of government with 32.3 % in the 1998 elections. In the aftermath of the election results, the CSSD did not invite the ODS to form a coalition government on the grounds that the Klaus government's narrow vision of national interest sharply contradicted with the Czech national interest. According to the CSSD, the Czech national interest could not be defined without the objective of full EU membership. In contrast to the ODS, the CSSD was

strongly in favor of European integration and highlighted the positive aspects of Czech membership (Hlousek and Pseja, 2004).

The CSSD is the strongest Europhile political force in Czech party politics. It defines itself in relation to its categorical rejection of Euroscepticism. In sharp contrast to the ODS, the CSSD endorses the current political and economic direction of the EU. It anticipates and advocates "the deepening of economic and political integration through a gradual strengthening of democracy and federative elements" by strengthening the role of both the European Parliament and the European Commission (Hanley, 2002: 7).

In the CSSD view, the EU is a means to reconcile conflicting national interests, overcome the historical marginalization of small states such as the Czech Republic and protect them against the political and economic threats of globalization. Similarly, the CSSD views the EU as a 'multidimensional European community', which will 'help the Czech Republic to prosper, achieve security and stability, improve its international position and facilitate the access of its citizens to education and employment opportunities' (Baun et al., 2006: 257).

From the perspective of Kopecky and Mudde (2002), the CSSD is a Europhile political party, which expresses both diffuse and specific support. The CSSD's unconditional support both for the economic and political deepening through integration confirms with Kopecky and Mudde (2002) definition of diffuse support. On the other hand, the CSSD also articulates specific support for the EU, defined as support for the general practice of European integration (Kopecky, 2004: 230), as it advocates the supranational direction of the EU's development.

The strong pro-European element was manifest, albeit in the form of general statements, in the CSSD's 1998 election program, entitled "Together With You for a Better Future". This called for a closer link between foreign policy and internal political developments. The CSSD defined the foreign policy objective of the Czech Republic solely in terms of EU accession, which constituted the overall priority of its election program (Baun et al., 2006: 257; Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008: 172). It articulated its strong support for cooperation with the European Commission for the Czech Republic's efforts in its pre-entry strategy. The issue of European integration was addressed in the foreign policy chapter of the program, which confirmed the Czech entry to the Union as the chief foreign policy objective.

On the other hand, the ODS articulated its vision of the EU in its 1998 election program, entitled "Head Up", which was divided into seven sections. The ODS program is significant because it is the ODS's first election program in opposition. The program consists of six chapters in addition to the preamble, which are titled " We don't see the recent past as black and white and we are ready to defend it"; "ODS: Protecting Democracy and Freedom"; "Four podebrad articles"; "We defend the national interest"; "The Secure State"; and finally " The Family: a proposal for four generations". Among these six chapters, the issues of Europe and European integration are addressed under the chapter on National Interest. It is of crucial significance to outline the essential difference between the CSSD's and the ODS's vision of the EU by looking at the ways in which the issues of Europe and European Integration are addressed in their election programme.

The CSSD views Czech membership primarily as a foreign policy objective, which represents the peak of Czech national interest, whereas the ODS

approaches the issue of Europe and Czech membership solely from a national interest based perspective, which frames Czech membership as contradictory to the Czech national interest. However, this national interest-based framing of Czech membership and the issue of European integration, rather than setting it as a prior foreign policy objective, reflects a significant shift in light of the previous 1996 election program.

In sharp contrast to the 1998 election program, the ODS addresses the issue of Europe and Czech membership in its 1996 election program entitled "Freedom and Prosperity", in the foreign policy section of the chapter on the "Powers of the State" (Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008: 169). The "Return to Europe" spirit appears as the main theme in the discussions concerning the Czech membership and European integration, which are characterized as a "long-term process guaranteeing member states of the European Union peace , stability, safety, freedom and economic prosperity" (Freedom and Prosperity, 1996: 9 cited in Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008). The ODS further articulated its support for the "expansion of the European Union and its openness toward the rest of the world, as well as deepening its political cooperation and the creation of a single internal market within the European Union" (Freedom and Prosperity, 1996: 9 cited in Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008).

On the other hand, the election programme , although re-articulating the party's support for the Czech Republic's objective of full EU membership, explicitly addressed the importance of the Czech nation state and further criticized "the European model of the social state and rejected the "dispersion" of the Czech Republic into supranational structures" (Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008 : 170). Hence, the shift in the ODS's position from being the party of government to

party of opposition was reflected in the form of a move towards a soft Eurosceptic attitude grounded in national interest clearly evident in its 1998 election program. While the 1996 election programme expressed the normative aspect of EU membership, the 1998 programme relied primarily on a reaction to particular aspects of European integration, which entailed a criticism towards the European institutional structure and policies grounded in a strong defense of Czech national interests.

On the other hand, the 1998 election programme of the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSCM), entitled "Others Talk About the People, We are with the People", includes a separate chapter devoted to the issue of Europe titled "A Firm Place for the Czech Republic in Europe". This followed the preceding policy line stated in its previous 1996 election programme. The 1996 election programme, entitled Socialism – A Chance for the Future, addressed the issue of European integration under a chapter on foreign policy, entitled "Peace and Cooperation" (Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008: 174). In that piece, the Communist Party did not refer to specific statements on the form of European integration. On the EU, they declared that they would support for Czech entry. However, the 1996 election programme clearly articulated what the KSCM was strictly against, namely the 'subjugation to the interests of supranational capital and world powers, loss of national sovereignty and the social victimization of citizens" (Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008: 174). Although the party stated its sympathy with the idea of Czech membership, the 1996 election program expressed a conditional support for European integration. In that sense, the KSCM expressed support for European integration as long as it would be guaranteed that the Czech Republic would not

become 'a colony' and join the Union on a non-discriminatory basis, receiving equal status as the old member states (Baun et al., 2006: 258).

In a similar vein to the 1998 election programme of the ODS, the KSCM stressed the necessity of a referendum through which the Czech people could express their opinion on Czech membership and evaluate both the costs and benefits of integration. Another common element between the ODS and KSCM relates to their emphasis on Czech statehood and rejection of supranational governance. The KSCM's support for European integration was dependent on the continuity of state sovereignty and restriction of EU powers" (Baun et al., 2006: 259).

The 2002 Parliamentary Election

The Czech Social Democrats finished the June 2002 parliamentary election as the first political party polling 30.2 %. The election is of crucial significance due to several reasons. First, the 2002 election results produced the first majority government headed by the Czech Social Democratic Party, which confirmed its status as the first major incumbent centre-left party anywhere in post-communist Central and Eastern Europe to win successive elections. Secondly, the 2002 election results proved two opposite trends for the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia and the Civic Democratic Party. The Communist Party demonstrated its best electoral performance ever by receiving 18.5 %. Although the electoral success of the Communist party offered the Czech Social Democrats the opportunity to form a coalition government, the Social Democrats (CSSD) produced a coalition government with the Christian Democrats (KDU-CSL) and the Liberals (US-DEU), received 14.3% of votes.

The Europeanization of Czech political parties is most evident in the capability of the issue of Europe to shape the election programs of political parties, which started to develop specific positions concerning Czech membership and the question of European integration since the end of the 1990s. Hence the election programmes of political parties in the run up to the 2002 national elections illustrate the increasing prominence of the issue of Europe and European integration in domestic political issues. While the

Table 8: 2002 Chamber of Deputies Election Results

Party	Votes	%	Seats
Czech Social Democratic Party (ČSSD)	1,440,279	30.2	70
Civic Democratic Party (ODS)	1,166,975	24.5	58
Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSČM)	882,653	18.5	41
KDU-ČSL and US-DEU	680,671	14.3	31
Association of Independents (SN)	132,699	2.8	0
Green Party (SZ)	112,929	2.4	0

Source: Czech Statistical Office,

http://electionresources.org/cz/chamber.php?election=2002

party election programs of the 1990s can be described with reference to a common rhetorical emphasis on 'back to Europe', the political agenda of political parties in the run up to the 2002 national elections reflects significant

programmatic changes, which transcended the general statements of the previous decade and created a differentiation among political parties on the basis of Czech membership and European integration.

Hlousek and Pseja (2004) put forward four major themes in which the issue of Europe is evidently manifest in the party election programmes: (1) accession and membership; (2) the future of Europe and Czech position within the EU; (3) the issue of EU funds in terms of the financial benefits that the Czech Republic will gain out of EU membership and (4) an emphasis on the promotion of equal rights between the old and new members in an enlarged Union. Among these four fields, the future direction of European integration and Czech position within the EU constitute the mainstream effects on shaping political parties' positions towards the benefits and costs of Czech membership and the broader question of the position of the Czech Republic in the EU.

The election program of the Czech Social Democrats for the 2002 elections, entitled "People First", heavily draws upon the impact of Czech membership on individual demands, needs and benefits for Czech citizens. In this vein, the benefits of Czech membership are framed under the objective of attaining individual dignity. Accordingly, the program posits that "accessibility to work represents for us a basic condition for a dignified life for every citizen. The entry of the Czech Republic into the EU may provide substantial help in this" (Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008: 173). The program of the CSSD did not include any statement of critique towards the EU and European integration as a continuum of their adoption of a significant pro-EU stance and Europhile attitude.

The 1996 election program of the CSSD clearly identified the party with the principles of the Maastricht Treaty and defined its position towards the question of Czech membership and European integration on the basis of opposition to the ODS stance, which adopted a nationalist based, soft-eurosceptic discourse without questioning the necessity of Czech membership. In opposition to the position of the ODS, the 1996 election program of the CSSD clearly stated: " We reject a negative approach to the European Union, the nationalist position and megalomaniacal pontifications which would only lead to the isolation of the Czech Republic" (cited in Havlik et al., 2008: 172).

While the issue of the position of the Czech Republic in the EU was not given priority by the election programs of the Social Democrats, the ODS articulated its support for Czech membership on condition that the Czech Republic will be placed "at the level of an equal partner of the member states of the Union" (Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008: 169). In contrast to the CSSD's opposition of a nationalist viewpoint, the ODS placed the role of the nation-state at the core of European integration and advocated support for Czech membership as long as the process of European integration would guarantee the promotion of Czech national interests.

In the run up to the 2002 national elections, the ODS published 'The Manifesto of Czech Eurorealism 2001', a political document aiming to contribute to the discussion of the EU in order to explicitly state the viewpoint of the ODS, its ideology and position concerning the current and future trajectory of European integration and Czech membership. The document consists of nine pages and is divided into four sections entitled 'European Union: present situation, future trends; The project of enlargement to the East; Czech Republic and European

Union; Alternative, Substitute and Other Solutions'. Among the four sections, the second and the third are given priority, where the benefits and costs of accession are discussed in detail and the form of the EU that the ODS wants the Czech Republic to join appears as the major theme in the document.

With regard to the second chapter, entitled "The Project of Enlargement to the East", the number of pages devoted to the discussion of the costs of accession is significantly higher than the benefits. The ODS viewpoint of the European integration is one of confrontation, as seen in the following passage: "It is necessary to realize that European integration had, has and will have principally the form of confrontation (naturally non-violent) of various political, economic and strategic interests" (Zahradil, 2001: 3). Accordingly, the ODS anticipates three main forms of confrontation out of the current and future state of European integration. The first form is defined as "the confrontation of European interests (the common interests of European bureaucracy, European institutions and member states) with the interests of the world's other centers". The second form of confrontation is "the clash of interests between the European bureaucracy and individual member states" (Zahradil, 2001: 3), and the final form is defined in terms of a "confrontation among the individual regional or local entities and lobbies within each member state as well as within the EU as a whole" (Zahradil, 2001: 3).

In addition to the articulation of existing different forms of confrontations, the ODS refers to the "democratic deficit" inherent in the European institutions and is strongly critical of the status of the European Commission as an executive body as well as the identification of the member states with the notion of "European Citizenship" (Zahradil, 2001: 3). Finally, the ODS's third main criticism relates to

the concept of political integration, which is defined in terms of the Union's objective towards building a common foreign and security policy.

In light of all these criticisms, the ODS discusses the supranational and intergovernmental models of European integration and, in contrast to the CSSD's supranational approach, states its preference in favor of an intergovernmental model, which is defined as the "cooperation of member states on equal terms and on a multilateral basis" as opposed to the supranational model described as "a unified European state with strong supranational institutions" (Zahradil, 2001: 3).

Another significant point needs to be made concerning the implications of the ODS's understanding of the benefits of enlargement. The document devotes only a paragraph to discuss the benefits of enlargement, which are solely conceived in terms favorable to the member states of Western Europe, the EU-15 (Zahradil, 2001: 2). In that sense, the enlargement process is perceived as a strategic benefit to those member states which desire the stabilization of Eastern Europe for their own security. Alternatively, the eastern enlargement process is perceived to favor "the interests of countries that oppose further intensification of the integration process" (Zahradil, 2001: 2). It is further stated that "the accession of new members, bound to cause a certain diffusion of the EU, may help them in their effort to stop supranational integration tendencies". In this respect, it is important to notice the fact that the ODS does not express any statement in favor of European integration as a process which entails benefits for the enhancement of Czech national interest but sees it as solely serving the interests of existing member states.

The third chapter, entitled "Czech Republic and the European Union", discusses the compatibility of supranational elements and principles of the EU with Czech statehood and arrives at the conclusion that the EU is incompatible with the founding ideals of the Czech state, defined on the basis of an Anglo-Saxon tradition of liberal conservatism. According to the ODS, Czech statehood advocates "a freely established European unity of loosely connected and cooperating states" (Zahradil, 2001: 4). In that respect, although the ODS defines Czech membership as one of the strategic goals of Czech Republic, it nevertheless urges the public to evaluate the utility of Czech membership in light of Czech national interests defined as "the ensuring of territorial integrity, political sovereignty, independence, stability and security". Under the same chapter, the subtitle "We want an intergovernmental model" articulates the ODS's desired model of European integration (Zahradil, 2001: 4):

> European integration must be a bottom-to-top process; it must come from below, from European nations and citizens of Member States represented by their parliaments and governments, not from the office desks of the European political and bureaucratic elite. We should reject further unnatural 'intensification' of the integration process tending toward a federal state

On the basis of the above, the ODS derives its eurosceptic attitude towards Czech membership and the issue of European integration from the concrete problems embedded within the current state of European integration that the ODS believes the EU is facing. In that respect, the ODS advocates a conditional support for EU entry given the prospective challenges that the Czech Republic would face under the current conditions of European integration. In this vein, the ODS makes the case as follows (Zahradil, 2001: 5):

> We must reject further extension of competencies granted to the European Commission as a non-elected, executive and administrative body with no direct electoral mandate. We must also reject new competencies for the European Parliament. Since there is no such thing as "European" public or "European" electorate, the EP can never become a genuine parliamentary institution reflecting "all-European" interests, but will rather always resemble a body of representatives speaking for various national, regional, local and other interests or lobbies.

In light of all these, the ODS evaluates the reliability of the promise of EU membership, and stresses the necessity to explore possible future directions and alternatives in Czech foreign policy in case the Czech Republic does not join the EU. Being a full member of NATO, and accession to EFTA and NAFTA are considered the best foreign policy alternatives, which could provide the Czech Republic with access to the European market and strengthen the transatlantic security relationship with the United States (Zahradil, 2001: 6).

The 2002 election programme of the KSCM, entitled "With the People, For the People", clearly expresses its distrust towards European integration and lack of support for Czech membership. In contrast to the 1998 election programme, the KSCM does not address the issue of European integration and Czech membership under a separate chapter. The emphasis on national interest continues to play a major role in defending a cautious and sceptic attitude towards membership. The primacy assigned to the defense of the national interest is evidently manifest in the 2002 election programme, in which the issue of entry and future role of the Czech Republic in the EU is addressed in a subchapter entitled "We support the National Interest Only in a Secure World" (cited in Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008: 175). In the case of the KSCM, the identification of national interest with anti- EU politics contributes to the consolidation of the party's position in the mainstream of Czech party politics.

A comparison between the 1998 and 2002 election programmes demonstrates a shift in the reservations of the KSCM towards the issue of Europe and Czech membership. While the 1998 election program placed strong emphasis on the danger of subjugation by the old member states and Czech Republic' colonization, the 2002 election programme draws its policy line and "Euroreject" position on the basis of the defense of the national interest broadly defined in terms of sovereignty without necessarily pointing to a political economy dimension.

The 2006 Czech Parliamentary Election

The Civic Democratic Party (ODS), the main center-right catch-all party in Czech party politics, won the 2006 Parliamentary elections after two successive terms in opposition. As the election results indicate on Table 3, the ODS gained 35.4 % and the party faced the challenge of forming a majority government coalition. The Social Democrats were second with 32.3 %, and the Communists third with 12.8% of the votes. Eventually, the ODS formed a coalition government with the Christian Democrats and the Greens.

Table 9: 2006 Chamber of Deputies Election Results

Party	Votes	%	Seats
Civic Democratic Party (ODS)	1,892,475	35.4	81
Czech Social Democratic Party (ČSSD)	1,728,827	32.3	74
Communist Party of Bohemia and	685,328	12.8	26

Moravia (KSČM)			
Christian and Democratic Union - Czechoslovak People's Party (KDU-ČSL)	386,706	7.2	13
Green Party (SZ)	336,487	6.3	6

The 2006 election programme of the Civic Democrats, entitled "Together for a Better Life", introduced a social reform programme and addressed specific policy areas, in which the party's position on European Integration is expressed under the chapter on Czech Foreign Policy. The chapter, "PLUS For Czech Foreign Policy", is divided into two sections in which the position of Czech Republic is discussed and the ODS's conception of the ideal form of the EU is formulated (Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008: 163). It is of crucial importance to note that the issues of Europe and European integration are no longer major themes of discussion under an independent chapter.

Although the ODS firmly states that the Czech Republic does not have a viable alternative than to continue with effective EU membership, the 2006 election program displays a declining trend in the attention paid to the issue of Europe and European integration in comparison to previous election programs and party documents. In the previous election cycle, the party had published two separate documents entitled "National Interest in the Real World" and "The Manifesto of Czech Euro-realism", which substantively discussed the issues of Europe, the Czech position in the EU and the desired form of European integration in detail.

However as far as the 2006 parliamentary election is concerned, the ODS addresses the issue of Europe with respect to domestic policy. In that sense, notwithstanding the decreasing urgency and salience of the issue of Europe and European integration, the 2006 election program can be regarded as a sign of Europeanization of domestic party political discourse since particular EU issues gain in importance as long as they have significant repercussions for domestic political discussions.

As far as the domestic political context of the 2006 elections is concerned, the greater salience of the domestic policy areas for the Civic Democratic Party can be best illustrated by the quotation below, which is a declaration on the official party website that discusses the features of the 2006 election programme (ODS, http://www.ods.cz/en/policy)

> ODS achieved victory in the 2006 parliamentary elections with the reform program "Together for a better life". In the program, ODS offered a friendly, fair state which values all basic human and civil rights, which does not engage in needless incursions into the lives of its citizens and which limits bureaucracy to the necessary minimum. ODS calls for an open society undivided by artificial social barriers, one which does not decide based upon the origin or momentary social position of its members.

A comparison between the 2002 and 2006 election programmes uncovers a shift in the ODS's conception of the relation between the national interest and European Integration. In the 2002 election period, the ODS definition of national interest is embedded within a conflictual understanding of the effects of European integration. Furthermore, the ODS felt the necessity to declare its intention to pursue alternative foreign policy options, in the Manifesto of Czech Eurorealism, in case the Czech Republic's bid for EU membership was overruled either by the

EU or by the Czech people. However, the main themes of the political approach adopted by the ODS during the 2006 election period are expressed within the context of domestic socio-economic issues.

In this sense, in contrast to the previous election, the issue of Europe and European Integration does not form the cornerstone of the ODS's 2006 election program. Rather these are integrated into prevailing socio-economic cleavages. Hence, in the context of 2006 parliamentary election the main theme of electoral competition between the two main poles of Czech party politics is not defined in terms of the parties' positions regarding the issue of Europe, the Czech position in the EU and European Integration, but rather in terms of the parties' adopted policy perspectives and positions on domestic socio-economic issues. However the 2002 electoral campaign of the ODS used an extensive anti-EU discourse, manifested itself in the form of a euro-realist rhetoric on the issues of Europe, the Czech position in the EU and European Integration. Although the bi-polar structure of the electoral competition between the CSSD and the ODS remains a constant in Czech party politics, the main themes of competition, which may give rise to the formation of new political cleavages or become integrated into the existing ones, present a change as the domestic context changes.

The electoral campaign of the 2002 election was significantly influenced by the atmosphere of the forthcoming referendum on Czech accession and secondly, it was the last national election in the context of Czech pre-accession, which was effectively utilized by the opposition ODS party to attack the incumbent government from a euro-realist perspective. On the contrary, the 2006 election is the first national electoral contestation, which led to the formation of center-right coalition led by the ODS, in the aftermath of the 2004 enlargement. In this

respect, the incumbent ODS, which used to be in opposition until the 2006 elections, adopted a milder version of its previous hard eurosceptic discourse. The issue of European integration lost its independent status as a major theme of domestic political discussion and was located under discussions on Czech foreign policy. Hence, the salience of the issue of Europe and European integration decreased as the distinction between the domestic and the foreign arena became even more distinct in the 2006 election program, which prioritized domestic socio-economic issues over foreign policy concerns.

On the other hand, the 2006 election program of the CSSD, entitled "Security and Prosperity", manifests the constant pro-EU element in the position of the CSSD by devoting an independent chapter on European Integration, which consolidates the party ideology and position regarding the issue of Europe and European integration in terms of its opposition to the European policy of the ODS (Havlik and Vykoupilova, 2008: 173). In contrast to the criticisms of the ODS concerning the European Constitution, the CSSD advocates unconditional support for the notion of European citizenship and European Constitution (Havlik and Vykoupilova , 2008: 174).

With regards to the KSCM, which preserves its stable electoral position by finishing third, the 2006 election program entitled "The Election Program of the Communist party of Bohemia and Moravia for the 2006-2010" devotes minimum space to Europe. Although the KSCM is a hard eurosceptic party, which always expressed opposition to Czech membership, for the first time the 2006 program responds to the reality of Czech membership, and "with critical reservations, respects the membership of the Czech Republic in the European Union" (Volebni program KSCM, 2006, online).

5.2 The 2003 Czech EU Accession Referendum

The 2003 Accession referendum outcome is a clear indication of an overwhelming political consensus on the issue of EU membership, which is manifested not only in the high percentage of voters who voted Yes, but more significantly by the relatively high turnout of 55%. Given the greater salience of the primary order elections for domestic politics, the strong 55% turn out rate was "only slightly below the 58 percent figure for the June 2002 parliamentary elections" (Baun et al., 2006: 264).

Table 10: The June 2003 EU Accession Referendum Results in the Czech Republic

	Total	**% of Registered Votes**	**% Valid Votes**
Yes	3 446 758	41.73	77.33
No	1 010 448	12.23	22.67

Source: Central Election Commission, www.volby.cz

The pro-EU coalition led by the Social Democrats entitled their campaign "the Information Campaign". Although political parties' positions on the issue of Europe and Czech accession were manifest in their 2002 election campaigns, both the incumbent and the opposition parties led active referendum campaigns. The incumbent 2002 government, composed of the Social Democrats (CSSD), the

Christian Democrats (KDU-CSL), and the Freedom Union Coalition (US-DEU), represented the pro-European coalition, expressing support for Czech accession and a federal EU without any reservations.

On the other hand, the opposition parties, the ODS and the KSCM, did not participate in the pro-accession campaign on the basis of their reservations regarding EU membership. Although the Civic Democrats define their orientation as pro-European and supported Czech accession, as opposed to the incumbent government's approach, they expressed support for an intergovernmental model of the EU and had reservations regarding the issue of EU membership. Recalling the euro-realist position of the party during the post-1998 period, the ODS argued that the party did not need to lead a pro-accession campaign given the pro-European orientation of its voters (Hanley, 2003:6). However, the ODS position on accession referendum presents an ambiguous case due to the fact that it did not explicitly run either a Yes or a No campaign. Rather, the ODS advocated that "the pro-accession campaigners were missing the point that the form of the EU mattered far more than mere accession to it" (Hanley, 2003: 6). On this basis, the party further expressed its criticisms that the pro-accession campaign disregarded the costs of accession. Within this context, the ODS instrumentalized opposition to the pro-accession campaign, despite its support for Czech membership, as an electoral strategy to oppose the incumbent government's European policy in order to justify the need for a re-formulation of an assertive Czech policy as prescribed by the Manifesto of Czech Euro-Realism.

On the other hand, the accession referendum led to a division within the Communist Party, as the only mainstream hard- eurosceptic party. The KSCM refrained from adopting an explicit stance on accession until March, when it

stated that it adopts "a Moderate No" position of "not recommending" EU membership (Hanley, 2003: 8). Accordingly, the least amount of Yes votes came from the KSCM voters, with 37 % voting for and 63 % voting against (Baun et al., 2006: 264; Hanley, 2003: 11).

5.3 The 2004 European Parliament Election

The analysis of the 2004 European Parliament elections matters for understanding the dynamics and functions of the politics of Euroscepticism as well as the role this plays in Czech party politics. The 2004 EP elections partly owes its significance to the fact that it is the first election since the EU expanded to twenty five member states, and it was the first time that parties from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe contested a transnational election. However, the 2004 European Parliament elections resulted in the "lowest average turnout across the EU since the introduction of elections to the chamber by direct universal suffrage" (Chan, 2004: 4). A comparative examination of the average turnout rates in the EU-15 and those of the new EU-10 countries; Cyprus, Malta, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia, demonstrates that the EU-15 has an average of 49.1 %, whereas the new EU-10 displays an average of 26.9% (Chan, 2004: 5).

As Table 11 indicates below, with the exception of Lithuania, neither of the CEE countries have a higher average turnout rate than the average EU-15 member states. This indicates the greater level of apathy amongst voters in the Central and Eastern European countries compared to the citizens of the EU-15 (Chan, 2004: 7). Among the CEECs, it can be stated that the Czech Republic displays a significant level of a lack of interest alongside Estonia and Poland.

Table 11: The 2004 European Parliament Elections Turnout in the CEECs

Country	No. of voters	%	Votes
Czech Republic	8 283 485	28,3	2 346 010
Estonia	873 809	26,8	234 485
Hungary	8 046 247	38,5	3 097 657
Latvia	1 397 736	41,3	577 879
Lithuania	2 654 311	48,4	1 284 050
Poland	29 986 109	20,9	6 258 550

Source: European Union, http://www.elections2004.eu.int/ep-election/sites/en/index.html

The 2004 European Parliament election results substantially changed the prevailing balance of political forces in Czech party politics. The ODS and the KSCM, both in opposition during the 2002- 2006 term, gained an overwhelming electoral success. On the other hand, the parties from the coalition government witnessed public dissatisfaction with very low levels of support. The main party of government, the pro-EU CSSD, could only receive 8.78 %, although the party had been the strongest supporter of Czech membership and European Integration since its foundation.

Table 12: Czech Political Parties Standing in the 2004 European Parliament Elections:

Parties	Valid Votes	Valid Votes in %
The Civic Democratic Party (ODS)	700 942	30.04
The Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSCM)	472 862	20.26
The Czech People's Party (KDU-CSL)	223 383	9.57
The Independents (NEZ)	191 025	8.18

Source: Czech Republic Statistical Office (CSU),

http://www.volby.cz/pls/ep2004/ep141?xjazyk=EN

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In its broadest sense, the Europeanization literature is defined as the study of the impact of European Integration on member states. The Europeanization of candidate states and new member states has only recently become a subject matter within the broad reserach agenda of Europeanization. As the second chapter showed, the literature on the Europeanization of candidate and new member states owes its development to the pre-accession adjustment processes of the candidate states of Central and Eastern Europe. In this respect, the study of the unique experiences of CEE candidate countries provides a rich empirical material, which further expands the scope of the Europeanization literature, through the discovery of new variables within new domestic contexts (Schimmelfenning and Sedelmeier, 2005: 5)

Although the Europeanization literature identifies three major strands of research on the basis of a differentiation between the polity, policy and politics dimensions, the vast majority of Europeanization studies pay considerable attention to the impact of the development of European level institutions and policy-making on

national level processes of decision-making, policy implementation and institutionalization. Hence, a specific focus on the changes and transformation of domestic politics, mainly political parties, party systems and party competition structures, is often neglected at the expense of studies on polity and policy dimensions, which are assumed to manifest more profound, tangible and significant outputs of Europeanization. However, as the scope and magnitude of European integration has become deeper and bigger, the politics dimension, which concerns the study of national political parties, party systems and party competition, has gained considerable significance within the scholarly literature, although it is still in the stage of development considering the greater extent of studies addressing the Europeanizaiton of polity and policy dimensions. In this sense, this study attempted to contribute to the development of an up and coming research agenda by focusing on the relation between European integration and national party politics.

To return to the limited impact of Europe on the politics dimension argument, this assumption is reinforced by some scholars writing on the Europeanization of national party systems. To illustrate the point, Peter Mair identifies "two obvious ways in which Europe might be seen to have had an impact" (Mair, 1999: 29), the format and mechanics of national party systems. Accordingly, the process of Europeanization can impact upon the format of the national party systems as long as it leads to the formation of new political parties and thereby increases 'the number of relevant parties in contention in national electoral arenas' (Mair, 1999: 29). On the other hand, the national party sytems are considered to be Europeanized as long as the mechanics of the party systems is affected. In Mair's (1999: 30) words the mechanics of the party system is defined as follows:

the way in which parties interact with one another in the national election arenas, either by modifying the ideological distances separating the relevant parties, or by encouraging the emergence of wholly new European-centred dimensions of competition.

On the basis of the above, Mair evaluates the extent of Europeanization of national party systems of member states on the basis of these two features, "as the key defining elements of any party system" (Mair, 1999: 30), and asserts that Europe in general,(and European integration in particular) do not generate direct impacts of Europeanization on national party systems of EU member states. It is further claimed that Europe has a limited impact on the party systems of member states.

However, in light of the findings of this study on mainstream political parties in Poland and the Czech Republic, the Mair argument could be modified. To begin with, Mair's framework does not pay attention to the question of how the issue of Europe plays a role in shaping individual party attitudes and positions concerning European integration. By adopting a system level approach, that is, by solely analyzing whether there is a change in the core determinants of the party systems, it fails to recognize the constitutive relation between the individual and system levels of analysis. The individual level of analysis entails the study of the relation between the issue of Europe and the process of European integration, and the development of individual political parties' position on these issues. As the previous empirical chapters on Poland and Czech Republic indicate, this relation is significant, due to the fact that any changes in the support of mainstream political parties' positions on the European issue either in a positive or negative direction, affects the development of other political parties' positions and attitudes

on the same issues in the context of national electoral competition. The analysis of individual political parties' positions and attitudes on the issue of Europe and European integration in Czech and Polish party politics demonstrates how further commitment to EU integration, which "exposes mainstream parties to charges of abandoning the national interest or sovereignty" (Ladrech, 2004: 54), opens up a political space for the emergence of anti-EU political parties or anti-EU politics within the established political parties in a Central and Eastern European context.

Pro-EU parties may prefer to harden their europhile positions by mobilizing their electoral base on the issue of Europe, and may even represent themselves as single-issue pro-EU political parties during the pre-election period depending on the electoral strength of the political parties that make use of an anti-EU rhetoric. The June 1998 Parliamentary election marks the beginning of the development of Czech political parties' positions on the issue of Europe and European integration, although Czechoslovakia's 'Return to Europe' had been widely accepted as the main foreign policy goal by all political parties since the first democratic elections in June 1990 (Baun et al., 2006: 256).

The case of the Czech Social Democrats electoral success in the 1998 Czech parliamentary elections perfectly illustrates the point. Therefore, the 1998 Czech parliamentary election is not only significant due to the fact that it is the first national election to be held in the aftermath of the opening of official accession negotiations with the first group of Central and Eastern European countries, of which Czech Republic and Poland were members, but because it is the first time when the issue of Europe and the question of EU membership entered the domestic political discourse.The Czech Social Democratic Party (CSSD), which used to be a marginal political force in the aftermath of 1989 outpolled the ODS

and established itself as a party of government with 32.3 % in 1998 elections. It owes its electoral success mostly to its strong Europhile attitude position, which was manifested in its 1998 election program. Its 1998 program accused the eurosceptic position of the previous ODS -led Klaus government, and defined its European policy in an absolute rejection of Euroscepticism.

Secondly, pro-EU parties may be inclined to make use of soft eurosceptic positions and political discourse, without necessarily damaging their europhile profiles, in order to respond to the prevailing reservations and sceptic attitudes of the public to prevent a possible decline in electoral support. As the chapter on Poland showed, the Civic Platform, which was founded as a liberal-conservative pro-EU party and is known to be the most pro-EU political party in the Polish party landscape, adopted a harder version of its soft-eurosceptic attitude in the run up to the 2004 European Elections by employing an anti-EU political rhetoric through the use of the slogan of "Nice Treaty or Death". It did so to express opposition to the ratification of the Constitutional Treaty. As a result, an observable, significant shift in the position and attitude of pro-EU political parties can take two forms: first, they can be either more assertive of their europhile attitude and become hard euro-supporters, or they can be supportive of expressing criticisms and discussing the costs, rather than the benefits, of EU membership and become soft-eurosceptics. In both cases, this can even become an electoral strategy to differentiate themselves from other pro-EU parties.

On the other hand, the same trend is observable in the case of eurosceptic political parties that may harden their soft-Eurosceptic attitude and become hard-Eurosceptics, that fundamentally question the necessity of EU membership and even express opposition to the issue (although implicitly if a mainstream

governmental party). Alternatively, a hard-eurosceptic political party may adopt a milder version of its euroscepticism and become a soft eurosceptic party by neglecting its previous rejection of support for the issue of Europe and European integration. Both political strategies can be adopted on the basis of a concern to differentiate themselves from other eurosceptic parties eligible for domestic electoral competition.

As a result, recalling Peter Mair's definition of the mechanics of party system, which is based on "the way in which parties interact with one another in the national election arenas, either by modifying the ideological distances separating the relevant parties, or by encouraging the emergence of wholly new European-centred dimensions of competition" (Mair, 1999: 30), the individual analysis of political parties' positions and attitudes on the issues of Europe and European integration is a fundamental necessity if one is looking for the effects of Europeanization on party politics. In that sense, the study of the politics of Euroscepticism becomes a major component of the study of Europeanization of national party politics and party systems, as individual political parties, conceived as both institutional and social actors with political agency, possess the capability to affect the patterns, in this case the format, of national party competition and thereby change the mechanics of national party systems.

On the other hand, depending on the magnitude of the influence of such Europe-specific party attitudes, which are manifest in soft or hard versions of a political party-based eurosceptic rhetoric, on the patterns of national party competition and party politics, the issue of Europe may even encourage the formation of new political parties and thereby affect the format of the party systems. In the case of the Czech Republic, three political parties; the Green Party (SZ), the Democratic

Union (DEU), and the Freedom Union (US), were founded during the pre-1998 Czech parliamentary election period and a strong pro-EU element is a common feature for all these parties. Furthermore, the aforementioned three political parties established themselves as single-issue pro-EU parties on the basis of unconditional support for Czech EU membership and adopted a pro-EU policy line and the europhile rhetoric of the Czech Social Democrats (CSSD). Among these parties, it is of particular importance to underline the electoral succes of the Freedom Union (US), which received 8.6 % of the votes and managed to become a junior coalition partner in the 1998 Czech government.

In light of the discussion above, this study contributes to the analysis of the Europeanization of national political parties and party systems and underscores the limited extent to which Western –european party based developed concepts can be exported in the context of Central and Eastern Europe. It does so through the analysis of Europeanization of political parties and patterns of party competition with a particular focus on the role of the politics of Euroscepticism in Poland and the Czech Republic.

As the discussion in the first chapter indicated, Europeanization East substantially differs from the equivalent in the West on the basis of a variety of striking differences in terms of their points of departure. In general terms, the Europeanization process in CEE countries coincides with their transition to democracy and market economies. Furthermore, Europeanization East begins under the "shadow" of the accession negotiations, which exert high pressures on candidate states due to EU membership conditionalities (Heritier, 2005: 206). This study demonstrates the need for developing context-specific analytical tools to study CEEC's europeanization processes by drawing upon country-specific

empirical analysis of Europeanization of political parties and the role of the politics of Euroscepticism in national party systems.

In addition to the need to stress the distinctive character of the CEEC's Europeanization processes, this study advocates a differential understanding of Europeanization by implementing a comparative analysis of the politics of Euroscepticism in Poland and the Czech Republic. While highlighting the distinctive features of Europeanization East from its Western counterpart, this study does not aim to advocate the development of different conceptual/ theoretical models of Europeanization in exclusive / rigid/ binary-opposition terms, but rather attempts to highlight the fact that the extent and outcomes of Europeanization, and how it functions, heavily depends on the national context that one examines.

In that sense, although the literature on Europeanization of member and new candidate states presuppose a convergence effect of Europeanization, this study offers a rather different result, that is, the Europeanization of national politics result in more divergence than convergence, due to the distinctive features of national political settings. This study is able to reach this conclusion from the empirical analysis of the politics of Euroscepticism in two different national party systems from Central and Eastern Europe. By the late 1990s, both countries began to distance themselves from the euro-idealism of the early post-communist years, when accession to the European Union was framed within the 'Return to Europe' argument, as realistic evaluations of the advantages and disadvantages of membership became a major theme of political debate at the mass public opinion and political party elite levels. The politics of Euroscepticism functioned differently in the party politics and system of these two different CEE countries.

In Poland, anti-EU rhetoric is adopted by almost all mainstream parties and hence the politics of Euroscepticism functions as a re-aligning issue, which provides common political ground for the Eurosceptic and pro-EU forces in case the Polish national interest is perceived to be at stake (such as in the case of the Constitutional Treaty). On the other hand, in the Czech Republic, the politics of Euroscepticism is evidently adopted by the main party of the center-right, the ODS, and the Communists. They are both mainstream parties in the Czech party system, although the Communists have never been a coalition partner.

On the basis of the above, this study incorporates individual (political parties), national (country-specific variables of domestic politics), and system level (patterns of national part political contestation/ party system characteristics) factors in the analysis of the relationship between the Europeanization of national party politics and party-based Euroscepticism. By assigning a primary role to the agency of political parties and by recognizing the constitutive relation between parties and the structure of political competition in light of the process of Europeanization, this study addresses the question of how Europeanization of domestic party politics can be better understood. Hence, the ability of political parties to affect both the mechanics and format of their party systems in the Central and Eastern European context validates the relevance of Radaelli's (2000: 3) conceptualization of Europeanization, which is defined as: "Processes of (a) construction (b) diffusion and (c) institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things' and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the   making   of   EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies."

In this sense, the process of Europeanization of domestic party politics is carried out through the agency of political parties on the basis of our analysis of the politics of Euroscepticism in Czech and Polish party politics. One of the major assumptions of Europeanization in the CEECs concerning the political parties' positions and attitudes on the issue of European integration is that the promise of full EU membership serves as leverage for mainstream political parties to distance themselves from anti-EU politics or any form of a Eurosceptic political discourse. This assumption is further consolidated by the salience of the "Return to Europe" argument in constructing a Europhile political consensus in the party politics of Central and Eastern Europe. However, this top-down approach of Europeanization, which does not foresee the possibility of a divergence in the ways in which political actors incorporate the issue of Europe "in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies" (Radaelli, 2000:3), fails to contribute to our understanding of the relation between the Europeanization of domestic party politics and the dynamics underlying party-based Euroscepticism in Central and Eastern Europe.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bache, Ian 2003. "Europeanization: A Governance Approach." Paper presented at EUSA 8th International Biennial Conference, Nashville.

Baun, Michael, Jakub Dürr, Dan Marek and Pavel Saradin. 2006. "The Europeanization of Czech Politics: The Political Parties and the EU Referendum," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44(2): 249-280.

Börzel, Tanja. 2002. "Pace-Setting, Foot-Dragging, and Fence-Setting: Member State Responses to Europeanization," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40(2): 193-214.

Börzel, Tanja. 1999. "Towards Convergence in Europe? Institutional Adaption to Europeanization in Germany and Spain," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 37(4): 573-96.

Börzel, Tanja and Thomas Risse-Kappen. 2003. "Conceptualizing the Domestic Impact of Europe." In Kevin Featherstone and Claudio M. Radaelli, eds., *The Politics of Europeanization.* NY: Oxford University Press, 57-83.

Börzel, Tanja and Thomas Risse-Kappen. 2000. "When Europe Hits Home: Europeanization and Domestic Change," *Florence, European University Institute (EIOP)* 4(15).

Bulmer, Simon and Martin Burch. 1998. "Organizing for Europe: Whitehall, the British State and the European Union," *Public Administration* (76): 601-628.

Carrubba, Clifford J. 2001. "The Electoral Connection in European Politics," *The Journal of Politics* 63(1): 141-158.

Chan, Kenneth. 2004. "Central and Eastern Europe in the 2004 European Parliament Elections A Not So European Event," *European Parties Elections and Referendums Network (EPERN) Working Paper* No: 16.

Checkel, Jeffrey T. 2001. "A Constructivist Research Programme in EU Studies," *European Union Politics* 2 (2): 219-49.

Cini, Michelle, Lucia Quaglia, Mari Neuvonen and Machiko Miyakoshi. 2007. "Europeanization." In Michelle Cini ed., *European Union Politics*. NY: Oxford University Press, 405-21.

Cowles, Maria Green, and et al. (eds.) 2001. *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and domestic change*. NY: Cornell University Press.

Dellenbrant, Jan Ake. "Parties and Party Systems in Eastern Europe." In Stephen White, Judy Batt and Paul G. Lewis eds., *Developments in East European Politics*. London: MacMillan, 147-163.

Duverger, Maurice. 1954. *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State.* London: Methuen.

Dyson, Kenneth, Klaus H. Goetz. 2003. "Europeanization Compared: The Shrinking core and decline of soft Power." In Kenneth Dyson and Klaus H. Goetz eds., *Germany, Europe, and the politics of constraint*. NY: Oxford University Press, 349-377.

Egea-de Haro, Alfonso. 2003. "The European policy space: does ideology reduce or foster cleavages?," Paper proposal prepared for the ECPR Joint Session at Edinburgh March 28- April 2.

Evans, Geoffrey and Stephen Whitefield. 1993. "Identifying the Bases of Political Competition in Eastern Europe," *British Journal of Political Science* 23(4): 521-548.

Featherstone, Kevin. 1998. "Europeanization and the centre periphery: the case of Greece in the 1990s," *South European Society & Politics* 3 (1): 23-39.

Featherstone, Kevin. 1988. *Socialist Parties and European Integration: a comparative history*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Gaisbauer, Helmut P. 2007. "Euro-Scepticism Revisited: Poland After EU Accession," *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 8 (1): 55-72.

Grabbe, Heather. 2002. "Europeanisation Goes East: Power and Uncertainty in the EU Accession Process." In Kevin Featherstone and Radaelli, C. eds., *The Politics of Europeanisation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 303-327.

Gunther, Richard and Larry Diamond. 2003. "Species of Political Parties: A New Typology," *Party Politics* (9): 167-99.

Hanley, Sean. 2002. "Europe and the Czech Parliamentary Elections of June 2002," *RIIA/ OERN Election Briefing* No.5.

Hanley, Sean. 2002. "From Neo-Liberalism to National Interest: Ideology, Strategy and Party Development in the Euroscepticism of the Czech Right," Paper presented at the Czechs on the Verge of Europe Conference. School of Slavonic and East European Studies. London.

Hanley, Sean. 2003. "The Czech EU Accession Referendum," *Opposing Europe Research Network Referendum Briefing* No.6.

Havlik, Vlastimil and Hana Vykoupilova. 2008. "Two Dimensions of the Europeanization of election programs: The Case of the Czech Republic," *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 41(2): 163-187.

Henderson, Karen. 2008. "Exceptionalism or Convergence? Euroscepticism and Party Systems in Central and Eastern Europe." In Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart eds., *Opposing Europe: The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism,* NY: Oxford University Press, 103-127.

Heritier, Adrienne. 2005. "Europeanization Research East and West: A Comparative Assesment." In Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier eds., *Conceptualizing the Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe.* NY: Cornell University Press, 199-210.

Hix, Simon. 2007. "Euroscepticism as anti-centralization," *European Union Politics* 8(1): 131-150.

Hloušek, Vít and Pavel Pšeja. 2004. "Europeanization of Political Parties and Party System in the Czech Republic,". Article prepared under the project Political actors in the process of Europeanization and internationalization of the political environment of the Czech Republic. The Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Czech Republic.

Hooghe, Liesbet, Gary Marks. 2007. "Sources of Euroscepticism," Acta Politica (42): 119-127.

Hooghe, Liesbet. 2007. "What Drives Euroskepticism?," European Union Politics 8(1): 5-12.

Hooghe, Liesbet, Gary Marky, and Carole J. Wilson. 2002. "Does Left/Right Structure Party Positions on European Integration*?," Comparative Political Studies* 35(8): 965-89.

Hughes, James, Gwendolyn Sasse and Claire Gordon. 2008. "How Deep is the Wider Europe? Elites, Europeanization and Euroscepticism in the CEECs" In Aleks Szczerbiak and Paul Taggart eds., *Opposing Europe: The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism,* NY: Oxford University Press, 181-208.

Katz, Richard S. and Peter Mair. 1995. "Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The emergence of the cartel-party," *Party Politics* (1): 5-28.

Kitschelt, Herbert, Mansfeldova, Zdenka, Markowski, Radoslaw & Toka, Gabor. 1999. *Post-communist Party Systems. Competition, representation and inter-party collaboration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kopecky, Petr. 2004. "An Awkward Newcomer? EU Enlargement and Euroscepticism in the Czech Republic," *European Studies: A Journal of European Culture, History and Politics* (21): 225-245.

Kopecky, Petr. and Cas Mudde. 2002. "The Two Sides of Euroscepticism: Party Positions on European Integration in East Central Europe," *European Union Politics* 11(4): 297-326.

Krouwel, Andrew. 2006. "Party Models." In Richard Katz and William Crotty eds., *Handbook of Party Politics*. London: Sage Publications, 249-70.

Ladrech, Robert. 1994. "Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 32 (1): 69-88.

Ladrech, Robert. 2001. "Europeanization and Political Parties: Towards a Framework for Analysis".Belfast, Institute of European Studies, Queens University of Belfast, *Queen's papers on Europeanization* No. 2/2001.

Lewis, Paul G. 2003. "The Impact of the Enlargement of the European Union on Central European Party Systems," *European Parties Elections and Referendums Network (EPERN) Working Paper* No.14.

Mair, Peter. 2008. "Political Parties and Party Systems." In Paolo Graziano and Maarten P. Vink, eds., *Europeanization: New Research Agendas,* NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 154-167.

Mair, Peter. 2005. "Introduction." In Giovanni Sartori *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis,* pp. xiii-xxi. ECPR Press.

Mair, Peter. 2004. "The Europeanization Dimension," *European Public Policy* 11(2): 337-48.

Mair, Peter. 2000. "The Limited Impact of Europe on National Party Systems," *Western European Politics* 23(4): 27–51.

Markowski, Radoslaw and Joshua A. Tucker. 2008. "Euroscepticism and Emergence of Eurosceptic Political Parties in Poland," Paper presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Aug.30- Sept.2, 2006 Philadelphia, 1-29.

Marks, Gary, Carole J. Wilson, and Leonard Ray. 2002. "National Political Parties and European Integration," *American Journal of Political Science* 46(3): 585-594.

Marsh, Michael. 1998. "Testing the Second Order Election Model after Four European Elections," *British Journal of Political Science* 28 (4): 591-607.

Mudde, Cas. 2000. "EU Accession and a New Populist Center- Periphery Cleavage in Central and Eastern Europe," *Center for European Studies, Central and Eastern Europe Working Paper* No.62.

Olsen, Johan P. 2002. "The Many Faces of Europeanization," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (5): 921-52.

Radaelli, Claudio M. 2000. "Whither Europeanization? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change," *European Integration Online Papers (EIOP)* 4(8).

Radaelli, Claudio M. and Romain Pasquier. 2008. "Conceptual Issues." In Paolo Graziano and Maarten P. Vink eds., *Europeanization: New Research Agendas,* NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 35-46.

Radaelli, Claudio M. 2003. The Europeanization of Public Policy." In Kevin Featherstone and Radaelli, C. eds., *The Politics of Europeanisation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 27-57.

Reif, Karlheinz and Herman Schmitt. 1980. "Nine Second-Order National Elections: A Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of European Election Results," *European Journal of Political Research* 8(1): 3-44.

Riishoj, Soren. 2004. "Europeanisation and Euroscepticism: Experiences from Poland and Czech Republic," *Central European Political Studies Review* 6(4): 1-44.

Risse, Thomas-Kappen, Maria G. Cowles, and James Caporaso. 2001. "Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction." In M. Cowles, J. Caporaso and T. Risse-Kappen eds., Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1-20.

Rulikova, Marketa. 2004. "The European Parliament Election In the Czech Republic," *European Parliament Election Briefing* (EPERN) No.9.

Sartori, Giovanni. 2005. *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. Essex: European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) Press.

Scarrow, Susan E. 2006. "The Nineteenth- Century Origins of Modern Political Parties: The Unwanted Emergence of Party-Based Politics." In Richard Katz and William Crotty eds., *Handbook of Party Politics*, London: Sage Publications, 16-25.

Schimmelfennig, Frank and Ulrich Sedelmeier. 2005. "Introduction." In Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier eds., *Conceptualizing the Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe,* NY: Cornell University Press, 1-29.

Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2001. "The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and Eastern enlargement of the European Union," *International Organization* (55): 47-80.

Sedelmeier, Ulrich. 2006. "Europeanization In New Member and Candidate States," *Living Reviews in European Governance*.

Smolar, Aleksander. 1998. "Poland's Emerging Party System," *Journal of Democracy* 9(2): 122-133.

Steenbergen, Marco R., Erica E. Edwards, and Catherine E. De Vries. 2007. "Who's Cueing Whom? Mass-Elite Linkages and the Future of European Integration," *European Union Politics* 8 (1):13-35.

Szczerbiak, Aleks. 2005. "Europe and the September–October 2005 Polish Parliamentary and Presidential Elections," *EPERN Election Briefing* No: 22.

Szczerbiak, Aleks. 2004. "Polish Euroscepticism in the Run Up to EU Accession," *European Studies* (20): 247-268.

Szczerbiak, Aleks. 2004. "The European Parliament Election In Poland," *EPERN Briefing* No.1.

Szczerbiak, Aleks. 2003. "The Polish EU Accession Referendum," *Opposing Europe Research Network Referendum Briefing* No.5.

Szczerbiak, Aleks. 2002. "After the Election, Nearing the Endgame: the Polish Euro-Debate In the Run Up to the 2003 EU Accession Referendum," *Opposing Europe Research Network Working Paper* No.7.

Szczerbiak, Aleks. 2001. "Polish Public Opinion: Explaining Declining Support for EU Membership," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39 (1): 105-122.

Szczerbiak, Aleks. 1998. "Party Structure and Organisation in Post-Communist Poland," Paper for the Political Studies Association- UK 50th Annual Conference. 10-13 April 2000, London.

Szczerbiak, Aleks and Monika Bil. 2008. "When in Doubt, (re-)turn to domestic Politics? The (non-) impact of the EU on party politics in Poland," *EPERN Working Paper* No.20.

Taggart, Paul. 1998. "A Touchstone of Dissent: Euroscepticism in Contemporary Western European Party Systems," *European Journal of Political Research* 33(3): 363-388.

Taggart, Paul and Aleks Szczerbiak. 2001. "Parties, Positions and Euroscepticism in the EU Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe" *SEI Working Paper,* No.46.

Taggart, Paul and Aleks Szczerbiak. 2002. "The Party Politics of Euroscepticism in EU Member and Candidate States," Paper prepared for presentation at the European Consortium for Political Research Joint Workshops. Turin, March 21-27.

Tsarouhas, Dimitris. 2006. "European Integration and Path Dependence: explaining the evolution of EU social policy," *European Political Economy Review* 3(2): 87-111.

Vink, Maarten. 2002. "What is Europeanization? and other questions on a New Research Agenda" Paper for the Second Yen Research Meeting on Europeanization. Milan, University of Bocconi, November 22-23.

White, John Kenneth. 2006. "What is a Political Party." In Richard Katz and William Crotty eds., *Handbook of Party Politics*, London: Sage Publications, 5-16.

Zahradil, Jan, Petr Plecity, Petr Adrian and Miloslav Bednar. 2001. *The Manifesto of Czech Eurorealism.* Available at: http://www.ods.cz/docs/dokumenty/zahradil-manifest.pdf