

118

Reihe Politikwissenschaft

Political Science Series

Products of Their Past?
Cleavages and Intra-Party Dissent
over European Integration

Erica E. Edwards

118

Reihe Politikwissenschaft

Political Science Series

Products of Their Past?
Cleavages and Intra-Party Dissent
over European Integration

Erica E. Edwards

February 2009

Institut für Höhere Studien (IHS), Wien
Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna

Contact:

Erica E. Edwards
Department of Political Science
Institute for Advanced Studies
Stumpergasse 56
A-1060 Vienna
☎: +43/1/599 91-180
email: edwards@ihs.ac.at

Founded in 1963 by two prominent Austrians living in exile – the sociologist Paul F. Lazarsfeld and the economist Oskar Morgenstern – with the financial support from the Ford Foundation, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, and the City of Vienna, the Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS) is the first institution for postgraduate education and research in economics and the social sciences in Austria. The **Political Science Series** presents research done at the Department of Political Science and aims to share “work in progress” before formal publication. It includes papers by the Department’s teaching and research staff, visiting professors, graduate students, visiting fellows, and invited participants in seminars, workshops, and conferences. As usual, authors bear full responsibility for the content of their contributions.

Das Institut für Höhere Studien (IHS) wurde im Jahr 1963 von zwei prominenten Exilösterreichern – dem Soziologen Paul F. Lazarsfeld und dem Ökonomen Oskar Morgenstern – mit Hilfe der Ford-Stiftung, des Österreichischen Bundesministeriums für Unterricht und der Stadt Wien gegründet und ist somit die erste nachuniversitäre Lehr- und Forschungsstätte für die Sozial- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften in Österreich. Die **Reihe Politikwissenschaft** bietet Einblick in die Forschungsarbeit der Abteilung für Politikwissenschaft und verfolgt das Ziel, abteilungsinterne Diskussionsbeiträge einer breiteren fachinternen Öffentlichkeit zugänglich zu machen. Die inhaltliche Verantwortung für die veröffentlichten Beiträge liegt bei den Autoren und Autorinnen. Gastbeiträge werden als solche gekennzeichnet.

Abstract

What explains contemporary intra-party dissent on EU issues? This article develops a cleavage theory model of internal party dissent over European integration. Drawing on Lipset and Rokkan's classic model of political cleavages and on its applications to party positioning on European integration, I argue that if one seeks to understand when, where, and to what extent internal divisions manifest themselves, one must look to the particular historical vulnerabilities of political parties. Using expert survey data, I demonstrate that the ease with which political parties are able to assimilate the issue of European integration is influenced by the legacy of past political tensions and the extent to which the economic and political aspects of the EU reactivate pre-existing cleavages.

Zusammenfassung

Was erklärt den gegenwärtigen innerparteilichen Dissens in Europafragen? Dieser Beitrag entwickelt, auf der Grundlage der Theorie politischer Konfliktlinien, ein Modell zum innerparteilichen Dissens über Fragen der europäischen Integration. Mit Bezug auf das klassische Modell politischer Konfliktlinien von Lipset und Rokkan und seine Anwendung auf die Entstehung von Parteipositionen zur europäischen Integration illustriere ich, dass ein Verständnis davon, wann und in welchem Ausmaß interne Konflikte auftreten, nur durch die Analyse der spezifischen historischen "Verwundbarkeit" einer politischen Partei begründet werden kann. Ich zeige anhand von Experteneinschätzungen, dass das Potenzial politischer Parteien, Aspekte der europäischen Integration in ihre übergreifende programmatische Ausrichtung aufzunehmen, von den Hinterlassenschaften vormaliger politischer Spannungsverhältnisse und dem Grad abhängt, mit dem die EU bereits früher bedeutsame politische Konfliktlinien neu betonen.

Keywords

political parties, intra-party dissent, cleavage theory, European integration

Schlagwörter

politische Parteien, innerparteilicher Konflikt, Konfliktlinien, europäische Integration

General note on content

The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and not necessarily those of the IHS
Department of Political Science

Contents

List of Figures and Tables	1
Introduction.....	3
1. A Cleavage Theory of Intra-Party Dissent.....	4
2. Hypothesizing Variation Among and Within Party Families	6
Class Cleavage	6
Church-State Cleavage.....	8
Centre-Periphery Cleavage.....	9
New Politics Cleavage	11
3. Patterns of Intra-Party Dissent.....	15
4. A Statistical Model of Intra-party Dissent.....	20
Conclusion	26
Appendix A: Variable Description.....	27
References.....	28

List of Figures and Tables

Figure 1: Distribution of parties by intra-party dissent, broken down by party family (1996-2002).....	16
Figure 2: Distribution of parties by intra-party dissent, broken down by party family subgroups (1996-2002).....	18
Table 1: Summary scores of index of cleavage tension	21
Table 2: Analysis of intra-party dissent over European integration	25

Introduction

May 29, 2005, marked the rejection by French voters of the European Constitutional Treaty, but December 1, 2004, will not soon be forgotten by France's *Parti Socialiste* (PS). Hoping to quell intra-party dissent over the controversial European document, Socialist leaders staged an internal referendum among party members to determine the official party stance. Fifty-nine percent voted to endorse the Treaty, but this failed to subdue party infighting. Rather the reverse. Former Prime Minister Laurent Fabius and his socialist allies continued to reject the Treaty, and their support within the party appeared to grow as the day of reckoning approached. The power struggle not only created uncertainty and unease for party supporters on the issue of European integration, leaving them without a clear signal as they stepped into the ballot box the following May, but it also reignited a long-standing debate about the party's core ideology (Ivaldi 2006).

Was this schism to be expected? The line of reasoning presented in this article suggests yes. While division over European integration in France has traditionally been the domain of Gaullist parties on the right of the political spectrum, I argue that the historical predispositions of the PS (and of socialist parties, more generally) made internal party dissent a likely outcome.

This article develops a cleavage theory model of intra-party dissent over European integration. Drawing on Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan's (1967) classic model of political cleavages, I argue that if one seeks to understand when, where, and to what extent internal divisions manifest themselves, one must look to the particular vulnerabilities of parties, which are primarily shaped by their historical experiences. As Marks and Wilson (2000) show, political cleavages provide a key for explaining how parties respond to issues of European integration. I extend this argument to intra-party dissent, contending that present-day rifts within political parties are not *sui generis* but reflect durable and deep-seated tensions.

In the next section I set out a theory of intra-party dissent. I then apply this theory to generate expectations about variation in dissent among and within party families. Finally, I test my hypotheses against data from expert surveys of political parties across fourteen Western European member states of the European Union (EU).¹

¹ The analysis stops in 2002 and therefore includes only Western European member states (i.e. the previous EU-15, minus Luxembourg for which expert survey data is not available).

1. A Cleavage Theory of Intra-Party Dissent

Which political parties are most vulnerable to internal dissent over European issues? My point of theoretical departure is an historical institutional perspective, which posits that rifts within political parties can be explained as expressions of prior, often deeply rooted, tensions. The model draws on Lipset and Rokkan's (1967) theory of social cleavages (also see Zuckerman 1982; Kriesi 1998). In their influential 1967 article, the authors link the configuration of European parties to social and cultural divisions that existed when party systems were established in the second half of the nineteenth century. They contend that the historical conflicts arising in successive critical junctures, namely the national revolution, the Protestant Reformation, and the industrial revolution, gave rise to enduring societal divisions that continue to shape identities, social institutions, and patterns of political contestation.

Few scholars today accept the notion that party competition is frozen along the lines described by Lipset and Rokkan (1967); nevertheless, class, religious, and centre/periphery cleavages remain important in framing how political parties respond to new issues (Sartori 1969; Dalton et al. 1984; Bartolini and Mair 1990; Kitschelt 1997; Mair 1997). This makes sense from an institutionalist point of view (Hall and Taylor 1996; Thelen 1999): organisations filter new issues through existing mental frames. Political parties are organisations with embedded ideologies and long-standing programs that engender intense loyalty on the part of leaders and activists (Budge et al. 1987). Given the high cost of abandoning constituency ties and programmatic commitments, political parties cannot reinvent themselves with each new challenge or electoral cycle. That is to say, 'a political party has its own "bounded rationality" that shapes the way in which it comes to terms with new challenges and uncertainties' (Marks and Wilson 2000: 434).

While the logic of embedded cleavages and commitments may be generalized across a range of issues, the character of European integration – and especially the dual nature of contemporary European integration – makes this a particularly interesting area of exploration. The European project simultaneously entails economic and political integration. From its origins in the 1950s, the creation of Europe has been an economic venture, involving the removal of tariff and non-tariff barriers, the creation of a single market, and the establishment of a monetary union and a common currency. However, European integration is also a political project, involving the transfer of authority from national actors to subnational and supranational actors as EU decision-making infiltrates new policy areas (including environmental, social, and foreign and security) and engages new sets of actors (including interest groups, social movements, political parties, and citizens). This qualitative and quantitative shift in the nature of the EU has gone hand-in-hand with heightened public contestation and increased politicisation of the integration process by political elites (Hooghe and Marks 2009; also see Marks and Steenbergen 2004).

Lipset and Rokkan's cleavage theory has been adapted to explain how political parties respond to these two components of European integration (Hix and Lord 1997; Hix 1999; Marks and Wilson 2000; Marks et al. 2002; Kriesi et al. 2006). The present article deepens and extends this line of reasoning. I suggest that divisions over European integration are not new schisms. Rather, they are expressions of entrenched tensions within party families and within individual parties that reflect historical cleavages activated by European issues. In other words, the ability of political parties to assimilate the issue of European integration is influenced by the legacy of past political tensions and specifically by the extent to which the nature of the EU (e.g. as a market for authoritative regulation) reactivates these pre-existing conflicts.²

This model leads one to expect levels of intra-party dissent over European integration to vary among party families, but cleavage theory also hints at the possibility of variation within party families. Lipset and Rokkan's theory highlights that the effect of a particular cleavage is often mediated by its interaction with prior societal cleavages and by 'different conditions of national politics and socioeconomic development' (1967: 114). Societal cleavages do not translate mechanically into constellations of political parties: 'there are considerations of organisational and electoral strategy; there is the weighing of payoffs of alliances against losses through split-offs; and there is the successive narrowing of the "mobilisation market" through the time sequences of organisational efforts' (Lipset and Rokkan 1967: 141). The result is marked geographical variation in party systems and, as I argue below, parallel variation within and among party families.

² Along a similar vein, Kriesi et al. (2006: 927) suggest an intensification of political conflicts within mainstream parties as they adjust their ideological positions to accommodate or "embed" European integration into the existing two-dimensional political space (defined by the authors as socio-economic and cultural).

2. Hypothesizing Variation Among and Within Party Families

The previous paragraphs apply cleavage theory to intra-party dissent over European integration *in general*. Below, I offer more specific expectations concerning variation in internal party dissent both among and within party families (see Table 1 for a summary).

Class Cleavage

The double-barrelled nature of European integration generates friction for parties competing on either side of the class cleavage (Hix 1999; Hooghe and Marks 1999; Ladrech 1993; Hix and Lord 1997). Emerging out of the industrial revolution and the conflict between blue-collar workers and owners of capital, the ***social democratic*** party family sits on the left side of the class cleavage. These parties tend to favour social equality and generous welfare spending and are rooted in the belief that ‘the economy must be brought under control through an interventionist state’ (Padgett and Paterson 1991: 49).

The European project pulls social democratic parties in opposing directions (Featherstone 1988; Ladrech 1997, 2000; Ladrech and Marlière 1999), challenging their economic ideals and setting the stage for dissent. On the negative side, economic integration jeopardizes nation-wide socialist achievements ‘by intensifying international economic competition and undermining Keynesian responses to it’ (Marks and Wilson 2000: 437). Increased capital mobility, pressure for greater labour flexibility, and heightened labour substitutability across countries – all consequences of deeper market integration – diminish the bargaining power of labour and increase that of employers. On the positive side, European political integration offers the possibility of continental regulation in an era when national regulation has seemingly lost its effectiveness.³

Given this tension, the potential for conflict remains high, especially for social democratic parties in countries with generous welfare states and powerfully organized labour. European integration is a political hazard in strong social democratic contexts, e.g. in Scandinavia, where national achievements are beyond replication at the European level. In such environments, social democrats fear that European integration will dilute redistribution and diminish the capacity of labour to bargain effectively.⁴

³ The unmitigated failure of French President François Mitterrand’s attempt at ‘socialism in one country’ in the early 1980s provided an important wake-up call, signalling that economic and political isolation from the European organisation was largely untenable. Since then, most social democrats have embraced the virtues of European integration, advocating a project of regulated capitalism to rival the more neoliberal and nationalist projects put forth by other party families (see Marks and Wilson 2000: 442-8).

⁴ This argument is similar to that of Kriesi et al. (2006) who distinguish between a ‘classical left’, which opposes economic liberalism and open borders because they threaten left achievements at the national level, and a

On the right side of the political spectrum, **conservative** parties are confronted with a similar rationale running in the opposite direction. For these more neoliberal parties, the European economic project has the benefit of constraining the economic intervention of national governments. The transaction costs of shifting investment across countries are minimized, inducing national governments to compete in attracting capital to their countries. The threat of political integration, however, looms large for these parties. Left unchecked, political integration runs the risk of developing a supranational government at the EU level capable of regulating markets.

The conservative party family is particularly susceptible to internal strife over European integration because of the long-standing tension between the neoliberal tradition, supporting free markets and minimal state intervention, and the national tradition, rejecting the importance of class to political issues (e.g. Baker et al. 1993, 1994; Alexandre and Jardin 1997; Flood 1997; Marks and Wilson 2000: 454-8; Hooghe et al. 2004: 235-7; Hooghe and Marks 2009: 17). The double nature of European integration touches directly upon this pre-existing fissure. For neoliberals, the European project of economic integration is largely an extension of their fundamental political-economic ideals, leading them to favour the venture to the extent that it improves regime competition and leads to a more integrated market. Though they believe that the focus of European integration should be economic, neoliberals acknowledge that some supranational political structures may be needed to realize the goal of market integration and are therefore willing to cede a degree of national autonomy if it leads to enhanced economic integration. This stands in stark opposition to nationalists who reject any dilution of national control. As defenders of national culture, language, community, and above all national sovereignty, nationalists are hostile to European integration in any form. The endemic tension between neoliberals and nationalists leads to the expectation that conservative parties will be particularly vulnerable to infighting over European integration. Moreover, variation among these parties will reflect the relative strength of the two opposing strands of conservatism.

In contrast, situated on the extreme left of the class cleavage, **radical left** parties of a **communist** bent should have little problem assimilating European integration, as they tend to reject the EU on both economic and political grounds. For these parties, European integration is not only an anathema to their extreme left goals (e.g. public control over capital flows, heavy national investment in industrial policy, statutory employment, etc.), but it is viewed as fundamentally undemocratic and controlled by capitalist interests (Christensen 1996; Hooghe et al. 2004). In its party manifesto for the 2004 European elections, for example, the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) called for 'deliverance from the bonds of the EU' (i.e. withdrawal from the EU), claiming that the European endeavour is nothing more

'modernised left', which embraces globalisation and tries to reconcile endorsements of neoliberal free trade with concerns for social justice. Also see Kriesi (2007: 86-7) and Giddens (1998).

than an alliance created 'to enhance big capital's share of the international capitalist market' and that the Treaties of Maastricht, Amsterdam, and Nice as well as the European Constitution 'deliver the *coup de grace* to popular rights and to democracy.'⁵ Since they are inclined to oppose the European project on both economic and political fronts, my expectation is that communist radical left parties will exhibit relatively low levels of internal dissent on EU issues.

It is important to note, however, that this expectation does not hold for the entire radical left party family. As we will see below, the emergence of a new politics cleavage across Europe has spurred the development of a second variant of radical left parties – the so-called 'new left'. While these parties tend to share the communists' views on the economic evils of the EU, they have adopted a more positive line on the political dimension. Thus, while communist parties should be unified, the opposite should be true for new left parties.

Church-State Cleavage

Originating in the Protestant Reformation, which pitted the Catholic Church against state- and nation-building elites, the church-state cleavage characterizes the second set of party families. **Christian democratic** parties correspond to the Catholic side of this cleavage. This party family has been among the most supportive of the EU project, as European integration coincides with the supranational aspirations of the Catholic Church. The anti-national bias of Catholic parties that arose from the historic battles with national state-builders feeds this affinity on the political side, while their practical desire for economic prosperity contributes to their support of international economic integration.⁶ Consequently, I hypothesize that Christian democratic parties will display high levels of internal party unity over European integration.

Unlike their Catholic counterparts, however, **Protestant** parties should be marred with intra-party dissent. These political parties have been profoundly fashioned by the distinctive layering and intermingling of the church-state and centre-periphery cleavages characteristic of Scandinavia (Valen and Rokkan 1974). Rooted in revivalist Lutheran fundamentalism, which grew out of opposition to the dominance of government elites and mainstream Lutheranism, these parties share none of the supranational proclivities of their Christian democratic counterparts and often exhibit a distinctly nationalist flavour. Though favouring economic integration at the European level because of its tendency to dampen the role of

⁵ KKE manifesto, 2004 European Elections, <http://inter.kke.gr/AboutGreece/elections/eu-election/2004eu-election/2004-euelection-statement/> (accessed 23 July 2007).

⁶ Although Christian democratic parties differ from market oriented conservative parties in their support for relatively generous welfare programmes, neither set of parties doubts the benefits of economic neoliberalism.

the state in the economy, the religiosity and opposition to central authority of Protestant parties leads them to vehemently oppose political integration (Karvonen 1994; Madeley 2004). Hence, I anticipate high levels of internal party dissent.

Centre-Periphery Cleavage

The centre-periphery cleavage emerged out of the national revolutions of the nineteenth century. The establishment of nation-states set administrative centres against peripheral, locally entrenched elites and resulted in ethnic and regionalist centre-periphery conflicts. In countries such as Britain, France, and Spain, with strong central states, this cleavage ultimately led to the suppression of strong territorially concentrated regional minorities (such as the Catalans, the Basque, the Scots, and the Welsh) and spurred the creation of regional political parties to defend such interests. In the more decentralized Protestant countries of Scandinavia, peripheral minorities remained territorially dispersed, resulting in emergence of strong agrarian parties protecting the interests of farmers and Lutheran fundamentalists (Marks and Wilson 2000: 438-9).

I expect **regionalist** parties to be fairly united in favour of European integration (Jolly 2007). European integration transforms the political setting in which these parties operate. To begin, because European integration modifies the notion of political sovereignty, the age-old adversary of peripheral nationalism – the state – has changed in nature. On the one hand, the regionalists' enemy has been weakened, as the nation-state's competencies and authority have markedly diminished. On the other hand, as Alan Milward (1992) suggests, European integration can also be seen as a lifeboat for nation-states (particularly for smaller nation-states), assuring their physical and economic security and thereby providing a mechanism for their survival (see Alesina and Spoaore 2003). Seen from the perspective of regionalist parties, the latter is a potential opportunity. The notion of 'independence within Europe' becomes a more viable option since the wider EU context diminishes economic and military costs.⁷ More specifically, in economic terms regionalist parties stand to gain from the European project because it provides an expanded and more readily accessible venue within which regional firms can participate, not to mention the substantial economic support the EU grants to Europe's poorest areas through its cohesion policies. Politically, European integration offers greater regional autonomy and representation and provides a more hospitable setting for ethno-territorial minorities than that provided within their national borders.

⁷ Jolly (2007) quantitatively demonstrates the power of the viability argument in explaining EU support among regionalist parties. These findings are backed up by a case study of the Scottish National Party (SNP) in which the author shows that 'independence in Europe' (i.e. viability) was decisive in the party's decision to begin endorsing European integration in the mid-1980s. Also see Sillars (1986) and De Winter and Cachafeiro (2002: 488).

Though sharing similar centre-periphery origins, the *agrarian* party family should possess few of the regionalist's tendencies for internal party cohesion since its moderately favourable position on economic integration is at odds with its decidedly negative stance towards political integration. Historically, agrarian (or centre) parties have represented rural areas and, similar to Protestant parties, bear the influences of the particular pattern of social cleavages characteristic of Scandinavia – namely the mingling of the church-state and centre-periphery cleavages with a third urban-rural divide. The degree to which these parties maintain their links to agrarian interests varies (Arter 2001), but their common rural heritage combined with the weakness of feudalism and the absence of the strong centralizing hand of the Catholic Church at the time of their inception remain influential. Agrarian parties view themselves as “champions of the rural periphery” and therefore are inclined to resist all movements toward centralisation of authority, which benefit urban centres to the detriment of local interests and undermine national identity, regardless of whether such movements occur at the national or supranational level (Sundberg 1999; Lindström and Wörlund 1988). Moreover, politically motivated territorial politics has tended to encompass protection of values and culture. As Batory and Sitter note: ‘given the tendency to portray the countryside as the source of “authentic” national identity in contrast to the cosmopolitan (and more multi-ethnic) cities, some agrarian parties are prone to define membership in the nation in ethnic (based on identity/culture) rather than civic (base on citizenship) terms (Smith 1986)’ (2004: 529). Consequently, similar to national conservative parties, agrarians oppose political integration because the EU is alien and disruptive to their own national cultural milieu (Urwin 1980).

Economically, however, agrarian parties are more positive. Though they tend to view European integration as promoting industrial and commercial interests to their disadvantage, they find the agricultural subsidies of the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) appealing. Additionally, while the EU's rules on competition from foreign goods and investment as well as on the allowances of national subsidies hurt farmers in some countries, they are potentially beneficial for agrarians elsewhere. The Swedish Centre Party's shift in position toward European integration in the 1990s, for example, was supported by the Federation of Swedish Farmers (LRF), who identified the economic benefits of EU membership to Swedish farmers. Denmark provides a similar story in which agrarians focus more on the economic benefits of membership than the threat of foreign competition (Batory and Sitter 2004: 532).

Finally, though included in this section, the *liberal* party family is actually rooted in three cleavages – the urban-rural (in England and Germany), the church-state (in the Low Countries, France, Italy, and Spain), and the centre-periphery (in the Nordic countries, Wales, and Scotland). Unsurprisingly given its diverse origins, this party family is the most ideologically heterogeneous of the families and is only broadly united by its opposition to ascription, clericalism, and aristocracy and by its support for economic and political freedoms. Though liberal parties of all stripes tend to favour greater economic freedoms and

are accordingly inclined to support economic integration, their backing of political integration varies cross-nationally.

Liberal parties can be divided into two varieties, both of which I expect to be fairly united over EU issues (Smith 1988; von Beyme 1985).⁸ On the one hand, *political* or *radical* liberals (such as the Danish *Radikale Venstre* and the Dutch D66) are left-leaning on economic issues and support a broad interpretation of democratic rights. Rejecting nationalism, these parties seek to minimize the constraints that national borders exert over the lives of individuals. On the other hand, *economic* or *conservative* liberals (such as the Dutch *Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie* and the Belgian liberal parties) are right-leaning and stress greater economic freedom. These parties advance European integration as a means to lower trade barriers and to institutionalise free markets, i.e. they support negative integration with respect to the economy but reject the notion of Fortress Europe and oppose the social democratic project for regulated capitalism at the European level (Marks and Wilson 2000: 449). Thus, although economic liberal parties favour European integration on economic grounds, they oppose political integration. I therefore hypothesize that these parties will be slightly more divided over European integration than their politically liberal counterparts.

New Politics Cleavage

The final three party families –radical right, green, and radical left (of the new left variety) – have grown out of the broad, so-called ‘new politics’ or ‘new values’ cleavage.⁹ Though its effect on the political space did not emerge until the late 1960s, the roots of this dimension lie in the post World War II era when the structuring capacity of the traditional cleavages described above began to dwindle as a result of secularisation, serialisation, value shifts, rising education levels, and increases in standards of living (Dalton et al. 1984; Franklin et al. 1992). In general, this cleavage contrasts old politics values – public order, national security, and traditional life styles – with new politics values – individual choice, participatory democracy, and environmental protection. European integration, with its close link to issues of national sovereignty and to the new political and cultural forms of competition connected with globalisation, is intimately associated with this new politics cleavage (Kriesi et al. 2006: 924).

⁸ Some identify agrarians as a third variant of liberal parties (see Weßels 1995; Hix and Lord 1997); however, their distinctiveness leads me to include them in a separate party family (see Lipset and Rokkan 1967).

⁹ This dimension takes on many guises in the literature: post-materialist/materialist (Inglehart 1990); new politics/old politics (Franklin 1992; Müller-Rommel 1989); left-libertarian/right-authoritarian (Kitschelt 1994); gal (green, alternative, left)/tan (traditional, authoritarian, national) (Hooghe et al. 2004).

By far the most Eurosceptic party family, **radical right** parties should be relatively internally cohesive with regard to European integration, although their ambiguity concerning economics does open the door to mild dissent (Fieschi et al. 1996; Hooghe et al. 2004; De Vries and Edwards 2009).¹⁰ Their internal unity stems from 1) the location of these parties decidedly at the right-authoritarian or *tan* (traditional, authoritarian, national) end of the new politics dimension and 2) the prominence of this dimension over the traditional economic left/right axis for these parties. Academics continue to debate the origin of the radical right as either a challenge to the new left on non-economic issues (e.g. nationalism and law and order) or as a response to economic insecurities and loss of confidence in governing parties (Ignazi 1992; Harris 1994; Kitschelt and McGann 1997; Flanagan 1987; Cole 2005), but the party family's ideological emphasis on nationalism, anti-immigration, traditionalism, and respect for authority is undisputed. Campaign slogans such as 'the Netherlands is full' (*List Pim Fortuyn*), 'Denmark for the Danes' (*Dansk Folkeparti*), 'in charge of our own country' (*Vlaams Blok*) as well as calls for an end to *Überfremdung* (over-foreignisation) and publications like Jean-Marie Le Pen's *Les Français d'abord* (The French First) illustrate the core sentiments of the radical right. With regard to Europe, scholars are quick to point out that their negative position (especially towards political integration) is simply an extension of radical right parties' core domestic platforms (Fieschi et al. 1996; Hooghe et al. 2004: 134). In the words of Le Pen: 'My European programme is a faithful extrapolation from the national programs of the National Front, since the same dangers which threaten France threaten Europe' (as quoted in Fieschi et al. 1996: 239-40).

Economic issues tend to be less salient but are hardly irrelevant (Poguntke 1993), and it is in this sphere that the stirrings of dissent concerning European integration arise. Attempting to formulate a more attractive platform and appeal to their declining middle class followers and to unskilled workers, a subset of far right parties has adopted elements of economic neoliberalism (Betz 1993; Kitschelt and McGann 1997). The *Dansk Folkeparti*, the *Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs* (FPÖ), and the *Vlaams Blok* support free trade and the single market, while others such as the France's FN and the Italian *Allianza Nazionale* (AN) remain more sceptical (Hooghe et al. 2004: 133). This economic aspect, however, has never been central, and as Kitschelt notes the tendency to embrace neoliberalism has declined as radical right parties have increasingly taken a more nationalistic and ethnocentric line (Kitschelt 2001: 435; Kriesi et al. 2006). The extreme right's ambivalent position on economic integration combined with its adamant rejection of political integration yields tension, leading one to expect moderate dissent over the EU issue.

¹⁰ Note that I am not discounting friction concerning the political dimension of European integration. Parties such as the German *Republikaner* and the French FN faced difficulties in the 1970-80s reconciling a supposed commitment to protecting European values and civilization against any external (i.e. non-European) threat with their strident opposition to any loss of national sovereignty. This tension appears to have dissipated with the Maastricht Treaty, as radical right parties dropped any notion of 'European patriotism' and wholeheartedly denounced the Treaty (see Fieschi et al. 1996).

The **green** party family, with ideological roots in the new social movements of the 1960s and 1970s and in the environmental critique of modern industrial society, sits firmly on the left-libertarian or *gal* (green, alternative, libertarian) end of the new politics spectrum. I expect green parties to be somewhat divided over the issue, as it rekindles pre-existing divisions. As Hooghe and Marks note: 'For left-gal parties, the European Union remains a difficult proposition because it combines gal policies with market liberalism' (2009: 17). On the one hand, essential values of the green movement, e.g. environmental sustainability, social justice, and global security, necessitate transnational or international coordination. Thus, the rhetoric of green parties suggests support for the 'uniting of the peoples' of Europe and the erasure of borders to the extent that such action facilitates solutions to transnational problems and diminishes nationalist sentiments. On the other hand, paramount to green values is a sharp critique of advanced industrial society and the environmental, social, and human costs that accompany economic and technological advancement. Clearly, the EU's focus on market principles, economic growth, and free trade does not sit well with this core green criticism.

Moreover, European integration revives the traditional strategic division between 'realists' (favouring pragmatic efforts to gain and hold power) and 'fundamentalists' (favouring strict adherence to ideology) (Doherty 1992; Burchell 2001; also see Poguntke 1989; Kitschelt 1988). To a large extent this debate has been resolved since even contemporary activists are likely to concede the utility of parliamentary representation in achieving green objectives (Doherty 2002; Carter 2001; Bomberg and Carter 2006: S99); nevertheless, its legacy persists and is brought into sharp relief in the context of European integration. The theory of political organisation espoused by green parties – entailing direct democracy, decentralisation, local influence, and diffusion of power (Burchell 2001; Verdung 1989; Kemp and Wall 1990; Hainsworth 1990) – is at odds with the EU's remoteness, structural hierarchy, and secretive decision-making. How can green fundamentalists, pioneers of the 'anti-party' party model of grass-roots democracy, accept the apparent 'mellowing' of green ideology that seems necessary to participate in the European project (Bomberg and Carter 2006)?

Importantly, the revived realists/fundamentalists debate is not reserved for organisational matters but carries over into discussions about party programs. The cost of "playing the EU game" seems to be increased de-radicalisation, as evidenced by acceptance by some green parties of monetary union, emissions trading, and more recently the Constitutional Treaty¹¹ as well as by the growing number of green campaigns focusing on "safer" issues (i.e. reforming EU democracy and accountability) to the neglect of more vital green matters (i.e. the environmental consequences of economic growth or security) (Bomberg 2002: 36, 44).

¹¹ Crum suggests that support for Constitutional Treaty by the majority of green parties (most of whom opposed previous EU Treaties) may signal a trend toward green parties 'shedding their anti-establishment views and merging into the political mainstream' (2007: 74).

Many green fundamentalists and grass-root activists have challenged such movements. Divisions within Germany's *Die Grünen*, for example, came to light when Joschka Fischer, then Foreign Minister of Germany and leading Green figure, vocally supported a European government as well as NATO and military action in Afghanistan. As Bomberg notes, 'These internal divisions [were] not new, but EU developments and activity certainly exposed and exacerbated them' (Bomberg 2002: 37).

Finally, straddling both the new politics cleavage and the traditional left/right class cleavage, radical parties of the *new left* should be lightning rods for internal dissent.¹² As the saying goes, 'politics makes strange bedfellows'. This is certainly true for new left parties which tend to be umbrella organisations allying communists – rooted on the extreme left of the class cleavage – with ecologists, feminists, civil rights proponents, and anti-war activists – rooted on the left-libertarian or *gal* end of the new politics cleavage.¹³ While their communist heritage leads them to solidly reject economic integration for reasons already mentioned, the diverse preferences of the left-libertarian elements of these parties result in unclear stances on the political end. Despite this general ambiguity, however, the dominant tendency is to embrace political integration as it minimizes nationalism, promotes broad democratic and human rights, and encourages equal treatment of women and minorities. These disparate positions on the political and economic aspects of integration make new left parties susceptible to internal dissent.

¹² In their mapping of a new structural conflict in Western Europe, Kriesi et al. (2006: 925) place both the new left and the greens in the upper left-hand corner, indicating their preference for integration on the cultural dimension and demarcation on the economic dimension. This placement supports the expectation described here.

¹³ Finland's Left Alliance provides a telling case in point. Based on the core values of freedom, democracy, and socially and ecologically sustainable development, the party was founded in 1990 from a merger of the Communist Party of Finland (SKP) with the Finnish People's Democratic League (SKDL) and the Finnish Women's Democratic League (SNDL); its one representative in the European Parliament sits with the United Left/Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL) party group. See http://www.vasemmistoliitto.fi/en_GB/ (accessed 29 July 2007).

3. Patterns of Intra-Party Dissent

Does cleavage theory provide a useful explanation of internal party dissent over European integration? If the answer to this question is positive, i.e. if present-day dissent over European integration echoes pre-existing tensions, we should observe clear patterns of intra-party dissent. First, internal dissent over European integration should remain relatively stable over time, with changes coinciding with shifts in the character of the EU. And second, party families – reflecting the amalgamation of parties' historical experiences (including their past political divides) – should exhibit predictable patterns of variation in intra-party dissent. Cleavage theory implies durability. The ideologies, social institutions, and configurations of political contestation stemming from traditional social cleavages may not be frozen, but they are also not ephemeral. The influence of such structures persists and continually shapes how actors react to new situations and issues. Strategic theories, by contrast, suggest change. Identities and positions are more fleeting since they reflect how actors manoeuvre to capture votes or to alter the underlying dimensions of competition.

To measure intra-party dissent over European integration, I employ data from fourteen EU member states stemming from three expert surveys carried out in 1996, 1999, and 2002 by researchers at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill.¹⁴ My measure of intra-party dissent is based on a question asking country experts to evaluate the overall level of dissent within national political parties on European integration. For 1996 and 1999, the question utilizes a five-point scale, with the lowest score indicating complete unity and the highest score indicating that the majority of activists are opposed to the party leadership. The central dissent question in the 2002 survey asks experts to evaluate the overall level of dissent on a ten-point scale, ranging from 'a party is completely united' (1) to 'a party is completely divided' (10). For the descriptive section of the empirical analysis, I convert all responses to a ten-point scale to facilitate the merger of data from the three time points. The ordinary least squares (OLS) regression in the later empirical section only incorporates information from the 2002 survey.


On the whole, the data are consistent with a cleavage theory explanation of intra-party dissent. Beginning with the time element, internal party dissent displays little variation over the 1996-2002 period. I assess stability over time for each party family by treating intra-party dissent as a repeated measures variable (since it recurs in 1996, 1999, and 2002) and using the general linear model (GLM) procedure to obtain an analysis of variation. The results of the analysis suggest stability. None of the tests of within-subject effects are significant,

¹⁴ The data are available at http://www.unc.edu/~hooghe/data_pp.php. For exact question wordings and complete descriptions of the data sets, see Ray (1999); Steenbergen and Marks (2007). On the utility of using expert survey data to measure intra-party dissent, see Edwards 2007.

indicating that intra-party dissent does not change considerably across the three time points.¹⁵

The patterns of party family variation illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 are in line with the expectations laid out in the previous section. Figure 1 pools expert survey data from 1996, 1999, and 2002 and charts the proportion of each party family that experiences high (black), medium (grey), and low (white) intra-party dissent. To establish these categories, I determine the mean level of internal dissent for all political parties at each time point. I then ascertain which parties fall one standard deviation or more below the mean point (low dissent parties), one standard deviation or more above the mean point (high dissent parties), and in the middle range (medium dissent parties).

Figure 1: Distribution of parties by intra-party dissent, broken down by party family (1996-2002)



Sources: Ray (1999); Marks and Steenbergen (2007). N=245.

¹⁵ Details are available upon request.


Low dissent is unusual. Only 14 percent of the political parties included in the analysis fall into this category. Indeed, no party family breaks the 33 percent mark (with the liberals coming closest at 29 percent), and two party families – protestant and agrarian – register no parties having low dissent. In the post-Maastricht environment of heightened salience and greater contestation of EU issues, few parties seem able to escape internal dissent.

High dissent, by contrast, varies considerably, ranging from no high dissent parties in the Christian democratic and regionalist families to 57 percent in the case of the agrarians. Both sets of mainstream parties originating in the class cleavage appear prone to dissent, with 30 percent of conservative parties and 18 percent of social democratic parties classified as having high levels of dissent. For conservatives, the historical tension between their national and neoliberal doctrines seems to be exacerbated by the difficult decisions they face in the economic and political spheres of integration. Similarly, the large percentage of social democratic parties marked by dissent is consistent with the notion that market integration highlights the endemic socialist trade-off between protecting national social democratic achievements and pursuing progressive social policies at the transnational level.

Party families are not homogeneous groups. The effects of successive cleavages are filtered through existing institutions and are powerfully shaped by elite interaction in the formation of party systems (Lipset and Rokkan 1967; Sartori 1969; Kitschelt 1997). While differences among party families allow us to explain a large portion of the variance among individual political parties, the power of the cleavage hypothesis is magnified when we peer inside party families.

The graphs below differentiate subsets within the social democratic, conservative, liberal, and radical left party families and chart the proportion of each subgroup that displays high (black), medium (grey), and low (white) intra-party dissent. The purchase gained by adopting this more refined approach is immediately apparent. All four figures are consistent with a cleavage explanation of intra-party dissent, with the conservative and radical left party families exhibiting sharp differences between subsets and the socialist and liberal party families demonstrating milder (though nonetheless significant) differentiation.

Figure 2: Distribution of parties by intra-party dissent, broken down by party family subgroups (1996-2002)



Sources: *Intra-party dissent over European integration*: Ray (1999); Marks and Steenbergen (2007). Party family subgroups: *Conservative* (N=30): Marks and Wilson (2000: 456). *Radical left* (N=35): Coding based on core ideological tendency of party leadership. For coalition parties or parties formed through mergers, the core tenants of each partner are considered. *Socialist* (N=45): Strength of national social democracy is the combined scores for social democratic participation in government, organisational strength of labour, and extent to which resources in a society are allocated authoritatively; see Marks and Wilson (2000: 444). *Liberal* (N=41): Kirchner (1988); Smith (1988), and Beyme (1985).

Focusing on the two cases where variation is the starkest, we find that conservative parties of a national bent are more likely to display high dissent than their neoliberal counterparts. Sixty percent of national conservatives are classified as high dissenters, while no neoliberal parties fall into this category. Comparing mean levels of intra-party dissent for the two groups is also telling: on a ten-point scale running from lower levels of dissent (1) to higher levels of dissent (10), the score of the national conservative parties is 5.9, over two times that of the economic conservative grouping. We likewise see sharp differences between subsets of the radical left party family. While there are no communist high dissent parties, almost one-third of new left parties fit this classification (see Figure 2b). It appears that new left parties such as Denmark's *Socialistisk Folkeparti* (SF) – rooted in popular socialism and the green movement – and Spain's *Izquierda Unida* (IU) – founded by a coalition of communist, humanist, green, and republican parties – face an uphill, and currently losing, battle bringing

together their anti-(economic) integration communist elements and their more pro- (political) integration left-libertarian factions.

Although variation in the socialist party family is less pronounced, Figure 2c shows that high dissent parties are more common in countries with legacies of strong social democracy (27 percent) than in those with weak social democratic traditions (6 percent). The *Socialdemokratiet i Danmark* (SD) and Sweden's *Arbetarepartiet Socialdemokraterna* (SAP) fall into the former category.¹⁶ Given their roles in establishing strong social democracy at home, it has been difficult for these parties to come to terms with a European construct that is characterized by negative integration. Though both the SD and the SAP have formally endorsed the European project of regulated capitalism, vocal factions within each maintain stark opposition (Aylott, 1997, 2002; Lawler, 1997; Sitter, 2001; Lindtröm, 1993; Saglie, 2000).

¹⁶ Note that social democratic dominance has lapsed in both countries recently. The 2001 and 2005 Danish elections resulted in coalitions led by the centre-right *Venstre* (V), and the control of the Swedish SAP ended in 2006 with the ascendancy of the centre-right *Moderata samlingspartiet* (M).

4. A Statistical Model of Intra-party Dissent

Descriptive statistics allow only a limited assessment of the cleavage theory hypothesis. In this section, I conduct a more thorough analysis of intra-party dissent over European integration by developing an *index of cleavage tension*. I use this variable to examine the central hypothesis that prior conflicts within party families and within individual parties are reactivated by the two-pronged nature of European integration (i.e. its economic and political dimensions), leading to internal dissent. I test this proposition using 2002 expert survey data while controlling for other factors, namely electoral system, occurrence of an EU referendum, left/right extremism, government participation, and EU party position.

To date, rigorous testing of the influence of cleavage structure on the positioning and internal dynamics of parties has been negligible. One reason for this is that we lack measures of cleavages at the level of political parties. The standard practice is to operationalise political cleavages using dummy variables for party families; however, this may mask certain nuances integral to the causal story. I address this problem by creating a new measure intended to capture cleavage location as it frames orientations on European integration.

The *index of cleavage tension* is constructed by plotting ten Western European party families (and their subsets) on two scales corresponding to the political and economic dimensions of integration. Both scales range from strongly in favour (+2) to strongly opposed (-2), with zero representing a neutral point. A party family's score on each dimension reflects the prior cleavage structure as it interacts with the character of European integration to shape the party's position, i.e. the scores reflect cleavage location as it frames positioning on the economic and political dimensions of European integration. My expectation is that the difference between the economic and political scores creates a tension that is expressed in political parties as internal dissent. To capture this tension, I measure the distance between a party family's positions on each of the scales. If a party family crosses the midpoint, i.e. if it is moderately or strongly opposed on one dimension and moderately or strongly in favour on the other, the family's score is multiplied by a factor of two. Scoring for the index is derived primarily from estimates in Marks and Wilson (2000: 445, 450, 453, 456) and Marks et al. (2002: 587), supplemented by additional secondary sources (see Table 1).¹⁷

Table 1 provides summary scores of the index of cleavage tension for the various party families and their subsets.

¹⁷ An alternative specification of the cleavage theory hypothesis is to use party family dummies. Such an analysis yields results similar to those presented here (see Edwards 2007).

Table 1: Summary scores of index of cleavage tension

Party Family	Cleavage Location	Position on European Economic Integration	Position on European Political Integration	Secondary Sources ^o	Index of Cleavage Tension
<u>Radical left</u>					
communist	<i>Class cleavage:</i> extreme left on state regulation of markets, welfare, social justice, democratic decision making.	<i>Strongly opposed:</i> integration increases economic inequality and decreases the capacity of national governments to regulate markets. (-2)	<i>Moderately opposed:</i> supranational institutions are inherently undemocratic and controlled by corporate interests. (-1)	Middlemas 1980; Christensen 1996; Kitschelt 1994; Waller & Fennema 1988; Timmermann 1987	1
new left	<i>New politics cleavage:</i> extreme left in some countries; environmental protection, life-style choice, women's and minority rights.		<i>Moderately in favour:</i> supranational institutions may enforce environmental and social standards, but democracy is weakened. (+1)		6
<u>Social democratic</u>					
strong national social democracy	<i>Class cleavage:</i> moderate left position on state regulation of markets, welfare, economic equality.	<i>Moderately opposed:</i> integration boosts regime competition and thereby constrains welfare and other government regulation. (-1)	<i>Strongly in favour:</i> supranational institutions improve capacity for European-wide regulation, though they are insufficiently democratic. (+2)	Butler 1995; Featherstone 1986, 1888; Gillespie 1993; Giddens 1998; Kitschelt 1994; Ladrech 1993, 1997, 2000; Ladrech & Marlière 1999; Notermans 2001; Paterson 1974; Paterson & Thomas 1986; Padgett and Paterson 1991; Piven 1992; Roder 2003; Scharpf 1991, 1999; Wilde 1994; Aylott 1999a, 1999b; Geyer 1997; Haahr 1993	6
weak national social democracy		<i>Moderately in favour:</i> integration increases economic growth. (+1)			1
<u>Green</u>					
	<i>New politics cleavage:</i> environmental protection, life-style choice, women's and minority rights.	<i>Moderately opposed:</i> integration increases economic growth but at the expense of human concerns, including the environment. (-1)	<i>Moderately in favour:</i> supranational institutions may enforce environmental and social standards, but democracy is weakened. (+2)	Knapp 2004; Kitschelt 1989; Taggart 1996; Hainsworth 1990; Rüdig 1990; Kemp & Wall 1990; Burchell 2001; Doherty 1992, 2002; Müller-Rommel 1989; O'Neill 1997; Bomberg 1998; Carter 2001; Bomberg & Carter 2006	4

Party Family	Cleavage Location	Position on European Economic Integration	Position on European Political Integration	Secondary Sources°	Index of Cleavage Tension
<u>Liberal</u>					
conservative/ economic	<i>Centre/periphery cleavage</i> (UK, Germany); <i>church/state cleavage</i> (Low Countries, France, Italy, Spain): opposition to ascription, clericalism, and aristocracy, and support for economic and political freedoms.	<i>Strongly in favour:</i> integration enhances market competition and economic freedoms. (+2)	<i>Neutral:</i> limited supranational authority is necessary to facilitate free markets; however, oppose re-regulation at European level. (0)	Beyme 1985; Salvadori 1977; Smith 1988; Bille & Pedersen 2004; Kirchner 1988; Benedetto & Quaglia 2007; Callot 1988; Guiat 2003	4
radical/political					<i>Strongly in favour:</i> supranationalism moderates nationalism; political freedom from borders increased; however, democracy is weakened. (+2)
<u>Conservative</u>					
economic	<i>Class cleavage:</i> support for free markets, minimal state intervention, and defence of national community.	<i>Strongly in favour:</i> integration extends free markets and pressures competing national governments to reduce market regulation. (+2)	<i>Neutral:</i> limited supranational authority is necessary to facilitate free markets. (0)	Layton-Henry 1980, 1982; Girvin 1988; Baker et al 1993, 1994, 1997, 1999; Demker 1997; Harmel & Svasand 1997; Evans 1998; Garry 1995; Norris & Lovenduski 2004; Alexandre & Jardin 1997; Hainsworth 1999; Sowemimo 1996; Whiteley 1994; Whiteley et al 1999; Whiteley & Seyd 1999; Knapp & Le Gales 1993	4
national					<i>Strongly opposed:</i> supranational authority undermines national sovereignty, national culture, and democracy. (-2)
Christian democratic	<i>Church/state cleavage:</i> support for social market economy, supranational Catholic church, conservative values.	<i>Strongly in favour:</i> integration increases economic growth and limits division within Europe. (+2)	<i>Strongly in favour:</i> supranational institutions provide a capacity for positive regulation while constraining nationalism. (+2)	Durand 1997; Gerard & Hecke 2004; Hanley 1994; Irving 1979; Kalyvas 1996; Lamberts 1997; van Kersbergen 1994; van Hecke 2004	0

Party Family	Cleavage Location	Position on European Economic Integration	Position on European Political Integration	Secondary Sources ^o	Index of Cleavage Tension
Protestant	<i>Church/state cleavage:</i> fundamentalist Lutheran opposition to liberalism, permissiveness, and central state elites.	<i>Moderately in favour:</i> integration weakens the role of the state in the economy. (+1)	<i>Strongly opposed:</i> integration shifts authority further away from national control to a more alien cultural milieu. (-2)	Valen & Rokkan 1974; Karvonen 1994; Madeley 1994, 2004	6
Agrarian	<i>Centre/periphery cleavage</i> (Scandinavia, Switzerland): defence of farmers and the periphery.	<i>Moderately in favour:</i> integration is driven mainly by industrial and commercial interests but includes agriculture subsidies and may entail economic benefits. (+1)	<i>Moderately opposed:</i> shifts authority further away from local control to a more alien cultural milieu. (-1)	Christensen 1997; Elder & Gooderham 1978; Urwin 1980; Arter 2001; Sundberg 1999; Batory & Sitter 2004	4
Regionalist	<i>Centre/periphery cleavage:</i> defence of the ethno-territorial minority against the centre and demand for political autonomy.	<i>Strongly in favour:</i> integration provides an economic framework favourable for regional political autonomy. (+2)	<i>Moderately in favour:</i> supranational authority weakens national control and creates a plural Europe. (+1)	Nielsen 1980; Lancaster 1989; Berger 1977; Cinnirella 2000; Crowley 2000; Dardanelli 2005; de Winter & Türsan 1998; Gallagher 1991; Scheinman 1999, De Winter & Cachafeiro 2002; Jolly 2007	1
Radical right	<i>New politics cleavage:</i> defence of the nation, national culture, and national sovereignty.	<i>Neutral:</i> integration produces losses and undermines national economic control. (0)	<i>Strongly opposed:</i> supranational authority undermines national sovereignty. (-2)	Betz 1984, 1993; Ignazi 1992, 2003; Harris 1994; Poguntke 1993; Fieschi et al 1996; Kitschelt 1997; Carter 2005; Knapp 2004; Givens 2005; Mudde 2000; Cole 2005	4

Notes: This table modifies and extends Marks et al. (2002: 587). Position on European economic/political integration measured on a four-point scale ranging from strongly in favor (+2) to strongly opposed (-2), with 0 representing a neutral point. Index of cleavage tension is the distance between a party family's positions on the European economic/political integration scales. If a party family crosses the midpoint, i.e. if it is moderately or strongly opposed on one dimension and moderately or strongly in favor on the other, the score is multiplied by two, e.g. the index of cleavage tension for national conservatives = 8 [4 (distance) * 2 (crosses midpoint)]. ^oFull citations of the secondary sources are not included in the list of references (due to word restrictions) but are available upon request.

In addition to the main variable of interest, I incorporate a number of controls to account for national and individual party characteristics. At the national level, I control for type of *electoral system* and the occurrence (at any point) of a *referendum* on European integration. Research on parliamentary unity suggests that the institutional setting can have a significant bearing on the internal divisiveness of political parties (Katz 1980; Boueck 2002; Harmel and Janda 1982; Bowler et al. 1999). In particular, parties competing in plurality systems tend to be more internally divided than those competing in proportional representation (PR) systems. There is also good reason to believe that political parties from countries that have held referendums on European integration may be more prone to internal dissent. National referendums take contestation out of the hands of parties and deliver it to citizens who cast votes not for political parties, but for (or often against) a particular issue (Leduc 2002; de Vreese 2006; Hobolt 2006). Consequently, they tend to be ‘flash points’ for the politicisation of EU issues (Hooghe and Marks 2009: 20; also see De Vries 2009) and often lead to party disunity.

At the individual party level, I include controls for *left/right extremism*, *government participation*, and *EU position*. Scholars have shown that peripheral parties that are marginalized on the main left/right axis of contention look for secondary issues (e.g. the EU) on which to compete (Riker 1982; Rabinowitz and Macdonald 1989), a strategy that should only work if the party is relatively united on the issue. Taking into consideration Taggart’s observation that intra-party conflict on the EU ‘seems to be the almost exclusive preserve of governmental parties’ (1998: 372), I also include a variable measuring the length of time a party has spent in office. Finally, I control for a party’s EU position anticipating that pro-integrationist parties will be more united on EU issues than their more Eurosceptic counterparts. Appendix A summarizes the indicators used in the analysis.

Table 2: Analysis of intra-party dissent over European integration

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients (b)	Robust Standard Errors
Index of cleavage tension	0.230*	0.047
Electoral system	0.106	0.169
Referendum	0.070	0.124
Left/right extremism	-0.168	0.277
Government participation	0.004*	0.001
Position	-0.477*	0.129
Constant	5.204*	0.824
R^2	0.510	
N	85	

Notes: Table entries are OLS estimates with robust, cluster-corrected standard errors. All party-level variables have been weighted by vote size. * $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

The OLS regression results presented in Table 2 confirm the cleavage hypothesis. The coefficient for the *index of cleavage tension* is positive and statistically significant. Moreover, computing the predicted probabilities reveals that cleavage tension has a large substantive effect: intra-party dissent increases by 18 percent when the strength of the cleavage tension variable moves from its minimum (1) to its maximum (8) value.¹⁸ These results suggest that current schisms within political parties over European integration are largely manifestations of entrenched, pre-existing hostilities. Internal divisions on EU issues arise when parties are unable to reconcile the two streams – economic and political – of European integration. The findings presented in Table 2 indicate that a political party’s ability to successfully square these two, often competing, aspects of the European project depends on the party’s past experiences.

¹⁸ The predicted probabilities are calculated using CLARIFY (Tomz, Wittenberg, and King 2003).

Conclusion

For much of the EU's history, political parties have avoided politicising integration for fear of provoking internal conflict (Ray 1997; van der Eijk and Franklin 1996; Steenbergen and Scott 2004; Hooghe and Marks 2009: 19). Research has shown that this apprehension is well founded. Disunity stymies the ability of political parties to strategically manipulate EU issue salience (Scott 2001; Steenbergen and Scott 2004; Netjes and Binnema 2007), hampers effective partisan cueing (Ray 2003; Steenbergen et al. 2007; Gabel and Scheve 2007), diminishes electoral popularity (e.g. Evans 1998; Ferrara and Weishaupt 2004), and at its extreme can be the death knell of a political party. But as Hooghe and Marks note: 'With the Maastricht Accord of 1991, decision-making on European integration entered the contentious world of party competition, elections, and referendums' (2009: 7). In other words, conflict over the EU is inescapable in Europe's existing political environment, and it appears that for many political parties so, too, is internal dissent.

Returning to the question posed at the outset, which political parties are most vulnerable to divisive pressures? This article has argued that an answer to this question can be found by applying Lipset and Rokkan's theory of social cleavages. The central thesis posited here is that current rifts within political parties reflect deep-seated tensions rekindled by the dual nature European integration. Consequently, to understand current divides over Europe, such as that faced by France's *Parti Socialiste*, we must turn to their distinctive historical legacies rooted in societal cleavages.

The empirical results presented in this article lend credence to this assertion. Data from expert surveys on party positioning on European integration reveal that intra-party dissent displays stability over time, yet varies in an explicable way across and within party families. Political parties are products of their past, profoundly shaped by their enduring ideological tendencies, long-standing constituency ties, programmatic commitments, and, from a longer historical perspective, by prior crises and upheavals. Embedded historical experience provides a key not only to the positions that political parties take on Europe, but also to the extent to which European issues engender conflict within parties. The findings of this article add to the body of literature on cleavage theory and party positioning, bolstering the notion that historical predispositions rooted in political cleavages provide "prism[s]" through which political parties come to terms with new issues that arise in a polity' (Marks and Wilson 2001: 459). By focusing on internal party dissent, this study addresses a fundamental lacuna in the literature on party politics.

Appendix A: Variable Description

Variables	Description
Intra-party dissent	Degree of dissent within a party on European integration as measured using the following expert survey items: For 1984-99, '[What is] the degree of dissent within the party over the party leadership's position?' (1=complete unity; 5=leadership position opposed by a majority of party activists). For 2002, 'How much internal dissent has there been in the various parties in [COUNTRY] over European integration over the course of 2002?' (1=party is completely united; 10=party is extremely divided). To facilitate comparison over time, all responses are converted to a 10-point scale with lower scores indicating minor dissent and higher scores representing major dissent. <i>Sources:</i> Ray (1999), Marks and Steenbergen (2007).
Index of cleavage tension	A variable capturing the historical experiences or programmatic commitments of political parties. 0=no tension; 8=extreme tension. <i>Sources:</i> See Table 1.
Electoral system	A dummy variable indicating the type of electoral system a country employs. 1=proportional representation (PR with or without thresholds, mixed member PR, Greece's reinforced PR), 0=plurality/majority (first-past-the-post, single transferable vote, France's two round system)
Referendum	A dummy variable indicating that a country has held a referendum on and EU issue. 1=referendum; 0=no referendum.
Left/right extremism	A dummy variable indicating that a party is one standard deviation above or below the mean left/right ideological position of all parties in a given year. <i>Sources:</i> Ray (1999), Marks and Steenbergen (2007).
Government participation	Cumulative months a political party has been in government since 1980.
EU position	EU position as measured using the following item: "[What is] the overall orientation of the party leadership toward European integration?" (1=strongly opposed to integration; 7=strongly in favour of integration). This variable was centred on the mean. <i>Sources:</i> Ray (1999), Marks and Steenbergen (2007).

References

- Alesina, Alberto, and Romain Spoaore (2003). *The Size of Nations*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Alexandre, Agnès and Xavier Jardin (1997). 'From the Europe of Nations to the European Nation? Attitudes of French Gaullist and Centrist Parliamentarians', in Charles Pattie, David Denver, and Steve Ludlam (eds.), *British Elections and Parties Review*, Vol. 7. London: Frank Cass, 185-206.
- Arter, David (2001). *From Farmyard to City Square? The Electoral Adaptation of the Nordic Agrarian Parties*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Aylott, Nicholas (2002). 'Let's Discuss this Later: Party Responses to Euro-division in Scandinavia', *Party Politics*, 8:4, 441-61.
- Aylott, Nicholas (1997). 'Between Europe and Unity: The Case of the Swedish Social Democrats', *West European Politics*, 20:2, 119-36.
- Baker, David, Andrew Gamble, and Steve Ludlam (1994). 'The Parliamentary Siege of Maastricht 1993: Conservative Divisions and British Ratification', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 47:1, 37-60.
- Baker, David, Andrew Gamble, and Steve Ludlam (1993). 'Conservative Splits and European Integration', *Political Quarterly*, 64(2): 420-435.
- Bartolini, Stefano and Peter Mair (1990). *Identity, Competition and Electoral Availability: The Stabilization of European Electorates 1885-1985*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Batory, Agnes, and Nick Sitter (2004). 'Cleavages, Competition and Coalition-Building: Agrarian Parties and the European Question in Western and East Central Europe', *European Journal of Political Research*, 43:4, 523-46.
- Betz, Hans-Georg (1993). 'The New Politics of Resentment: Radical Right-Wing Populist Parties in Western Europe', *Comparative Politics*, 25:4, 413-27.
- Beyme, Klaus von (1985). *Political Parties in Western Democracies*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Boueck, Françoise (2002). 'The Structure and Dynamics of Intra-Party Politics in Europe', *Perspectives on European Society*, 3:3, 453-93.

- Bowler, Shaun, David M. Farrell, and Richard S. Katz, eds. (1999). *Party Discipline and Parliamentary Government*. Columbus: Ohio State Press.
- Bomberg, Elizabeth (2002). 'The Europeanisation of Green Parties: Exploring the EU's Impact', *West European Politics*, 25:3, 29-50.
- Bomberg, Elizabeth, and Neil Carter (2006). 'The Greens in Brussels: Shaping or Shaped?', *European Journal of Political Research*, 45:S1, S99-S125.
- Burchell, Jon (2001). 'Evolving or Conforming? Assessing Organisational Reform within European Green Parties', *West European Politics*, 24:3, 113-34.
- Christensen, Dag Arne (1996). 'The left-wing opposition in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden', *West European Politics*, 19:3, 525-46.
- Cole, Alistair (2005). 'Old Right or New Right? The Ideological Positioning of Parties of the Far Right', *European Journal of Political Research*, 44:2, 203-30;
- Crum, Ben. (2007). 'Party Stances in the Referendums on the EU Constitution: Causes and Consequences of Competition and Collusion', *European Union Politics*, 8:1, 61-82.
- Dalton, Russell J., Scott C. Flanagan, and Paul Allen Beck, eds. (1984). *Electoral Change in Advanced Industrialized Democracies: Realignment or Dealignment?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- De Vreese, Claes (2006). 'Political Parties in Dire Straits? Consequences of National Referendums for Political Parties', *Party Politics*, 12:5, 581-598.
- De Vries, Catherine E. (2009). 'The Impact of EU Referenda on National Electoral Politics: The Dutch Case', *West European Politics*, 32:1, 142-71.
- De Vries, Catherine. E., and Erica E. Edwards (2009). 'Taking Europe to its Extremes: Extremist Parties and Public Euroscepticism', *Party Politics*, 15:1, 5-28.
- Edwards, Erica E. (2007). 'United We Stand? Examining Dissent within Political Parties on Issues of European Integration', presented at the 10th Biennial EUSA Conference, Montreal.
- Eijk, Cees van der, and Mark Franklin (1996). *Choosing Europe? The European Electorate and National Politics in the Face of Union*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

De Winter, Lieven, and Margarita G. Cachafeiro (2002). 'European Integration and Ethno-Regionalist Parties', *Party Politics*, 8:4, 483-503.

Featherstone, Kevin (1988). *Socialist Parties and European Integration: A Comparative History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ferrara, Federico, and J. Timo Weishaupt (2004). 'Get Your Act Together: Party Performance in European Parliament Elections', *European Union Politics*, 5:3, 283-306.

Fieschi, Catherine, James Shields, and Roger Woods (1996). 'Extreme Right-Wing Parties and the European Union: France Germany, and Italy', in John Gaffney (ed.), *Political Parties and the European Union*. New York: Routledge, 235-53.

Flanagan, Scott. C. (1987). 'Changing Values in Advanced Industrial Society Revisited: Towards a Resolution of the Values Debate', *American Political Science Review*, 8, 1203-19.

Franklin, Mark (1992). 'The Decline of Cleavage Politics', in Mark Franklin, Thomas Mackie, and Henry Valen (eds.), *Electoral Change: Responses to Evolving Social and Attitudinal Structures in Western Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 383-405.

Gabel, Matthew, and Kenneth Scheve (2007). 'Mixed Messages: Party Dissent and Mass Opinion', *European Union Politics*, 8:1, 37-59.

Giddens, Anthony (1998). *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gillespie, Richard (1993). 'A Programme for Social Democratic Revival?', *West European Politics*, 16, 174-178.

Hainsworth, Paul (1990). 'Breaking the Mould: The Greens in the French Party System', in Alistair. Cole (ed.), *French Political Parties in Transition*. London: Dartmouth, 91-105.

Harmel, Robert, and Kenneth Janda (1982). *Parties and Their Environments: Limits to Reform?* New York: Longman.

Harris, Geoffrey (1994). *The Dark Side of Europe: The Extreme Right Today*. London: Edinburgh University Press.

- Hix, Simon (1999). 'Dimensions and Alignments in European Union Politics: Cognitive Constraints and Partisan Responses', *European Journal of Political Research*, 35:1, 69-125.
- Hix, Simon, and Christopher Lord (1997). *Political Parties in the European Union*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Hobolt, Sara Binzer (2006). 'How Parties Affect Vote Choice in European Integration Referendums', *Party Politics*, 12:5, 623-647.
- Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks (2009). 'A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus', *British Journal of Political Science*, 39:1, 1-23.
- Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks (1999). 'The Making of a Polity: The Struggle over European Integration', in Herbert Kitschelt, Peter Lange, Gary Marks, and John Stephens (eds.), *Continuity and Change in Contemporary Capitalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 70-97.
- Hooghe, Liesbet, Gary Marks, and Carole Wilson (2004). 'Does Left/Right Structure Party Positions on European Integration', in Gary Marks and Marco Steenbergen (eds.), *European Integration and Political Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 120-40.
- Huber, Evelyne, and John Stephens (2001). *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State: Parties and Policies in Global Markets*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ignazi, Piero (1992). 'The Silent Counter-Revolution: Hypotheses on the Emergence of Extreme Right-Wing Parties in Europe', *European Journal of Political Research*, 22:1, 3-24
- Inglehart, Ronald (1990). *Cultural Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ivaldi, Gilles (2006). 'Beyond France's 2005 Referendum on the European Constitutional Treaty: Second-Order Model, Anti-Establishment Attitudes and the End of the Alternative European Utopia', *West European Politics*, 29:1, 47-69.
- Jolly, Seth K. (2007). 'The Europhile Fringe? Regionalist Party Support for European Integration', *European Union Politics*, 8:1, 109-30.

Karvonen, Lauri (1994). 'Christian Parties in Scandinavia: Victory Over the Windmills?', in David Hanley (ed.), *Christian Democracy in Europe: A Comparative Perspective*. London: Pinter, 121-41.

Katz, Richard (1980). *A Theory of Parties and Electoral Systems*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kemp, Penny, and Derek Wall (1990). *A Green Manifesto for the 1990s*. London: Penguin.

Kitschelt, Herbert (2001). 'Politische Konfliktlinien in westlichen Demokratien: Etnisch-kulturelle und wirtschaftliche Verteilungskonflikte', in Dietmar Loch and Wilhelm Heitmeyer (eds.), *Schattenseiten der Globalisierung*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 418-42.

Kitschelt, Herbert (1997). 'European Party Systems: Continuity and Change', in Paul Heywood, Erik Jones, and Martin Rhodes (eds.), *Developments in West European Politics*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 131-50.

Kitschelt, Herbert (1994). *The Transformation of European Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitschelt, Herbert, and Anthony J. McGann (1997). *The Radical Right in Western Europe*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Kriesi, Hanspeter (2007). 'The Role of European Integration in National Election Campaigns', *European Union Politics*, 8:1, 83-108.

Kriesi, Hanspeter (1998). 'The Transformation of Cleavage Politics', *European Journal of Political Research*, 33:2, 165-85.

Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Romain Lachat, Martin Dolezal, Simon Bornschieer, and Timotheos Frey (2006). 'Globalization and the Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Countries Compared', *European Journal of Political Research*, 45:6, 921-56.

Ladrech, Robert (2000). *Social Democracy and the Challenge of the European Union*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Ladrech, Robert (1997). 'Partisanship and Party Formation in European Union Politics', *Comparative Politics*, 29, 167-185.

- Ladrech, Robert (1993). 'Social Democratic Parties and EC Integration: Transnational Party Responses to Europe 1992', *European Journal of Political Research*, 24:2, 195-210.
- Ladrech, Robert and Philippe Marlière (1999). *Social Democratic Parties in the European Union: History, Organization, Policies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Lawler, Peter (1997). 'Scandinavian Exceptionalism and the European Union', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 35:4, 565-94.
- Le Pen, Jean-Marie (1984). *Les Français d'abord*. Paris: Carrère-Lafon.
- Leduc, Lawrence (2002). 'Opinion Change and Voting Behaviour in Referendums', *European Journal of Political Research*, 41:6, 711-32.
- Lindtröm, Ulf (1993). *Euro-Consent, Euro-Contract, or Euro-Coercion? Scandinavian Social Democracy, the European Impasse, and the Abolition of All Things Political*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Lindström, Ulf, and Ingemar Wörlund (1988). 'The Swedish Liberal Party: The Politics of Unholy Alliances', in Emil Kirchner (ed.), *Liberal Parties in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 252-78.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Stein Rokkan (1967). 'Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: An Introduction', in Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan (eds.), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross National Perspectives*. New York: Free Press, 1-64.
- Madeley, John T. S. (2004). 'Life at the Northern Margin: Christian Democracy in Scandinavia', in Steven van Hecke and Emmanuel Gerard (eds.), *Christian Democratic Parties in Europe Since the End of the Cold War*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 217-42.
- Mair, Peter. (2000). 'The Limited Impact of Europe on National Party Systems', *West European Politics*, 23: 4, 52-72.
- Mair, Peter (1997). *Party System Change*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marks, Gary, Liesbet Hooghe, Moira Nelson, and Erica Edwards (2006). 'Party Competition and European Integration in East and West: Different Structure, Same Causality', *Comparative Political Studies*, 39:2, 155-75.

Marks, Gary, and Marco Steenbergen (2004). *European Integration and Political Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marks, Gary, and Carole Wilson (2000). 'The Past in the Present: A Cleavage Theory of Party Positions on European Integration', *British Journal of Political Science*, 30, 433-59.

Marks, Gary, Carole Wilson, and Leonard Ray (2002). 'National Political Parties and Integration', *American Journal of Political Science*, 46:3, 585-94.

Milward, Alan (1992). *The Rescue of the Nation-State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Müller-Rommel, Ferdinand, ed. (1989). *New Politics in Western Europe: The Rise and Success of Green Parties and Alternative Lists*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Netjes, Catherine E., and Harmen A. Binnema (2007). 'The Saliency of the European Integration Issue: Three Data Sources Compared', *Electoral Studies* 26:1, 39-49.

Padgett, Stephen, and William E. Paterson (1991). *A History of Social Democracy in Postwar Europe*. London: Longman.

Pierson, Paul, ed. (2001). *The New Politics of the Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Piven, Francis. F. (1992). 'The Decline of Labour Parties: An Overview', in Francis. F. Piven (ed.), *Labour Parties in Postindustrial Societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-19.

Poguntke, Thomas (1993). *Alternative Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Rabinowitz, George, and Stuart E. Macdonald (1989). 'A Directional Theory of Issue Voting', *American Journal of Political Science* 83, 93-121.

Ray, Leonard (2003). 'When Parties Matter: The Conditional Influence of Party Positions on Voter Opinion about European Integration', *Journal of Politics*, 65:4, 978-94.

Ray, Leonard (1997). 'Politisizing Europe: Political Parties and the Changing Nature of Public Opinion about the EU', PhD theseis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Ray, Leonard (1999). 'Measuring Party Orientations towards European Integration: Results

from and Expert Survey', *European Journal of Political Research*, 36:2, 283-306.

Riker, William H. (1982). *Liberalism Against Populism: A Confrontation between the Theory of Democracy and the Theory of Social Choice*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co.

Saglie, Jo (2000). 'Between Opinion Leadership and "Contract of Disagreement": The Norwegian Labour Party and the European Issue (1988–1994)', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 23:2, 93–113.

Sartori, Giovanni (1969). 'From the Sociology of Politics to Political Sociology', *Government and Opposition*, 4:2, 195-214.

Scott, David J. (2001). 'The Salience of European Integration: The Strategic Behavior of National Political Parties in the European Union', PhD thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Sillars, Jim (1986). *Scotland, The Case for Optimism*. Edinburgh: Polygon.

Sitter, Nick (2001). 'The Politics of Opposition and European Integration in Scandinavia: Is Euro-scepticism a Government-Opposition Strategy?', *West European Politics*, 24:4, 22-39.

Smith, Gordon (1988). 'Between Left and Right: The Ambivalence of European Liberalism', in Emil Kirchner (ed.), *Liberal Parties in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 16-28.

Steenbergen, Marco, 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, 39-49.

Steenbergen, Marco, and Gary Marks (2007). 'Evaluating Expert Judgments', *European Journal of Political Research*, 46:3, 347-66.

Steenbergen, Marco, and David Scott (2005). 'Contesting Europe? The Salience of European Integration as a Party Issue', in Gary Marks and Marco Steenbergen (eds.), *European Integration and Political Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 165-92.

Sundberg, Jan (1999). 'The Enduring Scandinavian Party System', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 22:3, 221-41.

Taggart, Paul (1998). 'A Touchstone of Dissent: Euroscepticism in Contemporary Western European Party Systems', *European Journal of Political Research*, 33, 363-88.

Tomz, Michael, Jason Wittenberg, and Gary King (2003). 'CLARIFY: Software for Interpreting and Presenting Statistical Results', *Journal of Statistical Software*, 8.

Urwin, Derek W. (1980). *From Ploughshare to Ballot Box: The Politics of Agrarian Defence in Europe*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Valen, Henry, and Stein Rokkan (1974). 'Norway: Conflict Structure and Mass Politics in a European Periphery', in Richard Rose (ed.), *Electoral Behaviour: A Comparative Handbook*. New York: Free Press, 315-70.

Verdug, Evert (1989). 'Sweden: The Miljöparti De Gröna', in Ferdinand Müller-Rommel (ed.), *New Politics in Western Europe: The Rise and Success of Green Parties and Alternative Lists*. Boulder: Westview Press, 139-53.

Weßels, Bernhard (1995). 'Evaluations of the EC: Elite or Mass Driven?', in Oskar Niedermayer and Richard Sinnott (eds.), *Public Opinion and Internationalized Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 105-36.

Zuckerman, Alan S. (1982). 'New Approaches to Political Cleavages: A Theoretical Introduction', *Comparative Political Studies*, 15:2, 131-44.

Author: Erica E. Edwards

Title: Products of Their Past? Cleavages and Intra-Party Dissent over European Integration

Reihe Politikwissenschaft / Political Science Series 118

Editor: Guido Tiemann

Associate Editor: Elisabet Torggler

ISSN: 1605-8003

© 2009 by the Department of Political Science, Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS),
Stumpergasse 56, A-1060 Vienna • ☎ +43 1 59991-0 • Fax +43 1 59991-555 • <http://www.ihs.ac.at>
