

CHAPTER III

Election Manifestos and Programmes

In both ideological groups of parties the same *items* are analysed in their election manifestos, but for both the order of items varies in their presentation, depending on the quantitative *relevance* offered in the texts. With three dimensions (national sovereignty/democracy deficit/neoliberalism) the placing of the second never changes, but the first and third do: for the radical right the presentation order is national sovereignty/democracy deficit/neoliberalism, while for the radical left it is neoliberalism/democratic deficit/national sovereignty. Indeed, national sovereignty is a core issue of the radical right and its study focuses on two areas: the general rejection of the supranational EU policy and the migration issue (with the additional question of Turkey) as these form part of the “hard core” essentialist discourse of the radical right in relation to the bulk of its criticism of the EU. This does not detract from the fact that it also severely judges democratic shortcomings in the community and even its neoliberal policies for being prejudicial precisely for the national interest. In contrast, criticisms from the radical left focus on the direct denouncement of the EU’s current social and economic policies and their excessively discriminatory consequences for citizens. The democratic deficit of the EU is the main reason for considering the principle of national sovereignty actual and defensible which needs to be linked to popular interests.

One must bear in mind that the electoral manifestos of the 22 selected parties are very different both for their quantitative extension (although, in general, they are rather brief) and in their qualitative scope given to some or other items. In addition, the letter fonts and spaces vary, as well as the fact of having graphic illustrations or not, hence the indicator of their reach should be observed with some caution. In general, it is evident that the manifestos of the radical right are shorter, while the radical left tend to be longer and more extensive.

Table 1

Radical right (number of pages from lowest to highest):

PVV: 1
VB (b): 1 *
FPÖ: 2
UKIP: 2
LN: 3 **
LAOS (b): 3 ***
PRM: 3
FN: 4
DF: 6
NSA: 9
LAOS (a): 24 ****
JMM: 56
VB(a): 145 *****

Real Total: 117 pages.

* Programme for the European Elections 2009

** Programme for the local and European elections 2009
(The text has 63 pages of which three are on the EU)

*** Foreign Policy Programme

**** European Elections Programme 2009

***** Flemish Programme for the 2009 Election
(includes 3 pages of scattered European references)

Table 2

Radical left (number of pages from lowest to highest):

KSCM: 2
AKEL: 5
FG: 5
SYRIZA: 9
VP: 9
CDU-PCP: 12
SF: 15 *
BE: 16
KKE: 21
DL: 24
IU: 52

Real total: 170 pages.

* The English version occupies 15 pages and Gaelic and the other 15.

The Radical Right

1. National sovereignty

1.1. The rejection of political federalism

- The PVV is completely opposed to a possible European super-state as “nobody wants a supranational state. [It would mean] even more bureaucrats, more regulations, more taxes”, hence it only supports economic cooperation, strictly delineated through specific, independent treaties.

- For the UKIP the EU is a unbearable corset for the UK and so defends its proposal for the UK’s exit from the same since “leaving the EU will allow us to regain control and put British interests in front of European interests”. Its economic criteria is unmistakable: “We want a friendly relationship and free trade with all our neighbours, but NOT [*sic*] a political union”. Consequently, the “UKIP believes that the UK should leave the EU and our current membership should be replaced by a genuine free trade agreement similar to that enjoyed by other non-member nations of the EU such as Switzerland, Norway and Mexico”.

- The VB criticises the Lisbon Treaty because with it “the evolution towards a federal Europe has been strengthened” and that “we are against the European super-state which intervenes in all competences of member-states: the Nation States must remain the cornerstones of any future European collaboration” (VB b). For the VB the key is “the protection of Flemish interests, national sovereignty, the right of self-determination” which could fit into “a confederal Europe, in which the states retain their sovereignty” (VB a).

- The opposition of the JMM to the EU is very articulate, as is its alternative proposal, and both premises are based on the radical defence of the ever prioritised national interest. The JMM explicitly aligns with the forces “called Eurosceptic” that want to counter the dominant EU line favouring maximum supranationality: [the EU] “is already positioned over the states” and is heading towards the European super-state, making national independence impossible, a scenario that “must be rejected”. Indeed, for the JMM, “the central power of Brussels and the political elite that is linked to it (...) is planning to open the way for the United States of Europe, which will finally eradicate national states”. According to this political group, the pro-EU Hungarian parties have hidden the fact that integration would mean “giving up a large part of national independence”. After regaining freedom with the disappearance of the Soviet empire, now Hungary is being required to voluntarily give up its independence. Consequently, “a solid federal system of

bureaucrats, like a new breed”, has been created – strengthened by “the Treaty of Lisbon (...) [that] could be described as an important stage in the process of European empire building”.

From this diagnosis, the JMM believes that there is an alternative to the current EU: the “Europe of Nations” in counterpoint to the project of political union. This party supports “flexible forms of economic cooperation” meanwhile the right to self-determination and national sovereignty is respected. In its view, “Euroscepticism” is in reality “Eurosrealism” because “the peoples of Europe do not want to be part of an empire”. In short, the JMM argues that Hungary’s national interests could be better defended with its proposal, in line with its nationalist ideology, offered in the benefit not only of all citizens of the Republic of Hungary, but also for “all Hungarians living in national regions that have been separated from the country”. This is what leads it to demand a closer cooperation between the CEECs because objectively they have common interests to defend against the current EU.

- According to the LN, the EU unceasingly increases the centralisation of power in Brussels, with its “top down” decision making process without the consent of the people. The European integration process “is leading to a real and strictly continental super-state, whose democratic level, in fact, is nonexistent”. The LN opposes this “intrusive” EU and warns “of the danger to European peoples due to the imposed homogenisation by the Community institutions”. In this sense, this group states with determination that they “absolutely do not want to make the EU states “disappear” in the name of a supranational principle”. The LN is now habitually classified as a “eurosceptical” group, something that it no longer rejects, “perhaps because of these ‘eurosceptical’ positions, Europe is starting to discuss the revision of itself”.

In any case, the LN stated that “it is not against Europe in itself” and admits that there are common elements of identity, but this cannot lead to uniformity. On the one hand, the LN advocates the necessary formalisation of the “Christian roots” in European treaties, and accepts the strictly confederal institutional embodiment of the same. In effect, the LN confirms adherence to the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity traditionally wielded by the Catholic Church’s social doctrine and therefore states that “the Christian roots of our continent are the real glue that holds European peoples with diverse languages and traditions together”. With this, the LN requires the protection of the traditional family and roundly rejects any supranational provisions recognising unions of people of the same sex. Finally, the LN may accept an EU of strictly inter-governmental cooperation: “We want an EU based on a confederal model in which the member States maintain their own

sovereignty unchanged and where the particular Regional and territorial specificities and differences are recognised”.

- For the DF it is impossible and absurd to try to unite the EU with one policy given its substantial internal differences, “the DF is opposed to treating all people equally and against destroying the cultural and religious bases or creating a new European people. It may sound tempting, but it is not the way and can not be forced”. This party is against the regulatory expansion of the EU and opposes the possibility that this would in itself entitle the imposition of taxes on citizens of its various countries. So, “any attempt to create a European Constitution should be rejected” because that would mean that “a federal State would remove power from European peoples and create a small, only formally democratic elite, utterly remote from citizens”.

The DF, however, could accept intergovernmental economic cooperation with full respect for the sovereignty of States. In addition, in security matters, it would even be convenient to strengthen this cooperation in the fight against terrorism and organised crime, but without leading to the creation of a European police force that the DF rejects. Apart from that, according to this party “military security in Europe can only be preserved through cooperation in NATO”. In summary, for the DF the Danish Constitution must be *above* the regulation of the EU and Denmark has to preserve its right of veto and its capacity to decide essential issues for itself. The functions of the EU should be limited only to those issues in which the majority of the population of the member countries agree to delegate, for those tasks of a cross-border nature which may require common solutions and for mutually beneficial areas.

- The FPÖ argues that Austrian parties of the *establishment* “want the transformation of the EU into a centralised state (...) with Austria losing its freedom and neutrality”. The party defends the need to call binding referendums for any amendment of the Treaties, guarantee the maintenance of Austrian neutrality, keep Austria’s veto in community affairs and, of course, calls for a “Europe of nations” versus a “federal State designed by Brussels”. Also, as nationalist party, it is concerned about the fact that the German language is receding in EU institutions in favour of English and even French. For the FPÖ German should be preferred working language in the EU along with the other two mentioned.

- The NSA defines itself as a Bulgarian nationalist party whose purpose is to unite all ethnic Bulgarians and those of Bulgarian conscience [*sic*] – its main demand being to ensure national independence (its central slogan is “Give back Bulgaria the Bulgarians!”). The NSA is

against all international and supranational organisations that limit the sovereignty of the Bulgarian state and threaten whole sectors of economy with ruin. National reconstruction has to reinforce the character of Bulgarian as an official language in the country and the fundamentally central role of the Orthodox church has to be recognised.

- LAOS feels fully identified with the “eurosceptical” group in which it is integrated in the EP (this is the party that does not have the slightest inconvenience in being characterised as such). From their point of view, “Greece must preserve the right of veto on issues of vital national importance” (LAOS b). In any case, this party does not advocate a disengagement from the EU, given certain conditions:

We believe the future of our country is significantly associated with the EU and we support the integration of all European countries into a viable Union, something only possible if this is established as a confederation where historical, cultural and national roots and in particular the specific national characteristics of the peoples of Europe are protected. We believe in a Europe of nations. (LAOS b)

Finally, the particular nationalist obsession of LAOS is its radical opposition to the possible entry of Macedonia (the former Yugoslav Republic this party always calls Skopje, the name of the capital): “Macedonia” would be a “denomination of origin” whose *ownership* corresponds exclusively to Greece. Furthermore, according to LAOS, “Skopje” would not adequately protect the rights of its ethnic minorities and while the denomination of Macedonia is not removed (not even FYROM is accepted by this party) nothing can begin to be negotiated (LAOS a).

- The PRM is limited in its brief manifesto to asserting a defence of national sovereignty: on the one hand, this party commits itself to “be firm in negotiations with the EU to obtain equal opportunities for Romania compared to other Member States” and on the other, to “maintain and promote Romanian identity, traditions and customs.”

- For the FN the EU represents a mortal threat to the peoples of Europe, “the Europe of Brussels has not been an effective (defensive) barrier for our nation and its citizens, on the contrary, it has been the cause and factor of aggravation”. The FN “says the way forward is not that of Euroglobalism in the hands of a small group that is recruited by co-optation: “Eurocracy”; this is not the way of the “*European Soviet Union*” (emphasis on the original). So, the FN is radically against a European superstate since this would destroy identities, sovereignty and freedoms of the people:

National entities resolutely combat criminal EU developments. *This rejection of a Euroglobalist Super-State is in accordance with the true*

European tradition since Europe (...) has invented the freedom and equality of nations (emphasis on the original) (...) Yes, Europe and the world still needs France!

As a logical corollary of this ultranationalist thesis the FN rejects both “European citizenship”, much like the CFSP/ESDP: first, national citizenship should be preserved at all costs against the risk of a possible “absorption” into a “European citizenship”, embodying the submission of nations and secondly, the current foreign and defence policy of the EU leads its members to participate in “conflicts that are not ours, such as the absurd wars against Iraq and Serbia”.

The FN claims to have “another” idea of Europe “the right direction excludes neither European consultation nor industrial, cultural or other cooperation. But it implies a *radical break* with the global system” (emphasis on the original). In this sense, this group asserts that “the French FN patriots (...) are not ‘against Europe’ as a geographical, human or cultural reality, or against any form of European cooperation” because they acknowledge that, despite its profound diversity, there is “a certain common cultural heritage of the peoples of Europe”. Its proposal is that of a “Europe of nations” giving full guarantees to its people: “Europe can not be strong if the *Nations* [*sic*] that constitute it are not also strong, prosperous, independent, sovereign and respected”. Of course, this essentialist revaluation of the national bases of the peoples of Europe means that the “moral and spiritual values” of Christian roots must be faithfully respected.

Table 1

Primacy of National Sovereignty	All
Christian roots	LN NSA FN
No to a European federal state	PVV VB JMM LN DF FPÖ NSA FN

Yes to a European confederation of intergovernmental cooperation	VB JMM LN DF LAOS FN UKIP
Abandon the EU	

1.2. Turkey and non-EU immigration

- The PVV is opposed to further enlargement of the EU, “the European Union is too big. Enough. Each new member means more money for Brussels and a decrease in Holland’s power to decide. So there should be no further accessions to the EU. Corrupt states like Romania and Bulgaria have to be expelled”. In any case, the maximum hostility this party has is focused on Turkey: the intro title of its programme dedicated to its nomination is entitled “Turkey will never be welcome”. The PVV argues that by 2050 there will be a hundred million Turks and that their state, as a member of the EU, will dominate Brussels, supposedly a very damaging scenario for Europe and the Netherlands. Consequently, “as we in the PVV say: Turkey will not be an EU member now or in the next hundred years. Islamic culture is a culture diametrically opposed to ours”. For this party, It is precisely in this last Islamophobic consideration the central justification of its exclusionary criteria resides.

The intro title of the PVV’s program dedicated to immigration is entitled: “Eurabia or Europe?” (Confusing, incidentally, what is Arabic and what is Muslim). In parallel with the routine strategy of populist parties of the radical right, immigration, Islamisation and insecurity are associated – “mass immigration and Islamisation are a disaster for Europe and the Netherlands. The Islamisation of Europe and the Netherlands has to stop. So we want to decide who to admit and who not to. The right to veto on immigration must be maintained. In our country, we decide. There is enough Islam in Holland”.

- UKIP rejects the open-door policy with regard to the immigration, “the expansion of the EU encourages uncontrolled immigration (...). Our public services are crumbling under the pressure of more than a million people who have come to our country”.

- The VB states that “Turkey is not European but Asian. Turkey is an Islamic country that is not part of the European tradition” so it is necessary to “stop the negotiations for Turkey’s accession” (VB b). This party uses a closed cultural argument to demand “limiting the EU to

nations belonging to European civilization: so, Turkey can not be a member of the Union” (VBa).

Given the particularly xenophobic character of the VB (the *issue* of immigration is the most electorally profitable it has), it is not a coincidence that its manifesto is very detailed on this topic. For the VB: “the tide of illegal immigration is unstoppable and therefore we want a true ‘fortress Europe’ [*sic*] with impermeable borders”. This party requires that regularised immigrants be obliged to integrate by passing an “integration test” [*sic*], *conditio sine qua non* to obtain the right to permanent residence. In its view, “immigrants have to adapt to our culture, our norms and values, our customs and important traditional principles that have been developed on European soil”. In any case, the reception of new immigrants should be completely stopped, illegal immigrants repatriated, minimise family reunification and prevent “abuse” of asylum:

“On European soil, only European asylum seekers will be hosted” (somewhat anachronistic today with the automatic recognition of extradition between European countries). But the religious dimension is the most exploited by this party, “European states should formulate a draconian response [*sic*] to Islamisation and demand that Muslims living in Europe accept our values and our laws”. According to this thesis, some Muslim practices “are not just different from ours, (...) they are unacceptable (...). They violate treaties on European human rights”. With this diagnosis, the prescriptions of the VB are extremely restrictive and, indeed, many of them are contrary to Community treaties: withdraw recognition and subsidies for Muslim centres, ban the veil in public facilities, reserve job vacancies in the public sector for nationals, limit the free movement of people, abolish dual citizenship, prevent foreigners from voting in municipal elections and encourage repatriation agreements with third countries (VB and b).

- JMM only mentions minority issues with regard to one group inside the country and very relevant to Hungary: the Roma gypsies. The party rejects the official policies of positive discrimination for this group and that – in its opinion – the promotion of the Roma in education and employment should be done without the privileges that the current formula provides.

- The LN says that Turkey has no “European features” theirs being far from what is common in EU States. The LN cites Giscard d’Estaing and Angela Merkel as authoritative sources for the rejection of Turkey’s candidature, adding that Turkey’s democratic standards are notoriously inadequate. However, the LN asserts that there are powers outside Europe, such as the U.S., who would be the most interested in such an

outcome. From this viewpoint, it would be a totally conditioned guarantee to expand its strategic influence in Europe and weaken it even further. With this in mind, the LN adds two additional issues: Christian roots and polls. With the first, “Turkey’s entry into Europe would also provoke the collapse of the very concept of a Europe based on certain cultural and spiritual roots. Roots, we repeat again, that are Christian [with a capital “C”]. With the second, all the polls confirm that the majority of citizens reject the accession of Turkey – as opposed to the “political class” – and not to satisfy their demands would be undemocratic. On immigration, the LN demands well regulated movements not only for economic factors, but also for social and cultural considerations with an increasing trend towards border closures.

For the DF the constant enlargement of the EU is making the decision process increasingly difficult. The DF is concerned about the incorporation of new unstable States and, in any case, is opposed to integrating countries alien to “Western culture.” The DF believes that the strategy of enlargements is an attempt to create a European federal state, even though – in practice – this increasingly complicates the deepening of integration. This party argues that Turkey “is not a European country and [its] culture is incompatible with Europe”. Randomly combining geographical, cultural and social arguments, it states: “Turkey belongs to the Middle East and its citizens are not European. Turkey is influenced by culture and social norms that are far from Europe and this is reason enough to refuse it membership of the EU”. To more fully justify its rejection, the DF mentions the situation of women, occupation of northern Cyprus, high corruption, weak judicial independence, torture and denial of rights to ethnic minorities. Moreover, given its high population growth, in 2020 Turkey would be the most populous state in the EU and this would have an unbearable economic cost given its enormously underdeveloped agriculture. In conclusion, the DF agrees to increase cooperation with Turkey, but not incorporating it as a community partner.

According to this party, the EU immigration policy is totally misconceived because you can not open doors to people foreign to Western culture without their at least acquiring a minimum knowledge of it. Because of this, the EU policies of always attracting new waves of immigrants will cause “an unprecedented chaos” and also “attract less qualified people”. Again the usual Islamophobia blooms in this party when it asserts that “increased immigration into the EU will lead to a devastating Islamisation of Europe”. To sum up, “the DF believes that Denmark should maintain its right to ensure its own independent immigration policy” and, beyond this, that it must be the whole EU that stops the new influxes.

- The FPÖ argues that “Europe must end at its geographical borders”, an entirely arbitrary and useless conventional criteria because of its impossible objective determination. Its position is to immediately stop negotiations for Turkey’s accession to the EU. Its main critical arguments are concerned with certain international guarantees of Turkey with regard to the alleged dangers of Islam. In the first case, defending Turkey’s candidacy would be to convert oneself into a “henchmen of U.S. interests”. In the second, radical Islam and illegal immigration are associated with Turkey in a biased and unprovable way – for the FPÖ those who defend its candidacy provoke a return of radical Islam in Europe and mass emigration of Turks into Austria, with negative consequences for the people” and even for all the “Christian West”. Therefore, the sequence for the FPÖ is clear: Turkey’s accession would be a boon for radical Islamism and uncontrolled immigration. Consequently, the FPÖ demands the holding of a referendum in Austria on the possible incorporation of Turkey into the EU for the people to decide and that, from their perspective, you can not keep taking decisions of this calibre from behind citizens’ backs. In any case, you could offer Turkey a partnership agreement, but never integration.

For the FPÖ, on one hand, costly social benefits for those from outside the EU should be cut and on the other, the open door policy that has caused the increase in crime in Austria needs to be stopped: “Spain legalised thousands of illegal immigrants overnight who now can move freely throughout the EU. Since then, East European gangsters and bogus asylum seekers, who are actually criminals, bring muggings, robberies, the drug and human trade to Austria”. The FPÖ demands the reintroduction of border controls in the east, the expulsion of all non-native criminals and facilitating the acquisition of weapons for Austrian citizens, this last being a disturbing demand that favours private self defence over public safety.

- The NSA does not mention Turkey explicitly in its manifesto, but does include a mention of an internal regulation affecting the ethnic Turkish minority in Bulgaria, “*Ataka* proposes as its main purpose the suspension of the Islamisation of Bulgaria” and adds that building strictly non-Christian religious temples must be regulated.

- The LAOS is against Turkey joining the EU because it invaded northern Cyprus and that it continues to deny the Armenian genocide. From these premises, this party feels that negotiations with this country can not even be started. On other issues, the LAOS added that Turkey does not meet the minimum economic conditions for their integration in the EU, even with long transition periods (LAOS a).

- For the FN,

the Europe of Brussels (...) is the Europe governed by technocrats remote from reality (...). It is also the Europe colonised by immigration of African or Asian origin (...), the Europe in the process of Islamisation that plans to make Turkey one of its members. These are the results of the betrayal of the political classes and financial leaders and of their commitment to unbridled free trade and globalism.

Therefore, the FN rejects the candidacy of Turkey or any other “non-European” country intending to join the EU. Instead, we should enhance cooperation with European nations that are not in the EU (Serbia, Ukraine, Belarus and Russia).

On the issue of migration, the FN advocates a restoration of internal border controls and rejects the European Pact on immigration for being “permissive” (despite its harshly restrictive “Return Directive”) and for giving the Commission “excessive” power. According to this party, migration should be strictly restricted and must be exclusively a matter of national responsibility. With regard to other issues, the FN reaffirms its thesis of “national preference” in employment and, in all cases, prefers Community workers over foreigners.

Table 2

No to Turkey in the EU	PVV VB LN DF FPÖ LAOS FN
No to immigration from outside the EU	PVV UKIP VB LN DF FPÖ FN

2. Democratic deficit and neoliberalism

- For the PVV, “Holland’s interests must always prevail”, so this country should have the power of veto and to block EU decisions as well as a clear objective of “recovery of powers in all areas”. With regards the present, this party demands that the Lisbon Treaty (which it rejects) be subject to popular referendum. After this political criticism, the PVV expresses its protest about economic issues: “The Netherlands

is the largest net contributor to the EU. We want our money back. We want to allocate billions of Euros back to Holland and not to Brussels”. In accordance with closed ultranationalist criteria, the PVV rejects the idea that Dutch money can serve “to train farmers in Poland and France” or to build roads in Bulgaria or Portugal.

- The UKIP indicates that the EU is not only economically negative for the UK, but also in political terms as it has an unacceptable democratic cost. With this in mind, it states in its manifesto that in the last twelve months about 2,500 rules have come into effect in the country (75% of all laws that came into force in the UK in this period), something to be rejected because – in the opinion of the UKIP – these were “impositions” of “unelected bureaucrats in Brussels”. For this party, the British people have been denied a say via referendum on the Treaty of Lisbon, which is nothing more than a “camouflage” of the Constitutional Treaty rejected by the French and Dutch. The UKIP wants a UK “governed not by anonymous bureaucrats in Brussels, but by our own people through our elected parliament in Westminster” and that “the only people who should decide who can come, work and live in Britain are the British people”. In sum, the UKIP creates great alarm about the supposed loss of British control of agricultural and fisheries policies, which would be ruinous to the national interest. According to this diagnosis, the UK would lose jobs and substantial funds (“the EU costs us £ 40 million each and every day”), so “we believe that British taxes should be used in Britain”.

- The VB demands that key decisions such as the accession of Turkey or further transfers of sovereignty to the EU must always be subject to popular binding referendum (VB a and b). In economic affairs, the VB argues that Flanders should be one of the primary regions of the EU – this being blocked by some of its policies. On one hand, the VB requests the application of reduced VAT in some areas, and on the other, not to reduce the community measures for agricultural support in the face of international competition, to maintain subsidies to fishermen and to make the PPC more flexible (VB a).

- For the JMM, the EU works undemocratically, is bureaucratic, corrupt, anti-national and neoliberal: the Lisbon Treaty basically amputated national sovereignty, reduced democracy and erased the content from the European social model. According to this party, the EU is not democratic and is not governed by the classical theory of the division of powers, it is hyperbureaucratic, given the overreaching power of unelected decision makers in Brussels, it is unable to eradicate corruption (citing the case of the Santer Commission, despite being exonerated by the report of the “committee of wise men”), agrees to

accept States into the union that recognise same-sex marriage that undermines the traditional family model, admits no criticism of its policy on immigration, automatically disqualifying this as xenophobic and considering racist those who reject positive discrimination for the Roma (the case of the JMM). On one hand, the JMM criticises the Hungarian *establishment* that has submitted itself to the ordinances of Brussels and has disengaged itself from people's problems and is disappointed with the EU after entry and on the other asserts that it is unacceptable that EU law directly meddles in the internal legal order, assuming a position superior even to the national Constitution. The JMM opposes the neoliberal policies of the EU, a model that favours market concentration in a few large corporations. Such guidelines are designed by technocrats serving multinational companies whose deregulatory, liberalising and privatising policies have mined social and economic sovereignty. For the JMM, the EU falsifies the market and serves US centralised globalised finance – increasingly resembling a multinational neoliberal empire. This party asserts that the majority of Hungarian society feels cheated and deceived after the country's entry into the EU because the “political class” of the *establishment* drew an idyllic picture that has not been fulfilled at all, silencing opponents at the same time. Subsequent developments have confirmed that the promises of welfare and progress were a crude manipulation. Therefore, all Hungarian governments are responsible for accepting unfavourable terms of accession that have sacrificed national interests. In this general criticism, the JMM includes not only liberal forces and the post-communist left, but also the parliamentary right, which has been co-responsible for a capitulation of such a manner that all political groups function as a “single pro-EU party”. According to the JMM the conditions of accession of Hungary should be thoroughly reviewed as the current situation is very negative for national competitiveness, the “SMEs”, workers and internal production in general being increasingly marginalised and defenceless against the a flood of Western multinationals. In summary, the EU does not promote truly equal competition, suffocates the system with bureaucratic regulations and does not act democratically. The JMM claims that Hungary has lost national territory (26% now foreign owned), does not protect farmers from a CAP that only favours large agroindustrial entities, has not been able to open the labour market in Germany or Austria to Hungarian workers and has placed the country at the service of multinationals. The EU has not even been able to secure the rights of Hungarian minorities in neighbouring states. In conclusion, Hungary as a country has lost out in joining the EU and has been colonised in the same way as all the countries in the CEE area.

- For the NL, the 2008 Irish referendum was to be yet again a reiteration that the distance between the people and the EU had been confirmed, “the EU today is structurally based on a real and strict *democratic deficit*” (underlined in the original). In its view, “the progressive transfer upwards of sovereignty and powers is contributing to the removal of the voice of the people of Europe”. The remedy the LN proposes is the absolute respect for the principle of subsidiarity: “no European regulation should be adopted when this same regulation may be decided by the States (or regions with legislative powers)”. In economic affairs, the LN is against “bureaucratic regulations” and unfair competition, while defending the revaluation of traditional local products.

- The DF argues that various referendums have shown the growing separation between *Brussels* and citizens – something due to the inability to democratically control EU decision makers given the lack of real supervisory mechanisms. According to this party, Denmark can not accept intervention in its internal affairs from the outside, nor the waste of public money due to the irresponsible management, corruption and despotism of the EU. The elites have hijacked decision making against society’s interests, national democracy is in danger because of this process and citizens have not the slightest chance of influencing this. Consequently, the DF always demands referendums for any further transfer of powers to the EU, whose powers should be limited and, in part, renationalised. Although the DF recognises that the EP has increased its powers of *control*, the party is against its growing *legislative* function. On the one hand, “the DF does not see the European Parliament as being representative of citizens even when imposing its own rules” and on the other, “does not want it (...) to have legislative functions”. The party indicates that the PE favours greater integration, far beyond what people want, its “legislative interference” is inadmissible and that it violates free cooperation between sovereign states. In summary, the DF proposes cutting the powers of the Commission – which should be reduced to mere administrative body – and increase the Council of Ministers which oversees national interests.

For the DF it is inadmissible to share a common currency between countries that have carried out economic reforms and others who have not done so, since this harms the former, like Denmark (though not in the Euro). In any case, the DF advocates a drastic cut in community budgets.

- The FPÖ demands ongoing binding referendums on EU treaties and advocates radically dismantling Brussels bureaucracy. At the same time it rejects the neoliberal policies that only serve to benefit the interests of big business. In its view, the bank is responsible for the current crisis

and “the EU means globalisation at any price”. More particularly, the crisis has been caused “by profit seeking, pure and simple, the withdrawal of security measures, an irresponsible extension eastwards including doubtful trading and an almost servile alliance with the U.S.”. Consequently, the EU has not protected their countries from the catastrophic consequences of the economic crisis” and therefore “Brussels is the cause of mass unemployment and bankruptcy”. With this grim diagnosis, the FPÖ states that “the change in the EU should not be determined by corporations, but with the effort of social security”. For this, the transitional periods for the Austrian labour market should be broadened, tax havens frozen, the unconditional alliance with the U.S. ended, Austrian banking secrecy maintained, the national contribution to the EU cut and the country’s best assets not sold off. The FPÖ’s prescriptions seek to protect the domestic market and the interests of Austrian workers, reducing the net contribution of Austria to the EU by half, since the current level is notoriously unfair to the country – being also uncontrollable (in its view, many funds are squandered in corrupt Eastern European countries) – and to radically cut covert immigration, repatriating the foreign unemployed.

- For the NSA Bulgaria is at the bottom of income ratings for the EU because of the unrestricted application of a ruinous economic model imposed by the same, “the time has come to declare the end of neoliberal speculation”. The party supports “a state policy of recovery of lost markets for Bulgaria outside the EU” and requests the creation of a special agency to manage non-governmental EU funds transparently. Finally, “*Ataka* considers the revision of all agricultural production quotas with the EU necessary because they do not correspond to the real possibilities of production in Bulgaria and are damaging our country”.

- The PRM defends the promotion of Romanian products inside and outside the country and the prevention of domestic prices rising above the EU average. It also demands the receipt of “urgent and warranted” new community funding and specifies that this has to be three times what Romania gives to the EU. Also, the PRM seeks more EU grants for Romanian agriculture and demands that transitional periods that impose restrictions on Romanian labour within the EU are withdrawn as soon as possible.

- The FN demands that any new EU treaty or any new accession must necessarily be subject to a binding national referendum. In any case, it stands against the Lisbon Treaty that has betrayed the popular mandate of the majority of the French, Dutch and Irish. For the FN national law must always prevail over that of the community and States must be able to veto regulations set in Brussels. In the economic sphere,

the FN proposes the establishment of limiting import quotas in areas of special interest to France, advocating the reintroduction of the Franc and leaving the Euro as merely a virtual common unit, rejecting any transfer of financial authority to Brussels, as well as creating a European tax, declaring itself against the Community directives on hunting and fishing and condemning the “stupid” [*sic*] Stability Pact.

Table 3

The EU Treaties must always be subjected to a popular binding referendum	PVV UKIP VB DF FPÖ FN
The EU institutions are not democratic	JMM LN DF
Community law can not be superior to national law	UKIP JMM DF FN
Neoliberal policies are ruinous for national interests	PVV UKIP JMM FPÖ NSA PRM

3. The balance of radical right parties

The large amount of text dedicated to the myth of *national sovereignty* in the programmes of this ideological group stands out: not only does this dimension occupy about half of all the manifestos, but it is ideologically their *raison d'être*. In some cases, the emphasis on nation – usually with strong ethnic connotations – is reinforced with ideological reference to “Christian roots”, a clearly controversial element in counterpoint to the Muslim world and immigrants of this religious denomination. It is a kind of instrumental “neofesionalism” that pays electoral dividends for these parties in some countries.

This group resoundingly, massively and directly rejects a supranational European political union as they attribute every possible vice to this eventual European “super-state”: political centralism, administrative bureaucracy, undemocratic technocratic elitism, globalised economic

intrusion and cultural homogenisation. Instead, most are willing to accept the maintenance of mutually beneficial economic ties, but always from an intergovernmental perspective respectful of national sovereignty. Moreover, several parties even explicitly pronounce in favour of a loose confederation of independent states which could embody a true “Europe of Nations”. Only the UKIP maintains an eccentric position given its strategic option of leaving the EU as soon as possible.

The majority are very hostile and aggressive with the rejection of any eventual Turkish accession to the EU, a possibility that is filled with shades of the apocalypse: it is a country that would benefit from a representation in EU institutions given its huge population, it would claim almost all the structural and cohesion funds due to its serious economic backwardness, “it would flood” Europe with hundreds of thousands of immigrants and, especially, encourage the expansion of Islamic radicalism. Turkey and non-EU immigration are precisely two sides of the same propaganda strategy of these parties: they are stoking fears and resentments with a populist and xenophobic tone that in themselves provide electoral dividends. It is usual in this media to link immigration, crime and even terrorism for such reasons. Some of these parties are notoriously demagogical on illegal immigration and its allegedly “unbearable” cost to the public purse and public safety. Naturally these obsessions are characteristic of radical right parties in developed Western Europe – it is not the same with parties of this ideology in the CEE where the phenomenon of receiving immigrants from outside is virtually unknown given the under-development of these countries.

In keeping with the traditional distrust of the radical right parties in representative institutions, it is no coincidence that several of them demand the use of direct democracy for any reform of the Treaties and/or accession of new members. From their point of view, European leaders reiteratedly contravene the desire of various sectors of their populations who have had occasion to speak out negatively about certain community projects. The fact that the “political class” of the establishment always looks for ways to circumvent and even infringe some referendum results is an irrefutable testament to the undemocratic and anti-popular parties that encourage them. From these premises, the Community institutions are severely judged, denouncing them for bring grossly undemocratic, opaque and elitist. There are several parties of this ideological group that claim such institutions are unrecoverable and advocate a maximum strengthening of national control mechanisms to prevent anonymous and irresponsible “Brussels bureaucrats” taking decisions over national interests.

Finally, it is of great interest to analyse the economic criticism of the mostly neoliberal policies promoted by the current EU as this partly refutes certain topical viewpoints about such parties. Indeed, radical right-wing parties are traditionally attributed with a clear preference for free-market economic policies, perhaps coloured by conceptions of protectionist domestic production and commercial sectors. However, in the manifestos of 2009 there are repeated criticisms of financial globalisation and neoliberal economic policies that are deemed very harmful to national interests and are criticised for only benefitting multinational corporations and harming the great majority of people. Not surprisingly, critics of neoliberalism are particularly harsh with parties in the CEEC – socially very affected by them –, but the novelty is that many parties of this Western European ideological group reject the economic model that the current EU has imposed.

The Radical Left

1. The rejection of neoliberal Europe

- The SF says generally that the current economic policy of the EU increases poverty and inequality and in particular criticises EU competition regulations for inflexibly limiting regional and local State investments. Following this reasoning, the economic agenda of the EU only benefits large multinational corporations and harms the “SMEs” and the rights of domestic workers. The SF opposes the supremacy of the market, deregulation, liberalisation and privatisation of essential public services that should strictly be the States’ responsibility. With this, the party says that education, health, transport, communications, housing, water and energy are sectors that should not come under the auspices of the community. On one hand, the SF is against company relocations, and on the other, demands that European companies working outside the EU be especially respectful of labour rights and the environment.

With regard to specific policies, the SF – consistent with its nationalist ideology – demands a reform of the CAP to make Ireland’s agriculture and livestock industries ecologically sustainable and socially prosperous and to provide a viable fisheries policy for the country. It then moves on to make a clear commitment to renewable energy, “we completely reject suggestions that nuclear power has a role in reducing Irish carbon emissions as it is not a safe renewable source of energy”. What is then included is a specific demand of another type calling for the suspension of the preferential trade agreement with Israel while it continues the occupation of Palestinian territories. With this diagnosis, the SF focuses on prioritising the fight against poverty, inequality and

social exclusion as an alternative as it is essential to preserve the rights of workers. The party supports a sustainable and equitable economy, based on public services, environmental protection and regional development. Community funds should be used primarily to improve living conditions in society, while promoting fair trade: “the current economic crisis requires the EU to rethink its strategy and put people’s interests at the centre of its decision-making process”.

- For AKEL the current economic crisis is, in fact, the neoliberal model, whose consequences are being paid only by working people. The party is opposed to the liberalisation of public services and other *antisocial* measures, with the alternative of preserving today’s threatened social model: “a strong presence of forces of the progressive left in the European Parliament may contribute to the fight for a Europe the people rather than that of the monopolies”.

- The KSČM rejects the neoliberal policies of the EU because they worsen citizens’ living conditions, restricting social rights and sharpening differences. In addition, for this party, the EU imposes discriminatory conditions on the Czech Republic by limiting its agricultural production, reducing the free movement of labour and cutting funds. The KSČM demands a EU of citizens and nations with full democratic, economic and social rights. For this, goals such as job security, economic development, the end of business relocations, increased investment in education and an end to the privatisation of the public sector need to be pursued. As a consequence, banks must be regulated to limit speculative trading, energy policies coordinated, opportunities for truly free competition created (it is still striking that communists pursue this *Smithian* goal), tax or wage *dumping* prevented and way made for sustainable development.

- According to the BE, since the Treaty of Maastricht all successive European Commissions without exception have imposed neoliberal policies which are those that have led to the present social catastrophe: “Brussels is unable to agree a common strategy for relaunching the economy. The crisis demonstrates the limits and shortcomings of a European construction that unified markets, but that has always rejected the development of common policies to defend employment and improve social protection”. In summary, “the crisis shows the failure of the European project as we know it. The decline of the Union, when those who suffer need it most, constitutes, in itself, the death certificate of a strategy based on the single market and currency”. For the BE, EU leaders have only mobilised themselves to save the banks from collapse, while with social issues it is unable to develop common effective strategies. The BE demands that public funds supporting companies at

the European level should depend on the maintenance of jobs, while firms receiving public assistance that relocate should be severely penalised. For the BE there is a need for a “social and democratic refounding of the European project” in order for the EU to put solidarity and employment at the centre of its policies, “the security of the Union lies in economic development, in the model of social protection, the rights offered and the solidarity promoted”. As a consequence, the alternative is to promote Europe-wide anticrisis measures with more financial regulation, more transparency, more taxes for multinationals and more penalties for tax evasion, all in line with its central slogan: “We are Europhiles of the left”.

- Of those selected in this research, the KKE is the party that criticises the EU more severely with an overall valuation broadly condemning all its policies. On one side, the Greek Communists claim that “the EU has nothing to do with a people’s Europe”, and on the other, oppose the “four community freedoms” “established” by the Treaty of Maastricht (an incomprehensible mistake as it back references no less to the original Treaty of Rome in 1957). For the KKE the EU is a “Imperialist intergovernmental union” and all its economic, political and military proposals are “reactionary”. In its view, the EU only benefits big capital and is an example of worker exploitation and the miming of fundamental social rights. Consequently, the KKE asserts, “no to the EU of monopolies, capitalist exploitation, militarism and interventionism”. From this approach the KKE affirms that the EU generalises redundancies in all member countries and – with a victimism linked to conspiracy theories – the KKE claims that the EU favours anti-communist persecution [*sic*] in the whole community, while objectively promoting racism [*resic*]. In summary, all EU policies are neoliberal and catastrophic for workers, confirming the failure of hopes in the Welfare State: a very classical *orthodox* conclusion about the limits of *reformism*.

Indeed, for the KKE “the EU can not be reformed in favour of the people (...). It is a creation of the capitalists. The peoples who want to advance must oppose the EU and its policies, disobey and in accordance with due procedures disengage from its ties”. From this perspective, the weaker the EU the greater the possibilities for new forms of just cooperation between European countries to open up. So, the KKE claims that “we must weaken and overthrow the imperialist structure of the so called EU” and, in any case, disassociate Greece from it: ‘Breaking the ties with the EU would be the [Greek] contribution to the international peoples’ struggle’. It is no coincidence that the KKE is especially critical of Greek parties that support the “pro-EU consensus” that – in its opinion – should “be punished without remorse”. Though still sharing a eurogroup in the EP, the KKE is blunt with the PIE

(which SYRIZA – the national competitor among the radical progressive electorate – forms a part) – a Europarty disqualified as an “accomplice” of social democratic governments that carry out anti-popular policies. For the KKE, the PIE will lead to the disarmament of the labour movement, the dissolution or mutation of the CPs, the reduction of their influence and strength among working people and the intensification of the EU’s anti-communist and anti-socialist campaign.

So, for the KKE, only a socialist Europe would be fair, only a workers’ Europe would ensure fairness and so what is needed is resistance, disobedience, insubordination and internationalist action: a classic *agit-prop* programme of anti-systemic confrontation.

- For the CDU-PCP, “the crisis of capitalism is also a crisis of the foundations of the EU”. This is in crisis because of the neoliberal policies enshrined in the Lisbon Treaty based on deregulation, privatisation and cuts in social spending and fully in agreement with the views of the European Central Bank whose monetary policy only defends the interests of major powers. In addition, quite in keeping with its *orthodox* ideological doctrinaire, the Portuguese communists add that the enlargement of the EU with the CEECs has been “A reckoning with the experience of building socialism” that has destroyed its “progress” and “gains”, a nostalgic reflection absent from any criticism of the old *real socialism*. The party argues that “European integration was never a neutral process. The EU was and is, increasingly, a tool of capital powers in Europe”. In summary, the EU is in the service of the oligarchy and the powerful and is becoming a block of “imperialist character” [*sic*]. For the CDU-PCP, the EU only pursues policies of exploitation, capitalist concentration and centralisation, which reveals its “class nature”, in very traditional terms. The EU is deepening its neoliberal, federalist [*sic*] and military [*resic*] character, something that proves the “fallacies” of the rhetorical europhile discourse.

Portuguese Communists reject the Stability Pact and the free trade agreements sponsored by the EU, vindicating reform of European funds, the CAP and CFP to defend national interests. For the CDU-PCP the “fight against the three pillars of the ongoing process of European capitalist integration – neoliberalism, militarism, and federalism – and the construction of a workers Europe” must be undertaken. Ultimately, the CDU-PCP’s alternative message is to reverse the current *rightist* orientation of the EU to promote social and economic redistribution, always prioritising the interests of workers and the people of Portugal, national sovereignty and interests, “for an alternative Europe of workers and peoples!”.

- According to the IU, “the process of European integration prioritises economic and monetary union over political union and social cohesion” and also with neoliberal strategy that favours stability over employment, services and social benefits. This party approves the enlargement of the EU to include the CEEC, a real milestone, but it rejects the path chosen with the imposition of “shock therapy” that has had devastating social consequences. Neoliberalism only takes into consideration the wishes of banks and business and produces a concentration of wealth in a few irresponsible transnational monopolies. The Lisbon strategy based on competitiveness is producing disastrous social effects with public entities – that can not be regarded as commodities given their general public interest -having been privatised. So, on one hand, “the EU privatises profits and socialises losses” and on the other, “threatens public services”. Specifically, the IU demands a fundamental reform of the CAP to truly favour small and medium sized farmers and the repeal of the Bolkestein directive on the liberalisation of services. The IU advocates replacing the Stability Pact for one of Solidarity since “the Europe we want requires a democratisation of the economy”. The party considers “necessary restructure the EU based on new parameters, capable of focusing on people and their rights rather than private benefits”, this is the only way – in its opinion – to redistribute, generate stable and quality employment, protect the environment and extend social rights. The IU criticises the larger political forces for not deciding for a strategic refoundation of Europe – this being the cause of crisis in the integration process. The alternative advocated is “a pro-European policy of the left, not eurosceptical in nature, able to change the model of the EU” and “a persistent action against racism, xenophobia, ultra-nationalism, chauvinism [any difference between this and the former is not clarified, since both are practically synonymous], fascism, anti-communism [without recognising that authoritarian communism exists], homophobia and any other form of discrimination”.

- According to the DL, the neoliberal policies of the EU are responsible for the aggravation of the greatest economic crisis since the Second World War. The obsession with competitiveness sacrifices social rights: “in the EU the freedom of enterprises and capital has priority over fundamental social and political rights”. Therefore, the current EU – according to the DL – “goes against the interests of the majority of the population” and also “increasingly manages the implementation of imperial capital interests”. According to the party, the disturbing rise of neofascist forces in Europe is not a coincidence, it is something that should “be denounced and fought against without reservation”. The DL opposes deregulation – privatisation and liberalisation always affect key sectors and basic services and it demands the “highest priority for the

protection of public property”. In specific sectors, the DL rejects EU policies on development cooperation given that these have not promoted fair trade, it opposes EU constraints on collective bargaining in the States, does not support commercial criteria in research and demands the EURATOM Treaty be repealed, with a total abandonment of nuclear energy to avoid the complete failure of environmental policies.

For the DL neoliberal policies must be ended, not an impossibility as the triumphs [though ephemeral] of the referendums in France and Holland in 2005 and Ireland in 2008 have proven. The alternative proposal is to establish control of multinational corporations and international financial centres, with strict regulation of capital flows and their transactions in order to prevent speculative manipulation. The Stability Pact should be replaced with another promoting sustainable development and full employment and also there will have to be an increase in the insufficient EU budget and redirect this for social issues: “*Die Linke* advocates the prioritising of political and social rights above the free market”. To do this, “Europe needs a European government, oriented to employment, social cohesion and the sustainable economy”. The recovery and strengthening of the European social model should serve to give way to “a new economic and financial order”, countering speculation. In summary, the DL calls for “a Europe of people and not of business” in which social rights are not mere commodities. Finally, it is in favour of some further enlargement – but with a strategy of solidarity – and the rescue of CEECs after the “brutal” adjustments of their economies and societies.

- The FG argues that “this crisis is also the failure of ‘liberal Europe’”, an expression of the “historic crisis of capitalism” (a term, incidentally, which is already more than a century old). According to this party, “the EU is fully committed to the bankrupt neoliberal capitalist model”. From this perspective, the entire EU policy is aimed at privatisation, deregulation and the concentration of resources for the few. In summary, we should “question the dogma of free trade, develop public services, democratise them and reject their liberalisation” and all available instruments in the EU should be at the priority disposal of social and environmental interests.

- SYRIZA rejects the “pacted liberal-conservative/social democratic” EU – two sides of the same neoliberal coin that continues to cut social rights. Since the Treaty of Maastricht the expansion of neoliberal has not ceased because, on one hand, public money is used to rescue ailing banks and on the other social rights are cut. Neoliberalism severs national sovereignty and community institutions only “reinforce the measures that increase capital profit”. This coalition opposes further

privatisation, public spending cuts and policies designed to help development at the service of multinationals. For SYRIZA the “preservation and expansion of the welfare state” must be undertaken, clearly explaining to the public that it is the neoliberal capitalist order and an EU at its service that has caused the current crisis, hence the “need to show an alternative route to call into question the neoliberal hegemony and the capitalist system”. At the end of its manifesto, the slogan of a socialist Europe led by the left as the only long-term solution is reaffirmed.

- According to the VP, “the free market is superior to everything, more important than the environment, social rights and consumer protection”. That is, in the EU, the rights of companies are much more important than anything else, proving that “peace, prosperity and solidarity have never been [its] priorities”. In specific policies, the VP is against the current CAP that only benefits large agribusiness and livestock producers, and demands the re-nationalisation of the sector. It rejects the commercial criteria of the EU’s external trade policy, even more neoliberal and even neocolonial than that of the U.S. and it opposes the fact of Brussels deciding environmental standards and restricting state policies in these areas. Much in keeping with the high standards demanded by Scandinavian ecology, the VP asserts: “The EU is a bad scenario for climate and environmental policies” as they are subordinated to corporate interests. The VP “works for equality and against discrimination and repression [*sic*] in the EU”, does not accept that the EU can “interfere in welfare policies of member countries” (this is a widespread concern in Scandinavia) and claims to be a party “representative of many voters who oppose and are critical of the EU”.

Table 4

The economic policies of the EU increase social inequalities	All
The economic policies of the EU only benefit an oligarchy	BE KKE CDU-PCP DL SYRIZA VP
Essential public goods should not be privatized	All
The alternative is to recover the welfare state	SF AKEL KSČM BE IU DL SYRIZA
The alternative is to leave the EU and reclaim socialism	KKE

2. The democratic deficit and national sovereignty

2.1. The limits of European democracy

The SF rejects the Lisbon Treaty for being *undemocratic* and *ruinous* for Ireland, i.e., for not reflecting – in its opinion – popular interests and not really making Community institutions controllable. This was the text rejected in 2008 by the Irish South (Republic of Ireland) and deprived the people of Northern Ireland the opportunity to voice their opinion. The SF criticises an unelected and unaccountable Commission and a Court that prioritises the free market and private profit over sustainable development and a fair redistribution of wealth. In addition, the EU increasingly meddles in tax matters, something that should be immediately stopped at the root as this affects Irish tax sovereignty. The SF then proposes a thorough restructuring of relations with EU institutions through new and truly democratic treaties that should always include the *Social Progress Clause* and to strengthen the role of national and regional parliaments to correct the serious democratic deficit in the Community. Additionally the noticeably weak civic participation in decision-making in the EU should be increased and its finances made more transparent.

- The AKEL asserts that the failure of the TCUE “shows the wide gap between the aspirations of the peoples in the EU Member States, the governing circles in Brussels and the ruling classes in European states”. From the institutional point of view, the party is in favour of increasing the powers of the EP as the main way to improve the poor quality of democracy in the EU.

- The Czech Communists criticise the fact that in some countries the EU now have an exorbitant weight in decision-making processes, apart from the four principal community freedoms “they do not ensure a decent life for citizens – not even offering protection against the economic crisis. The influence of the market is implacable”. This has projection in the community’s political model – for the KSČM – dominated by an uncontrollable bureaucracy taking decisions with enormous lack of transparency and imposing many meaningless rules.

- The fact that the TCUE and the Lisbon Treaty have been rejected by three European nations and, despite this, the Lisbon text is in force, for the BE this is damning evidence of the unsurpassed elitist and undemocratic nature of the EU. It reveals the democratic deficit of the EU that acts with arrogance and authoritarianism to the exclusion of citizens. The BE demands a move beyond the anachronistic Lisbon Treaty and the drafting of a new text, a task that should be left to Parliament. A new treaty, concise and precise on objectives, rights and

institutions that should be subject to national parliaments. Also, the BE demands the democratisation of the European Central Bank, whose primary objective should be to place monetary policy at the service of job creation, which would require the establishment of mechanisms of social solidarity and equitable economic coordination in the EU. In summary, the BE states: “We are Europeans, but we are not eurocentric. We are pro-European, but we are not Eurocrats”.

- The KKE maintains the same argument as the BE for the people of France, Holland and Ireland to indicate the path they should follow in the current EU. The Greek Communists, even more emphatically, disqualify the EU Treaties as “reactionary” for being so negative for workers and society.

- In accordance with the unique interpretation of the Portuguese communists, the EU is based on inseparable triad (neoliberalism-federalism-militarism) whose logic is profoundly undemocratic and anti-social: the Treaty of Lisbon “heightens federalism as form of concentration of economic and political power in the large scale European capital and major powers”. Each step in the deepening of *federalist* institutional integration leads to the strengthening of the other two pillars, neoliberalism and militarism. Therefore, the CDU-PCP calls for a “combat against illusions based on federalist visions of Europe”. Consequently, their institutional proposals are clearly statist and intergovernmental: the Council of Ministers (today, the Union’s) is the entity that should have a leading role in the EU, ensuring each country has a vote and the right to veto. The CDU-PCP demands the maintenance of one commissioner per country, does not admit the reduction in the number of MEPs that can affect smaller countries like Portugal and rejects the transfer of justice and interior affairs to the community level, as this subtracts “competencies from the sovereignty of States”.

- The IU states that the “Lisbon Treaty demonstrates the political absurdity of where the Union now stands” a text obsessed with setting “free market pre-eminence over any other issue”. For this group, the popular rejection expressed in some referendums show some civic disagreement with so many anti-democratic and anti-social EU policies. The IU considers that European institutions have been at the exclusive service of dogmatic neoliberal policies. To reverse this course, “the EU should be open to the democratic participation of the entire society because if not, there is no future for it”. The democratisation of the EU involves giving way to responsible governance, the full guarantee of human rights, respect for minorities and the full participation of civil society with a capacity for control. On one hand, the IU states that the EP has to be enhanced (“it must have power to initiate legislation”) and

on the other, defends “a truly European constitutional process”. A new draft Constitution for Europe could only emanate from a democratically elected Constituent Assembly by direct universal suffrage for all citizens of the Member States and with a mandate to do so. Then, the new Constitution should be put to a referendum in every country on the same date.

- According to the DL, the EU states are increasingly addressing international crises with the use of military force, something that the Lisbon Treaty has strengthened. This is one of the main reasons for this party to oppose the same, using this to compete effectively with the Greens in Germany, historically the champions of pacifism which, incidentally, they have *modulated* after their experiences in federal government. The DL programme is quite detailed when criticising the democratic shortcomings of the EU Treaties and makes various alternative proposals: the President and all the Commission must be elected by Parliament, it must have the same political weight as the Council, the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice should not focus on the dogma of free competition because this limits the rights of workers, 50% “of all positions in the process of decision making at every level of the European institutions” must correspond to women candidates (this is also competitive with the Greens), Europol should not be “an agency of the European Union” and, finally, the storage of personal data that the EU is carrying out under the pretext of fighting terrorism is not admissible (the Treaty of Prüm, the agreement of 2007 with the U.S. on passenger data for flights) as this limits guarantees on individual rights. Instead, the EU should create a European tax for corporate and financial profits, at the same time simultaneously fighting against tax havens in a much more effective way.

For the DL democracy must take precedence over market radicalism and for this it needs, on one hand, to give way to a European economic government rather than the economy governing Europe, and on the other, approve a truly democratic European Constitution “the EU needs another contractual basis: a Constitution for the EU designed by citizens and endorsed by them in each of the Member States”. To this end, the DL advocates that the EP assumes the task of promoting the only institution to be legitimated by citizens and then ultimately gives the final word to them via referendum. Among the items that such a text should contain, the DL indicates a true separation of powers, economic neutrality (the European Constitution should be open to a mixed economic order in which the public sector can be the more relevant) and a vocation for the peaceful resolution of conflicts, implying progressive disarmament. To move in this direction, the DL suggests combining both the institutional struggle, as well as grassroots movements, very

much in line with some features of its political culture so critical of the system: “the democratisation of institutions and the democratisation of the economy can not be achieved without the extra-parliamentary organisation of a countervailing power. For this reason, we want to support a European network of networks”.

- The FG asserts that the EU suffers from a serious democratic deficit, with many unelected powers and not subject to the principle of popular sovereignty. This group rejects the Lisbon Treaty on which the French people have not been able to voice an opinion, which invalidates the referendum on the TCUE whenever the new text is basically the one rejected. The only institutional reference in its election manifesto is to the European Central Bank, an entity subject to the financial markets which should be placed at the service of society and subject to democratic control. The FG demands an independent Europe that rejects the competitive logic between peoples and pursues policies of peace and just cooperation.

- SYRIZA fully supports the rejection of the TCUE in France and Holland in 2005 and the Treaty of Lisbon in Ireland in 2008, expressions of popular opposition to hegemonic neoliberalism. This coalition demands the repeal of the Lisbon Treaty and the calling of obligatory referendums for successive texts. In its opinion, EU institutions are constantly slimming democracy and popular control over governments and this is what requires a profound institutional change. The EP should always be informed before and after the meetings of the two councils, national parliaments should increase their auditing capacity, the Court of Justice would require a major overhaul since it continues to cut social rights on an ongoing basis and the Central Bank – currently an uncontrolled neoliberal fundamentalist entity – should be changed from the roots up.

- The VP claims that supranationalism and the community Treaties in force respond to unacceptable policies as “the Lisbon Treaty transfers extensive power to the EU system controlled by the elite and the bureaucracy”, leading it to demand a referendum on this text in Sweden. This party asserts that “the EU is not democratic” nor transparent, nor fair, nor that the growing alienation of citizens is a coincidence. In its view, EU legislation is increasingly uncontrollable, secretive and invasive and therefore “we vote against proposals to increase the power of the EU”. It is an entity in which it is impossible to demand real responsibilities from decision makers who only act “in favour of their own interests”. The EP is conditioned and limited by projects that can only be submitted by a bureaucratic Commission serving interest groups linked to big business. The most shocking is that once this lack is

illustrated, the VP, instead of advocating an increase in the powers of the EP, affirms that it “must be replaced by a gathering of members from national parliaments”. This idea – effectively nationalist – contradicts the entire historical strategy of the bulk of left wing pro-Europeans and, translated, would be a regression to the situation before 1979, the year of the first direct elections to the EP. With respect to the Court of Justice, the VP criticises the fact that democratic decisions of the EP can be overridden (thereby ignoring its partial role as an effective *Constitutional* Court) or the non-approval of state decisions favourable to social rights (without realising that community law is superior to that of the national entity in their areas). Consequently, the party demands that “control of the police and justice should be taken from the EU”. At the same time, it criticises the lack of financial transparency in the Community which increases fraud and embezzlement and threatens to extend its fiscal competencies. For the VP, “the EU must decide on taxes” and criticises Swedish parties of the establishment because, although the Swedish people rejected the Euro in a referendum (2003), those – who are pro-Euro – adapt national economic policies to the same. For the VP, democracy over community governance must be a priority, social justice over market freedom, peace over defence.

2.2. National sovereignty and popular interests

- For the SF the national interests of Ireland are a priority in Europe, its view includes the whole of Ireland and from there it seeks community support for the reunification of the same. This party argues that the strategic plans of the EU should take into consideration the reality of a global “whole Ireland” when nominating objectives for EU funds because the “structural distortions” caused by partition must be compensated. In its view, the reunification of Germany in the EU indicates the path Ireland should follow regarding this. The SF defends strong economic sovereignty for Ireland, with strict control over natural resources and strong regulatory mechanisms for the market and the Treasury. In addition, it demands the support of Gaelic in EU institutions. The SF is against the CFSP/EPSP as they subordinate national interests and these policies are increasingly linked to NATO, which affects the neutrality of the Republic of Ireland. Finally, the party rejects ceding national sovereignty in police and judicial matters to an insufficiently democratic EU, which is also unacceptably restricting the right of asylum. The SF argues that Europe is becoming a security fortress, “this is the main reason why we oppose greater integration and centralisation of police and judicial powers” and that “we do not support the Schengen system”.

- From the outset, AKEL states its priority in the EP to be the fight for the rights of the Cypriot people, which is why this party demands more EU pressure on Turkey to resolve the problem of the division of the island. In its view, the Turkish Cypriots should not be able to vote in European elections in the present circumstances, but this does not prevent AKEL wanting to maximise closer relations with Northern *compatriots*. AKEL opposes the increasing militarisation of the EU and demands an autonomous European foreign and defence policy without reliance on NATO.

- The priority for the KSČM is to obtain contracts for Czech companies and reject NATO for subordinating national interests to the U.S.A., “the KSČM rejects NATO’s aggressive policy that has triggered local wars on behalf of the United States (...). We reject the participation of the Czech Republic in foreign military missions in our country”.

- The BE states, “we want a bigger and better Europe, but we reject the standardisation, reduction of local culture and the lack of respect for the mosaic of peoples, languages and countries that make up make Europe”, a fear – in fact – entirely unfounded because not even the most radical European federalist has ever proposed (nor could even try) to standardise the immensely rich pluralism within the EU. The BE points out that the EU has no real foreign policy, what little there is, is fully subordinated to the U.S.A. Consequently, European defence does not need NATO, an organisation inherited from the “Cold War” which, – in the opinion of this party – should be dissolved. In matters of cooperation with dependent countries, the behaviour of the EU is “deplorable” because its migration policies are increasingly restrictive and repressive, violating the fundamental right of the free movement of people.

- On one hand, the KKE claims that European funds for Greece have been established under very harsh and negative conditions for the country as they benefit the capitalists much more than the people and on the other, states that Greece alone has sufficient resources to ensure a wealth redistribution far superior to the actual situation. The KKE completely rejects the PESC/PESD and the eventual configuration of an improbable European Army and demands the withdrawal of Greek troops on NATO/EU missions. In its view, interventionism of the EU on humanitarian pretexts or the fight against terrorism are the equivalent to assuming the doctrine of preventive war led by the U.S.

- For the CDU-PCP the Lisbon Treaty violates the Portuguese Constitution whenever Portuguese law must be sovereign (ignoring the normative hierarchy of the sources of law with reference to Community supremacy, as the Court established decades ago). In addition the

treaties should be reversible and should prevent further transfer of sovereign powers to the EU because they subordinate Portugal. The CDU-PCP affirms that EU policies are at the service of the major powers in the EU (not only the usual triad – Germany/France/UK, but also Italy and Spain, (the latter being criticised – highly characteristic of Portuguese nationalism) and this affects the capacity of small countries such as Portugal, removing its control of national resources, both materially and even spiritually. In the latter sense, the CDU-PCP demands “the respect and the uncompromising safeguard of the cultural identity of each country and of all official and working languages”.

It is noteworthy, in particular, the anti-federalist obsession that responds to both Portuguese Communist *nationalism* and to a prejudice because the alleged political federalisation of Europe has not been empirically verified. The CDU-PCP defends a “Europe of cooperation between sovereign and equal states”, with “full respect for national sovereignty” against supranational impositions and federalism. In this sense, like the KKE with regard to SYRIZA, in Portugal the CDU-PCP has to face a competitive rival in the electorate of the radical left – the BE, leading in turn to forceful criticism of same “the *Leftist Block* essentially shares the federalist philosophy that proposes a strengthening of the supranational character of the EU’s institutional framework, devaluing and belittling the central importance of preserving national sovereignty as a guarantor of democracy”. For the CDU-PCP the EU is rapidly militarising in serving the interests of U.S. and also, is configuring a “fortress Europe” with a discriminatory immigration policy.

- The IU rejects the “rearmament the Lisbon Treaty advocates” and the subordination of the EU to the U.S. Consequently, the party calls for the dissolution of NATO and is against the creation of European military structures, although it affirms – somewhat contradictorily – that the EU should have its own form of “security” detached from the NATO and the U.S. In summary, for the IU NATO is a serious threat to European sovereignty and U.S. bases on European soil should disappear. As a party favourable to EU enlargement and, in particular, Turkey’s candidacy, the IU makes only one remark with regard to this: “the prerequisite for Turkey’s entry into the EU is the withdrawal of this country of Cyprus”.

In Spain, a country with a recent massive reception of immigrants, the IU criticises the contradictory policies of the EU in this area. In its view, EU policies have centered on external border controls with an “extremely hard sanctions system” of “irregular migrants”. On the one hand, “the EU has chosen to fortify” and on the other, “the absence of a

genuine European immigration policy has been supplemented by repressive measures”. In summary, the IU affirms, “we want to work towards a cosmopolitan Europe – open to immigration”.

- From a decidedly non-nationalist perspective, the basis of the DLs political thought in the dimension related to sovereignty has a clear anti-militarist commitment exceeding the German Greens. For the DL, security in Europe must be based on disarmament, non-intervention and the peaceful resolution of conflicts within the framework of the OESC and the UN. Moreover, in the opinion of this party – the EU has set a disastrous precedent in Kosovo, having violated international law (this being true, it can not be ignored that the bulk of this party historically originates from the old SED and with the Yugoslav conflict always showed “understanding” of the Serbian authorities’ viewpoint, proceeding as they did from the former Titoist *nomenclature*). The DL argues that the FPCS/EPSD encourages militarism and rejects enlargements of NATO and the overseas military missions. The party advocates the dissolution of NATO and the forces of EU military intervention “the cooperation and links between NATO and the EU have to end”. Its ideology is so doctrinally hyperpacifist that the “DL opposes all war missions, even those with a UN mandate” and that because “‘Humanitarian’ military interventions” do not exist. Being in favour of the enlargement of the EU, in the case of Turkey the DL states that this country “must respect and ensure the human and political rights of all its people, including its minorities.” On community policies for specific States the position of the DL is very *orthodox*: the EU should withdraw its unconditional support for Israel, to renounce its confrontation with Iran and “normalise” relations with Cuba.

On the issue of immigration, the DL demands the abolition of the border protection agency Frontex because it is “opposed to the current policy on immigration and asylum in the EU”. Also, the detention camps for illegal immigrants must be abolished because the immigration law can not be subordinated to the interests of the economy to provide cheap labour. The DL wants the recognition of full rights for the approximately eight million “undocumented” people residing in the EU and opposes the “return directive”.

- On a similar line, though not as developed, is the criterion of the FG for whom the EU should not be linked to the militaristic policy of the U.S.A: “Europe must break its Atlanticism and its alignment with the U.S., especially in the framework of NATO”. On the issue of migration, the FG demands the extension and strengthening of the rights of immigrants and the repeal of the “shameful” return directive.

- SYRIZA disagrees with creating a European superstate without the support of the people and without transparency. This coalition is not against cooperation between European peoples, but “the major field of conflict remains in the national States” and it is there where we have to change the balance of power to modify the character of the current unification of Europe. For SYRIZA a worrying attempt to create a European army is under way, which would increase the future risk of aggressive interventionism. So this group is opposed to what it sees as a drift towards militarisation in Europe and because of this demands the abandonment of Greece from NATO due to its imperialist policies. On Immigration – it is against both cutting the social rights of immigrants and not legalising undocumented migrants.

- According to the VP, with the Lisbon Treaty, the EU has taken “a major step on the road to a super-state” with increasingly intrusive ambitions and it “does not accept the dictates of EU bureaucracy as the interests of voters are more important than the establishment of the EU”. For the VP as “there is no strong public support to build a European super-State” the continued strengthening of the EU “must be avoided”. This does not prevent the maintenance of fair, flexible and free cooperative formulas between States and peoples, an impossibility – from its point of view – with the current elitist and bureaucratic EU. The deep distrust the VP has for the EU has a nationalist substrate linked to the protection of the welfare state itself: this is not the EU of 1994 when Sweden joined and today the large countries prejudice the smaller countries. So, on one hand, “the Swedish collective model is challenged by the EU system”, and on the other, “Sweden’s membership of the EU has had negative effects for work and public welfare”. Not surprisingly, then, the conclusion: “We want Sweden to leave the EU”.

The EU is already – as it is – effectively a military Alliance, with active “preventive” strategy policies that all contravene Swedish neutrality: [the VP] “will continue their struggle against the militarisation of the EU (...). The EU should not be a military defence alliance and Sweden should not participate in a progressive adaptation to NATO”. The VP points out that Sweden has its own defence system and if it participates in an international operation this should only be possible – in its case – with UN and of course Swedish Parliamentary authorisation.

The VP opposes a “Fortress Europe” that clearly discriminates and restricts rights. The party is opposed to the expansion of Community powers in the areas of police and justice because the use made of the same proves the fact of the growth of hostility in the EU towards non-

EU peoples. Finally, the VP is a strong supporter of strengthening the right of asylum and the free reception of immigrants.

Table 5

No o the Treaty of Lisbon	All
Strengthen Parliament	AKEL BE IU DL SYRIZA
Strengthen national parliaments	SF CDU-PCP VP
Primacy of National Sovereignty	SF AKEL KSČM KKE CDU-PCP
No to a European federal superstate	CDU-PCP SYRIZA VP
Leave the EU	KKE VP
Not to CFSP/ESDP within NATO	All
Free reception of non-EU immigrants	BE IU DL FG SYRIZA

3. The balance of radical left parties

The direct denouncement of neoliberal policies in the current EU is not only the unanimous *leitmotiv* of this ideological group, but also the most developed in their election manifestos. As parties that, in general, are linked to the historical tradition of the labour movement and anti-capitalist socialism it is no accident that they devote about half of their programmes to criticising the existing European socio-economic model that is objectively harmful to workers. All agree that the economic policies of the current EU aggravate social inequalities, precariousness and marginalisation and several specify that these only benefit a small

speculative financial oligarchy, unconnected from the real economy, which has subordinated governments according to their strict class interests. All the groups strongly support giving primacy to the public sector and, more particularly, the non-privatisation of essential goods and services because a society can not be considered as marketable commodity. An interesting point of interest is that, in a great majority of cases, their alternative proposals are not revolutionary in character as they limit themselves to asserting the need for the classic *Welfare State* of the “thirty glorious” years (1945-1975). In other words, the bulk of the radical left does not demand the opening of a path to an anti-capitalist programme of a transition to socialism, but – more modestly and realistically – to take the model of a mixed economy and universal social coverage typical of the post-1945 Western Europe tradition seriously. With this, the extreme radical position of the Greek Communists is exceptional, the only group that explicitly considers that the welfare state has been superseded from a historical point of view.

In the other two areas (democracy and national sovereignty) there is a connection because – in theory – this group of parties do not consider themselves doctrinally nationalist. So, in general, the defence of national primacy vis-à-vis the EU is undertaken not with essentialist arguments about ethnicity more or less, but about democracy: the democratic inadequacies of the current EU make it inadvisable to cede new lots of national sovereignty as this would be detrimental to popular interests. In other words, in an elitist and bureaucratic EU as we have today, we would be sacrificing democracy if we continue ceding lots of national power. So, while the EU does not undergo a real process of democratisation, the defence of national sovereignty is more than anything a democratic rather than a strictly nationalist imperative, though the objective effects of this policy today strengthen civic nationalist movements in many states. All parties of the radical left reject the Lisbon Treaty, especially because a fraud has reputedly taken place against countries who rejected the CTEU (in the view of these parties the Lisbon Treaty is practically the same) or the same (in the case of Ireland). This Treaty is presented as the consecration of the starkest neoliberalism in all its dimensions and even with the most elitist and anti-democratic opacity in its institutional format.

Now, when judging the existing alternatives in the dimension of the quality of democracy, two attitudes stand out: 1) several parties, in accordance with the historical tradition that is in principle more favourable to the supranationalism than that the *internationalist* left has defended, are particularly in favour of increasing the powers of the EP more than anything, yet 2) others, however, are wary of this approach and require the strengthening of the power of control and even the veto

of national parliaments, making them stronger than the EP. The first group is almost entirely made up of postcommunist or recycled communist parties, while in the second there is more heterogeneity for various *internal* reasons (they take *nationalist* positions here, for different reasons – three parties that are very different from each other: the SF, with an irredentist character, CDU-PCP, orthodox, and the VP, which is postcommunist).

The emphasis on national sovereignty as a shield against EU intrusions is very characteristic of the classic communists, the most enthusiastic supporters of this old doctrinal principle of little relevance in the world today. Not many clarify what their political project for the “other” Europe would be, or those who explicitly reject its eventual federalisation, the option with which both Communist and post-communist parties coincide, so national conditions being once again those that determine the strategy of each party in this area. The option of leaving the EU is also a very exceptional, radical proposal – only two parties, one Orthodox and the other postcommunist, have come postulate this.

The rejection of the EU’s current CFSP/ESDP is unanimous as the overall criticism is that they serve the interests of NATO and, worse, the U.S. For the majority of these parties the security and defence policies of the EU are taking on a dangerous *militaristic* drift that does not even benefit European states as such as they are in line with Washington’s agenda. With the rejection of NATO being virtually unanimous, it is also significant to find that several of the radical left parties – though they are a minority – refuse even to consider the possibility of creating a distinct European defence system, detached from NATO and the U.S. The anti-militarist and anti-imperialist culture so characteristic of this ideological group has produced a deep distrust and even rejection of such an option.

Finally, the issue of immigration is only mentioned by the parties from the countries where it is a relevant issue in the political agenda (Germany, France and Spain, in particular). They all have a very receptive attitude to non-EU immigration that they regard as a key contribution to European development. Their policies are flatly contrary to restrictions or repressive hardening of immigration laws – on the contrary, they are in favour of unfettered, free reception, hence their complaints of the current Community *involution* regarding this issue.

