ISSN 2335-2337. BALTIC JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCE. December 2015, No 4

RADICAL PARTY SYSTEM CHANGES IN FIVE EAST-CENTRAL EUROPEAN STATES: EUROSCEPTIC AND POPULIST PARTIES ON THE MOVE IN THE 2010s

Attila Ágh

ABSTRACT

This paper, in addition to describing the historical trajectory of party systems in the new European Union member states in general, describes the particular cases of five new Eastern-Central European (ECE) member states (NMS-5, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia), and the recent emergence of new, second party systems that have recently emerged after the collapse of their first party systems. The main message of this paper is that the historical transformations of the NMS-5 can best be described using a matrix of four party types: 1) populist, 2) Eurosceptic, 3) protest, and 4) extreme-right. Although Eurosceptic parties have been in the forefront of recent analysis, the other three forms included in this matrix are equally important, and even enhance the understanding of Eurosceptic parties in the NMS-5. Like the international literature, the focus of this paper is also on party developments, but includes a complex approach that accounts not only for political, but also for socio-economic, developments in the NMS-5.

Key words: *Eurosceptic, populist, extreme-right and protest parties, the first and second party system, Golem parties, critical elections, democracy capture.*

INTRODUCTION: CONCEPTUAL STRETCHING IN THE ANALYSIS OF EUROSCEPTIC PARTIES

The decline of democracy in the European Union's (EU) new member states (NMS) can be analysed from various sides, but one of the most important aspects to consider is the rise of Eurosceptic and protest parties within a general trend of increasing populism in this region. In the period following the 2008 global economic crisis, the attitudes of parties in Europe has been increasingly critical of both the EU and domestic political systems: "On both sides, an increasing national focus and a rise in populism as well as anti-EU sentiment are evident in all parts of society. The EU is more and more perceived as a problem. The weakest hold that the EU, and especially core countries in the euro zone, are imposing too much on them and asking too much from them" (Emmanouilidis, 2011, p. 13). These so-called critical parties

ATTILA ÁGH, Professor Emeritus at the Institute of Political Science, Corvinus University of Budapest, attila.agh@chello.hu.

deviate from mainstream parties in that they represent a kind of political reaction to the management of the global economic crisis by expressing the dissatisfaction of the masses, which are suffering the crisis's long-term effects. While the non-mainstream critical parties in Europe share some similarities and common features, they also show, rather directly, the idiosyncrasies of individual countries and regions. It is no surprise that international political scientists and scholars of European studies have been unable to cope with this rapid change in the world system. Hence there is no consensus regarding how to term these parties theoretically or as to how to treat them politically. Some analysts, to emphasize the common features of these marginal critical parties, have collected very different and diverging critical parties under the same hat and have rung the bell to proclaim that these parties represent a serious danger for Europe. Whereas other analysts have concentrated on the idiosyncrasies of individual parties or party types, they have obscured the source of this common trend despite the surfacing of the very important socio-economic circumstances that prompted the development of these parties in the given countries. Anyway, the debate on Eurosceptic and populist parties in the 2010s has restructured party theory in Europe. This paper tries to outline the theoretical consequences of this debate for parties in the NMS in general and for the NMS-5's parties in particular.[1]

There has been an outpouring of literature and a widespread discussion about non-mainstream critical parties under the various names of *populist*, *extremist,* and *protest parties*, but the most frequent and fashionable name has been *Eurosceptic*. In the last decade, the study of Eurosceptic parties has become a growth industry in international political science. The terms *populist party* and *protest party* have long been used in political science—and in the last decades, the term *extremist party* has also frequented agendas, understood in contrast to a *radical party* as an anti-systemic party. The term *Eurosceptic party* is, however, relatively new. It was first mentioned in the British daily national newspaper *The Times* in 1985; in earlier periods of the European Parliament (EP) the party term "nationalist" was used to describe opponents of EU integration. This new term reflects the fact that the party system has also been Europeanized; therefore the cleavage line between pro-EU and anti-EU parties has become crucial. This is all, to a great extent, thanks to British parties as the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) was, and remains, the most influential Eurosceptic party in the EP. The Eurosceptic party has turned out to be the brand name of actively and manifestly anti-EU parties across the European continent. Therefore, more and more, analysts have tended to call all critical, non-mainstream parties *Eurosceptic* or, interchangeably, *populist* parties—combining a conceptual chaos with a bugaboo.[2]

---

1 I have discussed the impact of the global crisis on the socio-political developments and decline of democracy in NMS (Ágh, 2014) and the specificities of the Hungarian party system (Ágh, 2015a,b). There has been literature on the radical transformations of party systems on all continents – e.g. Seawright (2012) in Latin America – that indicates the diverging specificities of this process. This paper deals with the basic party-system transformations in NMS-5 countries.

2 Eurosceptic discourse began with a speech by Margaret Thatcher in Bruges on 22 September 1988, but the term was oft used much later. The paper of Paul Taggart in 1998 is the theoretical foundation of Eurosceptic party research, jointly with Aleks Sczerbiak in the early 2000s with the distinction between hard and soft Euroscepticism

1. THE GENERAL FEATURES OF THE NMS-5'S PARTY SYSTEMS

1.1 The New Conceptual Framework for the Party Development in the EU

This whirling of many names, spurred by analysts' various focuses, has produced a situation of uncertainty in both politics and political science, notwithstanding that the real political life has produced on the other side a "natural selection,"—the 2014 EP elections was akin to a medical check-up for European parties and party systems. The influential project, *Voter Attitudes and EP Elections in Times of Crisis* asked, "will there be critical elections in the European Union?" (Schmitt, 2013). Actually, the 2014 EP elections were maintenance elections, not critical elections. It can be seen at first glance that despite a widespread sense of crisis and feelings of dissatisfaction in Europe, the EP elections did not unleash a major wave of change in the European party system as many analysts predicted, expected, and later described—claims European journalists have constantly repeated. There have been no fundamental changes to the structure of the EP or to the alignment of its main political groups because mainstream parties, by and large, have kept their positions (Bertsou, 2014). Although the critical parties have gained some space, their internal fights have significantly increased. Their quantitative gain has to be contrasted with their qualitative losses.

Over the last five years, journalists' absolute priority in their discourse regarding crisis management in the EU has been mistakenly focused on the EP elections, but the expected tsunami of change in the EP and the predicted Eurosceptic parties' landslide did not occur. The 2009 EP elections took place in what was still a pre-crisis mood. The following elections, held in May 2014, reflected a genuine post-crisis malaise. June 2014's Eurobarometer 81 indicated growing optimism as both the "Image of the EU" (35 versus 25 per cent) and the "Future of the EU" (56 versus 38 per cent) trends were positive and improving. This trend improved further in Eurobarometer 82, in November 2014 (with readings of 39 versus 22 per cent and 56 versus 37 per cent, respectively). The European malaise, however, has been exaggerated in the media and, to some extent, in politics. The EU public during these five years has been largely accustomed to the crisis's effects, and has absorbed or digested the radical changes originating from drastic crisis management measures.[3]

Accordingly, the latest EP election has been mistaken for a critical election, yet the size of critical parties and the quantity of their seats has *not* changed to such an extent that they provoked a power shift in the EP. No doubt, however, there has been a deep polarization in European public opinion. The political and policy distance has grown not only between the mainstream parties and the critical parties, but also between the soft- and hard-Eurosceptic parties. The extremist character of some hard-Eurosceptic parties has also become much more marked than before—thereby shocking EU populations and governments with their aggressive

---

(see Leconte, 2010, pp. 3-10). Leconte explains that "in today's political and academic discourse, Euroscepticism has become equated with different forms of opposition to European integration". It has been inflated and blurred with many contradictions, finally forcing Taggart and Sczerbiak to outline "what Euroscepticism is not" (Leconte 2010, pp. 5-6). See also Kopecky and Mudde (2002) or the theory of the "unortodox parties" (Pop-Eleches, 2010).

[3] The Eurobarometer has reported that the worst is over in the EU public opinion, since "trust and optimism are growing across the European Union", IP/14/543, Brussels, 12 May 2014. See also Toshkov et al., 2014.

styles and the racist ideologies. Nowadays, in general, Euroscepticism is high on the agenda in both European politics and European studies, not because of its actual political weight or influence in the EP or European politics, but because of the shocking and contaminating character of Eurosceptics' "anti-European" views and values. Interestingly enough, aggressive extremist parties have appeared not only in member states hit hardest by the global crisis (like Greece, Hungary, and Bulgaria), but due to the migrant issue in the most crisis-resilient member-states, they are appearing in the Nordic countries, too.[4]

Actually, the eighth EP was organized into 7 factions with 52 independent Members of the European Parliament (MEP) and these political groups have not experienced a political tsunami. The two biggest factions—the European People's Party (EPP, 221) and the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats (S&D, 191)—embrace 412 MEPs. The third largest faction is the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE, 67) with 479 MEPs. Finally, the fourth largest is The Greens—European Free Alliance (Green/EFA, 50) with 529 MEPs. These party groups may be considered mainstream and they still comprise the majority of the 751 MEPs—about 70 per cent—in the present EP. Indeed, this grand coalition has been alive and well; it dominated in legislation while the so-called fringe groups just tried to gain visibility (VoteWatch, 2015, p. 3). The so-called critical parties have formed three factions with 222 MEPs. The European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR, 70), based on the British Conservatives, and the Confederal Group of the European United Left/Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL, 52), based on the smaller leftist and green parties, are confronting the EU from both right and left as a velvet opposition of moderately soft-Eurosceptic parties with 122 MEPs, 16 per cent, altogether. The real Eurosceptic parties are beyond these political borders. Although analysts tried to define Eurosceptic party subtypes immediately following the last election, the actual demand to form EP factions generated a clear divergence among these parties that resulted in three very real subtypes. These three types of parties were not ready to cooperate with each other in the European Parliament and emphasized their distinctions from each other. Namely, during the EP-faction-organizing period, some Eurosceptic parties reacted angrily to the views of the others. Thus, under the pressure of EP regulations (twenty-five MEPs from seven member states were needed to form an EP faction), a natural selection emerged.

In June 2014, there was a strong divergence between the three main Eurosceptic groups (100 MEPs, 13 per cent) during the process of organizing EP factions). The first of these three groups organized the seventh EP faction—Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy (EFFD, 48)—dominated by the UKIP. The second group, of so-called radical Eurosceptic parties with a centrist effort, were dominated by France's National Front. Not only did the first and second group fail to find a common platform, but relations between the second and third group were

---

[4] About the critical elections literature see Róbert and Papp (2012), no surprise that the critical election model has been applied to Hungary as a classical case. I will return to this issue later when discussing the NMS-5 countries. Many well-informed Institutes have pointed out that there was no Eurosceptic or rightist-populist-extremist tsunami at the 2014 EP election. The chart of Bruegel (2014) shows that the relationship of political groups since 1979 has been rather constant and balanced, especially to the mainstream parties. Gros (2014, CEPS) has also indicated that no significant change can be noticed in the power relations in EP.

even more problematic—namely between the more consolidated "radical" group and the group of the remaining "extremist" Eurosceptic MEPs. Characteristically, the second group could not form a faction despite having more than twenty-five MEPs from six countries; they were not ready to accept racist and extremist partners. Hence, the biggest event in this faction organizing process was the manifest split between the centrist-leaning radical group and the extremist group—especially considering that the European media frequently refer to the Hungarian Jobbik (3 MEPs) and the Greek Golden Dawn (3 MEPs) as neo-Nazi or fascist parties. Finally, these real extremists, as the residual "independents," were separated informally into a very heterogeneous third group. In such a way, both the second and third Eurosceptic group remained without an EP faction, called in the EP parlance, "Non-Inscrits" (NI, 52). As to racism, the gap between the more consolidated radical Eurosceptic parties and the real extremists—Golden Dawn, Jobbik, and the like— may be larger at times than that between mainstream parties and the more moderate Eurosceptic parties—such as the UKIP and National Front—despite the many similar issues Eurosceptic parties advocate.[5]

In my view, in European studies, the non-mainstream, critical parties at large have been discussed rather uncritically so far, without properly or carefully distinguishing among them. This has created a situation of uncertainty in the post EP-election political analysis and generated the myth of extremist parties' success. The Big Four—populist, Eurosceptic, extremist, and protest parties—haunt European political science because there are no proper contrasts drawn between moderate and extremist critical parties. The latter comprise the relatively small number of truly Eurosceptic parties, which are represented by twenty to thirty MEPs. Among them, the really extremist Eurosceptic parties are usually organized and reorganized on the margin of their domestic political systems, with the exception of smaller countries experiencing severe crisis. These extremist Eurosceptic parties fight each other as fiercely as they fight the EU—after all, they are primarily based on aggressive nationalism and xenophobia. Also, it has to be taken into consideration that most of the noise—both in politics and in political science— about Euroscepticism is generated by the British case (44 Eurosceptic MEPs are from the UK) even though the British exit (Brexit) should be regarded separately from Euroscepticism in general. On the other side, the real danger is that the usual approach obscures Eurosceptic tendencies in mainstream party blocs and in soft-Eurosceptic parties in NMS, like the Fidesz or Law and Justice Party (PiS).

In the new member states the four types of parties, as a party matrix, make various combinations of party profiles. For example, some are more populist, but less extreme than others. These so-called critical parties react to the common problems of the EU crisis from all four sides, yet they present four different priorities related to the crisis. Nonetheless, while they mostly share the same critical less Europe tendencies, these parties still do not overlap

---

[5] In big outlines, first group is the EFFD with UKIP-24, Five Star Movement-17, Party of Free Citizens-1, Order and Justice-2; Sweden Democrats-2. The second group is composed e.g. from Front National (FN, 24); Party for Freedom (PVV-4); Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ-4); North League (Lega Nord-5); Congress of the New Right (KNP, 4 MEPs); Flemish Interest (VB-1). Finally, the third group consists e.g. of Jobbik (3), Golden Dawn (3), National Democratic Party of Germany (1); Democratic Unionist Party (1), Communist Party of Greece (2) and KSCM (3).

completely—though they usually oppose the mainstream parties that regularly represent the more Europe, pro-EU tendency. The characteristic of conceptual stretching in most analyses—resulting in theoretical chaos—is the interchangeable use of all four terms. This interchangeable use of terms is manifest in the 2014 EP post-election analyses, in which all four party names were used together and in various combinations, despite the divergence of these four types (for example, not all emerging protest parties are Eurosceptic). These journalistic misnomers appear even in theoretical EP analyses: many critical, non-mainstream parties have been classified, rather randomly, as one or two of the four party types.[6]

After the latest EP elections the Big Four "critical" parties can be viewed as parts of the following *party matrix*.

Populist Parties

Populist parties are not only anti-elitist and simplistic in sloganeering. A deeper analysis reveals that they can also be categorized by their contrasts and defined as either *responsive* or *responsible* parties, with respective short-term or long-term intents, or by acknowledging the conflict between direct political action and strategic vision (Bardi et. al, 2014). Populism may only be a marginal feature in the West (Mudde, 2007 and Giusto et al., 2013), but it has been the main party development trend in Eastern Europe, where governments have failed to meet the high expectations of NMS populations. In the NMS, populism—an endemic feature of all parties, including mainstream parties—has reached its peak, as seen in the "populism from above" of the governing parties. As a reaction to the global economic crisis, "Countries like Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and Czech Republic appeared to take a 'populist turn' . . . the incidents of threats to the EU's democratic principles and values has increased," (EPC, Balfour and Stratulat, 2012, p. 2). It is particularly true in the NMS that "Populists can easily project these problems onto 'Europe,' which in this case merely represents fear of the outside world in general . . . What has taken the form of an anti-EU vote constitutes in reality a protest against socio-economic problems at home," (Gros, 2014, pp. 2-3). In fact, the NMS parties can be analysed first from the side of populism—recently, populist protest actions have led to a rise in Eurosceptic parties in NMS.

Eurosceptic Parties

As Eurosceptic parties usually oppose particular EU policies or EU membership, their most common subtypes are the soft- and hard-Eurosceptic parties, respectively. Again, beyond the UK, hard-Euroscepticism is, above all, a product of the impoverishment and social exclusion generated by the global economic crisis. Before the global economic crisis, various sorts of soft-Euroscepticism were tolerated relatively well by governments in Western Europe through opt-out options and differentiated integration. Eurosceptics have only come to the fore to

---

[6] For instance, the Schuman papers – Deloy (2014) and Brustier, Deloy and Escalona (2014) - are quite informative as following the election events but they represent the classical case of theoretical misnomers by journalism because they have indeed used the basic terms interchangeably, somewhat chaotically.

oppose the emergence of tough crisis management measures in some public policies. As NMS had not fully completed their EU adjustment processes before the crisis—the outbreak of the global economic crisis closely followed their EU accession—they were hit especially hard. As a result, popular dissatisfaction and Eurosceptic parties are already on the move in NMS.

Protest Parties

Protest parties arise from the internal logic of the party system. When the party system has been eroded and corroded, new parties with a particular protest profile may spring up, though they usually survive for a shorter time than other parties. Or, protest parties may form to mobilize opposition or support when a very important policy issue comes to the fore. While, by definition, protest parties are not mainstream or well established, they are not necessarily populist, extremist, or Eurosceptic. Several kinds of protest parties are characteristic to the NMS, where there have been critical elections due to the erosion and de-legitimation of mainstream parties. In general, the initial party systems to emerge in young democracies are fragile due to their weak social links. Consequently, these parties have been elitist, provoking angry protest in the NMS, where protest parties have been emerging frequently in recent years.

Extremist Parties

Like the first three types in this four-party matrix, the rise in the number of *extremist parties* was also activated by the impact of the global financial crisis across Europe—with Greece being a classic case. Extremist groups can identify with the Left or the Right, but leftist-extremism appears mostly in the West as post-communist NMS grant little credibility to leftist extremists (the only major exception is the Czech Republic's Communist Party of Moravia and Bohemia, the KSCM). Extremist parties have a variety of profiles and priority issues, ranging from nationalist and racist to social and anti-global. Some extremist parties represent minority groups while others champion anti-minority group movements. Anyway, in NMS these parties are most often the prisoners of history, using "the politics of historical memory" as their main ideological weapon in domestic politics or in their fights against extremists in neighbouring countries. Altogether, the case of extremist parties best demonstrates the international incompatibility of extreme nationalist parties—in most cases, they see their main enemy in the same party group.[7]

The most characteristic case of conceptual stretching is analysts' warning cry that there is a growing number of extremist Eurosceptic parties in the EP. This claim is now a popular belief (perpetuated by the European media) and the most fashionable topic in the European

---

[7] The protracted social crisis has created a high level of xenophobia in NMS-5. Two Hungarian institutes – Political Capital (www.politicalcapital.hu) and Policy Solutions (www.policysolutions.hu) have been deeply involved into international research network on DEREX (Demand for Right-Wing Extremism, see www.derexindex.eu) and produced many papers also on the extreme-right parties, including Jobbik. Among the big party families the extreme right is less homogeneous even in Western Europe than the other families (see Ennser, 2012). As the above two Institutes describe them, this feature characterises the NMS-5 extreme right parties much more.

studies. Analysts have often used the terms *populist* and *Eurosceptic* interchangeably and, in many cases, the basic distinction between soft- and hard-Euroscepticism been lost. Unlike in the West, some mainstream parties in the NMS may have populist *and* Eurosceptic leanings, moreover they may advocate extreme views with a protest profile—as the Law and Justice Party (PiS) in Poland does. Other mainstream NMS parties are soft-Eurosceptic parties, like Fidesz. Thus, given the context of NMS, the dangers of conceptual stretching are even graver—theoretically and politically. Even if one neglects the interchange of party categorizations in these analyses, it is still necessary to insist on the distinction and deep divergences between Eastern and Western Europe in regard to party development (Polyakova, 2015).

1.2 The Specificities of Golem Parties and Hegemonic Party Systems in the NMS-5

The widespread prejudice against populist parties, and critical parties in general, is still haunting European studies where populist and critical parties are perceived with a one-size-fits-all attitude that fails to properly distinguish between the two party types in Eastern and Western Europe. The distinction between Eastern Europe and Western Europe, or between new and old member states, is becoming even more important due to the widening gap between the EU's core and its periphery. The reasons for these two different types of populism can be found in the EU's early systemic changes. To the masses, the ten years of membership has appeared to a great extent as the failure of the catching-up process. This deep dissatisfaction has produced within critical parties different sorts of Euroscepticism. Nowadays this failure is the point of departure in the analysis of NMS's parties and party systems, including their unique Eurosceptic features.

Neglecting the distinctions between Eastern and Western Europe misleads analysts. In Western Europe, social and national populism is based on: 1) resilient *post-welfare* (or 5-75-20) societies' struggle to cope with the problems of so-called well-being; and on 2) the relatively recent issue of the mass migration of *outsiders* to Western Europe. Quite contrarily, Eastern Europe's social and national populism is based on: 1) crisis-prone, premature, welfare societies, or *pre-welfare* (or 5-55-40) societies, that are still very far from achieving well-being characterized by sustainability and life-satisfaction; and on 2) the age-old tensions with local *outsiders*—autochthon *ethnic minorities,* such as the Roma, Jewish populations, and local minority groups from neighbouring countries. Also, in this respect, analysts cannot apply an evolutionary model to these two types by expecting the NMS to catch up, as if it would just take time for these states to reach the next stage of development, since neither the NMS-5 populations nor their parties are simply in an earlier stage of Europeanization or democratization. Actually, the NMS populations and their parties have been seriously diverging from the "Western European Road" since the very beginning of systemic change. Social consolidation, civil society, and local democracy in the NMS are in worse shape now than they were 25 or 10 years ago. The "transformative power" of the EU has shown its very tough limits (Kartal, 2014).

The usual typologies of parties and party systems applied to mainstream parties do not work for the NMS-5. The main task of these typologies is to identify the special role the parties

and party systems played during the last quarter-century of systemic change. The formal-legal approach of this narrow political history does not help, since the historical trajectory of the NMS countries was determined by the region's socio-economic history. After their first decade of EU membership, effective institutionalization is still missing in the NMS-5. There, formal-legal institutions were built like sand palaces, lacking solid social backgrounds and patterns of civic behaviour. Against the context of unrealized high expectations for some kind of welfare society, national-social populism offers ideological drugs to falsely recompensate the population with their mirage of a new age. Thus, in the NMS, the perceived reality differs very much from the genuine socio-economic reality. This contrast between the popular dream and reality grew during the NMS's first decade of EU membership. Deep malaise has appeared in both Eastern and Western Europe, but in very different ways—the East has been haunted by the idea of an increasing gap between the core and periphery and by the threat of further peripheralization. So, disappointment over failing to easily and rapidly catch up, compounded by the global economic crisis, has led to greater malaise in Eastern Europe than in the West.[8]

Moreover, the populism and Euroscepticism of the new Eastern European member states is also different from that of Southern Europe's new member states. In both regions, EU membership has brought with it a series of achievements, but it has also caused region-specific negative externalities. First of all, the Eastern European enlargement—with its development closely integrated with production structures in Western Europe—has produced dependency. Namely, Eastern Europe has become the semi-periphery of the "near West," and above all, of Germany and Austria. It has produced a very marked underdevelopment by drastically splitting individual NMS-5 countries into two parts: modernized regions and undeveloped islands of poverty. Thus split, a new member state is deeply divided internally between their developing and their declining regions. Thus, the crucial issue for the NMS is internal "territorial" social cohesion, or the ability to unite not only with the EU, but to also unite the modernized and undeveloped regions within their own country.

In the new political geography, the NMS-5 have been splitting into either West-of-the-East or East-of-the-East groups. The former has integrated their development rather closely with Western European development, and are, relatively, catching up. The East-of-the East group has absolutely declined—evidenced by their losses in competitiveness, high unemployment, and a worsening standard of living. There, despite attempts to cover these trends with national statistics, a drastic social polarization is underway. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish between the relative, fragile, and precarious satisfaction of the NMS-5 populations in the West of the East and their absolute dissatisfaction in the East of the East. Nonetheless, in this political geography, the general disappointment shared by NMS populations after ten years of EU membership determined the domestic party landscape. This basic domestic-territorial

---

[8] Many policy institutes (Bertelsmann, FH and WEF) have analysed this contrast between the formal and substantive democratization in NMS, see first of all the data of the EIU (2014,2015). The Quarter-Century in all dimensions has been very well described in the literature in great detail, see Banac (2014), CEPI (2014), Darvas (2014), European Catching Up Index (2014), GKI (2013), Grabbe (2014), IMF (2014a,b), Mannheim University (2014) and Munck (2012).

and social divergence is also responsible for the distinctions between soft and hard social movements, parties, and ideologies in the NMS that are West of the East and the NMS that are East of the East. These differences are easily detected on the electoral map of the countries given the varieties of populism and Euroscepticism in national and EP elections. The hard-populist and Eurosceptic parties have found popular support in countries East of the East, among the "absolute losers"—the unemployed; and the soft populist and Eurosceptic parties in West-of-the-East countries have gained the support of the relative losers—the declassed middle strata. This phenomena can be seen best on the electoral map of Poland, which is completely partitioned from east to west. Generally, due to the global economic crisis, the NMS populations have been living in a state of permanent insecurity (with an increasingly real precariat class in the middle) in these precariously positioned countries.

Actually, to discover what could be called the secret history of the NMS-5 region, one has to identify and define the region's political actors, parties and party systems in a way that the West's standard definitions cannot. This secret history can be described as a negative tendency of the emergence of Golem parties with their so-called hegemonic party systems. These parties have been the most relevant actors in their young yet declining democracies over the last quarter-century of the NMS's histories. The particular features of these parties, and their hegemonic party systems dominated by the strongest Golem parties, have structured the political and social life as a whole in the NMS. By the 2010s, they emerged, in different ways, as the dominant actors of the NMS party landscapes. The biggest NMS-5 parties, as the monopolistic political actors, have become almighty and comprehensive social actors with large, strong, informal networks, allowing them to embrace the economy and the media by merging politics and business (see Rupnik and Zielonka, 2013). Moreover, in this system of "crony capitalism" (The Economist, 2014) they have organized their own special pseudo-civil society from above as well. All of the NMS have suffered from very weak social embeddedness (Casal Bértoa, 2014), hence the emergence of socially and ideologically unanchored elites organized by political and economic oligarchs (Herman, 2015). However, as recent analyses have pointed out, these Golem parties have created an effective countrywide corruption network based on public procurement and EU transfers. In this way, Golem parties have, to a great extent, been able to control paralysed societies.[9]

In the NMS, parties' quasi-monopolization of the political scene alienated the population from politics. These populations' distrust of their new democratic institutions generated long-standing and culminating negative effects such as a systemic class bias in electoral participation—the region's biggest problem regarding political representation. A recent European Science Foundation (ESF) report warned that many NMS citizens "still feel frustrated and dissatisfied" about their economic and social security (ESF, 2012, p. 42). The socio-economically marginalized, a silent strata of "absolute losers," have had no chance to express their views at the national political level and Golem parties have also rendered the increasingly

---

[9] Ten Years of Membership has been evaluated in two important volumes – with the introductions of Rupnik and Zielonka (2013) and Epstein and Jacoby (2014) respectively – that have given a new conceptual framework for the NMS analysis.

impoverished middle strata of "relative losers" politically powerless. Altogether, in the terms of a participation and representation paradox: the *more* the absolute and relative losers have needed political representation as a pressure group, the *less* they have participated in political life, often because they have been represented by parties or other political organizations. Although their lack-of-representation situation has occasionally pushed impoverished masses to the streets to launch anomic actions, there were no major disturbances in the NMS in the 1990s when the populations' social patience was rather high. But from the 2000s onward, the outbursts of populist protest have increasingly taken the form of extreme-right demonstrations and extreme-right organizations. When this disempowerment reached its peak in the 2010s, there was a rise in soft- and hard-Eurosceptic parties and anomic movements; all sorts of populist and extremist organizations emerged, and protest parties made a volcanic appearance. This ideal model of the deep political crisis in the NMS has to be nuanced from both the side of the Golem parties and that of paralysed populations, since it shows only the bare bones.[10]

Thus, I have identified three consecutive crises, which have occurred in the past quarter-century: a transformation crisis, a post-accession crisis, and a global accommodation crisis. I have written a progress report (with a large database taken from the major international policy institutes) on this triple crisis process in NMS (Ágh, 2013a,b). Based on this data, my comparative paper concentrates on the NMS parties' transformations after the global economic crisis, since all NMS countries show similar trends. To analyse the party systems, their entire political landscape had to be overviewed before applying the conceptual framework elaborated above. The full matrix of the party transformations has to be described with the four types of parties: populist, Eurosceptic, protest, and extremist. Despite the increasing salience of Eurosceptic parties, populism is still key since populism runs through the whole history of the NMS' democratization. Euroscepticism is not just relatively new in the NMS, but the EU-based cleavage is still much less important than the winner-loser social cleavage in both national and EP elections. These four types of parties still share a common socio-economic background in that they are missing social consolidation, with some specific features and patterns of behaviour in the NMS region, although this varies widely by individual state. In the 2010s, the socio-economic shock of the global economic crisis prompted a prolonged party and political crisis in the NMS with these big Golem-type parties. Under pressure to manage the crisis, the first party systems eroded in the 2000s and, due to popular dissatisfaction, they finally collapsed in the 2010s. But the efforts to organize Golem parties and their hegemonic party systems have continued in the NMS's newly emerging second party systems following the critical elections. This recent political crisis has been based on a worsening social crisis

---

[10] There has recently been a huge party literature on NMS, see e.g. Gherghina (2014), Haughton (2014), Kopecky et al. (2012), Nakrosis and Gudzinskas (2013) and Sedelmeier (2014). The recent analysis of Lise Herman on "party-citizen dynamics" and on the "culturalist" approach to party developments has overviewed the huge NMS party literature (Herman, 2015, pp. 14-17). The party composition and life-time of the European governments is a very well researched topic in political science, the basic data have been published every year in *European Journal of Political Research*.

(of impoverishment and social exclusion leading to social populism) from below and it has culminated in an intensified identity crisis (of renationalization and xenophobia leading to national populism) from above. Indeed, the short overview of the NMS-5 party systems clearly demonstrates that political science can be a dismal science.[11]

2. THE COLLAPSE OF THE FIRST PARTY SYSTEM AND THE EMERGENCE OF SECOND PARTY SYSTEMS IN THE NMS-5

2.1 Critical Elections and Democracy Captures in the NMS-5

A critical election, which collapses the party system and produces significant political turmoil, differs from a party transformation in general—a critical election basically signals the change of the basic party system as a whole. Critical elections have been discussed in international political science, but are an under-researched topic in the NMS-5 with all of the region's specificities. There are three parallel processes that make an election *critical* and pave the way for an ensuing collapse of party systems: ideological, social, and political reconfigurations.

1) A new *ideological* configuration occurs when new issues come to the fore with new values and patterns of behaviour and new dividing lines emerge in ideology and public discourse.
2) A new *social* configuration follows radical transformations to the social structure that generate deep changes in the social base of parties and transform the main social cleavages.
3) A new *political* configuration is often evidenced by the appearance of new party images, a general shifting in positions on the Left-Right scale, and substantial changes to the links between interest groups and parties.

The critical election causes a new party or a new coalition to ascend to power, resulting in the collapse of the existing party system and the emergence of a new party system. The impact of a critical election can be summarized as three dramatic and fundamental transformations in the size and nature of parties in just one—or two consecutive—elections:

1) Among the *largest* parties, there are substantial reconfigurations in the leading parties. Sometimes the former governing party disappears and the big mainstream parties rearrange themselves.
2) Within the zone of *middle-sized* or *small* parties, many new protest and extremist parties appear or grow in size. Basically, the smaller critical parties transform.
3) Finally, modifications to the party system's overall *structure* and *character* result in the realignment of parties.

Most often, emphasis is placed on the defeat of governing parties, the victory of critical—or opposition—parties, and increased support for minor radical or extremist parties. Greater detail and elaboration, however, reveals that critical elections reflect a change in: the

---

[11] The data on the general impoverishment in the NMS are available in OECD, 2011, 2014. Nowadays the satisfaction with standard of living has been very much below the EU average in NMS, while the risk of falling into poverty has been among the highest in the EU (Eurobarometer 81, 2014, pp. 25,27). The social-cultural factors (e.g. civic political culture) have also been mentioned in several papers as well-being, life-satisfaction or social progress, i.e. those factors closely interwoven with social investment, social productivity and the like (Herman, 2015).

character of populism, the prevalence of extremism, and the popularity of protest parties. Moreover, in recent years and due to the increasing salience of EU membership in the NMS, the issue of Euroscepticism was (for the first time) relatively high on the political agenda in these critical elections. In addition, the EP elections—second-order elections, which typically have much lower turnout in NMS than the parliamentary elections—can produce even bigger party transformations; hence these "pre-elections" can also indicate the results of upcoming critical national elections. From a bird's-eye view, the basic issues of the NMS-5's historical trajectory are the deep ideological split between the Left and the Right (Savage, 2014), the decreasing popularity of political elites, and low participation in elections.[12]

In an effort to overview the NMS-5's first ten years of EU membership, Abby Innes identified two types of political developments; in doing so, she also explains the type of critical elections held in the NMS-5. Namely, the party state capture and the corporate state capture have defined the main NMS historical trajectories, a sharp contrast from the officially declared Europeanization and democratization processes. In the party-state-capture model political motivations dominate among the new elite. Because parties want to permanently control the state's machinery as a whole, they transform the state according to their values and expectations—as seen in Poland, Hungary, and most probably, in Slovenia. In the party-state-capture model, oligarchs are mostly in hiding. They are less like to play a direct political role and simply enjoy the privileges of state or agency capture. So oligarchs' rent-seeking or profit-seeking drive appears first through the domination of the state. Therefore, "The EU's leverage is necessarily limited in the cases of party state capture" (Innes, 2014, p. 101). In the opposite model, the corporate-state-capture model, economic motivation dominates state transformations. The powerful corporations and almighty oligarchs appear on the political scene rather directly, like in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. In this model neither party politicians nor oligarchs endeavour to transform the state machinery ideologically—according to their values and expectations—or long-term. Instead, their short-term rent-seeking drive or profit-seeking drive comes directly to the fore; business oligarchs in this model are active on the political scene. The best way to evaluate these two models, suggests Innes, is to use the World Bank's governance indicators (WGI)—specifically the "indicator of government effectiveness" and the "indicator of control of corruption."[13]

While outlining these two party systems, Innes correctly insists on a main East and West divergence, "The stable party competitions and Weberian states of post-war western Europe were founded on strong elite commitments to democracy and socially embedded through sustained productivity growth and universally rising living standards. But these conditions have never existed in central Europe." Yet, the conceptual framework, that has usually been

---

[12] The rankings of public trust in politicians in NMS-5 (out of 144 countries) are the following: CZ: 138, HU: 113, PL: 101, SI: 133 and SK: 121 (WEF, 2014: 409). Accordingly, there was a very low turnout in NMS e.g. at the 2004, 2009 and 2014 EP elections, the participation was 27.9-28.2-18.2; 38.4-36.2-28.9; 20.8-24.5-23.8; 28.3-28.3-20.9 and 16.9-19.6-13.0 per cent in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia respectively.

[13] The government effectiveness has decreased between 1996 and 2013 in the countries of party state capture (HU: 78.5-70.3, PL: 76.6-71.3 and SI: 79.5-78.9) and has improved in those of corporate state capture (CZ: 71.7-75.1 and SK: 71.2-73.2), while the control of corruption has worsened in all cases (CZ: 76.6-62.7, HU: 74.1-64.6, PL: 72.7-70.8, SI: 86.8-73.7 and SK: 66.3-59.8 – 100 is the best score, WGI, 2015). See also Ugur, 2013.

applied to the NMS in European studies has been based on "the golden age of European growth." Hence, "the transition literature has often drawn more optimistic conclusions about the consolidation of central European states" (Innes, 2014, pp. 88,90). Given this divergence between Eastern and Western Europe, I would factor in, as a common denominator, the role of party and corporate state captures in achieving a democracy capture. In this resulting democracy capture, Golem parties in a hegemonic party system "legally" transform the democratic polity into a facade-democracy by abusing their majority. Therefore, in their latest overviews of the "third wave" of democratization, analysts have pointed to a decline in democracy in the NMS, where most of the formally electoral democracies have not become substantial liberal democracies.[14]

2.2 A Bird's-Eye View of Critical Elections in the NMS-5

A bird's-eye view of the NMS's party system transformations (see the detailed data in the respective tables) in the selected five ECE states must start with Poland—a NMS trendsetter in socio-economic and political transformations and the site of the first NMS critical election. In 2005, Poland's former governing party, the "post-communist" Democratic Left Alliance (SLD), was heavily defeated with a loss of 161 seats in Sejm (Lower House) while the two main so-called critical parties gained a clear majority by winning a combined 179 additional seats. Since then, Poland's Civic Platform Party (PO) and the PiS have dominated the Polish party system in the last three elections, winning 288, 375, and 364 of the *Sejm's* 460 seats. The 2007 and 2011 elections were already the new, second party system's maintenance elections. Although the PO has been a clear winner, its majority has been constantly disputed by the PiS. Moreover the PO has been deeply corroded—its split-off "critical" party, the Palikot's Movement (RP), won 40 *Sejm* seats in 2011. It cannot be excluded that in 2015, the PiS—a large Eurosceptic party, which also harbours some extreme-right views—would come back to power, as the latest EP elections also indicate, and could invite the second collapse of the Polish party system. By 2004, the EP elections were pre-elections for 2005. The SLD had already lost, receiving only 5 seats, and the PO and PiS had a combined 22 of 54 seats with very fragmented party participation. This shift was even more marked in 2009 with 7 MEPs for the SLD, and 40 MEPs for the PO and PiS (out of 50 seats), and appeared again in 2014, with 5 MEPs for SLD and 38 MEPs for the PO and PiS (out of 51 seats). The Polish model is characteristic, not just of the overwhelming weight of the Right (PO and PiS), but also of the large variety of Eurosceptic parties with a rather hard profile like the League of Polish Families (LPR), the PiS, the Self-Defense of the Republic of Poland (SoRP), and the newly emerging Congress of the New Right (KNP).[15]

---

[14] See first of all the Special Issue of Journal of Democracy, e.g. the paper of Kagan with a special reference to Hungarian leaders "crack down on press and political freedom" (201529). See also Armingeon and Guthmann (2014), Gerschewski (2013), and Köllner and Kallitz (2013).

[15] Poland has a long history of protest parties coming from nowhere and disappearing or transforming on the margin of the party system, but now KNP is a big success that indicates the widespread public dissatisfaction. Even more the latest presidential election in spring 2015, Andrzej Duda (PiS) has won against Bronislaw Komorowski (PO) with 51.55 versus 48.45 per cent.

The profound transformation of the Slovak and Czech party system began in the second half of the 2000s and has continued into the 2010s. In the Slovak and Czech cases there was a prolonged two-step critical election, which even the latest elections have not fully concluded. The Slovak story began in 2006 when the dominant national-populist party, the People's Party-Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (HZDS), collapsed. Slovakia's story looks simple, the Smer has an increasing dominance with consecutive wins in the 2006, 2010, and 2012 elections (50, 62 and 83 seats out of 150). But the success of the Smer is in its shy Eurosceptic and brave leftist-populist profile in a deeply divided, but rather pro-EU, centre-right Democratic and Christian Union (SDKÚ), Christian Democratic Movement (KDH), Party of Hungarian Coalition (SMK-MKP) and Bridge (MOST-HÍD) context—a very unbalanced new party system. The transitory government change—the intermezzo of Iveta Radicova as prime minister—and the regularly emerging populist protest parties (such as Ordinary People and Independent Personalities (OĽANO) reveal the fundamentally fragile character of the second party system. This series of three EP elections suggests the relative dominance of the Smer (with 3, 5, and 4 MEPs out of 14, 13, and 13 seats respectively). Yet the aforementioned pro-EU and centre-right parties—including Freedom and Solidarity (SaS) in 2014—are the dominant representatives of Slovakia in the EP (with 8, 6, and 7 seats). Although the Eurosceptic extreme-right is weak (with 3, 2, and 2 seats), the Eurosceptic parties, jointly with the Smer, are still rather strong (with a combined 6, 7, and 6 seats). Again, these EP results are not indicative enough, given very low participation in the EP elections (16.96 per cent, 19.64 per cent and 13.05 per cent Slovakian voter turnout, respectively). The low turnout at the latest EP election, with many parties participating in the EP elections, and the lack of a clear and strong winner, may indicate the erosion of the second party system. Fico's defeat in the recent presidential elections could foretell a further prolongment of Slovakia's decade-long critical elections.[16]

Like Slovakia, the Czech Republic also lacks a clear, strong winner, but there have been many clear losers in the prolonged critical elections. Of the NMS, the Czech Republic's rapidly changing party landscape has the most Eurosceptic popular profile. There, a series of critical elections began in 2006.In 2006, the Civic Democratic Party (ODS) was relatively dominant (with 81 seats of 200), but declined, winning only 53 seats in 2010.By 2013, the ODS actually collapsed—winning only 16 seats. The ODS's main competitor, the Czech Social Democratic Party (CSSD)—despite its increasing weight of 74, 56, and 50 seats in 2006, 2010, and 2013 respectively—has *not* become the Czech Republic's new dominant party. Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSCM), an extreme-left and Eurosceptic party, has maintained a solid share of the parliament (with 26, 26, and 33 seats). Like the KSCM, the Christian Democratic Union (KDU) on the other side of the aisle (with 13, 0, and 14 seats) absorbed much of the centre-right votes. So neither the ODS in earlier elections, nor the CSSD in later elections managed to secure a places as the truly dominant party. In this very fragmented party system,

---

[16] In Slovakia in March 2014 Andrej Kiska was elected against Robert Fico as a "protest president", or independent honest person. The Guardian has described him as "millionaire turned philanthropist", http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/mar/30/slovakia-elects-andrej-kiska-president-robert-fico.

protest parties regularly emerged including : the Green Party (ZS) in 2006 (6 seats), the Coalition of (TOP) TOP in 2009 (41 seats), and the Public Affairs Party (VV) in 2010 (24 seats). This emergence of protest parties is even more clearly illustrated by the election results of the right-wing populist parties: in 2011 the Action of Dissatisfied Citizens (ANO) garnered 47 seats and the Dawn of Direct Democracy (UPD) secured 14. Indeed, the soft-Eurosceptic ODS and the hard-Eurosceptic KSCM have dominated the EP elections together with 15, 13, and 5 MEPs of 24, 22, and 21 seats, in addition to other Eurosceptic parties, which held 5 MEPs in 2004. The decline of Eurosceptic parties in 2014 has been slightly reduced by the Party of Free Citizens (SSO), which held 1 seat, rendering, a shared 20, 13, and 6 MEPs respectively. On the other side, 4, 9, and 15 MEPs seem to indicate a stronger support for the EU in this very unstable party system. The big question is whether or not this represents a real, long-term turn in public opinion.[17]

Hungary offers a classic case of critical elections. Whereas the Hungarian party system looked like a stable bipolar system—the two biggest parties won 85 per cent of the votes in the 2006 elections—this first party system actually collapsed in the 2010 elections. In 2010, the Fidesz Party was the clear winner in a newly emerging hegemonic party system. The former governing party, the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP), was drastically cut in size; Fidesz gained a two-thirds majority. This collapse changed not only the party system, but also the entire constitutional-political system. This trend continued after the 2014 elections, with a subsequent two-thirds majority for Fidesz resulting in the further fragmentation and marginalization of Hungary's leftist parties. Fidesz has so drastically transformed the electoral system and dominated the public media that its overwhelming 2014 victory has led to "elected autocracy." Parallel to these changes, an extreme-right, hard-Eurosceptic Jobbik Party has also been strengthened, gaining a respective 16 and 20 per cent of votes in the 2010 and 2014 elections. Jobbik also successfully gained 3-3 seats in each EP election in 2009 and 2014. Similarly, as a soft-Eurosceptic party, Fidesz has also dominated at the EP elections, winning 12, 14, and 12 seats out of 24, 22, and 21 seats. So Hungary, which arguably suffered the outcomes of the global crisis the most in NMS-5 due to its high indebtedness, has produced the most marked turn to a national-social populism combined with both soft- and hard- Euroscepticism.[18]

Slovenia, the most complicated case, is the most developed NMS country to experience a recent, deep, and protracted socio-economic and party-political crisis. Even before the global economic crisis, at the 2008 elections, the Slovenian party system was already over-fragmented. Fragile, multiparty coalitions were the result of the small size of Slovenia's two leading parties, the Social Democrats (SD) held 29 of 90 seats and the SDS held 28 seats.

---

[17] In the Czech Republic, the new ANO movement led by the multimillionaire Andrej Babiš received a large share of the vote in the Czech parliamentary elections in 2013 and it topped also the European elections in the country. This result may firmly establish ANO's place in the Czech Republic's party system.

[18] Hungary has become an "elected autocracy" due to the manipulated election, as Scheppele (2014) and Mudde (2014) have pointed out (see also Pappas, 2014). Certainly, Fidesz is the biggest and strongest Golem party in NMS.

This unbalanced and fragmented character of the party system only worsened when each of the leading parties and their shaky coalitions failed to manage the impact of the global economic crisis. These failures produced drastic changes to subsequent election ballots. In 2011 the Positive Slovenia (PS) and the Civic List of Gregor Virant (CV) were new entrants and in 2014, with the collapse of PS and the new Miro Cerar Party(SMC) joined the electoral arena. In contrast to these dramatic changes, Slovenians have consistently supported the EU in EP elections; actually, all of the country's successful parties have been pro-EU. Thus, in Slovenia, high-level protest and populist activity has been combined with very low levels of Euroscepticism and extremism.[19]

A bird's-eye view of the landscape of the transformations of NMS party systems reveals that many parties tried to become dominant Golem parties in hegemonic party systems based on the power of organized informal corruption networks, but did so only with dubious and transitory success—except for Hungary's Fidesz, which reached "elected autocracy" perfection. It is also clear that Poland and Hungary, dominated by right-wing parties, experienced a party state capture, while Slovakia and the Czech Republic illustrate a corporate-state capture. Poland's series of critical elections, from 2004 to 2005, occurred when the bipolar (post-Solidarity versus post-communist) party system collapsed. Even now, the weaknesses of their second party system are surfacing. The Czech Republic and Slovakia had a longer, two-phase process in the early 2010s.And, while Hungary presented a classic case of a critical election in 2010, Slovenia experienced a collapse and continues to struggle with a turmoil that has not yet resulted in a clear winner.

These countries' stories share many common features because, in NMS, long-term party identifications are weak. Thus, the short-term party preferences as actual improvisations at the elections have generated high electoral volatility as substitute allegiances. The consequently fragile parties and fragile party systems allow bigger parties to consistently abuse state power by using their informal networks for their own excessive corruptive gains. The most evident symptom of this NMS party system disease is the sudden upsurge of minor protest parties—an upsurge that extends well beyond parties' expected splits, mergers, and new names. The most acute form of this controversial de-democratization process is the emergence of personal parties. When voters lose their confidence in the available parties, they place their trust in independent, well-known, and "honest" personalities, as the voters of Slovenia have.

CONCLUSION: THE EMERGING SECOND PARTY SYSTEMS WITH BAD GOVERNANCE IN NMS

Instead of applying an evolutionary development model to the NMS—a practice that appears often in the majority of analyses regarding Eastern Europe and in the majority of the self-portraits presented by governments and their experts—studying Eurosceptic parties reveals

---

[19] In Slovenia there is no light yet at the end of the tunnel at the party transformations. Miro Cerar had to form a large coalition government, and this government has to face the task of the radical economic reforms, so its future is unclear.

the NMS's wide divergence from the EU mainstream and an increasing divide between the EU's core and its periphery. The NMS's first party systems were fragile and their newly emerging, unstable, second party systems have been overburdened by competing oligarchs, clientelism, and kleptocracy. Parallel to positive Europeanization and democratization story is a negative version of de-Europeanization and de-democratization that can be identified and described in great detail. The key issue of party analysis in this negative version is that NMS parties have tried to become all-embracing Golem parties and have focused their efforts on attempts to build hegemonic party systems. In fact, because these parties' informal networks extend from politics to the economy, to civil society, and to the media; their reach has penetrated all social sectors. These Golem parties, however, have produced short-lived, frequently changing, weak governments. Their short-term focus has led them to act *responsively* but not *responsibly*. This "populism from above" resulted in low performance and weak competitiveness, and altogether in the poor governance of the NMS.[20]

Ambrogio Lorenzetti presents *Justice* and *Tyranny* as the chief actors of his six famous Siena frescos depicting allegories of good and bad governments in both urban and rural settings. These frescos are timely symbols for ECE countries. The messages of Lorenzetti's fourteenth-century pictorial encyclopaedia—about the contrast between well-governed and ill-governed polities, or in recent terms, between Europeanized effective parties and degenerated, corrupt, and ineffective parties—are still applicable today. It is a pity that the ECE elites have not yet received, or have not yet been ready to understand, this very important message about the need for good governance based on a well-performing party system.[21]

---

[20] The successive analyses of BTI (2014a,b) have pointed out that in the NMS countries there has been a huge gap between their level of general development (SI index) and the government capacity of management (MI index).

[21] The figures of the Peace-Fortitude-Prudence/Magnanimity-Temperance-Justice have been presented on these frescos from one side and those of the Avarice-Pride-Vainglory/Cruelty-Treason-Fraud/Frenzy-Divisiveness-War from the other side. It is not so difficult to find the similarity between these symbolical figures of bad governance and the recent negative political heroes in NMS.

Domestic Party-political Developments in East-Central Europe

TABLE 1: The Czech Republic's parliamentary elections in 2006, 2010, and 2013 (Chamber of Deputies, 200 seats), turnout 64.47, 62.60, and 59.48%, respectively

Party	2006 votes	2006 seats	2010 votes	2010 seats	2013 votes	2013 seats
ODS	35.38	81	20.22	53	7.72	16
CSSD	32.32	74	22.08	56	20.45	50
KSCM	12.81	26	11.27	26	14.91	33
KDU-CSL	7.23	13	4.39	0	6.68	14
ZS	6.29	6	2.44	0	3.19	0
TOP 09	--	--	16.70	41	11.99	26
VV	--	--	10.88	24	--	--
ANO 2011	--	--	--	--	18.85	47
UPD	--	--	--	--	6.88	14

ODS – Civic Democratic Party; CSSD – Czech Social Democratic Party; KSCM – Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia; SNK – Alliance of the Independent European Democrats; KDU-CSL – Christian Democratic Union-People's Party, NEZDEM – Independent Democrats; ANO 2011 – Action of Dissatisfied Citizens; TOP 09 – Coalition of TOP 09; SSO - Party of Free Citizens; ZS - Green Party, VV – Public Affairs, UPD – Dawn of Direct Democracy.

TABLE 2: Czech Republic's EP elections in 2004, 2009, and 2014 (24, 22, and 21 seats respectively), turnout 28.32, 28.22, and 18.20%, respectively

Party	2004 votes	2004 seats	2009 votes	2009 seat	2014 votes	2014 seats
ODS	30.04	9 (ECR)	31.45	9 (ECER)	7.67	2 (ECR)
CSSD	8.78	2 (PES)	22.38	7 (PES)	14.17	4 (PES)
KSCM	20.26	6 (GUE)	14.18	4 (GUE)	10.98	3 (GUE)
SNK	11.02	3 (EPP)	1.66	0	0.52	0
KDU-CSL	9.57	2 (EPP)	7.64	2 (EPP)	9.95	3 (EPP)
NEZDEM	8.18	2 (NI)	--	--	--	--
ANO 2011	--	--	--	--	16.13	4 (ALDE)
TOP 09	--	--	--	--	15.95	4 (EPP)
SSO	--	--	--	--	5.24	1 (EFFD)

ODS – Civic Democratic Party; CSSD – Czech Social Democratic Party; KSCM – Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia; SNK – Alliance of the Independent European Democrats; KDU-CSL – Christian Democratic Union-People's Party, NEZDEM – Independent Democrats; ANO 2011 – Action of Dissatisfied Citizens; TOP 09 – Coalition of TOP 09; SSO - Party of Free Citizens.

TABLE 3: Hungary's parliamentary elections in 2006, 2010, and 2014 (386, 386, 199 seats respectively), turnout: 67.83-64.39 (first and second round), 64.20-46.62 (first and second round), 60.09 (one round), respectively.

Party	2006 votes	2006 seats	2010 votes	2010 seats	2014 votes	2014 seats
Fidesz	42.03	164	53.64	263	45.04	133
MSZP	43.21	190	21.28	59	(25.67)	29
Jobbik	---	---	16.36	47	20.30	23
SZDSZ	6.31	20	---	---	---	---
MDF	5.04	11	1.42	---	---	---
LMP	---	---	5.07	16	5.36	5
DK	---	---	---	---	(25.67)	4
E-PM	---	---	---	---	(25.67)	4

Fidesz – (originally: Alliance of Young Democrats), now Fidesz – Civic Alliance, together with KDNP (Christian Democratic People's Party), MSZP – Hungarian Social Democratic Party; Jobbik – For a Better Hungary; SZDSZ – Alliance of Free Democrats; MDF – Hungarian Democratic Forum; LMP – Politics Can Be Different; E-PM – Together 2014 and Partnership for Hungary. There was one independent MP in 2006 and one in 2010. MSZP, DK, and E-PM ran with a common party list in 2014, had 25.67 per cent on the common list, and 38 seats altogether, allocated as 29-4-4 seats and 1 seat was given to a liberal MP. Fidesz support, in absolute figures, from the 8.1 million electorate, was: 1990 (439.481), 1994 (416.143), 1998 (1,263.522), 2002 (2,306.763), 2006 (2,272.979), 2010 (2,743.626), and 2014 (2,142.142 and 122.638 votes from Hungarians in the neighbouring countries). Fidesz lost 600,000 voters, but with new manipulated electoral rules, (legislated by the Orbán government before the 2014 elections) the supermajority was reached again.

TABLE 4: Hungary's EP elections in 2004, 2009, and 2014 (24, 22, 21 seats respectively), turnout 38.42, 36.28, and 28.92%, respectively

Party	2004 votes	2004 seats	2009 votes	2009 seats	2014 votes	2014 seats
Fidesz	47.40	12 (EPP)	56.36	14 (EPP)	51.49	12 (EPP)
MSZP	34.30	9 (PES)	17.37	4 (PES)	10.92	2 (PES)
Jobbik	---	---	14.77	3 (NI)	14.68	3 (NI)
SZDSZ	7.74	2 (ALDE)	2.16	---	---	---
MDF	5.33	1 (EPP)	5.31	1 (ECR)	---	---
DK	---	---	---	---	9.76	2 (PES)
E-PM	---	---	---	---	7.22	1 (GREEN)
LMP	--	--	--	--	5.01	1 (GREEN)

Fidesz – (originally: Alliance of Young Democrats), now Fidesz – Civic Alliance, together with KDNP (Christian Democratic People's Party), MSZP – Hungarian Social Democratic Party; Jobbik – For a Better Hungary; SZDSZ – Alliance of Free Democrats; MDF – Hungarian Democratic Forum; LMP – Politics Can Be Different; E-PM – Together 2014 and Partnership for Hungary.

TABLE 5: Poland's parliamentary elections in 2005, 2007, and 2011 (Sejm, 460 seats), turnout 40.6, 53.88, and 48.92%, respectively

Party	2005 votes	2005 seats	2007 votes	2007 seats	2011 votes	2011 seats
PiS	27.0	155	32.11	166	29.89	157
PO	24.1	133	41.51	209	38.19	207
SoRP	11.4	56	1.53	0	--	--
SLD	11.3	55	13.15	53	8.24	27
LPR	8.0	34	1.30	0	--	--
PSL	7.0	25	8.95	31	8.36	28
RP	--	---	--	--	10.02	40

PO – Civic Platform; PiS – Law and Justice; LPR – League of Polish Families; SoRP – Self-Defence of the Republic Poland (Samooborona); SLD-UP – Democratic Left Alliance-Labour Union; PSL – People's Party; UW – Freedom Union; SDPL – Social Democracy; KNP – Congress of the New Right; RP – Palikot's Movement (Ruch Palikota). In 2005, German minority had two seats, in 2007 and in 2011 had 1-1 seat.

TABLE 6: Poland's EP elections in 2004, 2009, and 2014 (54, 50, and 51 seats respectively), turnout 20.87, 24.53, and 23.83%, respectively

Party	2004 votes	2004 seats	2009 votes	2009 seats	2014 votes	2014 seats
PO	24.10	15 (EPP)	44.43	25 (EPP)	32.13	19 (EPP)
PiS	12.67	7 (UEN)	27.40	15 (ECR)	31.78	19 (ECR)
LPR	15.92	10 (NI)	--	--	--	--
SoRP	10.78	6 (NI)	1.46	0	1.42	0
SLD	9.35	5 (PES)	12.34	7 (PES)	9.44	5 (PES)
PSL	6.34	4 (EPP)	7.01	3 (EPP)	6.08	4 (EPP)
UW	7.33	4	--	--	--	--
SDPL	5.33	3	2.44	0	--	--
KNP	--	--	--	--	7.13	4 (NI)

PO – Civic Platform; PiS – Law and Justice; LPR – League of Polish Families; SoRP – Self-Defence of the Republic Poland (Samooborona); SLD-UP – Democratic Left Alliance-Labour Union; PSL – People's Party; UW – Freedom Union; SDPL – Social Democracy; KNP – Congress of the New Right.

TABLE 7: Slovakia's parliamentary elections in 2006, 2010, and 2012 (National Council, 150 seats), turnout 54.7, 58.83, and 59.11%, respectively

Party	2006 votes	2006 seats	2010 votes	2010 seats	2012 votes	2012 seats
SMER-(SD)	29.1	50	34.79	62	44.41	83
SDKÚ-(DS)	18.4	31	15.42	28	6.09	11
SNS	11.7	20	5.07	9	4.55	0
SMK-MKP	11.7	20	4.33	0	4.28	0
HZDS-(L'S)	8.8	15	4.32	0	0.93	0
KDH	8.3	14	8.52	15	8.82	16
SaS	--	--	12.14	22	5.88	11
MOST-HID	--	--	8.12	14	6.89	13
OL'ANO	--	--	--	--	8.55	16

SMER-(SD) – Direction-Social Democracy; SDKÚ-(DS) – Democratic and Christian Union (and Democratic Party); SNS – Slovak National Party; SMK-MKP – Party of Hungarian Coalition; HZDS-(L'S) – People's Party-Movement for a Democratic Slovakia; KDH – Christian Democratic Movement; SaS – Freedom and Solidarity; MOST-HID –Bridge (a Hungarian and Slovak Coalition) and OL'ANO – Ordinary People and Independent Personalities.

TABLE 8: Slovakia's EP elections in 2004, 2009, and 2014 (14, 13, and 13 seats respectively), turnout 16.96, 19.64, and 13.05%, respectively

Party	2004 votes	2004 seats	2009 votes	2009 seats	2014 votes	2014 seats
SDKÚ	17.09	3 (EPP)	16.98	2 (EPP)	7.75	2 (EPP)
SMER	16.89	3 (PES)	32.01	5 (PES)	24.09	4 (PES)
HZDS	17.04	3 (NI)	8.97	1 (NI)	--	--
KDH	16.19	3 (EPP)	10.87	2 (EPP)	13.21	2 (EPP)
OL'ANO	--	--	--	--	7.46	1 (NI)
NOVA	--	--	--	--	6.83	1 (ECR)
SaS	--	--	--	--	6.66	1 (ALDE)
SMK-MKP	13.23	2 (EPP)	11.33	2 (EPP)	6.53	1 (EPP)
MOST-HID	--	--	--	--	5.83	1 (EPP)
SNS	2.01	0	5.55	1 (NI)	4.55	0

SMER-(SD) – Direction-Social Democracy; SDKÚ-(DS) – Democratic and Christian Union (and Democratic Party); SNS – Slovak National Party; SMK-MKP – Party of Hungarian Coalition (Party of Hungarian Community in 2014); HZDS-(L'S) – People's Party-Movement for a Democratic Slovakia; KDH – Christian Democratic Movement; SaS – Freedom and Solidarity; MOST-HID –Bridge (a Hungarian and Slovak Coalition); OL'ANO – Ordinary People and Independent Personalities and NOVA – New Majority-Conservative Democrats (KDS) and Civic Conservative Party (OKS).

TABLE 9: Slovenia's parliamentary elections in 2008, 2011, and 2014 (National Assembly, 90 seats), turnout 63.10, 65.60 ,and 50.99%, respectively

Party	2008 votes	2008 seats	2011 votes	2011 seats	2014 votes	2014 seats
SD	30.45	29	10.52	10	5.95	6
SDS	29.26	28	26.19	26	20.69	21
ZARES	9.37	9	0.65	0	-	-
DeSUS	7.45	7	6.97	6	10.21	10
SNS	5.40	5	1.80	0	2.21	0
SLS	5.21	5	6.83	6	3.98	0
LDS	5.21	5	1.48	0	--	--
PS	--	--	28.51	28	2.96	0
CV	--	--	8.37	8	0.63	0
NSi	--	--	4.88	4	5.53	5
SMC	--	--	--	--	34.61	36
ZL	--	--	--	--	5.97	6
ZaAB	--	--	--	--	4.34	4

SD – Social Democrats; SDS – Slovenian Democratic Party; ZARES – New Politics-Social Liberals; DeSUS – Democratic Party of Retired People; SNS – Slovenian National Party; SLS – Slovenian People's Party; LDS - Liberal Democracy of Slovenia; PS – Positive Slovenia (of Zoran Jankovic); CV – Civic List (of Gregor Virant), SMC – Party of Miro Cerar; ZL – United Left; ZaAB – Alliance of Alenka Bratusek. In 2008, 2011, and 2014 Hungarian and Italian minorities had, together, 2-2-2 seats.

TABLE 10: Slovenia's EP elections in 2004, 2009, and 2014 (7, 7, and 8 seats respectively), turnout 28.35, 28.37, and 20.96%, respectively

Party	2004 votes	2004 seats	2009 votes	2009 seats	2014 votes	2014 seats
NSi	23.57	2 (EPP)	16.58	1 (EPP)	16.56	2 (EPP)
LDS-DeSUS	21.91	2 (ALDE)	11.48	1 (ALDE)	--	--
SDS	17.65	2 (EPP)	26.66	2 (EPP)	24.88	3 (EPP)
ZLSD	14.15	1 (PES)	18.43	2 (PES)	8.02	1 (PES)
ZARES	--	--	9.76	1 (ALDE)	0.94	0
DeSUS	(21.91)	(2)	7.18	0	8.14	1 (ALDE)
Verjamem	--	--	--	--	10.46	1 (GREENS)

NSi – New Slovenia, LDS-DeSUS – Liberal Democracy and Democratic Party of Retired People in 2004, DeSUS (separately in 2009 and 2014) - Democratic Party of Retired People; SDS – Slovenian Democratic Party; ZLSD – United List of Social Democrats, in 2009 and 2014 SD – Social Democrats; ZARES – New Politics-Social Liberals; Verjamem – List I believe.

REFERENCES

Armingeon, K. and K. Guthmann. 2014. Democracy in crisis? The declining support for national democracy in European countries, 2007-2011. *European Journal of Political Research*, 50(3), pp. 423-442.

Ágh, A. 2013a. The triple crisis in Hungary: The 'Backsliding' of Hungarian Democracy after Twenty Years. *Romanian Journal of Political Science* (PolSci), 13(1), pp. 25-51.

Ágh, A. 2013b. *Progress Report on the New Member States: Twenty Years of Social and Political Developments*. Budapest: Together for Europe Research Centre.

Ágh, A. 2014. Decline of democracy in East-Central Europe: The last decade as the lost decade in democratization. *Journal of Comparative Politics*, 7(2), pp. 4-33.

Ágh, A. 2015a. The Transformation of the Hungarian Party System: From the Democratic Chaos to the Elected Autocracy. *Südosteuropa*, 63(2), pp. 201-222.

Ágh, A. 2015b. De-Europeanization and De-Democratization in East-Central Europe: From the Potemkin democracy to the elected autocracy in Hungary. *Journal of Comparative Politics*, 8(2), pp. 4-26.

Banac, I. 2014. Twenty-Five Years After the Fall of the Berlin Wall. *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures*, 28(4), pp. 653-657.

Bardi, L., Bartolini, S. and Trechsel, A. 2014. Responsive and Responsible? The Role of Parties in Twenty-First Century Politics. *West European Politics*, 37(2), pp. 235-252.

Bertelsmann BTI. 2014a. East-Central and South-East European Reports, http://www.bti-project.org/downloads/bti-2014/country-reports-2014/east-central-and-southeast-europe/, accessed on 7 November 2014

Bertelsmann BTI. 2014b. Country reports between 2003 and2014, http://www.bti-project.org/publications/downloads/, accessed on 7 November 2014.

Bertsou, E. 2014. The 2014 EP Elections: A Victory for European Democracy? A Report on the LEQS Annual Event 2014, LSE "Europe in Question" Paper Series, LEQS Paper No. 78, July 2014, http://www.lse.ac.uk/europeanInstitute/LEQS/LEQSPaper78.pdf, accessed on 6 November 2014

Bruegel. 2014. Chart of the week, EP elections since 1979, http://www.bruegel.org/nc/blog/detail/article/1376-chart-of-the-week-political-groups-in-the-european-parliament-since-1979/?utm_source=Bruegel+economic+blogs+re, accessed on 8 November 2014

Brustier, G., Deloy, C. and Escalona, F. 2014. Political families in the European elections May 2014, Fondation Robert Schuman, European issues No. 319, http://www.robert-schuman.eu/en/european-issues/0319-political-families-in-the-european-elections-may-2014-an-assessment, accessed on 10 November 2014, accessed on 10 November 2014

Casal Bértoa, F. 2014. Party systems and cleavage structures revisited: A sociological explanation of party system institutionalization in East Central Europe. *Party Politics*, 20(1), pp. 16-36.

CEPI, Central European Policy Institute. 2014. Fit for the Future, Central Europe 10 years after the EU Accession, http://www.cepolicy.org/events/fit-future-central-europe-10-years-after-eu-accession-prague-presentation, accessed on 9 November 2014

Darvas, Z. 2014. The convergence dream 25 years on, http://www.bruegel.org/nc/blog/detail/article/1528-the-convergence-dream-25-years-on/, accessed on 11 November 2014

Deloy, C. 2014. Ascension of populist parties but relative stability of political balance in the European elections, Fondation Robert Schuman, European issues No. 315, http://www.robert-schuman.eu/en/doc/questions-d-europe/qe-315-en.pdf, accessed on 11 November 2014.

EIU, The Economist Intelligence Unit. 2014. What's gone wrong with democracy and how to revive it, 1 March 2014, http://www.economist.com/news/essays/21596796-democracy-was-most-successful-political-idea-20th-century-why-has-it-run-trouble-and-what-can-be-do, accessed on 15 March 2014

EIU, The Economist Intelligence Unit. 2015. Democracy Index 2014, http://www.eiu.com/public/thankyou_download.aspx?activity=download&campaignid=Democracy0115, accessed on 15 July 2015

Emmanouilidis, J. 2011. A quantum leap in economic governance – but questions remain, EPC Post-Summit Analysis, http://www.epc.eu/documents/uploads/pub_1247_post-summit_analysis_-_28_march_2011.pdf, accessed on 10 December 2011

Ennser, L. 2012. The homogeneity of West European party families: The radical right in comparative perspective. *Party Politics*, 18(2), pp. 151-171.

EPC, Balfour, R. and Stratulat, C. 2012. The enlargement of the European Union, EPC Discussion Paper, 10 December 2012, http://www.epc.eu/documents/uploads/pub_3176_enlargement_of_the_eu.pdf, accessed on 11 December 2012

Epstein, R. and Jacoby, W. 2014.Eastern Enlargement Ten Years On: Transcending the East-West Divide? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(1), pp. 1-16.

Eurobarometer. 2014. Standard Eurobarometer 81, Spring 2014, July 2014, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb81/eb81_first_en.pdf, accessed on 15 July 2014

European Catch-Up Index 2014. 2014. Lessenski, M. (ed.) The Gravity Effect: Findings of the European Catch-Up Index 2014, European Policies Initiative-Open Society Institute, December 2014, http://eupi.osi.bg/cgi-bin/e-cms/vis/vis.pl?s=001&p=0070&g=, accessed on 20 December 2014

FH, Freedom House. 2014. *Nations in Transit 2014: Eurasia's Rupture with Democracy,* http://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit/nations-transit-2014#.U84V77GjJGM, accessed on 20 December 2014

Gerschewski, J. 2013. Three pillars of stability: legitimation, repression and co-optation in autocratic regimes, pp. 13-38, in Köllner, P. and Kailitz, S. (eds) 2013. *Democratization*, 20(1) .

Gherghina, S. 2014. Shaping parties' legitimacy: Internal regulation and membership organizations in post-communist Europe. *International Political Science Review*, 35(3), pp. 291-306.

Giusto, H., Kitching, D. and Rizzo, S. (eds). 2013. *The Changing Faces of Populism*. Brussels: Foundation for European Progressive Studies and Lexington Books.

GKI Economic Research Co. 2013. New Progressive Economic Perspectives in the Central and Eastern European Member States of the EU, http://www.progressiveeconomy.eu/content/central-and-eastern-europe-under-spotlight-progressive-economy-conference-4-october-budapest, accessed on 8 October 2013

Grabbe, H. 2014. Six Lessons of Enlargement Ten Years on: The EU's Transformative Power in Retrospect and Prospect. *Journal of Common Market Studies, ,* 52(7), pp. 40-56.

Gros, D. 2014. Europe is still standing, CEPS Commentary, 6 June 2014, http://www.gulf-times.com/opinion/189/details/395310/europe-is-still-standing, accessed on 8 June 2014

Haughton, T. 2014. Money, Margins and the Motors of Politics: The EU and the Development of Party Politics in Central and Eastern Europe, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(1), pp. 71-87

Herman, L. 2015. Re-evaluating the post-communist success story: party elite loyalty, citizen mobilization and the erosion of Hungarian democracy. *European Political Science Review*, 7(1), pp. 1-34.

IMF. 2014a. Central, Eastern, and Southeastern Europe, Regional Economic Issues Update, October 2014, http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/reo/2014/eur/eng/pdf/erei1014.pdf, accessed on 23 October 2014

IMF. 2014b. 25 Years of Transition, Post-Communist Europe and the IMF, Regional Economic Issues, Special Report, October 2014, http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/reo/2014/eur/eng/pdf/erei_sr_102414.pdf, accessed on 23 October 2014

Innes, A. 2014. The Political Economy of State Capture in Central Europe. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(1), pp. 88-104.

Kagan, R. 2015. The weight of geopolitics. *Journal of Democracy*, 26(1), pp. 21-31.

Kartal, M. 2014. Accounting for the bad apples: the EU's impact on national corruption before and after accession, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21(6), pp. 941-959.

Kopecky, P. and Mudde, C. 2002. The Two Sides of Euroscepticism: Party Positions on European Integration in East Central Europe. *European Union Politics*, 3(3), pp. 297-326.

Kopecky, P., Mair, P. and Spirova, M. (eds). 2012. *Party Patronage and Party Government in European Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Köllner, P. and Kailitz, S. 2013. Comparing autocracies: theoretical issues and empirical analyses, pp. 1-12, in: Köllner, P. and Kailitz, S. (eds). 2013. *Democratization*, 20(1), Special Issue *Unpacking Autocracies: Explaining Similarity and Difference*, p. 178.

Laclau, E. 2007. *On Populist Reason*. London-New York: Verso.

Leconte, C. 2010. *Understanding Euroscepticism*. Houndmills: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Mannheim University. 2014. Socio-Economic Assessment of the Danube Region: State of the Region, Challenges and Strategy Development, March 2014, http://ftp.zew.de/pub/zew-docs/gutachten/DanubeRegionFinalReportPartI2014.pdf, accessed on 1 April 2014

Mudde, C. 2007. *Populist Radical Parties in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mudde, C. 2014. The 2014 Hungarian parliamentary elections, or how to craft a constitutional majority, *The Washington Post*, 14 April 2014, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/04/14/the-2014-hungarian-parliamentary-elections-or-how-to-craft-a-constitutional-majority/, accessed on 15 April 2014

Munck, G. 2012. Conceptualizing the Quality of Democracy: The Framing of a New Agenda for Comparative Politics, http://kellogg.nd.edu/odonnell/papers/munck.pdf, accessed on 20 December 2012

Nakrosis, V. and Gudzinskas, L. 2013. Party Patronage and State Politicization in the Post-Communist Countries of Central and Eastern Europe. *The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy* . 5(2), pp. 89-121.

OECD. 2011. *Divided We Stand: Why Inequality Keeps Rising*, December 2011, http://www.oecd.org/document/51/0,3746,en_2649_33933_49147827_1_1_1_1,00.html, accessed on 15 July 2014

OECD. 2014. *Income inequality update - Rising inequality: youth and poor fail further behind*, http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/OECD2014-Income-Inequality-Update.pdf, accessed on 15 July 2014

Pappas, T. 2014. Populist Democracies: Post-Authoritarian Greece and Post-Communist Hungary. *Government and Opposition*, 49(1), pp. 1-25.

Polyakova, A. 2015. The backward East? Explaining differences in support for radical right parties in Western and Eastern Europe. *Journal of Comparative Politics*, 8(1), pp. 49-74.

Pop-Eleches, G. 2010. Throwing out the Bums: Protest voting and Unorthodox Parties after Communism. *World Politics*, 62(2), pp. 221-260.

Róbert, P. and Papp, Z. 2012. Critical elections in Hungary, http://www.sociology.ox.ac.uk/documents/epop/papers/obert-Papp_Critical_Elections_in_Hungary.pdf, accessed on 10 December 2012

Rupnik, J. and Zielonka, J. 2013. The State of Democracy 20 Years on: Domestic and External Factors. *East European Politics and Societies*, 27(3), pp. 1-25.

Savage, L. 2014. Who gets in? Ideology and government membership in Central and Eastern Europe. *Party Politics*, 20(4), pp. 547-562.

Scheppele, K. 2014. Legal But Not Fair (Hungary), *The New York Times*, 13 April 2014, http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/04/13/legal-but-not-fair-hungary/?_php=true&_type=blogs&_r=0, accessed on 17 April 2014

Schmitt, H. 2013. Critical Elections in the European Union? Voter Attitudes and EP Elections in Times of Crisis, Universities of Mannheim and Manchester, 12 December 2013, http://www.eui.eu/Projects/EUDO/Documents/2013EUDODisseminationConference/2013EUDOConfPowerPoints/Schmitt.pdf, accessed on 20 December 2013

Seawright, J. 2012. *Party-System Collapse: The Roots of Crisis in Peru and Venezuela*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sedelmeier, U. 2014. Anchoring Democracy from Above? The European Union and Democratic Backsliding in Hungary and Romania after Accession", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(1), pp. 105-121, Special Issue on Eastern Enlargement Ten Years On

The Economist. 2014. The crony capitalism index 2014, http://www.economist.com/news/international/21599041-countries-where-politically-connected-businessmen-are-most-likely-prosper-planet, accessed on 20 December 2014

Toshkov, D., Kortenska, E., Dimitrova, A. and Fagan, A. 2014. The "Old" and the "New" Europeans: Analyses of Public Opinion on EU enlargement in Review, MAXCAP (Maximising the integration capacity of the European Union), Working Paper Series No. 2, April 2014, www.maxcap-project.eu, accessed on 21 December 2014

Ugur, M. 2013. Europeanization, EU Conditionality, and Governance Quality: Empirical Evidence on Central and Eastern European Countries", *International Studies Quarterly*, 37(2), March 2013, pp. 41-51.

VoteWatch Europe. 2015. Who holds the power in the new European Parliament? http://www.votewatch.eu/blog/who-holds-the-power-in-the-new-european-parliament-launch-of-votewatch-europe-special-report-27-february-2015/, accessed on 1 March 2015

WEF, World Economic Forum.2012. The Europe 2020 Competitiveness Report: Building a More Competitive Europe, http://www3.weforum.org/docs/CSI/2012/Europe2020_Competitiveness_Report_2012.pdf, accessed on 21 December 2012

WEF, World Economic Forum. 2014. Global Competitiveness Report 2014-2015, http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GlobalCompetitivenessReport_2014-15.pdf, accessed on 19 December 2014

WGI, World Bank.2015. Worldwide Governance Indicators, http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#reports, accessed on 19 September 2015.