EUROSCEPTICISM IN RIGHT-WING PARTIES
A COMPARISON OF THREE EMERGING RIGHT-WING PARTIES

BACHELOR THESIS
CARMEN MIRIAM SCHNEIDER

SUPERVISORS
DR. RINGO OSSEWAARDE
DR. MARTIN ROSEMA

EUROPEAN STUDIES
SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE
UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE

(Photograph; Party program PVV)

ABSTRACT / SUMMARY

This thesis uses qualitative content analysis to classify and compare three Eurosceptic parties. Vasilopoulou (2013) is used as it is a typology especially for right-wing parties. Party manifestos and speeches of party leaders were analysed and used to classify the German newly founded Alternative für Deutschland (AfD), the Dutch Partij voor de Vrijheid (PVV), and the British United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP). The PVV and the UKIP were classified as 'Rejecting Euroscepticism' while the AfD was classified as the type 'Conditional Euroscepticism'. The most striking difference found between the parties is their view of Europe which influences their rhetoric and positions on the European Union. The parties also have topics in common; their view of immigration and the result of this immigration on the welfare state, but ultimately the differences in their view of Europe prevent cooperation between the parties.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

In a speech in Berlin in 2013, Herman van Rompuy, President of the European Council at the time outlined the problems the EU and its Member states are facing. Among them are the Eurocrisis, globalization, and populism. He is saying that Populism is gaining popularity because the people are losing trust in the institutions and politicians and populists are using this loss of trust and the outside threats like globalization to gain more support. Right-wing Eurosceptic parties are often called populist by the media and 'mainstream' parties. There are two series of explanations for the rise of right-wing populist, Eurosceptic parties. One focusses on the national problems which aid the rise of populist parties, e.g. the decline of the welfare state and the 'immigration threat', for this the term *populism* is used; while the second explanation is known under the term *Euroscepticism* and focuses more on a broader reflection of the multi-level European polity. This thesis focusses on characterising the Euroscepticism of the parties selected while populist tendencies will only be briefly touched insofar as they relate to Euroscepticism[1]. The European Union is under double pressure as it is affected by the low trust in politics and specifically hit. For example, the EU is blamed for problems created by globalization and while in the past general opinion was that the EU protects nation states' interests in a global marketplace, the EU is now often perceived as a threat herself. For a long time the European Union was associated with creating possibilities and empowering nation states and citizens, now however it is more often seen as intrusive, meddling, judging, and even punishing (van Rompuy, 2013).

As made clear by the speech by van Rompuy, Eurocriticism has risen dramatically since the onset of the Eurocrisis. In southern Europe, protesters are on the streets voicing their anger with the dramatic welfare cuts their governments have made. In northern Europe, resentment against the southern countries is rising, as billions are spent on what is seen as the bottomless pit of the southern countries, while local conditions are worsening. In both cases, the EU is blamed, for it is the single currency that has bound north and south, east and west together. This spurs the rise of Eurosceptic parties all over Europe, even in countries which are historically quite EU-friendly like Germany. Germany did not really have a Eurosceptic party which played any role in the elections but in February last year a party was founded which has one main goal, getting Germany out of the single currency. It was called Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) and it managed to get 4.9% of the votes in the German Bundestagselection in September, just 0.1% under the threshold to get into the Bundestag (Busch & Knelangen, 2004). The European Union specifically identified populist Eurosceptic parties as a problem for the Union. Populism and Euroscepticism were not always a match, the 'classic' Euroscepticism of the Northern countries and Great Britain did not have many populist elements in them. Nowadays however a new thread in form of populist right-wing Eurosceptic parties has come up which have had more electoral success since the Eurocrisis (Missiroli, 2011).

In the media the term Euroscepticism is often used without further explanation of what it actually means. In the general population Euroscepticism is often simplified into 'being against the European Union' and while this is the case on a superficial level, looking at the different parties which are

---

[1] It is important to note that the labels 'populist' and 'Eurosceptic' are often confounded in popular use. The term 'populist party' is associated widely as negative, and support for European integration is used by parties to establish themselves as 'mainstream', 'legitimate', 'democratic' parties while distinguishing themselves from the 'populist', 'illegitimate', 'protest' Eurosceptic parties (Dechezelles & Neumayer, 2010).

called Eurosceptic – and their agendas – it becomes clear that Euroscepticism is more complex than first thought. Euroscepticism is not just limited to party-based Euroscepticism, scientific literature distinguishes between public-based and party-based Euroscepticism. In the spectrum of party-based Euroscepticism it became clear that left-wing Euroscepticism is different than right-wing Euroscepticism (Conti & Memoli, 2011).

The next big elections for the Eurosceptic parties are the European elections this year. It would be logical for the Eurosceptic parties to work together in the European parliament to increase their power. Geert Wilders, the leader of the Dutch party Partij voor de Vrijheid (PVV), has announced that the PVV and the French Eurosceptic party Front National will work together in the next European Parliament (Benschop/nu.nl, 2013). The British UKIP though already made clear that they will not work together with the PVV and the Front National (BBC, 2013). This lack of enthusiasm to work together could be explained by the differences in Euroscepticism, stemming from the parties particular national backgrounds. Euroscepticism obviously has a wider spectrum than the name suggests and is not per se a unifier for the parties. The question is if there is something that connects all of these parties or if each Eurosceptic party is unique. This could influence how the European Union should react to the threat of right-wing Eurosceptic parties. So to find out more about the parties it is relevant to find out their similarities and perhaps more importantly, their differences.

The main research question for this thesis is descriptive and broadly defines the research aim and scope:

'How does the AfD differ from the UKIP and the PVV in its Euroscepticism?'

This research question is exploratory as the AfD is a new party which has not been categorized before. The focus is especially on the differences in the Euroscepticism of the AfD with the two older parties as the aim of this thesis is to find out what factors hinder a cross-national cooperation of the parties. To answer this question, we need a framework of analysis as well as a more in-depth definition of Euroscepticism. The scientific literature shows that Euroscepticism is indeed a wide spectrum which can reach from criticising certain policies of the European Union to promising to abolish the European Union altogether. One of the first scientists to define Euroscepticism was Paul Taggart (1998) and his observations are still the basis of most work on Euroscepticism today. Together with Szczerbiak he came up with the hard/soft Euroscepticism variations, where hard Euroscepticism is when the party completely rejects the European Union and soft Euroscepticism is when the parties only object to certain policies of the European Union (Taggart & Szczerbiak, 2004). However, they acknowledge themselves that this differentiation is very broad and consequently other scientists have expanded the typology. Kopecky and Mudde (2002) modified the distinction by using 'diffuse' and 'specific' support instead and derive from that four ideal types. Rovny (2004) went even further and added another dimension which categorises the parties by a strategic or ideological Euroscepticism. In this thesis we use the typology by Vasilopoulou (2011) which is a synthesis of the aforementioned typologies and incorporates their central elements into a typology which is specifically designed for right-wing parties. The typology is broad enough to incorporate parties from different countries, but also specific enough to put parties side by side and make a comparison. The typology uses four aspects to make up a type: a feeling of a common European heritage which is in Vasliopoulous typology assumed for all types of Eurosceptics, acceptance of the principle of the European Union in which the hard/soft distinction by Taggart and Szczerbiak is used, support for the current practice, and views on the future of European Integration. From these four aspects

Vasilopoulous derives three types of Euroscepticism: rejecting Euroscepticism, conditional Euroscepticism, and compromising Euroscepticism.

vWith regard to the theory it was expected that all three parties would agree that Europe has a shared cultural heritage. However, what was found is that this varied between the parties. The UKIP does not think that the UK belongs to Europe – at least not on a cultural level. The UK has a different history and a different culture than continental Europe. The PVV sees the Netherlands in a fight with other European countries which do not share the same culture and work ethics as the Dutch. There are countries which are similar enough to be considered allies but overall the PVV sees a clear divide with regard to culture between the Netherlands and the Southern and Eastern cultures. The AfD has a similar idea as the PVV though puts less emphasis on the uniqueness of the nation state and sees Europe divided by North and South with regard to work ethics and financial responsibility. During the research these differences became clear and while some differences were to be expected and are considered by Vasilopoulou, the extent of these differences was still surprising and noteworthy. However, this thesis only wants to show the similarities and differences of the parties; it is not in the scope of the thesis to offer more than a cursory explanation.

Qualitative content analysis was used to identify the differences in the Euroscepticism of the parties. The most recent party manifestos and selected speeches[2] from the same time frame were coded, combined and compared for each of the three parties. The party manifestos and speeches were first coded using the four aspects of the typology. The sentences which are an indicator about the parties opinion of one of the aspects were marked with different colours regarding the aspect and with a plus or minus regarding if it was in favour or not. Then the quotes were organised in a long table split up by party and aspect. The quotes were then also split up by themes which were identified by a second reading of the source material. Lastly after all the source material was coded and filled into the long table a third and final reading was used to ensure consistent coding throughout[3]. We found significant differences, particularly between AfD and the other two parties. The main finding is that each party has a different view of Europe, both on a social and cultural level, as well as in their vision for the future of the EU.

This paper will consist of three sections; methodology, analysis and results. In the methodology section we start with short literature review, in which we take a glance over the existing literature on populist and right-wing parties in general, and Eurosceptic parties in particular. We will then give some comments on the research design, and the methods used. In the second section, we will analyse each of the parties separately within the theoretical framework. The third and final part consists of a comparison of the three parties, a discussion of what the results of the comparison mean, and a conclusion in which we answer our main research question.

---

[2] As of writing, neither the AfD nor UKIP has a complete manifesto. UKIP does have a website detailing their position on a number of subjects, which we have used in place of a manifesto. For the AfD, the primary source material is speeches by prominent party members, which are also used for the other parties. Transcribed speeches are available from the author on request.

[3] An example of a coded document can be found in the appendices.

2. TYPOLOGY OF PARTY-BASED EUROSCEPTICISM

The aim of this chapter is to lay out why Vasilopoulous (2011) typology for right-wing parties with regard to Euroscepticism was used by reviewing existing literature on Euroscepticism. This thesis wants to answer the question how the Euroscepticism of the AfD differs with regard to the Euroscepticm of the UKIP and the PVV. For this it is necessary to classify the parties as only then it is possible to give a complete answer to the research question otherwise it is possible that the parties differences only come from the different degrees of Euroscepticism. Vasilopoulou (2013) builds her typology on three dimensions, the principle, practice and future of EU cooperation. From this she arrives to three types, namely rejecting Euroscepticism, conditional Euroscepticism, and lastly compromising Euroscepticsm. In the following paragraphs first the key authors with respect to Euroscepticism will be introduced and then the three ideal types as laid out by Vasilopoulou are explained, then the attributes for this ideal type are laid out and finally the ideal types are contrasted with the existing literature on party-based Euroscepticism.

In the study of Euroscepticism there are two prominent 'schools' which lead the discussion about the phenomenon, Sussex and North Carolina. The most influencing author from the Sussex school is Taggart (1998) who was one of the first researchers that looked further into the phenomenon of Euroscepticism and whose observations are still the basis of most work on Euroscepticism today. He located Euroscepticism mostly in the peripheral parties in the national party system which could gain something by opposing the status quo and the more established parties. He sees Euroscepticism as a phenomenon which is very much dependent on domestic contextual factors. Together with Szczerbiak he came up with an often used differentiation of Euroscepticism in parties, hard and soft Euroscepticism. 'Hard' Euroscepticism is for them when a party completely rejects the European Union, the economic and political integration, and either objects to their country joining the EU or is in favour of leaving. However, they state that in practice this could also mean that parties object just to the current form of EU integration as it is seen as an embodiment of negative values which go against their ideology, e.g. the EU is too liberal/capitalist/socialist. 'Soft' Euroscepticism is the contingent or qualified opposition to European integration. This means that the parties are in general not against the European Union but object to certain policies or are seeing the power of their country weakened and want to limit the power of the European Union (pp. 3-4). However, the authors themselves acknowledge that these differentiations overlap in reality and are too vague. For example, how would one classify a party that objects to the current form of EU integration as an embodiment of negative values which go against their ideology, e.g. the EU is too liberal/capitalist/socialist, but does not oppose EU integration in principle. In a later article they redefine 'hard Euroscepticism' as principled opposition of the European integration in the European Union and 'soft Euroscepticism' as not principled opposition of the European integration but an opposition to the current or planned further extension of the competencies of the European Union (Mudde, 2012)

The North Carolina school has proposed the cleavage theory to explain Euroscepticism. This theory argues that party positions on European integration are a reflection of cleavages in European politics. They identify two dimensions, the Green / Alternative / Liberal (GAL) versus the Traditional / Authoritarian / Nationalist (TAN) dimension. Hooghe, Marks, and Wilson (2002) describe an inverted U-curve in the position of party families when they combine the Left/Right dimension with an orthogonal dimension indicating the level of support. This means that parties on the extremes of the political spectrum are Eurosceptic while parties in the middle are much more supportive of European

integration. However, the extreme Left and the extreme Right do not use the same reasoning in opposing the European Union. The extreme Left opposes the neo-liberal character of the European Union, using mostly economic arguments in their Euroscepticism. The extreme Right is concerned about a loss of national sovereignty uses fear of a loss of national identity to aid its cause. (De Vries & Edwards, 2009)

All of the aforementioned authors have some shortcomings, according to Vasilopoulou (2009) the reason for this is that '*scholars have so far failed to provide concrete indicators of what European integration is*' (p.6). Vasilopoulou composes a typology which incorporates the key aspects of the Sussex school with a break-down of the European integration into three fundamental aspects; the principle, the practice, and the future of the European integration. She developed these three aspects through an attentive reading of the Treaties establishing the European Union (TEU). She defines the principle of European integration as '*the wish and willingness for any type of cooperation at a European level, not necessarily the one embodied by the EU*' (Vasilopoulou, 2009, p. 6). The practice of the European integration includes the balance between the intergovernmental and the supranational governing of the EU and the policies which are governed at the EU level. The future of European integration refers to the willingness of the member states to an 'ever closer union' recorded in the treaties, indicating that this means that more policy competencies will be transferred to the EU. In a later article she added another aspect to the typology, a cultural 'definition' of Europe which means that a common identity of European people is defined as a feeling of cultural, religious and historical bonds among the European nation states (Vasilopoulou, 2011). The typology of Vasilopoulou is used in this thesis because it is built on the findings of the authors of the Sussex school, it is therefore not necessary to use their typologies specifically in the analysis of the parties, it is tailored to categorize the Euroscepticism of right-wing parties, and the typology uses aspects which are directly derived from the TEU which means that they are from the 'real world' and not just theoretical.

2.1. 'REJECTING EUROSCEPTICISM'

The following section will describe the first ideal type, 'rejecting Euroscepticism'. In this ideal type the parties accept the idea that there is a common cultural, historical, and religious European heritage and they use this as an argument against immigration from outside of Europe or against cultures and religion which they see as non-European. However, they are strongly opposed to the other aspects of European Integration. Rejecting Eurosceptic parties are strongly against any kind of state cooperation at a higher multilateral level, they are anti-supranationalist in nature and hold the sovereignty of the nation state in high regards. Consequently, they also do not agree with the current practice in the European Union which includes the overall body of EU law and institutional framework, the European policies, and the way in which decisions are made. They want their nation state to leave the European Union so they do not support any kind of further European integration. In their opinion the system of governance in the EU is not legitimate (Vasilopoulou, 2011).

This ideal type would fall in the hard Euroscepticism dimension of Szczerbiak and Taggart as they define hard Euroscepticism as a principled opposition to European integration. Kopecky and Mudde (2002) criticize Taggert's definition as too broad and unclear and proposed a new distinction, namely 'diffuse' support and 'specific' support for the European integration. Diffuse support is when the underlying ideas of the European integration are endorsed, while specific support is when the support of the general practices of the European Union. The first dimension is used to separate the

Europhiles from the Europhobes as the Europhiles believe in the elemental ideas of the European integration while the Europhobes do not support these. The second dimension divides the Euro-optimists from the Euro-pessimists. From this they derive four ideal types and the one closest to our ideal type is the 'Euroreject' which is a Europhobe and an EU-pessimist. So they deepened the dimension of hard and soft Euroscepticism and introduce the question of how ideology and strategy influence the producing and modifying of policy positions in the parties. This is further explored by Rovny (2004) who uses two categories as axes for his conceptualisation, the magnitude of Euroscepticism and the strategic and ideological motivations behind Euroscepticism. The first category, magnitude, is partially covered by the hard/soft distinction but Rovny dismisses this as being only a nominal typology and therefore not going far enough. He proposes an ordinal typology as there can be different degrees of hard and soft Euroscepticism. So while the ideal type in the 'hard' Eurosceptic range is very clear cut, he thinks that there can be differences in parties which are in the hard Eurosceptic spectrum with regard to the importance that the opposition to the EU plays in the party programme or the sharpness of their rhetoric towards the EU. This will very likely be the case in the real world. However, it is not a very useful distinction in an ideal type and possibly quite difficult to measure as it would always be in comparison to other parties.

Rovny's second category, the motivations of Euroscepticism, is concerned with the question whether Euroscepticism is fuelled more by ideology or more by strategy. Kopecky and Mudde (2004) identified in their article that certain ideologies are more often Eurosceptic than others and with their notion of diffuse and specific support they imply the concept of ideological support and strategic support. Rovny defines ideology as '*a system of beliefs about the social world prescribing a set of normative goals and implying programmatic tools for achieving them*' (p. 35). This means that if a party is ideologically Eurosceptic it will pursue that goal even if it means losing voters, while strategically Eurosceptic parties will adjust their programme if that means they can win more votes (Sitter, 2003)[4].

Flood and Usherwood (2007) remark on the need to not just define negative Euroscepticism but also have categories for parties which are in favour of European Integration. They identify six categories of EU alignments. The one which fits this ideal type the best is the 'Rejectionist' which is described as 'outright refusal of integration, coupled to opposition to participation' (p.6). Another typology which takes into account positive attitudes towards European integration uses two so-called integration paradigms. The supranational paradigm begins from the presumption that only supranational authority is able to harmonize all the interests of the different states, and the intergovernmental approach which presumes that the sovereignty of the nation states and their governments is the most important thing. 'Rejecting Eurosceptics' then would be strongly in favour of an intergovernmental approach as this means that the cooperation between states would be realized through international organizations and international contracts (Kaniok, 2009).

Lastly two articles will be reviewed which will give a clearer understanding of the possible topics relevant to the parties in this ideal type. The article by Riishøj (2007) is about national and European identities but parts of his classification of Euroscepticism is also useful to this typology. He identifies

---

[4] This is an interesting concept and useful for a further analysis of the topic, but since parties are unlikely to tell the voter outright that they are only using Euroscepticism to gain more votes, it is difficult to measure. One could look over a longer period of time to see if their Euroscepticism changed in response to losing an election or gaining the possibility to become part of the government but this is not feasible in this study.

nine different classifications and the most useful for the Rejecting Euroscepticism are the identity-based Euroscepticism which includes the contradiction between national identity and European identity and the fear of losing the nation sovereignty and the national interest-based scepticism describes the contradiction between common European goals and national goals, its main goal is to defend national interests against the European Union (pp.508-509). Sørensen (2008) describes four ideal types of Euroscepticism which are aimed at explaining public Euroscepticism but are also useful for party-based typologies. The sovereignty-based Euroscepticism fits here the best as one could see the EU as an economically successful undertaking but still be sceptical about it and oppose any kind of supranational element in the European Union (p.8).

Summing up 'rejecting Euroscepticism';

- ✓ Believes in a common cultural, historical, and religious European heritage
- ✓ Rejects the principle of European Integration
- ✓ Rejects the practice of European Integration
- ✓ Rejects the future of European Integration

2.2. CONDITIONAL EUROSCEPTICISM

As already mentioned the typology of Vasilopoulou is used in this thesis because it incorporates the important aspects of the scientists of the Sussex school while being specifically designed for right-wing parties. The goal of this subsection is not just to explain the ideal type 'conditional Euroscepticism' but also to use the other authors to make clear why it is the right choice to use Vasilopoulou's typology for the analysis.

Conditional Euroscepticism is characterised by acceptance of a common European heritage and approval of the principle of European cooperation, combined with disapproval of the current practice in the European Union and further European integration. These parties see the necessity to have some kind of nation-state cooperation at the European level but they feel that the current practice in the European Union is too supranationalist and compromises the sovereignty of the nation state. They also question the legitimacy of the European Union and would rather have an confederate institutional framework for the European Union (Vasilopoulou, 2013).

This ideal type is in the category of 'soft' Euroscepticism as they do not oppose the European integration in principle (Szczerbiak & Taggart, 2003). Kopecky and Mudde (2002) would classify this ideal type as 'Eurosceptics' as it combines Europhile and EU-pessimist positions. The parties in this ideal type believe in the European integration but they do not think that the current European Union is the best way to achieve cooperation between nation states. In the categories from Flood and Usherwood (2007) conditional eurosceptics would be 'Revisionists' which they describe as '*wanting to return to an earlier state [of the European Union], usually before a treaty revision*' (p.8). While this description may be a little bit simple, it provides a good indication to what kind of goals the parties in this ideal type have. In this ideal type the intergovernmental approach is still highly favoured and the supranational aspects of the cooperation should be as low as possible (Kaniok, 2009).

For this ideal type the categories experience-base scepticism and institutionally based scepticism fit best. However, this ideal type is about public Euroscepticism so to fit into the ideal type the experience-based scepticism could be defined as the feeling that negotiations concerning membership of the EU have been unfair and asymmetric and the final result has been imposed. The

institutionally based scepticism is based here on the legitimacy of national versus EU institutions (Riishøj, 2007). The category used by Sørensen(2008) for this would be democratic Euroscepticism which is scepticism that centres on what is perceived to be inadequate structures of the existent political 'set-up' and as a result the feeling that one's voice is not being heard (p.8).

Summing up conditional Euroscepticism:

- ✓ Acceptance of common European heritage
- ✓ Accepts the principles of the European integration
- ✓ Rejects the practice of European Integration
- ✓ Rejects the future of European Integration

2.3. COMPROMISING EUROSCEPTICISM

The parties in this ideal type accept, like in the other ideal types, the existence of a common European heritage, they accept the principle of European integration and, most importantly, they also accept the current practice of the European integration. However, they do not want an 'ever closer union', so they reject further European integration. Compromising Eurosceptics do not feel that European integration is necessarily a good thing but they acknowledge that some aspects of it are beneficial for the nation state. They prefer intergovernmentalist institutions to supranationalist ones but they admit that the transfer of some decision-making powers to the European Union is necessary for the state to prosper, especially in the economic domain. Their goal is it to change the European Union from the inside so they participate in the EU institutions to promote the interest of the nation state. However, they are not in favour of a deepening of the European integration as this would reinforce federalism. It may be more appropriate to call them Euro-critics rather than Eurosceptics (Vasilopoulou, 2011).

This ideal type shows the disadvantage of Taggarts and Szczerbiak's hard/soft category as this would also fall into the soft Eurosceptic category. The classification of Kopecky and Mudde (2002) does not help us either to make the ideal type clearer as both compromising and conditional Eurosceptics fall in the category of 'Eurosceptics' since they are in favour of the principle of the European integration but they think that the European Union changed too much from the original outline. The other two categories do not fit any ideal type, as the 'Euroenthusiasts' are positive towards the European integration as well as the European Union and further integration, and the category of 'Europragmatists' is rather a theoretical one as they do not support the general underlying idea of the EU but support the EU nonetheless because their country or region benefits from the European Union (pp.300-304). The term 'Minimalist' fits this ideal type as it is defined as '*accepting the status quo, but wanting to limit further integration as far as possible*' (Flood & Underwood, 2007). With regard to the supranational and intergovernmental paradigm the parties in this ideal type prefer intergovernmentalism and limit supranationalism as much as possible, accepting some of it out of necessity.

The Euroscepticism in this ideal type has an economic character which means that the evaluation of the European Union is based on to what extent it can be useful for the national economy (Sørensen, n.d.). Also possible in this ideal type is policy-based Euroscepticsm or 'functional Euro-realism' which means that the parties oppose just certain concrete policies and single issues. It is also possible that they are only sceptical towards one single issue in the European Union and are very positive towards the other aspects of the EU (Riishøj, 2007).

To sum up 'compromising Euroscepticism':

- ✓ Acceptance of common European heritage
- ✓ Accepts the principles of the European integration
- ✓ Accepts the practice of European Integration
- ✓ Rejects the future of European Integration

2.4.SUMMARY

In this thesis the typology by Vasilopoulou (2013) is used as it is designed specifically for right-wing parties and incorporates elements of the other typologies, expanding on them where necessary. The most important and well known typology of Euroscepticism is the hard/soft distinction by Taggart & Szczerbiak (2004). Taggart and Szczerbiak themselves have acknowledged that especially the 'hard Eurosceptic' type is too limiting and does not show the subtleties of the different Eurosceptic parties very well. The typology by Vasilopoulou is built on this distinction and uses it to distinguish three ideal types of party Euroscepticism. The three ideal types will be used to determine in the analysis how Eurosceptic the parties are. This will work as a framework to categorise the parties and use the aspects of the typology to compare the three parties. Special emphasis is put on the first aspect of the typology, the common cultural European heritage.

3. METHODOLOGY

The following chapter aims at explaining which data was collected and how it was analysed. It aims to provide an insight into how the theoretical framework is connected to the method of analysis chosen. This research is exploratory as its purpose is to classify three right-wing Eurosceptic parties and find the differences and similarities in their Euroscepticism, with an emphasis on how they view Europe and how this view influences their Euroscepticism. The design is qualitative content analysis in which the statements of the parties regarding the European Union are classified into three ideal types so that in the end a clearer view of the landscape of Eurosceptic parties in Europe arises. In addition to the new party AfD in Germany, the UKIP was chosen as Euroscepticism is especially prominent in Great Britain, the final party is the Dutch PVV which is a rather successful Eurosceptic party. Overall, the research involves the collection of party manifestos and speeches of party leaders which will be interpreted on their Eurosceptic content and especially the similarities and differences between the three parties. In this chapter the research design will be discussed, and then the sampling method will be considered. Finally, the data analysis method and possible threats to the research design's reliability and validity will be examined.

3.1. DATA COLLECTION

In this research the party manifestos and speeches of party leaders were considered. The data was available through the parties websites. The AfD (Alternative für Deutschland) only exist since February 2013, for the other two parties the timeframe is from the beginning of 2012 to the current day. This incorporates the last general election in the Netherlands and it was also possible to gather enough data from the UKIP. It was not easy to find already transcribed speeches so most speeches were transcribed from Youtube videos of the speeches. The most recent party manifestos were used in conjunction with speeches made from 2012 onwards.

The data collection was somewhat problematic as not all parties had comprehensive manifestos available at the time of writing. In qualitative content analysis purposively selected texts are used which can inform the research questions being investigated (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009). Therefore only speeches were considered which have Europe or the European Union as their topic. Only the PVV has a full party manifesto of over 60 pages, allowing for a detailed analysis of the views of the PVV with regard to the European Union. The AfD only has keywords and phrases so not many 'emotions' or opinions can be deduced. From the UKIP sections of their homepage were used which means that the information comes from different sources with some sections being legislative proposals while others are just for informing the public about the views of UKIP. The different goals and audiences of these documents may present a problem, speeches were used to balance the weaknesses of the party manifestos. However, the speeches have flaws as well. All of the speeches of the PVV are from Geert Wilders which may reflect the political routine of this party, but it is still noteworthy as they lack diversity. Additionally most of the speeches were made in front of the Dutch parliament and not in front of a crowd which means it is possible that he was more moderate and less populist than he would have been at an election campaign. The speeches of the Afd though are all from different high-ranking leaders of the party so diversity of different opinions in the party is ensured. Also all the speeches are made at election campaigns. The speeches of the UKIP are as well from different leaders but they are at party conventions and not in front of a crowd which they want to convince to vote for them. This could mean that they are even more extreme in their views as

most of the audience shares their view and no negative backlash from the crowd is to be expected. While it is not in the scope of this thesis to answer the question when parties are more or less extreme, the possible implications of the different scenarios of the speeches should be kept in mind.

ALTERNATIVE FÜR DEUTSCHLAND

The party programme of the AfD is unfortunately only four pages long and in headwords so there is not much information about their Euroscepticism. After an inquiry the AfD stated that a full party programme will be adopted by the party meeting this year. Five speeches by high-ranking politicians in the AfD were chosen. The 'Speech of principles (Grundsatzrede)' by the party leader Bernd Lucke on the 27th of July 2013, the speech of the vice-leader Konrad Adam on the 27th of July 2013, the speech by the former BDI boss Hans-Olaf Henkel about the problems of the European economy policy, the speech by Professor Starbatty on the 24th of August 2013 about the Euro, and a speech by Bernd Lucke again on the 21st of July 2013. These five speeches were featured prominently on the homepage of the AfD and therefore it was assumed that they are considered important speeches by the party.

PARTIJ VOOR DE VRIJHEID

The PVV has a party programme called 'Hun Brussel, Ons Nederland' which is 54 pages long. Additionally a speech Geert Wilders made on the 25th of September 2013, a speech of him on the 24th of May 2012 about the 'ESM-Verdrag en de Verandwoordingsdag' 2012, Geert Wilder's speech on the 27th of June 2012, his speech in Ahoy from the 24th August 2012, and his speech about the 'Agenda Europese top' on the 11th of October 2012 were considered for the analysis. Most transcribed speeches on the internet by Geert Wilders were from his English homepage and were speeches he gave in other countries. These kinds of speeches were not used as it was hypothesized that he talks differently in another country, e.g. less xenophobic or at least more sympathetic towards this specific country. This would distort the results of the analysis and therefore for all three parties only speeches made in their home country for a mostly native public were considered. It was difficult to find speeches made by Geert Wilders for a campaign or in front of a public audience so speeches made by him in the Parliament were chosen. One can assume that these speeches were not just meant for the Parliament but rather for the Dutch public. It was impossible to find speeches by other important figures of the PVV which shows a certain party structure in which Geert Wilders is the undisputed leader.

UNITED KINGDOM INDEPENDENCE PARTY

The 'Common Sense Politics' policy forum on their websites was used which outlines their political stance as it was not possible to access a useful election manifest as at the moment only an election manifesto for the county elections 2013 are available. The 'Common Sense Politics' are more detailed. For the speeches Nigel Farage's speech at the UKIP conference 2013 on the 20th September 2013, his speech at the UKIP spring conference in Exeter on the 23rd of March 2013, his speech at the UKIP conference 2012 on the 23rd of September 2012, Tim Akers' speech at the UKIP conference 2013, and Tom Congdon's speech at the UKIP conference 2013, were considered. These speeches were chosen because they are the most recent speeches made and to an audience of supporters which meant that there thoughts and ideas did not need to be downplayed for the general public.

3.2. METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The three ideal types used for the interpretive content analysis were established through the theory. The three ideal types of party Euroscepticism will be used to classify the Euroscepticism of the analysed parties. After analysing the current theories regarding Euroscepticism the typology of Vasilopoulou was chosen as it compensates the disadvantage of the hard/soft distinction of Szczerbiak and Taggart, namely that the distinction is not clear enough, and since it is designed especially for right-wing parties it is from the existing theories the best choice. These ideal types are:

Table 1; typology of Euroscepticism

ASPECTS OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION	REJECTING EUROSCEPTICISM	CONDITIONAL EUROSCEPTICISM	COMPROMISING EUROSCEPTICISM
COMMON HERITAGE	Accepts	Accepts	Accepts
PRINCIPLE	Rejects	Accepts	Accepts
PRACTICE	Rejects	Rejects	Accepts
FUTURE	Rejects	Rejects	Rejects

The criteria of the three ideal types were used to classify the parties and compare the differences and similarities in their Euroscepticism. The party manifestos and speeches were read and analysed as a whole, and marked if they show either acceptance or rejection of one of the four dimensions of the ideal types. Sentences which show neither acceptance nor rejection of the four dimensions were not considered for this analysis. Qualitative interpretive content analysis was used because it goes beyond counting words or extracting objective content from texts to examine meanings, themes and patterns that may be manifest or latent in a particular text. Qualitative content analysis is prone to threats of validity, reliability and objectivity. Lincoln and Guba (1985, as cited in Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009) propose four criteria for evaluating interpretive research work which we will keep in mind, namely credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

This method of data analysis is following Vasilopoulous' (2011) method very closely. She mentions that a qualitative methodological approach is preferred because it can display the different arguments of the parties better than a quantitative approach. She also states that this will 'enrich and add qualitative substance to expert surveys' numerical assessments' (p. 236). This method is therefore not meant to stand alone; it is rather an addition to already existing party categorization. She chose to only analyse party manifestos as they are made to represent the party as a whole to the potential voters as well as to the party members. She acknowledges that a greater diversity of documents would have been preferable as it would have given a better understanding of the party positions on European integration. This thesis had even more problems as for only one party was a complete party manifesto available. The solution to this problem was using speeches to gain a better understanding of the party positions regarding the European Union. This however comes with its own problems as speeches have a different value than party programmes since they are not necessarily meant to be permanent and to some extent only transport the opinion of one person. Additionally the speeches were selected by the author, which means that this could be a biased sample of speeches. It is also not possible to use expert surveys' numerical assessments because for the German party which is very new, there are no expert surveys' numerical assessments yet.

One of the disadvantage of qualitative content analysis can be that the reader is unable to fully grasp how the author arrived to the conclusions she made. To help remedy this, the thesis uses quotations to illustrate why a party was categorized into a certain type, and an example coded document is provided in the appendices. This however does not solve the wider problems of reliability and validity in the research design. The party manifestos and speeches are only coded by one person and because qualitative content analysis goes beyond 'counting words' there is a possibility for reliability and validity problems. An article which tackles these problems better is 'Campaigning aganst Europe?' by Adam et al. (2013) which studied the campaign communication of parties by conducting an analysis of parties' campaign posters and their televised campaign spots. To categorise the parties into Eurosceptic and non-Eurosceptic parties they used expert assessments and party manifestos and to analyse the campaign communication they used multiple native-speaking coders which had to do a common coder training, do coding exercises and a reliability text. After the actual coding the data was checked for internal consistency and, if necessary, recoded (p. 86f.). This was however not possible in the case of this thesis because of time, money, and personnel restrictions[5].

Interpretive Description (ID) was used to classify real life cases into ideal types. ID concentrates on the empirical word, starting with a critical analysis of the current theoretical basis. This was done by examining current theories of Euroscepticism, of which the three ideal types by Vasilopoulou (2013) were selected for further use. The four aspects of the typology were used to classify the three parties. In these four aspects the content was further classified into themes which were found in the party manifestos and speeches in a first reading. So while there is generally no codebook in ID as there is in content analysis, here the aspects of the typology were used as criteria and themes found through a first reading were used to categorize the content further (Oliver, 2012). From the coding of the dimensions of the ideal type, common themes were identified; e.g. loss of sovereignty is a theme used by Rejecting Euroscepticism. By classifying the parties and identifying common themes of the ideal types the differences and similarities in the parties were shown (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

To classify the parties first all of the party manifestos and speeches were read and the sentences which fitted into one of the four aspects of the typology were marked. If the sentenced was positive about the aspect it was marked with a plus and if it was negative it was marked with a minus. This gave a first overview of the topic. Then a long table was made in which the sentences of each party are put together by aspect and then in the aspect further differentiated by a theme which came from the texts. In each theme they were again separated by sentences which were in favour of the theme or against it. This gave a good overview of how important the theme is for the respective party. The themes were used for all parties alike.

Table 2 below shows an overview of the main themes found through a first reading of the party manifestos and speeches.

---

[5] In fact, inter-coder reliability is an issue that is ignored by the majority of researchers in the field.

Table 2; recurring themes in coded documents, by aspect of Euroscepticism

European heritage	Principle	Practice	Future
Cultural differences with regard to money	Sovereignty	Against the Euro	Re-nationalisation
	Political cooperation	Loss of power	Negative outcome if nothing changes
	Only economic cooperation	Too much bureaucracy	European Superstate / United States of Europe
		Undemocratic	
		Immigration / exploiting the welfare state	
		Breaking the contracts	
		Elites are lying	
		EU is wasting money / costing money	

3.3. SUMMARY

The data for the categorisation of the parties is collected through the websites of the parties and through YouTube videos which were posted by the parties. For the AfD the party manifesto for the Bundestagswahl 2013 is used and five speeches which were featured on the homepage. For the PVV the party manifesto for the Verkiezing 2012 is used and five speeches made by Geert Wilders in the Dutch Parliament which were available transcribed on the homepage of the PVV. For the UKIP the website section 'Common Sense Politics' were used as there was no current party manifesto available. Five speeches made by various UKIP leaders on three of their party conventions were transcribed from YouTube. The gathered documents were then coded using the typology by Vasilopoulou (2013). The data was first roughly coded by marking in the text if a sentence shows that the party is in favour or not in favour of one of the four aspects of the ideal types. Then these sentences are transferred to a long table in which the sentences are additionally separated into themes which were developed from the first reading of the data. With regard to the data analysis possible threats to validity and reliability were considered. Possible threats to the validity could be the question if the keywords really are measuring the underlying concepts and if the parties really make their true positions known in their programme. Threats to reliability are that we are measuring concepts in different contexts and at different times.

4. ANALYSIS – THE DIFFERENT MEANINGS OF EUROPE

In this section the parties will be analysed regarding their Euroscepticism. The parties will be categorised into the ideal types by Vasilopoulou (2011) which were introduced in the theory. Each party will be analysed using these aspects and if they are in favour or not of it. This determines in which ideal type they fall. As discussed in the theory the advantage of using the typology by Vasilopoulou is that it incorporates the key aspects of the important typologies and that it is adapted specifically for right-wing parties which make it an ideal choice for this analysis. In the next sections we compare the differences and similarities in how the parties see Europe and how this influences their Euroscepticism, lastly we will discuss possible reasons for the different views of Europe by the parties. In line with the theory, the emphasis of the analysis lies on how the parties view and experience Europe along four themes: common heritage, principles, practice and future of the European Union.

The first aspect of the typology is that the parties agree on a common cultural heritage in Europe, defined as a 'feeling of cultural, religious and historical bonds among the European nation-states' (Vasilopoulou, 2011). In her definition of this aspect she states that Europe as a continent encapsulates the elements that connect European people and which is used as distinction to separate European people from people from outside. In the typology all the three types are in favour of a cultural definition of Europe. The second aspect of the typology is the principle of the European integration which means that there is a will of the party for cooperation at a multilateral level with a political character (Vasilopoulou, 2011). The third aspect is the practice of the European integration, the current policy. The fourth and final aspect of the typology is the future of the European integration, defined as the polity aspect, the 'ever closer union' and future expansion.

4.1. ALTERNATIVE FÜR DEUTSCHLAND

COMMON HERITAGE

The AfD describes two distinct cultural parts of Europe, at least with regard to the economy and the work ethic; the northern part, which is described as a hard-working culture afraid of inflation and where being frugal is a high priority; and the southern part of Europe, which is described as the polar opposite, almost inferior to the northern part. Greece in particular is portrayed as a nation of cheaters who tricked their way into the Eurozone and afterwards misused the low interest rate of the Eurozone to spend more money than they had:

> *'Sie konnten unter Beibehaltung der gleichen Zinszahlung im Budget ihre Schulden verdreifachen, dass heißt, dass sie dem griechischen Wähler Wahlgeschenke machen ohne das das eigentlich sichtbar wurde im Budget, weil die Zinssätze auf ein deutsches Niveau gesunken sind'* (Henkel, 2013, p. 3).

Further, the AfD describes the economic culture of the two ´sides´ of Europe as completely different, the North is worried about inflation; the South is portrayed as irresponsible and incapable of long term financial and economic planning. The combination of different cultures and different problems then also calls for different solutions. In the AfD's words;

> *`Wir müssen aufhören, die unterschiedlichen wirtschaftlichen und ökonomischen und finanziellen Kulturen den Bedürfnissen einer Einheitswährung unterwerfen. Wir müssen umgekehrt vorgehen, wir müssen die Einheitswährung den Bedürfnisse der bestehenden Kulturen anpassen '* (AfD, 2013, p. 2).

The AfD`s conclusion is then that the two cannot be united; while countries might change their financial behaviour – mostly through defaulting, the AfD does not believe the south will ever be more responsible as long as it has the north to rely on for financial and economic support.

PRINCIPLE

The AfD writes that the action of the government finds its confinement in the human rights, the basic rights, and the European treaties and thereby making clear that the European treaties will stay a part of the German politics. However, it is also clear that their main focus is on the economic cooperation between nations: *'Wir bejahen ein Europa souveräner Staaten mit einem gemeinsamen Binnenmarkt. Wir wollen in Freundschaft und guter Nachbarschaft zusammenleben.'* (AfD, 2013, p. 1). They are also saying that the single market is the true economical treasure of the European Union (Henkel, 2013, p.8). Any integration beyond that which is necessary for the single market and a peaceful Europe is an infringement on the sovereignty of European states.

PRACTICE

To the AfD, the single currency is the main bone of contention between north and south. By binding the economic faiths of two different cultures together, the Euro has hurt not only the German – and the 'northern' economy in general, but also the southern economy. They think that Germany does not need the Euro while it harms other countries (Alternative, 2013, p.1). To save the Euro it is necessary that the *'Vertreter der potentiellen Geberländer [die müssen] ununterbrochen den anderen Ländern sagen was sie zu tun haben, dass sind ja die potentiellen Nehmerländer'* (Henkel, 2013, p.7), that net contributors can dictate policy to net benefactors, but this is causing friction between the countries. Rightfully so in the opinion of the AfD as they do not want limit other countries sovereignty. While the AfD may or may not be sincere in their concern for the southern countries, the point is that they feel the southern economies 'worked' when they had sovereignty over their fiscal and monetary policy.

The AfD points out that instead of abandoning the project when it failed; the solution of the politicians is to promote an even closer union. In their eyed, this is going further down the rabbit hole; the cultures are simply too distinct, a monetary union can only work if the countries have a similar culture (Henkel, 2013). The AfD states that the elites in the European Union knew this from the beginning but they were lying to the public to achieve their goal of a closer union, and are now breaking the European treaties to save the Euro: *'aber die Bundesregierung kümmerte sich einen feuchten Kehrricht um Verträge und Versprechen'* (Lucke, 2013a, p. 3). Another point of criticism is that the EU is wasting money and here it is clear that wasting money means giving money to the southern countries who spend it on projects that are useless like highways to nowhere. The AfD is highlighting the fact that southern countries get money from the EU to spend while the northern countries have to provide the money which means that there is not enough money left to repair the German highways. They use the same argument when it comes to the Eurocrisis and the guarantee which they gave because this guarantee will become debts and debts have to be paid back which means that there have to be cuts made in the German budget (Starbatty, 2013). The AfD is also worried about the German welfare system and an uncontrolled immigration into aforementioned. They fear that people from the southern and eastern part of Europe are coming to Germany only for the child benefit and without the necessary job and language skills: *'Aber das Problem dieser Form von Zuwanderung besteht doch darin, dass es gar nicht berufliche Chancen sind, die die Immigration*

bewirken, sondern die Höhe des deutsche Kindergeldes' (Lucke, 2013b, p. 4). So while they do not want to get rid of the freedom of movement, they are not satisfied with the current practice.

CATEGORISING THE ALTERNATIVE FÜR DEUTSCHLAND

In conclusion, the AfD fits best into the 'conditional' Euroscepticism spectrum. By and large, they accept the system, but have objections to the policies and institutions of EU governance (Vasilopoulou, 2011). The party is most vocal in its criticism towards the common currency, however, when analysing the party in more depth it becomes clear that they object to more things in the European Union, e.g. immigration and a loss of sovereignty. The most interesting find is the clear divide the party draws between the north and the south of Europe, claiming that these are two different cultures with different work ethics and understanding of economy and money, implying that the south is less good at this, and that these two cultures do not fit together.

4.2. PARTIJ VOOR DE VRIJHEID

COMMON HERITAGE

The first aspect of the typology is the acceptance of a common cultural European heritage and it becomes clear that the PVV has a torn relationship towards this concept. On the one hand they clearly see the southern and eastern part of Europe as something different than the Netherlands, especially with regard to work ethic and economic perspectives. They contrast the 'lazy' Southern people with the hard working Dutch people who have to work harder and longer to finance the South:

> *'En terwijl Frankrijk de pensioenleeftijd vrolijk verlaagt van 62 naar 60 jaar, wordt in ons land de pensioenleeftijd verhoogd. Terwijl de mensen in Zuid-Europa met een wijntje in de zon mogen gaan zitten, moeten Nederlanders van het kabinet langer werken tot ze erbij neervallen'* (Wilders, 2012b, p. 2).

They do not feel a bond with the southern countries:

> *´Nee tegen hier bezuinigen en mensen in hun portemonnee raken en ondertussen betalen voor landen die hun broek niet zelf kunnen ophouden en de boel voor de gek hebben gehouden'* (Wilders, 2013, p. 2)

On the other hand in their fight against what they perceive to be the 'Islamisation' of Western Europe they do empathize the Judaeo-Christian history of Europe and do stress a common religious heritage. They use this distinction against the Islamic countries, to show how Muslims cannot be real Europeans and how a Muslim country cannot become part of Europe. They also show these differences in culture with regard to the European Union as in their opinion the Dutch people are naïve when it comes to the European Union while for example the Romanians are thinking only about how much money they can get out of the other countries:

> *'Nederlanders worden geacht bij 'Europa' te denken aan allerlei hoogstaande, roze dingen: internationale samenwerking, solidariteit en vrede. In Roemenië denken ze alleen maar: hoeveel geld kunnen we ze nog afpakken voordat die domme Hollanders wakker worden'* (PVV, 2012, p. 13).

The PVV feels connected to the countries which she feels are in a similar situation as the Netherlands, but feels threatened by cultures which differ from the Dutch culture too much; the southern and the eastern European countries.

PRINCIPLE

One of the PVV's main objections to the EU is the loss of sovereignty. They would like to secede from the Union as soon as possible, and gain the economic benefits of the single market through either the EEC, or by signing bilateral free trade treaties with the rest of Europe. As Geert Wilders says; "*Die [soevereiniteit] krijgen we terug als we weer baas worden over onze eigen economie, dus weg uit de EU. Vrijhandel regelen we zelf met andere landen*" (PVV, 2012, p. 19). They make it clear that their interests are in the Netherlands and the Netherlands alone (PVV, 2012, p.14). The European Union, its institutions, and its bureaucracy are called slavery (PVV, 2012, p.13), money-wasting socialist apparatus (PVV, 2012, p.23), and *'in essence a totalitarian regime'* (PVV, 2012, p. 26). Wilders draws a comparison to the Dutch struggle for independence against the Spanish in the 16th century - which sparked the Dutch Golden Age in its aftermath - to gaining independence from the EU, which he predicts will lead to a new golden age (Wilders, 2012b, p.2). To sum it up, the PVV is only interested in an economic cooperation and then also only with selected countries which have a similar culture.

PRACTICE

The PVV feels the EU has gone well beyond its purpose, and fears a federal European state. In Wilders' words;

> *'De Europese Unie heeft al lang niks meer te maken met vrijhandel. Brussel is een ondemocratisch monster – een vampier die ons leegzuigt tot we nog slechts een onbetekenende provincie zijn van het Groot-Europese Rijk.'* (Wilders, 2012c, p. 2).

The EU is seen as an undemocratic monstrosity, governed by elites who are neither answerable to Dutch citizens, nor do they care about the Netherlands or its culture (Wilders, 2012a). The PVV feels that not only is the Netherlands spending more on Europe then it receives, the Netherlands spends so much that the government has had to make cuts in welfare for its own citizens. The PVV contents that, adding insult to injury, this money is now spent paying for the – overly generous – welfare benefits of southern European states (PVV, 2012, p.11).

A further concern for the PVV is immigration, as the Netherlands does not have the power any more to decide immigration policy, the PVV feels that the European Union wants to bring *the 'entire third world into our country'* (PVV, 2012, p.10). Making the problem worse, the EU also enforces the Netherlands to open up welfare to all EU countries (PVV, 2012, p.10). This means that the welfare system is under double the stress, of all the immigrants and by the payments to the poorer countries of the European Union. While the PVV recognizes some benefits of the free movement of persons, it feels that exactly who should enjoy this free movement should be left for the Netherlands to decide (PVV, 2012, p.37). Valuing national sovereignty above all, the PVV sees no need for continued membership of the EU. The PVV feels that the Netherlands has no power in the European Union, and, consequently, is used by southern and eastern European countries as a way to pay the bills.

CATEGORISING THE PARTIJ VOOR DE VRIJHEID

The PVV wants the Netherlands to get out of the European Union; they favour bilateral contracts between countries instead of a multilateral political cooperation at European level. Until the time when it is possible to leave the European Union they want to make sure that there is as little EU incursion onto the national sovereignty as possible. Their main point is the loss of sovereignty that the Netherlands have experienced because of EU integration, and the consequences, both perceived

and real, of this integration. The PVV sees Europe as a composition of sovereign nation states, where some are more worthy of cooperation than others.

In summation, the PVV fits best into the ideal type 'rejecting Euroscepticsm' as they are against the principle, practice, and future of European Integration. Sovereignty and the freedom to choose are the most important points of the PVV, it is also interesting that they do not see any economic advantage of their membership or at least parts of the European policies like the single market. Europe is for the PVV mostly a conjunction of sovereign nation states which do not share much except their Judeo-Christian roots which have to be defended from a Muslim attack. Beyond this religious link, the PVV does not see Europe as having a common culture.

4.3. THE UNITED KINGDOM INDEPENDENCE PARTY

COMMON HERITAGE
The UK has always had a certain sense of isolationism when it comes to its relation with Europe, and the UKIP is particularly strong in this sentiment. In Nigel Farange's words (2013, p. 1);

'Because the fact is we just don't belong in the European Union. Britain is different. Our geography puts us apart. Our history puts us apart. Our institutions produced by that history put us apart. We think differently. We behave differently'.

The UKIP does not merely feel the UK is different, they feel superior. They claim that the law system is better and that the UK is the *'land of liberty'* (Farage, 2013, p. 2) while the continent does not have this kind of history: *'The idea of free speech was a reality in England when Europe was run by princes with tyrannical powers'* (Farage, 2013, p. 2).

PRINCIPLE
For the UKIP, sovereignty is the key. They want their sovereignty back, completely. In their opinion the UK is *'mad'* (Congdon, 2013, p. 1)to be in the European Union. They are demanding a referendum as soon as possible about the membership in the European Union. They believe that the British problems can only be solved outside of the EU since they see no advantages in the European Union. By the UKIP's calculations, the UK is paying £55 million into the EU's treasury every day. By leaving the European Union they would regain not just their sovereignty but also money which could be spend in reviving the economy. The UK's imperial history has left a strong mark on UKIP policies, leaving them feel superior to continental Europe, and more connected to the commonwealth. They disregard the people who say that the UK needs the European Union as *'the true voices of Little Britain'* (Farage, 2012b, p. 3) and claim that they speak for Great Britain. They do not want any kind of multilateral agreement, not even on pure economic terms; rather they want to have bilateral trade agreements. In that respect, the UKIP states that Europe is overvalued as a trading partner, and the UK's focus should be on the commonwealth, since they are the growing economies in the world and *'they speak English, have the Common Law, are our real friends out there'*(Farage, 2012a, p. 3). Finally, the UKIP feels that the EU is flawed from the ground up, and that by leaving the EU the UK would be a role-model, encouraging other countries to make the beneficial decisions of leaving the EU as well.

PRACTICE

Since they are so fully against the principle of the European Union it is no surprise that they are also completely against any current practice in the European Union. Their main concern about the European Union are the uncontrolled immigration of European people into Britain and the huge amount of money they think the UK loses every day because of their membership. Immigration is for them *'the biggest single issue facing this country'* (Farange, 2013, p.2). They want to stop the uncontrolled mass immigration into Europe as they think it is not sustainable anymore since Britain is already densely populated and this immigration wave, especially from Eastern Europe, puts an intolerable burden on the infrastructure and the public services (Common Sense Politics, 2013). The argument here is that the immigrants are draining the country's resources and it should be the British people first who benefit since they financed them. There are two problems with the immigration in the opinion of the UKIP, the immigrants are getting welfare money without having to pay into it first and they are taking jobs from British people. Welfare overall is not viewed very favourably by the UKIP which says that welfare should be a '*safety net for the needy, not a bed for the lazy*' (Common Sense Politics, 2013) and that in the current economic climates public spending needs to be cut. They demand that immigrants live and work for five years in the UK before they can claim any benefits, also they should have private Health insurance since the NHs is `*the National Health Service; it is not the International Health Service'*(Aker, 2013, p. 4). All in all, they are using a "Britains first" argumentation saying that the welfare benefits should be first and foremost available for British people and immigrants are taking benefits away from Brits.

They also claim that many immigrants receive welfare benefits for which they are not eligible. So the Romanian father goes to the UK to find a job there and then receives child benefits for his three children even though they are still in Romania. They are implying that this is one of the main reasons for the East European immigration wave (Farange, 2013, p.7). However, the immigrants are not just taking welfare benefits from the British people, they are also taking jobs and driving down the wages. Tim Congdon says that it is *'pretty plausible'* (2013, p.2) that the Eastern European immigrants are taking away jobs from the UK-born people as the employment of UK-born has fallen by 400 000 people while the employment of Non UK-born people has risen by 1.1 Million people over half of these Eastern European. In their opinion it is *'completely irresponsible'* (Farange, 2012, p.4) to have an open-door policy to the whole of Eastern Europe if the UK has a youth unemployment rate of 20%. They also claim that the European Union wants to solve the Eurozone crisis by exporting their unemployed through the EU job mobility portal (Aken, 2013, p.5).

Another issue for the UKIP are the huge cost they associate with the membership of the EU. They estimated the cost for the UK to be a member of the EU to £55 million a day in which are not just the taxes included which the UK has to pay to Brussels but also the costs of regulations to the British economy, tariff barriers, and the cost of lost jobs and welfare benefits to immigrants (Congdon, 2013, p.3). In their opinion the UK can only benefit from leaving the EU as they would get this money back, which they could spend to help the British economy, and they would be freed from the trade restrictions made by the EU. They do not feel a deep connection to Europe as Farange calls it an *'ageing and increasingly arthritic trade bloc'* (2013, p.5) which the UK does not need if it can open their market to the booming countries in the rest of the world.

The UKIP feels that the UK loses not just power to the EU but almost their sense of self. They feel that the UK is now governed by a foreign power and that *'most Britons didn't know what they were letting themselves in for'* (Farange, 2013, p.4) and through all the rules and regulations the spirit of

production, leadership, and enterprise is lost. The same goes for the civil rights which grew over centuries and now Europe just brushed them aside with the Human Rights Charter. They feel that the EU has taken away their constitutional, legal liberties while being undemocratic itself. They see the EU as a *'militarised undemocratic danger to the global peace'* (Farange, 2012a, p.7) while the power of their parliament is reduced to *'the level of a large council'* (Farange, 2013, p.6). The UKIP is blaming the political elites for this as they claim that they lied to the people or otherwise the British public would have never agreed to the membership (Farange, 2013, p.3). The lies and deceit of the current political parties is the reason why UKIP was founded (Farange, 2012a, p.5). In their eyes the 'career politicians' of the three big parties are all the same, they are lying and deceiving the British public (Farange, 2012, p.4).

CATEGORISING THE UNITED KINGDOM INDEPENDENCE PARTY

The UKIP is against the European Union and does not see any advantages for the United Kingdom to be part of the European Union. They want to get out of the EU as fast as possible since they believe that there are no advantages and only disadvantages, especially in the economic area. Therefore they are also not in favour of a purely economic Union. They stress the sovereignty factor and want to regain their freedom from foreign decision making. They also feel no cultural connection to the rest of Europe. They feel that the United Kingdom is 'different' and do not really belong under the headline 'Europe'.

In summation, the UKIP fits best into the 'rejecting Euroscepticism' type as the party is not in favour of any kind of multilateral cooperation, not even when it is just reduced to economic cooperation. They want to get out of the European Union as fast as possible and in their opinion the best thing would be to abolish the European Union all together because they think that the EU has no advantages for any country. It is interesting though that the UKIP does not see any cultural connection between the European Countries or rather that it does not see a cultural connection between the countries on the European continent but it does not see the United Kingdom to be a part of that. The fact that the UK is are Islands seem to set them apart with a different history and traditions. They feel much more connected to the countries of the Commonwealth which share their history and traditions because they were colonised by the British Empire. One could hypothesize that the UKIP still hold on to the image of the British Empire and the power they once had.

4.4. COMPARISON

When looking at the different meanings of Europe in the parties it becomes clear that all three parties have a different understanding of Europe. The analysis showed that there is a spectrum of feelings towards a common heritage, which ranges from UKIP's isolationism, to creating blocks of 'us' and 'them' by the AfD, and the PVV's individualism. The AfD sees Europe as two blocks which have a different work ethic and economic sense and therefore are not compatible, while the PVV sees Europe as a coming together of sovereign states which should fend for themselves. However, it is clear that the PVV makes a distinction similar to that of the AfD; there are countries which have a similar way of thinking and there are countries which do not fit together. In both cases this entails the North versus the South and the East. The UKIP is the outlier as they maybe see a similar cultural history in the European countries; however, they do not see the UK as part of Europe. For them the UK is different from the other European countries and they feel closer to the countries of the Commonwealth. The parties do have similarities though; they all feel that they are the 'alternative'

to the established mainstream parties. The established parties are portrayed as lying elites who do not listen to the wishes of the people while they are the peoples' party.

The empirical findings make it clear that the AfD differs substantially from the other two parties. The AfD does not want to abolish the European Union it rather campaigned in the beginning with the idea that they are pro-EU but anti-Euro. This was also the reason why it was perceived as a single-issue party as the fight against the common currency was the most important topic. The party itself tried to get away from the 'stigma' of being a single-issue party and tried to present a broader picture and more differentiated topics. Nonetheless it is noteworthy that in the election for the Bundestag the common currency is the most important issue for the AfD. The issue of the common currency is not such a big issue for the other two parties because their main focus lies on getting rid of the European Union. Also the United Kingdom does not have the Euro and therefore they are referring to the common currency more as an example of the mismanagement of the European Union and why the UK is better off without the EU. With regard to the point that the AfD is perceived as a single-issue party, the UKIP is an interesting case as they were also in the beginning a single-issue party which was only known for wanting to getting out of the European Union. This changed over time and while they are still mostly known as an anti-EU party, their policy portfolio is now much wider and incorporates other policy aspects as well. This will be the way that the AfD has to go as well if it wants to gain more votes and influence. Single-issue parties are usually not successful in the long run.

A common bond between all of the parties is their xenophobia which is more or less visible in all three parties. However, here again is the AfD the party which does not show it as openly as the other two parties. All three parties are saying that the citizens from the southern and eastern part of Europe are lazier and spending their money more recklessly than their own national citizens. Connected to the xenophobia is the theme that is the most similar through all three parties and their biggest concern when it comes to the practice of the European integration: the fear that immigration is destroying their welfare state. This is especially surprising with regard to the UKIP as the UK is not known as a welfare paradise and as a liberal welfare regime the emphasis should be more on the loss of jobs. And while they do talk more about the loss of jobs than the PVV and the AfD, their main focus is on the benefits people can receive in the UK. All of them are criticising the current welfare tourism in their countries and fear that the opening of the borders for the Romanian and Bulgarian people will result in a flooding of their welfare system to the point where it is no longer sustainable. The solutions they offer are ranging from a strict 'length-of-stay' principle which should be up to ten years in the case of the PVV to more creative solutions from the AfD which proposes that European citizens only receive welfare from their home nation which means that there is no advantage anymore in coming to Germany. Another common theme is that they are against any future European integration. They fear that the elites in Brussels want to establish a European Superstate or a United States of Europe which would reduce the nation states to federal states.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

After analysing the parties using the aspects of the typology by Vasilopoulou (2011) and categorising the parties into the ideal types, the research question question *'How does the AfD differ from the UKIP and the PVV in its Euroscepticism?'* can be answered in short by referring to the different ideal types into which the parties can be categorized. The UKIP and the PVV are both in the 'rejecting Euroscepticism' category which objects completely to the European Union while the AfD is in the 'conditional Euroscepticism' category which means that it is in favour of the principle of the European integration. Theories regarding populist parties were used to compare the parties more in detail which made clear that these parties have quite a few things in common with each other and do fit into the current theories of right-wing populist parties. However, there are also substantial differences beyond the different opinion about the principle of the European Union.

Vasilopoulou (2013) writes that to date there have been three waves of Euroscepticism, the current third wave having been triggered by the financial crisis. It combines '*mass Euroscepticism and protest with elite Euroscepticism and a fierce anti-referendum stance among EU-leaders'* (p.161). In this phase the public may also reduce their involvement with European politics and the national interest becomes more important than European solidarity. This trend was observed in all three parties, each arguing that in this time of crisis the respective nation states cannot afford a European solidarity with struggling countries since the national citizens should come first. With this in mind it is interesting to think about the difference between ideological and strategic motivated Euroscepticism. Ideological motivated parties would be unwilling to compromise their positions regarding the European Union even if it would mean a better result in the elections or government participation. Strategic motivated Euroscepticists though would change their stance if it would be beneficial for the party (Rovny, 2004). Additionally the theory suggests that fringe parties are more Eurosceptic than mainstream parties and when a party becomes a member of the governing coalition it will 'soften' their Eurosceptic stances (Hooghe et al., 2002). Current research confirms the moderating effect of government participation for Eurosceptic parties. However, the PVV became the second-largest party in the 2010 Dutch elections but did not become a member of the governing coalition[6]. This meant that Wilders had influence on the policies while still being able to maintain the picture that the PVV is an 'outsider' in the Dutch politics. Therefore there was no 'softening' of the Eurosceptic positions and his hard stance finally resulted in the resignation of the government (Taggart & Szczerbiak, 2013). The peculiar arrangement falls outside of the relatively simplistic 'U' curve of Euroscepticism defined by Hooghe et al. (2002), but it is clear that for the PVV, having more power did not result in a more mainstream attitude.

The UKIP, while never being in a position of power did undergo a change in political stances as well. When the party started it was a clear one-issue party which only party position was that the UK should leave the European Union as fast as possible. The UKIP faced a tension which many single-issue parties face: there were people who felt that this issue is a core issue of the party and cannot be changed while others saw the need to be more flexible in their ideology in the short run so that they can achieve their objectives in the long run (Usherwood, 2008). The UKIP broadened its political stance and positioned itself right of the Conservatives, while still maintaining an outsider image

---

[6] The PVV, while technically part of the opposition, lend its support to the ruling coalition as a 'gedoog partner'. In practice this meant the PVV could influence policy and the ruling coalition had a majority, while both sides could claim not to be affiliated with the other.

which appeals to voters who are disillusioned by the mainstream parties. This strategy resulted in a good result in the by-elections in 2012 and an extraordinary result in the local elections in 2013 in which they won a quarter of the votes (Gifford, 2014). With regard to the motivation behind the Euroscepticism of the UKIP it seems that they are more ideological motivated than strategic since they did not change their 'hard' Euroscepticism much over time. However, especially in the case of the UKIP the British electoral system is interesting as it is mostly a 'First-past-the-post'-system which has disadvantages for smaller parties. This meant that until recently there was no chance for a coalition government and the two big parties were dominating the national elections. The UKIP found its 'niche' as the party which is anti-EU and different than the mainstraim 'Lib-Lab-Cons' as they call the three mainstream parties to make clear that these parties are essential all the same (Sutcliffe, 2010). Changing their Eurosceptic positions to appeal to a broader contingency would probably mean losing the current voters and becoming too much like the other parties to gain more mainstream voters.

It is interesting that the AfD was founded in response to the current Eurocrisis and at the time is more or less a single-issue party; most of their electoral success can be attributed to their stance on the common currency. Only time can tell if a party has a more strategic or ideological motivated Euroscepticism, but it seems that at the very least the AfD used the current public feelings toward the European Union and the common currency to gain attention and electoral success. All three parties are said to be populists by mainstream parties, an accusation which they dismiss as a political manoeuvre which is meant to put them in a bad light. Populism is generally defined in the academic literature as '*an ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, 'the pure people' versus 'the corrupt elite', and which argues that politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people*' (Mudde, 2004, p. 543). The concept of populism is perhaps as broad as Euroscepticsm and a classification of the parties with regard to populism is outside of the scope of this study. However, by using the aforementioned definition certain similarities do catch the eye.

All three parties claim that they are different than the other 'mainstream' parties. The politicians from the other parties are lying to the people and are only working for themselves while the politicians from their parties are finally telling the truth (at least with regard to the European Union) and are not doing it for themselves but rather for some higher reason.

> *,[...] das erinnert mich an den großen Soziologen Max Weber der Politiker unterteilt hat in solche die von der Politik leben und in solche die für die Politik leben. Wenn der Kanzlerkandidat Steinbrück darüber philosophiert, dass das Gehalt des Bundeskanzlers mit 365 000€ nicht adequat ist im Vergleich mit dem was in der Wirtschaft bezahlt wird, ich verstehe das ja, aber wenn er darüber philosophiert, dann will er von der Politik leben, während die Mitglieder der Alternative Deutschland leben für die Politik sie haben eine Aufgabe, sie wollen nichts für sich, sie wollen etwas für Europa, für Deutschland, und für ihre eigenen Kinder und sie setzen dabei natürlich auch ihre eigene Freizeit ein, ihr Engagement und natürlich auch ihr Portemonnaie. Denn vieles was wir machen geht auf unser Portemonnaie, wir leben nicht von der Politik sondern für die Politik.' (Starbatty, 2013, p.1)*

This rather long paragraph from one of the candidates of the AfD demonstrates the state of mind of this party as the 'normal' politician is depicted as the enemy of the common man while the AfD is made up by the common man and works tirelessly to improve the life of the public. Similar quotations are made by the PVV: '*Kop in het zand, niet luisteren naar de burger en vooral niet naar de kiezer. De elites hebben gelijk en niet de gewone burger; het stemvee – dat te dom is om te*

denken, maar wel moet betalen.' (Wilders, 2013, p.2); and the UKIP when Nigel Farage says that ` […] *there is a wholesale rejection of the carrier political class going on. We have had enough of them. And they really all do look the same and sound the same and all go to the same school, the same Oxbridge college and none of them actually had a real job in the real world and none of them is in the politics for principle and that is what we stand for. Principle!' (2013, p.1).* However, irrespective of their rhetoric, until now no populist radical right party has changed the party system in Western Europe (Mudde, 2014). Rather in accordance with the theory of Hooghe et al. (2002) which states that Euroscepticism is mostly a phenomenon of fringe parties, populist parties change their programmes when they become successful and tone down the populism (Rooduijn, de Lange, & der Brug, 2012).

Populists tend to identify themselves with a 'heartland' that represents an idealised conception of the community they serve. The populist use this imagined territory to construct a concept of 'the people' as the object of their politics. However, the notion of 'the people' is too broad and diffuse to really be the uniting principle for populism. Rather this concept stands for an implicit or explicit commitment to the 'heartland' and 'the people' are just the population of this heartland. The heartland is a construction of an ideal world which is constructed from the past. It is romanticised, diffuse and the good life has already been lived and it shows that this is possible. At least that is what the populist sell (Taggart, 2004, p. 274). This notion of a heartland can be observed in all of the three parties; though it is most obvious for UKIP. They show an 'island mentality' insofar as they do not feel connected to the continent and feel superior to the rest of Europe. They feel that their distinct history and politics set them apart from the rest of Europe, and closer to the countries of the Commonwealth, therefore one of their main policy platforms is the preservation of the British identity (Sutcliffe, 2010). They also make a point of showing how much better the UK was when it was not yet in the European Union. The same can be seen in the PVV when Wilders makes links between the Spanish occupation of the Netherlands and Dutch membership of the EU, predicting a new golden age when the Netherlands regain their freedom. Their anti-islam positions can also be explained to some extend by this need to protect the heartland when they say *'De islam hoort niet bij Nederland. Die zal een eeuwige bron van onrust vormen' (PVV, 2012, p.35)*. The Islam is used to set boundaries to the heartland and 'the people'. The Islam was not part of the Dutch past when everything was better so it cannot be part of the new Golden Age. It is also used as a scapegoat for things that went wrong in the Netherlands. The AfD in contrast with the other parties does not want to leave the European Union it therefore has no need to go too far into the past to find a heartland[7]. Its heartland is the time Germany still had the D-Mark and no obligation to bail out other countries.

Immigration is one of the key concerns for populists as it challenges the uniform nature of the heartland (Taggart, 2004). A study done by Ivarsflaten (2007) shows that only the grievance over immigration was used by all successful populist right parties to mobilize voters. The other two grievances, economic changes and elitist and corrupt politics, were only used by some populist parties. This was also the case with the three parties used in this thesis as they all identified immigration as a threat for their nation state or more specifically for their welfare state. Even though these parties are generally categorized in the far right corner of the political spectrum they all have an economic agenda which is not opposed to a high level of economic redistribution from the rich to the poor, economic interference by the state, and an extensive welfare state as long as these cater to the native 'common man' (de Koster, Achterberg, & van der Waal, 2012, p. 4). The parties criticize

---

[7] And probably does not want to.

that the welfare services are for the most part not tied to the nationality of the receiver since they want only natives to be eligible or at the very least have a 'length-of-stay' principle. The UKIP argues that the welfare system is only feasible if you first have to pay in to get something out (Aken, 2013). This concept of restricting welfare services to the native population is known as 'welfare chauvinism' (Andersen & Bjorklund, 1990, p.212, cited in de Koster et al., 2012). At the same time, all three parties criticize the bureaucracy of the welfare state because in their opinion the bureaucrats are not able to help the really deserving people rather the bureaucrats are only interested in themselves and profit from the hard work of the 'common people' (de Koster et al., 2012).

Vejvodová (2013) identified four common issues in right-wing populist parties which are firstly the EU itself whose development and evolution is criticized. This thesis shows that this is indeed a common issue for the three parties which were analyzed. However, it has also shown that such a broad notion is not helpful in determining if right-wing parties can and will be cooperating and networking as the Eurosceptic spectrum is broad. The second topic she describes is the threat of the Islamisation of Europe. This perceived threat is used extensively by the PVV and may be even more a core issue of the PVV than their Euroscepticism. However, this threat was not so prominent in the other parties. The third theme is 'globalisation' which according to the right-wing parties is responsible for the immigration problems and the economic crisis. Along with globalization comes also a loss of national identity and traditional patterns of life in Europe. All three parties present themselves as defenders of national traditions and values. The AfD is the tamest one of the three because it has the view that the culture of Germany is similar enough to other north European cultures to justify a common northern Europe culture. The fourth common theme does not stand on its own; it is interfused with the other three themes. She calls it 'the defence of European civilization, of Europe's roots, values and culture' (p.379) which is more or less the same as the first aspect of Vasilopoulou's typology, the definition of a common European heritage. For this the results of the analysis was that a common European heritage is not as straightforward for the analyzed parties as it may seem. The UKIP feels that the UK is not part of the history of the European continent and therefore does not use the idea of a common European heritage while the other two parties may use this notion with regard to the Christian roots of Europe to fend of Turkey, when it comes to financial and economic cultures there is a clear divide through Europe.

In the chapters leading up to this conclusion, we have gathered discourses by three different European right-wing, populist and Eurosceptic parties. We have then analyzed these manifestos and speeches, and categorized the parties into a typology of Euroscepticism by Vasilopoulou (2013). Several differences were found, the PVV and UKIP both classified as 'Rejecting Euroscepticism', rejecting all aspects of the European Union, whereas the AfD classified as 'Conditional Euroscepticism', accepting the principle of the European Union, but rejecting the practice and future of the European Union, and the common currency in particular. Within and across the typification of Euroscepticism, further differences in how these parties see the common heritage of Europe were found. Influenced by history, geography and politics, each of the parties has a different view of Europe, and each has different ideas of which countries share the same culture. Their discourse and politics can to a large extent be explained by their vision of Europe.

To answer the main research question; the parties differ in who they see as 'us' and 'them'. For UKIP, 'us' is the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth, while Europe holds no particular significance. For the PVV 'us' is the Netherlands, and to a lesser extent northern Europe, whereas 'them' is southern and eastern Europe. In the PVV's view, each country should fend for their own interests, and it is not

in the Netherlands' interests to continue investing in the European Union, and the southern and eastern nations in particular. The AfD is the least critical of the European Union as a whole, which is reflected in their vision of Europe; while similar to the PVV in that they feel each country should represent their national interests first and foremost, they do see 'us' as a broad group of northern European states, with 'them' being the south and east, and they do see value in economic cooperation at a European level. This contrasts with the typology of Vasilopoulou (2013) which assumes that all Eurosceptic parties agree with the notion that Europe has a common cultural heritage. While the data set of this thesis was too small to give a definite answer, it does seem to indicate that the issue of a common cultural heritage is not as easily answered as Vasilopoulou makes it out to be. The clearest case for that is the UKIP which may think that Europe has a common cultural history as they do talk about the whole of Europe as a unit but it does not see the United Kingdom as part of this. The PVV and the AfD show a less clear-cut case as in the data used they talk about differences in the cultures of Europe with regard to the economy and the work ethics. Here it was possible to see a cut made between the northern culture and the southern culture. This does not mean though that they do not see a common European culture in other aspects as for example the Cristo-Judeo culture of Europe.

This difference of views is continued, and perhaps echoed, in the parties' discourse on the future European Union. While UKIP advocates the UK's full withdrawal from the European Union and the European free trade area, the PVV wishes to retain a free trade area while seceding from the Union. By comparison, the AfD 'merely' wishes to return the European Union to its pre-Maastricht status, returning sovereignty of all but the single market back to the member states. The party landscape of the right-wing parties in Europe is changing constantly with new parties emerging as was the case with the AfD or parties changing their programme. Adam et al. (2013) have researched Eurosceptic parties in the 2009 European Parliament election and they come to the conclusion that a principled opposition to the European Union is very rare and in their 11 country sample only the two British parties, the UKIP and the BNP, voice clear-cut EU criticism and demand that their country leaves the European Union. They conclude that '*Euroscepticism means something different on the British Isles compared to continental Europe*' (p.95). This thesis came to the same conclusion insofar as it also highlighted that the UK feels it is different from continental Europe. However, we identified that the view of Europe by the parties is one of the reasons for the differences in their Euroscepticism.

There are also similarities. Each of the parties places the issue of immigration high on the agenda, albeit with a different focal point. While for each of the parties the costs of welfare tourism is a reason to tighten immigration policies, the PVV adds an individual touch with its fear of the Islamification of Europe. Further, each of these parties sees itself as an alternative to mainstream politics. They are the self-declared people's parties, practicing honest, no-nonsense politics. Both these issues are commonly associated with right-wing populist parties (Mudde, 2013). Minkenberg & Perrineau (2007) agree that both the rejection of immigration and the 'antipolitical' sentiment are a connecting element in European right-wing parties, they come to the conclusion that *'nothing is more difficult to establish than an "international group of nationalists"'*(p.51). The article comes to the conclusion that the right-wing parties in Europe are not able to bring together their power and therefore they will not achieve their individual goals. It does not offer any explanations for this though it mentions that larger issues with the national identity and the strength of nationalist traditions are more important to the electoral success of right-wing parties than issues with the EU membership. This is an interesting point with regard to our findings of the different views of Europe

as they reflect how the countries see themselves. The findings show that for some parties more than for others the issue with the EU membership is actually an issue of strengthening the national identity by contrasting it with an 'enemy'.

While each of these parties is sceptical of the European Union, cooperation within the European Parliament is very unlikely. The AfD will not work together with the UKIP or the PVV because their goals are too different. The AfD wants to change the current practice of the European Union but ultimately wants to keep it while the PVV and the UKIP wants their countries out of the European Union as fast as possible. PVV has already made agreements with the French Front Nationale for cooperation in the European Parliament after the next election. However, only other extreme nationalist parties will want to work with them. Given Germany's past, for the AfD in particular association with Front National would likely have negative consequences. Especially the extreme positions on immigration and an anti-Islam position hinder a possible cooperation as the positioning of the party in the EP needs to be understood in terms of the strategic location of the party within the national political space of parties competing for governmental power, influence and public attention (Flood & Usherwood, 2005, p. 15). The UKIP shares the ultimate goal of PVV, the dismantling of the European Union, but they already made clear that because of the anti-Semitic history of the FN it will not join the group and rather stay with their current group in the EP, the 'Europe of Freedom and Democracy' group (Henley, 2014). The charter of this group states that it is in favour of an open, transparent, democratic, and accountable co-operation between sovereign nation states and it does not believe in such a thing as a single European people (Europe of Feedom & Democracy, 2014).

Taggart & Szczerbiak (2013) looked into what happens when Eurosceptic parties become part of the government as in the past Euroscepticism was mostly located in the peripheral parties. They found that in general being part of the government did seem to moderate their views on the European Union, though there are some cases were the Eurosceptic parties did have a discernable impact on policy (e.g. Hungary). However, the Eurosceptic parties were only minor players in the government. They conclude that Euroscepticism is now part of the mainstream of the European politics. The party landscape in Europe is changing with more Eurosceptic parties emerging and the existing becoming stronger. Germany was always one of the most Europhile countries in Europe and did not have a Eurosceptic party which played any real role in the German politics. This has changed with the rise of the AfD and their relative success in the German Bundestag elections. Euroscepticism is growing stronger in the public and subsequently also in the party landscape which makes it a more pressing matter for the European Union.

This thesis provides a first insight into a new Eurosceptic party in Europe, the AfD, and contrasted their views with that of two prominent Eurosceptic parties. The typology of Vasilopoulou (2011), which incorporates different aspects of already existing theories and applies it especially to right-wing parties, was used to analyse the three parties. None of the three parties was yet categorized using this typology and especially the AfD is still a dark horse in the party system. With regard to the theory the most interesting finding is that for the first aspect, which Vasilopoulou calls a definition of a common cultural heritage and for which all parties are in favour in her typology, this thesis comes to a different outcome. While all parties to some extend have a definition of a common cultural heritage in Europe, it differs widely in the parties and the parties also put emphasis on the different cultures which exist in Europe, notably the different economic and financial cultures which make a 'ever closer union' very difficult.

From this it became clear that the Euroscepticism of the German party is more moderate than that of the Dutch and British parties. However, even though the Dutch and British parties have the same goal, the withdrawal of their countries from the European Union, they still differ in the extent of that withdrawal and in the handling of Europe. This knowledge is crucial if the European Union wants to fight back against this Euroscepticism. Euroscepticism is a broad term which incorporates many different elements and therefore a nuanced reaction is needed. The Eurosceptic parties are constantly evolving and especially with the AfD it will be necessary to look further into the Euroscepticism of the party as it is a very new party and not much data was accessible. The coming European Parliament election will provide a good opportunity to compare more Eurosceptic parties and will provide more data as all of the parties will have more extensive party manifestos.

REFERENCES

Adam, S., Maier, M., de Vreese, C. H., Schuck, A. R. T., Stetka, V., Jalali, C., … Baumli, M. (2013). Campaigning Against Europe? The Role of Euroskeptic Fringe and Mainstream Parties in the 2009 European Parliament Election. *Journal of Political Marketing*, *12*(1), 77–99. doi:10.1080/15377857.2013.752245

AfD. (2013). Wahlprogramm Bundestagswahl 2013. Retrieved from https://www.alternativefuer.de/pdf/Wahlprogramm-AFD.pdf

Aker, T. (2013). Speech at the UKIP conference [Video file]. Retrieved October 11, 2013, from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kfHWJDwRm14

Busch, K., & Knelangen, W. (2004). German Euroscepticsm. *European Studies: A Journal of European Culture, History and Politics*, 83–98.

Congdon, T. (2013). The cost of the EU [Video file]. Retrieved October 12, 2013, from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cuv5OlPTtk4

Conti, N., & Memoli, V. (2011). The multi-faceted nature of party-based Euroscepticism. *Acta Politica*, *47*(2), 91–112. doi:10.1057/ap.2011.22

De Koster, W., Achterberg, P., & van der Waal, J. (2012). The new right and the welfare state: The electoral relevance of welfare chauvinism and welfare populism in the Netherlands. *International Political Science Review*, *34*(1), 3–20. doi:10.1177/0192512112455443

De Vries, C. E., & Edwards, E. E. (2009). Taking Europe To Its Extremes: Extremist Parties and Public Euroscepticism. *Party Politics*, *15*(1), 5–28. doi:10.1177/1354068808097889

Dechezelles, S., & Neumayer, L. (2010). Introduction: Is Populism a Side-Effect of European Integration? Radical Parties and the Europeanization of Political Competition. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, *11*(3), 229–236. doi:10.1080/15705854.2010.503030

Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *62*(1), 107–15. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x

Europe of Feedom & Democracy. (2014). Our Charter. Retrieved April 30, 2014, from http://www.efdgroup.eu/about-us/who-we-are/charter.html

Farage, N. (2012a). Speech at the UKIP conference [Video file]. Retrieved October 07, 2013, from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dKZsno1ktlk

Farage, N. (2012b). Speech at the UKIP Spring conference in Exeter [Video file]. Retrieved October 09, 2013, from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bAR0bOdY1mU

Farage, N. (2013). Conference Speech 2013. Retrieved October 10, 2013, from http://blogs.spectator.co.uk/coffeehouse/2013/09/nigel-farages-speech-full-text-and-audio/

Flood, C., & Underwood, S. (2007). *Ideological factors in party alignments on the EU: a comparison of three cases*. Retrieved from http://aei.pitt.edu/7875/

Flood, C., & Usherwood, S. (2005). Positions, Dispositions, Transitions: A Model of Group Alignment on EU Integration. *55th Annual Conference of the Political …*, (April 2005), 5–7. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228490382_Positions_Dispositions_Transitions_A_model_of_Group_Alignmen

t_on_EU_Integration/file/e0b4952306970dfaae.pdf

Gifford, C. (2014). The People Against Europe: The Eurosceptic Challenge to the United Kingdom's Coalition Government. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *52*(3), 512–528. doi:10.1111/jcms.12112

Henkel, H.-O. (2013). Rede im Augustinerkeller. Retrieved September 21, 2013, from https://www.alternativefuer.de/2013/09/11/hans-olaf-henkel-erklaert-das-politische-und-wirtschaftliche-europa/

Henley, J. (2014, April 28). The enemy invasion: Brussels braced for influx of Eurosceptics in EU polls. *The Guardian*. Couloummiers, Erfurt and Helsinki. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/apr/28/brussels-braced-influx-eurosceptics-parties-european-union-polls

Hooghe, L., Marks, G., & Wilson, C. J. (2002). Does Left/Right Structure Party Positions on European Integration? *Comparative Political Studies*, *35*(8), 965–989. doi:10.1177/001041402236310

Ivarsflaten, E. (2007). What Unites Right-Wing Populists in Western Europe?: Re-Examining Grievance Mobilization Models in Seven Successful Cases. *Comparative Political Studies*, *41*(1), 3–23. doi:10.1177/0010414006294168

Kaniok, P. (2009). Party Based Euroscepticism: Opposing the Commission or the European Integration? *Contemporary European Studies*, 25–45. Retrieved from http://www.ceeol.com/aspx/getdocument.aspx?logid=5&id=f231f50519cd4333b27117466222044e

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

297–326. doi:10.1177/1465116502003003002

Lucke, B. (2013a). Grundsatzrede. Retrieved September 22, 213AD, from https://www.alternativefuer.de/2013/09/11/bernd-lucke-afd-grundsatzrede/

Lucke, B. (2013b). Rede vom 21.07.2013. Retrieved September 25, 2013, from https://www.alternativefuer.de/2013/09/11/bernd-lucke-beim-sommerfest-der-afd-mv/

Minkenberg, M., & Perrineau, P. (2007). The Radical Right in the European Elections 2004. *International Political Science Review*, *28*(1), 29–55. doi:10.1177/0192512107070401

Missiroli, A. (2011). The rise of anti-EU populism : why , and what to do about it, (September).

Mudde, C. (2004). The populist zeitgeist. *Government and Opposition*. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2004.00135.x/full

Mudde, C. (2012). The comparative study of party-based Euroscepticism: the Sussex versus the North Carolina School. *East European Politics*, *28*(2), 193–202. doi:10.1080/21599165.2012.669735

Mudde, C. (2013). Three decades of populist radical right parties in Western Europe: So what? *European Journal of Political Research*, *52*(1), 1–19. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2012.02065.x

Mudde, C. (2014). Fighting the system? Populist radical right parties and party system change. *Party Politics*, *20*(2), 217–226. doi:10.1177/1354068813519968

Oliver, C. (2012). The relationship between symbolic interactionism and interpretive description. *Qualitative Health Research*,

22(3), 409–15. doi:10.1177/1049732311421177

PVV. (2012). Hún Brussel, óns Nederland. Retrieved from http://pvv.nl/images/stories/verkiezinge n2012/VerkiezingsProgramma-PVV-2012-final-web.pdf

Riishøj, S. (2007). Europeanization and Euroscepticism: Experiences from Poland and the Czech Republic. *Nationalities Papers*, *35*(3), 503–535. doi:10.1080/00905990701368746

Rooduijn, M., de Lange, S. L., & der Brug, W. V. (2012). A populist Zeitgeist? Programmatic contagion by populist parties in Western Europe. *Party Politics*. doi:10.1177/1354068811436065

Rovny, J. (2004). Conceptualising Party-based Euroscepticism: Magnitude and Motivations. *Collegium*, *Winter*(29), 31–47.

Sitter, N. (2003). Euro-scepticism as party strategy: Persistence and change in party-based opposition to European integration. *Paper Prepared for the 8th EUSA International Biennial Conference*.

Sørensen, C. (n.d.). Love me, love me not… A typology of public euroscepticism Catharina Sørensen,, (101), 1–29.

Starbatty, J. (2013). Rede vom 24.08.2013 an der Frankfurter Hauptwache. Retrieved September 24, 2013, from https://www.alternativefuer.de/2013/09 /11/professor-starbatty-der-euro-ist-sein-tatort/

Sutcliffe, J. B. (2010). " The Roots and Consequences of Euroscepticism : An Evaluation of the United Kingdom Independence Party " 1, (May).

Szczerbiak, A., & Taggart, P. (2003). Theorising Party-Based Euroscepticism: Problems of Definition, Measurement and Causality.

Paper Prepared for the 8th EUSA International Biennial Conference.

Taggart, P. (1998). A Touchstone of Dissent: Euroscepticism in Contemporary Western European Party Systems. *European Journal of Political Research*, *33*(3), 363–388. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.00387

Taggart, P. (2004). Populism and representative politics in contemporary Europe. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, *9*(3), 269–288. doi:10.1080/1356931042000263528

Taggart, P., & Szczerbiak, A. (2004). Contemporary Euroscepticism in the party systems of the European Union candidate states of Central and Eastern Europe, (July 2001), 1–27.

Taggart, P., & Szczerbiak, A. (2013). Coming in from the Cold? Euroscepticism, Government Participation and Party Positions on Europe*. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *51*(1), 17–37. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5965.2012.02298.x

Usherwood, S. (2008). The dilemmas of a single-issue party – The UK Independence Party. *Representation*, *44*(3), 255–264. doi:10.1080/00344890802237023

Vasilopoulou, S. (2009). Varieties of Euroscepticism : The Case of the European Extreme Right, *5*(1), 3–23.

Vasilopoulou, S. (2011). European Integration and the Radical Right: Three Patterns of Opposition. *Government and Opposition*, *46*(02), 223–244. doi:10.1111/j.1477-7053.2010.01337.x

Vasilopoulou, S. (2013). Continuity and Change in the Study of Euroscepticism: Plus ça change?*. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *51*(1), 153–168. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5965.2012.02306.x

Vejvodová, P. (2013). A Thorny Way to Find Friends: Transnational Cooperation and Network-building amonst Right-wing and National Populist Parties. In K. Grabow & F. Hartleb (Eds.), *Exposing the Demagogues: Right-wing and National Populist Parties in Europe* (pp. 373–396). Brussels: Centre of European Studies and the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung.

Wilders, G. (2012a). Agenda Europese top. Retrieved October 05, 2013, from Agenda Europese top

Wilders, G. (2012b). ESM-verdrag en Verantwoordingsdag 2012. Retrieved October 04, 2010, from http://pvv.nl/index.php/55-nieuwsbrief/edities/6236-spreekteksten-geert-wilders-esm-verdrag-a-verantwoordingsdag-2012.html

Wilders, G. (2012c). Toespraak in Ahoy. Retrieved October 05, 2013, from http://www.pvv.nl/index.php/36-fj-related/geert-wilders/6114-toespraak-geert-wilders-ahoy-24-augustus-2012.html

Wilders, G. (2013). Algemene Politieke Beschouwingen 2013. Retrieved October 04, 2013, from http://www.pvv.nl/index.php/36-fj-related/geert-wilders/7087-spreektekst-geert-wilders-algemene-politieke-beschouwingen-2013.html

Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science,*, 308–319.

I

ANNEX

CODING EXAMPLES

Common cultural heritage; Principle of the European Integration; Practice of the European Integration; Future of the European Integration

REDE VON HANS OLAF HENKEL IM AUGUSTINERKELLER

´[...] Und deshalb gibt es eine dritte Alternative, wir lassen den Euro dort wo er ist und wir gehen. Zusammen, mit Holland, Österreich, und Finnland.

Meine Damen und Herren, ich will ihnen nicht verhehlen, dass mir ihr Beifall verwundert, denn als ich das am Anfang meiner Rede gesagt hätte, dann hätte sie wahrscheinlich nicht so geklatscht, aber man bekommt eben nur dann ein gewisses Verständnis für diese Alternative, wenn man die Zeit hat sie zu erklären und die kriegen sie heute in den Medien eben nicht und schon gar nicht ohne das sie ständig unterbrochen werden. Aber das mal nur nebenbei. Aber lassen sie mich... Was bedeutet das und warum diese vier Länder? Das sind diese vier Länder, ich benutze immer gerne den Arbeitstitel Nordeuro, eins kann ich ihnen sagen, wir hatten sowas schon. In den fünfzehn Jahren bevor wir den Euro eingeführt haben und die Bundesbank eine Aufwertung gemacht hat, dann machte die holländische Nationalbank was? Sie hat auch aufgewertet und die österreichische auch. Also wir hatten den Nordeuro schon damals. Wir hatten zwar unsere eigenen Währungen, aber das System hat funktioniert. Warum? Weil wir in diesen Ländern eine einheitliche Inflationsangst oder Kultur haben. Die gibt es in den südlichen Ländern nicht und die werden wir auch nicht so schnell fossieren können. [...]`

´HUN BRUSSELS, ONS NEDERLAND´ PARTY MANIFESTO OF THE PVV

´Op 12 september geeft Nederland het antwoord. Onze belangen heten Nederland, daarna Nederland en daarna nog eens Nederland. Iedereen zijn eigen cultuur, eigen beslissingen, eigen rekeningen, eigen verantwoordelijkheden. Eigen blaren.

Wij zijn de enigen die zeggen: uit die fuik. Het touw om onze nek dat ons vastbindt aan de eurocraten en de geldsmijters moet los.

Wij zijn de enigen die tegen de ongekozen eurocraten zeggen: jullie einde is ons begin. Jullie droom is onze nachtmerrie. Jullie verlies is onze winst.

Wij zijn de enigen die zeggen: het moet maar eens afgelopen zijn. Nu weer baas in eigen land.´

NIGEL FARAGE'S SPEECH AT THE 2013 UKIP CONFERENCE

´I was in an immigration debate chaired by Nick Robinson. I started to talk about Europe, the rights of entry and residence that EU citizens have. He stopped me. No, he said, this debate is about immigration it's not about Europe. That's how deep the disconnect goes.

Ten thousand a week. Half a million a year. Five million economic migrants in ten years coming to this country. Unprecedented. Never happened before.

The effects are obvious. In every part of our national life. The strain these numbers are putting on public services.

Schools. The shortage of school places in primaries and secondary schools.

The NHS. The sheer weight of numbers that adds to the other problems of that

Housing. Demand pushes up prices.

Wages are driven down by the massive over-supply of unskilled labour.

And from the 1st of January next year, the risks increase massively.

The seven year period is up and nearly 30 million of the good people of Bulgaria and Romania have open access to our country, our welfare system our jobs market. How many will take advantage of that no one knows.

The Home Office don't have any idea at all. The previous estimate was 13,000 in total. Migration Watch thinks 50,000 a year. It could be many times that.

No one knows. It's no way to run a policy.`

INBREG GEERT WILDERS IN HET DEBAT OVER DE EUROPESE TOP

Terwijl Duitsland, Frankrijk en Italië een veto hebben, heeft Nederland dat niet. Weer hebben we niets te zeggen. Wij kunnen verplicht worden om, tegen onze wil in, miljarden in een bodemloze put te storten. Weg, Nederlands veto. Weg, Nederlandse zeggenschap over ons eigen geld. Weg, soevereiniteit.

Vz, terwijl die transferunie volop draait, hopen de eurofielen morgen met de bankenunie en de begrotingsunie nieuwe stappen te kunnen zetten naar hun einddoel: een politieke unie. De Franse president Hollande wil meer geld voor het zuiden, en de Duitse kanselier Merkel wil in ruil daarvoor, als we de kranten mogen geloven, meer bevoegdheidsoverdracht naar Brussel. `

LONG TABLE EXAMPLE

UKIP

Common Sense politics, Nigel Farage UKIP conference 2013, Nigel Farage UKIP conference 2012, Tim Congdon: The cost of the EU, Tim Aker: Head of UKIP Policy Unit 2013, Jill Seymoure UKIP conference 2013, Nigel Farage: UKIP Spring Conference Exeter

COMMON CULTURAL HERITAGE

Theme	Against	In favour
Cultural differences	Because the fact is we just don't belong in the European Union. Britain is different. Our geography puts us apart. Our history puts us apart. Our institutions produced by that history put us apart. We think differently. We behave differently. P.2	
	The roots go back seven, eight, nine hundred years with the Common Law. Civil rights. Habeas corpus. The presumption of innocence. The right to a trial by jury. On the continent – confession is the mother of all evidence. P.2	
	The idea of free speech was a reality in England when Europe was run by princes with tyrannical powers. Throughout Europe, England was known as the land of liberty. Here you had the possibility of dissent. Of free thinking. Independent minds and actions. That's us. UKIP belongs in the mainstream of British political life throughout the centuries. P.3	