
To what extent has Euroscepticism impacted upon policy development within the European Union?



Universiteit
Leiden

Alexander John Winstone

Faculty of Humanities

Leiden University

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree Masters of Arts (MA) in International Relations, specialisation European Union Studies.

Supervisor: Dr Jan Rood.

July 6th 2018.

Word count: 14996.

Table of Contents:

Abstract.	3
Introduction.	3
Historiography.	4
Methodology.	11
Chapter One: the United Kingdom.	14
Chapter Two: Denmark.	20
Chapter Three: Poland.	27
Discussion.	33
Conclusion.	36
Historiography.	39

Abstract:

Euroscepticism has become a burgeoning field of academic discussion in recent decades, but its impact on the European Union has never been fully quantified, particularly in the field of policy development. The thesis will take steps to provide some clarity in this area. The thesis will focus on three case studies: the United Kingdom, Denmark and Poland, and the impact of their Euroscepticism on Economic and Monetary Union, social policy, migration policies, and the notion of the EU as a liberal integration project. The thesis will find that increasing anti-migration rhetoric identified across all case studies, opposition to monetary integration, welfare chauvinism and fears over supranationality are restraining European policy development, and giving rise to a multi-speed Europe. The thesis will also find that the role of historic relations with Europe, and nationalist mythos continue to shape British ‘hard’ Euroscepticism and Danish and Polish ‘soft’ Euroscepticism. Indeed, the thesis will also argue that pervasive Eurosceptic rhetoric, which has existed for decades, shapes the rhetoric and policy direction of the EU, with overtures towards narrowing the ‘democratic deficit’ and attempting to establish direct citizen-institution relations.

Introduction:

Euroscepticism has continued to grow in stature in academic discussion and as a diverse political movement, since the terms entry into the political mainstream and following major political events, such as the rejections of the Constitutional Treaty and, most recently, Brexit. With the electoral success of Eurosceptic groups across Europe, research concerned with this fledgling phenomenon must be considered as hugely important in understanding its causes, composition, and political impact. The historiography of Euroscepticism is broad, with diverse and cogent analysis of the impact of Euroscepticism in European politics across several disciplines. This includes the impact of personality on Euroscepticism, political party positioning analysis, the ‘democratic deficit’, and critiques concerning the definition itself and its origins within the history of European Union. However, ‘perhaps the biggest lacuna, particularly from the perspective of practitioners and policy makers, is the lack of research on the impact of Euroscepticism on European politics and policy’ (Szczerbiak & Taggart, 2018: pp16-17). This is problematic, as it remains unclear from available research the extent to which Euroscepticism as a political force has changed national and European-level attitudes and policy, despite substantial theoretical discussions ongoing. The thesis will seek to understand why this is the case, assigning a methodology that will focus on the composition

of three member states' Euroscepticism, before drawing links to policy priorities and development within the polity.

The thesis will critically analyse the historiography of Euroscepticism, emphasising its diverse and extensive nature, whilst problematising its ability to apply itself to explain of institutional-level policy development, thus painting an inherently incomplete picture of Euroscepticism. The thesis will assess three current, as of 2018, European Union member states: the United Kingdom, Denmark and Poland, all of whom holding well-established, dynamic Eurosceptic movements, positioned in Western Europe, Scandinavia and Central and Eastern Europe, respectively. This is of importance as the thesis will be able to greater comprehend regional disparities and nuances in Euroscepticism otherwise missed in a case study that focusses upon a specific European region. The thesis will assess the composition of their Euroscepticism with regards to the euro, migration, European social policy and the notion of the European Union as a liberal integration project. The analysis will also consider the impact of member state histories within and prior to the polity, and themes of proximity, location and length of accession to member state Euroscepticism, which will be discussed within each chapter. The chapters' findings and its impact on European policy development will be assessed in the discussion.

Historiography:

Despite the maelstrom of current Eurosceptic discourse, for 'the first four decades of European integration, opposition or hostility to the European project was not on the agenda of scholars in the field of EU studies' (Leconte, 2015: 251), only emerging in parallel with debate regarding the European Union's 'democratic deficit', an 'emasculatation of national parliaments' which has had its origins, and existence, debated in recent decades (Singh Grewal, 2001: 119). Euroscepticism has become 'increasingly mainstreamed', more legitimate and salient, and less contested across Europe, with hostile public opinion towards European institutions, support for parties opposing further integration, and the rise of Eurosceptic civil society groups, fractious rhetoric in media discourses, and transnational cooperation amongst Eurosceptic parties (Brack & Startin, 2015: 240). Much of the historiography seeks to find the Eurosceptic 'watershed', with the Maastricht Treaty and its political aftermath the general consensus, alongside the argument that 'EU-related referendums have become a key feature of this mainstreaming process' (Brack & Startin, 2015: pp240-241). Another section that has seen protracted debate concerns the definition of

the term, following Taggart and Szczerbiak's definition of Euroscepticism as 'the idea of contingent or qualified opposition as well as incorporating outright and unqualified opposition to the process of European integration', with 'hard' and 'soft' classifications elaborated on over time (Brack & Startin, 2015: 241). Although increasingly complex categories of Euroscepticism have been advanced by Kopecký and Mudde, Flood and Usherwood, and many others, 'Euroscepticism has, since the late 1990s, nonetheless been analysed as a touchstone of dissent' (Brack & Startin, 2015: 241; Leconte, 2015: 252). Euroscepticism should thus be seen 'as mere proxy', with integration vetoed to sanction unpopular domestic governments (Leconte, 2015: 252). Euroscepticism, however, has often been described as a negative construction, with opposition founded on a vagueness which risks 'being everything and nothing' (Leruth et al, 2018: 4). The term itself has seen criticism about its narrowly defined and non-academic beginnings – a description of alarmed British Conservative politicians throughout the mid-1980s, alongside concerns that the term assumes that 'the only correct integration is Community integration (Leruth et al, 2018: 4; Leconte, 2015: pp254-255).

Eurosceptic discourses are thus a hotbed for criticism even at a definitions level, aimed at the vagueness of what Eurosceptics precisely oppose, and pro-Europeans support on policy matters (Leconte, 2015: pp254-255). This is important, as problematic definitions of Euroscepticism have practical ramifications for other fields of the historiography, such as its impact on policy development at the European Union. Nevertheless, its potential influencers are politically diverse, between 'new politics, old far-left politics through regionalism to new populism and neo-fascism in the far right' (Daddow, 2006: 68). Between 'hard' and 'soft' Euroscepticism, qualified and principled opposition, and the EU as being 'contrary to the national interest', 'resistance against [...] further integration at society level [remains] under-researched', which this thesis seeks to provide further understanding towards (Leconte, 2015: pp251-253). There are several explanations as to why this may be the case, argued by Kopecký and Mudde that 'soft' Euroscepticism 'is defined in such a broad manner that virtually every disagreement with any policy decision of the EU can be included', and difficulty separating types of Euroscepticism in practical applications (Kopecky & Mudde, 2002: pp299-300). The Eurosceptic historiography thus concentrates on definitions of the term, and its validity, but often to the detriment of understanding the precise composition of Euroscepticism in member states, and its impact on EU policy.

Another area discussed is reasons for the perceived weak legitimacy of the European Union, with responses focussing on ‘a de-politicized technocratic type of legitimacy [permeating] the communication of EU institutions’, with technical vocabularies of ‘directives’ and ‘regulations’ conveying the idea of an undemocratic polity (Leconte, 2015: 256). Such language ‘provides the ground to continuously reconstruct the EU as a monster bureaucracy concerned with technical matters’, with Euroscepticism ‘[re-injecting] politics into a largely de-politicized polity’ (Leconte, 2015: 256). Harmsen and Spiering found a ‘discursive shift’, in which European political debate turned more EU-critical in the 1990s, ‘in Germany, the Netherlands and Ireland’ (Lubbers & Scheepers, 2010: 788), although it often remained qualified to the European Union itself, and ‘not the goals of European integration more generally’ (Daddow, 2006: 64). Although debate regarding the composition of Euroscepticism remains problematic, ‘from the intrinsic difficulty of defining what the word ‘Europe’ means’ in terms of its geographic borders and shared histories, its perceived epicentre and the venue of ‘the most passionate disputes’ remains the United Kingdom, and concerns with regards to immigration remain areas of historiographic consensus, as well as fears that the pooling of sovereignty ‘erodes national self-determination and blurs boundaries between distinct national communities’ (Daddow, 2006: pp65-66; Hobolt, 2016: 1265). Acceptance of immigration and ethnic minorities is thus ‘giving way to calls for stricter control of immigration and assimilative integration of minorities’, and ‘these calls, formerly monopolized by the political fringe, now come from mainstream political forces and their leaders’, albeit in a more moderate fashion (Lesinska, 2014: 37). Immigration is thus one of few areas where the link between Euroscepticism and its policy impact, through gradual shifts in elite rhetoric, is at its clearest (Lesinska, 2014: 38).

It is with this in mind that we seek to understand why mainstream changes may adapt their rhetoric. Meijers argues that non-governing Eurosceptic parties provide incentives for centrist parties to shift their positions on European integration, citing spatial theory ‘as propagated by Downs’ in 1957, who argued that political parties are rational actors ‘attempting to maximise votes’, and that ‘policy strategy is always devised in terms of its competitor’ (Meijers, 2017: pp413-414). The historiography overwhelmingly focusses on the radical right’s impact on immigration issues, but there has been research, albeit in small quantities, on green parties and environmental issues, as well as populism and welfare chauvinism (Meijers, 2017: 414). The assumption propagated by Downs that ‘mainstream parties are the only relevant players to determine [saliency]’ has, however, been problematised in the face of the rise of populism

and challenger parties once on the fringes of Europe (Meijers, 2017: 415). Populism has emerged in the historiography recently, with analysts '[taking] great pains to show that much of populism's power and relevance lies in its 'chameleonic' nature, its ability to change according to context and attach itself to full ideologies, in what is described by Mudde as a 'thin-centred' ideological framework that threatens to supersede traditional assumptions of political behaviour (Aslanidis, 2015: 89). Weyland emphasises that populism is best seen as 'a political strategy through which a personalistic leader seeks or exercises government power based on direct, unmediated, uninstitutionalised support from large numbers of mostly unorganized followers' (Aslanidis, 2015: 96). However, whilst in some respects populism has provided new avenues for Euroscepticism to develop within member states, there are limitations. Mainstream parties must maintain a 'delicate balancing act of attempting to lure supporters of the challenger to their party by incorporating elements of the challenger's policy, while not alienating their own voters' base', in a calculation similar to Downs' theory in 1957 (Meijers, 2017: 415). The growth of Euroscepticism is encased within traditional understandings of political science, and in the form of populism where parties have the opportunity to capture unorganised electorates into their voting coalition by pursuing Eurosceptic policies and rhetoric.

Although there is consensus that Euroscepticism emerged following the Maastricht Treaty, it has been argued to have begun a second stage from 2008. Deteriorating economic circumstances following the Great Recession, coupled with increasing unemployment, social upheaval and growing anti-immigration and xenophobic sentiment 'quickly [spread] through the general population', often manifesting itself in support for radical, Eurosceptic parties, has been argued amongst academics (Lesinska, 2014: 38-39). The Eurozone crisis has also been seen to have caused this shift, with political leaders claiming 'that immigrants abuse welfare, pose additional burden to heavily indebted governments, pose threats to social and political order, and that multiculturalism – a tolerant acceptance of cultural diversity – had failed' (Lesinska, 2014: pp38-39). It is clear that the historiography of Euroscepticism paints a bleak picture for Europe, but debate has emerged that rejects this pessimism. Andrew Moravcsik has vigorously argued that notions of a 'democratic deficit' are incorrect, as European politicians within the Council of Ministers, as well as the leaders at the European Council, 'are ultimately accountable to their constituents' (Bølstad, 2015: 24). Although trends of Euroscepticism remain popular throughout Europe, certain trends in public opinion within the European Union have nevertheless been viewed positively. Instead, 'a

Europeanisation of national public spheres’ has been argued to be taking place; although mass media ‘remains national in structure’, it is increasingly reported on the same issues, and ‘using the same communicative styles and discourses’, which may represent a long-term advantage for the polity in being able to respond more effectively and efficiently to policy developments, internal and external crises, and Euroscepticism (Bølstad, 2015: 25; Rowinski, 2014: 980).

Nevertheless, European countries continue to exhibit different levels of support for integration, whilst Euroscepticism draws itself from different political dynamics amongst member states. It is clear that concern within the EU with regards to the loss of popular support has been a long-running trend in the historiography, with the study of Euroscepticism ‘[coalescing] around two specific areas: Euroscepticism in the party system, and Euroscepticism in public opinion’ (Bølstad, 2015: 27; Fitzgibbon, 2013: 105). The content of opposition to the European Union mostly focusses on the radical right, and the strength of its nationalism, and on the radical left with its opposition to neo-liberal policy (Fitzgibbon, 2013: pp107-108). This is argued to be perversely desirable for the European Union, with Kohler-Koch arguing for the ‘deliberative potential of civil-society-based contestation’, bringing ‘new ideas and arguments to the discourse on European integration, which has the potential to create a European demos as imagined by Habermas’ (Fitzgibbon, 2013: pp107-108). This is a more optimistic perspective than is common within the Eurosceptic discourse, with significant implications for policy development at the European level and the content of Euroscepticism within the member state. These concepts are bound up ‘with what Balme and Chabanet denote as the ‘grass-roots view of Europe’ (Fitzgibbon, 2013: 108), but this concept is disputed in the Eurosceptic historiography, with Usherwood arguing that although ‘Euroscepticism in British civil society is driven by events at the European level, its actions are resolutely focused on the national level’, removing potential capacity for European demos (Fitzgibbon, 2013: pp108-109). Furthermore, opinions are largely formed on the basis of domestic politics, with feelings of a lack of representation impacting support for ‘the European enterprise’ (Nielsen, 2016: 1176). In this sense, hopes for a ‘grassroots Europe’ and a Eurosceptic ‘demos’ remain remote.

It is clear that the United Kingdom occupies significant space in the historiography, which has only expanded following the Brexit referendum in 2016. Much has been made concerning Britain’s turbulent history with Europe, its ‘overly reverential attitude to recent history [...], and an almost total neglect of the peacetime dimensions of modern European history since

1945, both serve to exaggerate the tendency in the country to fall back on glib images of Britain as a great power with a ‘special relationship’ across the Atlantic with Europe a hostile ‘other’ across the Channel to be confronted rather than engaged with constructively’ classically seen as a driver of British Euroscepticism (Daddow, 2006: 66). Heavily discussed is the UK’s ‘knowledge deficit’ with regards to EU affairs, which has consistently been one of the highest in Europe, as well as Britain’s storied history as the EU’s ‘awkward partner’ (Startin, 2018: pp457-458). Significant work has also been undertaken in order to understand why the EU referendum resulted in Brexit, with much of the academic literature concluding that the referendum result was not only unsurprising, but predictable. On top of troubled historic connections with Europe, ‘binary plebiscites’, as utilised by David Cameron, were used to relative failure by fellow pro-EU elites, as well as the risk of a ‘punishment trap’, where governments ‘take a hit from some voters irrespective of the issue at stake’ (Startin, 2018: pp457-458).

Linking back to the impact of immigration rhetoric on policy development, the electoral rise of right-wing Eurosceptic, anti-immigration parties such as UKIP, and a ‘lopsided’ tabloid press, clearly shaped the policy trajectories of the United Kingdom and the European Union (Startin, 2018: 464). Delving further into why this occurred, ‘Strøm distinguishes between office-seeking, policy-seeking and vote-seeking models of party behaviour’. With regards to the former, ‘office-seeking parties seek to maximize their control over benefits that can be derived from holding public office’, thus aiming at winning, policy-seeking parties ‘seek to maximize their impact on public policy’, and vote-seeking parties in turn seek to maximize their share of the votes, with office-seeking parties holding the lion’s share of the literature, despite parties pursuing most, or all, of these objectives (Raunio, 2007: pp193-194). However, many of these areas clash in difficult electoral trade-offs, resulting in compromising, or even removing, policy commitments, in order to form a government coalition or gain the popular vote (Raunio, 2007: pp193-194). However, one of the major misconceptions in the literature of Euroscepticism and policy development, is the assumption that populism and Euroscepticism ‘always, only, and necessarily spreads ‘from the extreme to the mainstream and does so primarily because the mainstream apparently ignores the concerns of a significant slice of the electorate’ (Bale, 2018: 2). The fallacy of a one-way street is widespread, and Bale argues relations between radical fringe parties and those in government are a two-way street, depending on ‘time, agenda-setting, issue-ownership, votes, and policy influence flow in both directions’ (Bale, 2018: 2). This is critical, Bale argues, in

avoiding seeing populism ‘as a pathology somehow illegitimately imported into liberal democratic politics by insurgents rather than something that insiders may have been flirting with for years and something that is, therefore, a feature, not a bug’ (Bale, 2018: 2). Bale argues, therefore, that it was the Conservatives ‘who first fused populism and Euroscepticism and then fatally left the field, allowing UKIP [...] to harvest what Tory politicians had sown’ (Bale, 2018: 3). The implications of this two-way street, and the impact this had on Euroscepticism and policy development at the national and European level, will be further discussed.

Other areas of interest in the historiography have included the Nordic region, due to its association with a unique form of Euroscepticism. Euroscepticism in this region is commonly explained to be driven by ‘protestant political culture’, nation-state and sovereignty, but also for support for an egalitarian welfare state model, ‘based on universal benefits financed through relatively high taxation’, which made the Nordics ‘less interested in transferring policy-making powers to the European level’ (Raunio, 2007: 191). Danish history since joining the European Community in 1973, at the same time as the United Kingdom, showed ‘notable reluctance towards deepening integration’, following the rejection of the Maastricht Treaty via referendum in 1992, the inclusion of major opt-outs the following year, and a rejection of the Euro at the turn of the century (Raunio, 2007: pp191-192). Whilst Danish Euroscepticism has been characterised as ‘soft’, compared to ‘hard’ Euroscepticism in the UK, there has been some academic support for the notion of the Nordic countries ‘gradually becoming less Eurosceptical’, but this is tempered by continued criticism of movements towards deeper integration (Raunio, 2007: pp191-192). This will be elaborated upon in the chapters, as well as Poland and the Central and Eastern European region.

The historiography of Euroscepticism is relatively recent, but it is one with significant depth, particularly with regards to definitions and implications of EU opposition, and it is well represented in different fields. However, there remains significant issues with the historiography, one of which regards concerns of ‘the pathways of Eurosceptic action’, given little is known about ‘potential drivers of Eurosceptic attitudes and positions’, where ‘the translation into action is less clear’ (Leruth et al, 2018: 5). Remarkably, it is clear that academics have struggled to denote the true impact of Euroscepticism, even in the Brexit era, given ‘scant research on how and to what extent Eurosceptic activity shapes public policy or discourse’ (Leruth et al, 2018: 5). Whilst criticisms of Euroscepticism as a negative construction may aid this, even this approach fails to distinguish between Eurosceptic agency

and the ‘cut-and-thrust of the highly bargained EU system’ (Leruth et al, 2018: 5). Understanding of the discourse with regards to the European Social Model (ESM), and the relationship between Euroscepticism and welfare state politics, is also limited. Although it is clear that the ESM is underdeveloped, and it is taken as read that this is due to sovereignty issues and Euroscepticism, the existing literature does not inform us about whether these attitudes of EU citizens are related to welfare state institutions at the national level’ (Koster & Kaminska, 2012: pp901-902). There is a tendency to assume ‘EU member states share certain core values, rooted in normative beliefs about a just society’, which normatively shape policy, such as the welfare state, when there is varying support for such policies in different regions of Europe, with different levels of Euroscepticism (Koster & Kaminska, 2012: pp902-903).

Finally, the true definitions of Euroscepticism remain contested, with some consensus that without clear parameters of the term, it will be difficult, nary impossible, for its impact within member states and its policies to be understood. Frequent criticisms of typologies exist, which remains problematic given the ‘phenomena’ of Euroscepticism expanding to major governing parties in the UK, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, and junior coalition partners and confidence-and-supply arrangements in Austria, Ireland, Italy, Germany, as well as the Netherlands and Sweden, in recent years (Szczerbiak & Taggart, 2018: pp16-17). It is clear that following the ‘collapse of the permissive consensus, and the penetration of radical left and right parties into government, Euroscepticism has entered the mainstream’, with Brexit perhaps ‘the ultimate mainstream expression of the impact of Euroscepticism’ (Szczerbiak & Taggart, 2018: pp16-17). Despite this, its impact in governance and its impact in the European Union remains disputed, and despite theorising that ‘Eurosceptic party participation in government [is having] a discernible effect’ evidence of ‘European policy moving in a Eurosceptic direction’ remains less than clear-cut (Szczerbiak & Taggart, 2018: 17). In the European Union, whose history ‘has mainly been about avoiding conflict’, Euroscepticism may represent a major breach (Crespy & Verschueren, 2009: 377). This thesis will seek to assess whether this is the case.

Methodology:

To begin with, we will be using the definitions of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ Euroscepticism outlined by Taggart and Szczerbiak in our assumptions. Hard Euroscepticism ‘involves outright rejection of the entire project of European political and economic integration and opposition

to their country joining or remaining members of the EU’, whilst Soft Euroscepticism involves ‘contingent or qualified opposition to European integration’, and opposition ‘to the EU’s current or future planned trajectory based on further extension of competencies that the EU is planning to make’ (Daddow, 2006: 68). The thesis will discuss three case studies in individual chapters: the United Kingdom, Denmark and Poland. The chapters will discuss the histories of the case study with regards to its relationship with the European project, the sources and extent of their Euroscepticism, their impact on European policy development, dynamics such as proximity and location between neighbouring countries. Comparisons will also be drawn between the case studies, and Euroscepticism in Europe as a whole. The discussion chapter will focus on the chapters’ findings, and theorise the impact of the case studies Euroscepticism on European policy development alongside official EU reports, White Papers and speeches by the Commission President. The thesis originally planned to arrange interviews with individuals representing the member states at the Permanent Representations at the European Union in Brussels. However, due to time and budgetary restraints, this has proven unfeasible. The thesis will utilise primary source literature in the form of speeches delivered by major political leaders in governance of the United Kingdom, Denmark and Poland, and will focus on their relations with migration, Economic and Monetary Union, social policy, and their views on the liberal integration project. Speeches by high-level politicians were chosen as given their status and role as head of their respective country they are, or were, able to possess control in shaping their countries relations with policy development at the national and European level, as well as the composition of Euroscepticism, whether directly or indirectly. This will be supplemented with secondary source literature, which will assess the historic roots, impact proximity of Euroscepticism with the case studies, and their impact on Euroscepticism. The thesis chose to pick case studies that represented North-western Europe, Scandinavia and Central and Eastern Europe; this was pursued to provide adequate breadth, and so that findings for the thesis can be generalised across Europe to a larger extent.

The case studies for this thesis have been chosen for several reasons. All three are, as of 2018, current members of the European Union, with the United Kingdom and Denmark joining at the same time, held multiple contentious EU-related referendums, and their electorates have exhibited forms of Euroscepticism from voting for Eurosceptic parties to rejecting EU referendums (Fitzgibbon, 2013: 106). Although Poland joined the European Union much later, they remain an excellent case study. In the 2014 European Parliament

elections, the Polish Law and Justice Party (PiS), the Danish People's Party and the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) 'topped the polls in their respective countries', as representatives of Eurosceptic parties on the political right (Treib, 2014: 1546). Both the UK and Denmark have been emblematic of Euroscepticism, following Brexit and the Danish rejections of the Maastricht Treaty and the Euro, whilst Poland has emerged relatively recently as a leader in Euroscepticism in Eastern Europe (Nielsen, 2016: pp1180-1181). The thesis will also seek to understand whether 'hard', 'soft', or a more nuanced Euroscepticism is able to impact policy development the greatest at the national level. Furthermore, the roles of proximity and location will also be considered; Denmark and Sweden, for example, are 'extensive welfare states with high degrees of redistribution', known for their soft Euroscepticism (Nielsen, 2016: 1194). Finally, the case studies can be considered 'outsiders'; joining the polity at later times, with all three case studies considered once on 'the outskirts of Europe' at points in its history, and the UK, Denmark and Poland have undergone complicated relations with the EU in recent years (Bølstad, 2015: 33).

Eurosceptic public opinion within different member states undergoes 'considerable variation over time', and the thesis will capture this by assessing primary source literature from different time periods, in order to provide consistency in results. subsequent member state stances in governance and public opinion with regards to the Euro, European Social Policy and its support for liberal integration, over a significant timespan (Bølstad, 2015: pp37-39). This will include the United Kingdom from the mid-1980s, Denmark from the early-1990s, and Poland from the 2000s; periods in which Euroscepticism in these countries became more pronounced.

With regards to the United Kingdom's conflictual history with the polity, deriving from its 'island mentality' and reputation as 'the awkward partner' of the European Union, the thesis expects:

H1: that the United Kingdom's 'hard' Euroscepticism, manifesting itself in opposition to EMU, migration, and the EU as it currently is leads it to act in relative isolation at the European level, limiting its potential to impact European policy development.

With regards to Denmark's historic relations and proximity between Germany and Scandinavia, and its hostility towards supranational social policies alongside increasing welfare chauvinism:

H2: that Denmark and its interactions with European policy development will be influenced predominantly by its proximity to Scandinavia, with its ‘soft’ Euroscepticism typical of the Scandinavian sub-type; predominantly concerning EMU, welfare and migration. As such, European policy development will be negatively impacted upon in these areas.

With regards to Poland’s conflictual interactions within the polity, shaped by its anti-migrant rhetoric and welfare chauvinistic rhetoric, as well as its close relations as part of the Visegrad group alongside Hungary, Slovakia and the Czech Republic:

H3: that Polish policy priorities, as well as its ‘soft’ Euroscepticism, will be largely typical of its fellow Visegrad member states, and will impact European policy development in the fields of EMU, welfare and common responses to the migrant crisis.

As a consequence of these hypotheses, we expect that European policy development:

H4: will be negatively impacted upon in the fields of EMU expansion, freedom of movement, and hopes for the Europeanisation of social policy such as welfare.

United Kingdom:

As Gordon Brown stated in the House of Commons in 1997, ‘Britain has faced no question more important and more contentious than that of our relationship with Europe’ since the Second World War (Brown, 1997: 1). This has only intensified recently, with Brexit negotiations concerning ‘[taking] control of our borders, laws and money’, whilst protecting people’s jobs and security, as part of ‘a new and different relationship with Europe’, in the words of Theresa May (May, 2018). To understand UK ‘hard’ Euroscepticism, historical contexts must be examined, its role in Europe analysed, and its impact on policy fields considered.

It is important to set out the history of Britain and Europe. In many ways, ‘the UK has been the wellspring of Euroscepticism’; it is the source of the term itself, and the very first modern, ‘Eurosceptic’ politicians grew out from the mid-1980s political climate (Usherwood, 2017: 42). For Usherwood, groups across the political spectrum, ‘aided and abetted by a print press willing to give a platform to these groups, and a succession of governments not prepared to go beyond reactive problem and crisis management with regard to the EU, Eurosceptics were able to set public agendas to a very considerable extent’ (Usherwood, 2017: 42). The duration of member state membership is important. Whilst the United Kingdom joined in 1973, it did

not derive from notions of an inherent good in lowering the drawbridge to Europe, but out of necessity due to a sharply declining economy (Ross, 2011: 63). This was important, as joining the European Community with little choice economically, and despite passionate arguments made in the 1976 EEC referendum, allowed evocations of British history and mythos to be fostered within Euroscepticism, as part of a 'reheating' of British nationalism. Thatcher was effective in this manner, harnessing centuries of Britain '[fighting] to prevent Europe from falling under the dominance of a single power' in the Bruges speech, further reinforced following the Falklands War where she declared 'we have ceased to be a nation in retreat' (Thatcher, 1988; Grob-Fitzgibbon, 2016: 423). In this period, enthusiasm for participation in the project waned, with Thatcher quarrelling with leaders such as Chancellor Kohl of Germany, with mutual misunderstanding regarding each members positions, despite their relative proximity, further reinforcing the notion of Britain as an awkward partner, and the lack of understanding by continental Europe of Britain's 'island mentality' (Grob-Fitzgibbon, 2016: pp430-431).

Despite the 'fervently anti-European position' within the Labour Party subsiding under leader Neil Kinnock during this period, Euroscepticism within the Conservative government and the popular press continued (Grob-Fitzgibbon, 2016: pp431-432). Considerable distrust between Thatcher and the polity, particularly following Jacques Delors ascent to Commission President, increased, stunting potential policy consensus between member states, with Thatcher conceding only 'grudging admiration', and further becoming 'a stranger in Europe' (Grob-Fitzgibbon, 2016: pp433-435). Much of this was reactive, born out of the perception by Thatcher, and much of the UK, that 'Britain had been restored to a time when it triumphed as an extra-European power, a golden age that existed before the loss of national confidence in the 1960s and before the economic travails of the 1970s' (Grob-Fitzgibbon, 2016: 439). Much of Thatcher's language harked back to Britain's imperial past, and Delors ambitions of supranationality jarred with this image, with a growing number of Eurosceptics in the press '[seeking] to arouse their readers against a European future by appealing to the nation's sense of pride in its imperial past and military history' (Daddow, 2006: pp70-71).

With regards to Euroscepticism and the UK's Euro debate, it is clear that the Eurosceptic tradition in the press, utilising historic and emotional phrases, remained. Daddow finds that in response to potential overtures towards UK accession into the Euro, the emotive phrase 'abolish the pound' is utilised, a term 'freighted with negative connotations', reinforcing that Britain's 'relationship with the continent is conflictual rather than cooperative, exaggerated

by a succession of prime ministers ‘who have returned triumphantly from European summits playing to a domestic audience by claiming how hard they have fought for British interests’ (Daddow, 2006: 71). These undermine the significance of cooperation in EU policy development, whilst reinforcing Euroscepticism as a battle needing to be won. Other UK media sources, in tabloids and broadsheets, go further, advocating almost unilateral withdrawal from the EU ‘because the organization does not serve the country’s ‘interests’’, often left undefined, but presumably some combination of economic, political, strategic or perhaps cultural interests, as well as ‘the liberty to make our own rules’ (Daddow, 2006: 72). Clearly, Britain tends to construe Europe as a hostile ‘other’, with ‘the collective identification with national symbols, history and institutions far greater in the British political discourse than a potential identification with European symbols, history and institutions’ (Daddow, 2006: pp79-80).

New Labour’s rise to governance in 1997, in terms of its more open euro position, conciliatory integrationist approach and its views on welfare, perhaps should have represented a sea-change in British Euroscepticism, opening the way for closer convergence on European policy development. However, it has been argued that Labour’s foreign policy was ‘bolted on to’, and did not replace, ‘received memories of Britain’s imperial past and the concern for global powerdom and ‘leadership’ through which these memories have been nurtured’ (Daddow, 2006: 80). Whilst this was tactical, in order to gain electoral votes whilst continuing to enjoy, alongside Denmark, valuable opt-outs in areas such as in Justice and Home Affairs, it will remain a major regret that Tony Blair, following his historic election victory in 1997, made little effort to provide ‘strength and confidence in leadership both at home and abroad, particularly in respect of Europe’ (Bølstad, 2015: 26; Daddow, 2013: 211). One area of this was the Euro, in which Gordon Brown, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, committed in principle to joining EMU in October 1997, as long as the case for adoption was ‘clear and unambiguous’ and satisfied his ‘five economic tests’ (Cottarelli and Escolano, 2004: pp4-5; Brown, 1997: pp2-3). These were not satisfied by 2001, or the years thereafter, as a consequence of a failure to satisfy these difficult tests, but as a consequence of unabated public and media opposition to British adoption of the Euro. Even during a relative Eurosceptic lower water-mark at the turn of the century, the Labour government continued to pit British national interests against European interests in a zero-sum game, emphasised by ‘[trying to join] now would be to accept a monetary policy which would suit other European economies but not our own’, reinforcing oppositional conflict between the UK and the EU

despite the potential for closer convergence on financial policy matters (Brown, 1997: pp5-6). In this sense, New Labour failed to reverse the oppositional rhetoric of Thatcher's legacy, at least in terms of the UK's relations with the European Union, its ability to converge on policy matters, and address societal Euroscepticism (Daddow, 2013: 212).

However, there is more to British Euroscepticism than the pursuit of short-term national interests, fervent opposition of the Euro and welcoming words within the press and popular discourses of the major political parties. Rather, policy development has been argued to have been stunted by 'the geography of Britain's 'island story', and 'is often held up as a cause of Britain's remoteness from the EU which in fact conceals many more fundamental political, economic and in some cases xenophobic factors that operate under the rubric of the Eurosceptic tradition' (Daddow, 2013: 213). Furthermore, it is argued that British Euroscepticism has a classical realist dimension, influencing foreign policy more generally, despite Prime Ministers 'of both parties [stressing] that the British need to be members of strong alliances to safeguard and advance vital British national interests in an unpredictable and unsafe world' (Daddow, 2013: 214). Whilst realist calculations have been used in selling the British public that Europe is the way forward, 'the US always trumps the EU as a model for the expression of Britain's identity in the international arena', as well as organisations such as NATO, rather than the EU (Daddow, 2013: 214). This should not be surprising, given guiding principles within Thatcher's Bruges speech concerned 'willing and active cooperation between independent sovereign states is the best way to build a successful European Community' (Thatcher, 1988). As Daddow states, Thatcher was perhaps catalytic 'because [she] tapped into a Eurosceptic tradition, [creating] discursive space for the onward articulation and deeper entrenchment of the Eurosceptic tradition', by homing in on the themes of 'anti-federalism, anti-regulation, anti-protectionism and the importance of sovereign 'independent' nations inside the EU' (Daddow, 2013: 218). Whilst it is clear that the UK has undergone periods of convergence and subsidence with Europe, these themes remained intact in the realms of the Euro, the welfare state, and the EU's aims as a liberal integration project. A critical era may well have been under Blair, who existed in a paradox 'as a declared pro-European a Prime Minister committed to staying in with the Eurosceptic, Murdoch dominated, British press', and subscribed to the belief that Britain ceased to be a nation in retreat, whatever that entailed (Daddow, 2013: 219; 222).

Although Daddow sketches a baseline of relatively consistent Eurosceptic rhetoric in governance, the press and the electorate across the United Kingdom's membership of the

polity, Daddow omits party activity with regards to the phenomenon, which has recently included the ‘essentially symbiotic relationship between the Tories and UKIP’, which heavily influenced policy priorities in the Conservative governments under David Cameron (Bale, 2018: 2). The Conservatives ‘centre of gravity’ shifted towards Euroscepticism, nativist immigration policy and populist rhetoric following the 1997 General Election, and the leadership of William Hague and Michael Howard (Bale, 2018: 4). By the 2004 European Parliament elections, however, UKIP was emerging in opinion polling, much to the concern of Conservatives, but whilst UKIP amassed a paltry two percent of the vote in the 2005 General Election, the emergence of David Cameron as Conservative leader, and not a ‘thoroughgoing populist Eurosceptic’, provided electoral space for UKIP to occupy (Bale, 2018: pp4-5). Critically, Nigel Farage emerged as UKIP leader the following year, and attempted to move ‘UKIP beyond its roots as a single-issue, anti-EU party and to make a deliberate populist play for voters alienated by Cameron’ (Bale, 2018: pp5-6). Progress in the electoral vote for UKIP in the 2010 election was a single percentage, but within two years David Cameron made ‘his fateful promise to deliver an in/out referendum in the next parliament’, within four years UKIP comfortably won the 2014 European Parliament elections, took four million votes in the 2015 General Election, and helped deliver Brexit in 2016 (Bale, 2018: pp5-6). Political success achieved by a small party was achieved following the formation of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition, which denied Cameron ‘a truly conservative government’ and allowed further political space for UKIP to occupy, as well as the decision by UKIP to pursue Labour and Conservative votes by heavily focussing on immigration, piling on pressures inside both parties to take a more nativist line (Bale, 2018: pp9-10). Despite internal advice that attempts to ‘out-UKIP UKIP’ would surely backfire, it is clear that immigration rhetoric under Cameron became much firmer, and so did policy cooperation with the European Union (Bale, 2018: pp10-11). In the autumn of 2014, Cameron delivered a controversial speech aiming to deliver ‘a long-term plan for immigration’, which called for the expulsion of foreign criminals, called for ‘controls over who has the right to receive benefits’ and citizenship, and alleviating ‘the pressure on our schools, on our hospitals, and on our housing’ (Cameron, 2014). Despite these calls, Cameron’s claims that ‘Britain is an island nation, but we’ve never been an insular one’, and that ‘we’ve always looked outward, not inward’, and called for ‘our friends in Europe’ to ‘[talk] about this properly, [as] the entire European Union is built on a gift for compromise’, as part of his vision for a reformed EU, ‘in the interest not only of Britain but of every member state’ (Cameron, 2014). Given the centrality of the Four Freedoms to the EU, the

nativist and populist elements of Cameron's speech reinforced opposition to the polity as it stood at the time, in line with a 'harder' Euroscepticism and more protracted policy development.

Bale makes clear that 'UKIP's achievement cannot be understood without taking into account both the populist interventions and the internal politics of its mainstream centre-right competitor', the outcome of which was an increase in Eurosceptic and anti-immigration rhetoric that [fostered] the conditions for Brexit, as part of a more virulent 'hard' Euroscepticism (Bale, 2018: 12). However, the 'symbiosis between the two sides of the right' is by no means 'a distinctively British phenomenon' (Bale, 2018: pp12-13; Hobolt, 2016: 1265). British Leave voters were mostly motivated by anti-immigration, anti-integration and anti-establishment sentiments, whilst stark demographic divides, where 'the less well-educated and the less well-off [voted] in large majorities to leave the EU, while the young graduates in the urban centres voted to stay', reflects a typically European character to support for the polity (Hobolt, 2016: 1265). Deep-seated concerns held by many of the European electorate with regards to the 'pooling of sovereignty that potentially erodes national self-determination and blurs boundaries between distinct national communities', which has surely shaped policy development at the European level (Hobolt, 2016: 1265). Several conclusions can be drawn, one of which is that Euroscepticism 'is not the main driver of political or social change, but rather a marker of other forces, notably around dissatisfaction and disengagement, nationalism and identity politics, and economic and social marginalisation', and there 'is no one 'Euroscepticism', only 'Euroscepticisms' (Usherwood, 2017: 43). Indeed, there is no 'positive ideological core' to the phenomenon, only dislike to some aspect of European integration, across political ideologies (Usherwood, 2017: 43). This breadth of Euroscepticism, best summed as 'we are in Europe, but not of it', is prevalent both in the United Kingdom, but also across member states (Glencross, 2015: 557). The UK, alongside its Nordic and Eastern European allies, including Denmark and Sweden, 'dug their heels' in discussions with regards to the Europeanisation of welfare, as well as European Social Policy, as a consequence of Euroscepticism in these areas (Ross, 2011: pp44-45). Gordon Brown as Prime Minister, for example, spoke at the European Parliament about how 'globalisation has violated moral boundaries', in critical terms that represented an, albeit small, break from the traditional, right-wing Eurosceptic composition in Britain (Brown, 2009). Whilst the United Kingdom enjoyed support for its intergovernmental approaches following the enlargements in 1995 and 2004, it is clear that the United Kingdom remained

largely in-type as an awkward partner, particularly with regards to EMU, where ‘national patriotism and anti-European nationalism’ continued to ‘correlate negatively with acceptance of the euro’ (Ross, 2011: 54; Brack & Startin, 2015: 246; Matyja et al, 2014: pp7-8). Startin argued that this may be a consequence of the ‘permissive consensus’, evident in most EU members pre-Maastricht never materialising in Britain, as a consequence of historical and geographical explanations (Brack & Startin, 2015: 246). It is clear that this has continued, with continuing concerns over future enlargements, ‘floods’ of immigrants and diminished welfare and healthcare services that contributed to the Brexit referendum in 2016 (Copsey, 2015: 160).

It is clear that although the UK has accepted the EU as a liberal integration project with regards to further market integration, the UK has historically viewed its relations with Europe ‘in opposition’, even during the Eurosceptic lower-water mark of Labour government in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Whilst social policy and welfare concerns are less prominent in British Euroscepticism than elsewhere, hostility to the euro, migration and supranational integration permeates civil society. Coupled with the UK’s ‘island mentality’ and ‘awkward partner status’, this has resulted in a ‘hard’ Euroscepticism that has seen the UK as a constant source of disruption in European policy development.

Denmark:

Danish Eurosceptic discourses are decisively tied to welfare, in much the same way that historic, geographic and policy-driven British exceptionalism impacts Euroscepticism in the UK. As outlined by Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, the Nordic welfare model, which Denmark subscribes to, ‘[believes] that each individual has a role to play solely based upon the simple fact, that we are human beings and that we believe that a welfare state is not in contradiction to competitive strength but a condition to competitive strength’ (Rasmussen, 1999). The Nordic welfare model, across Scandinavia, has nonetheless been associated with Euroscepticism, showing lower than average support for integration amongst European citizens. Indeed, ‘Euroscepticism is usually ‘explained by the affluence of the region that together with an egalitarian welfare state model — based on universal benefits financed through relatively high taxation — make the Nordics less interested in transferring policy-making powers to the European level (Raunio, 2007: 191). Historical arguments, based on ‘protestant political culture, concepts such as nation-state and national sovereignty’ have also

been made, as well as Denmark's troubled relations with EMU, which this chapter will discuss (Raunio, 2007: 191).

Despite a history of 'EU-scepticism', the Danish refusal of Maastricht came as a real shock, but it was ultimately written off by EU insiders 'due to long held views in Denmark against the transfer of sovereignty to the EU' (Ross, 2011: pp19-20). However, and similarly to British Euroscepticism, the immigration dynamic lays at the heart of Danish distrust of the integration project. Whilst this is not unique to the UK and Denmark, as immigration rhetoric has become especially virulent across Europe recently, the 'older' themes reanimated by the Great Recession concerning 'national debt, jobs, welfare costs and fiscal burdens' were particularly present in Denmark, whilst criticisms of multiculturalism, 'fuelling arguments against immigration in Europe', was mobilised with regards to the welfare state (Lesinska, 2014: 41). Immigration rhetoric prior to 2015, it is clear from speech acts from major political leaders and academic leaders, resembled a dog-whistle rather than 'an open call to arms' (Lesinska, 2014: 43). However, in response to the refugee crisis of 2015, Denmark's neighbour Sweden 'embarked on one of the largest self-described humanitarian efforts in its history, opening its borders to 163,000 asylum seekers', and despite the declarations of the Swedish Prime Minister that it would not occur, the border between Denmark and Sweden closed on November 24th 2015 (Barker, 2017: 1). Although drastic action was taken by the Swedes, Denmark acted akin to its Scandinavian partner, constructing a fence at Kastrup Airport in Copenhagen, the first time since the post-war period 'that those wishing to enter Sweden from Denmark could not without an identification check or passport control' (Barker, 2017: 3). In this sense, Danish perceptions and reactions to immigration and the migrant crisis followed Scandinavian, rather than German, lines.

However, it is clear that Danish Euroscepticism prior to the refugee crisis oversaw a relatively consistent escalation in immigration rhetoric. Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen declared in the Folketing in 2009 that his liberal conservative party Venstre 'is the first government that has taken the job of integration seriously', by 'taking the population's insecurity and unchecked immigration seriously' (Rasmussen, 2009). In comparison to Bale's argument that Euroscepticism in the UK was reinforced by predominantly unofficial, but mutually reinforcing interactions between the Conservative Party and UKIP, Venstre worked in close cooperation with its far-right, Eurosceptic competitor the Danish People's Party (DPP), in order to bring immigration 'under control'

(Rasmussen, 2009). Common concerns featured the fear of the loss of welfare and Danish jobs, reinforced by the Great Recession, which Rasmussen discussed in detail in speeches about the risk of losing jobs ‘that we cannot replace’, where ‘we risk losing our prosperity, and if we lose our prosperity – then we lose our welfare! Then we lose international influence. And we then lose safety and security’ (Rasmussen, 2009). However, fears concerning immigration are not the only root cause of Danish concerns of the loss of its welfare state, with EMU and the single currency a major driver. Perhaps surprisingly, in 2009 Rasmussen argued that ‘the economic crisis has underlined that it will be to the advantage of Denmark to participate in the euro area’, but he nonetheless retrenches, arguing that ‘it is by no means at all a foregone conclusion that we can join the euro area’ due to a large public finance deficit, and ‘neither the political nor the economic preconditions for a referendum on the euro are fulfilled at the moment’ (Rasmussen, 2009). Indeed, the central argument behind opposition to joining the euro concerns sceptical public opinion and the national interest. Whilst what the latter denotes is vague in Britain, in Denmark it is more lucid, with the argument made that ‘we must continue to be one of the most affluent countries in the world in order to be able to maintain and finance one of the best welfare societies in the world’, generally translated into policies such as ‘greater service value for our welfare tax money’, alongside larger immigration and integration legislation reforms’ (Rasmussen, 2009). Clearly, these policies are often at odds with the desired policies of the European institutions.

Following the financial crisis, as well as the refugee crisis, it is clear that Eurosceptic rhetoric escalated in Denmark, much like the UK and wider Europe. Lars Løkke Rasmussen, who returned as Danish Prime Minister, focussed on immigration rhetoric in his speech on January 1st 2018, but with less implicit connection to the Nordic welfare model. Condemning the idea of ‘children who grow up in an environment where it is not the norm that parents go to work’, Rasmussen attacked many of the typically cited failures of multiculturalism in of themselves, such as the rise of ‘parallel societies’, ghettos, ‘downward spirals’, and ‘people do not take responsibility, do not participate, [and do] not make use of the opportunities we have in Denmark – but stand outside the community’ (Rasmussen, 2018). This, he argues, has caused cracks to appear in the map of Denmark (Rasmussen, 2018). Rasmussen admonishes ‘decades of lax immigration policy [that has] played a contributory role’, the notion that more were allowed into Denmark than could be integrated, and thus the only solution was firm immigration policy (Rasmussen, 2018). In order to achieve this, he argues Denmark must ‘[apply] the brakes’, work with the EU in reducing asylum seekers, and send Syrian refugees

home ‘as soon as conditions permit’ (Rasmussen, 2018). Rasmussen’s reassurance to the Danish population, many of whom ‘share my concern’ of ‘the abuse of hospitality and the challenge of the Danish way of living’, spans the bulk of his speech, and there are clear electoral reasons for this (Rasmussen, 2018). Indeed, the DPP has continued to emerge as a major party in Denmark, challenging Rasmussen’s liberal-conservative government. However, whilst the DPP has clearly impacted Rasmussen’s governments, both in formal coalitions and spatial theory capabilities, at both the national and European policy level, the DPP has long been highly influential, such as it was in the 2000 Euro referendum.

Whilst the DPP polled only at 10% in the year 2000, slogans such as ‘for Krone and Fatherland’, ‘exhorting Danes to defend their currency and their very nationhood’, had a major impact on the outcome of the Danish Euro referendum, where the rejection of the single currency sent shockwaves in a manner that the Danish rejection of Maastricht eight years did not (Cohen, 2000). The Eurosceptic image that the DPP projects concerns the age-old preservation of sovereignty, with typically European arguments within the ideology of the phenomenon that the euro would further erode national sovereignty and identity, when ‘it is already becoming more multi-ethnic and globalised’ (Cohen, 2000). Despite Denmark’s adherence to the Nordic welfare model, Danish proximity was often perceived at the European level to be ‘a mere tail to the German bulldog’ (Cohen, 2000). However, this changed when fears grew that Euro rejection, which plunged 25% to the dollar and eroded its credibility as a premium currency, could snowball, as part of a resurgence of identity politics in the form of nationalist, anti-immigration parties that were rising in Belgium, Austria and Greece, as well as exposing ‘Franco-German centrality’ to European affairs (Cohen, 2000). Much like the United Kingdom, Danish Euroscepticism has historic roots of a greater, independent state. Danish sensitivity to the loss of territory by German and Sweden still resides, with notions like ‘the Danish house is more like a bungalow today’ in existence, and its decline ‘from a regional power to a powerless realm’ (Cohen, 2000). Many scholars have acknowledged ‘the symbolic importance of money, beyond considerations of iconography’ and its relationship with Denmark, arguing ‘Danish attitudes towards the euro were informed by certain foundational myths about what constituted the Danish nation’ (Sørensen, 2014: pp33-34). Critically, they argue from the eighteenth century to 1864, ‘the Danish state underwent a transformation from constituting a large conglomerate state to a small and culturally heterogeneous nation-state’, whilst most Danish historians agree that ‘the traditional state-centred patriotism developed into a nationalist ideology with Danish

language and culture as common denominators’ (Sørensen, 2014: pp33-34). The idea of the ‘nation’ consequently ‘carries an inherent anti-elitist potential that can be readily articulated if the state-elite fails to appear legitimate’ (Sørensen, 2014: pp33-34). It is perhaps here Pia Kjaersgaard, then-leader of the DPP, may have drawn from the well of Danish nationalism in her Euroscepticism, when she asks ‘do we want to see our decisions more and more taken by the ECB?’, as well as ‘do we want this multiculturalism, this multi-ethnicity, in which we were never consulted?’ (Cohen, 2000).

It is with this in mind that Denmark’s ‘notable reluctance towards deepening integration’, its 1992 rejection of the Maastricht Treaty by referendum in 1992 and the negotiation of major opt-outs thereafter, is perhaps indicative of fears of the EU as a liberal integration project. It is also perhaps indicative of the importance of shared histories, proximity and the timing of member state accession. It is thus unsurprising that Swedish EU policy is notably similar, given its proximity and late joining of the polity, and is often marked as ‘cautious and hesitant’, with the Swedish electorate rejecting the single currency by referendum in 2003 akin to its Danish counterparts (Raunio, 2007: pp191-192). Nevertheless, the Danish rejection of the Euro came as a major shock to the EU, and perhaps emboldened its Nordic neighbours to reject the common currency, reinforcing Scandinavian soft Euroscepticism and providing barriers to policy development in the field of EMU (Raunio, 2007: pp191-192). Following their rejection of the Maastricht Treaty, Danes were lauded, such as in the UK, as being ‘fiercely proud’, but reactions following the Euro referendum were much more condemnatory (Downs, 2001: 222). One reason was the outside perception of the DPP as extremely nationalistic, even racist, and ‘unethical’ (Sørensen, 2014: 37). Others condemned Danish left-wing parties who campaigned against the euro for working alongside the DPP, although the socialist and green parties focussed on the economic arguments and risks to Danish welfare built by ‘the working class with their own hands’ (Sørensen, 2014: 37). Both, however, utilised the krone as a potent national symbol as part of the Danish way of life, and a crucial precondition to the future existence of the Danish welfare model, with the nationalist repercussions of this tactic remaining (Sørensen, 2014: 37; 42; pp46-47).

The 53.1% rejection of the Euro, on 87.5% turnout, unveiled a pronounced Euroscepticism in Denmark (Downs, 2001: 225). Contrasting images of a shaken Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, and an ‘ebullient’ Pia Kjaersgaard describing the victory as ‘one for democracy and for the Danish people against an elite’, and as ‘a signal to the EU to slow down the train

of integration, for the good of all’, altered the pace and scope of EMU policy (Downs, 2001: 225). Although Prime Minister Tony Blair, who wished to join the Euro in conflict with Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown, denied that ‘a No vote would dash his hopes for a similar poll in Britain, the Danish verdict clearly came as a severe blow to those contemplating accession to the euro in the near future’, providing a clear setback for potential policy development in the EMU, in which the UK would never consider Euro accession thereafter (Downs, 2001: 226). The same occurred in Sweden, where mounting pressure not to forge ahead with the Euro dominated the its government (Downs, 2001: 226). Policy development was impacted by the establishment of a ‘two-tier’, multi-speed, Europe, of ‘core’ EMU countries including France and Germany and those wishing to hold back, such as Denmark, Britain and Sweden (Downs, 2001: 226). The emergence of a ‘core’ and a ‘periphery’, by countries on the outer boundaries of Europe both geographically and their desire for less integration, thus emerged following the Danish referendum (Bering, 2001: pp63-64). When comparing these reasons for the result, some similarities can be seen with Brexit, where concerns over sovereignty, national identity and integration, as well as immigration concerns, dominated discussions (Bering, 2001: pp63-64). This provides some evidence that the composition of Euroscepticism, and the reaction against it, remains relatively static over time. Danes were accused of being ‘inward looking, suspicious and fearful of outside influences’, with *Der Spiegel* accusing Danes of being ‘more racist than the Austrian nationalist leader Jorg Haider, and covered nightmarish conditions of immigrants in Denmark’ (Bering, 2001: 64). The international response was jarring in Denmark, a country that historically prided themselves on its welfare state, and its role in the international stage lecturing the USA ‘on race, poverty, Third World debt and energy conservation’ (Bering, 2001: 64).

The ‘fear of foreigners’, when reading opinion polling following the Danish rejection of the Euros, had arguably nothing to do with the referendum result, but this has been rejected, and argued that ‘it had everything to do with it’ (Bering, 2001: 64). Currency questions are often abstract, and difficult for ‘the man of the street’ to quantify, and the euro question devolved into a proxy war ‘over foreigners and the future of Denmark’ (Bering, 2001: 65). The DPP under Kjaersgaard sought to halt immigration and oppose participation in the EU, in order to appease its voter base of former Social Democrats, blue-collar workers and the elderly who were generally anti-immigration and Eurosceptic (Bering, 2001: 65). It is from this perspective, where Brexit was seen as a proxy vote to decide the future relations and policies

of the United Kingdom, that the Danish euro referendum draws parallels, alongside the characterisation of Denmark ‘as timid, cautious, suspicious, and perhaps a bit racist’, in a similar manner to Britain (Bering, 2001: pp67-68). However, and despite the fears of the ‘virus’ of political correctness at the European level, open typical of Eurosceptic rhetoric, Eurobarometer has provided evidence that ‘Nordic citizens are gradually becoming less Eurosceptical’ (Bering, 2001: pp71-72; Raunio, 2007: 192). Although the financial crisis, the refugee crisis and Brexit has shifted Danish and European politics, and despite a host of minority governments since European accession in 1973, ‘none of the minority cabinets have dissolved over European issues’, even in times of referenda (Raunio, 2007: 194). Although worries amongst Danish and European officials that Denmark’s EU membership may come under strain, as well as its ‘alliances’ with Britain, the DPP has not made a Danish exit a short-term priority, despite Denmark’s perception as being a possible domino in EU withdrawal (Milne, 2016). Kenneth Kristensen Berth, MP and EU spokesman for the DPP, bemoaned the withdrawal of Britain from the EU as Denmark’s principle European ally and the increasing role of Germany, underlining the importance of proximity as the DPP, and Denmark in general, as it seeks to move away from Merkel’s ‘unpopular immigration policy’ (Milne, 2016). Drawing comparisons between ‘hard’, British Euroscepticism and Denmark’s ‘softer’ variety, its politics, histories and its impacts on European policy development, must be treated with appropriate caution.

Danish ‘soft’ Euroscepticism draws itself from the fear of declining welfare, concerns over globalisation and being undermined by a liberal integration project. However, concerns regarding the euro and EMU, as well as increasing anti-migrant rhetoric manifesting itself in welfare chauvinism, derives its roots from the importance of the Danish currency to its nationalism, and is also tied to the loss of Danish territory to its proximate neighbours in Germany and Sweden. Indeed, the role of history in developing these attitudes is important to understand. Danish ‘soft’ Euroscepticism is nonetheless alike to Scandinavia, with Danish disruption of policy development manifesting itself in social policy, the euro and responses to the migrant crisis.

Poland:

The current Polish government has been active in its involvement, and conflicts, with the European Union. Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki argued in a 2018 speech that ‘Europe needs a new vision’, that Europe ‘must find a way to respond efficiently to the threats but at the same time to maintain sovereignty of the individual EU Member States’, and that the ‘Eurozone should be reconsidered’, words characteristic of a intergovernmental, soft Eurosceptic discourse widespread across Europe (Morawiecki, 2018). A seminal aspect of new Euroscepticism following the migration crisis includes the demand for further border protections and greater security, and a ‘joint response’ to the migration crisis (Morawiecki, 2018). However, whilst this type of discourse would be typical of the UK, or the rest of Europe, the need ‘to develop tools at the European level in the area of tax havens’, and safeguard welfare, would be more typical of perhaps Scandinavian, non-Eurosceptic discourses, overall representing a Euroscepticism that remains stridently intergovernmental in terms of migration and EMU, but supranational in social policy (Morawiecki, 2018). This rough approximation of ‘welfare chauvinism’ is typical of current Polish ‘soft’ Euroscepticism, as this chapter will demonstrate.

The United Kingdom and Denmark shared similar paths to entry; a delayed accession in 1973, and the view that both countries were ‘on the borders’ of a growingly integrated Europe. Poland and Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs) pathway to the EU was significantly different, following the collapse of regional hegemony of the Soviet Union, and the collapse of its political and economic system (Wagener, 2002: pp152-153). Whilst the United Kingdom and Denmark shared initial malaise towards European integration prior to joining, albeit stronger in the former, Polish and Eastern European political discourses ‘immediately declared their intent to ‘return to Europe’, [...] catching up with the post-war political and economic development’, central features being the welfare state and higher productivity (Wagener, 2002: pp152-153). Poland was the most extreme reaction of the former, with the immediate post-communist welfare state’s ‘social expenditure in GDP [increasing] from 17% in 1989 to 32% in 1995’, with comparatively modest increases elsewhere (Wagener, 2002: 155; 161). However, whilst Poland may have undergone dramatic welfare expansion compared to its CEECs, which later receded and has now significantly increased under the current Law and Justice government (PiS), ‘a striking feature of

contemporary politics in East-Central Europe is the ongoing erosion of the consensus on the question of European integration' (Wagener, 2002: 155; Kopecky & Mudde, 2002: 298).

Whilst Poland was atypical when compared to CEECs, and wider Europe, in being unaffected by the Great Recession, the 'decline of democracy and the weakening of global competitiveness have been the common historical trajectory in the last decade', and represents 'a special case of the European crisis', with the rise of 'the freedom fight ideology [becoming] popular' (Ágh, 2016: 33). Whilst this may be seen as usual, given a Polish 'domestic boom off the back of increased higher consumption and infrastructure development brought in by EU funding', the Polish domestic solution divides 'on social mores' and '1990s attitudes to its communist past', and not economic development (Copsey, 2015: 63). CEECs have generally constructed 'black-and-white narratives on the nation-state building fighting with enemies against oppressive foreign powers', which in Poland and Hungary represents a reverse from its formerly close convergence with Europe 'among the new democracies', and its successful 'return to Europe' discourse (Ágh, 2016: 34). Reversals in Europeanisation, and the rise of Euroscepticism and 'velvet dictatorships' in Poland and Hungary, both EU and Visegrad states, may be considered surprising, but is argued to derive from inherent contradictions in Visegrad and CEEC narratives (Ágh, 2016: 39). In Eurobarometer surveys, national and European identities seemingly co-exist in Eastern Europe, with many identifying with their nation and Europe, but 'the traditionalising narrative can be described in the terms of political culture as the victory of 'subject' type of political culture's patterns over the slowly emerging citizen' type (Ágh, 2016: 39). This, Ágh argues, 'led to a deep conflict with the rules and values of the EU, and the cultural conflict continues not only inside CEECs countries', but between EU institutions and the populist governments (Ágh, 2016: 39).

Whilst it is wise to be cautious of Ágh's argument that similar narrative contradictions have driven battles between CEECs and EU institutions, given contrasting public opinion and experiences between states prior to and following accession, a new dynamic in 'understanding citizenship in terms of re-defining the boundaries between citizens and non-citizens' has occurred not just in the Visegrad and Eastern European states, but across Scandinavia and Western Europe (Kopecky & Mudde, 2002: 298; Nordensvard & Ketola, 2015: pp356-357). The majority of 'research on nationalism and social policy focusses on developed, multinational states', with new rightist parties not necessarily adopting traditional stances in terms of economic redistribution, with new parties 'not by definition opposed to

high levels of economic redistribution from the rich to the poor, economic interference by the state, and an extensive welfare state' (Nordensvard & Ketola, 2015: pp357-359). This is the case with PiS, who heavily focussed on 'state institution reforms and [...] on economic and social issues' in the 2014 European Parliament campaign (Cichosz, 2017: 222). With new right-wing support for welfare expansion, some have mused whether a 'Europeanisation of social policies' is underway, which would be a boost to policy development in the field of European social policy (Koster & Kaminska, 2012: 903). For Europeanisation to occur, 'processes of construction, diffusion and institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things', and shared beliefs and norms' must be defined and consolidated in the EU policy process, and incorporated 'in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures, and public policies' (Koster & Kaminska, 2012: 903). However, it is clear that this has not been the case, with a rise in welfare chauvinism prevalent in Scandinavia but also in Poland and CEECs, serving to inhibit this process.

Different theories have been advanced with regards to welfare state preferences and its connection to Euroscepticism in recent years, alongside the diminishment of 'the widespread perception of Eurosceptic voters as being simply parochial nationalists' (Koster & Kaminska, 2012: pp904-905; Leconte, 2015: 254). Nevertheless, 'the positive correlation between nationalism, negative views on immigration and Euroscepticism seems to be quite robust across countries', alongside the idea that the nation state remains 'the most important arena for solidarity among citizens' (Leconte, 2015: 254; Nordensvard & Ketola, 2015: 359). In this case welfare chauvinism, prevalent to differing degrees in Poland, Denmark and the United Kingdom, and across the European Union, rests on 'welfare programmes [implying] a mechanism of 'inclusion and exclusion that allow them to build an 'ingroup' of national community', where welfare creates bonds and solidarity (Nordensvard & Ketola, 2015: 359). Egalitarian welfare states, it is argued, prioritise the self-determination of the state within discourses, with 'social democratic welfare [states playing] a major role in the development of national identity' (Nordensvard & Ketola, 2015: pp359-360). This is critical as an explanation as to why Europeanisation, or even some level of European policy development, has failed to materialise with regards to social policy, even when social democratic political parties, who tend to be the most pro-European integration, are in power at the national level. In this case, solidarity is held firmly at the national level.

Poland is particularly emblematic in this regard. A ‘poster child for successful post-communist transition’, with its economy as its ‘strongest performer for at least the last decade’, the emergence of PiS, its left-wing economic agenda and right-wing social agenda has raised concerns with regards to a hardening of Poland’s ‘soft’ Euroscepticism (Krastev, 2016: pp88-89). Polish political parties often change their policy dynamics and rhetoric regularly, far more than its regional partners, and PiS has called for significant increases in public expenditure, in order to support increases to social pensions, disability benefits, and healthcare provision, as outlined by Prime Minister Morawiecki (Stepinska, 2015: 15; Morawiecki, 2018). The migration crisis ‘defined the changing nature of European politics’, with many Europeans associating migration with rising terror attacks and ‘the overburdening of the welfare state’ (Krastev, 2016: 91). In this case, the migration crisis and subsequent increasing desires for immigration control and welfare chauvinism is not a ‘lack of solidarity’, but ‘a clash of solidarities’; national, ethnic and religious solidarity ‘chafing against our obligations as human beings, and creating a border between internationalists and nativists (Krastev, 2016: 92). Whilst this interpretation is useful as a reason as to why anti-migrant rhetoric has increased, ‘CEECs position on refugees is no accident’, with its roots in history, demography, and ‘twists [in] post-communist transitions’, with Poland typical of its neighbours attitudes (Krastev, 2016: 93). Whilst Western European attitudes to the world, such as Britain, were shaped by colonialism and its legacy, CEECs were born from ‘the disintegration of empires and the outbreaks of ethnic cleansing that went with it’ (Krastev, 2016: 93). Poland, prior to 1939, was a multicultural society ‘with more than a third of its population German, Ukrainian or Jewish’, whilst in the present day it is one of the most ethnically homogenous societies in the world, with 98% of its people being ethnic Poles (Krastev, 2016: 93). Historical links to multiculturalism are thus different in Poland and its neighbouring states compared to the rest of Europe, where ‘a return to ethnic diversity suggests a return to the troubled interwar period’ and the Soviet era, representing a significant and unique reason for CEEC hostility to migration and supranationality (Krastev, 2016: 93)

Polish hostility, or ‘aggression’, to policy discussions and diplomatic talks with the European Union is not uncommon, and is shared by the United Kingdom and fellow CEECs. Poland, for example, raised issues with regards to the expansion of QMV and the Lisbon Treaty, drawing sharp criticism alongside the UK and other Visegrad states such as the Czech Republic, that in European policy development, things are not decided ‘by fisticuffs and knockouts’ (Ross, 2011: pp54-55). A hardening of rhetoric at the national, and consequently

European level, has occurred following the rise of PiS to power. Current Deputy Prime Minister, and former Prime Minister Beata Szydło, ‘stressed that the Polish Government sustained its position that Poland would not support mechanisms for the automatic allocation of refugees’, which ignored ‘the national competence in the refugee policy’ (Szydło, 2017). However, the liberal-conservative Civic Platform in power prior to PiS nonetheless opposed the further integration of migrants, with Ewa Kopacz arguing ‘our solidarity must correspond to the possibilities of our country’ (Kopacz, 2015). Whilst rhetoric has hardened, and disputes between PiS and the institutions intensifying in recent years, it is clear that Poland has long adhered to a baseline of the UK’s ‘market-only’ approach to the EU, alongside its Visegrad partners in the Czech Republic and Hungary, as well as the Baltic states (Ross, 2011: pp66-67). This is interesting, in that it highlights that the United Kingdom is moderately successful in advancing its agenda alongside CEECs despite its reputation as ‘an awkward partner’, demonstrates Polish convergence with its Visegrad members, and highlights that as this grouping is prominent, then the possibility for policy development and Europeanisation outside of economic policy, recedes (Ross, 2011: pp66-67). The repercussions of this can be linked to a potential ‘Europeanisation of Euroscepticism’, and advocacy for an alternative Europe, which in Poland is based on defending national sovereignty and identity, rooted in the need ‘to defend the ‘heartland’ against an insidious external threat’, whether that is migration, or aspects of supranational integration (Harmsen, 2010: 336).

One critical area of continued Polish resistance, shared with the United Kingdom and Denmark, concerns the Euro. Unlike the United Kingdom and Denmark, where the latter rejected the euro in a close, contentious referendum, and vigorous opposition in the former prevented a referendum even taking place, Poland has a history of Euro support. In 2002, 60% ‘considered that the changeover to the euro would bring more advantages than disadvantages’ (Genge, 2014: 428), with support until the financial crisis that the euro was ‘a safe harbour’ (Genge, 2014: 429). Polish citizens reacted well to Slovakia, a neighbour and Visegrad member, successfully changing to the euro in 2009, and in response then-Prime Minister Donald Tusk announced the ‘ruling government’s objective to join the Eurozone by 2012’ (Genge, 2014: 429). Tusk even pushed the timeline forward, aiming to adopt the euro by the end of 2011, adopting a roadmap at the Council of Ministers that hinted towards greater policy correspondence between Poland and the EU with regards to EMU (Chancellery of the Prime Minister of Poland, 2008). Tusk alluded, nevertheless, to the difficulty in maintaining the desired pace of Eurozone entry, emphasising the necessity of ‘cooperation on

that issue also with the opposition’, as well as the President, at the national level, which would prove extremely difficult (Chancellery of the Prime Minister of Poland, 2008). Tusk’s failure in delivering Poland accession into the Euro may have been a consequence of ‘a multi-level structure of attitudes towards the euro, where individuals’ measure ‘perceived gains and losses from introduction of the euro and life attitudes’, and attempts to force ‘another individual to support the introduction of the euro’ are ultimately unsuccessful (Matyja et al, 2014: 3). Furthermore, and similar to the Danish euro referendum becoming a proxy for other issues, ‘money perception is very dynamic and dependent on current political and social issues’, and this would overwhelm Polish plans for Euro accession (Matyja et al, 2014: 4).

Whilst the ongoing Eurozone crisis would scuttle the perceived economic benefits of Polish entry, particularly with regards to Poland’s successful economy at the time, the historic and patriotic symbols of ‘[the] eagle on the Polish zloty’, and the symbolism of currency, national sovereignty and historical mythos are shared amongst the case studies and some, but not all, CEECs and Visegrad states (Matyja et al, 2014: 4). Przybyszewski argued ‘monetary nationalism affected the perception of the gains in a negative way and the perception of losses in a positive way’, which means that ‘a person with a higher level of monetary nationalism understated the gains and exaggerated the losses associated with introduction of the euro’ (Matyja et al, 2014: pp10-11). This has only increased with regards to Poland following the Eurozone, with ‘the level of acceptance of the euro by the feeling of losing one’s national identity’ declining, and ‘attachment to the Polish zloty’ increasing (Matyja et al, 2014: 23). Polish attachment to the zloty in 2014 stood at 73%, whilst the euro was considered ‘reliable’ and ‘common’ at 47% and 45%, respectively, with a trade-off between Poland existing, even during the Eurozone crisis, that the euro would enable Poland to become economically stronger at the expense of a loss of sovereignty (Matyja et al, 2014: 23). However, whilst Western culture is positively received amongst Poles, European institutions suffer significantly, with only 30% showing trust in the European Union prior to the migration crisis, where Eurosceptic rhetoric has grown significantly under PiS (Matyja et al, 2014: 24). Whilst there has been a clear strain in relations between Poland and the European institutions, in which Hungary, a Visegrad state, has also corresponded with, Polish support for membership of the EU remains amongst the highest in Europe, ahead of Germany at 74% in 2018 (Kroet, 2018).

Poland, with regards to welfare chauvinism, immigration, its perceptions of the EU as a liberal integration project and the Euro is at once typical of its proximate countries, and in other senses different. On the one hand, Poland shares similarities with regards to rising welfare chauvinism, anti-migrant rhetoric and maintaining its national currency, akin to the United Kingdom and Denmark, but with differences with regards to CEECs and Visegrad members. There is a general trend for CEECs and Visegrad states to bolster ‘liberal forces within the EU’, led by the UK, by undermining policy development progress at the European level with regards to these areas (Copeland, 2014: 27). Indeed, ‘differences between political economies are significant and enlargement has had little impact on its direction, as it just expands the diversity of capitalisms with little overall impact’ (Copeland, 2014: 27). Historical reasons must also be accounted for, with prospects of supranational policy development and Europeanisation bringing back painful memories of Poland’s turbulent past, with this often decisive in setting boundaries at the member state level (Copeland, 2014: 27). However, it is clear that Poland remains ‘soft’ Eurosceptic, despite the confrontational rhetoric of PiS post-2015, and high support for EU membership. Structural funds and social policy remain decisive in continued support for the EU in Poland, where the EU is often perceived as a ‘cash cow’ (Copsey, 2015: 109). Poland’s relationship with the EU is complex; despite reactions against European integration, such as declining support for the Euro, and European-level migration policy, the adoption of the former has not been definitively rejected, Poland seeks supranational support for areas such as tax reforms, and EU support remains extremely high despite the current PiS government’s ‘soft’ Euroscepticism. Poland, therefore, can be compared in some ways to the Visegrad states and CEECs, as well as the UK and Denmark, but its relationship is wholly unique.

Discussion:

Following the rise in Eurosceptic and anti-migrant rhetoric, as well as opposition to EMU, European social policy, and the failure of responses to the migration crisis and concerns over further integrating in the liberal integration project, European policy development has continuously suffered setbacks. The EU has undergone major identity crises, manifesting itself in White Paper’s and projects delivered by the institutions, with strong rhetoric aiming to restore confidence, focus ‘EU policies on the key challenges’, ‘strengthen democratic legitimacy’ and ‘build ties between the EU and its citizens’ (Van den Brande, 2017: 1). The overwhelming language in EU documents such as the Van den Brande Report is of citizen

focus, forming partnerships and ‘building bridges’, with a focus on engaging ‘Europe’s youth’ (Van den Brande, 2017: 1). Despite a cavalcade of issues within the European project, including Brexit and the migration crisis, to the slow Eurozone recovery, President Juncker’s State of the Union Address in 2017 was optimistic, referencing the need to ‘[catch] the wind in the EU’s sails’ and building a Europe ‘that protects, empowers and defends’ (Van den Brande, 2017: 1). In order to achieve this, emphasis was placed on ‘agenda-setting [needing] to be bottom-up, letting citizens co-decide in a reformed model that builds consensus from below’, signalling an acknowledgement of Eurosceptic complaints regarding the EU’s ‘democratic deficit’, as well as placing greater emphasis on member states concerns, such as migration, social policy and EMU raised by, but not exclusive to, the United Kingdom, Denmark and Poland (Van den Brande, 2017: 2). In a further concession towards the ‘democratic deficit’, the EU pledged to give citizens the opportunity to be involved in the EU at ‘local, regional and national’ levels (Van den Brande, 2017: 2). In a shift in how policy development has traditionally been perceived, and has, occurred, ‘citizens’ dialogues’ have attempted to connect the EU with its citizens, with 333 occurring in 145 towns and cities throughout Europe from January 2015 to September 2017 (Van den Brande, 2017: 2).

It is clear that the EU has considered more than setting dialogue, but also the need for ‘emotional engagement with the Union by Europeans’, where ‘legitimacy can only be sustained as a virtual cohesive force if it comes from people’s hearts and minds’ (Van den Brande, 2017: 7). This may have been a response not just to events such as Brexit, but also the 2014 European Parliament elections, which resulted in the election of ‘a substantially larger number of parties who hold Eurosceptic positions’ (Szczurbiak & Taggart, 2018: 12). Juncker argued in his 2016 State of the Union Address that ‘it is essential to stop nationalising the successes and Europeanising the failures of the EU’, whilst ‘EU leaders should be less restrained in defending the set of values that are embedded in the Treaties’ (Van den Brande, 2017: pp10-11). Efforts outlined in 2017 included the development of ‘a global strategy’ to improve coordination between institutions and member states, place greater emphasis on the values and aspirations of the Bratislava Declaration, ‘inspire creativity and emotion’ in communication, and focus on people’s ‘day-to-day concerns’, as well as stimulate public debate and explain the cost of a ‘disunited Europe’ and the importance of political stability (Van den Brande, 2017: pp26-27). It is clear that these represent fresh attempts at constructing a European ‘demos’ and respond to long-standing Eurosceptic critiques, solutions that have continued to allude the institutions since its

formation, in order to provide greater output legitimacy to its citizens, improve the input legitimacy into the polity, and further European policy development.

Although it is clear that the Van den Brande Report was a response moulded by growing populism and Euroscepticism, and events such as Brexit and Donald Trump's presidential victory, themes prevalent in the report have long been in existence, and the seeking of more effective policy development was outlined in Juncker's opening speech as Commission President. Juncker stated he '[wanted] to work for a Union that is committed to democracy and reform; that is not meddlesome but works for its citizens rather than against them' and, in a nod towards European policy development, stressed 'I want to work for a Union that delivers' (Juncker, 2014). Juncker also asserted that 'it's time for Europe stood tall on its own feet', pooling resources, and that whilst the rescue of the euro was successful, it was 'weak on the social side', bemoaning that 'workers and retired people had to shoulder the burden of structural reform programmes, while ship owners and financial speculators became even richer', in a nod to left-wing Eurosceptic complaints, as well as critiques of European social policy prevalent in members like Denmark (Juncker, 2014). Juncker also made overtures to a multi-speed Europe, where he argued for some members, the limits of European policy development 'may already have been reached' (Juncker, 2014). The prevalence of a multi-speed Europe derives not just from 'opinion-leaders in the core Eurozone countries [...] reluctant to foot the bill to expand the Union to include more members', but from member states such as the United Kingdom, Denmark and Poland, who have continued to oppose, albeit to varying degrees, the euro, migration, the liberal integration project and European social policy as it currently stands (Hobolt, 2014: 679). This was implied in the Bratislava Declaration, which argued for 'focus on citizens' expectations', and 'an attractive EU they can trust and support' (Bratislava Declaration, 2016: 2). The general hostility towards migration in all three case studies, and its impact on future policy, can also be found in the declaration 'never to allow [returns] to uncontrolled flows [...] and further bring down [the number] of irregular migrants, as well as 'ensure full control of our external borders' (Bratislava Declaration, 2016: 3). Juncker indicated 'migration will stay on our radar', and in terms of policy, stated that 'over 1,700 officers from the new European Border and Coast Guard' were employed, alongside the stemming of irregular flows of migrants arriving through Eastern and Central Mediterranean routes (Juncker, 2017: 10). Ultimately, Juncker argues, 'the future of Europe cannot be decided by decree', but 'the result of democratic debate and, ultimately, broad consensus' (Juncker, 2017: 12). With this broad consensus,

including the United Kingdom, Denmark and Poland, and its proximate neighbours reacting to and raising anti-migrant rhetoric, policy consensus at the European level has resulted in tougher rhetoric and stances towards migration from outside of Europe.

It is clear from a policy development perspective that the EU has mobilised on citizens' concerns regarding its democratic deficit, as well as to the resistance of member states to specific policy areas. One recent effort is the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI), launched in 2011, aiming 'to allow citizens to propose legislation for the Commission in its particular areas of competency once an initiative reaches one million signatures across at least seven Member States', in an effort to increase the 'functional participation of civil society' in the European policy-making process (Fitzgibbon, 2013: 111). However, it is clear that this initiative was flawed; arguments have been postulated that 'citizens evaluate the EU through proxies, such as national institutions', as well through a cost-benefit analysis of European integration or the country's economy (Vasilopoulou & Wagner, 2017: 383). Ultimately, the ECI will be heavily influenced by factors at the national level, diminishing its potential impact of being a direct line to citizens' interests. It has also been argued that 'the notion of Euroscepticism is now traceable in the official discourse of EU institutions and (pro-European) national decision-makers', with consistent aims at fighting the phenomenon following the derailment of the Constitutional Treaty in 2005, as well as the European Governance White Paper in 2000 (Leconte, 2015: 250). Academics have argued that there has been a 'bottom-up', national to European level, impact on European integration, with occurrences such as Brexit axiomatic of this, which has served to undermine the implicit conveyance of 'top-down' Europeanisation, which has been undermined in European policy development (Leconte, 2015: pp257-258). Indeed, this has served to challenge attempts at constructing an overarching demos, as a consequence of Euroscepticism (Leconte, 2015: 258). The result is that Euroscepticism, and malaise in areas of European policy development such as migration, EMU, and social policy, has debased the capacity of the EU to undergo processes of Europeanisation, as a consequence of increased bottom-up interactions with the European level (Copeland, 2014: pp104-105).

Conclusions:

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the findings of this thesis. It is clear that anti-immigration rhetoric has heavily featured in the Euroscepticism of the United Kingdom, Denmark and Poland, escalating in recent years and often manifesting itself in welfare

chauvinism, in differing degrees, in each case study. Opposition to the euro, and convergence towards EMU was also a common trend throughout the case studies, although this varied to significant opposition in the UK to a far more open-ended example in Poland. However, concerns over pervasive supranationalism, the undermining of national sovereignty, and the history and mythos of currency in British, Danish and Polish have permeated their respective Euroscepticism's. Advances towards an Europeanisation of social policy have also been rejected by the case studies, although once again Poland has recently been open to common action in tax reforms at the European level. As a consequence, the Euroscepticism of the case studies have limited the expansion of policy development in EMU, social policy and responses to the migration crisis, causing European efforts to crises to decline, and laid the groundwork for a multi-speed Europe in the future. Finally, Euroscepticism shaped the discourse of European leaders and documents for decades, with continuous focus on engaging citizens, closing the democratic deficit, and attempting to get to the heart of what Europeans care about, with civil-society entities and citizen-institution pathways the outcome of policy development driven by concerns over the spectre of Euroscepticism.

We can also draw conclusions from the hypotheses. With regards to H1, the hypothesis is mostly correct; the United Kingdom's actions within the EU were typical of its 'awkward partner' status in Europe, even when Euroscepticism had subsided somewhat from government discourses. However, the UK has been effective in its role as leader of a 'liberal opposition' with the EU, working alongside Denmark, Poland and other member states, so although the UK may maintain awkward relations, it has been effective in impacting policies prior to Brexit. With regards to H2, the hypothesis is correct; Danish 'soft' Euroscepticism and its focus on immigration, opposition to the euro and fears of its Nordic welfare system being undermined are broadly typical of Scandinavian Euroscepticism, and Denmark has tended to act closer to this region than its German neighbours. With regards to H3, the hypothesis is somewhat correct. Whilst Polish 'soft' Euroscepticism shares similarities between CEECs and Visegrad states, particularly Hungary and in fields such as immigration, Poland is unusual in its recent emphasis on protecting welfare and advancing aspects of social policy, and its internal Euro debate is dissimilar to Visegrad and Euro member Slovakia, as well as other CEECs who have joined the Eurozone. Finally, with regards to H4, the hypothesis is correct, with the dominance of anti-migrant rhetoric, and reticence regarding EMU and welfare. However, it is clear from the analysis of official papers and speeches that Euroscepticism saturates policy development processes at the European level in all areas and

over a significant time period, given the prevalence of Eurosceptic talking points such as Europe ‘getting to the heart of what Europeans care about’, shrinking the capacity of policy development along those lines. Looking towards the future, Euroscepticism and its impact on policy must continue to be investigated. Whilst the thesis found it unfeasible to interview members of the case studies’ Permanent Representation due to time and budgetary constraints, this research design would be advisable to use in the future. In the interests of scope, Southern European, left-wing Euroscepticism is only brushed upon in the thesis – future work should focus on how they have impacted policy development. Finally, the thesis used case studies representing three European regions, sacrificing depth of understanding in particular regions for comparability – work focussing on specific regions is also advisable.

Bibliography:

Primary Sources:

Chancellery of the Prime Minister of Poland. (2015). 'The Prime Minister on the migration crisis in the EU: I won't take any actions which would destabilise Poles' life' – 5th September 2015'. *Premier.gov.pl*. Available: <https://www.premier.gov.pl/en/news/news/the-prime-minister-on-the-migration-crisis-in-the-eu-i-wont-take-any-actions-which-would.html>. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Chancellery of the Prime Minister of Poland. (2017). 'Prime Minister Beata Szydło: Migration policy must be pragmatic and efficient – 23rd June 2017'. *Premier.gov.pl*. Available: <https://www.premier.gov.pl/en/news/news/prime-minister-beata-szydlo-migration-policy-must-be-pragmatic-and-efficient.html>. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Chancellery of the Prime Minister of Poland. (2018). 'Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki: Europe needs a new vision'. *Premier.gov.pl*. Available: <https://www.premier.gov.pl/en/news/news/prime-minister-mateusz-morawiecki-europe-needs-a-new-vision.html>. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Chancellery of the Prime Minister of Poland. (2018). 'Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki: Our policy is pro-family, prosocial, pro-solidarity – 22nd April 2018'. *Premier.gov.pl*. Available: <https://www.premier.gov.pl/en/news/news/prime-minister-mateusz-morawiecki-our-policy-is-pro-family-prosocial-pro-solidarity.html>. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

David Cameron. (2014). 'JCB Staffordshire: Prime Minister's speech. The Prime Minister delivered this speech at JCB, Staffordshire. It includes proposals made as Leader of the Conservative Party – 28th November 2014'. *Gov.uk*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/jcb-staffordshire-prime-ministers-speech>. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

European Commission. (2017). *White Paper on the future of Europe: Reflections and scenarios for the EU27 by 2025*. Available: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/white_paper_on_the_future_of_europe_en.pdf. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

European Union. (2016). *The Bratislava Declaration*. Available: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/21250/160916-bratislava-declaration-and-roadmapen16.pdf>. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Gordon Brown. (1997). 'Statement by Gordon Brown on EMU (27 October 1997). On 27 October 1997, Gordon Brown, Chancellor of the Exchequer, describes the British Government's position on the third stage of Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and on the United Kingdom's possible adoption of the euro. Statement by the Chancellor on the Economic and Monetary Union, 27 October 1997', p1-7. *CVCE*. Available: https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2005/8/23/9c5cfd42-e606-48e6-9b68-969d6bb328fd/publishable_en.pdf. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Gordon Brown. (2009). 'Gordon Brown: EU must take the lead in reforming global financial institutions - 24th March 2009'. *European Parliament Plenary sessions*. Available: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+IM-PRESS+20090323IPR52329+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Jean-Claude Juncker. (2014). 'A new start for Europe: My agenda for Jobs, Growth, Fairness and Democratic Change – July 15th 2014'. *European Parliament plenary session, Strasbourg*. Available: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-14-546_en.htm. Date accessed: 22nd June 2018.

Jean-Claude Juncker. (2017). 'State of the Union 2017 by Jean-Claude Juncker, President of the European Commission, 13th September 2017'. *European Commission*. Available: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/state-union-2017-brochure_en.pdf. Date accessed: 22nd June 2018.

Lars Løkke Rasmussen. (2009). 'Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen's Opening Address to the Folketing (The Danish Parliament) on Tuesday 6 October 2009'. *Statsministeriet*. Available: http://stm.dk/p_12957.html. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Lars Løkke Rasmussen. (2018). 'Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen's New Year Address 1st January 2018'. *Statsministeriet*. Available: http://stm.dk/p_14611.html. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Luc Van den Brande. (2017). 'Reaching out to EU citizens: seizing the opportunity: report by Luc Van den Brande, special adviser to the President of the European Commission: in summary'. *European Commission; Directorate-General for Communication*. Luxembourg: Publications Office, p1-27.

Luc Van den Brande. (2017). 'Reaching out to EU Citizens: A new opportunity, About us, with us, for us'. *A report by Luc Van den Brande, Special Adviser to the President of the European Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker*, p1-36.

Margaret Thatcher. (1988). 'Speech to the College of Europe ("The Bruges Speech"), Tuesday September 20th 1988'. *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*. Available: <https://www.margarethatcher.org/document/107332>. Date accessed: 22nd June 2018.

Poul Nyrup Rasmussen. (1999). 'Conference on Regional Cooperation in an Enlarged Europe, April 19, 1999 - Opening statement by Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen'. *Statsministeriet*. Available: http://stm.dk/p_11051.html. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Poul Nyrup Rasmussen. (1999). 'Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen's speech at the Conference "States and Markets" - Monday the 8th March 1999'. *Statsministeriet*. Available: http://stm.dk/p_11053.html. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Theresa May. (2018). 'PM speech on our future economic partnership with the European Union: Prime Minister Theresa May's speech on our future economic partnership with the European Union – March 2nd 2018'. *Gov.uk*. Available:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-on-our-future-economic-partnership-with-the-european-union>. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.

Secondary Sources:

Agnieszka Stepinska. (2017). 'Chapter 2: Political Advertising During the 2014 Polish EU Parliamentary Election' in: Ruxandra Boicu, Silvia Branea & Adriana Stefanel (eds.) *Political communication and European Parliamentary elections in times of crisis: perspectives from Central and South-Eastern Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, p13-28.

Aleks Szczerbiak & Paul Taggart. (2018). 'Contemporary research on Euroscepticism: The State of the Art' in: *The Routledge Handbook of Euroscepticism*, London: Routledge, p11-21.

Amandine Crespy & Nicolas Verschuere. (2009). 'From Euroscepticism to Resistance to European Integration: An Interdisciplinary Perspective', *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 10 (3), p377-393.

Anders Ravn Sørensen. (2014). 'The Danish euro: constructing a monetary oxymoron in the Danish euro debate', *National Identities*, 16 (1), p31-51.

Andrew Glencross. (2015). 'Going it Alone? The Choice of Political Union in British Politics', *Political Quarterly*, 86 (4), p555-562.

Attila Ágh. (2016). 'Cultural War and Reinventing the Past in Poland and Hungary: The Politics of Historical Memory in East-Central Europe', *Polish Political Science Yearbook*, 45 (1), p32-44.

Barbara Pisciotta. (2016). 'The Center-Periphery Cleavage Revisited: East and Central Europe from Postcommunism to Euroscepticism'. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 22 (2), p193-21.

Benjamin Grob-Fitzgibbon. (2016). 'Chapter 17: Mrs. Thatcher, John Major and the Road to European Union' in: *Continental Drift: Britain and Europe from the End of Empire to the Rise of Euroscepticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p423-460.

Benjamin Leruth et al. (2018). 'Chapter 1: Defining Euroscepticism: From a broad concept to a field of study' in: Benjamin Leruth et al, (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Euroscepticism*, London: Routledge, p1-5.

Carlo Cottarelli and Julio Escolano. (2004). 'Assessing the Assessment: A Critical Look at the June 2003 Assessment of the United Kingdom's Five Tests for Euro Entry'. *IMF Working Paper*, p1-47.

Cécile Leconte. (2015). 'From pathology to mainstream phenomenon: Reviewing the Euroscepticism debate in research and theory'. *International Political Science Review*, 36 (3), p250-263.

-
- Cynthia Kroet. (2018). 'Support for EU and exit referendums up across Europe: survey'. *Politico*. Available: <https://www.politico.eu/article/eu-support-increases-in-europe-continent-but-also-exit-referendum-support/>. Last accessed: July 5th 2018.
- Ewa Genge. (2014). 'A latent class analysis of the public attitude towards the euro adoption in Poland'. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, 8 (4), p427-442.
- Ferry Koster & Monika-Ewa Kaminska. (2012). 'Welfare state values in the European Union, 2002–2008. A multilevel investigation of formal institutions and individual attitudes', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 19 (6), p900-920.
- George Ross. (2011). *The European Union and its crises: through the eyes of the Brussels elite*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, p19-102.
- Hans-urgen Wagener. (2002). 'The Welfare State in Transition Economies and Accession to the EU', *West European Politics*, 25 (2), p152-174.
- Henrik Bering. (2001). 'Denmark, the Euro, and Fear of the Foreign'. *Policy Review*, 104 (1), p63-72.
- Ivan Krastev. (2016). 'The Unraveling of the Post-1989 Order' *Journal of Democracy* 27 (4), p88-98.
- Johan Nordensvard and Markus Ketola. (2015). 'Nationalist Reframing of the Finnish and Swedish Welfare States—the Nexus of Nationalism and Social Policy in Far-Right Populist Parties' *Social Policy and Administration* 49 (3), p356-375.
- John Fitzgibbon. (2013). 'Citizens against Europe? Civil Society and Eurosceptic Protest in Ireland, the United Kingdom and Denmark'. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 51 (1), p105-121.
- Jørgen Bølstad. (2015). 'Dynamics of European integration: Public opinion in the core and periphery'. *European Union Politics*, 2015, 16 (1), p23-44.
- Joseph Lacey & Rainer Bauböck. (2017). 'Enlargement, association, accession – a normative account of membership in a union of states', *Journal of European Integration*, 39 (5), p529-543.
- Jukka Snell. (2016). 'A New Settlement for the United Kingdom: Undermining the Euro by Limiting Free Movement', *European Law Review*, 41 (2), pp145-146.
- Julie Hassing Nielsen. (2016). 'Personality and Euroscepticism: The Impact of Personality on Attitudes Towards the EU'. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 2016, 54 (5), p1175-1198.
- Magdalena Lesinska. (2014). 'The European Backlash against Immigration and Multiculturalism', *Journal of Sociology* 50 (1), p37-50.

-
- Marcel Lubbers & Peer Scheepers. (2010). 'Divergent trends of Euroscepticism in countries and regions of the European Union'. *European Journal of Political Research*, 49 (6), p787-817.
- Marcin Matyja, Dorota Matyja, Krzysztof Przybyszewski & Grzegorz Banerski. (2014). 'Perception of Euro in Poland – Economic and Psychological Factors'. *Management and Business Administration*, 22 (4), p3-25.
- Marzena Cichosz. (2017). 'Chapter 15: What's the Right Kick-Off to a Good Finnish? Polish Political Parties and Their Strategies in the 2014 European Parliament Elections', in: Ruxandra Boicu, Silvia Branea & Adriana Stefanel (eds.) *Political communication and European Parliamentary elections in times of crisis: perspectives from Central and South-Eastern Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, p215-228.
- Maurits J. Meijers. (2017). 'Contagious Euroscepticism', *Party Politics*, 23 (4), p413-423.
- Nathalie Brack & Nicholas Startin. (2015). 'Introduction: Euroscepticism, from the margins to the mainstream', *International Political Science Review*, 2015, 36 (3), p239–249.
- Nathaniel Copsey. (2015). *Rethinking the European Union*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, p31-226.
- Nicholas Startin. (2018). 'Chapter 35: How the Referendum was Lost: An Analysis of the UK Referendum Campaign on EU Membership' in: *The Routledge Handbook of Euroscepticism*, London: Routledge, p456-467.
- Oliver J. Daddow. (2006). 'Euroscepticism and History Education in Britain'. *Government and Opposition*, 41 (1), p64-85.
- Oliver J. Daddow. (2013). 'Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair and the Eurosceptic Tradition in Britain', *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 15 (2), p210-227.
- Oliver Treib. (2014). 'The voter says no, but nobody listens: causes and consequences of the Eurosceptic vote in the 2014 European elections'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, p1541-1554.
- Paris Aslanidis. (2015). 'Is Populism an Ideology? A Refutation and a New Perspective' *Political Studies* 64 (1), p88-104.
- Paul Copeland. (2014). *EU enlargement, the clash of capitalisms and the European social dimension*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, p21-109.
- Paul Rowinski. (2014). 'Euroscepticism in the Berlusconi and Murdoch Press' *Journalism* 18 (8), p979-1000.
- Petr Kopecký & Cas Mudde. (2002). 'The Two Sides of Euroscepticism'. *European Union Politics*, 3 (3), p297-326.

-
- Richard Milne. (2016). 'Denmark establishment fears British breakaway will stir domestic Euroscepticism; Populism'. *The Financial Times*. Available: <https://global-factiva-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2443/ga/default.aspx> . Date accessed: May 9th 2018.
- Robert Harmsen. (2010). 'Concluding Comment: On Understanding the Relationship between Populism and Euroscepticism', *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 11 (3), p333–341.
- Roberto Henke, Theo Benos, Fabrizio De Filippis, Mara Giua, Fabio Pierangeli & Maria Rosaria Pupo D'Andrea. (2018). 'The New Common Agricultural Policy: How do Member States Respond to Flexibility?' *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56 (2), p403-419.
- Roger Cohen. (2000). 'Identity Crisis for Denmark: Are we Danes or Europeans?' *The New York Times*. Available: <https://www.nytimes.com/2000/09/10/world/identity-crisis-for-denmark-are-we-danes-or-europeans.html>. Date accessed: June 22nd 2018.
- Sara B. Hobolt. (2014). 'Ever closer or ever wider? Public attitudes towards further enlargement and integration in the European Union', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21 (5), p664-680.
- Sara B. Hobolt. (2016). 'The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23 (9), p1259-1277.
- Shivdeep Singh Grewal. (2001). 'The Paradox of Integration: Habermas and the Unfinished Project of European Union'. *Politics*, 21 (2), p114-123.
- Simon Usherwood. (2017). 'How has Brexit changed British Euroscepticism?' *Political Insight*, 8 (2), pp42-43.
- Sofia Vasilopoulou & Markus Wagner. (2017). 'Fear, anger and enthusiasm about the European Union: Effects of emotional reactions on public preferences towards European integration'. *European Union Politics*, 18 (3), p382-405.
- Tapio Raunio. (2007). 'Softening but Persistent: Euroscepticism in the Nordic EU Countries'. *Acta Politica*, 42 (2-3), p191-210.
- Tim Bale. (2018). "'Who Leads and Who Follows?'" The Symbiotic Relationship between UKIP and the Conservatives—and populism and Euroscepticism' *Politics* (2018), p1-15.
- Vanessa Barker. (2017). *Nordic Nationalism and Penal Order: Walling the Welfare State*. London: Taylor and Francis, p1-124.
- William M. Downs. (2001). 'Denmark's referendum on the euro: The mouse that roared ... again', *West European Politics*, 24 (1), p222-226.