



EUROPEAN
COUNCIL
ON FOREIGN
RELATIONS

ecfr.eu

BRIEF
POLICY

ANNEX:

FELLOW TRAVELLERS: RUSSIA, ANTI-WESTERNISM, AND EUROPE'S POLITICAL PARTIES

Gustav Gressel

MAIN PAPER SUMMARY

- There is a large amount of ideological overlap between some European political parties and the Russian government. Significantly, these include parties considered to be 'mainstream' – it is not just 'fringe' parties which share elements of the Kremlin's world-view.
- European political parties range from those that are 'hardcore' in their 'anti-Westernism' to those that are fully pro-Western. The former are much more open to cooperation with Russia and are generally aligned with its priorities.
- Strong election showings from anti-Western parties can change the character of entire national political systems. Most countries are 'resilient' to 'anti-Western' politics, but a large minority are favourable towards Russian standpoints. Important players like France and Italy form part of the 'Malleable Middle' group of countries which Moscow may seek to cultivate.
- The populist, anti-Western revolt of the last decade did not originate in Russia. But it is yet to run its course, and Western politicians should act now to prevent Russian taking further advantage of it.

1. The methodology of the party survey

The challenge of this paper was to measure anti-Western ideological patterns in such a way as to ensure results across Europe were comparable. If a survey were only to ask, for example, "How Eurosceptic is a certain party?" researchers working in different political environments might have very different understandings of the term 'Euroscepticism'. I decided to create a survey with ideological statements provided. A researcher would have to identify which precoded statement best represented parties' views on particular topics. Statements were identical across all countries, to ensure that different ideologies could be mapped and compared.

As a first step I collected an array of pro-Western and anti-Western statements visible in contemporary political debates. Then I simplified them to provide short statements representing the different opinions and ideological fissures across Europe. I sent the questions to colleagues and researchers for their views about whether these statements were representative of the political debate and to ask what may be missing. Bringing some items together into single questions sometimes meant making some compromises. For example, researchers from non-aligned countries complained that the European Union and NATO were put together in the statements on the European security order. For them, NATO and EU represent very different things. However, for most EU member states which are also NATO members, they are not. For researchers from western Europe it was inconceivable that the OSCE should be represented at all in this question, as many regard it as irrelevant. On the other hand, its omission would have been unacceptable to non-aligned states. In the end, some sort of compromise was found on statements that dissatisfied all on an equal level.

Another issue was how to deal with coalitions and party alliances. If a voting block remained as one administrative body after the election – sharing or merging party structures and offices in parliament – the block was treated as one party. If the block was an electoral coalition that had no cooperation other than a shared list on election day (no shared or merged structures), the parties were treated as individual parties. This of course required some discussion, particularly with Bulgarian, French, Italian, and Portuguese colleagues, as such blocks are particularly common in their party systems.

All parties represented in national parliaments or the European Parliament were identified, using the Fisher Weltalmanach – a German encyclopaedia on political and economic affairs – as reference.¹ Altogether, 252 parties across 28 EU member states were identified. Questionnaires comprising 12 questions each were sent out to national researchers, with the relevant political parties included for an individual researcher's country. Editing the surveys was completed in December 2016 and the survey was open from early January 2017 to the end of March 2017.

The 12 questions covered:

1. *The 'finality' of the EU.* While Euro-federalist views are the most pro-Western approach represented in the survey, other pro-Western stances still include support for deepening the European integration process and keeping alive the possibility of further enlargement. The neutral view would leave things as they are. Anti-Western standpoints rest on over-extension and over-burdening of the EU, calling for returning policy areas to the level of the member state, or revoking the supranational character as such. The most radical anti-Western position is to call for a dissolution of the EU or for one's country to leave.

2. *Liberalism as a European value.* The pro-Western position on this question is to embrace liberalism and the ideological heritage of the Enlightenment as essential pillars of the post-1945 political order. A neutral stance on this would be to state that liberalism is important but equal to other political values such as equality and solidarity. An anti-Western stance would reject liberalism as an Anglo-Saxon concept not in line with European traditions or European political culture. The most radical illiberal statements designate liberals as elitist conspirators working against their own culture and people.

3. *Secularism as a European value.* The most pro-Western statement calls on Western societies to overcome religious bigotry of any kind through a secular order. Others state that, although based on Christian roots, Europe's societies have evolved and the coexistence of different religions under a secular order is feasible. The anti-Western statements available in the survey call this into question, regarding even Europe's secular order as something exclusively based on its Christian roots. On this view, migrants with different cultural backgrounds would not fit in. More radical anti-Western statements would consider

secularism to be dangerous, a policy that could allow Islam to take Europe over.

4. *Views on the European security order.* The most pro-Western statements set out that common norms, common values, and a democratic constitution are preconditions to a common security architecture. Security at this stage can only be guaranteed by the EU and NATO. Those stressing the role of the OSCE as a common organisation occupy a more neutral position, while on the anti-Western side the 'expansion' of NATO and the EU is blamed for the tensions in Europe. They stress the necessity to find common ground with Russia and other authoritarian systems. The most anti-Western position is to dissolve NATO in favour of an alliance with Russia.

5. *Views on transatlantic relations.* When this question was originally conceived in October 2016, the patterns were clear: the most pro-Western answers stressed the importance of the transatlantic link based on common values and interests, while the anti-Westerners leaned towards anti-Americanism. However, the election of Donald Trump changed everything, as he is, in essence, an anti-Western president. I therefore had to rewrite the items, with pro-Western forces stating a wish to save the West from Trump and maintain a transatlantic link despite him. An additional anti-Western position was added that would see the transatlantic link based on a Trumpian or Bannonist world-view.

6. *Views on free trade and globalisation.* Pro-Western positions hold that free trade and globalisation are positive, and that governance issues can be resolved through international organisations. The anti-Westernist stances are isolationist and protectionist, either in favour of protecting national workers and trade union rights or national industries and national culture.

7. *Relations with Russia.* Pro-Western statements regard Russia as a revisionist power intending to change the current European order, while anti-Western answers regard it as a 'normal' great power with 'legitimate' interests in its neighbourhood or even as a strategic partner and ally, particularly in the 'fight against terror'.

8. *Sanctions on Russia.* This is a follow-up to question 7. The pro-Western answers state that Russia needs to be punished for its ongoing violations of international law, while the anti-Western answers want lift sanctions as quickly as possible for the sake of own economic interest as well as to forge ties with Russia.

9. *Support for Ukraine.* The pro-Western answers to this question state that every country has the right to choose its alliance and role model for social, political, and economic modernisation – as long as Ukraine is committed to Westernisation it deserves support. The anti-Western answers deny this, stating that Moscow's interests in the neighbourhood come first, and that great power interests

¹ Fischer Weltalmanach 2017, S Fischer Verlag GmbH, Frankfurt am Main.

come before self-determination.

10. *Views on refugees and migration.* The pro-Western answers reiterate Europe's humanitarian responsibility and that this is a common task which all states should share in. Migrant communities could be integrated if policies to do this are put in place. The anti-Western answers state that the influx of non-Christian migrants will lead to serious disruption or even the end of Europe as we know it because 'alien' cultures cannot be integrated.

11. *Views on the war in Syria.* Pro-Western statements maintain that authoritarian repression was responsible for the outbreak of the conflict and it would therefore only end if a form of government is found that represents the interests of all religious and ethnic groups in that country. On the anti-Western side, some believe that states in the Muslim world can only be ruled with an iron fist and so Russia's intervention on the side of Bashar al-Assad was the only thing to be done.

12. *The party's links to Russia.* The pro-Western answers distance political parties from the Russian regime, and/or they support Russian civil society and opposition movements. On the anti-Western side, parties either promote Russia's economic interests, are a mouthpiece of Russian propaganda, or cultivate close ties with the Kremlin.

The survey was completed by 91 researchers, based variously in universities, think-tanks, and national media outlets. The survey respondents were therefore subject specialists rather than a broader sample of public opinion. Diplomats and party officials were not approached for reasons of impartiality.

The response rate was: Poland 10, Germany 9, Finland 7, Austria 5, Italy 5, Romania 5, Slovakia 5, Sweden 5, Czech Republic 4, France 4, Hungary 4, Netherlands 4, Spain 4, Belgium 3, Bulgaria 3, Denmark 2, Greece 2, Latvia 2, United Kingdom 2, Cyprus 1, Estonia 1, Lithuania 1, Malta 1, Slovenia 1, Portugal 1, Luxembourg 0, Ireland 0, Croatia 0. Responses from Cyprus, Latvia, and Lithuania were unsatisfactory and incomplete and had to be discarded from the survey. Data from Belgium and Slovenia need to be treated with caution, as their findings do not tally with the findings of other reports on the political discourse in these countries.

Methodologically, the survey comprised a series of quantified qualitative interviews rather than a quantitative survey. Apart from the item values (see below) of the individual party list, the data is not suited for the use of sophisticated statistical instruments. Comparing countries with each other or making comparisons within single national parliamentary systems had to rest on descriptive comparisons. Only among the parties' item values I dared to try to investigate whether individual items correlate across the party spectrum (whether parties supporting

A would also support, or oppose, B). But otherwise the numbers are purely descriptive, and should be treated as such.

The survey comprises researchers' assessments of parties' public statements to the domestic audience, and the insight these give into ideological standpoints. The results showed that some governing parties vote differently in Brussels from what they say they would do at home, on topics such as sanctions on Russia, Euroscepticism, and support for Ukraine. But this is a survey about ideological affinities, not about government policies. This was a deliberate choice. Government policies or voting behaviour in the European Council is subject to a dynamic on its own. Governments make compromises in one field to gain in others. It is about tactics and interests, not about ideology. But ideology and domestic communication are used to rally supporters, mobilise the electorate, and attract members and donors, ideology and domestic signalling reveals much more about the mood and attitudes of the political, social, and economic groups the parties represent in those countries. Political influencing on the other hand does not address only the top executive level. As seen in the examples cited in the paper, political influencing often concerned the wider operative environments of political decision-makers: parties, economic entities close to political parties, government officials, bureaucrats, media representatives and outlets, or opinion-makers. I therefore designed the survey to measure domestic signalling and ideology, not governmental decisions.

In the cases of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, France, Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia, individual responses and additional feedback from researchers on the survey helped to clarify issues, strengthening the validity of the statements.

Researchers were able to choose multiple answers per party, as political parties usually represent a wide range of opinions. The survey also included fields to indicate a party split on a particular matter or whether a party is neutral on a topic and/or does not regard the topic as something worth debating. For the states from which I received more than a few responses, I was also able to judge the range of positions identified with a single party: is the party's vision coherent, or do researchers attribute it with different and contradictory statements, indicating that the party is not united on the issue?

All statements had a particular numerical value ranging from +3 to -3 (in extreme cases -4), with +3 representing the most pro-Western statement and -3 the most anti-Western statement. As researchers could choose multiple statements per question for one party, an average value of the responses attributed to the party was calculated for each response. A 0.75 factor was then applied if the researchers marked the party as split. A factor of 0.5 was applied if researchers marked the party as entirely neutral or indifferent on an issue. The resulting number

representing the stance of a party towards one specific item is called the 'item value' (IV). IVs may vary from +3 to -3. However, in practice they are lower, with numbers from 0 to ± 1 indicating a slight inclination towards Western or anti-Western stances, numbers between ± 1 and ± 2 showing a strong inclination, and all scores above ± 2 a very strong inclination. In the policy brief, statements about whether a party supports one or the other positions (for example, whether it is judged to be Eurosceptic, liberal, and so on) rests on the party's IV on the respective item (EU integration, liberalism, and so on). All IVs are listed in the table attached in this annex.

The sum of all 12 IVs of each party represents the overall stance of the party and whether it can be described as anti-Western or not. This number is called 'party index' (PI). The table containing all 181 parties evaluated in this report was ranked according to the PI.

The national index (NI) indicates the affinity of the entire party system towards pro- or anti-Western positions. The NI is calculated by multiplying the PI of each party represented in national parliament with the respective ratio of the party's national representation: representation ratio $R = (\text{seats in the lower house} + \text{seats in the upper house}) / (\text{total seats in the lower house} + \text{total seats in the upper house})$. This is done with all parties represented in national parliaments, and their numbers are added up. To illustrate the NI: if a country's unicameral parliament has 100 seats, 60 of which are occupied by party A, 25 seats by party B, and 15 seats by party C, the national index would be calculated $NI = PI_A * 0.6 + PI_B * 0.25 + PI_C * 0.15$ (the respective representation ratio (R) is 0.6, 0.25 and 0.15) or $NI = PI_A * R_A + PI_B * R_B + PI_C * R_C$.

The NI reveals where small but strongly anti-Western parties sit in relation to other national parties. A party might have a very negative PI, but if its national representation ratio is only marginal, it will not feature prominently on the NI. On the other hand, if mainstream parties support anti-Western positions, their impact on the NI is significant.

Both the indexes – the party index and the national index – are values comprising the sum of all 12 answers. Therefore their value can vary to a much greater extent than the item values: in practice the NI varies from -9.32 to +16.58 and the PI from about -35.53 to +28.08. Both values are used to rank parties or nations. They are not suited to be compared with individual items for methodological reasons.

To compare the different parliamentary systems on their stances on individual items, the 'national item value' (NIV) is calculated. Each party's IV on a particular question (EU integration, or liberalism, or any other individual item) is multiplied by the party's respective representation ratio. Then all parties represented in the national parliament are taken together. The formula is: $NIV = IV_A * R_A + IV_B * R_B + IV_C * R_C$. Again, the NIV locates

small, strongly anti-Western parties in relation to other parties. Only the larger parties have a significant impact on the NIV, and a negative NIV indicates that the national consensus – not only some anti-system parties – is tilted towards anti-Westernism. In theory a NIV can range from +3 and -3. But as the value represents a broad variety of parties, it varies in much smaller margins than the IV. Numbers from 0 to ± 0.5 represent a slight inclination, ± 0.5 to ± 1 a strong inclination, ± 1 to ± 2 a very strong inclination and everything above ± 2 is an exceptionally strong national consensus. The NIV allows comparisons of ideological inclinations towards each of the 12 issues between all the 22 states covered in the survey. Patterns across certain member states allow similar-minded countries to be grouped according to these values – as done in the policy brief.

2. Remarks on the party systems and the clustering of parties

Out of the 252 parties represented in either the 28 national parliaments or the European Parliament, the survey produced enough data to provide an assessment on 181 of them. In the paper, I grouped the parties into (1) hardcore anti-Western parties, (2) moderate anti-Western parties, (3) moderate pro-Western parties, particularly the "indifferent left", and (4) fully pro-Western parties. The rationale behind such grouping is based on numbers, elaborated on here.

Whether a party is judged to be anti-Western or not depends on the party's PI value. Sixty-one parties have a negative PI, and so are judged to be anti-Western. However, it is more difficult to draw a line between fully anti- or pro-Western parties and moderate anti- and pro-Western parties. The individual IVs of fully anti-Western parties have strong to very strong inclinations towards anti-Western positions. Pro-Western stances are occasional, and show only slight inclinations to pro-Western stances. Among moderate anti-Western parties, pro-Western stances become more strong and more frequent, while anti-Western inclinations in individual IVs are more moderate. With moderate and fully pro-Western parties, it is the other way round. The table attached to this text illustrates those groupings.

3. Does 'anti-Western' mean 'pro-Russian'?

There is no definition of a 'pro-Russian' party, and the survey would not allow parties to be identified in such a way. Three of the questions in the survey (on the relationship with Russia, sanctions, and party links to Russia) are directly relate to Russia. Three other questions indirectly relate to Russia (the European security order, support for Ukraine, and the war in Syria). To be awarded a negative PI, it is not enough to have anti-Western positions only on the Russia-related items. Anti-Western parties need to reject other moments of the European order as well, such as European integration, secularism, open societies, free trade and economic globalisation, or the

transatlantic link. Being an anti-Western party is therefore different from being a pro-Russian party. For the reasons described below, question 7 (“relationship to Russia”) was the item best suited for judging the parties’ stance on Russia. When the policy brief states that a party is inclined towards positive views on Russia, it is usually referring to this question.

However, there is a strong link between pro-Russian stances on individual items and anti-Western attitudes. Looking into the correlation of IVs, the IV for the question on the relationship to Russia (question 7) correlates strongly with sanctions² and support for Ukraine,³ but even more so with the issues of the European security order,⁴ transatlantic relations,⁵ and free trade and globalisation.⁶ This means that a party sceptical of Russia also wants sanctions to stay, embraces strong transatlantic relations, and favours free trade. Meanwhile, a party that perceives Russia as a strategic partner wants sanctions to be removed instantly, is hostile towards the United States, and favours economic autarky and protectionism. Correlations between the issues relations with Russia, and European integration,⁷ and the war in Syria⁸ are weaker but still significant. This means that parties which perceive Russia as a partner are Eurosceptical and want the Syrian civil war to be resolved through restoring Assad’s rule.

4. The left-right divide – and why it is irrelevant

The ranking of the anti-Western parties is led by prominent extremist right-wing parties like the Bulgarian party *Ataka* (PI -35.53), Kotleba – our Slovakia (PI -33.14), *Jobbik* (PI -27.64), *Front National* (PI -26.89), *Fratelli d’Italia-Centrodestra Nazionale* (PI -26.02), the United Kingdom Independence Party (PI -26.00), *Lega Nord* (PI -25.73), and the Austrian Freedom Party (PI -22.42). But left-wing parties do not fall far behind. Of the 61 parties inclined towards anti-Westernism, 20 are left-wing parties, including communist or ex-communist parties like: the Czech Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (PI -12.05) and the *Front de Gauche* (PI -11.50), new left-wing anti system parties like the Five Star Movement (PI -15.33) and *Unidos Podemos* (PI -6.60); left-wing separatist regional parties like *EH Bildu* (PI -10.50) in Spain, left-wing anti-bourgeois green parties like the Portuguese Green Party (PI -14.00) or the Austrian Green Party (PI -0.70); and governing mainstream socialist parties like the Bulgarian Socialist Party (PI -18.13) or the Austrian Social Democrats (PI -4.73). Anti-Westernism is not restricted to the right-wing fringes of the ideological spectrum, but instead forms a *Querfront* (‘front’) of left-wing and right-wing forces against the current political order.

2 Symetric Somers’ d 0.65, p-value 0.000, n=146.

3 Symetric Somers’ d 0.59, p-value 0.000, n=148.

4 Symetric Somers’ d 0.60, p-value 0.000, n=144.

5 Symetric Somers’ d 0.53, p-value 0.000, n=149.

6 Symetric Somers’ d 0.50, p-value 0.000, n=147.

7 Symetric Somers’ d 0.33, p-value 0.000, n=149.

8 Symetric Somers’ d 0.40, p-value 0.000, n=138.

I used the left-right divide as a control variable for testing correlations between various items in the survey. However, aside from the issue of secularism, the left-right divide proved entirely irrelevant. There are Eurosceptic left-wing and right-wing parties just as there are illiberal and anti-globalist left-wing and right-wing parties. Whether a party considers itself politically right-wing or political left-wing has no impact on its agenda, and says nothing about its ideology. Judging from the survey results, being ‘left’ or being ‘right’ is more an issue of tradition and lifestyle. In each of the 22 countries surveyed, ‘left’ and ‘right’ parties occupy different niches in the ideological spectrum. Parties with similar ideological patterns call themselves ‘conservative’ in Hungary and ‘social democratic’ in Slovakia or Austria. Likewise, the left-right divide says little about pro-Russian attitudes. Advocating close relations with Russia is popular among both anti-Western right-wing and anti-Western left-wing parties. Lifting sanctions is advocated by some left-wing and right-wing parties, and close party links to the regime are maintained by both left-wing and right-wing parties.

The only evident split in the anti-Western camp is that on secularism and how to deal with the refugee crisis. The reason there is no correlation between advocacy for close ties with Russia (Q7) and anti-secular thought (Q3),⁹ as well as attitudes towards the refugee crisis (Q10),¹⁰ is above all the difference between right-wing and left-wing pro-Russian parties on these issues. This is puzzling to a certain extent, as Russian propaganda in Europe is increasingly strident about Europe being ‘overrun’ by Muslim migrants. Still, there are various pro-refugee left-wing parties that are also strongly inclined to pro-Russian views (such as *Unidos Podemos* and *Die Linke*). The visible – but much weaker – correlation of advocating closer ties with Russia (Q7) and anti-liberal stances is only due to mostly moderate left-wing parties’ strong support for liberalism on the one hand and wish for close ties to Russia on the other.¹¹ As Russia is the epicentre of an illiberal revolt against established elites (particularly liberal social democratic parties) this desire among social democratic parties to forge closer ties with Russia and a positive relationship with the Kremlin – the ideological role-model of their fiercest enemies – was called in the main report “the indifferent left”.

5. Missing responses

Another number that reveals much about the ideological struggle taking place in Europe is the collection of topics in the survey which received no response from the researchers. Where no response was received for a particular party’s position on a topic, none of the researchers was able to judge the respective party’s position on an item – because it is not discussed in that party or not discussed at all in that particular nation. The highest number of missing items is

9 Symetric Somers’ d 0.06, p-value 0.368, n=145.

10 Symetric Somers’ d 0.14, p-value 0.041, n=150.

11 Symetric Somers’ d 0.26, p-value 0.000, n=152; However, a general correlation between ‘left’ parties and support for liberalism could not be established (Cramer’s V 0.66, p-value 0.105, n=171).

for the war in Syria (Q11), with 34 missing responses. In many places there is a feeling that their country has no say in this matter and so no responses were forthcoming. The second is Relations with Russia (Q7), with 29 missing items. This is followed by: European security order with 28 (Q4), party links to Russia with 27 (Q12), sanctions with 25 (Q8), support for Ukraine with 23 (Q9), transatlantic relations with 16 (Q5), free trade and globalisation with 16 (Q6), secularism with 14 (Q3), refugee crisis with 14 (Q10), liberalism with 10 (Q2), and European integration (Q1) with eight responses missing. Strikingly, foreign policy topics lead this ranking. Across Europe, the ideological debate about the current and future European order is above all a debate on domestic politics, and foreign policy issues will only play a role if they strongly affect domestic politics like the refugee crisis. Many pro-Russian parties use Russia as a topic for domestic signalling: to show their dissent with current elites. It is not necessarily about Russian foreign policy per se.

6. Remarks about party systems

Just as political parties were ranked in the party index (PI), the 22 countries surveyed here were ranked in the national index (NI). And, as the dispersion and ratio of pro- and anti-Western IVs among political parties was used to cluster them into certain groups, the NIVs were used to divide the individual nations into groups.

The first group, the “anti-Western Stalwarts”, is easy to identify: Hungary, Austria, Greece, Slovakia, and Bulgaria are the five countries where anti-Western ideological patterns dominate the political spectrum. On the 12 questions, the anti-Western patterns are in the majority in a ratio of 10:2 in Hungary, 12:0 in Austria, 8:4 in Greece, 10:2 in Slovakia and 10:2 in Bulgaria. It is worth looking at the ranking and item values of the governing and mainstream parties of those countries – most of which rank negative – and the respective anti-Western patterns in the NIV.

In the second group, the “Malleable Middle”, the pro-Western inclination of the party systems are stronger than anti-Western leanings: in the Czech Republic (NI +2.13) pro-Western stances lead 8:4, in France (NI +2.91) 9:3, and in Italy (NI +4.53) 9:3. However, anti-Western dissent in these countries is predominantly about Russia (Q7 on relations with Russia, Q8 on sanctions, and Q12 on party links), as the liberal and secular inclinations of the pro-Western parties are strong enough to prevent those parliamentary systems from having negative marks on those NIV as well. However, looking closer into the ideological patterns of those parties promoting close ties with Russia – like *Forza Italia* in Italy (PI -3.00) or *Les Républicains* (PI -2.33) in France – reveals that they are anti-Western in a wider sense. Again, for them Russia is an ideological statement above all, and their support for closer ties with Russia a signal to the domestic audience to underpin the party’s anti-Western inclination.

Among the other parliamentary systems, anti-Western patterns are rather isolated and do not reveal a particular link to Russia. In the countries around the Baltic Sea (Finland, Sweden, Estonia, Poland, Denmark), there is even a consensus that, regardless of the anti-Western positions of some parties (like Law and Justice in Poland), Russia is neither a role model nor a strategic partner.

Looking at the countries in northern Europe (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom) reveals that key elements of the post-1945 order in Europe – free trade, the transatlantic link, and liberalism – are accepted throughout the party system, often including the anti-Western parties. In the south, these items are much more contested. It is also striking that in the north Eurosceptic parties also support free trade, while in the south support for free trade always coincides with support for EU integration. This has historic reasons. In the north, free trade policies were in place before accession to the EU and seem like a natural choice. In the south protectionist policies prevailed until European integration overcame them. Hence the EU is understood as an agent for economic liberalisation.

7. Spread

As the response rate per country was low, the survey permits few conclusions based on the spread of answers (whether researchers attributed similar ideological patterns to a party’s ties with Russia or whether they disagreed about the ideological stance of those parties). Responses from Hungary and Bulgaria indicated the highest level of cohesion among experts. They judged the parties the same way and needed few items to describe the parties’ ideological stance. A high level of cohesion was observed in other central and eastern European states. This indicated that the ideological statements provided in this survey are better suited to identifying which parties in this region are anti-Western versus which are pro-Western parties.

In north and south-western Europe, missing responses were more frequent, and there were larger spreads between researchers, indicating that the statements provided by this survey were less ideal for identifying ideological differences in those regions. It would be valuable to repeat this exercise on a larger scale with more input from Scandinavian and south-eastern European researchers on the formulation of the ideological statements.

8. The incoherent Visegrad Four

Since Law and Justice won the parliamentary election in November 2015, it has tried to establish Poland as the leader of the Visegrad Four (Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia). However, according to this survey, Poland shares few common features with the other Visegrad countries (except for anti-secular patterns). Even on issues where numbers are similar, details reveal the differences. In numbers the Visegrad Four tend

towards low positive or negative attitudes on transatlantic relations. But in Poland, however, the negative ranking occurs only because Law and Justice and Kukiz'15 want to build the transatlantic link on a 'Trumpian' world-view. Among the other Visegrad countries, Euro-chauvinist anti-Americanism is widespread. Both show up as negative values in the survey, but they are negative for very different reasons. On the European security order and particularly on Russia, the rift between Poland and the other Visegrad countries is most obvious. The country most closely resembling Poland is Finland. However, there are limits to the similarities between countries around the Baltic Sea. Poland obviously lacks a Scandinavian-style left. The Scandinavian countries lack the very openly pro-European parties like the Civic Platform in Poland (IV +1.92 on supporting the EU) and *Nowoczesna* (IV +2.23 respectively). In the other Scandinavian countries the entire party system is much more inclined towards free trade and economic liberalism (NIV in Sweden 0.46, Denmark 0.84), while in Finland (NIV +0.07) and Poland (NIV -0.01) state-centric economic thought is much more common. The data suggests that Poland should intensify cooperation with other northern European countries, particularly its neighbours across the Baltic Sea. In the north, countries are relatively Eurosceptical, relatively pro-American, relatively liberal on the economy, and particularly sceptical towards Russia.

9. Topics

While the survey is far from complete on all the issues that drive Europe ideologically, looking closer at the EU average on the 12 topics under question and the correlations between them could provide useful hints about the importance of these issues for the ongoing populist surge as well as for Russia's ability to exploit it.

The only issue where the European average tilts towards the anti-Western line is the question about party links to Russia (Q12; average NIV -0.090). Of the 22 states surveyed the national party system in 12 countries tilts towards anti-Westernism. Parties are therefore at least somewhat willing to engage with Vladimir Putin's regime and to act as an agent for Russian interests at home (promoting deeper economic ties, quoting Russian propaganda, or deepening personal and institutional links with the regime). The numbers reveal a high level of political subversion particularly in Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Italy. But at the European level, the problem might be less dramatic than indicated by the numbers. The response rate to this question is low, particularly from northern European countries, where a lot of parties engage in human rights advocacy and civil society dialogue with Russia (such activities would have resulted in more positive marks for northern European parties). So the survey might not adequately reflect the positive contribution of those parties, and the European average might have shifted. In any case the north-south and east-west divisions were visible in the survey. While the protestant north is fairly

immune to the lure of strengthening party ties with actors in Russia (average NIV +0.753), the Catholic and Orthodox south is not (average NIV -0.484). On no other issue is the difference between the two larger (a difference of +1.237). According to individual feedback from researchers in many states, particularly in Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia, and Romania, influencing by Russia is made easier by weak transparency rules, oligarchic or state-centric media structures, weak public accountability of the governments, the failure to implement of EU legislation (particularly the third energy package), and weak counterintelligence services. This makes it particularly easy for Russia to cultivate close ties with mainstream parties and government officials – the former having much greater impact on the national ranking than Russian ties to obscure anti-system parties.

As mentioned in the policy brief, anti-secular thoughts or the fear of losing Europe's Christian identity is the most interesting pattern of identity issues revealed by the survey. Eight countries have a parliamentary system tending towards anti-Westernism: Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Slovakia, Romania, Greece, Austria, Finland. The EU average NIV is low, standing at +0.107. This topic stands out for other reasons as well. It does not correlate with any apparent desire to forge close ties with Russia, indicating that the issue concerns more than just Russia's allies in Europe.¹² Correlations with social liberalism¹³ or the refugee crisis¹⁴ is visible. Liberal parties tend to be secular. But other correlations are too weak to take them into account. This means that anti-secular thought is spread across a wide range of parties; and this variable appears to operate independently of the parties' thoughts on other issues like EU integration, free trade, and issues of European security. For example, there are a number of pro-European parties which are anti-secular as well. However, "secularism" and "the refugee crisis" are the only two topics in the survey that correlate with the classical left-right scheme.¹⁵ It is the only identity issue that seems to capture wider segments of the centre-right middle class. It is therefore ideally suited to splitting national consensus and paralysing political debate.

On the question about relations with Russia, ten countries lean towards the anti-Western line: Greece, Hungary, Austria, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Portugal, Italy, Belgium. The EU average NIV is +0.238. The topic is also inherently divisive, as national consensus vary greatly, from an NIV of -1.34 in Greece to +2.12 in Poland. The division is especially pronounced between the EU's north and south.¹⁶

On free trade and globalisation party systems in seven countries indicate preferences for the anti-Western

¹² Symmetric Somers' d 0.06, p-value 0.368, n=145.

¹³ Symmetric Somers' d 0.41, p-value 0.000, n=163.

¹⁴ Symmetric Somers' d 0.46, p-value 0.000, n=160.

¹⁵ Secularism and left-right scheme: Cramer's V 0.74, p-value 0.003, n=166; refugee crisis and left-right scheme: Cramer's V 0.64, p-value 0.011, n=167.

¹⁶ The north-south division and Russia correlate strongly: Cramer's V 0.80, p-value 0.001, n=152.

arguments: Austria, Hungary, Greece, Slovakia, Bulgaria, France, and Poland. The EU average NIV is +0.260. Support for free trade correlates strongest with a strong position on the “European security order”¹⁷ and “transatlantic relations”.¹⁸ It is an essential pillar of the post-1945 Western identity fostered by the Marshall Plan and the economic success of post-war Europe.

On sanctions, the national discourse is in favour of lifting them as soon as possible in seven countries (Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, and Slovakia), but the EU average is on the side of keeping them (average IV +0.342).

On liberalism as European value, the party systems in Hungary, Austria, Greece, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Poland tilt towards illiberal stances. Still the EU average NIV of +0.391 is positive. Liberalism correlates moderately with all other 11 issues, indicating the central position that the idea of civic self-determination takes in the struggle with the anti-Westernists. As Russia is the epicentre and role model of the illiberal revolt in Europe, the political battle with both Russia and its fellow travellers will be about this issue. It is therefore perhaps little surprise that the most pro-Western parties in this survey strongly embrace liberalism.

On the war in Syria, only five party systems (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Finland, and Austria) overall support a solution on Assad’s or Russian terms (EU average NIV +0.479).

On the refugee crisis, seven nations tilt towards an anti-Western line: Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Austria, Bulgaria. But the EU average NIV +0.519 is surprisingly high. But the issue is closely related to that of secularism and may prove more explosive if the numbers of refugees from the Middle East rise again.

Euroscepticism seems to be a minor issue, with only three nations ranked negatively: Hungary, Denmark, and Austria. The EU average NIV of +0.545. However, it is the only issue where the north is more anti-Western than the south, having the impression that the south is living at the expense of the north’s hard work. Most parties link support for the EU to other security-related items. This correlates most strongly with support for free trade,¹⁹ the European security order,²⁰ and the transatlantic link.²¹ A strong link to support for Ukraine is visible as well.²² This suggest that Europeans perceive the EU as a means to secure and safeguard their freedom and prosperity.

On transatlantic relations, five countries tending towards an anti-Western position: Hungary, Greece, Austria,

Bulgaria, Slovakia reject a transatlantic bond based on Western liberal values.²³ The EU average NIV is +0.781. On the European security order, only four countries reject an order built on Euro-Atlantic institutions: Greece, Austria, Hungary, Slovakia. The average NIV in Europe is +0.781. While many countries seek closer ties with Russia, few want to abandon NATO.

Despite talk of ‘Ukraine fatigue’ in Europe, support for Ukraine is the least controversial issue. Only two countries – Austria and Bulgaria – have a party system sceptical of support for Ukraine; the EU average NIV is +0.877. However, the Dutch referendum on the EU’s Association Agreement with Ukraine also showed that Ukraine may be quickly thrown under the bus if it is connected to other identity issues that matter more to the electorate such as Euroscepticism. And while support for Ukraine may be strong rhetorically, in practice only a few countries have substantially contributed to the support effort.²⁴

10. Is there a wider Russian strategy?

Even before the survey was finished, I was confronted with the question of what role the “fellow travellers” would play in Russian foreign policy and what use Russia would be to them. The survey does not give any direct answer to those questions. It can only assess the spread of ideological patterns that facilitate Russian influencing. Nevertheless, some results of the survey coincide with other observations. And since sending out the survey, I have discussed Russian influencing in various countries with researchers involved in the project, which allowed me to make some preliminary remarks on the issue.

As stated in the policy brief, signalling is the main purpose of pro-Russian rhetoric or visits to Russia. For moderate anti-Western mainstream parties in particular (such as *Forza Italia* or *Les Republicains*), such activities are visible signs that they do not toe the traditional Western line of their established, liberal opponents. But to more radical anti-Western parties, Russia is more than just a signal. They share much of the anti-Western ideology promoted by the Kremlin. To them, the Kremlin is proof that their ideas work. Both the Kremlin and European radical anti-Western parties share the view that the West is in decline and that the liberal order is unsustainable. In the long run, only ‘patriotic’ forces may save Europe, or they will have to rebuild Europe from liberal ruins. For that, they would need the support of a benevolent hegemon – much like the liberal-bourgeois reconstruction after 1945 was only possible through the support of the United States. Russia without doubt is the most powerful illiberal state on the European continent, so in the mind of Europe’s hardcore anti-Westernists it would perform this role. (For obvious reasons, parties

17 Symmetric Somers’ d 0.62, p-value 0.000, n=152.

18 Symmetric Somers’ d 0.62, p-value 0.000, n=158.

19 Symmetric Somers’ d 0.51, p-value 0.000, n=162.

20 Symmetric Somers’ d 0.48, p-value 0.000, n=151.

21 Symmetric Somers’ d 0.45, p-value 0.000, n=162.

22 Symmetric Somers’ d 0.44, p-value 0.000, n=154.

23 In Poland the transatlantic bond is not rejected as such, but Law and Justice wants to base it not on common liberal values but on Trumpian or Bannonist values.

24 For more on the support effort, see Gustav Gressel, *Keeping Up Appearances: How the EU Supports Ukraine’s Transformation*, ECFR, October 2016, available at http://www.ecfr.eu/publications/summary/keeping_up_appearances_how_europe_is_supporting_ukraines_transformation.

like the *Front National* or the Austrian Freedom Party will not turn towards Recep Tayyip Erdogan's Turkey – the other illiberal dictatorship in Europe – for help).

This ideological sympathy based on a radical illiberal view as well as a social Darwinian attitude towards history is particularly strong between the Russian intelligence services and ultra-conservative oligarchs in Russia and right-wing extremist parties in Europe. Most recent research has concentrated on these connections.²⁵ However, this is not the complete picture. A lot of Russian influencing activities target European mainstream parties, European business elites, and established forces within European societies. The survey has revealed that among some mainstream parties too, anti-Western thought is present. There is no doubt that they assist Russian influencing activity, or will make the relationship with those parties and social forces more robust. But it is not the same kind of 'anti-system brotherhood' (like with extremist parties) that unites these forces with their Russian counterparts. The moderate anti-Western parties are still moderates.

While little research has been done on Russian influencing of the political mainstream, it seems that the Russian foreign ministry, Russian diplomats, Russian big businesses (particularly energy companies), and Russian cultural and intellectual actors prefer to cultivate ties with European mainstream parties and particularly the moderate anti-Western ones.²⁶ That said, the Russian foreign ministry and the foreign policy establishment (such as former diplomats, think-tanks) are much less anti-Western than their counterparts in the secret services. The Russian intelligence community on the other hand embraces anti-Semitic and anti-American conspiracy theories and a social Darwinian, illiberal world-view that is comparable to those of Europe's most far-right or even fascist parties.

But who drives Russian foreign policy? What is the actual influence of the Russian foreign ministry compared to the intelligence community? The decisions to annex Crimea and invade Donbas were advocated by the intelligence services. The foreign ministry was not involved in those decisions, or was overruled.²⁷ This is indeed a worrying

²⁵ See for recent research: Anton Shekhovtsov, *Moskau und die Rechten, Wie radikale Gruppierungen Unterstützung von Moskau erhalten*, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, Reihe Impulse, Nr. 539, Juli/August 2016 (a book on the same matter is due to arrive in autumn); Péter Krekó, Lóránt Györi, Edit Zgut, *From Russia with Hate, The activity of pro-Russian extremist groups in Central-Eastern Europe*, Political Capital Kft., Budapest, 2017; Attila Juhász, Lóránt Györi, Péter Krekó, András Dezső, "I am Eurasian", *The Kremlin connections of the Hungarian far-right*, Study Paper from the project "Strategies against far-right extremism" by the Heinrich Böll Foundation, 2015, available at http://www.politicalcapital.hu/wp-content/uploads/PC_SDI_Boll_study_IamEurasian.pdf; *The Russian connection, Kremlin's influence in the affairs of the far right is a phenomenon seen all over Europe*, *Europost*, 25 April 2014, available at <http://www.europost.bg/article?id=10423>; Jean-Yves Camus, *A long-Lasting Friendship: Alexander Dugin and the French Radical Right*, in: Marlene Laruelle (ed.), *Eurasianism and the European Far Right, Reshaping the Europe-Russia Relationship*, Lexington Books, Lanham, Boulder, New York, London, 2015, p.79-96; Giovanni Savino, *From Evola to Dugin: The Neo-Eurasianist Connection to Italy*, in: Marlene Laruelle (ed.), *Eurasianism and the European Far Right, Reshaping the Europe-Russia Relationship*, Lexington Books, Lanham, Boulder, New York, London, 2015, p.97-124.

²⁶ The most recent paper on Russian influencing is Alina Polyakova, Marlene Laruelle, Stefan Meister, Neil Barnett (Ed.), *The Kremlin's Trojan Horses, Russian Influence in France, Germany, and the United Kingdom*, Atlantic Council 2016, available at http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/publications/The_Kremlins_Trojan_Horses_web_0228_third_edition.pdf.

²⁷ For recent research on both decisions, see Tor Bukkvoll, *Why Putin went to war: ideology, interests and decision-making in the Russian use of force in Crimea and Donbas*, *Contemporary Politics*, No. 22/3, 2016, p. 267-282.

sign. The security services' strong role in Russia's foreign policy decision-making cycles might be an explanation for the increasingly aggressive and assertive meddling in Western election campaigns. But still, one needs to be careful not to draw conclusions too quickly. Compared with the Soviet Union, Russia is an utterly de-institutionalised state. Decisions ultimately depend on Putin, and Putin's favour regarding whom to trust and whom to listen to changes. There is no proper institutional framework that guarantees one group a specific influence on decisions compared to others. Favour and power are in constant flux.

The de-institutionalisation of Russia's decision-making apparatus also spurs competition between services and different branches of the foreign policy apparatus over competences and power. Because there is no institutionalised division of labour between different services, and competences and money may be shifted by Putin on short notice depending of the 'success' different services have, each of them tries to report as much success as there may possibly be. It is hard to assess how much such bureaucratic rivalries and calls for attention have caused the activities of Russian intelligence services, diplomats, state-run enterprises, and loyal oligarchs to increase over the last year. But it is conceivable that bureaucratic policies and inter-service rivalries are equally important as strategic or ideological considerations. However, it is hard to keep track of the inner dynamics of Kremlin decision-making.

There are, of course, constants on what Russia wants in a wider sense: To replace the current European order by a system based on spheres of influence and assured exceptionalism for great powers.²⁸ It tries to split Europe from the United States and would like to replace organisations that emphasise the equality of states (like the EU) with a loose directorate or concert of great powers. And hence Russia tries to reach out to whomever it thought would be susceptible to these ideas. But still, Moscow at times has illusionary hopes on what European politicians would deliver (for example neither Gerhard Schröder nor Silvio Berlusconi vetoed NATO enlargement). Or different agencies in Moscow are divided on who would be the right partner in Europe to deliver these objectives. And finally there is competition over how and by whom to approach and cultivate these ties. Hence there is no conclusive verdict on the ultimate strategies and aims of Russian influencing in Europe – not with my paper nor with any other research conducted in recent history.

²⁸ See Kadri Liik, *How to Talk with Russia*, ECFR, 18 December 2015, available at http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_how_to_talk_to_russia5055; Kadri Liik, *What does Russia want*, ECFR, 26 May 2017, available at http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_what_does_russia_want_7297.

Table 1: Political parties

Ranking	Party name	Country	Q1 EU integration	Q2 Liberalism	Q3 Secularism	Q4 Security order
1	Ataka	Bulgaria	-2.67	-2.75	-2.75	-2.75
2	Kotleba – People's Party Our Slovakia	Slovakia	-2.83	-1.65	-2.75	-2.5
3	Jobbik	Hungary	-1.5	-2.6	-1.86	-1.33
4	Front National	France	-3.25	-2.75	-1.1	-1.61
5	Fratelli d'Italia/Centrodestra Nazionale	Italy	-2.33	-2.33	-2.25	-1
6	UK Independence Party	UK	-3	-2.5	-2	-2
7	Lega Nord	Italy	-2	-2.4	-1.5	-2
8	Freedom Party	Austria	-2	-2.11	-1.13	-2.13
9	Danish People's Party	Denmark	-2.5	-1.67	-1	-1.5
10	Vlaams Belang	Belgium	-2	-2.67	-1.67	-1
11	Independent Greeks	Greece	-0.5	-2.25	-2.5	-1
12	Golden Dawn	Greece	-0.63	-2	-3	0
13	Nationaldemokratische Partei	Germany	-1.2	-2.12	-1	-1.33
14	Bulgarian Socialist Party	Bulgaria	0.94	-1.33	-0.5	-1.5
15	Alternative für Deutschland	Germany	-2.07	-1.23	-1.75	-0.8
16	Unitary Democratic Coalition	Portugal	-3	-1	3	-3
17	Alternative for Bulgarian Rebirth	Bulgaria	1	-1.33	-0.33	-1.5
18	Five Star Movement	Italy	-0.75	0.19	0.56	-1.67
19	Liberal Conservative Reformers	Germany	-0.75	-1.5	-1.2	-0.13
20	Patriotic Front	Bulgaria	-0.67	-2	-2	-0.75
21	Fidesz	Hungary	-1.5	-2.6	-1.67	-1
22	We Are Family	Slovakia	-0.67	-1	-1	-1.5
23	Dawn – National Coalition	Czech Rep.	-3	-2.5	-1.5	-1
24	Green Party	Portugal	-3	-1	3	-3
25	SYRIZA	Greece	-0.75	-0.6	0	-2
26	Slovak National Party	Slovakia	-0.33	-0.96	-1.8	-1.4
27	Movement for Recharging Bulgaria	Bulgaria	-0.5	-2.67	-1.25	
28	Christian Democratic People's Party	Hungary	-1.5	-2.6	-1.83	-1
29	Sweden Democrats	Sweden	-2.6	-3	-1.33	-1
30	Communist Party	Greece	-0.5	-2		
31	Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia	Czech Rep.	-0.8	0.25	3	-1
32	Party of Freedom	Netherlands	-2.75	0.75	-1	0.2
33	Front de Gauche	France	-2.2	-1	1	-0.84
34	Team Stronach	Austria	-0.67	-0.79	-0.75	-0.33

Hardcore anti-Western parties

Moderate anti-Western parties

Moderate pro-Western parties

Pro-Western parties

Q5 Transatlantic relations	Q6 Free trade & globalisation	Q7 Relations with Russia	Q8 Sanctions	Q9 Support for Ukraine	Q10 Refugee crisis	Q11 War in Syria	Q12 Party links	Party Index (PI)
-3.75	-3.5	-3	-2.67	-3	-2.75	-2.75	-3.2	-35.53
-3.6	-3.14	-2.75	-3	-2.75	-3	-1.5	-3.67	-33.14
-3	-2.6	-2.33	-2.5	-1.67	-2.25	-2.67	-3.33	-27.64
-2.33	-2.57	-2.4	-2.43	-1.1	-2.25	-1.88	-3.22	-26.89
-2	-2.6	-2.5	-2	-2	-2.5	-2.5	-2	-26.02
-3	-2.5	-2	-1.5	-2	-2	-1.5	-2	-26
-0.75	-2.33	-2.33	-2.25	-2	-2.67	-2.5	-3	-25.73
-0.96	-2.64	-2.13	-2.6	-2	-1.8	-0.69	-2.25	-22.42
-1.5	-2	-2	-3	-2	-2	-2	-1	-22.17
-2	-2.5	-1	-2	0	-3	-1	-2	-20.83
-1.5	-1	-2.5	-2.5	-2	-1.5	-1	-2.5	-20.75
-4	-2.5	0	-1.5	-2.5	-3	0	0	-19.13
-2.29	-2.91	-1.25	-1.5	-1.25	-2.44	-1.75		-19.04
-1	-1.67	-2	-2.25	-2.4	-1.75	-2	-2.67	-18.13
-1.32	-1.5	-1.45	-1.7	-0.8	-1.38	-1.43	-2.67	-18.09
-4	-3	-2	-3	-1	3	0	-4	-18
-1.75	-2	-2.4	-2	-1.67	-0.25	-2	-3.17	-17.4
-0.75	-2.33	-1.67	-2.25	-1.67	-1	-2		-15.33
-0.88	-1.88	-0.67	-2	-0.33	-2	-1.71	-1.75	-14.79
-0.67	-2.67	0.33	-0.33	-0.67	-2.5	-3	0.25	-14.67
-1.67	-1.25	-1	-1.5	1	-1.75	1	-2.33	-14.27
-1.5	-2	-1	-1.5	-1.5	-0.75	0.75	-2.5	-14.17
	-1.5			-1.5	-2	-1	0	-14
-4	-3	-2	-3	-1	3	0		-14
-2.33	-2.67	-2.5	-2.5	0	2	0	-2.5	-13.85
-0.67	-0.67	-1.38	-1.5	0	-0.8	-2.5	-1.5	-13.51
-1.33	-1.75		-1		-1	-1.5	-2.5	-13.5
-1.67	-1.25	-1	-1.5	1	-1.75	2	-2.33	-13.43
0	-3	0			-2			-12.93
-4		-2.5					-3.5	-12.5
-1.5	-2	-3	-3	-1.5	-0.5		-2	-12.05
	-2	-0.75	-1	-1.33	-2.14	-1.5		-11.53
-1.75	-2.09	-1.5	-1.25	-0.88	1	-1.5	-0.5	-11.51
-0.75	-2	-0.58	-1.67	-0.6	-1.5	-0.44	-1.4	-11.48

Ranking	Party name	Country	Q1 EU integration	Q2 Liberalism	Q3 Secularism	Q4 Security order
35	EH Bildu	Spain	0	-1	2.5	0
36	Finns Party	Finland	-1.56	-0.67	-1.83	1.5
37	Die Linke	Germany	-0.89	-0.06	0.85	-0.89
38	Left Bloc	Portugal	-2	3	3	-3
39	Unidos Podemos	Spain	-0.5	-0.4	2.25	-1.6
40	Südtiroler Volkspartei	Italy	0.75	1	-1.5	
41	United Left	Slovenia		3	3	-2
42	Kukiz'15	Poland	-0.64	-1.69	-0.38	0.64
43	Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya	Spain	1	-0.67	2.33	0
44	Left Party	Sweden	-2.4	0.5	0.5	-1.33
45	Social Democratic Party	Austria	0.23	0	0.6	-0.33
46	Forza Italia	Italy	0.33	0.25	-1	-0.5
47	Direction – Social Democracy	Slovakia	0.89	0	-0.17	0
48	Sinistra Ecologia Libertà	Italy	1	1	2.4	-3
49	Les Republicains	France	0.2	-0.11	-0.56	0.09
50	Partij voor de Dieren	Netherlands	-0.75	-1		
51	Conservative People's Party of Estonia	Estonia	-2	-3	-3	3
52	Grande Sud	Italy			-2	
53	Movement for Rights and Freedom	Bulgaria	1	1.5	0.67	1
54	50Plus	Netherlands	-1			
55	Il Megafono-Lista Crocetta	Italy			-1	
56	Centrum	Finland	-0.3	-0.29	-1.05	0.19
57	Austrian Peoples' Party	Austria	0.47	0.29	-0.75	0.33
58	Ordinary People and Independent Personalities	Slovakia	0.21	-0.6	-0.5	0.5
59	Staatskundig Gereformeerde Partij	Netherlands	-1.33	-2	-2	0.5
60	Left Alliance	Finland	-0.5	0.67	0.83	-0.5
61	Green Party	Austria	0.86	1	0.71	-0.4
62	Sinn Fein	UK				
63	Onafhankelijke Senaats Fractie	Netherlands				
64	Centre	Estonia	1		0	
65	People-Animals-Nature	Portugal	-2	-1	3	
66	Green Party	Sweden	-0.56	2	1	
67	Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe	Poland	0.32	0	-1.67	1.06
68	Christian Social Union	Germany	0.3	-0.1	-1.14	0.46
69	Law and Justice	Poland	-0.81	-1.71	-2.18	1.92
70	Ano	Czech Rep.	0.17	1.5		-0.5
71	Democratic Unionist Party	UK	2			
72	Feminist Initiative	Sweden	-0.67	1.5	1	

Q5 Transatlantic relations	Q6 Free trade & globalisation	Q7 Relations with Russia	Q8 Sanctions	Q9 Support for Ukraine	Q10 Refugee crisis	Q11 War in Syria	Q12 Party links	Party Index (PI)
-3	-3	-2.5	-3	-1.5	3	-2		-10.5
-0.78	-1.73	0.25	-1	0.67	-1.09	-1.5	0	-7.74
-1.35	-1.38	-1.27	-1.16	-0.75	2.67	-1	-2.33	-7.55
-1	-3	-3	-3	-1	3	0	0	-7
-1.6	-3	-1.5	3	-1.75	3	-2	-2.5	-6.6
	-3				-3		0	-5.75
-1	-1	-2.5	-2	-2.5	3	-1.5	-2	-5.5
-0.96	-0.82	0.05	-0.29	0.3	-1	-0.83	0.25	-5.37
-2	-3	-2	-1.5	-0.33	3	-2		-5.17
-2	-1	-1		-1	3			-4.73
-0.7	-1	-0.71	-0.71	-0.71	-0.19	0	-1.2	-4.73
1	0.38	-0.5	-1.5	0	-0.5	0		-3.04
0	0.33	-1	-1.33	0.38	-0.43	-0.14	-1.4	-2.87
-1	-0.75	-2				0		-2.35
1	0.08	-0.54	-0.45	-0.06	-0.25	-0.07	-1.67	-2.33
0.5	-1							-2.25
-3	3	3		3	-2	-2	1	-2
								-2
-0.5	0.67	-1	-0.5	-1.25	0.83	-0.75	-3	-1.33
								-1
								-1
0.3	0	0.6	-1	0.25	1	0	-0.67	-0.97
0	0.33	-0.11	0.2	0.14	-0.25	0.08	-1.67	-0.93
0	0.5	-0.5		0.5	-1		0	-0.89
-0.83	1	-0.67	0	1	1.5	2		-0.83
0.31	-1.14	-0.8	-0.5	-0.33	2.17	0	-1	-0.8
-0.75	-1.86	-0.64	-0.43	-0.5	1.89	0.25	-0.83	-0.7
							0	0
								0
1	0		0	1	0	0	-2	1
-1	-1				3		0	1
-2	-2				3			1.44
-0.5	-0.5	0.9	0.33	0.5	-0.5	0.33	1.2	1.48
0.83	0.35	0.33	0	0.48	-0.13	-0.13	0.25	1.53
-1.38	-0.54	2.58	2.18	1.67	-1.67	0.25	1.38	1.7
0.5	1	-0.75	0.5	1	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	1.92
								2
-2					3			2.83

Table 1: Political parties (continued)

Ranking	Party name	Country	Q1 EU integration	Q2 Liberalism	Q3 Secularism	Q4 Security order
73	Centro Democratico	Italy	2	1	0	
74	Socialist Party	Netherlands	-1.5	1.2	1.5	1.25
75	Freedom and Solidarity	Slovakia	-0.63	0.5	0.63	0.25
76	Social Democratic Party	Finland	0.73	0.29	1.5	0.23
77	Nieuw-Vlaamse Alliantie	Belgium	0.67	0	0	1
78	Social Democratic Party	Czech Rep.	1.25	0.25	1	0.5
79	Ulster Unionist Party	UK	-1			
80	Christen Unie	Netherlands	-0.67	-0.67	-2	1.25
81	Parti Radical	France	1.5	0.75	1.33	1.5
82	Valle D Aosta & Foreign Italians	Italy	3	2	0	
83	Social Democratic Party	Romania	0.56	-0.71	-1.33	1.25
84	Christian and Democratic Union – Czechoslovak People’s Party	Czech Rep.	1.5	1	-2	1.5
85	New Democracy	Greece	1.38	0.5	-0.75	1.5
86	GERB	Bulgaria	1.67	0.25	-0.67	2.67
87	Nouveau Centre	France	1.33	1.5	0.5	1.5
88	Partiit Laburista	Malta	1	3	1	
89	Partit Demòcrata Europeu Català	Spain	2	1	-2	2
90	Christian Democratic Party	Sweden	0.67	-0.33	-2	
91	Christian Democrats	Finland	-0.07	-0.33	-1.88	1.4
92	Coalicion Canaria	Spain	1	0.5	-2	2
93	Parti Radical de Gauche	France	1	0.75	1	1
94	Le Centre pour la France/ Mouvement Democrate	France	1.8	0.75	0.25	0.17
95	Social Democrats	Germany	1.93	0.53	0.61	0.35
96	Alliance of Liberals and Democrats	Romania	0.38	-0.45	-0.5	1.6
97	Liberal Alliance	Denmark	-1.5	2	1	
98	Plaid Cymru	UK	1			
99	Network	Slovakia	1	0.67	0.67	1.5
100	Partido Popular	Spain	1.5	0.5	-1.13	2.33
101	Politics Can be Different	Hungary	1.5	1	2	2
102	Parti Socialiste	France	1.13	0.75	1.75	0.38
103	Partiit Nazzjonalista	Malta	2	1	-1	
104	Partido Nacionalista Vasco	Spain	2	1.33	-0.67	2
105	Unione di Centro /Nuovo Centrodestra	Italy	1	2	0	1
106	Swedish Social Democratic Party	Sweden	1	0	0.5	-0.33
107	Conservative Party	UK		0.75		
108	Alternative	Denmark	0.5	3	0	

Q5 Transatlantic relations	Q6 Free trade & globalisation	Q7 Relations with Russia	Q8 Sanctions	Q9 Support for Ukraine	Q10 Refugee crisis	Q11 War in Syria	Q12 Party links	Party Index (PI)
								3
1.5	-1.33	-0.8	0	-0.25	1.5	2	-2	3.07
0.19	0.43	0.43	-0.75	0.8	0.56	0.25	0.67	3.32
1.13	0.17	-0.75	-0.5	0.33	1	0.33	-1	3.46
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.67
0	1	-0.75	0.5	1	0	-0.5	-0.5	3.75
3			2.5				0	4.5
2	1	-0.67	0	1	1.5	2		4.75
0.5	0.5	0	-0.75	0	-0.2	0.25	-0.5	4.88
								5
1.25	-0.5	1.4	1.6	2.33	0.56	0.33	-1.4	5.34
	1	-0.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	-0.5	0	5.5
0.75	1.5	0	0	0.5	0	1.67	-1.5	5.54
0	1.25	-0.33	0.25	1.5	0.8	-0.33	-1.5	5.55
0.63	1	0	-0.75	0	-0.2	0.17	0	5.68
1		-1	0	2	-1	1	-1	6
-0.5	2	-0.5	0		2	0		6
1	1	2	1	1	1		1	6.33
0.38	1	1.33	1.5	1	2.5	0	-0.33	6.5
1	2				2			6.5
1	0.5	0	0.5	0.25	0	0.75	0	6.75
0.75	0.63	0	0.75	0.75	1.25	0	-0.33	6.76
0.92	0.4	0.14	0	0.47	1.41	0.88	-0.36	7.26
1.25	0.1	1.2	1.6	2.33	0.38	0.33	-1.4	6.82
	3			2	0		0.5	7
3				1			3	8
0.5	0.75	0	0.5	0.5	1		1	8.08
1.67	2	0	0	0.67	1	0.2	-0.5	8.24
0	-2.25		0.5	1.5	0.5	1	0.5	8.25
1.33	-0.08	-0.25	0.5	0.5	0.43	0.84	1	8.27
2		2	0	2	0	1	0	9
1.5	2		0		2	-1		9.17
0.75	1.5	-1	0.5	1	1.5	1		9.25
1.33	1	1	1	1	2		1	9.5
0.5	-0.5	2	2	2	0	1	2	9.75
	2				3		1.33	9.83

Table 1: Political parties (continued)

Ranking	Party name	Country	Q1 EU integration	Q2 Liberalism	Q3 Secularism	Q4 Security order
109	Swedish People's Party	Finland	1.89	1.11	0.6	1
110	NEOS	Austria	1.17	2	0.92	1.67
111	Christen-Democratic & Vlaams	Belgium	1.75	1.5	0	2
112	Red-Green Alliance	Denmark	-2.5	-1.67	3	
113	Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in Romania	Romania	0.69	1.13	-0.2	1.33
114	Union of Centralists	Greece	0	1.88	3	
115	Most-Híd	Slovakia	1.43	0.5	0.5	1.5
116	Europe Ecologie Les Verts	France	2	1.25	1.69	1
117	National Collective	Finland	2.11	1	1	1
118	Civic Democratic Party	Czech Rep.	-1.5	2	1	3
119	Centre Party	Sweden	1.2	2	0.5	0
120	New Slovenia	Slovenia	2	-2	-2	2
121	Partii Socialiste	Belgium	0.63	1.4	2.25	2
122	Greens	Finland	0.94	1	1.4	0.94
123	En Marche!	France	1.6	2.5	1	0.75
124	Socialistische Partii Anders	Belgium	1.75	1	1.8	2
125	Centre Democratie Humaniste	Belgium	1.75	2	0	2
126	People's Party for Freedom and Democracy	Netherlands	0.25	2.25	1.33	1.25
127	Top 09	Czech Rep.	1.8	2	-2	2.5
128	Christian Democratic Union	Germany	1.1	0.94	-0.39	1.5
129	Free Democrats	Germany	1.29	1.5	1	0.71
130	People's Movement Party	Romania	-0.44	0.75	0.15	2
131	Mouvement Reformateur	Belgium	2	2	1.25	2
132	Christian Democratic Appeal	Netherlands	0.5	1	0.33	0.67
133	Open Vlaamse Liberalen en Democraten	Belgium	2.17	2	1.25	2
134	Conservative People's Party	Denmark	0	-1.5		2
135	De Vlaamse Groenen	Belgium	1.5	1.25	0.38	2
136	Ecologiste/Eco	Belgium	1.5	1.25	0.38	2
137	Democrats for a Strong Bulgaria	Bulgaria	1.13	1.67	-0.33	2
138	Slovenian Democratic Party	Slovenia	2	-3	-2	3
139	National Liberal Party	Romania	0.63	0.9	0.54	1.57
140	CDS – People's Party	Portugal	1	1	-2	3
141	Moderate Party	Sweden	1.75	0.38	0.5	2.5
142	Hungarian Socialist Party	Hungary	1.67	1.33	0.75	2.5
143	Save Romania Union	Romania	0.69	2.5	0.45	2
144	Social Democrats	Slovenia	2	2	2	2
145	Socialist Party	Portugal	2	0	2	2

Q5 Transatlantic relations	Q6 Free trade & globalisation	Q7 Relations with Russia	Q8 Sanctions	Q9 Support for Ukraine	Q10 Refugee crisis	Q11 War in Syria	Q12 Party links	Party Index (PI)
0.57	1	-1	1.5	1	2.5	0	-0.33	9.84
0.13	1.2	0	0.75	1	1	0.33	0	10.16
1	0	0	0	1	2		1	10.25
2	-3	3	3	0	3	3	0.5	10.33
1.25	0.83	2	1.5	2	0.56		-0.67	10.43
3	3							10.88
0.67	0.75	0.56	1.4	1.4	1	0.75	0.75	11.21
0.25	0.56	0.25	0.5	0.33	2.2	0.75	0.5	11.28
0.86	1.5	1.67	1	1.33	1	0	-1	11.47
1	1	2	1.5	1	0	0.5	0	11.5
1	2		1	1	2		1	11.7
	2	2	3	2	-0.5	2	1.5	12
1	-1	0	0	1	2	2	1	12.28
0.94	1.2	0.67	1.5	1	2.17	0	0.67	12.41
0.75	1.8	-0.17	0.5	0.33	2.2	1.25	0	12.52
1	-1	0	0	1	2	2	1	12.55
1	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	12.75
1.8	1.67	0.4	0.5	1.33	1.33	1.67	-1	12.78
1.5	2	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	-0.5	0	12.8
1.56	0.95	0.84	1.5	1.08	1.25	0.94	1.6	12.87
1.3	0.43	0.75	1.38	0.82	1.05	1.29	1.43	12.94
1	1	2.25	2	2.67	0.38	0.33	1	13.08
1	1	0	0	1	2		1	13.25
1.5	1.33	0.4	0.5	1	1.13	2	3	13.36
1	1	0	0	1	2		1	13.42
3	1	3	3	0	1.5	1	0.5	13.5
-1	-1	0	3	1	3	2	2	14.13
-1	-1	0	3	1	3	2	2	14.13
0.67	0.25	2.6	2	1.25	0.5	1.33	1.4	14.46
1	2	2.5	3	3	-0.5	2	1.5	14.5
1.25	1	2	2	2.33	0.63	0.75	1	14.59
3	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	15
2	2	2	1	1	1		1	15.13
2	1	-0.5	1.5	2	1.33	2	-0.33	15.25
1.8	0.88	2	1	2.33	1.1	0.75	0.33	15.83
2	1	-0.5	1.5	2	1	2	-1	16
3	2	-1	0	2	2	1	1	16

Table 1: Political parties (continued)

Ranking	Party name	Country	Q1 EU integration	Q2 Liberalism	Q3 Secularism	Q4 Security order
146	Reformist Block	Bulgaria	1.75	1.25	0.33	2.5
147	Liberals	Sweden	2	1.75		2.5
148	Democratic Party of Pensioners of Slovenia	Slovenia	2	2	2	2.5
149	Bündnis 90/Die Grünen	Germany	1.83	1.81	0.69	0.5
150	Dimocratiki Symparataxi	Greece	2.2	0.2	1	2
151	Partito Democratico	Italy	2.14	1.67	2	2
152	Slovenian People's Party	Slovenia	2	-3	1	3
153	Social Democrats	Denmark	0	0		3
154	Ciudadanos	Spain	2.4	1.33	0.5	2
155	Social Democratic Party	Portugal	1	0	1	3
156	Labour Party	UK		1	1	
157	Platforma Obywatelska	Poland	1.92	1.88	-0.08	2.11
158	Labour Party	Netherlands	0.75	2	2	1.33
159	Nowoczesna	Poland	2.23	2.5	1.08	2.06
160	Socialist People's Party	Denmark	0.5	0.33	2	2
161	Social Democratic Labour Party	UK				3
162	Partido Socialista Obrero Espanol	Spain	2	1.29	1.75	1.67
163	Venstre	Denmark	0	2	1	3
164	To Potami	Greece	2.5	1.5	2.5	
165	Alliance of Alenka Bratušek	Slovenia	2	2	3	3
166	Green Party	UK	1	1	0.5	2
167	Democratic Coalition	Hungary	2.38	2.17	2.25	3
168	Hungarian Liberal Party	Hungary	2.17	2.6	2	1.5
169	GroenLinks	Netherlands	2.17	2.75	2	1.4
170	Modern Centre Party	Slovenia	2	2	1	2.5
171	Social Democrats	Estonia	2	2	2	3
172	Pro Patria & Res Publica Union	Estonia	0	1	1	3
173	Democrats 66	Netherlands	2.29	2.6	2	1.4
174	Dialogue for Hungary	Hungary	2	2.2	1.67	1.5
175	Free Party	Estonia	0	2	2	3
176	Scottish National Party	UK	1	3	0	3
177	Egütt	Hungary	2	2.2	1.67	3
178	Liberal Democrats	UK	2.33	2		1.5
179	Radicale Venstre	Denmark	2	3	3	2
180	Reformists	Estonia	2	2	1	3
181	Scelta Civica	Italy	2.75	1.67	1.67	2

Q5 Transatlantic relations	Q6 Free trade & globalisation	Q7 Relations with Russia	Q8 Sanctions	Q9 Support for Ukraine	Q10 Refugee crisis	Q11 War in Syria	Q12 Party links	Party Index (PI)
1.67	1.5	2.2	1.5	1.67	-0.33	0.38	1.75	16.16
2	2	2	1	1	1		1	16.25
2	1	-0.5	1.5	2	1	2	-1	16.5
0.63	0.35	1.64	1.82	0.82	2.57	1.89	2	16.55
2.5	2	0.5	1.5	1	2	1.67		16.57
2	1.33	0.67	0.5	2	1.67	2		16.98
2	2	2	3	2	-0.5	2	1.5	17
3	1.5	3	3	2	0.67	0	1	17.17
2.5	2	0	0.33	1.33	2	2.5	1	17.9
3	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	18
2.5		2	2	2	2	2.5	3	18
1.69	0.95	2.27	1.85	2.22	1.1	0.5	1.67	18.07
1.8	1.67	0.4	0.5	1	1.67	2	3	18.12
1	1.1	1.11	1.83	2.11	1.6	0.33	1.25	18.2
2	1		3	2	3	2	0.5	18.33
2.5	2		2	1	2	3	3	18.5
2.17	1.5	1.33	0.33	2	2.5	2.33	1.33	20.2
3	3	3	0	2.5	0	2	1	20.5
3	3	1.33	2	1.33	2	1.67		20.83
2	2		3	2	1	2	-1	21
2.5		1	3	1	3	3	3	21
1.5	2.5	0	2	2.5	2.5	1.5	-1	21.29
1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	2	21.77
2.2	1.67	0.2	0.5	1.67	2	2.33	3	21.88
2	2	-0.5	3	3	1.5	2	1.5	22
2	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	22
3	2	3	3	3	1	-1	3	22
2.2	2	0.4	0.5	1.67	2	2.33	3	22.39
1	2.5	1.5	2.5	3	2.5	1.5	1	22.87
2	2	3	3	3	0	0	3	23
2.5	2		1	2	3	3	3	23.5
1.5	2.5	1.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	2	25.37
2.5	2.5	3	2	2	3	3	3	26.83
2	3	2	3	0	3	3	1.33	27.33
3	2	3	3	3	1	3	2	28
1	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	28.08

Table 1: Political parties (continued)

Table 2: National political systems

Coun-	National Index	Q1 EU integration	Q2 Liberalism	Q3 Secularism	Q4 Security order
Hungary	-9.32	-0.8	-1.72	-1.1	-0.3
Austria	-6.39	-0.09	-0.19	-0.19	-0.44
Greece	-5.74	0.12	-0.34	-0.21	-0.51
Slovakia	-4.71	0.05	-0.25	-0.46	-0.18
Bulgaria	-3.8	0.92	-0.25	-0.56	0.88
Czech Rep.	2.13	0.29	0.73	0.36	0.55
Finland	2.49	0.27	0.19	-0.03	0.67
France	2.91	0.61	0.34	0.66	0.27
Italy	4.53	1.03	0.89	0.87	0.38
Sweden	6.63	0.41	0.05	0.14	0.41
Poland	6.95	0.24	-0.32	-1.18	1.82
Malta	7.3	1.43	2.13	0.13	0
Denmark	8.02	-0.69	0.3	0.5	1.28
Romania	8.03	0.49	0.06	-0.37	1.2
Spain	8.87	1.33	0.59	0.25	1.44
Germany	9.3	1.22	0.8	0.15	0.81
Belgium	9.55	1.27	1.11	0.78	1.67
Netherlands	9.33	0.04	1.42	0.79	0.94
Portugal	11.12	0.82	0.61	0.37	1.67
UK	11.84	0.17	0.82	0.26	0.2
Slovenia	16.32	1.82	0.63	0.51	2.22
Estonia	16.58	1.02	0.98	0.68	2.2
EU average	5.089	0.545	0.391	0.107	0.781
EU north	9.17	0.349	0.651	0.356	0.93
EU south	3.185	0.636	0.269	-0.009	0.712
North-south difference	5.986	-0.287	0.382	0.365	0.218

Q5 Transatlantic relations	Q6 Free trade & globalisation	Q7 Relations with Russia	Q8 Sanctions	Q9 Support for Ukraine	Q10 Refugee crisis	Q11 War in Syria	Q12 Party links
-1.11	-0.95	-0.98	-0.97	0.88	-1.12	0.8	-1.96
-0.51	-0.97	-0.78	-0.76	-0.62	-0.29	-0.09	-1.45
-1.09	-0.78	-1.34	-1.22	0.01	0.92	0.54	-1.84
-0.4	-0.17	-0.76	-0.94	0.07	-0.46	-0.29	-0.92
-0.46	-0.15	-0.56	-0.47	-0.14	-0.29	-1.05	-1.66
0.15	0.53	-0.43	0.24	0.59	-0.07	-0.33	-0.49
0.4	0.07	0.37	-0.15	0.62	0.86	-0.23	-0.55
0.93	-0.02	-0.35	0	0.18	0.17	0.33	-0.21
0.92	0.27	-0.2	-0.4	0.61	0.49	0.59	-0.93
0.87	0.46	0.95	0.73	0.67	1.23	0	0.73
-0.23	-0.01	2.12	1.78	1.69	-0.54	0.25	1.34
1.43	0	0.3	0	2	-0.57	1	-0.57
1.47	0.84	1.37	0.75	0.81	0.45	0.45	0.48
1.06	0.2	1.4	1.48	1.95	0.48	0.41	-0.32
1.17	0.97	0.04	0.52	0.59	1.78	0.43	-0.24
0.82	0.49	0.49	0.8	0.68	1.57	0.82	0.64
0.73	0.06	-0.02	0.21	0.74	1.49	0.75	0.78
1.39	0.68	0.02	0.18	0.7	0.93	1.37	0.87
2.13	1.2	-0.3	0	1.08	2.16	0.84	0.54
1.2	0.02	1.59	1.58	1.6	0.91	1.47	2.02
1.41	1.58	0.24	2.33	2.29	0.88	1.72	0.68
1.82	1.39	2.05	1.84	2.32	0.45	0.76	1.08
0.641	0.26	0.238	0.342	0.877	0.519	0.479	-0.09
1.139	0.564	0.976	0.82	1.055	0.914	0.663	0.753
0.409	0.118	-0.107	0.118	0.794	0.335	0.393	-0.484
0.73	0.446	1.083	0.702	0.261	0.579	0.27	1.237

This page has been left intentionally blank

This page has been left intentionally blank

ABOUT ECFR

The **European Council on Foreign Relations** (ECFR) is the first pan-European think-tank. Launched in 2007, its objective is to conduct cutting-edge research, build coalitions for change, and promote informed debate on the development of coherent, effective and values-based European foreign policy.

ECFR has developed a strategy with three distinctive elements that define its activities:

- **A pan-European Council.** ECFR has brought together a distinguished Council of over 250 members – politicians, decision makers, thinkers and business people from the EU's member states and candidate countries – which meets once a year. Through regular geographical and thematic task forces, members provide ECFR staff with advice and feedback on policy ideas and help with ECFR's activities in their own countries. The Council is chaired by Carl Bildt, Emma Bonino and Mabel van Oranje.
- **A physical presence in the main EU member states.** Uniquely among European think-tanks, ECFR has offices in Berlin, London, Madrid, Paris, Rome, Sofia and Warsaw, allowing the organisation to channel the opinions and perspectives of a wide range of EU member states. Our pan-European presence puts us at the centre of policy debates in European capitals, and provides a platform for research, debate, advocacy and communications.
- **Developing contagious ideas that get people talking.** ECFR has brought together a team of distinguished researchers and practitioners from all over Europe to carry out innovative research and policy development projects with a pan-European focus. ECFR produces original research; publishes policy reports; hosts private meetings, public debates, and "friends of ECFR" gatherings in EU capitals; and reaches out to strategic media outlets.

ECFR is a registered charity funded by charitable foundations, national governments, companies and private individuals. These donors allow us to publish our ideas and advocate for a values-based EU foreign policy. ECFR works in partnership with other think-tanks and organisations but does not make grants to individuals or institutions.

www.ecfr.eu

The European Council on Foreign Relations does not take collective positions. This paper, like all publications of the European Council on Foreign Relations, represents only the views of its authors.

Copyright of this publication is held by the European Council on Foreign Relations. You may not copy, reproduce, republish or circulate in any way the content from this publication except for your own personal and non-commercial use. Any other use requires the prior written permission of the European Council on Foreign Relations

© ECFR July 2017

ISBN: 978-1-911544-25-8

Published by the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR),
4th floor, Tennyson House,
159-165 Great Portland Street,
London, W1W 5PA, United Kingdom

london@ecfr.eu