Populist Euroscepticism in the Iberian Peninsula

Abstract

This paper examines the incidence of populism and Euroscepticism, and their empirical convergence, in the Portuguese and Spanish party systems before and after the Great Recession. We address the question of the transformation on the supply side of populist Eurosceptic parties in both countries and the conditions for the emergence of new niche populist Eurosceptic parties in countries characterized by the absence of populist radical right parties in the past. In Greece, from the beginning of the recession, the number of voters who support Eurosceptic parties, that is, parties that consider as a threat to the national sovereignty the lack of independence and autonomy from the supranational organisms, has considerably grown, triggering a new political division that have transformed the Greek party system (Pappas, 2014, Stavrakakis & Katsambekis 2014). Here we explore in comparative perspective the role of Euroscepticism in the Spanish and Portuguese party systems, two countries also hit by the Great Recession and suffering from austerity measures. Has a similar political division emerged in the Spanish and Portuguese party systems combining Euroscepticism with populist politics? What is the contemporary impact of populist Euroscepticism in both party systems? We assess the role of considerations regarding the EU at the party level, and their consequences upon the party systems. More specifically, we address the extent to which Euroscepticism has become increasingly relevant for radical left-wing/populist parties. For this purpose, we use Chapel Hill Expert Surveys about political parties positioning on European integration (1999-2014) and data on levels of populism applying holistic grading (Hawkins 2009).
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Introduction

Recent changes in the Portuguese and Spanish party systems allow us to problematize the contemporary links between populism and Euroscepticism in European politics. Before the Great Recession, Portuguese and Spanish politics exhibit two main characteristics. First, low levels of Euroscepticism characterized political parties and public opinion (Llamazares and Gramacho 2007). One of the reasons to study Euroscepticism with a regional focus on Southern Europe was precisely the pro-Europeanism of parties and voters and the marginal inroads of Euroscepticism in these countries (Verney 2011:34). Euroscepticism in both countries played a minor role in party competitive dynamics. Euroscepticism was circumscribed to radical left parties and, in the Spanish case, some minority nationalist parties (Llamazares & Gramacho 2007, Gómez-Reino, Llamazares & Ramiro 2008). Strictly speaking, very few parties in Portugal and Spain can be classified as Eurosceptic. According to Trieb (2014), in Portugal that only included the Left Bloc (Bloco de Esquerda, BE), and in Spain, United Left (Izquierda Unida, IU) and the newly born Podemos, all of them classified as ‘soft’ Eurosceptics in his analysis. Second, the focus of party based populist Euroscepticism in Europe was the populist radical right, but both Portugal and Spain lack relevant parties of this party family in their party systems or any ‘populist’ party to speak of (Llamazares & Ramiro 2007, Alonso & Kaltwasser 2014). Thus, low Euroscepticism and absence of populist parties, whether left or right, were characteristics of Portuguese and Spanish party systems before the crisis and the implementation of austerity policies from 2010 onwards. As such, there was no populist Euroscepticism in the Portuguese and Spanish party systems.

The comparison of the Portuguese and Spanish cases before and after the crisis offers fruitful ground for exploring the conditions for the surge of populist Euroscepticism in

---

1 Yet for some authors the signals of change were already emerging at the beginning of this decade. Several indicators show that in Spain indifference of rejection to European integration has been increasing over the past decade (Verney 2011, Ruiz Jimenez & Egea de Haro 2011) and that Portuguese politics has been increasingly polarized on EU issues.

2 What made the South traditionally distinctive was not the causes of Euroscepticism but its low levels (Llamazares and Gramacho 2007, Hooghe & Marks 2007:123).

3 The new LIVRE in Portugal could also added to the list but failed to become the Portuguese Syriza and it clearly depart from the populist schemata.
Southern Europe. Both countries were severely hit by the Great Recession and the timing of the sovereign debt crisis was similar. The Portuguese and Spanish governments implemented austerity packages and fiscal consolidation measures forced by the European Union at the beginning of the decade. In May 2010, the Socialist Spanish government announced an austerity package that reduced public expenditures by 1.5% of the GDP. The Spanish government would switch its economic policies from expansion to austerity and followed with several economic measures. The Spanish parliament approved a reform of labor regulations that increased flexibility and decentralization and the public pension scheme.4 Finally, in the summer of 2011, in the face of the escalating debt crisis, the Socialist and Popular parties agreed to conduct a constitutional reform that imposed balanced budgets. In Portugal, a few months later, in September 2010, the Portuguese government also announced an austerity package to reduce public spending, increasing taxes and introducing far-reaching reforms to improve productivity, international competitiveness and public sector efficiency.5 In the first half of 2011, Portugal requested a €78 billion IMF-EU bailout package in a bid to stabilize its public finances. The Portuguese three-year EU-IMF €78bn ($83bn; £55bn) bailout was implemented.

Before the Great Recession different analysis pointed out to the difficulties to mobilize citizens with a Eurosceptic platform in both countries. The study of Llamazares and Gramacho (2007) showed comparatively low levels of Eurosceptic orientations displayed by the Spanish, and Portuguese citizens (also Greek) given the historical positive associations with the EU.6 They suggested that in Portugal and Spain, major parties would have to confront important strategic dilemmas if they wanted to articulate different

---

4 Retirement age was moved from 65 to 67 years (although this change would take place incrementally), and the time period used to calculate pensions jumped from 15 to 25 years.

5 Between 2008 and 2013, Portugal adopted three different approaches to the crisis, each of which was implemented by a different government. The first approach focused on the sustainability of the financial sector. The second shifted the focus to mitigating the adverse economic and social impact of the crisis. And the third approach concentrated on fiscal adjustment. Since 2008 Portugal has had two centre-left governments, formed by the Socialist Party, and one centre-right coalition government (Pedroso 2014:2).

6 In Portugal and Spain, negative views of Europe are more likely among both cultural exclusivists and left-wingers. Attitudinal data reveal, though, that there are positive correlations between anti-immigrant attitudes and left–right orientations in these three countries. And expert data on political parties also reveal strong correlations between the positions adopted by parties in the left–right and anti-immigrant dimensions (in Greece, Portugal, and Spain) (Norris, 2005, 48) and in the gal-tan and economic left–right dimensions (in Portugal and Spain, but not in Greece). Even if changes in the political articulation of the gal-tan and left–right economic dimensions are possible (Kitschelt, 2004).
sources of Euroscepticism. In turn, it would be possible for third, niche parties to emerge emphasizing the cultural sources of dissatisfaction with European integration while strategically downplaying economic redistributive issues (Llamazares & Gramacho 2007). But that outcome seemed rather unlikely a decade ago and it would ultimately depend on a populist radical right party overcoming the constraints that prevented its electoral success in these party systems (Llamazares & Gramacho 2007:229). However, Llamazares and Gramacho (2007) did not consider the possibilities open for the mutation of the radical left and the rise of third parties of a different kind: new left-wing populist Eurosceptic parties emphasizing distributive issues within the context of the economic crisis and the implementation of austerity policies. Before the crisis Euroscepticism remained within the boundaries of traditional radical left parties, mainly the Coligação Democrática Unitária (born in 1987) and the Bloco de Esquerda (born in 1999) in Portugal, and Izquierda Unida (born in 1986) in Spain. After the crisis, a third niche party, Podemos, has emerged in the Spanish party systems exhibiting a distinctive populist Euroscepticism.

We investigate the transformation of the supply side of populist Euroscepticism in both countries and the extent to which its configuration diverges. Allegedly, in Spain the supply side of populist Euroscepticism since 2014 has dramatically changed with the rise and success of Podemos. We describe and map the levels of populism and Euroscepticism in Portugal and Spain after the crisis. We focus on the transformation of the traditional radical left and our puzzle focuses on the contrasting outcomes on the supply side of both Portuguese and Spanish party systems: the presence and absence of populist Euroscepticism in both countries and the mutation of the traditional radical left. The impact of the crisis on Portuguese and Spanish politics diverges on the supply side.7

In the next section we present the analytical framework for our analysis of populist Euroscepticism and its incidence in Southern Europe. We introduce the conceptual framework and develop a proposal for establishing the descriptive and analytical links between populism and Euroscepticism that can be applied to Portuguese and Spanish party systems.

---

7 We do not address the question of what factors account for variation in orientations towards EU. In Llamazares and Gramacho’s research, individual perceptions of the benefits of country membership in the EU is the most important factor in explaining attitudes towards EU in Portugal and Spain. Other factors such as the performance of national economies or the influence of fear of cultural risk also played a role (Llamazares and Gramacho 2007).
politics—links that are tenuous and difficult to define. Second, we establish the evolution of the position and salience of EU for Portuguese and Spanish political parties. The paper analyzes first the levels of party-based Euroscepticism in both countries to ascertain whether a visible shift from permissive consensus to a constraining dissensus on EU matters, as hypothesized by Hooghe and Marks, has taken place before and after the crisis (Hooghe & Marks 2009). In order to explore the politicization of European integration during this period, we examine the evolution of the salience of European integration in Portuguese and Spanish parties. We summarize the evolution of country and party indicators of Euroscepticism using data from Chapel Hill Expert Surveys (1999-2014). Latter we proceed to analyze the level of populism of parties, in order to know to what extent do Portuguese and Spanish parties exhibit a populist Euroscepticism and the distinctive characteristics of the populist Euroscepticism in contrast to traditional radical left parties in the Portuguese and Spanish party systems. By analyzing changes in ideological stances of parties we also determine if and how the outlines of Euroscepticism have been transformed as a result of the contemporary European crisis (economic and refugees), besides if and how these new debates have echoed across the party-political arena. We conclude by deriving the main consequences of this comparison for the understanding of the convergence of Euroscepticism and populism and its translation into the existing party systems in Southern Europe.

Analytical Framework

There is a conceptual challenge integrating populism with Euroscepticism (Taggart and Pirro 2016). Both phenomena are widely analyzed in the literature yet often as empirically linked but analytically separate and distinctive issues (Taggart & Szcerbiack 2008). Even the empirical overlap between populist and Eurosceptic politics does not appear in many instances: not every Eurosceptic party is necessarily populist, and not every populist party is necessarily Eurosceptic (Taggart and Pirro 2016).8 Here we outline the main conceptual developments that guide our approach to integrate both phenomena and explore the conditions for the convergence, descriptive and analytical, of both populism and Euroscepticism on the supply side of party politics. We later apply this framework to

8'As they state, the convergence is not necessary. It is possible to identify populists who are not Eurosceptic and non-populist Euroscepticism but in practice, they are a relatively small, and diminishing number’ (Pirro and Taggart 2016).
analyze the Portuguese and Spanish cases. Both cases represent instances of the lack of overlap between Euroscepticism and populism before the crisis and new developments within the context of widespread social mobilization and the rise of anti-austerity movements, first in Portugal and later in Spain.

Euroscepticism

The politicization of European integration implies an increase in polarization of opinions, interests or values (De Wilde 2011:566). As such it is a larger political process than the mere presence of Euroscepticism. Euroscepticism emerged in political discourse in 1992 as a term to refer to skepticism about European integration (Hooghe & Marks 2007:120). While its roots go back to the postwar period, since the Maastricht treaty it became an increasingly widespread phenomenon in European politics (Verney 2011). Euroscepticism “expresses the idea of contingent or qualified opposition, as well as incorporating outright and unqualified opposition to the process of European integration” (Taggart 1998: 366).

The distinction between ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ Euroscepticism coined by Taggart and Szczerbiack (2008) has become a useful typological device to classify party based Euroscepticism. ‘Hard’ Euroscepticism is defined as ‘principled opposition to the EU and European integration and therefore can be seen in parties who think that their countries should withdraw from membership, or whose policies towards the EU are tantamount to being opposed to the whole project of European integration as it is currently conceived’ (Taggart and Szczerbiak 2008a: 7). ‘Soft’ Euroscepticism does not include principled opposition to the EU, but ‘concerns on one (or a number) of policy areas’ leading to ‘qualified opposition to the EU’ (Taggart and Szczerbiak 2008: 7). Notwithstanding criticisms on this construction (see Kopecky and Mudde 2002), their typology remains the first step in the analysis of party orientations towards the EU.

Research on party based Euroscepticism involves two different perspectives, what Mudde calls Sussex and North Carolina schools (Mudde 2012). These schools differ in definition, scope and findings on the position on European integration. Here we combine Taggart’s framework on ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ Euroscepticism typological approach with Hooghe & Marks, as the one side of a continuum that ranges from ‘very positive to very negative dispositions towards European integration, its policies, its institutions or its principles’ (Ray 1999, Hooghe & Marks 2007:120). Our goal is to examine the different degrees of
Euroscepticism exhibit by Portuguese and Spanish parties, identify hard and soft Eurosceptic parties in both Portuguese and Spanish party systems, and explore the potential for the politicization of European integration in both countries before and after the crisis.

Euroscepticism appears mostly in the fringes of party systems and varies for ideological and strategic reasons (Taggart 1998, Ray 2007). The left-right dimension structures the position of political parties towards European integration. This empirical relationship is represented by an inverted U curve (Marks 2004, Marks, Wilson and Ray 2002). The curve shows support among centrist parties and opposition among parties towards both extremes. De Vries and Edwards (2009) show the concentration of Euroscepticism in the extremes of party systems, being radical left and right the most Eurosceptic party families in Europe. The radical right party family, however, is the truly Eurosceptic vanguard of Europe. While Euroscepticism is concentrated on both radical party families, its relative importance for party ideological stands has changed over time. Euroscepticism, treated as a secondary feature of the party core ideologies, increasingly moved to the fore (Gómez-Reino & Llamazares 2013).

Populism

As early as 1969, Ionescu and Gellner pointed out the increasing importance of populism in politics, but also its elusive conceptual nature. Since the publication of their work, theoretical improvements on populism, now a global phenomenon, have also made significant conceptual inroads into its nature, characteristics and applications. A common definition is still emerging in the literature but in recent years, there is increasing convergence and overlap in the use of the concept. The scholarly debate is shifting from concept development towards methodology and measurement, and populist attitudes at the mass level (Hawkins 2009, Poblete 2015, Van Kessel 2014). In this paper we follow Hawkins’ ideational approach to study populism to treat it as a set of ideas and latent dispositions (Hawkins 2009, 2010, Hawkins et al 2012).

---

9 There can be no doubt about the importance of populism. But no one is quite clear just what it is. As a doctrine or as a movement, it is elusive and protean. It bobs up everywhere but in many and contradictory shapes. Does it have any underlying unity? Or does the name cover a multitude of unconnected tendencies? (Ionescu & Gellner 1969:1).
**Populism as a concept**

There is an emerging common conceptual framework to analyze populism (Hawkins et al. 2012, Mudde and Kaltwasser 2013, Stavrakakis & Katsambekis 2014, Van Kessel 2014). Yet convergence, rather than consensus, seems to be prevailing. While there is considerable overlap between three types of definitions of populism during the past decade, as political discourse, ‘thin’ ideology, and political communication style, there are also underlying differences (Hawkins 2010, Mudde 2004, Jagers and Walgrave 2007).

First, there are differences in the nature and implications of understanding populism as an ideology or a political discourse (Canovan 1999, Hawkins 2010, Poblete 2015, Rooduijn 2015). Second, minimal definitions still exhibit differences in the use of populist as a ‘classifier’ or a ‘descriptor’ in the analysis (Van Kessel 2014). As Van Kessel aptly put it, populism as a ‘classifier’ refers to a circumscribed universe of populist actors, and populism as a ‘descriptor’, ‘denotes (more fleeting) expressions of populist discourse in political systems’. Thus, as Hawkins stresses, populism as a substantive and populist as an adjective need to be separated in the analysis (Hawkins 2010: 41).

Underlying these overlapping definitions, a core of basic features identifies the presence of populism in politics. Conceptual developments in the literature dwell on the minimal number of features and properties of populism (Meny and Sorel 2000, Taggart 2002). According to Mudde (2004: 543, see also Mudde and Rovira Kaltwasser 2012), populism is a thin ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite’. Moreover, politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people (see further Stanley 2008, Van Kessel 2014). Hawkins’ definition of populism links its presence to five distinctive elements: Manichaean outlook; identification of Good with the will of the people; identification of Evil with a conspiring elite; and two other elements: an emphasis

---

10 Very different conceptual frameworks to analyze populism still coexist in the contemporary literature that ranged from political strategy to political movements (Weyland ….)

11 The distinction advanced by Hawkins deserves to be highlighted. Worldview and discourse are both like an ideology in that they refer to sets of beliefs that shape and provide meaning to the political actions of a believer. But unlike an ideology, they lack significant exposition and contrast with other worldviews or discourses and are consequently low on policy (Hawkins 2010:page, see also Canovan 1999).

12 See for example the conceptual confusion emerging from the distinction between ‘thin’ and ‘thick’ populism (Jagers and Walgrave 2005, Wejnert and Woods 2014, Poblete 2015. The ‘thin’ and the ‘thick’ are understood as either dimensions within populism (thin the people), thick (anti-establishment, exclusivist politics) as in the analysis advanced by Jagers and Walgrave, or populism as a thin ideology in contrast to thick ideologies—the classic liberal and Marxist theories (Sergiou et al 2013).
on systemic change and anything-goes attitude toward minority rights and democratic procedure (Hawkins 2009, 2010). Among the five characteristics identified by Hawkins to define populism, the ‘Manichaean outlook’ stands in first place. 13 The definition fits within the larger conceptual convergence identified in the above literature. Hawkins’ analysis of populist discourse offers a universal analytical framework superimposed on right or left distinctions to examine the presence or absence of populism in party discourse and individual positions across the political spectrum.

**Populist political discourse: approaches**

In this paper we follow a definition of populism as political discourse. Discourse analysis provides three different approaches to the study of populism (Poblete 2015). First, the well-known theoretical framework advanced by Ernesto Laclau considers populism as a political construction of the people through antagonisms. Under this poststructuralist framework, every social practice has a meaning constituting discourse (Laclau 2007, Poblete 2015). Second, a postmodern approach understands populism as a set of ideas or latent meanings in speech, writing and symbolic action (Hawkins 2010, Poblete 2015). Third, populist discourse can be explored through content analysis—explicit linguistic allocution prone to more sophisticated quantitative measurement (see Poblete 2015, Rooduijn and Pawels 2014). 14

Hawkins’ ideational approach is operationalized and measured through holistic grading (Hawkins 2009, 2010). A human base coding approach, it grades texts and speeches evaluating them as a whole (2010). Holistic grading allows a quantitative assessment of the degree to which parties and party leaders are populist, and a comparative examination of the levels of populist discourse longitudinally across parties and countries.

**Populist political parties**

Even if a minimal definition of populism is provided, the application of the concept to political systems, political actors, and discourses can be problematic (Van Kessel 2014).

---

13 As Hawkins put it: Populism is just such a Manichaean outlook. It assigns a moral dimension to everything, no matter how technical, and interprets it as part of a cosmic struggle between Good and Evil.

14 The three approaches involve different epistemologies we do not discuss here: purely hermeneutical, interpretative with positivist categories and purely positivist and quantitative (Poblete 2015).
A case in point is the analysis of parties and party families with the label ‘populist’ attached to in the European continent. The existence of different variants of populist parties of the right and the left is a matter of theoretical and empirical research. The analysis of the ‘populist’ in European politics has been inextricably linked to radical right parties, reducing and essentializing the characteristics of the populist phenomenon in the European arena (Stavrakakis 2013). The labeling of the radical right in Europe as populist seems uncontroversial (Mudde 2007, 2012). In the widely used definition by Mudde, the populist radical right is ‘nativist, authoritarian and populist’ (Mudde 2007). However, the incidence and relationship of populism with the radical left is more recent and less developed in the literature. Mudde and Rovira Kaltwasser expand the definition of populism to identify inclusive and exclusive populisms that would respond to left and right populisms (Mudde and Rovira Kaltwasser 2012). Stavrakakis emphasizes the distinctive nature of a left populism in the European arena (Stavrakakis 2013, Stavrakakis and Katsamebekis 2014). March and Mudde (2005) advance the proposition that the radical left in Europe is in mutation, and the emerging new radical left employs a new ideological approach in the form of social-populism (March and Mudde 2005). The category of radical left parties is defined by March and Mudde as including a variety of Communist, ex-communist, Green and New Politics parties in Europe. 15 March identifies a specific Left-wing populism among the radical left: populist socialists and social populists among the radical left (March 2011).16 Here populism is mainstream in its demystification of the political elite, political resentment and external challenges to identity, so they treat it as a universal populist Zeitgeist in Western Europe also present among the radical left.17 The distinction between inclusionary (Left) and exclusionary

15 They state: we identify a ‘radical left’, which is radical first in that it rejects the underlying socio-economic structure of contemporary capitalism and its values and practices (ranging from rejection of consumerism and neoliberalism to outright opposition to private property and capitalistic profit incentives). Second, such radicals continue to advocate alternative economic and power structures involving a major redistribution of resources from the existing political elites. These groups are ‘left’ first in their identification on economic inequity as the basis of existing political and social arrangements, and their espousal of collective economic and social rights as their principal agenda. Second, anti-capitalism is more consistently expressed than antidemocracy, although a radical subversion of liberal democracy may be implicit or explicit in the redistributive aims of many groups. Finally, this left is internationalist, both in terms of its search for cross-national networking and solidarity, and in its assertion that national and regional socio-political issues have global structural causes (such as ‘imperialism’ or ‘globalization’ (March & Mudde 2005: 25).

16 In Western Europe, parties like the Dutch Socialistische Partij (Socialist Party, SP), or the Scottish Socialist Party (SSP) possess similar features, articulate similar themes and have gained a niche in their respective party systems. Luke March and Cas Mudde What’s Left of the Radical Left? Comparative European Politics 2005: 3

17 They are also populist in terms of juxtaposing ‘the moral people’ against ‘the corrupt elite’ (Mudde, 2004).
(Right) populism advanced by Mudde and Rovira Kaltwassser (2012) along three dimensions (material, symbolic and political) also points to the universality of populism but in a different direction, circumscribing left-right occurrence to regional subtypes, Europe (exclusive) and Latin America (inclusive) (Mudde and Rovira Kalwasser 2012:178).

At stake in this emerging debate on the incidence of populism on the radical left and right party families are two separate questions. First, debates seem to agree on a minimal definition of populism as populist discourse, a universal form with common characteristics exhibit both by left and right parties yet the proper definition of different subtypes (inclusive/exclusive, left/right) is under construction (Hawkins 2009, 2010, Mudde and & Rovira Kaltwasser 2012). Second, the relative weight of populism in the different party families, as shown in the differential location of the adjective ‘populist’ in Europe, the populist radical right in contrast to the radical populist left, is still an open question (Mudde 2007, March & Mudde 2005). While the former question invites further conceptual clarification of populism and its variants, the later involves the exploration of the levels of populism exhibit by parties with right and left orientations and the relative importance and incidence of populism in the definition of party families.

Convergence or divergence: the links between Euroscepticism and populism

For the convergence (unity, coordination) of Euroscepticism and populism to emerge, both phenomena have to exist in the first place. As pointed above, even if a minimal definition of populism is provided, the application of the concept to political systems, political actors, and discourses can be problematic (Van Kessel 2014). The convergence of populism and Euroscepticism involves the presence of political actors with a well-defined and measured populist and Eurosceptic discourse. Both the Portuguese and Spanish party systems were characterized by the presence of radical left Eurosceptic parties not linked to populist forms, and the absence of populist radical right parties. Thus, one of the elements was not present. For this convergence to emerge on the supply side on the Portuguese and Spanish cases, we explore the transformation of the old radical left in new ideological populist-forms among its ideological features, as suggested by March and Mudde (2005), and the emergence of new distinctive populist Eurosceptic parties. We hypothesize that the opening of the political opportunity structure within the context

______________________________
of the Great Recession provided incentives to political parties to change their ideological and strategic stand, change their party discourse or enter the political arena to mobilize public opinion.

**Impact: Eurosceptic populism as a challenge**

According to Taggart and Pirro (2016), the crises has facilitated populist Eurosceptic parties to challenge the pro-European consensus and reinforce the constraining dissensus. However, despite the salience of the economic, financial, and refugee crises across Europe, these crises have affected European countries in different ways. Arguably, the Portuguese and Spanish crisis represented a financial and economic downturn with wide repercussions in the population but both countries did not experience the migrant and refugee crises politically exploited by populist radical right parties. Thus, we expect the politicization of different dimensions of political contestation and variation in the salience of different political issues in contrast to other European countries.

Finally, we tentatively dwell on the impact of this surfacing populist Euroscepticism in Portugal and Spain. By impact, our convenors refer to populist parties’ *ability to wield direct or indirect influence on respective political systems in general, and policy dimensions in particular*. The stimulus introduced by populist parties would then consist of the capacity to change course of events, which might develop differently otherwise (Williams 2006: 42) and looked at the interaction between (populist) radical parties and their mainstream competitors (e.g. Minkenberg 2001; Meguid 2005). The type of responses of mainstream parties include (Downs 2001), engaging or disengaging from competition with their populist competitors on the European dimension. These strategies will alternatively result in:

1a) collaboration with the populists on European issues;
1b) co-optation of their Eurosceptic agenda;
2a) attempts to isolate populists in their Eurosceptic trajectory;
2b) attempts to ignore the Eurosceptic appeals of the populists.

According to Taggart and Pirro (2016), most interactions will cluster around co-optation (1b) or isolation (2a) strategies. One major form of cooptation is the contamination effect or ‘contagion’ of populist discourse and programs by populist parties. Matthijs Rooduijn, Sarah L de Lange and Wouter van der Brug (2014) have examined the programmatic reactions to the rise of populist parties and explored whether mainstream parties have
adopted populist programs as well. Their analysis of the results of a content analysis of election manifestos of parties in five Western European countries (France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands and the United Kingdom) shows that the programs of mainstream parties have not become more populist in recent years.\textsuperscript{18}

Although our convenors argue very few mainstream parties will be able to ignore the Eurosceptic pleas of their competitors, the differential politicization of European integration in different party systems can explain such outcome (2b). Thus, we hypothesize that in party systems where the incidence of Euroscepticism and its salience is very low, such as Portugal and Spain, the interaction and strategies of mainstream parties will cluster around the isolation of Eurosceptic parties, downplaying EU issues or the outward ignorance of populist Eurosceptic parties.

\textbf{Variables: definition, operationalization and measurement}

We seek first to determine if there has been an increasingly politicization of EU matters in Portuguese and Spanish politics (De Wilde and Trenz 2011) before and after the Great Recession and the implementation of austerity policies. We seek to ascertain whether the levels of Euroscepticism have increased in Portugal and Spain before and after the crisis. In order to do that, we use the CHES trend file 1999-2014 to establish the position and salience of EU for Portuguese and Spanish political parties. We will explore the salience of European integration as a key aspect of the degree of Euroscepticism. Thus, both position and salience of European integration will be considered here as an indicator of the politicization of EU matters in both party systems.

The expert survey includes 6 Portuguese parties and 23 Spanish parties. In favor of parsimony, for our analysis we have selected the parties that have a relevant role in the party system dynamics and remain in the national competition in 2014. Therefore, in the Portuguese case are considered 5 parties (CDU, CDS-PP, PS, PSD, BE and MPT), and 12 in the Spanish one (PSOE, PP, IU, CiU, PNV, ERC, BNG, CC, UPyD, Amaiur, Podemos and Ciudadanos).\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{18}Interestingly, their findings suggest that populist parties change their own programmes when they have been successful: Their initial success makes them tone down their populism’ (Rooduijn, De Lange, Van Der Brug 2014).

\textsuperscript{19}List of party abbreviations in Annex A
In terms of EU position, we use POSITION defined as ‘overall orientation of the party leadership towards European integration’ on a seven-point scale ranging from complete opposition to complete support of European integration. In terms of the two schools identified above, North Carolina operationalization of soft Euroscepticism is between the values of 2 and 4 (Mudde suggests to use 5 as cut off point somewhat in favor while North Carolina uses 5 (Mudde 2012: 197)

The variable EU_SALIENCE is defined as the ‘relative salience of European integration in the party’s public stance’ on an eleven-point scale ranging from no importance to European Integration as the most important issue.

For populism, we use the definition of populism advanced by Hawkins (Hawkins 2009, 2010) and Mudde & Kaltwasser (2012), and holistic grading to measure the levels of populist discourse across parties and actors. Unfortunately, our data do not allow proceeding in the same manner for the analysis of populist discourse for the 2014 Portuguese and Spanish cases. Our data for populist discourse in the Spanish case covers 2011 and some parties in 2014 but the Portuguese data for 2014 is still in the making. We complement data on populism with the variable salience of anti-establishment rhetoric introduced in the 2014 Chapel Hill Expert Survey.

The politicization of European integration before and after the crisis: Evolution of position and Salience of EU among Portuguese and Spanish parties

We start mapping out the position of salience of Portuguese and Spanish parties longitudinally. In the period before and after the crisis (2010-2014) in both the Portuguese and Spanish party systems there were changes in the overall orientation of political parties towards the European Integration. The levels of Euroscepticism after the crisis are confirmed in Portugal and Spain among parties of the radical left. If we use a cut-off point of 5, (soft) Eurosceptic parties in Spain are IU and Podemos in 2014, and in Portugal the MPT (soft), BE, a much more Eurosceptic party and CDU, a ‘hard’ Eurosceptic. In addition, the incidence of Euroscepticism is also present in left-oriented minority nationalist parties and coalitions such as BNG, Amaiur and ERC. However, as the position of these parties show, Euroscepticism in the Spanish party system, even after the crises, can only be defined as moderate or soft. Paradoxically, the position of most Spanish parties towards European Integration became more favorable while in Portugal only the position of the governing parties (PSD and CDS-PP) became more favorable
with the crisis. The data indicates that the significant increases in the salience of European Integration between 2010 and 2014 in both countries with the crisis but for a few exceptions.

In Portugal mainstream parties had an overall positive orientation towards European integration, although with the economic crisis the position of the PS has turned more negative. The traditionally Eurosceptic parties, CDU y BE, are even more so in 2014, in particular the CDU, which achieves the highest level of Euroscepticism since its creation.

CDU is the most Eurosceptic party during all the period under study, yet in 2014 it is the most Eurosceptic (1.88). Its position shifted 1.12 points towards Eurosceptic orientations since 2010. BE was traditionally one the most Eurosceptic parties in Portugal, with the exception of the CDU. However, the BE was more Eurosceptic at the beginning of the 2000 than during the period of the crisis. CHES data show that in 2014 its position is 3.13, 0.54 points less in favor of European integration than in 2010. CDS-PP shows a positive orientation, despite at the beginning of the past decade the party was against European integration. Its position shifted over time and acquired its highest level after the crisis in 2014 (6.13), shifting 0.63 points in favor of European integration between 2010 and 2014. This may be explained by the fact that the CDS-PP has participated as a minor party in the government implementing the austerity measures imposed by the EU after the bailout. As for the PS, one of the two main Portuguese parties, in government for different periods since the transition to democracy and also during the first period of the economic crisis, its position on European integration suffered after the crisis. From 2000 onwards the PS had a very positive orientation towards European integration, yet in 2014 the levels of Euroenthusiasm achieved its lowest level (6.38), decreasing 0.42 on the scale towards Euroscepticism with respect to 2010. The other mainstream Portuguese party, the PSD, has also being in favor of European integration, although slightly less than the PS. In 2014, the PSD, party in office and in charge of implementing austerity policies rigged to the rescue, registers the highest level of pro-European orientations since 2000 (6.88, slightly over 2010 when its score was 0.11 less in favor). Lastly, the MPT, whose data only cover 2014, obtains a 4.71 on the scale and therefore can be treated as a soft Eurosceptic, more moderate in its orientations than the CDU and BE.

In Spain Euroscepticism is more difficult to identify than in Portugal. Paradoxically, most political parties in Spain have evolved towards Euroenthusiast orientations after the crises. Traditionally, the most Eurosceptic parties were IU and some nationalist parties,
especially those left-oriented (ERC, BNG) and less so PNV (center-right). However, all of them exhibit a rather moderate Euroscepticism, and in some periods, even show Euroenthusiast orientations (the BNG in 2002, PNV in 2014, and ERC in 2010 and 2014). The PP, party in office during the hardest period of the Spanish crisis and clearly in favor of European integration since 2000 although traditionally less Euroenthusiast than the PSOE—shows in 2014 its highest orientation towards European integration (6.80), above the PSOE. Its positive orientation increases 0.80 points with respect to 2010. In contrast, the PSOE, in office during the first stage of the recession and always in favor of European integration, in 2014 obtains one of its lowest scores (6.70)—the lowest achieved in 2002. The IU is the most Eurosceptic party in the Spanish party system. From 2000 onwards up to the present, the overall orientation of the party towards European integration ranges from 3.67 (1999) to 4.75 (2010). From the beginning of the crises its Eurosceptic position has increased but not abruptly such as in the Portuguese cases (4.6 in 2014). UPyD – born in 2009 and now extinct, mildly showed pro-European position in 2010 (5.27 in favor of integration) and clearly more so in 2014 (6.67). The newly born Ciudadanos, whose scores are only available for 2014, also exhibits clear pro-European orientations (6.67). The Catalan CiU – the majority and governing coalition in Catalonia until the most recent changes in the Catalan party system—was a traditional supporter of European integration (positions ranging from 6.58 in 1999 to 6.09 in 2010). From the beginning of the crises, however, its position has mildly shifted towards more Euroenthusiast orientations (0.21 more with respect to 2010). The Basque PNV – in government during the time period analyzed, has been a traditional supporter of European integration, although its position has been less Euroenthusiast than Catalan parties. The positions of the PNV on European integration range from 5.75 in 1999, 6.08 in 2002, 5.62 in 2006, 5.73 in 2010 and 6.44 in 2014. Surprisingly, the highest level of support for European integration is also achieved after the crises. CC exhibits a similar trend. The Canary Coalition has a positive orientation towards European integration. The starting point is a favorable position on European integration (6 in 1999, 6.18 in 2002), a decrease in positive orientations (5.27 in 2006 and 5.60 in 2010), to later show the most Euroenthusiast position in its history after the crises (6.38 in 2014). The other Catalan major party, ERC, which represents a left-oriented Catalan nationalism – exhibits more moderate positions on European integration, leaning towards soft Euroscepticism. In 1999 ERC position was 4.5, 4.46 in 2006, 5.27 in 2010 to achieve a 5.56 in 2014, the highest position on European integration.
during the period analyzed. Despite the position of the ERC is not comparable to the pro-European orientations of other parties, it follows the same trend of increases in the favorable position towards European integration. In turn, the Galician BNG also follows a similar trajectory; in 2014, its position was more in favor of European integration than in 2010 (from 4.82 to 5.00).

CHES data also covers new coalitions in the Spanish party system whose scores are only available for 2014. The Basque and Navarrese coalition Amaiur obtained a score of 4.71 on the scale, becoming part of the moderate of soft Eurosceptic nationalist actors. Finally, the newly born Podemos obtained a score of 4.44 in the 2014 CHES Expert Survey, being, together with IU, the most Eurosceptic party in the contemporary Spanish party system.

**Figure 1.** Evolution of the party positioning regarding EU integration. 1999 - 2014


As of the evolution of the salience of European integration, 2002 was a key year for party agendas with the introduction of the euro. In Portugal, there is significant variation in the evolution of the salience of European integration in the Portuguese party system. Even then, with the economic crisis, European integration has become even more relevant for all Portuguese political parties. Integration has been a relevant issue in 2002 (with the introduction of the euro) with the exception of CDU and BE, parties that did not

---

20 Amaiur was a left political coalition in the Basque country and Navarra to defend the right of self-determination created in 2011. It included Eusko Alkartasuna, Alternatiba, Aralar and independents of the abertzale left.
accentuate their stances against European Integration in the period of adoption of the common currency. Salience decreased in 2006 and 2010 but it became very important in 2014 for all parties. Interestingly, in 2002 the salience of European integration was only significant for mainstream parties whereas them and minor parties gave similar relevance to European integration in 2014. The only exception is the MPT, the party that assigned less relevance to European integration in the Portuguese party system. However, without exceptions, the salience of European integration has increased from 2010 to 2014 (Figure 2).

In Spain the evolution of the salience of European integration in the Spanish party system has followed a different trajectory. Mainstream parties are those that attach more salience during the period under study, even in 2014 European integration becomes a more relevant issue for most mainstream in comparison with Eurosceptic Spanish parties. The relative importance of European integration for some regional parties increased since 2010 and 2006, yet it does not reach the levels of widespread salience it exhibited with debates on the common currency. Minor parties and new parties consider European integration a relevant matter, but salience is higher for national and minority nationalist parties. Nonetheless, in Spain, the salience of European integration has increased for all parties from 2010 to 2014.

**Figure 2.** Party positioning in the bi-dimensional space: UE Saliency vs UE position.
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Populism in Portugal and Spain

To what extent do Portuguese and Spanish parties exhibit a populist Euroscepticism? Table 1 reproduces the scores of populist discourse of Portuguese and Spanish political parties using holistic grading (Hawkins and Castanho da Silva 2016)\textsuperscript{21}. The scores, combining the analysis of manifestos and speeches, show the low levels of all parties before the outbreak of the crisis, the highest corresponding to IU in Spain. Aggregate country scores for Portugal and Spain in 2011 show higher levels of populism in Spanish parties. Data on the populist discourse of Spanish parties in 2014 show that Podemos obtained the highest scores. Unfortunately, data for the Portuguese case in 2014 are still under construction so a meaningful comparison of the extent to which Portuguese parties have leaned towards populist discourses in their programs and speeches is not yet available.

The data from the Chapel Hill expert survey 2014 complement the information on populist attitudes. A new variable, salience of anti-elite and anti-establishment rhetoric, introduced in the 2014 Chapel Hill Survey for the first time allows locating the level of party rhetoric. We are aware that anti-establishment rhetoric only covers one feature of

\textsuperscript{21} Hawkins and Castanho use holistic grading to measure populism and apply it to 136 parties from 26 countries in Europe and the Americas. The data set allows classifying party systems according to the level of populism in parties’ discourse. It includes electoral manifestos and speeches by party leaders, from all main parties in a political system to establish how populist each actor is, and compare it to other cases (Hawkins and Castanho da Silva 2016).
the concept of populism we have developed above. Still, we believe this indicator provides useful information to identify populist Eurosceptic parties in both systems. In Portugal CDU, MPT and BE show the highest scores, between more than 7 on a 10-point scale (also the lowest positions on European Integration). In Spain the new born Podemos shows the highest scores in anti-elite rhetoric, 10 on a 10-point scale, followed by UPyD and Ciudadanos. IU, BNG and Amaiur also are situated above 5 on this scale. Podemos and IU also show the lowest scores on the position on European integration, while UPyD and Cs have a very positive view on European Integration. While this variable only partially taps into populist discourse—antiestablishment is one of the elements of the definition advanced above—the results are consistent with the populist scores of holistic grading although they indicate higher level of rhetoric.

Table 1. Populist discourse of Portuguese and Spanish political parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Manifesto</th>
<th>Speeches</th>
<th>Party score</th>
<th>Anti-elitist rhetoric (CHES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal 2011</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDS-PP</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDU</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDS-PP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain 2011</td>
<td>PSOE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UPyD</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CiU</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PNV</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Combining data from party positions on European integration with the relative salience of anti-elite rhetoric, the category of populist Eurosceptic parties can be constructed. We try to establish the convergence of populism and Euroscepticism by mapping in the bi-dimensional space the European Position and anti-elite rhetoric salience of Portuguese and Spanish parties. This strategy results in the identification of the Populist Eurosceptic parties within the right lower quadrant (Figure 3). In the case of Portugal, can be confirmed that BE and CDU are populist Eurosceptic parties. The CDU is the most Eurosceptic, although the levels of salience of anti-elite rhetoric are similar for both parties. As we opted to use a higher cut off point for soft Euroscepticism (Mudde 2012), in the Spanish case we find among the category of populist Eurosceptic parties Amaiur, BNG (on the limit), IU and in particular Podemos. The four parties are all moderate Eurosceptic (all positions within the range of 4 and 5), although they differ in the scores of anti-elite rhetoric salience. As for the salience of anti-elite rhetoric, Amaiur, BNG y IU have moderate positions, whereas for Podemos is the most important issue in their public interventions, according to 2014 CHES data, and the populist scores of the party according to the 2014 analysis of manifests and speeches with holistic grading.
Position toward European Integration and Ideology

Here we explore if there have been significant changes in the ideological contours of Euroscepticism in Portugal and Spain. We use the CHES Expert survey variables on parties’ overall ideological stance, position of parties in the ideological stance on economic issues, and views on freedoms and rights. In addition to shifts in the position towards European integration, Eurosceptic parties could also have displayed changes in their ideological profile during the period of the Great Recession.

In Portugal political parties have barely changed their ideological orientations but positions show a greater polarization. A new Eurosceptic party has emerged, the MPT,

The variables are defined as follows: lrgen: position of the party in YEAR in terms of its overall ideological stance.

LRECON = position of the party in YEAR in terms of its ideological stance on economic issues. Parties can be classified in terms of their stance on economic issues. Parties on the economic left want government to play an active role in the economy. Parties on the economic right emphasize a reduced economic role for government: privatization, lower taxes, less regulation, less government spending, and a leaner welfare state.

GALTAN = position of the party in YEAR in terms of their views on democratic freedoms and rights. “Libertarian” or “postmaterialist” parties favor expanded personal freedoms, for example, access to abortion, active euthanasia, same-sex marriage, or greater democratic participation. “Traditional” or “authoritarian” parties often reject these ideas; they value order, tradition, and stability, and believe that the government should be a firm moral authority on social and cultural issues.

which is, according to the CHES Expert Survey, the rightest wing party of the Portuguese party system. In addition, the CDU, the most Eurosceptic and left wing party, moved to the left, a position of 0.5 on the ideological scale (0.67 in 2010). In contrast, the BE moderates its ideological position moving slightly towards the center (from 1.17 to 1.33). A closer look reveals that in the economic dimension, both the BE and the CDU have radicalized their positions to some extent, being more favorable to an active role of government in the economy. On this scale the BE moves from a position of 1 in 2010 to 0.37 in 2014; the CDU from 0.5 to 0.33. Interestingly pro-European parties have moved in the opposite direction, favoring privatization, tax cuts, deregulation, less public and welfare expenditures, that is, a support for the austerity measures implemented after the Great Recession. The position of the PS increases from 4 to 4.67; and the PSD from 7 to 7.83. The position of Portuguese parties on the (GAL-TAN) dimension moves to the right, with the exception of the PSD. The CDU dramatically changes its position, from 1.67 in 2010 to 4.17 in 2014.

**Figure 4.** Party positioning in the bi-dimensional space: UE position vs Ideology. Portugal 2010 -2014

The effects of the implementation of austerity policies in the changing positions of political parties can be observed at views around the axes related to the improvement of public services vs tax cuts and deregulation of national economic sectors. Regarding the position of the parties on improving public services versus tax increases, the Portuguese parties have changed their position based on their ideological stance. The three parties of the left (PS, BE, CDU) have moderated their speech on the subject of improving public services - especially the BE and CDU, the populist Eurosceptic parties, who have softened their position in a greater extent; while right-wing parties (PSD and CDS-PP) have relaxed their positions relative to lower taxes, which result in a move toward the political centre from both sides of the ideological axis. The MPT enters 2014 with a moderate position on this issue. In relation to the deregulation of the economy, the left parties remain unchanged its position with respect to 2010, both the BE and PS as the CDU, besides the CDS-PP, minority partner of the Portuguese government in 2014. The PSD instead, is 2.17 points over 10 more are in favour of deregulation of the economy than in 2010. The MPT is in a rather neutral position regarding the deregulation topic (4.33).

Possible changes triggered by the refugee crisis will be observed through the positions of the parties on issues related to immigration policy and models of cultural integration of immigrants into the host societies. In matters of immigration and multiculturalism, the two parties forming the coalition government in Portugal, we could say are approaching positions. While the PSD, usually neutral in these matters, vary slightly its position towards a tougher immigration law and assimilationist model of integration; the CDS-PP, which has traditionally been placed in extreme positions against immigrants, slightly moderated their positions on both topics. In the same vein, the MPT advocates a strict immigration law, as well as a model of assimilation. The left parties (PS, CDU and BE), meanwhile, are more in favour than in 2010 for a lax immigration law. However, only the CDU is more in favour of multiculturalism than in 2010, while the PS and BE moderate their positions in this regard.
Table 2. Changes in party-positioning. Portugal 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spend vs Tax</th>
<th>Deregulation</th>
<th>Immigration policy</th>
<th>Multiculturalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS-PP</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDU</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPT</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Spain the rise of Podemos has polarized (in absolute terms) the party system, being located on the extreme left (1.67). Populist Eurosceptic parties (IU, BNG, Amaiur and Podemos) are all left-wing. Of all these parties, Podemos is still the more Eurosceptic and leftist party of the Spanish party system, while previously existing parties (IU and BNG) have slightly moderated their positions in comparison with 2010. With regard to pro-European integration parties (all right-wing, the PSOE and ERC in 2014) the evolution with the crises has been different. Whereas PSOE, ERC, PP and CC have move towards the center, UPyD, CiU and PNV have slightly moved towards the right. The same can be observed in the economic division of party system. The position on ideological economic issues shows that PSOE, IU, ERC and BNG moved in different degrees towards the center (more so the PSOE); while UPyD, CiU and CC moved towards the right and the PP remains in a similar position. Regarding economic ideological position of new parties, Cs stands at 6.5, while Amaiur is the party located more to the left (1.14) in economic terms, followed by Ps (1.25). Regarding the cultural dimension of electoral competition (GAL-TAN) some parties have moved towards the pole of the Green Alternative Libertarian, such the PSOE and UPyD. Other parties traditionally positioned in the GAL pole have softened their stances as IU, ERC and BNG. Spanish right-wing parties, conventionally
positioned in the Traditional Authoritarian Nationalist pole of the axis, have slightly moved towards the cultural center, giving a kind of convergence towards the center in this dimension. New parties, are positioned in closer to the GAL pole of the cultural division, specially Podemos.

**Figure 5.** Party positioning in the bi-dimensional space: UE position vs Ideology. Spain 2010 -2014

In terms of the position of Spanish parties towards austerity, between 2010 and 2014 the comparison of the position of parties on public services versus tax reductions show that the PSOE is the only party whose position on public expenditures has improved in 2014. IU and BNG have marginally changed their positions (IU moves from 0.91 to 1; BNG from 1.78 to 1.89). The PP, CiU, PNV and CC are more in favor of tax reductions in 2014. The evolution of ERC is more relevant, shifting from a position in favor of public services in 2010 (2.4) to a clear support for tax reductions (6.5). This dramatic change is likely to be connected to the demand of independence in Catalonia, and its close ties with the issue of the economic contribution of the autonomous community to the expenses of the Spanish central government - ERC claims that taxes would be lower in an independent
Catalonia. The new parties show contrasting positions on social expenditures. While Cs adopts a neutral position (5.13), Amaiur and especially Podemos, are in favor of improving public services. In terms of deregularization of economic services, Spanish parties are less in favor than in 2010. The PSOE and BNG were already against it, while CiU and PNV exhibited a moderate positions that favor deregulation. The PP, UPyD, CC, IU and ERC all moderate their position against deregulation. In turn, the new parties, as expected, behave in different ways: Cs in favor of liberalization of economic services, and Amaiur and Podemos, against it.

The Spanish parties also show differences on the position regarding immigration policy. The PSOE, IU, ERC, BNG are in favor of less restrictive immigration laws. In contrast, PP, CiU, PNV, CC prefer a more restrictive immigration law. The new parties, Amaiur and Podemos, are in favor of less restrictive immigration law, especially Podemos. Ciudadanos favors restrictive immigration law. In terms of migrant’s integration and asylum seekers, PSOE, IU, BNG are more in favor of multiculturalism than in 2010. In turn PP, UPyD, CiU, PNV, CC and ERC exhibit more assimilationist positions. The new parties in 2014, Amaiur and Cs exhibit moderate positions in favor of assimilation and Podemos is clearly in favor of multiculturalism.

Table 3. Changes in the party-positioning. Spain 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spend vs Tax</th>
<th>Deregulation</th>
<th>Immigration policy</th>
<th>Multiculturalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSOE</strong></td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP</strong></td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IU</strong></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UPYD</strong></td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS</strong></td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PS</strong></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIU</strong></td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PNV</strong></td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concluding remarks

The Portuguese and Spanish parties identified here had experienced an electoral growth in recent years. The Bloco de Esquerda jumped from 5.2% of the vote and 8 seats in the 2011 general elections to 10% of the vote and 19 seats in 2015. The Spanish Izquierda Unida obtained 6.92% and 11 seats in the 2011 general elections, but the coalition merely obtained 3.7% of the vote and 2 seats in the 2015 general elections. Izquierda Unida entered a coalition with Podemos for the 2016 general elections that did not fulfill the expectations of their leaders, Alberto Garzón and Pablo Iglesias. The success of Podemos in European and general elections in 2014-2016 shook the foundations of the traditional Spanish party system to become the third party.23

In Portugal the crisis left the pillars of the radical left more radical and more Eurosceptic and exhibiting an anti-elite rhetoric. The BE was born as a coalition in 1999 from two small left-extremist parties (Revolutionary Socialist Party, PSR and Popular Democratic Union, UDP) and a political movement (Política XXI) (Lisi 2011:130). The BE has similarities with the new politics profile elaborated for left-libertarian parties in old democracies (Lisi 2011: 132). Party manifestos combine traditional socialist policies and libertarian and post-materialist issues. It included welfare state issues in education, health and social security, yet it also politicized new topics such as ecology, gender and antiracism, peace and drugs (Lisi 2011). In 2007 the programmatic stand of the BE changed as the coalition attempted to avoid the image of an extreme to one of an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5.57</th>
<th>5.33</th>
<th>6.38</th>
<th>5.57</th>
<th>6.44</th>
<th>6.28</th>
<th>6.57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERC</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNG</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAIUR</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


23 The party was officially registered in March and the following May it had achieved a major electoral breakthrough, obtained 5 MEPs to the European parliament, and become the fourth most-voted party in the party system. In the May 2015 regional elections, Podemos became the third most voted for party at the national level. In the general elections of December 2015, Podemos, in alliance with other groups in Catalonia, Galicia, and Valencia, became the third most voted for party by obtaining 20.7% of the votes, at short distance of the traditional Socialist Party (22%) and the Popular Party (28.7%). Electoral results the following June 2016 general elections, confirmed Podemos (21.1% of the vote) as the third force in the Spanish party system.
‘ecosocialist’ party (Lisi 2011:138). In Spain a new party Podemos (We Can) suddenly emerged in 2014 after the Spanish economic and political crisis of the previous years. The political discourse of the new party was directed against the economic and political establishment—the caste, in the language of the party. Our analysis shows the distinctiveness of the populist Euroscepticism of Podemos in comparative perspective. The analysis of Hugo Marcos and Carolina Plaza applying Hawkins’ technique of holistic grading shows that Iglesias’s discourses portray a Manichean vision of society referring to the difference between the people and “the caste” (la casta), the political and economic elites that occupy a privileged social position and lead the government and the economy (Gómez-Reino & Llamazares 2015). In Laclau’s terms, the caste works here as the excluded other that, through its 'demonization,' allows the constitution of the people (Laclau 2007: 70 and 80-83). In this interpretation, professional politicians are more interested in maintaining their privileges than in serving the interests of the people. For these reasons, left and right divisions have become irrelevant, and are used as manipulating devices by political elites. Thus, unlike other Portuguese and Spanish parties of the radical left moving towards populist traits, the genesis of Podemos is inextricably linked to the use of populist discourse analysis in party mobilization ad downplaying the left-right dimension (Gómez-Reino & Llamazares forthcoming), and illustrates a more intimate and contemporary connection between populism and Euroscepticism.

Our analysis has identified a category of populist Eurosceptic parties in Portugal and Spain after the Great Recession and the implementation of austerity measures in both countries. Combining data from party positions with the relative salience of anti-elite rhetoric, in the Portuguese case BE and CDU emerged as part of this category. The CDU is the most Eurosceptic party, although the levels of salience of anti-elite rhetoric are similar for both parties. In the Spanish case the Basque Amaiur, the Galician BNG, IU and in particular Podemos pertain to the category of populist Eurosceptic parties. In the Spanish case, all four parties are moderate Eurosceptic and as for the salience of anti-elite

---

24 The uses of patriotism in Iglesias’s discourses also represent a radical novelty. In Spain patriotism has been mostly emphasized by the political right, which has also attempted to link Spanish pride and nationalism to conservative institutions (the Army, the Crown, the Church), traditional values (Catholicism), and the rejection of foreign-based ideologies, such as liberalism or socialism. The association of Spanish nationalism with the centralist and anti-peripheral policies conducted by the Francoist regime increased the unease of the Spanish left with patriotic and nationalist rhetoric. Iglesias’s discourse attempted to overcome this division by establishing a new encompassing division between all the people and the elites. Patriotic pride and dignity were now linked to solidarity, hard work, and care for the common good (Gómez-Reino & Llamazares 2015).
rhetoric, Amaiur, BNG and IU have moderate positions, whereas for Podemos is the most important issue in their public interventions.

Overall, the position on European integration of Portuguese radical left parties is more negative than their Spanish counterparts, and was accentuated during the period of the implementation of the austerity measures. Paradoxically Spanish political parties have not tapped into European integration and their positions after the crisis have even improved. We have identified the presence of a populist Euroscepticism in Portugal and Spain with distinctive features. More interestingly, our analysis shows the different shape of populist Euroscepticism in both countries. While in Portugal populist Eurosceptic parties are more Eurosceptic than populist, in Spain the weight of Euroscepticism is lower for all the populist Eurosceptic, radical left and nationalist alike.

Regarding the characterization of the populist Eurosceptic parties in Portugal and Spain, our analysis confirms that all of them are situated at the extreme of the ideological axis, specifically on the left. As for the changes in the ideological contours of populist Eurosceptic parties, our analysis show that in Portugal, both the CDU and the BE have moderated their positions in relation to the improvement of public services compared to before the crisis, while no changes are observed in their positions around the deregulation of the economy. Instead, their overall economic stances show that both parties are in favor of more state intervention in the economy than in 2010. A similar pattern is observed in Spain, where IU and BNG has slightly softened their economic stances with respect to 2010. Instead, new populist Eurosceptic parties, Podemos and Amaiur, are the most radical parties in economic terms (those who most strongly advocate for the state intervention in the economy). Although the old parties (IU and BNG) have moderated their economic appeals with respect 2010, it should be noted that the positions of the old and the new populist Eurosceptic parties are very similar. The same applies in relation to the improvement of public services and deregulation.

Surprisingly, our study also confirms that, despite not having dramatically experienced the refugee crisis, in both countries the more relevant changes regarding programmatic stances of parties are related with cultural issues, with few exceptions. Although we can still say that populism in Southern Europe, unlike in other European countries, is inclusionary, inasmuch as all populist Eurosceptic parties recorded favorable positions regarding lax immigration law and multiculturalism, all of them are farther from the pole GAL than in 2010, especially the CDU in Portugal. In Spain, it is worthy to mention that
minor nationalist parties are more moderate regarding immigration issues than the Eurosceptic populist statewide political parties are.

As for the changes in the positions of mainstream parties in relation to the European integration, it should be noted that in both party systems, the conservative parties (PSD in Portugal and PP in Spain) are more in favor than ever, while the social democratic parties (PS in Portugal and PSOE in Spain) recorded the worst figures on this matter. The analysis of this phenomenon cannot be separated from the role of government / opposition that mainstream parties played in the period of analysis.

Further investigation is necessary to determine to what extent discourses of populist Eurosceptic parties have exerted an impact on the strategies of traditional parties. This preliminary analysis suggests that populist Euroscepticism in the Portuguese and Spanish party systems seems to be circumscribed to a limited political space. In addition, further research needs to examine in depth changes in the ideological contours of populist Eurosceptic parties, their causes, and the strategic factors that shape populist Euroscepticism in Iberian politics.
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### Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Name of the party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Bloco de Esquerda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDU</td>
<td>Coligação Democrática Unitária</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPT</td>
<td>Partido da Terra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Partido Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>Partido Social Democrata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDS-PP</td>
<td>Partido do Centro Democrático Social – Partido Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>PSOE</td>
<td>Partido Socialista Obrero Español</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Partido Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Izquierda Unida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UPyD</td>
<td>Unión Progreso y Democracia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CiU</td>
<td>Convergència i Unió</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PNV</td>
<td>Partido Nacionalista Vasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Coalición Canaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BNG</td>
<td>Bloque Nacionalista Galego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amaiur</td>
<td>Amaiur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podemos</td>
<td>Podemos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ciudadanos</td>
<td>Ciudadanos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>