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ABSTRACT
Patronage is central to Polish party politics. This paper examines the extent of party patronage in Poland in the period 2001-2006. The two governments under investigation are: the left coalition government of the Democratic Left Alliance, the Labour Union and the Polish Peasant Party formed in October 2001 and the right minority government of the Law and Justice party formed in October 2005. A significant extent of party patronage was expected in the case of the Democratic Left Alliance, which confirmed a dominant party thesis (Grzymała-Busse 2003; O’Dwyer 2004). However, in the case of Law and Justice, party patronage was expected to be hindered by party competition. This has not been the case, which challenges two arguments put forward by Grzymala-Busse (2003) that the dispersion of parliamentary power constrains party patronage and that in Poland the general pattern is that of decreasing rent-seeking.
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I. Introduction

Patronage is central to Polish party politics. Following the abolition of the *nomenklatura* system in 1989, which linked all key public appointments to communist party membership, *multiparty nomenklatura* has occurred in postcommunist Poland. Political parties allocate jobs in public and semi-public spheres and politicians play a decisive role in running thousands of state-owned enterprises, state agencies, institutions and funds. In a partitocratic polity “favours distributed by parties have covered many aspects of public life” (Blondel 2002: 251). According to the estimates some 90 thousands party activists may be recommended by a party for a job in public sector in Poland (Bogusz et al. 2000). State politicisation is extensive.

The aim of this paper is to analyse party patronage in Poland in the period 2001-2006. Party patronage is defined in terms of appointments, i.e. jobs in central government administration, quangos and state-owned enterprises. The period under investigation is determined by two electoral outcomes: in the September 2001 parliamentary elections the centre-left Democratic Left Alliance and the Labour Union electoral coalition won yet was short of majority, hence formed a coalition government with the Polish Peasant Party, while in the September 2005 parliamentary elections the right-wing Law and Justice party won and formed a minority government. However, the analysis is limited to governments’ first five months in office. This is justified by the fact that key appointments are distributed immediately after the government is formed. Moreover, in both cases, formal government arrangements changed during the term in office.

Theoretical assumptions on clientalism, party government and party competition shed some light on party patronage. Kitschelt (2000) identifies several factors which make clientelist politics a plausible prospect, for example the underlying trajectory of state formation. The idea of party government captures the relationship between party and government (Blondel 2000). O’Dwyer (2004) argues that in the case of a dominant party in government, the government parties can be expected to monopolise and maximise patronage. Grzymała-Busse (2003) claims that when many actors compete for governance, they constrain each other in the extraction of resources from the state.
Borrowing from the aforementioned assumptions, a significant extent of party patronage was expected in the case of the Democratic Left Alliance, which confirmed a dominant party thesis (Grzymała-Busse 2003; O’Dwyer 2004). While in the case of Law and Justice, party patronage was expected to be hindered by party competition. The dispersion of parliamentary power with a minority government counting on the support of fringe populist parties, and strong opposition were to constrain party patronage. However, drawing from a variety of evidence I have shown that party patronage was as extensive as in the case of the Democratic Left Alliance, one could even argue that to some extent it exceeded the magnitude of SLD patronage; because of more political appointees in government and an attempt to completely abolish the civil service. Hence, I have challenged two arguments put forward by Grzymała-Busse (2003) that the dispersion of parliamentary power constrains party patronage and that in Poland the general pattern is that of decreasing rent-seeking.

Party system and party competition are central notions in the analysis of party patronage in Poland. The Polish party system is the most complicated and the most dynamic in Eastern Europe (Benoit and Hayden 2004: 12). In the 1990’s there were both old cleavages (solidarity v. communist) and emerging ones (pro-EU v. anti-EU). In 2001 new antisystem parties were elected to parliament. After the 2005 elections there has been an emerging polarisation between the Civic Platform and the Law and Justice party.4 An additional characteristic of the Polish party system is a high degree of defections and party switching (Benoit and Hayden 2004; Gwiazda 2005). Initially only post-solidarity parties were considered to be underinstitutionalised. However in 2004 some thirty post-communist deputies from the Democratic Left Alliance quit the governing party to form a Polish Social Democracy and in 2005 some other quit to join the Democratic Party. Since 1989 the Polish party system has remained underinstitutionalised, generating unstable governments and fractious oppositions (see Markowski 2001). No ruling party has managed to win re-election.

Patronage-ridden politics exists in many contemporary societies and has been present in a European context (Shefter 1977; Müller 2000; Blondel 2000; Grzymała-Busse 2003; O’Dwyer 2004). Nevertheless, it is an understudied phenomenon and “efforts have to be made to expand our knowledge both at the level of each country and
comparatively” (Müller 2000). Moreover, there remains a research deficit of this phenomenon in Central Europe in the first years of the new millennium. So far, analyses have concentrated on synchronic comparisons of East Central European states in the 1990’s (Grzymała-Busse 2003; O’Dwyer 2004), yet within-state analyses and diachronic variation were overlooked. Hence, this paper addresses a research deficit in the area of party patronage in Poland. Moreover, a detailed analysis of Polish party politics in the period 2001-2006 is presented. However, in this paper I concentrate only on central government while local government and administration are excluded. Finally, the limitation of the study is that most information on patronage is soft based on evidence which is not easily quantified (see Müller 2000). Nevertheless, the objective of the paper is not to quantify party patronage but rather to trace idiosyncratic patterns at two moments in time in Poland. Hence, the classification I propose is an aid and will guide me in the analysis of variation in party patronage.

A comparative method is employed as a research technique. However, this epistemological strategy is case-oriented. The choice of the two parties allows the undertaking of a detailed comparison of two different parties in terms of ideology (left-right dimension) and government type (minority v. majority). I concentrate mainly on the two parties, neglecting to an extent formal or informal coalition partners, because the Democratic Left Alliance and the Law and Justice party were in reality governing parties in 2001 and 2005 respectively with the highest per cent of support. The CBOS public opinion poll in December 2001 showed the following support for the parties in government: 40 per cent for the Democratic Left Alliance; 3 per cent for the Labour Union and 8 per cent for the Polish Peasant Party while in February 2006 the support for Law and Justice was 34 per cent. The data for the analysis of party patronage came from Sejm documents, party and government statements, quality newspapers such as Gazeta Wyborcza and Rzeczpospolita; and informal interviews with civil servants and academics in Poland.

The remainder of this paper is divided into three sections. Section 2 is a conceptual and theoretical analysis of patronage. Section 3 is an empirical analysis of party patronage in Poland. Finally, a concluding section presents a discussion and comparison of two parties and summarises the empirical findings.
II. Conceptual and Theoretical Insights

Defining Party Patronage
Like other key concepts in the social sciences, patronage is open to conceptual disputation and empirical debate. In fact, the concept of patronage is often associated with linkage, politicisation, clientalism and corruption. However, in order not to run the risk of conceptual stretching, I will show how the concept of party patronage is distinct from other notions with its emphasis on appointments as party resources.

Daalder (1966) provided one of the first definitions of patronage as the ‘reach’ or ‘permeation’ of parties within the state and semi-state sector: “perhaps the best measure to distinguish the relative hold of party elites on a political system is to ask how far positions of political influence can be obtained through party channels” (Daalder 1966: 75). Shefter (1977) defines patronage as a benefit, which may take many forms, which politicians distribute to individual voters, campaign workers, or contributors in exchange for political support. Following Shefter’s definition, Warner (1997) claims that patronage may not be monetary; instead it may include jobs, police action, licenses and bureaucratic intervention. According to Müller (2000) patronage is “the use of public resources for political goals; it is either an appointment or a policy decision.” For Blondel (2000) patronage means the distribution of favours (such as an honour, a job, a contract, or public construction works) to individuals in exchange for political advantages accruing to those who give the favours, i.e. either the government or the political party.

Political parties continue to be evaluated in terms of the linkage between the state and civil society. Lawson (1980) discusses the links between citizens and policy-making and examines the linkage by reward which implies that political parties act mainly as channels for the exchange of votes for favours. Kitschelt (2000) distinguishes between clientelist and programmatic linkages. While a programmatic linkage involves politicians’ pursuit of policy programs that allocates benefits and costs to all citizens, a clientelist linkage implies delivering specific material advantages to a politician’s electoral supporters such as public sector patronage, public housing, and industrial protection.
The concept of state politicisation implies that political parties take over a supposedly neutral state bureaucracy and public administration, using the state as a source of private rents (Grzymała-Busse 2003). State politicisation is operationalised by the use of two indicators: the regulation of party financing and the growth of public administration.

Patronage denotes clientalism (Eisenstadt and Lemarchand 1981; Clapham 1982; Kitschelt et al 1999). According to Eisenstadt and Lemarchand (1981) patrons who are in power provide clients with desired goods, protection and support while in return patrons are furnished with other kinds of goods and services. Clientalism is typically based on personalised exchange between politicians and clients in a routinised institutional mode with mutually calculable transactions (Kitschelt et al 1999). For Roniger (2004) clientalism is “a form of patrimonial corruption of public agencies” and entails votes and support given in exchange for jobs and other benefits.

Claims that a political party is rent-seeking (and tries to extract uncompensated value from the state), often accompany allegations of government corruption, or the undue influence of special interests. Political corruption entails the misuse of governmental (public) power for illegitimate, private advantage.

In this paper party patronage denotes party penetration of the state and it is defined in terms of appointments (see Ware 1996; Kopecký and Mair 2006). A party in government is an agent who appoints their supporters to a variety of public and quasi-public positions. This definition differs from other concepts in a way that on the supply side, it concentrates only on appointments in public and quasi-public spheres, neglecting other forms of benefits that parties may provide. According to Ware (1996) the government is a resource for the party and controlling it provides ways of strengthening the party itself: “This is achieved by placing party supporters in administrative or quasi-administrative positions over which the governing party has influence” (Ware 1996: 349). Although it is a narrow concept, it allows for a research focus, clarity and easier operationalisation of the concept.

Finally, the World Bank definition points out positive role of patronage as well as its negative connotations, there is a certain number of appointments which are necessary for running the state, while more contested appointments are those in the semi-public or
economic sphere: “Some political appointments are fully legitimate. A small number of these appointments are justified as a means for political leaders to fashion a circle of government policy-makers who share a common agenda.” However, it is also the case that patronage is “the transgression of real or perceived boundaries of legitimate political influence, the violence of principles of merit and competition in civil service recruitment and promotion” (World Bank 2000). The World Bank concludes that “patronage is clearly a problem.” However, it should be emphasised that contested appointments are not contested because of corrupt activities but because of extensive party involvement in a state.

**Theoretical Assumptions**

The existing body of literature on clientalism, party organisation, party government and party competition presents a variety of theoretical arguments about party patronage. In what follows, I will examine a set of propositions put forward in order to explain party patronage.

According to Roniger (2004) the research on clientalism in the late 1960’s and 1970’s assumed that clientalism was a vestige of early modern development and that patron-client relationships would eventually disappear in the course of development or democratisation (see Huntington 1968). Shefter (1977) emphasises the relative timing of bureaucratisation and democratisation as key explanatory variables of patronage. Daalder (1966) claims that if bureaucracy developed long before social and political groups, it enjoyed a distinct existence. While analysing linkage Lawson (1980) puts forward the hypothesis that the greater a party’s control over patronage appointments, the more likely its voters will remain loyal.

Since the late 1990’s there has been an upsurge of works on party organisation and the emergence of a new party type, the cartel party, in which colluding parties become agents of the state (see Katz and Mair 1995; Katz and Mair 2002). When developing an argument on the new party type, Katz and Mair (1995) emphasise the continuous access of parties to the resources of the state to ensure their own collective survival: “Principal among the strategies they could pursue was the provision and regulation of state subventions to political parties” (Katz and Mair 1995: 15).
recent work, Katz and Mair (2002) add other resources available to parties invading the state, they argue: “the parties have risked being seen as privileging themselves, and using state resources in order to strengthen their own position in terms of subsidies, staffing, patronage and status” (Katz and Mair 2002: 134). Moreover, in the case of cartel party, the party in public office is privileged in contrast to the weakening position of the party on the ground and in the central office. In sum, parties have ensured their own survival as organizations by invading the state (Katz and Mair 2002).

Borrowing from party organisation and party government assumptions, Blondel and Cotta (2000) argue that “the larger and the more autonomous the party organisation, the more patronage will be in reality controlled by party authorities while being formally distributed by the government.” Moreover, the role of party leadership is important: “the role of parties in controlling governments is obviously enhanced when politicians with a long career of top positions in the party organisation provide the bulk of ministers and when party authorities play a decisive role in the selection of these ministers.” However, the role of leadership may be limited by party democracy and party factions.

The idea of party government captures the relationship between party and government (Blondel 2000). Blondel (2000) claims that in partitocratic systems, the supporting parties benefit from patronage and patronage is widespread. In Westminster-type majoritarian systems, patronage is low. In conciliatory systems, there is no need for patronage as “the relationship between party leaders, members and electors is based on traditionally strong bonds of loyalty which do not need to be boosted by material incentives and benefits” (Blondel 2000: 246). Moreover, Blondel (2000) claims that patronage has increased in some countries because programmatic rule was abandoned or where a party endeavoured to move away from traditional partitocratic arrangements in the direction of Westminster-type system.

The existing accounts of patronage in East Central Europe are of four types: path-dependent accounts emphasise broad communist regime legacies (Maćzak 1994; Kitschelt et al 1999; Ekiert & Hanson 2003; Kochanowicz 2004; Kochanowski et al 2005); functional accounts underline the need for state growth in new democracies due to the fact that new market economy institutions had to be created (Bartkowski 1996; Ganev 2001: Gimpelson and Triesman 2002); linkage accounts examine the dependence of
parties on state funding and weakly developed linkage with the civil society (Van Biezen 2004); and party competition accounts analyse the distribution of party power in parliament and parties’ ability to act independently (Grzymała-Busse 2003; O’Dwyer 2004).

The arguments of the regime legacy and party competition received most credence. Kitschelt et al (1999) argue that political actors are constrained by the experiences of the past and the patterns of economic and political resource distribution under the old regime. For example, in the Czech Republic following bureaucratic-authoritarian communism, strong programmatic party formation is expected. By contrast, in Bulgaria characterised by patrimonial communism, the parties’ programmatic articulation is much weaker. Finally, in Hungary and Poland which are formerly national-accommodative communist polities, intermediate conditions for programmatic party formation are anticipated.

According to Grzymała-Busse (2003) and O’Dwyer (2004) party competition is a main explanatory factor in state politicisation. Grzymała-Busse (2003: 1125) argues that “the potential for rent-seeking covaries with the structure of party competition,” where one party dominates the system it seeks rents from the state with minimal constraints while pluralist competition limits access to rent-seeking and patronage. “The dominance of one party should lead to minimal regulation of rent-seeking, covert and informal state financing, and an increase in public administration. The more we move to a multiparty system with dispersion of power, the more competitions are likely to build in mutual guarantees and constraints” (Grzymała-Busse 2003: 1132). Moreover, “no party has been able to monopolise the state. Instead governments have increasingly codified an independent civil service” (Grzymała-Busse 2003).

O’Dwyer (2004) argues that demobilised societies and delegitimised states are necessary but not sufficient conditions for the expansion of the state administration after communism. Instead robust party competition determines whether the tendency to patronage politics will become the practice. Party competition may constrain patronage if it produces both coherent governments and credible oppositions. Conversely, in two cases patronage is rampant. Firstly, in the case of a dominant party in government and a divided opposition, the government parties can be expected to monopolise and maximise
patronage. “Intervention in the administration takes the form of purges, ousting officials unsympathetic to the political machine and affecting the entire administration, potentially down to the lowest level” (O’Dwyer 2004). Secondly, in the case of the weak governance extreme underinstitutionalisation favours the creation of incoherent governments and less than credible oppositions.

Whether patronage evolves in new democracies depends on the specific circumstances. Kitschelt (2000) identifies several factors which make clientelist politics a plausible prospect, such as the underlying trajectory of state formation, lacking bureaucratic professionalisation, having no past episodes of political mobilization with programmatic universalist liberal and social democratic parties, as well as current democratic institutions and partial economic reform privileging rent-seeking groups in the privatisation process.

The main limitations of most of the aforementioned accounts are: the level of analysis problem and a holistic approach to explanation. For example, Shefter’s sequencing thesis is adequate yet it cannot explain the variation in patronage after communism (O’Dwyer 2004). Similarly, regime legacy accounts are too holistic as they try to explain everything by a reference to path-dependency. Rather than assuming a macro-approach I concentrate on a meso-level, i.e. a party. Drawing from theoretical assumptions of Grzymała-Busse and O’Dwyer, I examine arguments of a dominant party and ‘power dispersion’ in parliament in a single-country context. Grzymała-Busse and O’Dwyer have proposed synchronous comparisons of some East Central European countries and concentrated only on rent-seeking in state administration while they neglected the economic sector, while my analysis is broader and includes state-owned enterprises.

III. Party Patronage in Poland

Poland has a long tradition of a political culture based on clientalism and personalised relations (Mączak 1994; Kochanowicz 2004; Kochanowski et al 2005). In communist Poland public administration operated under the communist party nomenklatura system, according to which all appointments in the administration were made on the
recommendations of the communist party. Thus, the period of state socialism left a particular legacy: developed probably the extreme case of a government system based upon clientalism (Maćzak 1994). In the 1990’s a new phenomenon of *multiparty nomenklatura* emerged in Poland: instead of *monoparty nomenklatura*, in the multiparty systems they are the dominant parties in government who try to gain as many appointments possible for its people. In the 1990’s clientalism and patronage characterised both post-communist and post-solidarity parties (Kochanowski et al 2005).

The state administration grew steadily in the years 1990-2000 regardless of who was in government (O’Dwyer 2004). However, in the late 1990’s there was an expectation that EU accession process and the necessity to harmonise the Polish legal system and public administration with European standards may hinder party patronage at least in the civil service sphere (SIGMA 2002).

In this paper party patronage is examined in the period 2001-2006. Before I proceed with the comparison of the Democratic Left Alliance and the Law and Justice party, first I want to present a classification of party patronage in Poland.

**Classification**

The following classification of appointments is based on the observation of the practices of an appointment system in Poland. Formal institutions provide the framework of the analysis, yet it is also indicated how parties may use their power to appoint and in certain cases to bypass the law. Classification, which allows for grouping entities into categories, is a necessary component of systematic comparison (Landman 2005). Hence, in the following empirical section, I will systematically compare the two parties by examining different categories in each case. I propose to classify the appointments into five categories. They are the appointments in government, parliament, civil service, quangos and economy.

- **Government appointments**, such as ministers, deputy ministers and political cabinets, as provided for in Regulation No. 13 of the Council of Ministers of 25 February 1997 and the Law of 8 August 1996 on the Organisation and Rules of Procedures in the Council of Ministers and on the competences of Ministers.
The governing party decides on the number of ministers, the size of political cabinets and the size of central government in general.

- **Sejm and Senate appointments**, as provided for in the 1997 Constitution or the Rules of Procedures of the Sejm, such as: the State Tribunal, the Constitutional Tribunal, the National Judicial Council, the National Broadcasting Council, the Ombudsman, the Ombudsman for Children, the High Chamber of Control, etc.

  The parties in parliament decide by a simple majority who is selected to the positions appointed by the Sejm and Senate. Certainly, the governing party makes the final decision on the appointments.

- **Civil service**, as regulated by the law of 18 December 1998. The law declared the apolitical character of the civil service and a dividing line was drawn between political and professional appointments. According to the law on civil service, political appointees, who resign with the change of administration in the central government administration, include: ministers, their deputies, regional governors and their deputies, and political advisers. The jobs of a Director-General and down the ladder of hierarchy should be taken by the civil service.\(^8\)

  However, if the law is not fully implemented, infringements are possible. A governing party may try to appoint to positions of civil servants, by bypassing the civil service recruitment process and competitions. Before a competition is announced an auxiliary, who is temporarily in charge, can be appointed, the so-called, *p.o. pełniący obowiązki*, i.e. *acting*. A delay in announcing a competition may follow. If the minister manages to influence the appointment of a Director-General, than he may also influence appointments of department directors and deputy directors.

  Moreover, a governing party may attempt to modify formal institutional arrangements: by amending legal acts or passing new acts.

- **Quangos**,\(^9\) which are non-departmental bodies under the government control in terms of funding, appointments and function, are regulated by different legal acts.

  In Poland there are some 100 agencies, foundations and funds which are under control of ministers or a prime minister.

  If there is no provision for a term limit, the chances are high that a chairperson of a quango will be selected by the governing party. Moreover, the practice of abolishing,
merging and establishing new quangos gives the governing party a significant leverage in appointing their chairmen.

- **State-owned enterprises** are under the supervision of the Minister of the Treasury (in few cases other ministers), as regulated by the Law of 8 August 1996 on the Organisation and Rules of Procedures in the Council of Ministers and on the competences of Ministers; the Law of 4 September 1997 on Departments of Government Administration; and the August 1996 Law on Commercialisation and Privatisation of State-owned enterprises. The law stipulates that the Minister of the Treasury represents the Treasury in matters concerning the Treasury property, decides on commercialisation and privatisation of state enterprises and state investment funds, and protects the interests of the Treasury. The Minister of the Treasury, on behalf of a governing party, may influence appointments in management and supervisory boards of the companies in which the Treasury owns the shares.

**The Democratic Left Alliance**

The Democratic Left Alliance (SLD), a direct organisational successor to the communist party, had successfully refashioned itself as a Western social democratic party. Initially SLD was set up as a coalition in 1991 and then as a party in 1999. SLD was “integrating parties, trade unions, social organisations, and unorganised people connected with the social-democratic ideas of justice and social equality.” Leszek Miller was a leader of the party in the period 1999-2004 and definitely, he was the most powerful in the party. Economically, SLD did not oppose the economic reforms outright, but claimed that the pace of privatisation should be slower, that government social spending should be increased even if that meant a larger deficit (Jackson et al. 2003: 90).

The 2001 parliamentary elections resulted in a decisive victory of the electoral coalition of the Democratic Left Alliance and the Labour Union (UP) which won 41 per cent of the vote and got 216 seats in a 460 Sejm, the lower chamber of the Parliament; though the Labour Union got only 16 seats out of 216 (see Appendix 1). It was a huge success given that the governing party in the period 1997-2001- the Solidarity Electoral Action (AWS) and its former coalition partner, the Freedom Union (UW), did not get
any representation in the Sejm. Nevertheless, SLD-UP did not have the majority in the Sejm, hence the former SLD ally - agrarian Polish Peasant Party (PSL)\textsuperscript{12} joined the coalition government.

- Government appointments

In October 2001 the coalition government headed by Prime Minister Leszek Miller was formed and supported by an investiture vote. Miller’s government was smaller than the previous AWS government: there were fewer ministers: 15, while in the previous government 17; and deputy ministers, more than 30 fewer. Out of 15 minister portfolios, SLD coalition partners got only three: PSL got Agriculture and Environment while UP – Infrastructure.

In the beginning the position of SLD was very strong, in particular during the first Miller’s government in the period October 2001- March 2003. The Prime Minister was unquestioned leader of the dominant party in parliament while the opposition was weak and divided. Moreover, the government was supported by President Kwaśniewski, non-partisan, yet a former SLD member. The dominant position of SLD soon raised doubts whether Prime Minister Miller represented the interests of the state or only of his party.

In his inaugural address the Prime Minister promised a ‘Cheaper state:’ “We will start saving from ourselves. We have chosen not to increase wages in government administration. There are fewer ministers; there will be fewer directors, CEOs, fewer agencies and state institutions” (Miller 2001). The proposal of abolishing or merging quangos was to bring savings. However, the policy of abolishing or merging agencies in reality causes significant expenses as a result of paying gratuity to dismissed civil servants.

- Parliament appointments

Among Sejm and Senate appointments, one of the most interesting is the case of the National Broadcasting Council which is a state body established to regulate the matters concerning radio and television broadcasting, as provided by the 1993 law. Moreover, Article 213 of the 1997 Constitution stipulates that “the National Broadcasting Council shall safeguard the freedom of speech, the right to information as well as safeguard the public interest regarding radio and television broadcasting.” The Council consisted of nine members elected for a six-year term: six of the Council members were coalitional
nominees. One of them was Włodzimierz Czarzasty (appointed by President Kwaśniewski) who was later involved in the Rywin corruption scandal. Moreover, the Council could initiate regulations in the field of its competence, which it did. The amendments to the law on Radio and TV broadcasting increased the scope of the Council by limiting privatisation of regional broadcasting stations; instead a Polish public regional channel was established, controlled fully by public TV. Furthermore, the Council introduced a four-year licence for public broadcasters.

- Civil service

SLD tried to influence appointments in the civil service although Article 1 of the 1998 Act on Civil Service establishes the civil service “in order to secure professional, reliable, impartial and politically neutral execution of tasks of the state,” while Articles 31 and 44 provide for a recruitment process based on competitions.

In November 2001 the government submitted a bill on amendments to the Act on Civil Service. One of the proposals was that a Director-General may appoint for higher posts in central administration thus circumventing the civil service recruitment process. Article 144a stipulated that “until 31 December 2002, if it is justified, the Head of the civil service may appoint upon the proposal of the Director-General of the office, for the vacant positions persons who are not civil service employees.” The government’s justification of the bill was that there were vacant positions which should be filled.

The opposition claimed that these changes were clear signs of party patronage and accused Miller of “arranging jobs for his colleagues” and appointing his supporters. The roll call no 190 of 18 December 2001, showed that only parties in government supported the bill (395 were in favour while 225 deputies were against). Although all opposition parties (the Civil Platform, the Self-defence, Law and Justice party and the League of Polish Families as well as the Conservative Popular Alliance) voted against, they could not influence the outcome. President Kwaśniewski signed the law 3 days later.

In general, the amendment was highly criticised for upsetting the idea of apolitical civil service (Graczyk 2002). While Pacewicz (2001) argued that now “a state is a party” because a party decides to change the law in order to cater for its interests, introducing legally binding measures which facilitate appointments of party supporters to higher positions in civil service.
• **Quangos**

In the first months in office Miller’s government undertook a programme of abolishing or merging state agencies as he promised in the ‘Cheaper state’ programme. He planned to abolish at least twenty different quangos. Yet, SLD was ambiguous about abolishing quangos: some agencies were actually abolished; some were abolished but immediately after new bodies were established in their place or new bodies were set up by merging former agencies; others were to be abolished but in reality they were not.

First, the Chief Customs Office headed by a post-solidarity UW deputy, was abolished and the Minister of Finance took over the responsibility of the former Office. Second, the government officially abolished the Office for the Regulation of Telecommunication and the Office for Post Regulation, instead in March 2002 the Office for the Regulation of Telecommunication and Post was established in which an SLD official became a chairman. Similarly, the State Agency for Foreign Investment and the Polish Information Agency were abolished; instead their competences were taken over by a new Agency for Information and Promotion of Poland. Third, although initially the Agency for Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture was to be abolished, instead both SLD and PSL promptly replaced its management board and the plan to abolish the Agency was disregarded. It was an influential agency. Established in 1994 by former SLD-PSL coalition government in order to support agriculture and rural development, the Agency dealt with the implementation of EU programmes and it carried out financial transfers for most of the measures under the pre-accession agricultural funds, such as SAPARD. Moreover, apart from the headquarters, the Agency had 16 regional and 314 district offices, ready to be staffed.

As regards dividing ‘the spoils’ among coalition partners, in general SLD dominated the appointments. However, the Polish Peasant Party had a particularly strong influence in the aforementioned Agency for Modernisation and Restructuring of Agriculture, while the Labour Union in the General Directorate for National Roads and Motorways (the only UP minister was in charge of Infrastructure).

• **State-owned enterprises**

According to the Ministry of the Treasury at the end of 2001 there were 2028 companies in which the Treasury was a shareholder (Ministry of the Treasury 2002). The Minister of
the Treasury was Wiesław Kaczmarek, an SLD deputy who in the previous SLD-PSL
government was the Minister of Ownership Transformation and who was considered to
have significant connections with business.\textsuperscript{14}

In three months the coalition government altered members of management and
supervisory boards in some of the most important state enterprises: PGNiG, the Oil and
Gas Group; KGHM, the copper mining group; PSE, the Polish Power Grid group; Poczta
Polska, the Polish Post; Ruch, the press distribution group; National Lottery; PZU, the
insurance group; Zelmer, the household appliances manufacturing group. Soon after the
following companies had their management boards replaced: Ciech, the chemical and
pharmaceutical group; PKP, Polish Railways; and PKO BP, the bank. While SLD
dominated appointments, the Polish Peasant Party had a particularly strong influence on
appointments in the PSE, Polish Power Grid company.

As regards the appointments, certainly the Minister of the Treasury and Prime
Minister Miller made the decisions. The Minister of the Treasury appointed his people to
state-owned enterprises and Prime Minister Miller supported him strongly. On several
occasions President Kwaśniewski, a former SLD member, intervened. Kaczmarek
confirmed during investigative procedures at the Sejm special committee on a PKN Orlen
case,\textsuperscript{15} that in February 2002 he received a list of names, in the Presidential Palace,
proposed for a new supervisory board in PKN Orlen, similarly the following day he
received the same list in the Chancellery of the Prime Minister.

When SLD was replacing management and supervisory boards, they justified their
decisions by the fact that members of boards nominated by the post-solidarity
government were not competent and were not loyal to the SLD minister. Prime Minister
Miller often talked about removing Krzaklewski’s people (Marian Krzaklewski was a
leader of AWS, former post-solidarity governing party). Similarly Kaczmarek criticised
his AWS predecessors for clientalism. Yet, he promoted his old friends (Matys and
Smoleński 2002). On several occasions the dismissals raised suspicions, for example the
PGNiG management board was dismissed when it tried to negotiate more favourable
terms for Poland of gas imports from Russia. The dismissal of the PKN Orlen chief
executive was masterminded with the use of the secret service (Stasiński 2002), a case
which was later investigated by the Sejm special committee, a verdict is pending.
The Law and Justice party (PiS) was set up in 2001 under the leadership of twin brothers Lech and Jarosław Kaczyński. Most party members were at one time associated with the now defunct Solidarity Electoral Action coalition, or the right-wing ROP. The party was established on a wave of popularity gained by Lech Kaczyński, while heading the Ministry of Justice (June 2000 to July 2001) in the AWS government. While in 2002 Lech Kaczyński was elected a mayor of Warsaw and in 2005 elected President of Poland, Jarosław Kaczyński became the party chairman. The troika party leadership (two brothers Kaczyński and Prime Minister Marcinkiewicz) was dominated by the PiS leader, Jarosław Kaczyński.

The right-wing PiS favours a traditional social order, a strong state, the principle of law and order and a fight against crime and corruption. With their roots in the anti-communist Solidarity movement, PiS leaders believe that too many ex-communists retained power and they are responsible for much of the corruption in Poland. In its 2005 “Justice for All” manifesto, Law and Justice promised to decrease employment in the state administration and “to purge the state from the communist past and communist clientalism.” Economically, the party supports a state-guaranteed minimum social security and a degree of state intervention in economy within market economy bounds.

On 25 September 2005 Law and Justice won parliamentary elections receiving 27 per cent of the vote and assuming 155 out of 460 seats in the Sejm. The liberal Civic Platform (PO) came in a close second gaining 24.1 per cent of the vote and 133 seats. Initially, Law and Justice had planned to rule together with the Civic Platform, but coalition talks broke down due to disagreements over power-sharing, economic policy and a bitter presidential electoral campaign. The Law and Justice party won both parliamentary and presidential elections with Lech Kaczyński assuming the presidential office at the end of December 2005.

- Government appointments

In October 2005 an unknown PiS member, Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz, became Prime Minister who in November 2005 succeeded in an investiture vote in his minority government with 272 votes in favour (Law and Justice, the League of Polish Families, the
Self-defence and the Polish Peasant Party) and 187 against (the Democratic Left Alliance and the Civic Platform). Eight of Marcinkiewicz’s 17-member cabinet were non-party technocrats.

Although it seemed that the PiS minority government would be constrained and party patronage would be hindered, it was not the case. The Law and Justice party was dependent on the votes of the populists of the left – the Self-defence party led by Andrzej Lepper, and the right – the League of Polish Families (LPR). To secure parliamentary support, PiS used a ‘sticks and carrots’ strategy. It made budgetary promises; cheap petrol for farmers and an increase in unemployment benefits (Self-defence demands); and a pay supplement for newly born babies (LPR demands). Then in February 2006 PiS signed a stabilisation pact with the League of Polish Families and Self-defence to guarantee stable support for its minority government, followed by a formal coalition agreement in May 2006. The stabilisation pact envisaged that the parties to the agreement would not submit a ‘no confidence’ motion, they would support 153 bills listed in the attachment to the pact and they would not propose additional bills which were not previously agreed by the parties to the agreement. However, Law and Justice frequently called for early parliamentary elections in spring 2006. None of the parties agreed. Even informal PiS supporters did not welcome the proposal. This was a ‘stick,’ in particular for the League of Polish Families as the CBOS opinion poll showed in February 2006 that the party could hardly pass a 5 per cent electoral threshold.19

In November 2005 the government adopted a directive on establishing an interministerial group for implementation of the programme - ‘Cheap state.’20 The plan envisaged limiting state administration employment by 10 per cent, standardisation of state administration, abolishing various agencies, foundations and funds (there are only four listed), while merging others.

Meanwhile after one hundred days in office, the PiS government increased the number of appointments in central government administration by 75 new jobs, of which 47 are jobs in political cabinets and 15 in the Chancellery of the Prime Minister. The record-breaker was the Minister of Environment, who appointed eleven political cabinet advisers. His predecessor had only two. The Minister of Construction and Transport had ten advisers, the Minister of Internal Affairs and Administration had nine advisers, the
Minister of Education had six advisers and the Minister of Agriculture – eight. However, the Minister of Foreign Affairs had none (Gnacikowska 2006). The government had twice as many secretaries and undersecretaries of state in comparison with Belka’s government [in the period May 2004 - October 2005] and even exceeded Miller’s government, not to mention the members of political cabinets (Gnacikowska 2006). As regards political appointments in the central government, it was confirmed in the interviews that in general PiS supporters were appointed; there was nobody from LPR or Self-defence. However, there were few exceptions: for example, the Minister of Regional Development, or the Minister of Finance, who was formerly associated with the Civic Platform. Moreover, some acting officials were appointed.

- Parliament nominations

Law and Justice proposed to reduce the number of members of the National Broadcasting Council from nine to five: the change did not mean that the Council would be less political. Pursuant to the Act of 29 December 2005 on transformations and modifications to the division of tasks and powers of state bodies competent for communications and broadcasting, the term of office of the previous National Broadcasting Council expired (it was to expire for most board members in 2009) and a new board was established. Out of five members two of them are appointed by the Sejm, one – by the Senate and two by the President. In fact, the Sejm appointed one member of the National Broadcasting Council from the League of Polish Families and one from Self-defence, while the Senate appointed a PiS candidate and President Kaczyński appointed two PiS supporters. Consequently, the Law and Justice party dominates the Council. The new chairperson of the Council, nominated by the President, has a right to appoint chairmen of public TV and radio. The appointment of one Self-defence member and one LPR member to the Council was said to be one of the rewards that PiS gave to the two parties for their support of the minority government.21

- Civil service

Although PiS had declared a support for apolitical civil service, it only paid lip service to the needs of introducing apolitical civil service. In 2001 Jarosław Kaczyński, then a leader of the opposition party, heavily criticised Miller’s government for politicising the state when amendments to the law on civil service were passed in parliament: “SLD
invades the state, the amendments to the law on civil service are a step to state politicisation.” When the Law and Justice party came to power its attitude changed. The two bills proposed by PiS were the clear evidence that the party showed a lack of real commitment.

At the beginning of January 2006 the government submitted a bill on amendments to the 1998 civil service law (Proposal 233/2006, Sejm) which was passed two months later with the votes of PiS, Self-defence and LPR (Roll-call 61/2006, Sejm). The act modified the law on the civil service by excluding from the civil service higher positions in government administration, such as a Director-General. Moreover, it allowed for “the transfer to the central government administration of the functionaries of the Highest Chamber of Control or local administration in cases when the interests of the civil service require this shift.” The opposition declared it would refer it to the Constitutional Tribunal for adjudication upon its conformity to the Constitution.

Furthermore, on 29 March 2006 the government submitted to the Sejm a bill on the civil service which is to completely revolutionise the idea of the civil service in Poland. The Office of Civil Service and the Council of Civil Service will be abolished and instead a new National Panel of Public Staff is proposed. The new body is to comprise of competent but politically loyal civil servants. The Prime Minister will be head of the institution (Sejm 2006). The opposition has immediately declared the new bill unconstitutional.

Moreover, the procedure to appoint ‘acting’ functionaries was applied. There were few cases of dismissing a functionary who did not support the party and immediately appointing one who supported the incumbent governing party.

- Quangos
The PiS programme of the “Cheap state” envisaged abolishing some state agencies, foundations and offices; and merging some others. In fact some agencies were abolished, the very example being the Government Centre for Strategic Studies abolished in February 2006. Some other quangos were to be abolished, for example the Agricultural Property Agency, while some others were to be merged, for example, the Agricultural Market Agency and the Agency for Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture which carries out financial transfers for most of the measures under the Common
Agricultural Policy and Structural Funds. However, the agencies have not been merged. Quite the opposite, in November 2005, a new chairman of the Agency for Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture was appointed and immediately dismissed chiefs of regional branches. Although Self-defence hoped to gain some positions in the Agency, only PiS dominated the appointments. In the case of the Agricultural Property Agency which the government promised to abolish, there is a conflict of interests between the Minister of Agriculture heading the “agriculture lobby” which wants to take over the Agency from the Minister of the Treasury, and Prime Minister who announced its liquidation (Naszkowska 2006).

Despite the Cheap state rhetoric, new quangos were founded: either completely new or set up in the place of previously existing bodies. The very example is the Office of Electronic Communications which was set up under the Act of 29 December 2005 on transformations and modifications to the division of tasks and powers of state bodies competent for communications and broadcasting. It replaced the Office of Telecommunications and Post Regulation which was established by a previous SLD coalition government. The new chairman assumed tasks and powers within the competence of the chairman of the previous institution.

The Law and Justice party was also very innovative in its proposals for new quangos; an Anti-Corruption Agency and a National Institute of Education are the examples.

A new Anti-Corruption Agency was high on the list of PiS election promises and in January 2006 a bill was sent to the Sejm. Article 1 of the draft law stipulates that the Anti-Corruption Agency is a “special service for fighting corruption in state institutions, local government, both in public and economic sphere.” The cost estimates are 70 million PLZ (almost 18 million euros) in the first year and the Agency is to employ some 500 functionaries. The opposition has criticised the proposal for establishing another ‘political’ institution and advised: either to reinforce the existing public institutions, including the justice sector, police and intelligence agencies, which deal with various aspects of corruption; or to create a less apolitical institution (under the government proposal the head of the Anti-Corruption Agency is accountable to the prime minister). A PiS deputy is said to become Head of the Office.
The National Institute of Education is another PiS initiative. The Institute is to design educational programmes, promote patriotism and civic culture as well as to control media with respect to their promotion of Christian values and their educational impact on the youth. It will cost upwards of 11 mln PLZ in 2007 and 2.6 mln in preparations (altogether some 3 million euros) and is to employ around 100 officials. The chairman will be nominated by the Sejm and supported by the Senate for a five-year term (Sejm 2006).

- State-owned enterprises

At the end of December 2005, the Minister of the Treasury supervised 1,405 companies including 426 sole shareholder companies of the Treasury and 979 companies in which the Treasury held shares (Ministry of Treasury 2006). In two first months in office Law and Justice altered management boards of PGNiG, the Oil and Gas group; LOT, the airline company; KGHM the copper mining group. Moreover, the supervisory boards in Lotos and PKN Orlen, the petrol groups, were replaced. At the beginning of February 2006, in Stocznia Gdynia, the biggest shipbuilding group, six new members (out of 11) of the supervisory board, were appointed. Furthermore, in supervisory boards of Ruch SA and KGHM there are PiS members. Moreover, a deputy chief executive of PKO BP, the bank, was from the circle of former Warsaw mayor while the chief executive of Nafta Polska, the company founded to privatise Polish oil and chemical sectors, was a PiS supporter.24

There is no doubt that the leader of Law and Justice influenced the appointments. In 2005 the Minister of the Treasury confirmed in the interview that PiS party members may be interested in being appointed for positions in state-owned enterprises. Yet, Jarosław Kaczyński decides (Wielowieyska. 2005). The PiS leader wants to control the appointments in state enterprises and prepared a list of potential candidates for boards (Grochal and Kondzińska 2006).

IV. Discussion and Conclusions

The examination of the Democratic Left Alliance and the Law and Justice party sheds more light on party patronage in Poland in the period 2001-2006. The basic finding of this study is that both parties have used their term in office to appoint their supporters to a
variety of public and semi-public positions. Moreover, the extent to which the allocation of jobs is controlled by governing parties is significant. Both the Democratic Left Alliance and the Law and Justice party tried to maximise party patronage.

The classification of party patronage has facilitated a systematic comparison of the two parties and an assessment of the extent of party patronage in Poland. Although only a sample of empirical examples was presented, I could generate the following prepositions based on the extensive quality newspaper research and informal interviews.

First of all, it should be pointed out that to some extent political appointments in government were streamlined. This may be justified by the fact that these types of appointments are in the spotlight. Nevertheless, Law and Justice exceeded the Democratic Left Alliance with the number of political appointments in central government.

Furthermore, I have also observed that governing parties took the opportunity to influence appointments controlled by the parliament. This category showed the dynamics of formal and informal coalitions. Having the majority in the Sejm, SLD could easily influence the appointments. The example of the National Broadcasting Council shows how its powers may be increased by amending legislation. Although the PiS position in the Sejm was different as it had to rely on the support of the populist parties, it influenced the appointments in the Council and succeeded in having the majority in the National Broadcasting Council.

Another remarkable finding is that the civil service was particularly vulnerable to political pressures. Although the objective of politically neutral, impartial and professional civil service is to secure efficient functioning and managing of the state, irrespective of the political situation and changing governments, the governing parties have staffed the upper tiers of the central government administration. Some flagrant cases of violation of civil service regulations were evident, such as law amendments or appointments of acting functionaries. The governing parties amended legal provisions and thus showed a lack of real commitment to introducing the apolitical civil service as it would deprive them of the possibility of job distribution and would make the administrative staff more independent. Certainly Law and Justice exceeded their predecessors as they presented not only amendments to existing civil service law, but also
proposed a new law abolishing the civil service and introducing a more politically-dependent service.

As regards quangos, first of all, if there was no provision for a term limit, the chances were high that a chairperson of a quango would be selected by a governing party. However, there was also a more innovative way of intervening in the appointments in quangos, for example abolishing a quango meant that the chairman appointed by political predecessors would easily lose his job, even if his term in office had not finished. Instead a new office was set up (in practice the offices just changed the names, taking over the competences of previously existing bodies). Both governing parties promised to restrict the number of quangos. Although initially some were to be abolished, in reality they were not. Creating new quangos which were led and then staffed by party loyalists was another way of increasing the number of appointments available for the governing party. PiS seemed to be very innovative as regards setting up new quangos.

Finally, the governing parties have also intervened in the economy by appointing management and supervisory boards of state-owned enterprises. In this category the Democratic Left Alliance seemed to prevail: due to a sheer number of state-owned enterprises in 2001 and due to its strong links with business.

When examining the style of party patronage, I have found out that the difference between the parties resulted from a form of government. In the case of a PiS minority government, some patronage benefits, normally associated with being in the government were offered to opposition parties that agreed to sustain a minority government in parliamentary votes even though it did not join the government formally. However, none of positions offered was in government, civil service, quangos or state enterprises, they were only the positions appointed by parliament, such as members of the National Broadcasting Council or the Ombudsman for Children. Besides using ‘carrots,’ however PiS also used ‘sticks’ and the argument of early elections.

At last some general patterns of party patronage in Poland may be disclosed:

• Extent: in both cases party patronage is extensive. Governing parties permeate many aspects of political life and reward key supporters with positions in government, civil service, quasi-governmental organisations and boards of state enterprises.
• ‘Cheap state’ rhetoric: neither a ‘cheaper state’ advocated by SLD nor a ‘cheap state’ promoted by PiS meant exactly what it envisaged. Quite the opposite, it meant an expansion of party patronage. Both parties used the rhetoric as an excuse for abolishing institutions dominated by previous governments’ supporters, instead new ones were set up with their own supporters being nominated for the new positions.

• Justification: Law and Justice typically justified party administered appointments by the need to bring in people untainted by a communist past, while the Democratic Left Alliance stressed the professionalism and experience of their nominees. ‘Purges’ after the political predecessor by subsequent governing parties recur every four years.

• Legal framework: formal institutions are often endogenous. The governing party uses legal instruments for achieving political goals. Each side influenced the final outcome whether by designing laws in a way convenient for them or circumventing the rules in the appointment system.

• Leadership: both the leader of the Democratic Left Alliance) who was also the head of government) and the leader of Law and Justice made the decisions on appointments. It has been confirmed that in general, loyalty was a criterion for selecting a person rather than more meritocratic considerations.

In conclusion, the aforementioned findings have challenged the claims of Grzymała-Busse that the dispersion of power limited party patronage and that rent-seeking is decreasing in Poland. I have demonstrated that the minority position of the government did not hinder Law and Justice from extracting resources from the state. Moreover, its attempt to change civil service law could drastically increase the politicisation of the state. Governing parties are relentlessly involved in the economy and extract additional resources from quangos. In this paper I have examined party patronage in a single-country context over time, but it is applicable to a variety of contexts. In particular, the other countries of Eastern Europe or Blondel’s partitocratic states in Western Europe would be excellent cases for further comparisons.

The question remains how to explain widespread party patronage in Poland in the period 2001-2006. The expectation that the EU accession will limit party patronage did
not materialise. Similarly, neither regime legacies nor old cleavages can explain party patronage. When explaining this phenomenon, the underinstitutionalisation of the party system needs to be examined. Katz and Mair (1995) claim that parties are said to “ensure their own survival as organizations by invading the state.” In the case of party system underinstitutionalisation, parties may have even greater incentive to extract resources from the state in order to guarantee their organisational survival. However, further research should address this theme.
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Appendix 1

Table 1: Elections to the Sejm on 23 September 2001 and 25 September 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party name</th>
<th>460 Seats</th>
<th>Percentage in 2001 elections</th>
<th>460 Seats</th>
<th>Percentage in 2005 elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Left Alliance and Labour Union,</td>
<td>216</td>
<td><strong>41.0%</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej i Unia Pracy, SLD-UP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Platform</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Platforma Obywatelska, PO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-defence of the Republic of Poland</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Samoobrona Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Justice</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prawo i Sprawiedliwość, PiS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Peasant Party</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe, PSL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The League of Polish Families</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Liga Polskich Rodzin, LPR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition of Solidarity Electoral Action of the Right</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Koalicja Akcja Wyborcza Solidarność Prawicy, AWS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Union</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unia Wolności, UW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Social Democracy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Socjaldemokracja Polska, SDPL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Partia Demokratyczna)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Minority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mniejszość Niemiecka)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Elections to the Senate on 23 September 2001 and 25 September 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party name</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Left Alliance and Labour Union,</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej i Unia Pracy, SLD-UP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Platform</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Platforma Obywatelska, PO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-defence of the Republic of Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Samoobrona Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Justice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prawo i Sprawiedliwość, PiS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Peasant Party</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe, PSL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The League of Polish Families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Liga Polskich Rodzin, LPR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition of Solidarity Electoral Action of the Right</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Koalicja Akcja Wyborcza Solidarność Prawicy, AWS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Union</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unia Wolności, UW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Social Democracy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Socjaldemokracja Polska, SDPL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Partia Demokratyczna)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes

1 A term used by Jan Pastwa, Head of the Civil Service, as cited in Bogusz, A., D. Macieja and Z. Wojtkowska (2000).
2 A Polish term ‘upartyjnione państwo’ captures well the idea of state politicisation and partitocratic polity
3 PiS formed a coalition government with Self-Defence and the League of Polish Families in May 2006, while the Polish Peasant Party left the SLD coalition in March 2003 because of a disagreement on biofuel law supported by PSL and motorway tax criticised by PSL. The second Miller government was in office in the period 3 March - 2 May 2004. The government faced a long list of problems, including poor economic growth, high unemployment and poverty. Prime Minister Miller resigned in May 2004 and Marek Belka (SLD) became Prime Minister.
4 Tomasz Zukowski proposes to examine polarisation based on competition between the Civic Platform and the Law and Justice party, in which two parties occupy to poles (see Gazeta Wyborcza, 25 November 2006).
5 Jan Pastwa, Head of the Civil Service, has recognised that local government and administration are more politicised than central administration (Macieja et al 2000).
There are two types of employees in the civil service in Poland. First, a civil service employee - a title granted after preparatory service of few years and an examination passed at the end of the service. Second, a civil servant - a civil service employee is nominated to the post of a civil servant after going through a qualifying procedure, and demonstrating necessary qualifications (Urząd Służby Cywilnej 2005).

A term quango is used to denote various quasi non-government organisations or quasi-autonomous national government organisations. The term has been used to describe a range of organisations to which governments have devolved power (other acronyms are also used QANMGO and NDPB).


The Solidarity Electoral Action (AWS) Akcja Wyborcza Solidarność was established in June 1996 in order to unite post-Solidarity centre-right parties for parliamentary elections in September 1997. AWS was a broad coalition of parties and groupings, social movements and trade unions. In the 1997 parliamentary elections, the AWS rightwing electoral alliance won 33.8 per cent of the vote and formed a coalition government with the liberal Freedom Union.

In the September 1993 parliamentary elections the former communists in the Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) won 20.4% of the vote and 171 seats, while their former agrarian allies in PSL, with 15.4% of the vote and 132 seats, scored second. The only post-Solidarity party to win significant parliamentary representation in 1993 was the Democratic Union, finishing third with 10.6% of the vote and 74 seats.

The Rywin corruption scandal (named after the film producer Lew Rywin) began in 2002. In exchange for a bribe, Rywin offered Michnik (editor of Gazeta Wyborcza) to arrange for a change in a draft law aimed at limiting the print media's influence on radio and television, in Michnik's favour. The original draft would have prevented the paper's publishing house Agora S.A. from taking over TV stations. Rywin claimed that he was acting on behalf of a "group in power" which wanted to remain anonymous. The Sejm special committee investigated the case. In September 2004 a minority report authored by a PiS deputy Ziobro (which departed from the SLD majority report) was passed in the Sejm and named among others Prime Minister Miller, Włodzimierz Czarzasty (a member of the National Broadcasting Council) and Lech Nikolski (Miller's Chief of Cabinet) as the masterminds behind Rywin's mission.

In 1995 Kaczmarek set up Polkomtel which owned the mobile network Plus GSM. Big state enterprises such as KGHM copper mining group and PKN Orlen invested in Polkomtel.

In the PKN Orlen case the representative of the Treasury was accused of mismanaging the company while another accusation was of using intelligence units for exerting pressure on Orlen management board.

The Movement for the Reconstruction of Poland Ruch Odbudowy Polski (ROP) was the party of the right whose origins went back to November 1995, when its leader Jan Olszewski was running for the presidency. The party strategy was to build on its traditional patriotic electorate by adding small and medium sized business people threatened by unfair competition from foreign capital and the ex-communist nomenklatura. The Kaczyński brothers and their Centre Accord party were linked to ROP.


There was a fierce competition between PiS and PO during the presidential electoral campaign. In the end, Lech Kaczyński won the second round on 23 October 2005 with 54% of the vote, ahead of Donald Tusk, the PO candidate.