

# Party Politics of Foreign and Security Policy in Europe

Workshop at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam  
5 and 6 October 2017

## Preliminary list of papers

Tapio Raunio / Wolfgang Wagner

*The Party Politics of Foreign and Security Policy in Europe and Beyond*

### Part 1: Mapping party positions and coalitions

All papers in this part examine patterns of political parties' positions across countries. The papers differ as regards the countries and periods under study and, most importantly, in the data and methodology they use including manifestos (Pennings; Jeroen / Dandoy), Voting Advice Applications (Garzia / Trechsel), recorded votes (Rosén), speeches (Jeroen / Dandoy) and public opinion data (Isernia / Olmastroni).

Paul Pennings

*Trends in the partisan positions on internationalism and defence in Europe, 1945-2016*

Diego Garzia / Alexander Trechsel

*Mapping parties' positions on foreign and security issues in the European Union, 2009-2014*

Guri Rosén

*An exceptional cleavage? Does EU trade policy undermine the party consensus in the European Parliament?*

Pierangelo Isernia / Francesco Olmastroni

*Policy Mood, Party Politics and Policy Responsiveness on the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy*

Joly Jeroen / Régis Dandoy

*Do they really care? A Comparative analysis of party preferences and their differential impact on foreign policy in six countries*

### Part 2: Party Families and Transnational Coordination

The papers in part 2 address the transnational similarities and differences across like-minded parties. A key question is to what extent national context qualifies or even trumps transnational identities of like-minded parties. Attention is also paid to the actual mechanisms and practices of transnational cooperation and coordination.

Fabian Virchow

*Foreign and Security policies of European radical right parties*

Fabrizio Coticchia / Enrico Calossi

*Similar roots, different behaviors? The foreign policy of Social Democratic and Centre-left parties in Europe: the cases of France, Germany and Italy*

Afke Groen

*Loose Coordination or Ideological Contestation? Transnational Cooperation of Political Parties on European Foreign Affairs in the German Bundestag*

Tapio Raunio / Wolfgang Wagner

*Ideology or national interest: foreign and security policy votes in the European Parliament*

### **Part 3 The impact of party ideology on foreign policy or on international politics**

The papers in part 3 share an interest in the effect of a government's party political composition on actual foreign policy. Methods used range from a case study (de Pantz / Milani) to regression analysis (Böller / Wenzelburger). While EU countries are at the centre of analysis, non-European countries are frequently included. De Pantz / Milani's study of South Korea focuses on the question of whether the logic of party politics and foreign policy applies to East Asia as well.

Tim Haesebrouck / Patrick Mello

*Patterns of Political Ideology and Security Policy*

Florian Böller / Georg Wenzelburger

*Guns or Butter? How Party Ideologies Affect Foreign and Security Policy in Western Industrialized Countries*

Federica de Pantz / Marco Milani

*The Party-Political Dimension of Foreign Policymaking: South Korea's Ideologies and Strategies*

## Abstracts

Paul Pennings

*Trends in the partisan positions on internationalism and defence in Europe, 1945-2016*

Europe has witnessed important changes regarding internationalism and defence. One important development is the end of the Cold War which has fundamentally changed the views that parties have on the type and degree of external threats. The end of the Cold War also led to the influx of Eastern European parties into the European party groups which might have had an impact on the positions that these groups take on internationalism and defence. A second development is the rise of new challenging (Euro-sceptic) parties which oppose most of the preferences on militarism and defence that are expressed by the established party groups.

This paper seeks to sketch the main trends and variations in the partisan positions on internationalism and defence in Europe in the postwar period. In order to analyse these trends and variations the party manifesto data will be used (<https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/>). These data cover the party policy positions of all main parties in all election years in the postwar period. The analysis will produce descriptive statistics and plots which show how the partisan positions on internationalism and defence have been developing.

The paper will test the main propositions in the literature on why party positions on internationalism and defence do differ. The first proposition is that the left-right cleavage matters. Left parties are expected to be dovish (favouring a pacifist outlook) and internationalist whereas the right parties are more likely to be hawkish (favouring a pro-military outlook) and less internationalist. The distinction between internationalism and defence is relevant, since two parties may be equally positive towards militarism, but generally have different strategies in mind to accomplish such goals, such as the international versus the nationalist approach to foreign policy.

Secondly, the distinction between party groups matters since most Christian democratic, Social democratic and Liberal parties have defended an internationalist stance whereas the newer challenging parties like some populist and right-wing parties defend a more nationalist view.

A third cleavage that is relevant is the division between the major European regions, in particular Western and Eastern Europe. Most Eastern European parties are expected to be more pro-military oriented than most Western European parties because they fear more external threats. To which extent is this the case and how does this evolve over time both within and between regions?

Finally, a fourth distinction is relevant, namely the time period. It is expected that parties are more pro-military during the cold war than after the cold war.

By combining these cleavages and distinctions the paper will try to answer the question how and why the partisan positions on internationalism and defence have evolved in Europe. If left-right ideology, party group membership, regional affiliation and time period are important, the combination of these factors should explain a large part of the variation in partisan positions on internationalism and defence. To which extent is this really the case? Which are the cases that remain unexplained? Can these cases be explained by idiosyncratic factors or should alternative dimensions be included in the analysis?

Diego Garzia / Alexander Trechsel

*Mapping parties' positions on foreign and security issues in the European Union, 2009-2014*

In this paper, we provide a comparative analysis of European parties' position on foreign and security issues in the EU28 across the last two EP elections (2009-2014). The aim of this paper is three-fold. First, we measure the extent to which party positions on such issues remained stable across these turbulent five years. Second, we investigate these positions in terms of dimensionality: by means of confirmatory factor analysis, we look at whether foreign and security issues actually load onto the same factor across the whole EU28. Third, we offer an explanatory analysis of the competing factors potentially affecting parties' position. By means of multivariate regression models, we test the competing effect of party ideology, overall attitude towards EU integration, and structural factors at the party level (e.g., size, governing status, etc.) in view of answering the following question: Do parties hold "genuine" positions over EU foreign and security policy, or are they rather due to their relatively more encompassing attitude towards EU integration?

The data comes from the EU Profiler and euandi projects. These were two transnational Voting Advice Applications (VAAs) developed during the 2009 and 2014 European elections campaigns respectively. Party positions were coded through an iterative method which combines expert coding of party positions and self-placement of the parties themselves. The cumulative dataset at our disposal, including data for 242 political parties across the EU28, provides us with one of the largest datasets available to test both the dimensionality and the explanatory factors of party positions on foreign and security issues across the European Union.

Guri Rosén

*An exceptional cleavage? Does EU trade policy undermine the party consensus in the European Parliament?*

Although the negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) may be about to be put on ice indefinitely, it has caused quite a stir across the European Union. Not least in the European Parliament, who had to postpone its vote on a resolution on recommendations to the Commission because there were too many suggestions for amendments. In addition, conflicts within party groups were threatening to disrupt the process. Particularly the German Social Democrats were under a lot of pressure to reject the infamous Investor State Dispute Settlement mechanism. This raises the question whether the general pattern of a left-right cleavage in the party politics of the European Parliament might not hold when the Union is deciding on external relations? Could it be that these issues raise particular concerns that trigger national interests to trump party group discipline? In the case of the South Korea Free Trade Agreement, for example, several MEPs were working hard to safeguard their national car industries. Thus, in this paper I analyse the pattern of roll-call votes on trade in the European Parliament, including international agreements as well as trade legislation. The first goal is to investigate whether one needs to redraw the traditional cleavage structures to understand how the European Parliament votes in external relations. Secondly, if trade really is an exception, the question becomes why: what are the scope conditions of its exceptionality? Using different measures of salience (importance of the dossier, public opinion), the ambition is to shed light on the party politics of trade policy, and the conditions under which MEPs are willing to rebel against their party groups.

Pierangelo Isernia / Francesco Olmastroni

*Policy Mood, Party Politics and Policy Responsiveness on the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy*

The paper examines the relationship between the European public's support for a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and policy patterns in the very same policy field by using a comparative

longitudinal perspective. By studying the conditions that affect cross-national and over-time variations in support for the CFSP, our study addresses three main questions: (a) who is driving whom in the policy-opinion interaction on foreign and security issues; (b) the role the domestic (political and institutional) and international contexts play in affecting governments' responsiveness on these issues; (c) the impact of party cleavages on governments' receptiveness to public demands in matters of foreign and security policy.

While scrutinizing the evolution of foreign policy dynamics and Europeans' preferences over time, the paper investigates the presence, evolution and determinants of policy responsiveness in different EU countries. In doing this, the paper attempts to identify both the institutional and contingency factors that influenced European public's approval of a CFSP and the impact of public attitudes and cleavages on member states' willingness (or reluctance) to cede portions of sovereignty in this policy area.

Joly Jeroen / Régis Dandoy

*Do they really care? A Comparative analysis of party preferences and their differential impact on foreign policy in six countries*

The last few decades, the notion has slowly gained ground that a country's national interest is not uniformly defined and understood, and that political parties hold very different views of what the most important and urgent issues are regarding the country's external relations and foreign policies (see for example Rathbun 2004; Kaarbo 1996; Joly and Dandoy 2016). A vast body of research on party politics has examined how political parties differ in their policy intentions expressed through manifestos before elections, and how these affect the ensuing policies of newly elected governments (McDonald and Budge 2005; Klingemann, Hofferbert, and Budge 1994). Yet, we know only very little about how parties differ in their foreign policy intentions and how they, ultimately, determine the country's foreign policies. Therefore, we propose to systematically study party differences across 6 different countries of different institutional design (Belgium, Denmark, France, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States), over a long period of time (1981-2013) across a wide variety of foreign policy issues (including defense and security, foreign and humanitarian aid and international trade).

Our first goal is to empirically assess which foreign policy issues political parties find most important and find patterns in the differences across ideologies and party affiliations. In other words, do ideologically left wing parties emphasize other policy issues than their right wing counterparts across countries? Our second goal, then, is to examine whether differences between parties within countries vary over time and how international events, like the collapse of the Soviet Union and 9/11 affect party positions and ideological differences. Finally, our third and main goal is to examine the impact ruling parties have on the foreign policies of their respective countries. Looking at the influence of issue emphasis in manifestos on emphasis in the ensuing yearly policy speeches (e.g. State of the union, throne speeches) in our different countries, we will be able to determine how coalition politics influence the relationship between party and government. Using manifesto and policy speech data coded according to the Comparative Agendas (CAP) codebook and coding procedures (similar to CMP procedures), we measure which policy issues each actor emphasizes most. The advantage of these CAP codes is the great detail they provide – 32 codes for foreign and security issues alone. Analyzing these manifesto and policy speech data will, thus, provide valuable insights in how political parties define their country's national interest and most important foreign policy challenges across parties, countries, and over time.

Fabian Virchow

*Foreign and Security policies of European radical right parties*

Radical right parties have increased their share of the vote in European elections constantly. Sometimes they were so successful that they were also involved in a government or supported a minority government. In many cases, their programmatic approach in foreign policy is sceptical or even negative to European integration and follows the idea of bringing back full sovereignty to the nation-state. In line with an anti-American stance, several of these parties are in favour of closer relations with Russia. They also take a strictly anti-immigrant position and argue for the use of military force to keep them away from their home country and/or the European continent.

This paper gives a systematic overview and comparison on the foreign and security policy agenda of several radical right parties in the European Parliament, amongst them the Front National (France), The Freedom Party Austria (Austria), the Vlaams Belang (Belgium), the Lega Nord (Italy), Party for the Freedom (Netherlands), Sweden Democrats (Sweden), Alternative for Germany (Germany), ANEL (Greece), Jobbik (Hungary). This paper will refer to speeches and papers given in the context of the European Parliament as well in the particular national context (party manifestos in particular), refer to voting behaviour and watch out for cases in which these parties might have had an influence on the decisions of national parliaments and/or governments in security and foreign policy issues. In doing that this paper will find out

- a) if and to what an extent there is a shared security and foreign policy in this political spectrum
- b) what the areas of most dis/agreement are
- c) how the parties link their basic programmatic ideas to issues of foreign and security policy
- d) if voting behaviour on issues of security and foreign policy issues are in line with the programmatic positions of these parties.

Fabrizio Coticchia / Enrico Calossi

*Similar roots, different behaviors? The foreign policy of Social Democratic and Centre-left parties in Europe: the cases of France, Germany and Italy*

Why do political parties that share the same ideological roots adopt different foreign policy behaviors? The current debate regarding the explaining factors of such divergence is still lively and controversial. The recent “European crisis” offers an interesting arena to better assess the effects of domestic and international constraints on political parties’ foreign policy. The international affiliation to the same transnational organizations (such as, at the European level, the European Parliament Political Groups and the European Political Parties) well illustrates the belongingness to the same political ideology. The paper, which adopts a comparative perspective, investigates three European national parties: the French Socialist Party (PS), the Italian Democratic Party (PD) and the German Social Democratic Party (SPD). Although different levels of responsibility, all of them are ruling parties. Indeed, the PS governs in a “semi-one-party” cabinet, the PD is the leading party of a coalition government, and the SPD is the junior party within the CDU-led cabinet.

Our aim is to assess how these parties assume similar or different positions on three current crucial foreign and security policy issues for the European Union: the Migrant Crisis, the Economic and Financial Crisis and the Islamist Terrorism. Following the main approaches developed in Foreign Policy Analysis, the paper identifies three (non-mutually exclusive) explanatory variables of the expected different behaviors amongst the above-mentioned parties: the level of perceived external threat, the coalition foreign policy (i.e., nature of the party involvement within the national executive) and the change of the party leadership.

The common affiliation of the above-mentioned parties to the Party of the European Socialists (PES) and to the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (S&D) allows to exploit the PES' electoral platforms for the European Parliament (EP) elections and the S&D's declaration on the occasion of important EP votes or events as the major empirical source for figuring out the ideological determinants of the Social Democratic political family. Therefore, extensively based on primary and secondary sources, the paper offers a cross-country and cross-time (2007-2016) analysis to contribute at the current debate on: the impact of party ideology on foreign policy, the transnational coordination between parties in foreign affairs, the personalization of politics in Western democracies, and the role of party politics in foreign policy decision-making process.

Afke Groen

*Loose Coordination or Ideological Contestation? Transnational Cooperation of Political Parties on European Foreign Affairs in the German Bundestag*

National political parties in the European Union operate in a complex environment. The field of Foreign and Security Policy is particularly puzzling: contrary to the European Parliament, that seems to have the will and capacity but not the authority to wield influence in foreign affairs, it has been argued that national parties either do not have the will or parliamentary capacity to do so. In the face of an "executive drift", previous research has viewed inter-parliamentary cooperation in foreign affairs as a promising venue to enhance parliamentary control, but has also shown that the particularities of this policy field make cooperation difficult (Herranz-Surrallés 2014). There are however good grounds to expect that cooperation along political party lines is more fruitful, as party ties are more long-standing and flexible than new institutional platforms. Moreover, the ideological interests of parties may lead them to seek cooperation with like-minded parties to contest issues transnationally. Based on Resource-Dependence Theory, this article first presents a theoretical discussion of the potential characteristics of cooperation along political party lines in the field of foreign and security policy. It subsequently examines the practices of the parties in the German Bundestag in transnational party cooperation through a case study of the highly politicised military operation EUNAVFOR Med. The research is focused on the behaviour of German Members of Parliament in seeking cooperation along the lines of national parties, the political groups in the European Parliament and the European party families. The article is based on original data from semi-structured interviews that will be conducted in the period of January-May 2017. Ultimately, the article seeks to contribute to a better understanding of the characteristics of transnational party cooperation and why such cooperation either takes the form of loose coordination or of ideological contestation.

Tapio Raunio / Wolfgang Wagner

*Ideology or national interest: foreign and security policy votes in the European Parliament*

Studies of roll-call votes in the European Parliament show that most party groups are very cohesive, the left-right dimension is the dominant cleavage in the chamber, and that most votes are adopted with broad supermajorities. This paper asks whether these findings extend to foreign and security policy, issue areas characterized by intergovernmentalism and entrenched national interests. The 'politics stops at the water's edge' idiom suggests that national interests trump party politics. In contrast, recent studies of politicization in international relations find evidence for party political cleavages as regards foreign and security politics. Examining the positions of individual MEPs, party groups and national parties in the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> (2004-2014) parliaments, the paper compares voting behaviour in foreign affairs with overall patterns of party unity and coalitions whilst also differentiating between various types of foreign and security policy matters.

Tim Haesebrouck / Patrick Mello  
*Patterns of Political Ideology and Security Policy*

Some recent work on political ideology shows the existence of partisan divides on matters of foreign and security policy – challenging the traditional notion that “politics stops at the water’s edge”. When taken as a whole, however, studies provide decidedly mixed evidence of party-political differences outside domestic politics. In this paper, we aim to provide a systematic analysis of the relationship between political parties’ ideological positions and security policy across 25 European countries. To estimate party-political positions, we use data from two alternative sources: the widely-used Comparative Manifesto Project (CMP) and the 2010 and 2014 versions of the Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES). We apply these datasets to construct alternative estimates of governments’ left-right positions. These are then used to explore the relationship between political ideology and (a) the general support for peace and security operations as indicated in the CHES dataset and (b) decision-making on specific military deployments, ranging from peacekeeping to enforcement operations.

Florian Böller / Georg Wenzelburger  
*Guns or Butter? How Party Ideologies Affect Foreign and Security Policy in Western Industrialized Countries*

Conventional wisdom holds that parties do matter in domestic affairs—especially when it comes to distributional policies of welfare and the economy. In the realm of foreign and security policy however, partisan contestation and ideological differences become muted by overarching national interests. While external threats and imminent international crises might indeed suspend “normal politics,” governments maintain considerable leeway for political decision making beyond the water’s edge: for example whether to engage in nation-building abroad, increase military capabilities or provide economic assistance for developing countries. In times of fiscal austerity and war weary publics these strategic choices entail material and political consequences. It therefore comes as a surprise that policy scholars have hitherto hardly investigated whether partisan ideology matters when foreign and security policy decisions are made.

The proposed paper seeks to contribute to the literature by examining whether and, if yes, how the ideological composition of governments affects foreign and security policies. Based on a thorough review of the literature on partisan effects on public policies, we use a multi-dimensional concept of foreign and security policies in order to assess how partisan differences in government matter. More specifically, we expect that left-wing parties should be less inclined to increase military expenditure, whereas right wing-parties are more skeptical towards development assistance in foreign countries than their left-wing contesters. At the same time, governments that include left-wing parties and especially left-libertarian parties should be more cautious to participate in military interventions. We test our expectations in a multiple regression analysis of OECD countries after 2001 and find support for the thesis that the ideological composition of governments matters. However, the effect depends on the differentiation of the overall concept of foreign and security policy in more fine-grained dimensions. Building on the pattern found in the quantitative analysis, we also explore whether the results hold when the policy process leading to major decisions in foreign affairs is examined in detail. This second step gives us more insights into the causal mechanisms that bring about the patterns at the aggregate level and enable us to nuance our findings.

Federica de Pantz / Marco Milani

*The Party-Political Dimension of Foreign Policymaking: South Korea's Ideologies and Strategies*

This paper aims to evaluate whether the party-political divide has had an impact on the development of foreign policy and security strategies in the case of South Korea. It will add on the scarce literature on the role of party politics in foreign affairs, thus contributing to a more thorough understanding of the international behaviour of countries often deemed as merely dominated by structural forces. The South Korean case is particularly appropriate to this aim, as it allows us to show that, notwithstanding constant and extreme threats to national security (namely the unsolved issue with North Korea), party politics can still be a decisive source of action.

This paper will argue that the left/right divide, especially in terms of contrasting ideologies, has had a great influence on the delineation of two different strategies for the international relations of South Korea. Whilst this polarity has its roots in previous administrations, it became most evident during the transition from the Roh Moo-hyun (2002-2007) to the Lee Myung-bak (2007-2012) presidencies. For this reason, after introducing the peculiar foreign policy making system of South Korea, we will analyse the historical development of the left-right divide and the emergence of a party-political dimension in the country's foreign policy. Subsequently, we will highlight how this divide has formed the basis for the foreign policy reappraisal occurred in 2007, during the transition from the Roh to the Lee administrations. To this aim, we will concentrate on specific foreign policy initiatives carried out during each presidency and show the relevance of party-political variables vis-à-vis structural factors in the definition of different priorities. We will collect data from campaign manifestos, party programmes and presidential speeches, most relevant sources in relation to the South Korean foreign policymaking apparatus.

## Short biographical notes

### Florian Böller

- Since 2008: Research Associate and Lecturer in Political Science, University of Kaiserslautern
- Spring 2017: Visiting Scholar, Harvard University, Center for European Studies, Cambridge (MA)
- Feb 2014: PhD in International Relations, University of Kaiserslautern
- Oct-Dec 2013: Visiting Scholar, University of Wisconsin, Madison (WI)
- Dec 2008: Master's Degree in Political Science, University of Heidelberg

#### *Research Interests:*

- Domestic Sources of Foreign and Security Policy, with a focus on the US case

#### *Recent Publications:*

- Böller, Florian/Werle, Sebastian (2016): "Fencing the Bear? Explaining US Foreign Policy towards Russian Interventions", in: *Contemporary Security Policy, online first*.
- Böller, Florian (2015): "More than a 'Constitutionally Created Potted Plant?' Der US-Kongress und die demokratische Kontrolle militärischer Interventionen, in: *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen*, 46:3, 622-644.
- Böller, Florian (2015): "Partners in Leadership? Die Krise(n) der deutsch-amerikanischen Beziehungen aus rollentheoretischer Perspektive", in: *Sicherheit + Frieden*, 33:1, 32-37.
- Böller, Florian/Werle, Sebastian (2013): "Booster or Brakeman? Die Rolle der USA in nuklearen Rüstungsabkommen gegenüber Russland", in: *Zeitschrift für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik*, 6:3, 369-391.

### Enrico Calossi

holds a PhD in "Political System and Institutional Change" and since 2013 has been Lecturer on "European Union" and "Italian Politics and Society" at the California State University Florence. He was Research Fellow at the University of Pisa (2011-2013) and Post-Doc Research Associate at the European University Institute (2010-2014), where he coordinated the "Observatory on Political Parties and Representation" at the "Robert Schuman Center of Advanced Studies". His fields of research are political party's organizations, Italy's and EU's foreign policy, European Union democracy, and left-wing politics. He wrote the book "Organizzazioni e Funzioni degli Europartiti. Il caso di Sinistra Europea" [Organizations and Function of Europarties. The case of European Left] and was coauthor of "How to Create a Transnational Party System" (2010) and of "Political Parties and Political Foundations at European Level. Challenges and Opportunities" (2014). He will soon publish "Anti-Austerity Left Parties in the European Union. Competition, Coordination, Integration".

### Fabrizio Coticchia

is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Genoa. He has been Jean Monnet Fellow at the European University Institute. His fields of research are foreign policy analysis, strategic culture, public opinion and military operations, party politics and security issues, Italian and European defence policy, development cooperation. His articles have appeared on: "Foreign Policy Analysis", "Contemporary Politics", "Mediterranean Politics", "Armed Forces&Society", "Evaluation and Programme Planning", "European Security", "Small Wars and Insurgencies", "Italian Political Science Review". Among his books: "Italian Military Operations Abroad: Just Don't Call it War", with P. Ignazi and G. Giacomello (Palgrave 2012); "La guerra che non c'era. Opinione pubblica e interventi militari italiani" (Egea 2014) and "Adapt, Improvise, Overcome? The Transformation of Italian Armed Forces in Comparative Perspective", with F.N. Moro (Ashgate 2015). He will publish (with J. Davidson): "Italian

Foreign Policy under Matteo Renzi: A Domestically-Focused Outsider and the World", Lexington (forthcoming)

### **Régis Dandoy**

is Marie Curie fellow at University of Louvain. His research and teaching specializations include Belgian politics, federalism, elections and party manifestos. He received his PhD from the University of Brussels (ULB) in 2012.

### **Diego Garzia**

is a Senior Researcher and Lecturer at the University of Lucerne. He holds a PhD in 'Comparative and European Politics' from the University of Siena. Between 2012 and 2014, he held a Jean Monnet Fellowship at the European University Institute in Florence. He worked extensively on internet-based Voting Advice Applications (VAAs) and significantly contributed to the development of this field of studies within political science. In 2014, he took part in the development of euandi as scientific coordinator and supervisor of the 121 researchers working for the project.

### **Afke Groen**

is a PhD candidate at the Department of Political Science of Maastricht University and the Graduiertenkolleg of the Amsterdam Institute for German Studies (DIA). Her project, started in August 2015, explores practices of cooperation along political party lines in the European Union, with a focus on the behaviour of parliamentary groups and Members of Parliament in the German Bundestag. She has been part of several research teams, including the Horizon 2020 project EUENGAGE (ongoing) and the Evaluation of the Lisbon Treaty for the Dutch Tweede Kamer (completed 2014). Previously, Afke has worked as a junior research and lecturer at the Department of Political Science (2014-2015) and research intern at the Observatory of Parliaments after Lisbon (2013-2014). She contributed to the Palgrave Handbook of National Parliaments and the European Union and was co-editor of a special issue on national parliaments of the Internationale Spectator.

### **Tim Haesebrouck**

is a post-doctoral researcher at Ghent University. His research interests include military intervention, Responsibility to Protect, democratic peace theory, burden sharing and Qualitative Comparative Analysis. His work appeared in Foreign Policy Analysis, Journal of Conflict Resolution, International Politics, Political Studies Review and European Foreign Affairs Review.

### **Pierangelo Isernia**

is Chairman of the Department of Social, Political and Cognitive Sciences and Professor of International Relations and Research Methodology at the University of Siena. His research interests are in public opinion and foreign policy, attitude change and deliberative democracy. He is series editor (with Maurizio Cotta) of the Oxford University Press INTUNE series on European Integration and has published several articles in professional journals and edited books on these topics. His most recent book is Public Opinion, Transatlantic Relations and the Use of Force (Palgrave, 2015, with Philip Everts).

### **Jeroen Joly**

is a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Toronto. His research mainly focuses on party governance and political communication in both the domestic and foreign policy sphere. He obtained his PhD from the University of Antwerp in 2013.

### **Patrick A. Mello**

is a Research Associate and Lecturer at the Bavarian School of Public Policy at the Technische Universität München, Germany. His research focuses on international security, the influence of domestic politics on foreign policy, and comparative and case study research methods (particularly fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis). He is the author of *Democratic Participation in Armed Conflict* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014) and has recently published in the *European Journal of International Relations* and the *Journal of International Relations and Development*.

### **Marco Milani**

is Post Doctoral Fellow at the Dornsife College – Korean Studies Institute, University of Southern California. He received his doctoral degree in History and International Relations of Asia from the University of Cagliari (Italy). Previously, he has been a visiting research fellow at the Institute for Peace and Unification Studies (South Korea) and the Leiden Institute for Area Studies (Holland). His research interests include: Inter-Korean Relations, History and International Relations of East Asia, Korean Studies and IR Theory.

### **Francesco Olmastroni**

is a postdoctoral fellow at the Centre for the Study of Political Change, University of Siena, and field and data manager for the Laboratory for Political and Social Analysis (LAPS), the Survey Research Centre of the University of Siena. His recent publications include *Framing War: Public Opinion and Decision-Making in Comparative Perspective* (Routledge, 2014), ‘Public opinion and European Foreign Policy’ (with Pierangelo Isernia), in K. E. Jørgensen, Å. Kalland Aarstad, K. Verlin Laatikainen, E. Drieskens and B. Tonra, *SAGE Handbook of European Foreign Policy*, London: SAGE, 2015) and ‘Patterns of Isolationism: A Quantitative Assessment of Italy’s Defence and Foreign Policy from Government Alternation to “grand coalitions”’ (*Contemporary Italian Politics*, 2014).

### **Federica de Pantz**

is a PhD student in the Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick. Her research investigates the role of Middle Powers as system-affecting countries through an analysis of South Korea and South Africa’s foreign policies in global governance institutions. Her research interests include IR Theory, Foreign Policy Analysis, Role Theory, Global Governance and Philosophy of Social Sciences, among others.

### **Paul Pennings**

is Associate Professor of Comparative Political Science at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. His research interests are in the fields of party politics, comparative methodology, consensus democracy and European politics. He has co-authored *Organizing Democratic Choice: Party Representation Over Time* (Oxford University Press, 2012) and *Doing Research in Political Science. An Introduction to Comparative Methods and Statistics* (Sage 2006).

**Tapio Raunio**

is Professor of Political Science at the University of Tampere and a visiting professor at Dalarna University. His research interests include legislatures and political parties, the Europeanization of domestic politics, semi-presidentialism and the Finnish political system. His work appeared in *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *European Union Politics*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Journal of Legislative Studies*, *Party Politics*, and *Scandinavian Political Studies*.

**Guri Rosén**

is a postdoctoral Fellow at ARENA, University of Oslo. She is also guest researcher at CERGU Centre for European Research, University of Gothenburg. She has published articles in journals such as the *Journal of European Public Policy* and the *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Her current project investigates the role of the European Parliament in the EU's trade policy after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, funded by the Norwegian Research Council.

**Alexander Trechsel**

is Professor of Political Communication at the University of Lucerne. He received his PhD in Political Science (1999, with distinction) from the University of Geneva. In 2005 he joined the European University Institute (EUI) in Florence as first full-time holder of the Swiss Chair in Federalism and Democracy. He initiated the European Union Democracy Observatory (EUODO) at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies of the EUI. There, he directed the EU Profiler project in 2009, a pan-European Voting Advice Application for the European Parliamentary Elections. The project won the 2009 World E-Democracy Forum Award, and it was followed in 2014 by euandi.

**Fabian Virchow**

- Professor of Political Science, University of Applied Sciences Düsseldorf (since 2010)
- Head of Research Unit on Right-Wing Extremism at the University of Applied Sciences Düsseldorf (since 2010)
- Visiting Professor, Global Visitor Program, NYU, 2013
- Senior Lecturer, Cologne University, 2009-2010
- Professor of Peace and Conflict Studies, Philipps University Marburg, 2006-2007; 2008-2009
- Senior Researcher, Media and Cultural Studies, Paris-Lodron-University, Salzburg, Austria, 2008
- Ph.D., Political Science, Free University of Berlin, 2005
- Diploma, Sociology, Hamburg University, 1987

Several publications on radical right parties and movements, some with a particular focus on foreign and security policy

**Wolfgang Wagner**

is Professor of International Security at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and co-leader of the theme 'Europe and the World' at the Amsterdam Centre for Contemporary European Studies (ACCESS Europe). He has been researching the manifold links between domestic politics and foreign policy with a particular focus on parliaments, political parties and political culture. He has published in *International Studies Quarterly*, *Parliamentary Affairs*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, *European Political Science Review*, and *Journal of Peace Research*

### **Georg Wenzelburger**

- Since 2014: Associate Professor (Juniorprofessor) for Political Economy, Department of Social Sciences, University of Kaiserslautern
- 2009-2014: Assistant Professor (Akademischer Rat), Department of Political Science, University of Freiburg
- 2009: PhD in Political Science, University of Heidelberg
- Research Interests:
- Public Policies (Fiscal Policy, Social Policy, Law and Order Policy) and Political Economy
- Partisan Theory

#### Recent Publications:

- König, Pascal/Wenzelburger, Georg (2016): “Honeymoon in the Crisis: A comparative analysis of the strategic timing of austerity policies and their effect on government popularity in three countries”, in: *Comparative European Politics*, online first.
- Wenzelburger, Georg/Hörisch, Felix (2016): “Framing effects and comparative social policy reform. Comparing blame avoidance evidence from two experiments”, in: *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 18:2, 157-175.
- Wenzelburger, Georg (2015): “A global trend towards law and order harshness? How globalization, partisan ideology and the party system shape law and order policies in 20 Western industrialized countries”, in: *European Political Science Review*, online first.
- Wenzelburger, Georg (2015): “Parties, institutions, and the Politics of Law and Order”, in: *British Journal of Political Science*, 45:3, 663-687.
- Wenzelburger, Georg (2014): “Fact of Fiction? Welfare cuts and fiscal adjustments”, in: *Journal of Public Policy*, 34:1, 63-92.
- Wenzelburger, Georg (2014): “Blame avoidance, electoral punishment and risk perceptions“, in: *Journal of European Social Policy* 24:1, 80-91.