The Pragmatic Euroscepticism of Scandinavia

Nielsen, Julie Hassing

Published in:
Routledge Handbook of Euroscepticism

Publication date:
2015

Document version
Tidlig version også kaldet pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Nielsen, J. H. (Accepteret/In press). The Pragmatic Euroscepticism of Scandinavia. I N. Startin, & S. Usherwood (red.), *Routledge Handbook of Euroscepticism* Routledge.

The Pragmatic Euroscepticism of Scandinavia

Chapter contribution to: *Routledge Handbook of Euroscepticism* (eds. S. Usherwood & N. Statin) (Routledge – *forthcoming*). Section 3: Public Opinion about the European Union

Author: Ass. Professor, Julie Hassing Nielsen, University of Copenhagen

Chapter: The Pragmatic Euroscepticism of Scandinaviaⁱ

Introduction: What is distinctive about Scandinavia?

The Scandinavians are European pragmatists (e.g., Schuck and Vreese 2013). While both Denmark and Sweden have rejected full membership of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), Denmark furthermore maintains three opt-outs on other salient EU areas. Meanwhile, Norway has twice rejected membership, yet remains a close EU partner through various parallel agreements. Still the Scandinavian pragmatists remain devoted Europeans (e.g., Knudsen 2008), and Scandinavian Euroscepticism is best characterized as being soft rather than hard.

This chapter reviews the evolution of Euroscepticism in Scandinavia from Danish entrance into the European Community (EC) in 1972 to the impact of the economic crisis in 2014. It does not include the semi-autonomous regions of Scandinavia, encompassing Greenland, Iceland and the Faroe Islands despite their different degrees of attachment to Denmark. First, I briefly conceptualize Euroscepticism, discussing previous literature with particular focus on the origin and determinants of Euroscepticism in Scandinavia. Then I turn to the similarities and differences in Euroscepticism in Denmark, Sweden and Norway, focusing on popular referendums on EU questions, voter turnout in European Parliament (EP) elections, the evolution of hard and soft Euroscepticism, and the representation of Euroscepticism through Members of the European Parliament (MEP's).

A conceptualization of Scandinavian Euroscepticism

It was Denmark that threw the EU into one of its most severe legitimacy crises. With a resounding “no” to the Maastricht Treaty (TEU) in 1992, the astonished European leaders had to reconsider the extent to which popular support was behind the integration project (e.g., Franklin, Marsch and McLaren 1994). Ever since, academics as well as professionals in the field of European integration have asked what causes popular opposition towards European integration, and does it differ amongst the Member States? While this chapter will not extensively account for the evolution of Euroscepticism (for a more thorough discussion about the theoretical concept see chapter XX in this volume), it nevertheless examines the core debates on the characteristics of Euroscepticism,

enabling us to distinguish Scandinavian Eurosceptical traits from the more general discussion about EU attitudes formation

A popular dichotomy applied to the study of Euroscepticism is the difference between hard and soft. Hard Euroscepticism refers to a principled opposition to European integration accompanied by a wish for national withdrawal. Conversely, soft Euroscepticism captures a contingent opposition to integration, including only particular community areas or salient policies (Taggart and Szczerbiak 2001). Kopecky and Mudde (2002) further characterize Euroscepticism according to David Easton's differentiation between diffuse and specific political support, distinguishing between euro-enthusiasts, euro-pragmatists, euro-sceptics and euro-rejects (Kopecky and Mudde 2002). Flood (2002) goes even further, sketching a six-point continuum, consisting of the following categories: rejectionist, revisionist, minimalist, gradualist, reformist and maximalist (Flood 2002). Later, numerous attempts have followed to capture more clearly the multiple different dimensions in the concept of Euroscepticism (e.g., Rovny 2004; Sørensen 2007; Sørensen 2008; Vasilopoulou 2011). The diverse conceptualization of Euroscepticism is critical to understanding the Scandinavian countries in a European context (Archer 2000, pp. 88). While Euroscepticism exists to minor or larger degrees in most Member States, the Scandinavian variant, as I will also argue below, cannot be characterized as hard Eurosceptic, although it has been, at times, rather lukewarm. Scandinavian Euroscepticism, particularly the one expressed in Denmark and Sweden, is best placed in the soft category.

While the concept of Euroscepticism has many dimensions, the study of it has taken place from many angles. Mostly, the phenomenon has been treated as the dependent variable, and explorations include various ways of explaining why certain people are sceptical towards the European enterprise. Research into explaining EU attitudes formation has been extensive in the past years. As a result, we now have multiple explanations on what generates EU attitudes. We know that to a certain extent opinions on the EU are largely based on domestic politics (Anderson 1998), although politically aware and knowledgeable citizens tend to evaluate EU and national politics separately (Karp, Banducci and Bowler 2003). Furthermore, support for European integration is also found to be motivated by a range of different calculations, including egocentric utilitarianism (McLaren 2007), community identity (Hooghe and Marks 2005), partisan context (Gabel 1998), democratic concerns (Gabel and Hix 2005) or concerns about the lack of democratic representation

(Rohrschneider 2002) as well as the challenges to hold politicians accountable (Hobolt and Tilley 2014) to mention a few of the multiple studies. Here the question is how Scandinavian Euroscepticism fits into these more general findings. What are the similarities, and what distinguishes Scandinavia?

The Path to EU Membership: Denmark, Sweden (and not Norway)

The Swedish and Danish paths to EC/EU membership is very different, while Norway remains in a category of its own, having twice rejected joining the union. Below, I briefly provide historical details about the Swedish and Danish paths to membership – and, in the case of Norway, the close partnership with the EU.

Denmark

Following a popular referendum in 1972, Denmark became an EC member, along with Ireland and Britain, in the first enlargement wave in 1973. It is no coincidence Denmark became the first Scandinavian EC Member State. From the beginning, the Danish government was the most sympathetic towards the European enterprise (Archer 2000, pp. 89), which was mainly grounded in pragmatic economic considerations (Pedersen 1996, pp. 87). Then, as well as now, agriculture comprised the largest Danish export sector, with the United Kingdom and Germany its main markets. Thus, from early EC negotiations, most political parties were positive towards membership. Yet, as we shall see in the next section, these early negotiations revealed one of the more profound and consistent cleavages in Danish EU politics, which would – again and again – prove difficult for Denmark after accession. While a majority of the Danish political elite – across the traditional left-right ideology spectrum – supports European integration, the Danish population is more hesitant. Hence the Danes have often, against the better advice from their political leaders, rejected further EU integration in popular referendums, which were institutionalized on salient EU issues from early membership days. Although the Danish constitution only requires a referendum in cases where the proposal does not enjoy a 5/6 majority in the Parliament, it has nevertheless become customary to run them even if the Parliament possesses the required majority or if the subject is judged to be particularly important despite the fact that it does not relinquish national sovereignty to the EU level (Knudsen 2008, pp. 155).

Most famously, the Danish population's reluctance on political integration was witnessed in the now-famous rejection of the TEU in 1992. Although the Danish politicians managed to renegotiate the Danish TEU accession terms in 1993, the "no" resulted in the still-existing four Danish opt-outs from the Treaty. These include an opt-out from the EMU's third phase, defense cooperation, European citizenship and the supranational elements of the Justice and Home Affairs cooperation (for more on these opt-outs see DIIS 2008). Yet the Danes are not hard Eurosceptics. Although they have rejected further integration in popular referendums, they have the highest level of feeling of attachment to the EU compared to other EU Member States (Archer 2000, pp. 94), and this has remained high despite the recent Eurozone Crisis, as we shall see in the next section.

Sweden

Unlike Norway and Denmark, Sweden has insisted on international neutrality since WW2. Hence the Swedish government was initially the most sceptical of the Scandinavian countries towards EC membership because it wished to maintain that neutrality (Aylott 2008, pp. 182). This was made clear in 1961 when the then Social Democratic Prime Minister Tage Erlander declared full Swedish EC membership to be incompatible with European integration (Widfeldt 1996, p. 101). Hence, Sweden did not apply for membership when Norway and Denmark approached the EC in the 1960s, and for decades Swedish EU politics was described as cautious and hesitant (Raunio 2007, pp. 192). Unlike its Danish and Norwegian counterparts, the European questions did not enter into the Swedish agenda before the mid-1980s. Then, like most European countries, Sweden was struggling financially, and when the plans for a European Union took shape in the late 1980s, Swedish politicians no longer considered an EC trade agreement to be sufficient (Widfeldt 1996, pp. 102). Simultaneously, the Cold War, in which Swedish neutrality policy was embedded, ended with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. In this changed context, Sweden re-considered its position. Furthermore, as we shall see in the next section, the Swedish population also became more positive towards EU membership in this period. This pattern nevertheless changed in the mid-1990s when again there was a majority against what had then become EU accession (Widfeldt 1996, pp. 105-106).

In 1991, Sweden officially applied for membership of the EU. And in November 1994, the Swedish population endorsed accession by a less than impressive 52.3 per cent in favour. Like in Denmark and Norway, it was mainly industry and commerce that endorsed entry to the EU, while the green parties, the socialist left and the blue-collar workers and smaller farmers mainly

opposed it (Archer 2000, pp. 104). The Swedish population remains lukewarm towards EU integration (Aylott 2008). Although they endorsed it in the mid-1990s, it was a close run thing, and they remain reluctant to integrate in some salient policy areas. Just like Denmark, Sweden decided to remain outside the EMU's third phase by deliberately not complying with the currency convergence criteria. And like Denmark, Sweden held a popular referendum on the issue in 2003, where the Swedes rejected Euro entrance. Unlike Denmark, however, Sweden did not request an exemption from the EU treaty during membership negotiations, and therefore the country is obliged to adopt the Euro when it has fulfilled the economic criteria (Svensson 2006, pp. 215). This, nevertheless, is unlikely to happen in the near future. In 1991, the Swedish government tied the Swedish Krona to the ECU (later to become the Euro). Soon after, along with the British Pound, the Krona fell victim to exchange rate speculation following the Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM2) crisis. A year later the Krona had to leave the ERM2. Since then, unlike the Danish Krone, the Krona has not been tied to the common currency (Chang 2009, pp. 171-172).

Norway

Along with Denmark, Norwegian politicians started EC membership negotiations in 1971. Yet, unlike Denmark, the Norwegians rejected accession by a small margin of 53.5 per cent against 46.5 per cent in a popular referendum in 1972 (Sæter 1996, pp. 133). While the core topics in the negotiation talks centered on agriculture and fishery, the referendum also revealed what would become one of Norway's major EC/EU cleavage in the years to come: a division between the cities and the south-east (the pro-European camp), and the country side and the north-west of the country (the anti-EU camp) (Archer 2000, pp. 96; Sitter 2001). Along with its Nordic neighbours (Sweden and Finland), Norway later applied for EU membership in 1992. Yet the dominant Labour Party remained divided between pro- and anti-forces, and the Norwegian parliament had a blocking majority of 58 anti-membership representatives. Although the Swedish referendum, resulting in a positive vote in favour of European membership, was held prior to the Norwegian vote, the positive result did not spill over to Norway. In November 1994, the Norwegians, with an extraordinary 89 per cent voter turnout, rejected EU entrance. Hence, contrasting with both Sweden and Denmark, the Norwegians have remained consistently hard Eurosceptic (Archer 2000, pp. 94; Skinner 2012, p. 432). Since the second Norwegian referendum, Norwegian EU policy has been focused on close EU adaption without formal membership (Sæter 1996, p. 133). As with the first referendum, the dividing lines are between the pro-European cities and the south east of Norway, whereas the

countryside and the north west parts remain skeptical. Yet more division lines remain. Whereas the Norwegian manufacturing industry and commerce in general favour EU membership, the primary industries oppose it. Furthermore, divisions include cultural and socio-economic cleavages, which have survived Norway's recent transition to an oil-based economy (Archer 2000, pp. 98-99; Skinner 2012). Others have suggested that Norway's self-image is more Atlantic than just European due to its geographical location in the European periphery (Archer 2000, pp. 95).

Norway maintains a very close relationship with the EU. Instead of membership, it joined the European Economic Area (EEA) in 1994. The EEA agreement covers many salient EU policies, including all relevant laws of the EU single market (except those concerning agriculture and fishery). Additionally, Norway participates in a number of EU agencies and programmes, although it does not possess voting rights. Furthermore, it works closely with the EU on foreign policy issues, and it actively seeks association with the defence and security dimensions of EU foreign policy. Norway is also a part of the border-free Schengen Area, and it participates in the Dublin system for asylum claims, Europol and Eurojust.

Eurosceptic similarities and differences: Denmark, Sweden and Norway

Considering Scandinavia's reputation of Euroscepticism, it is puzzling that empirical evidence points to much differentiated responses to European integration over time. In brief, the evolution of Scandinavian Euroscepticism is a nuanced phenomenon (e.g., Archer 2000, pp. 89). Differences and similarities between expressed Euroscepticism in Denmark, Sweden and Norway can be measured in various ways. As mentioned in the previous section, the literature on Euroscepticism distinguishes between popular (e.g., Hobolt and Wratil 2015; Sørensen 2007) and party-based (e.g., Rovny 2004; Taggart 1998). Although these two dimensions remain intertwined, I mainly focus here on the populations' attitudes to European integration. Below, I account for the outcome of the popular referendums held in Scandinavia from the early Danish and Norwegian accession talks to the recent Danish 2014 Patent Court referendum. Furthermore, I explore the evolution of Euroscepticism in Denmark, Sweden and Norway, looking at the long term evolution of hard Scandinavian Euroscepticism vis-à-vis the European average (1972-2014), as well as soft scepticism towards the Euro compared to the average EU 28 (2007-2014). Yet as popular Euroscepticism cannot be distinguished from that which is party-based, as political parties only

survive if their policies are widely supported by the public, I also briefly account for some of the main features of Swedish and Danish party-based Euroscepticism.

It is most likely that the repeated Scandinavian “no” to further European integration in popular referendums has earned the region its Eurosceptic reputation. Most significantly, it was the Danish no to the TEU in 1992, when the European leaders for the first time experienced the gap between the wishes of the political pro-integrationist elite and the public. From an elite understanding of a popular permissive consensus, the political elite for the first time experienced the growing popular constraining opposition to the European project (Hooghe and Marks 2009). The Danish 1992 referendum was, however, not the first one held in Scandinavia. As illustrated in Table 1, all Scandinavian countries have held several referendums. Although the end results diverged with a Danish accession yes in 1972 (with an exceptional 63.3 per cent pro-accession), and a Swedish yes in 1994 (52.3 per cent for accession), the Norwegians did not resolutely reject EU accession, although the country twice rejected the European project. In 1972, 46.5 per cent of Norwegians voted in favour of accession to the EC, while a similar large minority of 47.8 per cent voted for it in 1994. In brief, neither of the Scandinavian populations are consistently hard Eurosceptics. As seen in Table 1, the lowest range of “yes” votes was in 2003 when Sweden rejected Euro-entrance – and even then the figures were still above 40 per cent favouring entrance. Hence, although all Scandinavian countries indeed have rejected further European integration in various shapes and at various times, the populations are consistently divided between the yes and no camps. Again, this speaks for the Scandinavians as not being hard Eurosceptics, but rather – unlike other Member States – they have had the opportunity to have a say in which directions they wished the European project should go.

(Table 1)

One of the patterns worth noticing in Table 1 is the very high level of voter turnout. While high turnout is one of the Scandinavian trademarks, boasting one of the highest average electoral turnouts in the world (e.g., Franklin 2004), this is also the case when it comes to EU referendums and EP elections. Figure 1 shows the voter turnout in the EP elections from the first direct election in 1979 to the most recent one in 2014. Contrary to the European trend, both Denmark and Sweden have in the last three elections experienced an increase in turnout from 2004 to 2014. The Swedish turnout increased by 13 per cent points from 38 per cent in 2004 to 51 per cent in 2014, while the Danish went up by 8 per cent points from 48 per cent in 2004 to 56 per cent in 2014. While one of the most predominant explanations on voting patterns is habitual voting (e.g., Franklin 2004), which explains why the overall voting pattern in Scandinavia at EP, national and local elections remain very high compared to international standards, it does not explain why the Swedish and Danish turnout has increased over the past decade, while the remaining European average has decreased. However, if voter turnout can be interpreted as legitimizing the political system, these patterns point to a growing legitimacy of the European system in Scandinavia, while the opposite trend might be prevalent in the rest of Europe.

(Figure 1)

One of the main stereotypes of Scandinavians is the fact that they are hard Eurosceptics. Yet the question remains to what extent the Scandinavians earned this reputation rightly or if it is an unjustified interpretation. Figure 2 below shows the evolution of hard Euroscepticism in Denmark and Sweden vis-à-vis the rest of the European average over time. Hard Euroscepticism is measured by an index, consisting of a set of questions tapping aspects of it. Importantly, Figure 2 is based on Eurobarometer data from the Mannheim accumulative survey from 1973-2002. This data is extended here by generating a new, similar index constructed on the basis of new survey items. However, because the survey items used to measure hard Euroscepticism change over the course of time, the index items change accordingly. Table 2 summarizes the different index questions used over time to generate the index of hard Euroscepticism. Following the methodology and in order to extend the Mannheim indexⁱⁱ, a new index has been created. It consists of 5 questions, which are

consistently asked from 2002 to 2009 in the Eurobarometer series. In 2010 and 2011 two of the questions are combined into one question and thus there is a break in the index.

(Figure 2)

To ensure concept consistency between this newly generated index variable on hard Euroscepticism from 2002 onwards, a separate control measure is introduced: *“Taking everything into consideration, would you say that (OUR COUNTRY) has on balance benefitted or not from being a member of the European Union?”* (BNFT in Figure 2). As seen, the benefit control baseline correlates positively with both the constructed Mannheim index variable (1973-2001) as well as our newly constructed one from 2002-2009 and thus serves as a benchmark for consistency.

The index is constructed in such a way that 4 indicates strongly pro-European, while 0 indicates strongly hard Euroscepticism. One of the strongest features of the index is that it serves perfectly well as a measure of Euroscepticism between countries. As seen in Figure 2, the overall trend in Europe, encompassing the Scandinavian countries, is an increase in support for European integration over time. This also confirms previous findings, showing an overall trend over time towards greater European-wide adherence to European integration (Bølstad 2014). However, in contrast with the European average, Danish hard Euroscepticism between 1973 to around 1991 has consistently been one index point higher than the European average, meaning that the Danes actually demonstrated less Euroscepticism than the average European. However, in around 1991, the gap between the EU and the Danish average narrows. In 1992, with the TEU, the EU went from an economic community to a political union – an evolution a small majority of Danes rejected in that year. Since 1991, the Eurosceptic gap between Denmark and the EU average has narrowed. In around 2007-2008, the European average exceeded the Danish for the first time. This pattern is not surprising when considering the newly democratized East European Members joining the EU in 2004; the economic crisis from 2007 onwards also caused greater skepticism towards the European enterprise amongst non-Euro countries (Hobolt and Wratil 2015).

Sweden joined the EU in 2004. As Figure 2 shows, the Swedish endorsement of the European project was actually greater than the EU average until 2008. Like the Danish pattern, the gap between the Swedish and the EU average also narrows until the latter overtakes former in 2010. Importantly, however, from 2009-2011, the items tapping hard Euroscepticism change dramatically (see Table 2). Hence, the Eurosceptic patterns identified here might both change due to the changes in survey items as well as a change in Eurosceptic sentiments. However, as we shall see below, the pattern of a more pro-European EU average in the difficult years during the Eurozone crisis vis-à-vis a more skeptical Danish and Swedish population is identified when it comes to soft Euro Euroscepticism. One important note to Figure 2 is that the index variables from 2002 – 2011 follow the baseline benefit pattern less consistently. One of the reasons might be that the period considered is relatively short compared to the Mannheim index and fluctuations thus has a greater influence which, in time, would mean less. Also, it is not said that the baseline pattern is reflecting the true answer and it is only used as a benchmark for our own index which by far exceeds the Mannheim index in terms of robustness and generality. Furthermore, as mentioned, measuring Euroscepticism over time is a hard task but regarding internal ranking between countries the index has a very strong feature since the consistency is perfectly intact.

(Figure 3)

In Figure 2, we witnessed that general Scandinavian support for EU integration has become more positive in the past decade. The question is, however, to what extent this trend is also found with regard to soft Euroscepticism. Recall that both Sweden and Denmark deliberately remain outside the EMU's third phase, following popular referendums in 2000 (Denmark) and 2003 (Sweden) (see Table 1). Since then, the 2007 global financial crisis led to a persistent Eurozone crisis. Does the pattern of a gradual more positive attitude towards the EU in general also spill over to the questions of EMU membership? Figure 3 provides us with the answer. It shows the percent of respondents answering being positive towards Euro, tapped by the following survey item: *“What is your opinion on each of the following statements? Please tell me for each statement, whether you are for it or against it. A European Monetary Union with a single currency, the Euro”*. As seen in Figure 3, the Danish and Swedish levels of support for the Euro drop dramatically as the Eurozone crisis deepens in 2009 onwards, from around 55 per cent being in favour of the Euro to only 30 per cent or below

in 2011, although a minor positive evolution is found from 2011 onwards. A similar pattern is not found amongst the Eurozone Member States, where support for the Euro only drops around 10 per cent points from 2008 – 2014. These findings echo well research in the area that show a similar evolution for Eurozone Member States (Hobolt and Wratil 2015).

Although the focus of this chapter is predominantly on popular EU attitudes in Scandinavia, we cannot distinguish this view from the general representation through political parties. If Scandinavians have become softer on hard Euroscepticism throughout the years, while remaining skeptical towards the common currency, how does this combination pattern play out with regard to the representation of Eurosceptic parties in the European Parliament (EP)?

While Denmark has held direct elections to the EP since the first direct election in 1979, Sweden has held them since 1999, following EU entrance in 1995. In the run up to the Danish 1972 accession referendum, the first direct anti-EC political organization was born. What became known as the People's Movement ("Folkebevægelsen") grew from various groups promoting the Nordic alternative and socialism combined with "*peace-cum-anti-nuclear grass-roots movements*" (Knudsen 2008, pp. 156). Although the People's Movement spread across the political left-right spectrum, it was deeply rooted in the socialist left. Although it predominately centered on the single anti-EU cause, it nevertheless successfully obtained 29 per cent of the votes in the first EP election, with a solid 4 mandates out of the 16 national total mandates. The next decade, the EP elections were the main activity of the People's Movement. However, in the aftermath of the turbulent referendum on TEU in 1992, it split with the core (maintaining its old name) advocating for leaving the EU, and a softer variant of Euroscepticism, which took the name of The June Movement ("Junibevægelsen") (Knudsen 2008, pp. 156-157). This gradually lost power in the late 1990s, and was dissolved in 2009. The People Movement, however, continued to be represented in the European Parliament, although weakened. At the latest 2014 EP election, it only won one mandate. It maintained, importantly, the support of the socialist left party, The Unity List ("Enhedslisten"), which since 2011 had obtained the influential role of being the crucial supporting party of the Danish minority government.

From the early accession talks onwards, political parties in Denmark were deeply divided on the European issue, and this included the smaller but influential Social Liberals. The bourgeois parties

were in general in favour (Knudsen 2008, pp. 156). However, this also included the major Social Democratic Party, where arguments of giving up high welfare standards were put forward against gaining beneficial access to the exports markets of the EC. This pattern of a split Social Democratic Party is similar in all Scandinavian countries, where established Eurosceptic branches can be found (Sitter 2001, p. 29).

Importantly, many of the Eurosceptic parties have moved from being hardliners against EU membership to only opposing some parts of European integration and to being soft Eurosceptics. Such a movement is most predominantly found in the Socialist People's Party ("Socialistisk Folkeparti"), which originally strongly opposed EC membership but gradually softened at the end of the 1990s (Knudsen 2008, pp. 158). However, this does not mean that Euroscepticism is disappearing the Danish political landscape. Rather, the variant of soft Euroscepticism against a political union, encompassing Euro membership, has proven persistent. In the recent 2014 EP election, the soft eurosceptic Danish Folk Party ("Dansk Folkeparti") won 4 out of 13 seats. Combined with the one mandate to the hard Eurosceptic line maintained by the People's Movement, Danish Euroscepticism is therefore still represented in the EU institutions. This election result supports the overall EU trend of a more Eurosceptic population at the EP 2014 – most likely due to the Eurozone crisis (Bertoncino and Koenig 2014).

Swedish Euroscepticism has also weakened in the past decades. As in Denmark, it is mainly softly expressed towards particular issues, such as with Euro entrance (Aylott 2008, pp. 181-182). Swedish partisan Euroscepticism – hard as well as soft – stems from the early days of membership negotiations (e.g., Aylott 2008; Miljan 1977). Following some turbulence in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the Swedish party system now consists of seven main parties (Aylott 2008, pp. 183), i.e. Social Democrats ("Socialdemokraterna"), the Conservatives ("Moderaterna"), the Liberals ("Folkepartiet"), the Christian Democrats ("Kristdemokraterna"), the Centre Party ("Centerpartiet"), the Green Party ("Miljöpartiet"), and the Left Party ("Vänsterpartiet"). However, two new parties have recently emerged and also won representation in the EP 2014 elections. These are the Feminist Initiative ("Feministiskt initiativ"), which was established in 2005 and which is not hard Eurosceptic as long as "patriarchal structures are avoided", and the Swedish Democrats ("Sverigedemokraterna"), which is a right-wing populist party. While the Swedish Democrats have existed since 1988, the party has only recently obtained enough support to win mandates in the

national parliament and in the EP. Like the Danish pattern of Eurosceptic representation at the latest EP election, the Swedish Democrats, resembling in many ways the Danish Folk Party and including the same Eurosceptic agenda, argues for continued non-participation in the Euro- and re-negotiation of the Schengen Acquis as well as for a new referendum on Swedish EU politics. The latter can only be interpreted as hard euroscepticism. However, as newcomers in politics, the party only won its first seats in the national parliament in 2010, and they did not obtain a landslide victory as the Danish Folk Party did in the 2014 EP election. Out of 20 Swedish seats in the EP, they gained only 2.

Like in Denmark, the Social Democrats have been the biggest Swedish party for decades. And like in Denmark, they (along with all other major Swedish parties except the Liberals) are against an EU federation (Aylott 2008, pp. 183). The Centre Party hesitantly endorsed EU membership in 1994, maintaining skepticism towards the common currency. Furthermore, many Euro opponents are found in the non-socialist parties. In brief, some division within parties exists with regards to the Euro question (Svensson 2006, pp. 214-215). However, only the Left Party and the Greens opposed EU membership in 1994 (Aylott 2008, pp. 184). The opposition was mainly rooted in the fear of losing national autonomy, preferences for decentralized decision-making, and the Swedish long-standing wish for neutrality (Aylott 2008, p. 189). While soft Euroscepticism can be found in all Swedish parties, three parties - the Social Democrats, the Centre, and the Christian Democrats – contain organized Eurosceptic factions (Aylott 2008, pp. 184). The Swedish Democrats, however, changed this picture, as their current programme exists possesses elements of both soft and hard Euroscepticism.

In sum, as also emphasized elsewhere, strong and integrated partisan Euroscepticism is found both in Denmark and Sweden (Raunio 2007, pp. 42). This opposition has been present in Sweden, Denmark (and Norway) in the socialist left from the early accession talks in the 1970s (Sitter 2001, p. 28), while the past decades also witnessed a growing right-wing populist branch of Euroscepticism in Denmark and Sweden. Party-based Euroscepticism in Scandinavia such as that illustrated above, is probably best described as being driven by domestic government-opposition patterns directly linked to opposition politics, while simultaneously shaping coalition politics (Sitter 2001), as seen in Denmark and in Sweden, where the Danish People's Party and the Swedish Democrats increasingly gain domestic influence as critical supporting parties of minority

governments (in Denmark) or in party coalitions. This pattern is in line with a broader European trend, being characterized by an increase in right-wing Euroscepticism (e.g., Elsas and Brug 2014). Yet Scandinavian Euroscepticism follows a multiple cleavage and diverse political pattern, consisting of a centre-periphery and urban-rural cleavages as well as competition between values-or interest-based parties and new populist parties on the right and the anti-establishment opposition on the left (e.g., Sitter 2001, p. 24-25). Some cleavages, such as the urban-rural dimension, for example in the case of Norway, are more pronounced in some countries (Sitter 2001, p.30).

A common denominator for Scandinavia is that left-wing parties maintain a general opposition to European integration, as witnessed in EP elections and in popular referendums. And Scandinavian skepticism towards the EU enterprise mainly comprises opposition towards full EMU membership and the political union (Archer 2000, pp. 105). This predominantly soft opposition, however, remains consistently strong. Hence, the conclusion made by Archer more than 15 years ago still holds: *“the Nordic states – whether governments or people – are not “against the EU” let alone anti-“Europe”, but they had and do have particular reservations about certain policies in the EC/EU and about the speed and direction of the integration process. Anything that smacks of federalism is normally resisted”* (Archer 2000, pp. 107).

Conclusion

The Scandinavians are EU pragmatists. While Denmark joined the European Community in 1973 and Sweden gained accession in 1995 – both following a popular referendum – Norway has twice rejected accession to the EU following a popular referendum. This chapter argues that although the Scandinavians are known for being amongst the Eurosceptical members of the European Union, Sweden and Denmark nevertheless are not hard Eurosceptic. On the contrary, the Swedish and Danish support for European membership has grown the past years, although the Eurozone crisis has caused a decline in the support.

Furthermore, voter turnout in European Parliament elections have increased in both Sweden and Denmark the past decades, contrasting the declining European average. However, soft Euroscepticism is high in both Denmark and Sweden, particularly when it comes to political integration and Euro support. Lastly, the chapter shows that both Sweden and Denmark have witnessed a left-wing and right-wing based party Euroscepticism, where the past years particularly the right-wing grounded Euroscepticism has been on the rise. Yet, the chapter closes by arguing that multiple societal cleavages have to be considered when understanding what constitutes Euroscepticism in Denmark and Sweden.

Bibliography

- Anderson, C. J. . 1998. "When in Doubt, Use Proxies. Attitudes Towards Domestic Politics and Support for European Integration." *Comparative Political Studies* 31(5):569-601.
- Archer, C. . 2000. "Euroscepticism in the Nordic Region." *Journal of European Integration* 22:87-114.
- Aylott, N. . 2008. "Softer but Strong: Euroscepticism and Party Politics in Sweden " in *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism* edited by A. Szczerbiak and P. Taggart. Oxford Oxford University Press
- Bertoncino, Y. , and N. Koenig. 2014. "Euroscepticism or Europhobia? Voice vs. Exit? ." in *Policy Paper 121 - 27 November 2014*, edited by Notre Europe Jacques Delors Institute. Paris
- Bølstad, J. . 2014. "Dynamics of European integration: Public opinion in the core and periphery " *European Union Politics* Early online version 1-22.
- Chang, M. . 2009. *Monetary Integration in the European Union* Uk Palgrave Macmillan
- DIIS. 2008. "De Danske Forbehold over for Den Europæiske Union." edited by Danish Institute for International Studies. Copenhagen DIIS
- Elsas, E.v. , and W.v.d. Brug. 2014. "The changing relationship between left-right ideology and euroscepticism, 1973-2010." *European Union Politics* early online version 1-22.
- Flood, C. . 2002. "Euroscepticism: A Problematic Concept." Paper presented at the UACES 32nd Annual Conference and 7th Research Conference Queen's University Belfast
- Franklin, M. , M. Marsch, and L. McLaren. 1994. "Uncorking the Bottle: Popular Opposition to European Unification in the Wake of Maastricht." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 32(4):455-72.
- Franklin, M. N. . 2004. *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies since 1945*. New York Cambridge University Press
- Gabel, M. . 1998. "Public Support for European Integration: An Empirical Test of Five Theories." *Journal of Politics* 60:333-54.
- Gabel, M., and S. Hix. 2005. "Understanding Public Support for British Membership of the Single Currency " *Political Studies* 53:65-81.
- Hobolt, S. B. , and J. Tilley. 2014. "Who's in Charge? How Voters Attribute Responsibility in the European Union " *Comparative Political Studies* 47(6):795-819.
- Hobolt, S. B., and C. Wratil. 2015. "Public opinion and the crisis: the dynamics of support for the Euro." *Journal Of European Public Policy* Early online view 1-19.
- Hooghe, L. , and G. Marks. 2009. "Postfunctionalism a postfunctionalist theory of European integration: from permissive consensus to constraining dissensus " *British Journal of Political Science* 39(1):1-23.
- Hooghe, L. , and G. Marks. 2005. "Community, Calculation, and Cues." *European Union Politics* 6(4):421-45.
- Karp, J. A., S. A. Banducci, and S. Bowler. 2003. "To know it is to love it? Satisfaction with democracy in the European Union." *Comparative Political Studies* 36(3):271-92.
- Knudsen, A.L. . 2008. "Euroscepticism in Denmark " in *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism*, edited by A. Szczerbiak and P. Taggart. Oxford Oxford University Press
- Kopecky, P. , and C. Mudde. 2002. "The Two Sides of Euroscepticism: Party Positions on European Integration in East Central Europe." *European Union Politics* 3(3):297-326.
- McLaren, L. . 2007. "Explaining Mass-Level Euroscepticism: Identity, Interests, and Institutional Distrust." *Acta Politica* 42(2-3):233-51.
- Miljan, T. . 1977. *The Reluctant Europeans. The Attitudes of the Nordic Countries towards European Integration*. London: C. Hurst.
- Pedersen, T. . 1996. "Denmark and the European Union " Pp. 81-101 in *The European Union and the Nordic Countries* edited by L. Miles. London: Routledge
- Raunio, T. 2007. "Softening but Persistent: Euroscepticism in the Nordic EU Countries." *Acta Politica* 42:191-210.

- Rohrschneider, R. . 2002. "The Democratic Deficit and Mass Support for an EU-wide Government." *American Journal of Political Science* 46(2):463-75.
- Rovny, J. . 2004. "Conceptualising Party-Based Euroscepticism: Magnitude and Motivations'." *Collegium* 29:31-47.
- Schuck, A. R. T. , and C. H. d. Vreese. 2013. "EU-phoria or -phobia? Danish public opinion about the EU " Pp. 175-89 in *Denmark and the European Union* edited by A. Wivel and L. Miles. London: Routledge
- Sitter, N. . 2001. "The Politics of Opposition and European Integration in Scandinavia: Is Euro-Scepticism a Government-Opposition Dynamic? ." *West European Politics* 24(4):22-39.
- Skinner, M. S. . 2012. "Norwegian Euroscepticism: Values, Identity or Interest." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50(3):422-40.
- Svensson, A. F. . 2006. "Sweden: A member of the European Union but without the Euro " *Futures* 38(2):212-23.
- Sæter, M. . 1996. "Norway and the European Union: domestic debate versus external reality " in *The European Union and the Nordic Countries* edited by L. Miles. London: Routledge
- Sørensen, C. 2007. "Euroscepticism: A Conceptual Analysis and Longitudinal Cross-Country Examination of Public Scepticism Towards the European Union." in *Department of Political Science* Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen
- Sørensen, C. . 2008. "Love Me, Love Me Not: A Typology of Public Euroscepticism " in *Guildford: European Parties Elections and Referendums Network* edited by EPERN Working Paper 19.
- Taggart, P. . 1998. "A touchstone of dissent: Euroscepticism in contemporary Wester European Party systems " *European Journal of Political Research* 33:363-88.
- Taggart, P. A. , and A. Szczerbiak. 2001. "Parties, Positions and Europe: Euroscepticism in the EU Candidate Countries of Central and Eastern Europe " *EPERN Working Paper 12* Guildford: Euroepan Parties Elections and Referendums Network
- Vasilopoulou, S. . 2011. "European Integration and the Radical Right: Three Patterns of Oppositions " *Government and Opposition* 46(2):223-44.
- Widfeldt, A. . 1996. "Sweden and the European Union: implications for the Swedish party system " in *The European Union and the Nordic Countries* edited by L. Miles. London: Routledge

Data sources:

Downloaded from ICPSR

- The Mannheim Eurobarometer Trend File, 1970-2002 (ICPSR 4357)
- Eurobarometer 70.1 (2008)
- Eurobarometer 72.4 (2009)
- Eurobarometer 74.2 (2010)
- Eurobarometer 76.3 (2011)
- Eurobarometer 78.1 (2012)
- Eurobarometer 80.1 (2013)
- Eurobarometer 81.4 (2014)

Chapter: The Pragmatic Euroscepticism of Scandinaviaⁱⁱⁱ

Table 1. EU Referendums and Results in Norway, Denmark, and Sweden (1972-2014)^{iv}

Year	Country	Object	Turnout (%)	Yes (%)
1972	Denmark	EC Membership	90	63,3
	Norway		79	46,5
1986	Denmark	Single European Act (SEA)	75	56,2
1992	Denmark	Maastricht Treaty (TEU)	83	49,3
1993	Denmark	Maastricht Treaty (TEU) ^v	87	56,8
1994	Norway	EU Membership	89	47,8
	Sweden		83	52,3
1998	Denmark	Amsterdam Treaty	76	55,1
2000	Denmark	Single currency ^{vi}	88	46,9
2003	Sweden	Single currency	83	42,0
2014	Denmark	Patent Court	56	62,5

Source: www.eu-oplysningen.dk Norwegian figures found at <http://www.ssb.no/euvalg>; Swedish figures found at www.regeringen.se (webpages consulted 29 January 2015)

Figure 1: Voter Turnout in European Parliament Elections: Denmark, Sweden, EU Average (1979-2014) (%)

Sources: Author's own figure. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/000cdcd9d4/Turnout-%281979-2009%29.html> and <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2014-results/en/election-results-2014.html> (webpages consulted 29 January 2015)

Table 2: Index Construction and Items to Figure 2

Year	Questions	Countries	Eurobarometer
2002	<p>(1) "Generally speaking, do you think that (OUR COUNTRY)'s membership of the European Union is a good thing?"</p> <p>(2) "Taking everything into consideration, would you say that (OUR COUNTRY) has on balance benefitted or not from being a member of the European Union?"</p> <p>(3) "In general, does the European Union conjure up for you a very positive, fairly positive, neutral, fairly negative or very negative image?"</p> <p>(4) "People may feel different degrees of attachment to their town or village, to their region, to their country or to European Union. Please tell me how attached you feel to (OUR COUNTRY)?"</p> <p>(5) "People may feel different degrees of attachment to their town or village, to their region, to their country or to European Union. Please tell me how attached you feel to Europe?"</p>	Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Ireland, UK, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Finland, Sweden and Austria	58.1
2003	*	Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Ireland, UK, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Finland, Sweden, Austria, Northern Ireland, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia	60.1
2004	*	*	62.0
2005	*	*	63.4
2006	*	*	65.2
2007	*	Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Ireland, UK, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Finland, Sweden, Austria, Northern Ireland, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria and Romania	67.2
2008	<p>(1) "Generally speaking, do you think that (OUR COUNTRY)'s membership of the European Union is a good thing?"</p> <p>(2) "Taking everything into consideration, would you say that (OUR COUNTRY) has on balance benefitted or not from being a member of the European Union?"</p>	*	69.2 71.3

	<p>(3) “In general, does the European Union conjure up for you a very positive, fairly positive, neutral, fairly negative or very negative image?”</p> <p>(4) “Thinking about this, to what extent do you personally feel you are (NATIONALITY)”.</p> <p>(5) “Thinking about this, to what extent do you personally feel you are European?”.</p>		
2010 /2011	<p>(1) “Generally speaking, do you think that (OUR COUNTRY)’s membership of the European Union is a good thing?!”</p> <p>(2) “Taking everything into consideration, would you say that (OUR COUNTRY) has on balance benefitted or not from being a member of the European Union?”</p> <p>(3) “In general, does the European Union conjure up for you a very positive, fairly positive, neutral, fairly negative or very negative image?”</p> <p>(4) “You feel you are a citizen of the EU?”</p>	*	<p>73.4</p> <p>75.3</p>

Sources: Author’s own table. Eurobarometer surveys.

Notes: * indicates the same as stated in the row above.

Figure 2. The Evolution of Hard Euroscepticism: Denmark, Sweden and the EU Average

Sources: Author's own figure. Eurobarometer surveys (see appendix).

Notes: For the Mannheim Index Spain and Portugal were included from 1986; Norway is included in 1991-1993 and 1995; Finland, Sweden and Austria are included in 1995.

Figure 3: Evolution of Soft Euro Euroscepticism Towards the Euro in Denmark, Sweden and the EU Average (2008-2014) (%)

Source: Author's own figure. Eurobarometer.

Notes: Average European countries consists of all other EU Member States that particular year, including non-Euro EU Members.

Downloaded from ICPSR

- The Mannheim Eurobarometer Trend File, 1970-2002 (ICPSR 4357)
- Eurobarometer 70.1 (2008)
- Eurobarometer 72.4 (2009)
- Eurobarometer 74.2 (2010)
- Eurobarometer 76.3 (2011)
- Eurobarometer 78.1 (2012)
- Eurobarometer 80.1 (2013)
- Eurobarometer 81.4 (2014)

ⁱ I thank Christoffer Jensen Weissert (Kraka) for excellent student assistance.

ⁱⁱ For more about how the Mannheim index is generated see <http://www.gesis.org/eurobarometer-data-service/topics-trends-question-retrieval/eb-trends-trend-files/mannheim-eb-trend-file/>

ⁱⁱⁱ I thank Christoffer Jensen Weissert (Kraka) for excellent student assistance.

^{iv} Table 1 does not include the 1982 popular referendum in Greenland, which – after obtaining home-rule status from Denmark in 1979 - decided to leave the EC.

^v Denmark voted on the Maastricht Treaty including the Edinburgh Amendments ("Edinburgaftalen"), which gave Denmark its four opt outs from EU cooperation.

^{vi} With the Edinburgh Amendments (1993) Denmark is exempt from participation in the Economic and Monetary Union's third phase, which includes the common currency (the Euro). It was the abolition of this opt out clause that was sent to referendum in 2000.