European
University
Institute

ROBERT
SCHUMAN
CENTRE FOR
ADVANCED
STUDIES

WORKING PAPERS

RSCAS 2020/102

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

Integrating Diversity in the European Union (InDivEU)

The Politics of Differentiated Integration: What do Governments Want? Country Report - Czechia

Vratislav Havlík and Hubert Smekal

European University Institute

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

Integrating Diversity in the European Union (InDivEU)

The Politics of Differentiated Integration:

What do Governments Want? Country Report - Czechia

Vratislav Havlík and Hubert Smekal

EUI Working Paper **RSCAS** 2020/102

Terms of access and reuse for this work are governed by the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC-BY 4.0) International license. If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), editor(s), the title, the working paper series and number, the year and the publisher.

ISSN 1028-3625

© Vratislav Havlík and Hubert Smekal, 2020

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC-BY 4.0) International license.
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Published in December 2020 by the European University Institute.
Badia Fiesolana, via dei Roccettini 9
I – 50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)
Italy

Views expressed in this publication reflect the opinion of individual author(s) and not those of the European University Institute.

This publication is available in Open Access in Cadmus, the EUI Research Repository:
<https://cadmus.eui.eu>

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

The Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, created in 1992 and currently directed by Professor Brigid Laffan, aims to develop inter-disciplinary and comparative research on the major issues facing the process of European integration, European societies and Europe's place in 21st century global politics.

The Centre is home to a large post-doctoral programme and hosts major research programmes, projects and data sets, in addition to a range of working groups and *ad hoc* initiatives. The research agenda is organised around a set of core themes and is continuously evolving, reflecting the changing agenda of European integration, the expanding membership of the European Union, developments in Europe's neighbourhood and the wider world.

For more information: <http://eui.eu/rscas>

The EUI and the RSCAS are not responsible for the opinion expressed by the author(s).

European Governance and Politics Programme

The European Governance and Politics Programme (EGPP) is an international hub of high-quality research and reflection on Europe and the European Union. Launched in 2018, it is part of the research programmes of the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies at the European University Institute.

The EGPP maintains its core activities through externally funded research projects, including financial support from the European Commission through the European Union budget, and is animated by the Programme Associates, leading scholars from different disciplines brought together by their interest in European integration and its future development.

For more information: <http://europeangovernanceandpolitics.eui.eu/>

Integrating Diversity in the European Union (InDivEU) is a Horizon 2020 funded research project aimed at contributing concretely to the current debate on the 'Future of Europe' by assessing, developing and testing a range of models and scenarios for different levels of integration among EU member states. InDivEU begins from the assumption that managing heterogeneity and deep diversity is a continuous and growing challenge in the evolution of the EU and the dynamic of European integration.

The objective of InDivEU is to maximize the knowledge of Differentiated Integration (DI) on the basis of a theoretically robust conceptual foundations accompanied by an innovative and integrated analytical framework, and to provide Europe's policy makers with a knowledge hub on DI. InDivEU combines rigorous academic research with the capacity to translate research findings into policy design and advice.

InDivEU comprises a consortium of 14 partner institutions coordinated by the Robert Schuman Centre at the European University Institute, where the project is hosted by the European Governance and Politics Programme (EGPP). The scientific coordinators of InDivEU are Brigid Laffan (Robert Schuman Centre) and Frank Schimmelfennig (ETH Zürich).

For more information: <http://indiveu.eui.eu/>

Integrating
Diversity in the
European Union

The research leading to this report was conducted within the InDivEU project. The project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 822304. The funders had no role in the study design, data collection or analysis.

Abstract

This paper illustrates that the salience of differentiated integration has been quite low in Czech political debate since the country's accession to the European Union in 2004. Abstract thinking about differentiated integration is virtually absent in governmental documents. They include occasional references to sensitive specific issues, such as the euro and the eurozone, Schengen and the Fiscal Compact. Similarly, parliamentary debates lack in-depth discussion of differentiated integration, although a few isolated speeches touching on two- or multi-speed Europe were delivered. This paper argues that, in general, Czech politicians do not favour differentiated integration because they do not want the Union to split into a centre and a periphery. They want Czechia to be part of the integration mainstream which is quite remarkable given the Czech reluctance to participate in ambitious integration projects.

Keywords

Czechia; differentiated integration; multi-speed Europe; core Europe.

Summary of Results

I. Salience

The salience of differentiated integration (DI) has been quite low in the Czech political debate since the country's accession to the European Union in 2004. Government programmes do not mention DI models or DI mechanisms, and the same picture occurs in Prime Minister speeches. Only some DI instances have appeared in these documents, mostly concerning the euro and the eurozone, Schengen and the Fiscal Compact. Members of Parliament have occasionally debated DI models and DI mechanisms, but in just a couple of speeches and unsystematically and irregularly. Only the years 2007 and 2017 brought more vibrant DI debates, particularly on a multi-speed and a two-speed Europe. A higher salience of enhanced cooperation was caused by few debates with a few speakers who often mentioned this DI mechanism in relation to the Banking Union (bank tax) and the European Prosecutor.

II. Position

Depth is lacking in political debates on differentiated integration. Government programmes largely omit DI models and DI mechanisms but elaborate on some DI instances, mainly on adoption of the single currency. The approach to membership of the eurozone changed from an ambitious vision of a speedy accession to postponing the accession until it is clearly beneficial for Czechia. Prime Ministers' speeches offer a similar record, although DI mechanisms appear a little more. Prime Minister Nečas (2010–2013) rejected a two-speed Europe. However, he called for a debate on adoption of the euro because according to him the eurozone represented the core of Europe. Similarly, Prime Minister Bohuslav Sobotka (2014–2017) opposed a multi-speed Europe for its potential to split the Union into a centre and a periphery.

Members of Parliament have discussed DI mechanisms mainly when debating the future of Europe and questions concerning the eurozone. Other contexts have occurred only rarely, for example in speeches about migration policy or Brexit. Overall, in parliamentary debates DI models have been discussed overwhelmingly neutrally. In addition, DI mechanisms have been mentioned predominantly in a neutral context. However, a noticeable number of negative statements – mainly in connection with a multi-speed Europe – have appeared as well. Positive statements concerning differentiated integration have only occurred very rarely.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. The salience of DI	2
2.1 Government programmes.....	2
2.2 Key speeches by Prime Ministers.....	3
2.3 Parliamentary debates	5
2.4 Summary of the salience of DI	8
3. Government positions on DI	9
3.1 Government programmes.....	9
3.2 Key speeches by PMs	10
3.3 Parliamentary debates	12
3.4 Summary of DI government positions	15
4. Conclusion	16
Appendices	17

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Salience of DI instances in government programmes.....	3
Figure 2 - DI models in the Chamber of Deputies (2004-2019).....	5
Figure 3 - DI models in the Senate	6
Figure 4 - DI mechanisms in the Chamber of Deputies	6
Figure 5 - DI mechanisms in the Senate.....	7
Figure 6 - Instances of enhanced cooperation	8
Figure 7 - Position on multi-speed and multi-end Europe in parliamentary debates	13
Figure 8 – Position on enhanced cooperation and opt-outs in parliamentary debates.....	13
Figure 9 - Political parties and DI issues in parliamentary debates (2008, 2012 and 2017-2020)	14
Figure 10 - Context of DI debates	15

1. Introduction

Czechia acceded to the European Union (EU) in 2004 as part of the biggest enlargement wave in EU history. Ten new countries, mainly from central and eastern Europe (CEE), joined the bloc and increased the number of Member States from 15 to 25. After a phase of initial enthusiasm, some of the new countries experienced disillusionment with certain aspects of EU membership and their positions in the EU. Czechia stands out even in this group of states. Only 39% of the Czech population trusted the EU in the 2019 Eurobarometer,¹ which is the lowest percentage among all the CEE Member States. This basic description of Czechia as a particular case among the new Member States adds to the appeal of this report because it also enables an assessment of whether Czechia behaves differently in terms of the salience of the issue of differentiated integration (DI) and government positions on DI. The Czech DI record provides useful material for discussions on differentiated integration because Czechia does not take part in the single currency and in one moment strove to join the United Kingdom and Poland in their Protocol 30 on the application of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. Moreover, Czechia is not among the countries enthusiastically joining various instances of enhanced cooperation.

This report investigates the salience of differentiated integration (DI) in Czech government discourse between 2004 and 2019. It also probes into the position of Czech governments on the issue of DI in selected peak-salience years (2008, 2012, 2017-2020). The results are based on an analysis of various government documents (Appendix 1). We analysed the salience of DI issues in government programmes and first speeches, in European Council presidency speeches, in Future of Europe speeches, Prime Minister European Council Statements and parliamentary debates. We consider government programmes the most important source of information on the government's positions on the issues of interest. They should elaborate on matters which the government finds essential. Moreover, given their length, they also enable more elaboration. Various speeches represent an additional source, to which less attention will be given because they might reflect more personal, rather than government, agendas, and more circumstantial, rather than long-term programmatic, issues. The report covers both chambers of the Czech parliament, the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies (PSP).

The report distinguishes among three levels of abstraction in government discourse on DI. First, two different models of DI are distinguished at the conceptual level. On the one hand, the 'multi-speed EU' model depicts DI as a temporary phenomenon and implies that all Member States (MSs) will ultimately reach the same level of integration. On the other hand, the 'multi-end EU' model depicts DI as a potentially permanent feature of European integration. In this model, the MSs do not necessarily strive to reach similar levels of integration. Instead, each MS can 'pick and choose' to adjust its own level of integration to national preferences and capacities. Second, the analysis focuses on DI mechanisms. On the one hand, the enhanced cooperation mechanism allows a limited group of MSs – under certain conditions – to pursue deeper integration without having to involve all the MSs. On the other hand, the 'opt-out' mechanism allows MSs to refrain from participating in common policies. In short, enhanced cooperation allows a MS to integrate more than other MSs, while opt-outs allow a member state to integrate less than other MSs. Finally, the analysis looks at various instances of differentiated policies and policy fields. A total of twenty-one instances are included in the analysis. They are grouped in four different categories: (a) instances of enhanced cooperation; (b) instances of opt-out policy fields; (c) instances of inter se agreements; and (d) instances of external agreements. Inter se agreements are agreements which EU Member States conclude outside the framework of the European Union. External agreements are agreements between the EU and non-EU states.

The salience of DI models, DI mechanisms and DI instances is assessed by counting key words in the above-mentioned documents (See Appendix 2 for an overview of the key words). The assumption

¹ Standard Eurobarometer 92, Autumn 2019, <https://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/ResultDoc/download/DocumentKy/88848>, p. 6.

is that the more a government talks about DI, the more relevant it is. While key word counts in government programmes and PM speeches show the salience of DI in specific moments in time, the analysis of parliamentary debates allows us to identify trends over time and situational peaks. We triangulated the results of the key word analysis by engaging in a close reading of the relevant document sections and assigning an overall score to each document (holistic grading, see Appendix 3). Besides the salience of DI in domestic politics, we focused on the positions of various actors on issues associated with DI. We used the same sources as mentioned above to find out more about the views of political actors on DI issues, and about the framing and reasoning various actors use. In addition, we map how the framing and reasoning change. To this end, references to key DI words in parliamentary debates were manually coded as negative, neutral or positive using QDA Miner software. Section 2 details the results of the salience analysis. Section 3 provides the results of the position analysis.

2. The salience of DI

We demonstrate the salience of DI in the Czech political arena through an analysis of government programmes, Prime Minister speeches and parliamentary debates. The particularities of the Czech language warrant a notice. It has seven cases, which made quantitative text analysis quite a protracted exercise.²

2.1 Government programmes

Czechia is a country with quite a high turnover of governments. During the period of interest (i.e. 2004–2020), ten government programmes were produced – eight by regular governments and two by caretaker governments.³ They are of different lengths and levels of detail depending primarily on the nature of the government. Caretaker governments tend to draw up short programmes, while ordinary political governments normally have extended ones. The documents can thus vary in length from 7 to 51 pages. The EU typically occupies a high position on the list of government priorities, with an individual chapter in the programmes devoted to relations between Czechia and the EU.

Government programmes do not elaborate on DI models and mechanisms. The concepts associated with DI models and mechanisms only appear rarely (see Appendix 4) and do not go beyond vague proclamations (see section 3.1). The only incidence of conceptual DI key words appeared in the 2014 government programme and concerned the ‘core Europe’ concept. This means that the government programmes lack any explicit references to issues such as differentiated integration, two-/multi-speed Europe, variable geometry, concentric circles or à la carte integration. Neither of the DI mechanisms (enhanced cooperation and opt-out) ever appeared in government programmes in the period of interest. However, the programmes include several references to the key words ‘Future of Europe.’

While the government programmes remain mostly silent about DI models and mechanisms, they **regularly mention DI instances** (Figure 1). The European single currency manifestly scores the most references (26), followed by EU enlargement (10), Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) and Schengen (both 9). Schengen only recently emerged as a topic – in connection with the sharp increase in irregular migration to the EU starting in 2015 – while enlargement and ESDP are consistently on the agenda. More recently, Czech government programmes have also begun mentioning the Eastern Partnership (4).

² For example, it was not possible to present the aggregate results for all seven grammatical cases and multiple words in one neat graph due to the limitations of the text analysis software used for the report (Voyant-Tools). Nevertheless, the software was used as a basis for the quantitative analysis of salience.

³ The government programmes were in 2004, 2005 2006, 2007, 2009 (caretaker government), 2010, 2013 (caretaker government), 2014 and twice in 2018. In 2018, two government programmes were drafted. The first government of Andrej Babiš did not succeed in the first vote of confidence in the Chamber of Deputies in January 2018. The second vote of confidence in July 2018 approved the government coalition of Babiš’s ANO with the Social Democrats. The second government programme is largely based on the first one, but we count them separately.

Figure 1 first shows the overall development of the salience of DI instances over time and then zooms in on individual issues. Roughly half of the possible DI instances, such as Rome III, the Unitary Patent, Matrimonial Property Regimes, the Financial Transaction Tax, the European Public Prosecutor, the Prüm Convention, the Single Resolution Mechanism and the Unified Patent Court, have remained entirely undiscussed in government programmes. The overall frequency of occurrences of DI instances largely depends on the intensity of the debate on the single currency, which had its heights right after the Czech accession to the EU in 2004 and again since 2018. Similarly, frequent references to Schengen in the only two government programmes after the 2015 ‘migration crisis,’ which profoundly resonated in the political discourse in central and eastern European countries, greatly added to the increased profile of DI issues in the two 2018 government programmes.

Figure 1 - Salience of DI instances in government programmes

2.2 Key speeches by Prime Ministers

In this subsection, we include so-called first speeches by newly appointed Prime Ministers in the Parliament and the subsequent debates, European Council presidency speeches, Future of Europe speeches and Prime Minister European Council statements.

When exploring **first speeches**, we look both at the Prime Minister’s first speech when introducing the priorities of the new government in the lower chamber of the Parliament and at the following debate.

Conceptual DI key words are entirely lacking in the first speeches and they only appear rarely (sketchy discussions on the future of Europe in 2007, 2014 and 2018) and vaguely in subsequent Prime Ministers’ debates with parliamentarians. **DI mechanisms, such as enhanced cooperation and opt-outs, were absent from the first speeches.**

The single currency has been by far the most debated DI issue in first speeches and subsequent parliamentary debates, followed by the Fiscal Compact and Schengen.⁴ Prime Ministers have not prioritised European issues in their statements. They usually only came up later in debates when, typically, opposition parliamentarians expressed their disagreement with the government’s position.

⁴ Although Schengen has not been mentioned in connection with an opt-out, but only generally.

Czechia experienced a particularly tumultuous Council presidency term (January-June 2009). The coalition government of Mirek Topolánek fell in March 2009, and the caretaker government of Jan Fischer replaced it a month and a half later. Czechia, therefore, prevented itself from leaving more profound imprints on the European agenda due to significantly weakening its leadership position. Prime Minister Topolánek addressed the European Parliament with his **presidency speech** on 14 January 2009. Our analysis showed that Topolánek centred the speech around his favoured topic of energy policy.⁵ His speech focused more on immediate goals than grand visions of the future of Europe. **It did not include any references to the concept of DI, DI models or DI mechanisms.** The speech mentioned a few instances of DI, specifically ones related to EU external policy, such as the Eastern Partnership, the European Neighbourhood Policy and EU enlargement.

Unlike the European Parliament, the national parliament did not have the opportunity to hear an official presentation of the priorities of the Czech presidency when it commenced in January 2009. We approximated an official introduction to the Czech EU Council presidency to the most similar events and therefore included the first evaluation by Prime Minister Topolánek of the progress with the presidency and the following debate, in both the lower and upper chambers of the parliament. Topolánek first informed the Senate on 8 January 2009⁶ but focused more on a pending gas crisis (an interruption in gas supplies from the Russian Federation to the EU) than on the broader presidency agenda. There was no debate on conceptual DI issues, but the Prime Minister and discussants touched on the issues of the Eastern Partnership and EU enlargement. The Chamber of Deputies heard Topolánek at a more advanced stage of the EU presidency on 5 February 2009, but did not even touch on DI-related issues and instead spent a day criticising the government for its handling of various problems. Only a small part of these problems concerned EU-related matters, such as dealing with the Russian Federation, Israel and Palestine.

Czechia belongs to the minority of countries which have not participated in **Future of Europe** debates in the European Parliament (2018–2019).⁷ However, the government organised some events domestically. Under the umbrella of citizens' consultations on the Future of Europe, 22 discussions in 11 cities took place,⁸ including a kick-off event with Prime Minister Andrej Babiš and a final debate with the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the State Secretary for European Affairs. Among the ten issues most debated, the only DI instance was the single currency. Otherwise, the citizens' concerns related to other problems.⁹ The whole project did not attract much prominent media attention. Tellingly, the Czech version of the official website of the European Commission on the Citizens' Dialogues and Citizens' Consultations¹⁰ only shows a blank page.

We have not found any repository of pre- and post-European Council press statements by Czech Prime Ministers. Therefore, our analysis of the salience of DI issues in such statements remains only cursory. We Google-searched various conceptual DI terms (two-speed and multi-speed Europe, core Europe) in Prime Ministers' speeches. The results are very sketchy. Some instances of DI-related addresses probably remained undiscovered, but they at least provide us with some information on Czech

⁵ The most frequent words in the corpus were: European (46); Czech (32); EU (31); presidency (30); and energy (29).

⁶ The Senate's session was supposed to deal with the results of the European Council in Brussels in December 2008, but both Topolánek and the senators made use of the occasion to discuss presidency-related issues.

⁷ See Ralf Drachenberg and Silvia Kotanidis (2019). The Future of Europe debates in the European Parliament, 2018-19. *European Parliamentary Research Service*, p. 1. ([https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2019/637948/EPRS_IDA\(2019\)637948_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2019/637948/EPRS_IDA(2019)637948_EN.pdf)).

⁸ Tereza Chlebounová (2018). Závěrečná zpráva: Jakou Evropu chtějí čeští občané? *Euroskop.cz*, (<https://www.euroskop.cz/9274/32163/clanek/zaverecna-zprava-jakou-evropu-chteji-cesti-obcane/>).

⁹ Úřad vlády České republiky (2018). Závěrečná zpráva k občanským konzultacím v ČR, p. 6 (https://www.euroskop.cz/gallery/103/30958-zprava-obcanske-konzultace_cz_oez.pdf).

¹⁰ See https://ec.europa.eu/commission/files/citizens-dialogues-and-citizens-consultations-key-conclusions_cs (visited on 26 June 2020).

Prime Ministers' views on DI topics. We included in our sample one statement by Mirek Topolánek, one by Bohuslav Sobotka, two by Petr Nečas and two by Andrej Babiš. Apparently, DI was not among the most pressing issues that the Czech political elite wanted to address (on the content of Prime Ministers' perspectives on DI, see section 3.2).

2.3 Parliamentary debates

The Czech Parliament consists of a lower and an upper chamber (the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate), with the lower chamber playing the role of critical political battlefield and the upper chamber a stabilising factor with partial veto powers. A proportional representation system determines the composition of the lower chamber (the 200 deputies are members of political parties), while the senators earn their seats in two-round majority elections. We present basic quantitative overviews of discussions on DI issues in the Czech Parliament separately because the debates in each of the two chambers proceed quite independently. The analysis starts with the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate follows.

Figure 2 shows how often members of the lower chamber of the Parliament mentioned one of the conceptual DI key words and how mentions developed over time. We can observe a high variability between individual years, ranging from zero mentions in a total of six years to 29 mentions in 2017. Regarding individual conceptual DI key words, the concept of a multi-speed Europe emerged as the most used (30 mentions, with peaks in 2007 and 2017 – 11 and 13 mentions, respectively). Core Europe and a two-speed Europe were discussed as well, unlike the concepts of a coalition of the willing, two-tier Europe, concentric circles and à la carte, which were never mentioned in the lower chamber debates¹¹.

Figure 2 - DI models in the Chamber of Deputies (2004-2019)

Figure 3 shows that the upper chamber's discussions on DI issues were similar to the debates in the lower chamber. The most debated concepts are two- and multi-speed Europe, which seem to be viewed interchangeably, and core Europe. Similarly, the debates witnessed several peaks (2007 and 2017) but

¹¹ Appendix 5 compares the overall frequencies of all the conceptual key words to the key word 'future of Europe.' 2017 appeared to be the busiest year for exchanges on the future of Europe (13 mentions).

also years with very low or even zero DI activity. The senators covered almost all the conceptual key words, the only exception being the concept of concentric circles. The Future of Europe was also discussed in waves, the highest being right after EU accession (2004–2006) and then in 2017 (Appendix 6).

Figure 3 - DI models in the Senate

Figure 4 shows similarly erratic patterns. The mentions of DI mechanisms – enhanced cooperation and opt-out – seem to be unrelated not only to each other but also to the DI models presented above. The busiest DI model year (2017) is not matched by a similar frequency of debates on DI mechanisms. Mostly, DI mechanisms earned very few remarks, except ‘enhanced cooperation,’ which recorded eight comments in 2010 and opt-out, which had six appearances in 2012.

Figure 4 - DI mechanisms in the Chamber of Deputies

Figure 5 shows that quite a lively discussion evolved around DI mechanisms in the Senate. These were debated more often than in the Chamber of Deputies. In 2012, the number of hits for enhanced cooperation reached a record 40. However, this high number is not a result of a sudden interest in enhanced cooperation, but of reappearing mentions of phrases connected with the banking union in only five speeches. On the other hand, in the preceding and most of the following years, enhanced cooperation was not mentioned at all.

Figure 5 - DI mechanisms in the Senate

Discussion on DI instances follows similar patterns in both chambers. Among instances of enhanced cooperation DI, the Financial Transaction Tax and the European Public Prosecutor received the most attention by far. Among inter se agreements, the European Stability Mechanism and the Fiscal Compact became quite well-debated issues, with low hundreds of mentions in both Chambers. Among external integration DI instances, the European Economic Area and the Eastern Partnership became subjects of speeches in both chambers. However, by far the biggest DI-connected buzzwords were Schengen and especially Economic and Monetary Union (see Appendices 7-9 for the results).¹²

¹² The results for 'opt-out' not only show mentions of the given terms connected to opt-out, but all mentions of words under the opt-out heading (Schengen, etc.).

Figure 6 - Instances of enhanced cooperation

6a) Chamber of Deputies

6b) The Senate

2.4 Summary of the salience of DI

The salience of differentiated integration has been quite low in Czech political debate. The government programmes did not mention DI models or DI mechanisms, and the same can be said of Prime Minister speeches. In these documents, only a few mentions concerning DI instances occurred, mostly in relation to the euro and the eurozone, Schengen and the Fiscal Compact. The parliamentary debates witnessed few remarks about DI mechanisms and models, but typically only in a couple of speeches. There are two exceptions to this trend: the years 2007 and 2017, when multi- and two-speed Europe appeared more frequently. The holistic grading of documents (see Appendix 3) corroborates the results. The overall scores point to a low salience of the issue and rather negative positions on DI. Some of the DI

instances reached high salience on the parliamentary agenda, especially Economic and Monetary Union and Schengen.

3. Government positions on DI

This section focuses on developments in government positions on DI models, mechanisms and instances. It shows similarities and differences among different political parties and assesses the stickiness of positions on DI issues.

3.1 Government programmes

Government programmes abound with references to EU funds, whereas discussion on broader EU issues is mostly absent. DI instances find their way into government programmes primarily in reaction to a pressing political topic, such as accession to the single currency or Schengen after the 2015 migration wave. First, we discuss government positions in the rare appearances of concepts associated with DI models and mechanisms. Then we elaborate on government positions on DI instances, especially on the euro and Schengen.

In its only reference to the concept of core Europe, the 2014 government programme declared the aim of Czech EU policy was to head towards the European integration core. Similarly vague were the ideas on the future of Europe. Since the Czech accession to the EU in 2004, government programmes have consistently emphasised the significance of European integration for the bright future of the continent. Czech governments declare that they want to actively participate in discussions on the future of the EU so that Europe can successfully respond to new challenges. The recurring thread calls for an EU that is closer and more understandable to the people, democratic, effective and competitive. More specific positions on the future of the EU are sporadic. The 2013 caretaker government programme supported deeper integration and a stronger political and economic European voice on the global stage. Most recently, the two government programmes of 2018 called for an EU which does less but much better.

DI instances occur in government programmes much more frequently than conceptual thoughts on the future of Europe and the Czech place in it. As was shown above (section 2a), the single currency dominates the list of references to DI instances. The position on the euro pretty well reflects the overall Czech approach to European integration. The 2004 and 2005 government programmes urge carrying on with domestic reforms in order to join the single currency in 2010 at the latest. After no mentions or very vague mentions in the next government programmes, the 2014 programme subscribes to active involvement in meeting the conditions to adopt the euro and declares that the government would reassess the reserved attitude to monetary integration and financial cooperation. The 2014 programme even claims that Czechia would join the Fiscal Pact.¹³ However, both 2018 government programmes changed the course again, stating that the government did not find it possible to join the eurozone in the current situation. The loss of Czechia's own monetary policy, the unfinished process of nominal and real convergence to the eurozone and the necessary involvement in the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) were among the reasons justifying the negative stance on quickly joining the eurozone.

Similarly, the government programmes in the 2000s (2004, 2005 and 2007) prioritise joining the Schengen Area by the end of 2007, while both 2018 government programmes emphasise adequate protection of external Schengen borders against illegal migration. The Security and Defence Policy also recurs in governments programmes, but typically warrants only vague mentions of active Czech participation. Two programmes (2007 and 2013) hint that the government at the time supported closer EU cooperation in collective security. Such appeals came to fruition recently in both the 2018

¹³ Czechia joined the UK in 2012 in being the two states which did not endorse the Fiscal Pact.

government programmes calling for enhanced cooperation in the field of defence and declaring that Czechia will join PESCO.

The Czech decision on (not) joining Protocol 30 on the application of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights evolved in twists. Then-President Václav Klaus conditioned his signature for Czech accession to Protocol 30 on the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty, and the 2010 government programme repeated that it insisted on its earliest possible ratification, together with ratification of the next accession treaty. Nevertheless, Czech governments then ceased to strive for Protocol 30, and the promise given to President Klaus came in vain.

Regarding horizontal integration, Czech government programmes consistently express support for the accession of western Balkans countries to the EU. Some programmes give importance to the European Neighbourhood Policy and emphasise support for the Eastern Partnership. However, they do so only in a few words and without deeper justification.

3.2 Key speeches by PMs

This subsection examines Czech Prime Ministers' speeches delivered in important political moments. They include the introduction of government programmes to the Parliament ('first speeches'), speeches to the chambers of Parliament at the beginning of the EU presidency and addresses on European issues.

Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek (2006–2009) gave a broad **speech** on his vision of Europe and the Czech Council presidency in Athens in April 2008 (i.e. approximately half a year before the start of the Czech presidency).¹⁴ Topolánek strongly supported further EU enlargement, which could encompass not only the traditionally mentioned western Balkans but also Georgia and northern African countries. Topolánek called for a more flexible, liberal and adaptable EU, and increased competitiveness through tearing down trade barriers and removing overregulation. He opposed unification, but still it is not clear how Topolánek approached differentiated integration.

Prime Minister Topolánek addressed the European Parliament in his **EU presidency speech** on 14 January 2009. The Eastern Partnership stood high among the list of priorities. Prime Minister Topolánek explained why: "As a new Member State with experience of totalitarianism, our membership of the Community means a great deal to us, and we consider it our moral duty to strengthen cooperation with those who are left outside." Further on, Topolánek substantiated his thoughts in more detail: "The deepening of the eastern dimension of the European Neighbourhood Policy through a strengthening of cooperation with the countries of the region (above all, with Ukraine), and likewise with the countries of the Transcaucasian and Caspian region, is of great importance, not only morally but also practically. This cooperation will enable us to diversify our foreign trade and supplies of energy raw materials."

Topolánek also expressed support for the quickest possible accession of Croatia to the EU, so that it could provide an example to other countries in the western Balkans. One interesting vision for the future of Europe included enriching the classical four freedoms with a fifth freedom – the free movement of knowledge, which would supposedly signify a return to medieval universalism.

The Prime Minister's exchanges with the two chambers of the Czech Parliament did not go deeply into conceptual debates but instead discussed pressing issues for the Czech presidency at the time. Among DI instances, Topolánek's responses to some questions contributed to a better understanding of the government's position on the Eastern Partnership and enlargement. Topolánek supported formalisation of the Eastern Partnership, which according to him should have reached the same status as the Union for the Mediterranean. This step should halt the ongoing misbalance in various

¹⁴ Mirek Topolánek (2008). Projev premiéra Mirka Topolánka na téma českého předsednictví EU. 11. 4. 2008. (<https://www.vlada.cz/cz/za-premierem-a-vladou/projev-premiera-mirka-topolanka-na-tema-ceskeho-predsednictvi-eu--proneseny-v-recke-republice-11-4-2008-33920/>).

neighbourhood policies. Regarding enlargement, the Czech presidency hoped to move forward the accession process with Croatia and pushed for further integration with Serbia.

Prime Minister Petr Nečas (2010–2013) broadly shared Topolánek's views, which does not surprise given that they both represented the soft Eurosceptic party ODS (Civic Democrats). Nečas pointed out that EU development was unavoidably heading towards a multi-speed Europe. He associated the core with the eurozone, which necessarily proceeds with integration more deeply than countries outside the single currency. Therefore, posited Nečas, it made more sense to debate when Czechia wanted to join the eurozone than if it wants to belong to core Europe. Regarding enhanced cooperation, Nečas called for a thorough analysis of the costs and benefits of Czech participation in various DI instances instead of general declarations that we want to be inside the core.¹⁵ Conceptually, Nečas disliked the term 'two-speed Europe,' which according to him implied two speeds or a division into groups. He preferred the concept of variable geometry, with one common base for all the EU Member States and other policies pursued by those that wanted. Nečas conceded that the eurozone Member States needed to coordinate their economic and fiscal policies more, and he found it incorrect when a eurozone non-member which did not want more integration in this direction prevented them from doing so. Nečas perceived differentiated integration as also legitimate beyond the single currency, e.g. in cases such as Schengen and the unitary patent. However, he saw one critical limit: differentiated integration should not interfere with cooperation by the whole EU.¹⁶

Unlike previous soft Eurosceptic Civic Democrat Prime Ministers, more pro-integrationist Social Democrat Prime Minister Bohuslav Sobotka (2014-2017) perceived differentiated integration unfavourably. Sobotka even talked about "the spectre of multi-speed Europe."¹⁷ He instead called for convergence between the centre and the periphery, which was not possible in a Europe divided between the old stable core and the indecisive periphery. Sobotka feared permanent inequality between the EU Member States, which would continually deepen, and possibly would even lead to the dissolution of the Union.¹⁸

Current Prime Minister Andrej Babiš (2017–now) shares Sobotka's antipathy to the concept of a two-speed European Union which might divide Europe into small clubs.¹⁹ In Babiš's own words, "We absolutely disagree with the idea of a two-speed Europe where the core of the EU would integrate more and its periphery less. We cannot have a Union where you have one foot in and one foot out."²⁰

To put the stances of the last three Prime Ministers into perspective, we compare their attitudes, reasonings and motivations. Soft-Eurosceptic Nečas endorsed differentiated integration by reasoning that it was not fair to block the countries which want to integrate more. Unlike Nečas, the following Prime Ministers, Sobotka and Babiš, opposed multi-/two-speed Europe, but for different reasons. Soft pro-integrationist Sobotka favoured a united Europe and feared growing rifts and a potential destabilisation of Europe. Babiš instead did not want Czechia to be labelled a state outside core Europe. Therefore, he opposed splitting the EU according to speeds/extents of integration.

¹⁵ Petr Nečas (2012). Česká "unijní" politika potřebuje racionální debatu. 28. 6. 2012 (<https://www.ods.cz/clanek/1742Po>).

¹⁶ Petr Nečas (2012). 10 tezí předsedy vlády k budoucí podobě Evropy. 3. 4. 2012 (<https://www.vlada.cz/cz/clenove-vlady/premier/vyznamne-projevy/10-tezi-predsedy-vlady-k-budouci-podobe-evropy-94293/>).

¹⁷ Bohuslav Sobotka (2017). Základním principem sociální Evropy je sblížení příjmů a životní úrovně. 27. 4. 2017 (<https://www.vlada.cz/cz/media-centrum/aktualne/premier-sobotka-zakladnim-principem-socialni-evropy-je-sblizovani-prijmu-a-zivotni-urovne--155716/>).

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ ČTK (2018). PM Babiš at Globsec: Two-speed EU must not divide Europe. Prague Daily Monitor, 21. 5. 2018 (<http://praguemonitor.com/2018/05/21/pm-babi%C5%A1-globsec-two-speed-eu-must-not-divide-europe>).

²⁰ Andrej Babiš (2018). The vision of the future of the EU. 18. 10. 2018 (<https://www.vlada.cz/en/clenove-vlady/premier/speeches/the-vision-of-the-future-of-the-eu-169079/>).

Generally, when addressing the Parliament with their government's programme ('**first speeches**'), Prime Ministers do not extensively discuss positions on European issues. The most salient topic – the euro – has regularly received a brief mention and the government position was then critically commented on by opposition MPs. Repeatedly, opposition MPs criticised the lack of European issues on the government agenda or non-transparent government positions on them. Since 2014, supporters of a rapid Czech adoption of the euro have remained silent, and only those opposing the single currency and the Fiscal Pact have voiced their concerns.

Czechia has not been very active in the **Future of Europe debate**. The concept of differentiated integration has not attracted any attention, and the only DI-related part of the discussion concerned the Czech adoption of the euro, on which the public remained divided.²¹

To sum up, various speeches point to DI concepts, especially two-speed Europe, but do not offer much elaboration. Political leaders voice their positions and sometimes add reasons for them, but do not go as far as to, for example, indicate if they would be willing to try to block closer integration among other states. They have difficulties in squaring the fact that Czechia might be disadvantaged by not being among the core EU states and the fact that it is not a member of the eurozone, where arguably the most crucial closer differentiated cooperation takes place.

3.3 Parliamentary debates

DI key words have not resonated very often in Czech parliamentary debates. Although one could have expected a discussion starting at least from the 2017 White Paper on the Future of Europe, in reality some discussion took place only in 2017 (see Table 2). Two topics dominated this debate: the five scenarios in the White Paper and the tightly connected question of the extent to which the eurozone would divide Europe between a core and a periphery. Afterwards, the debate markedly attenuated because in the whole following period (2018–2020) there were only a total of 6 (!) statements on multi-speed or multi-end Europe. These data demonstrate a minimal significance of the debate on the EU's future for Czech parliamentarians.

As for views on the multi-speed and multi-end Europe DI models, our analysis of parliamentary debates in the two Czech legislative chambers shows that both concepts were discussed somewhat neutrally. However, we should distinguish between discussions on the two models. Whereas deputies and senators addressed multi-end Europe (i.e. a core Europe and two-tier Europe) mostly neutrally, multi-speed Europe has emerged as a divisive issue. Particularly politicians from the leftist Social Democratic Party (ČSSD), which is generally labelled pro-European, have often opposed ideas of a two- or multi-speed Europe. One observation is striking and applies to the whole period under study (2008, 2012, 2017–2020): only very few positive statements on DI have appeared and only in very specific cases (i.e. support for a particular instance of enhanced cooperation). Multi-speed Europe and multi-end Europe have not been supported at all (see Table 1).

²¹ Úřad vlády České republiky (2018). *Závěrečná zpráva k občanským konzultacím v ČR*, p. 7 (https://www.euroskop.cz/gallery/103/30958-zprava_obcanske_konzultace_cz_oez.pdf).

Figure 7 - Position on multi-speed and multi-end Europe in parliamentary debates

7a) Multi-speed Europe (two-speed and multi-speed)

(n=36)	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Government (n=21)	9	12	0
Opposition (n=15)	8	7	0
2008	2	0	0
2012	0	1	0
2017–2020	15	18	0

7b) Multi-end Europe (core and two-tier Europe)

(n=24)	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Government (n=8)	3	5	0
Opposition (n=16)	1	15	0
2008	0	0	0
2012	0	6	0
2017–2020	4	14	0

DI mechanisms have been discussed more than DI models in parliamentary debates. However, if one looks at the data in more depth, it appears that the most hits (39) for enhanced cooperation were present in one single debate in 2012. Opt-outs did not find their way into parliamentary deliberations in the years studied. In those few instances when they were discussed, opt-outs received only neutral mentions and did not emerge as a topic polarising the debate (see Table 2). In such cases, speakers mentioned examples from other EU Member States, such as opt-outs for the United Kingdom and Denmark, but without any further implications for Czechia and its position in the EU. Similarly, speakers approached enhanced cooperation predominantly neutrally, without frequent evaluative – either positive or negative – statements.

Figure 8 – Position on enhanced cooperation and opt-outs in parliamentary debates

8a) Enhanced cooperation

(n = 59)	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Government (n = 32)	3	25	4
Opposition (n = 27)	0	25	2
2008	0	1	0
2012	0	37	2
2017-2020	3	12	4

8b) Opt-outs

(n = 8)	Negative	Neutral	Positive
Government (n = 8)	0	7	1
Opposition (n = 0)	0	0	0
2008	0	1	1
2012	0	6	0
2017-2020	0	0	0

The distribution of DI statements among political parties is very uneven (see Table 3). In the years under study, parliamentarians from two traditional parties – the leftist Social Democrats (ČSSD) and the rightist Civic Democrats (ODS) – discussed DI much more often than the rest of the political field (together 95 hits out of 127). Tellingly, DI issues were only touched on in three statements in the whole period of interest (see Table 4) in a political project called ANO 2011 of billionaire Ander Babiš, who participated in government from 2013 and whose party has been the strongest government party since 2017 with Babiš as Prime Minister. Traditional rivals from ODS and ČSSD, both of which have recently cleared the way for the newly dominant political power ANO 2011, display quite similar attitudes to DI. Neutral statements dominate, although the Social Democrats express some positive opinions on enhanced cooperation, while the Civic Democrats are invariably neutral or negative, with the exception of one positive view on an opt-out. The parties differed in the topics which they emphasised. Social Democrats focused on enhanced cooperation in their speeches and Civic Democrats on core Europe and opt-outs.

Figure 9 - Political parties and DI issues in parliamentary debates (2008, 2012 and 2017-2020)

9a) Which parties discuss DI?

n=127	Multi-speed + Two-speed	Core Europe + two-tier	Enhanced cooperation	Opt-outs
ČSSD	18	11	38	0
ODS	7	11	2	8
TOP09	1	0	11	0
Non-affiliated	2	0	7	0
KDU-ČSL	2	0	1	0
KSČM	3	0	0	0
ANO2011	2	1	0	0
Piráti	0	1	0	0
Zelení	1	0	0	0
Úsvit	0	0	0	0

9b) How did ČSSD discuss DI?

	Multi-speed + Two-speed	Core Europe + two-tier	Enhanced cooperation	Opt-outs
Positive	0	0	6	0
Neutral	8	8	30	0
Negative	10	3	2	0

9c) How did ODS discuss DI?

	Multi-speed + Two-speed	Core Europe + two-tier	Enhanced cooperation	Opt-outs
Positive	0	0	0	1
Neutral	3	10	2	7
Negative	4	1	0	0

DI issues appeared in Czech parliamentary debates predominantly in two contexts. A two- or multi-speed EU was often discussed in connection with the future of Europe, typically with neutral or negative connotations. In addition, membership of the eurozone and its consequences for membership of ‘core

Europe’ and for a multi-speed EU were among the topics discussed. Regarding enhanced cooperation, the Banking Union and the European Public Prosecutor stood out (see Table 4). Both were typically mentioned in a single debate and in neutral terms.

Looking at individual DI instances, only ‘Future of Europe’ recorded a significant number of non-neutral statements. The future of Europe was discussed mainly in debates about the White Paper on the Future of Europe. Even though this topic was approached predominantly neutrally (24 statements), a considerable number of negative comments (15) appeared as well. In such cases, DI was presented as a disintegration tool, while speakers favoured a stable, homogenous and united EU. Positive statements included, for example, ones on the Fiscal Compact. Some speakers supported Czech involvement in the Fiscal Compact because they perceived the participants as an “elite club of states.” Membership of such a club promised a potential for more Czech influence in the future of the EU.

Figure 10 - Context of DI debates
In which context were DI mechanisms and DI models discussed? (2008, 2012 and 2017-2020)

	Multi-speed + Two speed	Core Europe + two-tier	Enhanced cooperation	Opt-outs
Future of Europe	22	9	6	0
Banking Union	0	0	35	0
eurozone	6	8	1	5
Euro-Prosecutor	0	0	11	0
Fiscal Union	1	1	3	0
Social policy	1	4	1	0
Brexit	3	0	0	0
Migration policy	2	1	0	0
Lisbon Treaty	0	0	1	3
other	1	1	0	0
Economic Crisis	0	0	1	0

To sum up, we observe a clear majority of neutral statements in parliamentary debates on DI. The Social Democrats, who traditionally supported deeper European integration, appear to be the main political power with non-neutral statements. Besides the still dominant neutral views, they also voiced negative positions on DI. The other traditionally strong political party, the Civic Democrats, commented on DI issues too, but mainly in neutral terms. Babiš’s ANO 2011, which has recently emerged as a leading political party, has not dealt with DI topics.

The data on the number of appearances of various DI terms warrant some caution. For example, the high number of ‘enhanced cooperation’ mentions results mainly from one short parliamentary debate in 2012 when deputies said the words 40 times, sometimes even more times in one sentence. Therefore, it is not the result of some long-lasting political dispute but rather of a sudden exchange of opinions.

3.4 Summary of DI government positions

Differentiated integration was not discussed consistently and richly in the period studied. When speaking about the EU, (with one exception) government programmes did not mention DI mechanisms or models. They were much more focused on some instances of DI, mainly the possibility of adopting the single currency. The position regarding membership of the eurozone changed from very enthusiastic to sceptical. Prime Minister speeches show very similar characteristics, although they mentioned DI mechanisms a little more. Prime Minister Nečas (2010–2013) expressed opposition to the concept of a two-speed Europe. He urged focusing more on eurozone accession because, according to him, the

eurozone represented the core of Europe. At the same time, Nečas voiced support for more integration of the states which wanted to cooperate more on selected policies. Prime Minister Bohuslav Sobotka (2014–2017) wholly opposed a multi-speed Europe for its potential to split the EU into a centre and a periphery.

Parliamentary debates discussed DI mechanisms dominantly in relation to the future of Europe, and also to the eurozone. Other contexts occurred just rarely in sporadic cases, typically in speeches about migration policy or Brexit. A high salience of enhanced cooperation was generated by a few debates with few speakers, who often mentioned this DI model in relation to the Banking Union (the Bank Tax) or the European Prosecutor. Overall, DI models were discussed in parliamentary debates purely neutrally. DI mechanisms were also mentioned predominantly in a neutral context, but a considerable number of negative statements appeared as well. These negative attitudes mainly concerned a multi-speed Europe. Only a few comments supported differentiated integration.

4. Conclusion

The Czech debate on differentiated integration closely resembles Czech political discussions on European integration in general. Political statements emerge in reaction to external stimuli and lack a systematic character or richness. Comments on DI models, mechanisms and instances do not usually provide deeper reasoning and appear instead as shallow political statements.

The original EU membership enthusiasm of the mid-2000s is long gone, and an accounting logic, emphasising what Czechia receives from the EU and what it contributes, has prevailed. The delay in accession to the eurozone and the explanation of it by the government is instructive on this account: Czechia will only join the euro if it is beneficial. At the same time, Czechia is learning with difficulty how to square two elements: being outside the eurozone and yet not being outside the core of Europe.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Overview of the documents analysed

Documents analysed	Years
Parliamentary debates (lower house and upper house)	2004-2020
Government programmes	2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2013, 2014, 2018 (2x)
First speeches by prime ministers	2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2010, 2013, 2014, 2018 (2x)
EU presidency speeches	11 April 2008; 8 and 14 January 2009; 5 February 2009

Appendix 2 Overview of key DI words and Czech translations

Key words	Czech equivalent	Synonyms/core words
Conceptual key words/Models		
Differentiated integration	Diferenciovaná integrace	Diferenciace evropské integrace
Coalition of the willing	Koalice připravených	
Two-speed Europe	Dvourychlostní Evropa	
Multi-speed Europe	Vícerychlostní Evropa	
Variable Geometry	Proměnlivá geometrie	Variabilní geometrie
Core Europe	Jádro EU	Jádro evropské integrace; integrační jádro
Two-tier Europe	Dvoustupňová Evropa	Dvoustupňová EU; Dvoustupňová integrace
Concentric circles	Koncentrické kruhy	Soustředné kruhy
À la carte	À la carte	
Future of Europe	Budoucnost Evropy	Budoucnost EU
DI MECHANISMS		
Enhanced cooperation	Posílená spolupráce	
Opt out	Opt out	
DI INSTANCES – Enhanced cooperation		
Pesco	pesco	
Rome III	Řím III	Nařízení Řím III
Unitary patent	Jednotná patentová ochrana	
Matrimonial property regimes	Majetkové poměry v manželství	Majetkové vztahy mezi manželi
Financial Transaction Tax	Daň z finančních transakcí	
European Public Prosecutor	Evropský žalobce	Evropský veřejný žalobce; úřad evropského veřejného žalobce
DI INSTANCES – opt-out		
Schengen	Schengen	Schengenský prostor
Economic and Monetary Union	Hospodářská a měnová unie	euro
Security and Defence Policy	Bezpečnostní a obranná politika	
Area of freedom, security and justice	Oblast svobody, bezpečnosti a práva	
Charter of Fundamental Rights	Charta základních práv, Listina základních práv	

Social Chapter	Sociální oblast	Sociální otázky
DI INSTANCES – Inter se agreements		
Prum convention	Průmská smlouva	Průmské rozhodnutí rady; průmská rozhodnutí
European Stability Mechanism	Evropský stabilizační mechanismus	
Fiscal Compact	Fiskální úmluva	Fiskální pakt, Fiskální kompakt
Single Resolution Mechanism	Jednotný mechanismus pro řešení krizí	SRM
Unified Patent Court	Evropský patentový soud	Patent EU
DI INSTANCES – external integration		
European Economic Area	Evropský hospodářský prostor	
Customs Union + Turkey	Celní unie + Turecko	
Eastern Partnership	Východní partnerství	
Euromed	Euromed	Evropsko-středomořské partnerství

Appendix 3 Holistic grading of positions on DI issues

Document type	Document	Salience	Position	Reason
Government programmes	2004	1	1,5	wants active participation in EMU, Schengen and ESDP
	2005	1	1,5	wants active participation in EMU, Schengen and ESDP
	2006	0,5	1	support for enlargement, active participation in the discussion on the future institutional set-up of the EU
	2007	0,5	1	support for enlargement, active participation in the discussion on the future institutional set-up of the EU; aim: to accede to the Schengen Area by the end of 2007
	2009	0	XXX	very vague: support for EU enlargement and ESDP
	2010	0,5	1	wants ratification of Protocol 30
	2013	0	XXX	the caretaker government, vague: deeper integration, a stronger Europe, deeper coordination of economic and fiscal policy, for development of ESDP
	2014	0,5	1,5	for adoption of the euro, accession to the Fiscal Pact, wants to be in the integration core
	2018_1	1	1	for the time being, no accession to single currency; support for PESCO; EU urgently needs reform and the Czech Government will actively participate in the discussion – wants less Europe, but more effective.
	2018_2	1	1	for the time being, no accession to the single currency; support for PESCO; EU urgently needs reform and the Czech Government will actively participate in the discussion – wants less Europe, but more effective.
First speeches	2004	0,5	1	only mentioning the euro and Schengen
	2005	0,5	1,5	two brief mentions of the euro (support)
	2006	0	XXX	
	2007	0,5	1	opposition critique of the lack of European issues in the government programme, quite a lot on the Czech presidency of the EU Council,
	2009	0	XXX	
	2010	0	XXX	one statement criticising Czech non-transparency on adoption of the euro
	2013	0	XXX	
	2014	0,5	0,5	Opposition member against fiscal compact; future of the EU; the euro when beneficial for Czech citizens;
	2018_1	0,5	0,5	Opposition members against the euro and the Fiscal Compact, very long discussion, almost nothing on the EU (except rare brief mentions of the euro)
	2018_2	0	XXX	very few mentions of DI instances - only the Eastern Partnership and enlargement (CZE supports both)
presidency speech NP presidency speech, EP FOE	2009	0,5	1	Eastern Partnership high among priorities, also enlargement and ENP; rather vague on the future of Europe
	2018	0,5	1	Priorities for the FOE are stated
	28	10,5	6	
		28	11	
	Score	0,357	0,545	
		low salience	rather negative	

Appendix 4 DI models and mechanisms in government programmes

Source: Authors, based on ten Czech government programmes in the years 2004–2020

Appendix 5 Comparison: conceptual key words vs ‘future of Europe’ in PSP debates

Appendix 6 Comparison: conceptual key words vs ‘future of Europe’ in Senate debates

Author contacts:

Vratislav Havlík

Joštova 10
60200 Brno
Czechia

Email: vhavlik@fss.muni.cz

Hubert Smekal

Joštova 10
60200 Brno
Czechia

Email: hsmekal@fss.muni.cz

With the support of the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

The European Commission supports the EUI through the European Union budget. This publication reflects the views only of the author(s), and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.