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INTRODUCTION

Snap elections in the Czech Republic resulted in unexpected electoral breakthrough of ANO 2011 following the trend from 2010 of new parties entering the Parliament. They were held on 25 and 26 October, seven months before the expiry of then elected parliament. The previous government elected in May 2010, governed by Prime Minister Petr Nečas, had to resign due to corruption and bribery scandals. The situation was so tense that the temporarily appointed Prime Minister Rusnok lost his vote of confidence which led to the Chamber of Deputies dissolving itself. ANO 2011, originally civil initiative, scored almost 19% in the national elections which guaranteed the second place and gain of 47 seats in the national Parliament.

In recent years the electoral breakthrough of anti-establishment parties and challengers has become a topic for many researchers to analyze. The majority of such research is aimed at identifying structural factors such as socioeconomic conditions, voting behavior, party system, or electoral system as a reason behind the rise of such challenging parties. Most works compare the parties across countries (see e.g. Abedi 2004, Mudde 2007), others focus on analyzing particular cases (see e.g. Arter 2010, Rydgren 2006). In the Czech Republic, the research somewhat lacks behind. The rise of new populist parties was discussed in Populist political party in East-Central Europe, where Havlík focuses on two parties SPR-RSČ and VV (Public Affairs) (Havlík 2012). SPR-RSČ was also analyzed by Hanley in Populism in Europe and the Americas (Hanley 2012). The latest contribution to this topic represents the chapter written by Havlík in Populism in the Shadow of the Great Recession (Havlík 2015). Apart from the mentioned, there have been no works dealing with anti-establishment parties, let alone ANO 2011, in the Czech Republic.

The aim of this work is therefore to analyze the factors that gave rise to ANO 2011 in general elections in the Czech Republic in 2013. The thesis focuses on two main questions in the analytical part of the work: “Which political opportunity structures were present?” and “How did ANO 2011 make use of these opportunities?” By answering these questions, factors which led to ANO´s success should be identified and evaluated.

Firstly, theoretical model will be presented. That requires examining the political opportunity structures, more precisely their presence and absence. As a foundation for this thesis Rydgren’s concept (e.g. Rydgren 2006) will be used as it provides detailed and thorough theoretical frame suitable for the work’s purposes. Even though the framework was
used in analyzing predominantly radical right parties in the Scandinavian area, the concept is well applicable to other systems as well. Rydgren includes vast variety of factors such as structural conditions, electoral and political system, voting behavior, and others where he analyses not only presence of political opportunity structures but also party’s ability to make use of them. And it is the context of particular country that Rydgren stresses as that plays a key role in explaining why this specific party gained success at this specific time in the specific country.

The first part of this thesis will focus on the conceptualization of anti-establishment parties and their key characteristics as ANO 2011 is not a clear case to classify. The movement received “populist label” from some scholars, the public, but especially Czech media. The excessive overuse of this term led to general belief that ANO is a populist party. Even though ANO meets some criteria of populism, especially the anti-establishment appeal and a belief that elites are corrupt, it does not see politics as a general will of people (see Prokešová 2013). Thus ANO is treated as an example of an anti-establishment party (or movement as they call themselves) as it follows from characteristics discussed in the first chapter of this thesis. Therefore, the term anti-establishment party will be used to describe ANO 2011 throughout the work (see e.g. Kubát and Lebeda 2014, p. 119).

After the clarification of terminology, the theoretical framework will be discussed. Next the brief history, organizational structure, access to essential resources, and ideological profile of ANO will be analyzed. Furthermore, it will be assessed if the movement took the advantage of favorable political opportunity structures and how it benefited from the existing niches with focus on the political and economic context of the country. The last part of the work will focus on the electorate of ANO 2011.
1. ANTI-ESTABLISHMENT POLITICAL PARTIES

Since 1970s many new parties have entered parliaments across the western democracies. The successful ones were at first glimpse quite different. Take for example Jean Marie Le Pen’s Front National, The Freedom Party of Austria, or the Greens on the left such as Alliance 90/The Greens in Germany. However, they all have had something in common— they have presented themselves as alternatives, they have critically reacted to mainstream parties, and have called for new ways of doing politics. To classify these parties, scholars have been using vast variety of names. The one that has been used the most is populism and all its prefixes and adjectives such as neo-, right-wing, or, national and many others. Some call them anti-parties, discontent parties, or protest parties (See Schedler 1996: 292). Even though such parties are difficult to characterize, they share the populist appeal distinguishing corrupt elite from pure people—“a relationship of profound otherness, and, in the extreme cases, conflict” (Stanley 2008: 103). Firstly, the mobilization against established movements has been associated with the left (the first were militant students in 1968, then the New Left and New Social Movements in the 1970s, and the Green or New Politics parties in the early 1980s (Mudde 2004: 548)). However, the far right parties have been gaining success parallel with the Greens since 1970s and might be considered predominant nowadays.

Alongside usual, “standard”, populist parties, a new type of protest parties has appeared. These parties are driven by the protest appeal and have the potential to reach the overnight electoral breakthrough. They “combine mainstream ideology on economic and sociocultural issues with fierce anti-establishment rhetoric and demands for political reform, transparency, and new way of doing politics” (Hanley and Sikk 2014: 2). They are politically important, particularly in CEE, where there are perfect conditions for their analysis. Besides Czech ANO 2011, as is the case of this study, other parties such as Simeon II National Movement in Bulgaria can be mentioned or another great example in neighboring Slovakia and its OĽaNO (Ordinary People and Independent Personalities).

Anti-establishment parties (or anti-establishment reform parties as Hanley and Sikk 2014 call them) are not anti-political per se, it is rather the opposite. AEPs do not reject political principles and do not seek the replacement but they share “a desire to change the way politics is conducted” (Hanley and Sikk 2014: 1).

If we follow Abedi’s definition, AEPs perceive themselves as challengers to established political parties (Abedi 2004: 49). They see the main cleavage in the society as a
conflict between the rulers and the ruled. The term anti-establishment itself captures the dichotomy “of the politics of opposition (and) those wielding power” (Barr 2009: 31). Similarly, Schedler sees the political arena as a triangle with the malicious political class on top and innocent people and heroic AEPs occupying the bottom. Whilst AEP and the people share harmonic relationship, political elites are seen as enemies (Schedler 1996: 293). Albeit true for many populists, Schedler’s triangle does not explicitly coincide with the view of AEPs discussed in this work as only very few of them really emphasize pureness of people against the corruption of elites. According to Mudde’s minimal definition, populist parties are reckoned to divide the society into two separated groups the pure people and the corrupt elite (Mudde 2004: 543), contrasting the two on the basis of moralistic appeal. But as Hanley and Sikk promptly note, only few anti-establishment parties “make the strongly moralistic distinctions between the political elite and the pure unsullied people said to be a defining characteristic of populist parties.” (Hanley and Sikk 2014: 2).

Viewed as challengers, anti-establishment parties need to attack the established parties from the outside as it is difficult to conduct this anti-campaign from the inside (For more about the bimodal conceptualization—insider or outsider, see Barr 2009). Anti-established parties are thus outsiders (e.g. Ignazi 1992, Schedler 1996). Yet to feel as an outsider does not make you one per se. The way to gain political prominence is through a newly established association or party. That is why one of the main characteristics of AEP is its newness in means of organization and structure (e.g. Hanley and Sikk 2014). Novelty or the project of newness (see e.g. Sikk 2012) is of a great advantage for AEP as it promotes a change, a shift of direction. That is why the project is so appealing for a wider group of voters. The novelty gives the actors a privileged position where they can exploit the charm and aura of un-known (Schedler 1996: 298). Moreover, if it is combined with mainstream ideology, timid voters do not have to fear drastic changes (Sikk 2012: 478).

According to AEPs, there is no difference between the government and opposition (Schedler 1996: 295). Politics normally works on the basis of relationship between the government and parties in opposition, in any way, AEPs see this as irrelevant. Both the government and the opposition will merge creating a platform against them, making an AEP the only opposing party in the system. And because they see the main cleavage in the society as a conflict between the rulers and the ruled (establishment and people), “it thereby implies that all establishment parties, be they in government or in opposition, are essentially the same” (Abedi 2004: 49).
Anti-establishment parties differ in many characteristics, ideology being one of them. It is not clear on which side of the spectrum AEPs operate and issues they raised “do not coincide with the existing “left-right” line of political division (Meguid 2008: 4). Following Schedler (1996), it seems that AEPs are usually indefinable in terms of left and right, however, heading into either direction as the result of the pressure from other parties. Yet he states that “anti-political-establishment actors show a clear 'elective affinity' with right-wing parties” (Schedler 1996: 302). There has been rather big confusion about the labeling which resulted in many authors automatically classifying AEPs as radical right (Hanley and Sikk 2013). This does not mean that far right in Europe is irrelevant (take e.g. Hungary’s Jobbik or the Sweden Democrats) but rather to make it clear that such generalizations are not to be applied here. The anti-establishment appeal can be in fact combined with various policy platforms and ideologies depending on the choice of particular party. Thus it cannot be said that all anti-establishment parties lie on the right side of the spectrum or vice versa but every case must be treated individually without premature conclusions.

After having described the anti-establishment parties, let us briefly summarize the most important characteristics they all have in common. AEPs are challengers to the political establishment, they challenge "the status quo in terms of major policy issues and political system issues" (Abedi 2004: 49). They combine politics of mainstream reformism (Hanley and Sikk 2014: 2), fierce anti-establishment rhetoric, and a new way of conducting politics. Even though they are against the establishment, they do not oppose the politics itself but rather seek the chance to represent new issues that were neglected by the established parties. Not only are they challengers, they represent outsiders as well. AEPs are new in a sense of organization and structure and they attack established parties from the outside, hence outsiders, making themselves the only real opposition in the system. They "borrow" from populism the antagonistic relationship between people and elites (or ruled and rulers) yet with a visible difference as was stated above that only few AEPs really emphasize pureness of people against the corruption of elites. As far as left and right goes, there is a tendency towards declaring their rightist orientation; nevertheless, imprudent generalizations need to be avoided.
2. POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURES AND THE RISE OF AEPs

A common approach to examine the rise of new parties is the political opportunity structures as it is a complex and thorough framework. The political opportunity structure is in short the arrangement of the whole political arena where particular actors operate. The concept dates back to 1960s responding to major changes that happened in Europe and the United States (see e.g. Kriesi 2004, Tarrow 1998) followed by the formation of Political Process Theory (PPT) in 1970s and 1980s explaining the social movement mobilization. According to Tarrow, political opportunities are “permanent (...) dimensions of the political struggle that encourage people to engage in contentious politics” and constraints are factors that then discourage contention (Tarrow 1998: 19-20).

There are plenty of approaches how to study POS which itself defines the research. Tarrow sees as key factors (1) the opening of access to participation for new actors; (2) the evidence of political realignment within the polity; (3) the appearance of influential allies; (4) emerging splits within the elite, and (5) a decline in the state’s capacity or will to repress dissent” (Tarrow 1998: 76). He admits, though, most opportunities and constraints are situational, thus not long-term and stable and cannot be characterized as structures (Tarrow 1998: 77). Rydgren believes that those unstable political opportunity structures must be studied together with the relatively stable and permanent ones (Rydgren 2006: 13-14). Although Rydgren used the concept of political opportunity structures to analyze the rise of populist radical right parties, this concept is believed to be useful in understanding the electoral boom of other parties as well outside of this political family (Rydgren 2006: 13 - 14). His model focuses on four areas: (1) the presence/absence of POS; (2) the success of a party to take advantage of such opportunities; (3) political profiles and strategies of the party; (4) and its organizational structures and resources (Rydgren 2006: 13).

The arrangement of the political arena can be as well understood with the supply and demand theory. Cas Mudde has been dealing with the rise of populist radical right, explaining its success on analyzing factors on both demand and supply side (Mudde 2007). On the demand side he explains the optimal conditions for political actors such as modernization and other socioeconomic processes differentiating the macro-, meso-, and micro- level (see Mudde 2007: 201-230). The demand side does not, however, explain the success of PRR, let alone why people vote for them. The supply side is needed to transfer the demands into political action. On the external supply side, what virtually corresponds with the political opportunity structure, Mudde deals with (1) institutional context (e.g. electoral system), (2)
political context (e.g. dynamics in society), (3) cultural context (e.g. subcultural organizations), and (4) media (e.g. politicization of issues). POS do not determine factors in the success of PRR albeit they can distinctively facilitate the success, or failure, and are of great importance in the breakthrough stage (Mudde 2007: 253). On the internal supply side he puts emphasis on factors such as leadership, organization, ideology, and internationalization (Mudde 2007: 231-274). These are directly connected with political parties themselves and constitute a major factor in explaining their electoral success, or failure so to speak.

Similarly, Lucardie proposes three main factors that explain the electoral success of new political parties (1) political project that addresses urgent problems (similarly Mudde and Rydgren- politicization of new issues), (2) party´s resources such as members, and media attention (also Rydgren- party organization and media resources and Mudde- organization on internal supply), and (3) political opportunity structure (Lucardie 2007: 175). Anti-establishment parties are then best described as prolocutors who “represent interests neglected by established parties, depend mainly on the political opportunity structure and specifically the position of established parties with respect to salient cleavages and issues, as well as on the electoral system” (Lucardie 2007: 175).

Electoral success or failure of populist parties was also discussed in the work of Stijn van Kessel (2015) who considers (1) electoral system, (2) availability of the electorate, (3) responsiveness of established parties, and (4) supply of new parties as casual conditions in research of the rise of new populist parties. Again, the similarity and overlap with other authors can be seen: the electoral system (Mudde- institutional context, Rydgren- the degree of convergence in political space), the availability of the electorate (Mudde-political context, Rydgren- collaboration with mainstream parties, Tarrow- the appearance of influential allies), or supply side (Mudde- internal supply, Rydgren- party organization).

To conclude, as a foundation for this thesis Rydgren’s concept will be used as it provides detailed and thorough theoretical frame suitable for the work’s purposes. Rydgren includes vast variety of factors such as structural conditions, electoral and political system, voting behavior, and others where he analyses not only presence of political opportunity structures but also party’s ability to make use of them. The theoretical framework for this thesis will be completed with findings of other authors mentioned above. The whole chapter will be thus divided into external and internal supply side. On the external supply, factors such as appearance of new niches, dealignment and realignment process, politicization of new issues, political system, collaboration with mainstream parties, and party’s profile
will be analyzed. The internal supply side will then focus on party organization and its internal resources.

2.1 EXTERNAL SUPPLY

2.1.1 Appearance of niches in the electoral arena

Rydgren sees as the basic opportunity structure the appearance of niches in the electoral arena (Rydgren 2005: 418–420, Rydgren 2006: 14–16). Niches are blank spaces or “gaps between the position of the voters and the perceived position of the parties in the same political space”. If there is a sudden change of public opinion (i.e. demand) and the parties are not able to adapt their programs to satisfy this demand (i.e. present a supply) they are likely to lose the voters as these gaps are going to be filled by new parties. New parties are then likely to rise when there are niches large enough and the percentage of party identification is low (Rydgren 2006: 14). This normally happens only when some dramatic changes in the society occur otherwise it is normal for any political arena to feature some niches.

This phenomenon has been especially visible since the 1960s where there was a boom of new parties entering political systems across Europe. New parties were able to maintain political profiles that fit the gaps and articulate previously neglected topics such as environment, immigration, or regional autonomy. Bonnie Meguid calls those aptly niche parties (Meguid 2005: 347). Niche parties were able to locate political issues corresponding with voters’ demand and created a new main cleavage (see Lipset and Rokkan 1967) that overshadowed the existing one(s) pushing the established parties further away or gave new meaning to the main old cleavage.

These changes in voters’ position and preferences leading to higher volatility in many European countries have had according to Rydgren several consequences: (1) Interests of some voters have changed. (2) Particular group of voters have feared the loss of their identity. (3) The confidence in established parties have weakened and resulted into people think the parties are the ones to blame for not doing any real changes in the society. (4) Certain groups of voters have lost their faith in particular cognitive frames through which they interpreted the world, abandoning old patterns in favor of new frames (Rydgren 2006: 15). This creates breeding ground for new anti-establishment parties as voters are willing to throw old loyalties away and they are prepared to accept new alternatives. AEPs can offer new frames that see
status quo as unjust thus increasing the already existing political distrust in mainstream parties even more.

2.1.2. Dealignment and realignment process

There has been a significant decline in party identification in recent years. By party identification we mean a deep psychological bond between a particular party and a voter. Although, it does not strictly mean voting for a particularly party, it has a potential to influence voters. It does not directly correspond with party membership either even though it seems logical. It is first and foremost a psychological connection that is very personal and positive (see e.g. Campbell et al. 1960, Linek 2009). Party identification can play a very important role in predicting the voter behavior. The bond is usually stronger considering the parties that reflect deep social contradictions and mutually competing systems of values and ideologies (Vlachová 2003: 489). The identification is rooted deeply among voters of traditional cleavage parties. On the other hand, it is not so important for voters of non-cleavage parties which do not build their program around socially resonating topics.

“One explanation for partisan dealignment is the diminishing value of partisanship in contemporary politics” (Dalton 2009: 9). Partisanship is in general a tendency to support particular political actor which is likely to lead to a partisan identification – a long-term identification with the preferred political party or actor. Dealignment (see e.g. Inglehart 1990) thus represents a trend in which voters abandon their previous party identifications. This decline of partisan affiliation has been linked by many authors to the decrease of strength of cleavages in politics. Other explanations include “changes in the media context, social mobility that erodes group identities and the increasing complexity of social and political life” (Dalton 2007: 2). Voters are also better equipped to assess politics themselves due to a better access to information, which is again somewhat linked to the media, and mainly to better education as they have the political skills to make their own decisions without needing to rely on the party (Dalton 2007). Dealignment is then followed by realignment which is the process in which voters change the structure of their voting behavior according to a set of new principles (Rydgren 2006: 16).

As was stated above, the main explanation of the dealignment processes is represented by the decline of strength of existing cleavages. Political behavior is structured by cleavages, sociocultural (cultural liberal values vs. authoritarian or particularistic values) and economic one (owner vs worker) being the most important (Rydgren 2006: 16). Study of cleavages
represents one of the most influential and important approaches in the voter behavior studies. The concept was developed by Stein Rokkan and Seymour Lipset back in 1967. Cleavage basically means an existence of a social conflict that is reflected in public attitudes and demands that influence voters’ decision to support a particular party which reflects such divides in society (Havlík and Voda 2014: 3). To use such concept on the East European countries which had suffered decades of communist rule and lack or distortion of democratic principles has proven to be far more difficult. However, without a doubt cleavages have played a specific role, whether a marginal or a significant one, over years in many different states and regions and they “reflect country’s historical inheritances as well as its post-communist economic and social experiences” (Whitefield 2002: 183). Socioeconomic cleavage was the one that shaped the post-war world, yet it is not considered dominant nowadays. In recent years the sociocultural cleavage has risen due to politicization of new issues such as immigration, environment, or corruption. The process of realignment is thus critical. In countries where the socioeconomic cleavage and support for old established parties surviving on the left-right dichotomy has decreased, the probability that new parties will emerge is more likely. In case of anti-establishment parties, who combine urgent issues with fierce anti-establishment rhetoric as they oppose those wielding power, new protest cleavage is of high importance. In countries where the salience of protest dimension has increased, and as the consequence of the dealignment process voters’ preferences have changed, anti-establishment parties are gifted perfect breeding ground to mobilize the voters.

Among the process of dealignment, other factors might be helpful to understand the rise of new anti-establishment parties. As stated above, anti-establishment parties are likely to rise rapidly. They seem as a small threat at the beginning but they promptly make clear that they constitute a real challenge to established parties and party system. With their demands for political reform and resurrection of politics they attract masses of people. If there is general dissatisfaction with the way politics is conducted, it creates a perfect platform for such protestors and their critical rhetoric to name the issues and proclaim delivering the solution. “Great political alienation among certain groups of the electorate, diminished trust in political institutions, a decline in the number of voters with strong party identities and loyalties, and less class-based voting” (Rydgren 2006: 17) are all factors which create favorable political opportunities structure and are salient in understanding the rise of AEPs.

If this is the case the voter turnout with strong party identification is declining. Elections are a symbol of democratic legitimacy of modern countries. Through elections the system of representation is established. Given the variety of candidates, people can influence
public policy. If elections are related to the legitimacy of a system, voter turnout must be high otherwise it could mean a threat for such legitimacy. If the voter turnout is lower, the extent to which the government is dependent on public’s approval is lower as well (Linek 2013: 9). Also if the turnout tends to be low the differences in representation follow. This might lead to social inequality as particular social groups are not represented topic wise. Public’s needs and interests simply do not have to correspond with those of politicians’ (Linek 2013: 10). In times of political scandals, people’s trust and certainty might be shattered and therefore “voters are more likely to choose the ‘exit’ option to express their dissatisfaction” (Pauwels 2010: 1016). Powell and Tucker (2013) explain the high volatility levels on the basis of lack of party-switching. Meaning that established parties are not able to change in office, leaving space for “populist mobilizations by new challengers” to enter the arena. If the old established parties are in the crisis of losing their members and if the society is prone to experience manifestation of anti-partyism (see e.g. Ignazi 1996) and the distrust towards political institutions, the probability of AEPs breakthrough are presumably greater. Rydgren (2006: 18) identifies four reasons why this is happening: (1) Political actors cannot adapt to changes in society and are separated from the reality. (2) The decision-making process is not transparent due to increasing complexity. (3) The convergence of mainstream parties made it unclear for voters what is left and what is right. (4) Voters disenchantment has risen due to various politicians’ affairs and scandals driven by media starving for sensation.

To sum up, If voters are discontent with the performance of mainstream political parties and the overall level of trust in political institutions is decreasing, favorable POS will be created for AEPs to mobilize the voters. Moreover if the level of party identification is decreasing and the volatility is increasing it will create favorable conditions for AEPs to gain protest votes by strongly distinguishing themselves from established parties.

### 2.1.3 Politicization of new political issues

P politicization (see e.g. Buzan 1997, Zürn 2014) of new issues is the process in which a specific topic or issue is being introduced in the political arena. What was before apolitical becomes a concern for voters. Political parties try to either take a stand on an existing topic, and usually oppose some other party, or gain supporters for an issue which they are concerned with. Typical examples are welfare state for social democrats or independence for regionalist parties. Since World War II two main waves have brought specific issues to most European countries. Environment and immigration were the two topics that changed party systems across Europe. First the Green parties emerging from environment movements shook the
political arena in 1980s in West and spread into some parliaments in East Europe in the 90s (Bågenholm 2011: 5). Approximately at the same period the anti-immigration wave hit Western Europe. Radical right parties mobilized issue voters as the immigration question “often created a niche on the voter arena” (Rydgren 2006: 18). Since no other party profiled itself as anti-immigrant in a particular arena/country, the politicization of immigration issue has broadened the political opportunity structure and has brought profit (also due to media attention) to the new right-wing populist party.

While immigration and environment are relevant issues for many far right parties, it is not applicable in case of anti-establishment parties (namely the type we are dealing with). As we stated above, anti-establishment parties need to have an open political environment to enter the political arena which is caused by the lack of confidence in conventional established parties and the competence of elites. If the levels of confidence are at the lowest, the situation creates an open platform due to inability of established parties to respond to the crisis and AEPs’ swift supply of neglected issues which is likely to mobilize the voters. Thus it is claimed that they rise from the crisis. Political crisis is the result of not only poor governance and poor economics, but also particular political scandals and corruption. An anti-corruption party can be characterized as “one whose main focus in the election campaign is on fighting corruption, either by addressing the issue in general terms, i.e. that corruption is a serious problem that needs to be combated, or more specifically by accusing the opponents, i.e. the established parties for being corrupt” (Bågenholm 2011: 6). Similarly, Hanley and Sikk define such parties as those who “may make appeals to fight corruption; replace corrupt or inefficient elites; create new democratic structures; or simply offer novelty of political style” (Hanley and Sikk 2014: 2).

Among authors dealing with the connection between any crisis and populist parties is Benjamin Moffitt (e.g. Moffitt 2014) who sees crisis as internal to populism. He argues that political actors deliberately create and preserve the feeling of crisis or failure situation, and “radically simplify the terms and terrain of political debate and advocate strong leadership and quick political action to stave off or solve the impending crisis” (Moffitt 2014: 2). Although he deals with populist parties, his findings are relevant for AEPs as well as they rise from the crisis and present simple solutions to mobilize the voters. Moffitt introduces six steps which in reality do not have to follow in the exact order. These steps are used by protest actors to elevate the level of crisis, name the one who is responsible for it, and present simple solutions (Moffitt 2014: 10). They are to:
1. Identify failure
2. Elevate to the level of crisis by linking into a wider framework and adding a temporal dimension
3. Frame ‘the people’ vs. those responsible for the crisis
4. Use media to propagate performance
5. Present simple solutions and strong leadership
6. Continue to propagate crisis

(Moffitt 2014: 10).

Firstly, the crisis must be identified. Anti-establishment actors will choose a particular failure, better if it is already a salient issue such as failure of established parties to secure job vacancies in times of economic crisis. Similarly, Rooduijn argued that crisis is among the four most important principles that populist parties share (Rooduijn 2014). In this sense his findings correspond with those of Moffitt’s that “it does not matter whether this proclaimed crisis is real or not; it only matters that (they) argue that there is such a crisis” (Rooduijn 2014: 6). “Once the initial failure has been linked and elevated into a wider framework of crisis, the populist actor is able to identify those who are responsible” (Moffitt 2014: 13). In this step, the question of success or failure lies in the media spreading. According to Moffitt’s findings, politicians must be somewhat unusual or specific in style or behavior to get the media attention they need (Moffitt 2014: 14-15). The challenging party must also present simple solutions. In doing so, they often portray other political actors as incompetent to distinguish themselves from mainstream politics.

“Generally, the crisis situation constitutes an opportunity for change” (Kriesi 2014: 3). Poor economic performance may be seen as a social crisis as well which can consequently make voters find another political party- an alternative to vote for. Hanley and Sikk (2014: 7) have proven this to be true in their comparative study in Central and Eastern Europe which they concluded stating that “the inability of (some or all) established parties credibly to respond to economic crisis and their loss of legitimacy because of growing concerns over corruption prepared the ground for AERP breakthrough.” However, it is not only crisis itself that makes it easier for challengers to enter the system; the time is a concern as well. The longer the crisis lasts, the greater likelihood to mobilization there is. Regarding AEPs, corruption and crisis of confidence are among the most important issues for them to rise from. If the country is suffering from long-lasting and/or repeating corruption scandals, AEPs are expected to mobilize voters and benefit from blaming the guilty party and offering new solutions.
2.1.4 The degree of convergence in political space

Political opportunity structure can be influenced by the degree of convergence in political space. By the convergence we mean the fact that main political parties will over time converge on particular matters and take similar stand on the most important political issues. As Kitschelt (1995) argued it can create political opportunities for new parties based on political distrust and alienation. The decreased ideological distance which is the consequence of the convergence may make voters feel that there is no real difference between the mainstream parties which may result in protest voting (see e.g. Rydgren 2004, Rydgren 2006). By protest voting the electorate shows dissatisfaction with the current political system and instead of casting vote for mainstream parties they vote for a subject that is foreign to political system, in our case the new anti-establishment party. Rydgren states that the convergence can also lead to disruption of dominant cleavage dimension, leaving space for new, alternative cleavage to thrive which is likely to be beneficial for new parties (Rydgren 2006: 19).

Amir Abedi (2002) has dealt with the convergence theory as well comparing several countries in different time periods. In his work he tests whether anti-establishment parties would be more successful due to (1) small ideological distance between mainstream parties and/or (2) the polarization of party system (Abedi 2002: 555). He found out that new parties are truly more successful in those countries where the distance between left and right is significantly smaller. However, he did not prove the polarization theory stating that “the analyses provide more support for the ‘establishment party divergence’ hypothesis than for the one that stresses the importance of ‘party system polarization’ “ (Abedi 2002: 570).

The convergence can thus stimulate political distrust and alienation as voters feel that there are no differences between the established parties. Even though politics normally works on the basis of relationship between the government and the opposition, AEPs see this as irrelevant as both are essentially the same. AEPs believe that both government and opposition parties will grow together therefore in order to enter the system, AEPs need to differentiate themselves from the existing parties. “This has become easier in recent decades as there is a tendency among mainstream parties to become more moderate and hence similar in ideological terms” (Pauwels 2010: 1016). These factors can altogether create opportunities for new protest parties to rise as “voters no longer see a difference among established parties and believe that politicians form a closed ‘political class’ that is only out to help itself to wealth
and power at the expense of the ‘common man’ (Pauwels 2010: 1016-1017). The convergence among the main political parties is therefore expected to increase the chances for the rise of new anti-establishment parties.

2.1.5 The degree of closure or openness of political system

The electoral system is another very important institutional variable in explaining the rise of new parties that needs to be considered. It is believed that particular attributes of various electoral systems work to new small parties’ disadvantage, especially anti-establishment ones. This is the case of countries using the majority system as it predominantly is a hindrance for new parties. It was noted by Maurice Duverger and later it became known as Duverger’s law that “the simple-majority single-ballot system favors the two-party system” (Duverger 1995: 217). On the other hand, the double ballot majority system and proportional representation tend to multipartism. Other features mainly the district magnitude and electoral threshold distinctively affect the proportionality of the system as well (van Kessel 2015: 19). These and other features determine whether the party gets the seats and how proportional their representation is to be. The district magnitude is the most important variable influencing the output of the system. The higher the magnitude the higher the proportionality is and vice versa. A higher district magnitude helps to distribute seats more accordingly to vote distribution thus favors smaller parties. An artificial tool used to limit the shattering of the parliament is the legal threshold (Chytilek et al. 2009: 200). Threshold obstructs parties with only limited vote share from entering the parliament. This mechanical effect causes “the third and fourth largest party in a majority system receiving decidedly fewer seats than would be proportionate to the number of votes cast for them” (Rydgren 2006: 19).

Apart from this mechanical effect, a psychological one plays an important role as well (Duverger 1995). Voters in disproportional electoral systems may feel that their vote for a small party is wasted one since it does not yield the awaited results. Therefore they are likely to cast their vote for a much bigger party in order to make their vote count. Obviously, it is much harder for a new party to score in the general elections in countries where the pluralistic and disproportional electoral system is rather closed. This can highly influence the political opportunity structure for new parties.

In countries where the electoral system is based on proportional representation with relatively low electoral thresholds anti-establishment parties are likely to benefit as these proportional systems “increase the possibilities of new political parties to enter parliament” (Krouwel and Bosch 2004: 3). A higher district magnitude should also lead to “more
proportionality between votes and allocated parliamentary seats, which in turn is beneficial for smaller, or new, political parties” (van Kessel 2010: 8). As the voting system in the Czech Republic has not changed in comparison with the previous period, it is not expected to have a significant effect on explaining ANO’s electoral success.

2.1.6 Collaboration with mainstream parties

Building a rapport with one or more mainstream parties has a significant effect for the new challenging party. Such cooperation can shed a positive light on the new party leaving a profound impact on the relationship with the electorate. Collaboration with established party(s) helps to legitimize the till-this-time outsider and with the help of media attention, the electoral breakthrough is likely to happen. The interaction between the new party and the old, established ones “to a large extent create of foreclose opportunities” (Mudde 2007: 237).

Such cooperation could have a negative effect as well as “it can serve to shrink the niches available for continued mobilization on the electoral arena (Rydgren 2006: 20). Also it can weaken the party’s legitimization. If an anti-establishment party is proclaiming its anti-establishment orientation and presenting itself as the only real opposition to mainstream corrupt parties, the alliance with powerful colleague could be seen as a denial of the party’s ideals. The collaboration of right wing populists with mainstream parties is powerful especially in the breakthrough stage, in the time of their mobilization (see e.g. Mudde 2007, Rydgren 2006) before the party has succeeded at a national level. The timing plays an important role as well. It is far more convenient for the new party to start such cooperation before it scores at a national level. At the same time it can hamper the mobilization if the new party has already obtained a certain place in the electoral arena (Rydgren 2006: 20-21).

To sum up, the collaboration between mainstream party(s) and an anti-establishment party might create favorable opportunity structures for the rising protest party at the beginning of its emergence, just before its electoral breakthrough. Yet for protest parties it might not be worth the possibility of the shrinking niches in the political arena. In the analytical part of the thesis, it will be discussed if these assumptions apply to ANO’s case or rather if no collaboration might favor the rise of the anti-establishment party.

2.1.7 Strategies and ideological/rhetorical profile

Even though the political opportunity structure is in favor of a new party to rise, it is naïve to think that it will automatically happen. The supply of strategies and ideological
profile must correspond with the available niches in the political arena. According to Rydgren, new parties borrow the ideological or rhetorical profile from mainstream parties on the basis of three conditions: (1) the party they were inspired with is successful; (2) both parties are geographically close, and (3) the challenging party identifies with the mainstream one (Rydgren 2006: 21). Cas Mudde (2007) also deals with party copy-catting. However, the direction is opposite. He claims that it is the mainstream parties that copy the right wing populists so as to limit the elections’ loss or even gain support (Mudde 2007: 241). Copying may be favorable for the new party as well, especially a radical one. The copy-cat action can legitimize the new party in voters’ eyes and thus increase its electoral success.

Such strategies are typical for the Scandinavian parties. Progress Party in Norway (FrP), Danish People's Party (DF), or Sweden Democrats (PS) have all taken over anti-establishment, anti-immigrant, and populist rhetoric, what is more their names resemble as well as they occupy similar positions in their national parliaments (Jupskås 2012). However, this does not apply to the Czech Republic. In case of ANO and its 2013 electoral success, setting of effective strategies and ideological profile will be confirmed if the movement benefits from the successful politicization of new issues. Therefore this political opportunity structure will not be examined separately.

2.2 INTERNAL SUPPLY

2.2.1 Party organization and internal resources

It is not only the political opportunity structure that matters. What is more important is the party’s ability to exploit the opportunities and make use of the available niches in the political arena. Rydgren thinks that it is the party’s own history and preferences of its members which determine the process of adopting a new ideological profile (Rydgren 2006: 22).

Internal organization

Party organization is arguably the most important factor in explaining the electoral success of new anti-establishment parties. Mudde adds that it is even more important in explaining their persistence, not only performance in the breakthrough stage (Mudde 2007: 264). Functioning party organization leads to electoral success and voter maximization. On the other hand, when a party deals with “incompetent personnel, disorganized behavior, and internal splits” it undermines the cohesion of party organization thus its power. So what does
make a functioning organization? This is a difficult question to answer as the study of party’s organization and decision-making process is hard to analyze. Researchers have very limited information of parties’ internal lives and also lack of empirical information of populist parties’ structures.

Secondly, a party needs active members to fill the seats in the parliament as well as to be actively involved in running a campaign. Rydgren stresses the need of mass of volunteers who are willing to distribute leaflets, posters, and voting slips throughout the campaign (Rydgren 2006: 23). Such devotion is not only to party’s benefit, it can prove as a struggle if a party leader feels temptation to change or modify the party’s articles or manifesto. The party members are not just plain sympathizers but devoted supporter who identify with the party’s profile and ideology and it may take time to win the acceptance or approval of proportional part of the members to do any changes. Other important factor is the party unity against the changing demand of people. If the party is not able to react to voters´ demands due to the urge to sustain its unity and standard routines, it might create permanent niches (Rydgren 2006: 23).

Internal democracy - party as a business-firm

It follows that anti-establishment parties tend to be organized upon the principle of democracy. However, some populist and radical right parties do not even attempt to create a democratic structure. They organize the structure around a strong leader with minimal framework whether due to ideological or simply strategic reasons. Such an organization strengthens the leader persona and limited membership is convenient as the members have no other occupation anyway (Mudde 2007: 270-271). Also, if the power is centralized it is far easier to change the articles or opinions. Nevertheless, it is not only non-democratic actors that create one-man parties. Some leaders prefer to run the party as a company or small family business. Hopkin and Paolucci have come up with a brand new name for such parties in 1999-the party as a business-firm (Hopkin and Paolucci 1999). They followed Panebianco’s (1988) electoral-professional party model which they connected with rational choice theory. They state that these parties are office seeking, meaning they “formulate policies in order to win elections rather than win elections in order to formulate policies (Downs 1975: 28). The key characteristic of such parties is a strong position of its leader. Usually a businessman is behind the foundation of a business-firm party which he uses to promote his interests. Another important feature is a high degree of centralization of power around the party leader and an absence of an official party ideology or coherent set of social relationships.
This is connected with the level of members as grassroots membership is limited (Hopkin and Paolucci 1999: 308-333). The party does not need any members, that is why it is ideologically broad to attract anyone as these parties “rather than integrating mass collective identities (…) aim only to achieve political office (Hopkin and Paolucci 1990: 310). The last important feature is the access to unlimited professional expertise in mass communications (Hopkin and Paolucci 1990: 322). That means that the party uses professionals and marketing experts in campaigning. To conclude, AEPs are expected to have a different party organization than “standard” mainstream parties to differentiate themselves from existing elites as a part of their anti-establishment rhetoric. If the party is organized based on the business-firm model, it is expected to do better in the elections and to be more efficient in terms of internal policy.

Leadership

Many researchers have stressed the importance of strong leaders (see e.g. Barr 2009, Mudde 2004, Weyland 2001) leading into conclusion that they play an important role in a party’s success. Obviously, having a particularly charismatic leader is a useful resource for any political party and there have been charismatic populists such as Peru’s former president Alberto Fujimori, radical right wing populists Jean-Marie Le Pen (FN), or Jörg Haider (FPÖ) (see e.g. Mayer and Sineau 2002, Wodak and Pelinka 2009). On the other hand, there were many right wing populist parties which were short of charismatic personalities and gained electoral success as well as the opposite- charismatic leaders lacking the success (see Mudde 2007, part III, chapter 11). Either way, it is believed that external leadership can be a useful attribute of the success of new parties and is more important in the breakthrough phase, while party organization is imperative in the phase of electoral persistence” (Mudde 2007: 262).

While external charisma is of great importance, it goes hand in hand with an internal one. It is not enough to create in Weber’s words (Weber 1987) “charismatic bond” between a leader and his followers; it must be perceived that way as well. Leadership is not only the popularity among voters and an ability of leaders to attract masses but they must be appalling to party members as well. While the external leader brings the electoral victory, the internal one might keep the party together (Mudde 2007: 263; 272).

While it is very difficult to measure leadership or charisma of a leader, Eatwell (2005) provides minimal criteria that should be met. Firstly, a leader must have a special mission to save the people. “Although they portray themselves as the embodiment of a special mission,
they also claim to **belong to the ordinary people.**” (Eatwell 2005: 105-108) “Another important technique of a charismatic leader is to create **friend–enemy categorisations** in order to demonize the ‘other’ ” (Pauwels 2010: 1024), in this case the establishment. Last but not least is the leader’s **personal presence**- a rhetoric style capable of creating a positive image. An anti-establishment party is thus likely to succeed if the leader can offer a solution to a hopeless situation (especially political crisis as a consequence of corruption and other scandals) and present themselves as professionals/experts who have nothing to do with those who got the country into such trouble, and are capable of saving the situation. It is thus expected that strong leadership has a significant impact on the party’s rise as the power is centralized in their hands.

**Summary**

From the explanatory model, which was described above, follows that a new anti-establishment party must meet three basic conditions to gain the electoral success. (1) There must exist a favorable political opportunity structure; (2) The challenging party must present ideological profile that meets the available niches in the political arena; and (3) The new party must be well organized and obtain sufficient resources in a way to be able to fulfill the presented profile (Rydgren 2006: 25).

In order to emerge and establish such a party, some of the following POS must be present: (1) Appearance of niches in the electoral arena, (2) Dealignment and realignment process, (3) Politicization of new political issues, (4) The degree of convergence in political space, (5) The degree of closure or openness of a political system, (6) Collaboration with mainstream party(s), (7) Strategies and Ideological and rhetorical profile, and (8) Party organization and internal resources.
3. DATA AND METHODS

The thesis focuses on two main questions in the analytical part of the work: “Which political opportunity structures were present?” and “How did ANO 2011 make use of these opportunities?” By answering these questions, factors which led to ANO’s success should be identified and evaluated.

The analysis is based on the theoretical framework introduced in the second chapter of this thesis which works with different POS theories and concludes in meeting three conditions and seven factors which are founded mainly on the basis of Jens Rydgren’s concept. Firstly, ANO 2011 will be described. Brief history, organizational structure, access to essential resources, and ideological profile of ANO will be analyzed. Next, political opportunity structures will be analyzed. Their presence or absence is highly important for electoral breakthrough of new parties. The thesis will use the post-electoral research from 2013 which was conducted by the Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences (http://archiv.soc.cas.cz/). Furthermore, data from the official election results site will be used (http://www.volby.cz/), and lastly figures from public opinion polls which are all stated in the list of sources. This data will show why people have decided to vote, and most importantly, which reasons did mobilize them to cast their vote for the Movement ANO 2011. Therefore it will be possible to say if ANO 2011 benefited from the opportunities, especially the newly created niches.

The Dealignment and realignment process opens opportunities for new parties. Firstly, origins of cleavages in Czech society will be discussed. The thesis focuses on up to now dominant socioeconomic cleavage of left-right orientation and its possible downfall connected with the situation after 2010 parliamentary elections. Is the cleavage no longer dominant and has the last two elections set a trend destabilizing the Czech party system? The factors of favorable conditions presented in this chapter are: decreasing importance of socioeconomic cleavage, decreasing level of party identification, decreasing level of political party membership, decreasing level of voter turnout, higher volatility, and decreasing level of trust in political institutions and democracy.

Party identification will be measured by two different approaches. The first, less standard operationalization, works with analyzing sets of two follow-up elections and focuses on the question about a voted party (e.g. Kunštát 2006; Vlachová 2000; 2001; 2003). Here it must be stressed that such non-standard
operationalization can present interesting findings but they must be interpreted accurately. The results are concerned with the respondents who stated to have participated in the previous elections. The level of party identification is then being artificially increased by including all voters who declared their vote for any party in previous elections or their will to participate in the following ones (Linek 2009: 189). The results should be thus interpreted as a bond between a particular party and its electorate rather than party identification. According to Linek (2009) it is more appropriate to use a specific type of questions when analyzing party identification. He compared two different ways of finding out about voters’ identification- the CSES version based on Comparative Study of Electoral Systems program (http://www.cses.org/) (How close do you feel to be to a particular party?) and CVVM version (How strongly do you identify with a particular party?)- Both following the initial question “Which party did you vote for in previous elections?” Linek concludes that CVVM version imposes categories upon voters (e.g. a supporter of a party or agree with most of party’s opinions) whereas CSES version provides abstract categories (e.g. feel very close) and works with a feeling of close relations. Thus it is more appropriate to use CSES version since CVVM version overvalues share of voters who identifies with a particular party (Linek 2009).

Party membership is analyzed on the basis of comparing the percentage of membership as a whole working with data (available in years 1993-2008) from “Going, going, . . . gone? The decline of party membership in contemporary Europe” by van Biezen, Mair, and Poguntke. These findings will be completed with data comparing changes in membership in case of individual parties since 1990 to 2013.

Level of trust in political institutions and democracy will be analyzed on the basis of the data from Our Society Survey conducted by the Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences collected by Public Opinion Research Center. The data concerning level of confidence in democracy will be drawn from Eurobarometer- Public Opinion Surveys.

Voter turnout is assessed using data from Czech statistical Office and its website (www.volby.cz).
Another factor is the degree of convergence in political space. Here the general politics as well as parties’ attitudes towards particular issues is of our concern. The analysis will focus on polarization of the system and the ideological distance between the parties. The higher the convergence is, the more open the system will be for new parties. The degree of convergence will be analyzed by comparing the left-right orientation of Czech parties based on their manifestos. The data will be drawn from the Manifesto Project database which is “a comparative content analysis of parties’ manifestos in over 50 countries.” working on the basis of coding quazi- sentences (www.manifestoproject.wzb.eu). The quazi- sentences show the amount of favorable mentions of each category. Apart from right-left scale (RILE index), we will work with values: Welfare State- need to introduce, maintain or expand any public social service or social security scheme; Market Economy- free market and free market capitalism as an economic model; and Planned Economy- long-standing economic planning by the government.

Next is the degree of closure or openness of the political system. The openness or closure is determined by the voting system, the proportional representation in this case. Generally, the more conditions and odds (such as legal threshold) a party must overcome to get the seats, the less open the political system is and the less favorable opportunities it brings.

Regarding the collaboration with mainstream parties, it might be greatly beneficial for a challenging party to maintain a positive rapport with government parties. However, it may prove the complete opposite and shed a negative light on an anti-establishing party going against its “anti-establishment nature”. Thus no exact indicators exist to measure such effect and the particular political and cultural context of the country must be considered.

Lastly, particular niches will be presented. The often articulated issue in the Czech politics has been economic crisis and corruption. The thesis will work with public opinions as well as ANO’s politicization of this issue and party’s attitude towards it. Another important issue that resonated in the Czech society was ongoing dissatisfaction with existing political parties that can be labeled as a call for a change. That is connected with people’s distrust in political institutions and political parties in general. This chapter will therefore discuss topics which might have created niches for new parties to fill.

When analyzing the crisis, this thesis will follow Moffitt’s framework, which was presented in the previous chapter, and which will be modified to four steps to fit the criteria of the thesis. That is (1) the existence of crisis articulated by the anti-establishment party, (2)
The final chapter of the thesis deals with the Electorate of ANO 2011. Public opinion polls will be presented and upward trend of ANO’s preferences will be analyzed. Then the voter profile will be examined. As the main source of data, the thesis will use the post-electoral research from 2013 which was conducted by the Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences (http://archiv.soc.cas.cz/). This research is based on quota sampling with the number of respondents being 1653. However, with the sample of ANO voters being smaller (n=253). These will be complemented by the data from Our Society surveys (2001-2013) conducted by the Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences collected by Public Opinion Research Center (www-nesstar.soc.cas.cz). The typical ANO voter will be characterized in terms of socio-demographic characteristics as well as voter behavior. The data will be complemented by adjusted residuals that are based on the difference between the observed count and the expected count. Moreover, logistic regression analysis will be presented as it allows for controlling the effect of other relevant variables. Because the dependent variable is a binary one (a vote for Movement ANO 2011), logistic regression is the most appropriate technique as it predicts a discrete outcome. The probability of this outcome can be predicted by independent variables (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). “The estimations may be biased, however, when the distribution of the dependent variable is extremely skewed and the number of cases is limited” (Pauwels 2014: 76). As said before, the dependent variable in this thesis is a vote choice (“Which political party have you voted...
for?”. As Independent variables education, occupation, job status, contentment with democracy, important issues, and right-left-scale identification were chosen as well as control variables such as age and gender. (“What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?”; “What is your current economic status?”; “Are you currently...?”; “How satisfied are you with how democracy works in your country?”; “What topic was of the highest importance for you in these elections?”; Where would you put yourself on right-left scale?”). For each categorical variable, the reference category is indicated. An odds ratio of 1 means that, compared to the reference category (e.g. men), the other category (e.g. women) is equally likely to vote for ANO. If an odds ratio is smaller than 1, it says that the category is less likely to vote for ANO compared with the reference category and vice versa if it is higher.

---

1 Q.10f „Kterou politickou stranu jste volil/a?”
2 S.2 „Jaké je Vaše nejvyšší dosažené vzdělání?”
3 S.8 „Nyní bych se rád dozvěděl něco o tom, co v současnosti děláte. Jaké je Vaše současné ekonomické postavení?”
4 S.11 „Pracujete (naposledy jste pracoval)....?”
5 Q.23 „Jak jste celkově spokojen s fungováním demokracie v zemi?”
6 Q.3a „Které téma bylo pro Vás osobně nejdůležitější v těchto volbách do Poslanecké sněmovny?”
7 Q.22 „Kam byste se sám zařadil na této stupnici?”
4. THE MOVEMENT ANO 2011 AND INTERNAL SUPPLY

4.1 Political context, sentiment

Before the movement will be analyzed according to its organization and internal resources as well as its rhetorical profile, let us situate its creation to general economic and political context of the country. The period between the 2010 general elections and the 2013 snap elections was heavily influenced by general turbulence in society that was caused by political scandals. After the 2010 general elections the Czech party system was disrupted. The winner party (ČSSD) did not manage to form a cabinet and for the first time Government was formed by the runner up. What is more, it was for the first time in its modern history since the centric KDU-ČSL with great coalition potential did not pass the needed 5% to get to the Parliament. As a result ODS was joined by new parties TOP 09 and VV and together they formed a collation.

Although the main article of the coalition was to fight the corruption, the cabinet has experienced sever downfalls and difficulties regarding its ministries leading into a huge scandal resulting in cabinet’s demission. Firstly, it was the scandal at the State Environmental Fund of the Czech Republic. The Minister of the Environment Drobil was accused of bribery and had to resign (Aktualne.cz 2012a). Next, it was the crisis in the ranks of Public Affairs. In April 2011, Vít Bárta, the Minister of Transport at that time, was accused of bribery by his fellow party members Jaroslav Škárka, Stanislav Huml, and Kristýna Kočí. Škárka revealed that Bárta was supposed to bribe members of VV not to give up information about party´s financing. Also documents verifying Bárta´s attempt to solely gain economic profit for his company ABL by entering the politics were found (Aktualne.cz 2011). This turmoil led to several resignations as some members of VV were expelled from the party and Bárta was accused by the State Prosecution. During the spring of 2011 another scandal was exposed. According to a leaked tape showing a VV member Kristýna Kočí, it turned out that the coalition partners were planning an overthrow from the inside which later led to the party´s split and creation of a new party LIDEM- Liberal Democrats (Aktualne.cz 2012a). LIDEM was created around the minister Karolína Peake and other 6 ministers who then officially replaced the Public Affairs that went to the opposition.

As a consequence of all these downfalls, the opposition attempted several times to overthrow the government by using the constructive vote of no confidence. In January 2013 PM Nečas had stood against the vote for the fifth time and succeeded in turning over the
proposal put forward by ČSSD (iDnes 2013a). Even after all the previous scandals, the biggest one was yet to come. On 13th January, 2013 ÚOOZ arrested Jana Nečasová (then Nagyová) - chief executive of PM’s cabinet, ex-deputies Ivan Fuksa and Petr Tluchoř (ODS), and other individuals from the secret services due to reasonable suspicion of bribery and misconduct in office (Lidovky.cz 2015). Only after four days since the arresting followed by media exposure (the police intervention became known as “Nagyová Affair”) PM Nečas resigned from both PM and ODS leader posts (iDnes.cz 2013b). Although ODS wanted to get the chance to form another cabinet with Němcová as its new leader, President Zeman decided to charge an economic expert Jiří Rusnok (non-partisan), who previously served as Minister of Finance in Zeman’s cabinet, to form a caretaker government. However, Rusnok did not gain the confidence vote by 93 to 100 and because ODS, TOP 09 and LIDEM did not have the majority of votes the Chamber of Deputies dismissed itself on 28th August, 2013 (PSP ČR 2013).

Apart from the political situation, the troubling time between the 2010 general elections and the 2013 snap elections can be characterized in terms of sentiment in the society. The dissatisfaction with established political parties had been escalating ever since 2002 and reached its maximum in 2013. According to the Our Society survey (CVVM 2002-2013) preferences for established parties began to decrease in 2002. In 2006 less than half of the respondents preferred any of the established parties and the number dropped to 38% in 2010. It also meant a huge drop in ODS preferences (CVVM 2010) after the affairs mentioned above. This trend followed in 2013 and preferences for established parties decreased to historical minimums. Also the number of respondents with no preferred party increased. In 2002 the survey did not even contain such option and in 2002 20.8% of respondents used this option to express the antipathy with suggested parties. In 2013 the number of respondents who stated that they would not vote for either of the running parties increased by 10.1%. On the other hand, the number of people preferring any new party has increased by almost a fifth in the observed period. If we compare these findings with actual election results shown in Graph No.1 such trend can be confirmed. The increase in preferences for new parties in the period 2002-2006 is exclusively assigned to the Green Party as the first wave of protest parties came later in 2010. Since 2002, the support for established parties dropped by 29.43% compared with 2010 as the preferences for new parties started to grow rapidly. In 2013 the sum of the electoral results of these new parties was 33.83%.
According to CVVM survey asking about particular issues in society, 63% of respondents were rather or totally discontent with general atmosphere in society in January 2013. The majority of these respondents, exactly 74%, were also rather or very discontent with the political situation and only 1% of respondents were satisfied with the state of corruption in the Czech Republic whereas 62% were totally discontent. What is more, 83% were totally or rather unhappy with both economic criminality and unemployment, and only 4% were satisfied with public finances (CVVM 2013a). Such tensions in society might have favored new parties that filled vacant niches and offered voters solutions regarding system corruption, financing, and unemployment.

4.2 Brief history of ANO 2011

The Movement ANO 2011 was founded in November 2011 by a billionaire tycoon Andrej Babiš. It started as a civic initiative following the citizens’ association the Action of Dissatisfied Citizens (Akce Nespokojených Občanů). After several public appearances where Babiš expressed his thoughts about system corruption and politicians for which he got positive response, he wrote an appeal to all Czech citizens on 11th November, 2011. Babiš, whose origins are Slovak, expressed his thoughts about corrupt public administration and political elites (AnoBudeLip.cz). In this letter he addressed all Czech citizens to join this initiative and re-build a prosperous and thriving country once again. His criticism of system corruption and mainstream elites later became the basis for the movement’s manifesto. Apart from describing the horrible state Czech country was in, he went on to explain why he wanted to enter the political arena and what he was going to achieve. He compared the situation to
events which took place in 1989 just before the Velvet Revolution suggesting the country being on the same crossroads as then and leaving space for citizens to act (Výzva ANO 2011). ANO 2011 has been registered as a political movement since 11th May 2012 and started to use an abbreviation ANO on 26th of March 2013 (Portal Ministerstvo vnitra ČR). Originally, ANO was supposed to stand for the 2012 regional elections but did not manage to nominate candidates. In order to get ready for the 2014 regular elections, ANO had to make important changes such as putting together a new campaign team, massive re-branding, and hiring external specialists such as Czech Campaigns and American Penn Schoen Berland Agency (PSB) (Králová and Kominek 2014: 108-109).

4.3 Ideology and rhetorical profile

As was stated in the theoretical part of this thesis, in order for anti-establishment parties to rise there must exist a favorable political opportunity structure and the party must present ideological profile that meets the available niches in the political arena (Rydgren 2006: 25). The opportunity was set on the basis of corruption and personal scandals of the previous coalition government, ANO thus needed to present itself as an anti-corrupt movement strongly distinguishing itself from established parties and the way they had been ruling the country. As the demand and open niches already existed, ANO supplied it with its strong rhetoric by saying: “we are not like politicians, we DO work” (AnoBudeLip.cz) and presenting its members as experts who enter the politics to make a change and build a thriving state that will be run as a firm (Aktualne.cz 2012b).

As mentioned previously in the theoretical chapter, it is not clear on which side of the spectrum AEPs operate and issues they raised “do not coincide with the existing “left-right” line of political division (Meguid 2008: 4). Before the 2013 elections Babiš claimed that ANO was neither left-wing nor right-wing and refused to cooperate in case of possible victory with both ODS and TOP 09 as the “right was corrupt”. However, he also refused both left parties KSČM and ČSSD because of great differences among their and ANO’s manifesto (Novinky.cz 2013a). Therefore when analyzing ANO’s profile, it would not be much helpful to try to place the movement on either side but rather to assess particular policies which will help to understand ANO’s profile. The movement’s manifesto consists of more parts and currently is even tailored to particular types of elections. However, in 2013 only one document existed which was divided into three parts-priorities, foundation, and a

---

8 “Nejsme jako politici, makáme.”
departmental manifesto. It must be stressed that ANO had previously changed the manifesto several times and was adapting it during the campaign for which it was heavily criticized. Babiš, however, claimed that these were “not changes, rather improvements” (iDnes.cz 2013c). Nevertheless, it was not particularly clear where the movement stood in important questions such as health service charges and appointing/removal of public prosecutors (iDnes.cz 2013c).

The main part of the manifesto is the 12 articles in the foundation document. First two articles correspond with movement’s anti-establishment and anti-party profile. Right in the first article, the movement distinguishes itself from the established parties by saying “YES to a quality brand”. Here it refers to “good old times: "when our country was not in a debt (...) and was not being embezzled by godfathers whom nobody knows as they hide themselves behind incompetent politicians." (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013a) In the history “our country was ruled by qualified professionals; today it is governed by politicians who know nothing about ordinary people.” (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013a) The second article continues in similar sense where ANO criticizes established politicians by saying that they are responsible for the bad conditions and atmosphere as they live in a bubble full of arguments, plots, scandals, and crime offences whereas ANO offers capable professionals who have accomplished something in life (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013a). Both articles thus show exactly what was stated in the theoretical chapter of this thesis that AEPs elevate the level of crisis the country is in, name actors who are responsible for it, and present simple solutions. The anti-establishment appeal is clearly presented in the name as ANO is not a party, but a movement. Its leader Babiš has clearly stated it several times: “We are not a typical political party (...); we want to be a fellowship of decent honest people who feel the urge to do something for their country” (Svobodneforum.cz 2015). By declaring themselves as ordinary citizens a clear alienation from mainstream parties is visible as politicians work solely for their own benefit whereas ANO is here to serve people’s interests.

---

9 ANO means YES in Czech.
10 „Naše země nebývala zadlužená (...). Nebyla systematicky rozkrádána bezejmennými kmotrovnskými uskupením a těmi, jejichž jména nikdo ani nezná a kteří se kryjí tvářemi neschopných politiků.”
11 „(...) ji vedli lidé, kteří něco dokázali. Dnes nás zastupují (...) politici, kteří o každodenním praktickém životě většiny národa nevědí vůbec nic."
12 Although simple solutions are presented, it is not clear which particular steps ANO wants to take to deliver the results.
13 „Nejsme ani klasická politická strana, kde si musíte kariéru vysedět. Chceme být hlavně společenství slušných a poctivých lidí, kteří cítí potřebu udělat něco pro svou zemi.“
Other issues that ANO represents in its manifesto are mainly concerned with economy. Even though it was said previously that ANO is neither a left nor right-wing party, its economic preferences are definitely right-wing oriented (e.g. against progressive taxes, or raising corporate income taxes) (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013). Similarly, in case of welfare state questions, ANO is leaning towards right compared with other parties. Data from project Manifesto show besides other things the need to expand any public social service or social security scheme and the amount of its favorable mentions in manifestos. Even though welfare state is generally more important for left-wing parties, ANO scored 5.249 regarding the welfare state expansion compared with 6.544 of ODS and 8.696 of TOP 09 as right wing parties and 12.791 of left-wing ČSSD showing that ANO did not deal that much with this issue in its manifesto (CMP 2015). Generally, ANO’s manifesto offers collection of values and promises of what the movement wants to change but not how it wants to do it. Even in the departmental manifesto exact particular steps and measurements are missing. This can be confirmed by Sokol’s findings: “There are both right-wing and less right-wing questions in the manifesto. From his (Babiš’s) public appearances, the cult of a great successful leader and critique of corrupt environment rises. And that is what works for the voters”14 (parlamentnilisty.cz 2013a).

The communication style of the movement is truly what matters the most, especially in case of Babiš. He emphasizes the difference between the movement and mainstream parties. He combines the protest appeal with offering simple solutions. In his public appearances, he uses his own experience and non-political origin to stress his capability. He also uses informal language to get closer to his voters and show he is one of them. What is more, by referring to his exceptionally good financial situation he wants to show that would not enter politics to become wealthier, rather the opposite:

“I do not enter politics to get money, trust me I do not need more money. I want more- I want our children to live in the Czech Republic without needing to move abroad to be able to live a decent life.”15 (Výzva ANO 2011)

14 „V programu se dají najít jak pravicové věci, tak věci méně pravicové. (...) Z jeho veřejných vystoupení vychází jen kult velkého úspěšného podnikatele a kritika korupčního prostředí, což na voliče funguje.“
15 „Do politiky nejdu kvůli penězům, věřte, že žádné další nepotřebuji. Jde mi o víc – hlavně o to, aby zde, v České republice, ehtěly žít i naše děti, aby za slušným životem nemusely odebízet do zahraničí.“
All in all, ANO based its profile on declaring no inclination towards left or right although rightist tendencies might be proved. Secondly, being a movement, it strongly proclaimed the difference in their internal organization in comparison with mainstream parties.

4.4 Party organization and internal resources: offline and online campaign

Apart from the existence of available niches and adequate supply an anti-establishment party must be also well organized and obtain sufficient resources in a way to be able to fulfill the presented profile (Rydgren 2006: 25). Following the theoretical chapter, it can be said that new parties without party history might be more likely to succeed, especially if they have a hierarchical structure and access to resources. ANO is almost a perfect example of this description. It was a new movement lacking any political history and having a hierarchical structure. Such parties that were created outside of the parliament are generally more centralized and controlled from the top down. This applies for ANO as well. The structure is created on four stages by local, county and regional16 organizations which are all under the patronage of the authority with countrywide field of activity that can determine the foundation or termination of these organizations (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013b).

Going back to the theoretical model, ANO’s internal democracy can be discussed. In the theoretical chapter, key characteristics that represent the business-firm model were presented. ANO has a strong leader who concentrates the power in his hand as will be discussed in the following paragraph. As far as the membership is concerned, ANO is in no need for extending its voter base as it is a brand new movement. Perhaps we can expect this urge in the future but as for right no, no such tendencies were noticed. The absence of official party ideology is also valid for ANO as it was discussed above it does not coincide with the existing “left-right” line of political division. Regarding the last key characteristics- access to unlimited professional expertise- it will become clear in the following paragraphs that ANO had a professionally led campaign and access to market analyses, public surveys, and experts’ advice. All in all, ANO is a perfect example of a business-firm party (movement) led by a successful businessman owning the currently third largest company in the Czech Republic17-Agrofert.

---

16 místní, oblastní a krajské
17 (www.czechtop100.cz.)
AEPs are likely to do better if they have a charismatic leader who can offer solutions to a hopeless situation (especially political crisis as a consequence of corruption and other scandals) and present themselves as professionals/experts who have nothing to do with those who got the country into such trouble, and are capable of saving the situation. Following the theoretical model presented earlier, a leader must have a special mission to save the people, which is in case of Babiš and ANO to purify the politics, get rid of system corruption and run the state as a prosperous company. Secondly, Babiš has never put himself above his voters, making always sure he is one of them, one of the discontent citizens:

“I pay hundreds of million on taxes and I am as angry as you all. I am angry because politicians are not only able to govern our country; what is more, they witness its embezzlement.”\(^{18}\) (Výzva ANO 2011)

Next is the categorization of friends and enemies which is most definitely fulfilled in case of Babiš as mentioned above with ANO’s campaign slogan: “we are not like politicians, we DO work.”\(^{19}\) (AnoBudeLip.cz). Finally, personal presence is of our concern. A leader must be a confident speaker to attract masses of voters either in life (e.g. at rallies) or via TV. This turned to be a rather weak skill for Babiš perhaps because Czech is not his mother tongue. After several public appearances and general criticism Babiš decided to hire a teacher of Czech language and other rhetoric experts (Aktualne.cz 2015). However, in times of heated pre-election debates, Babiš tend to switch to his native Slovak. This is something he is not afraid to address when for example asked by journalist about a TV spot where he admits to “speak poor Czech”.\(^{20}\)(Parlamentnilisty.cz 2013b).

Having a strong party leader could be sometimes seen as an obstacle rather than advantage. ANO has been called several times “the one-man-party” as Babiš is the leading figure and the most famous personality in the movement. He is also the main financial contributor to the movement’s running (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013c) and his powers as a chairman of the movement are enormous. According to the movement’s rule book, a chairman summons statewide assembly (the main authority) “if needed” or must be requested by at least two thirds of all members (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013b). Therefore a chairman can gather the assembly de facto whenever he wants to. The same goes for the second most important executive body- the committee, a chairman can also appoint and remove the movement’s

\(^{18}\) “(…) platím stovky milionů korun na daních a jsem naštvaný stejně jako vy. Naštvaný proto, že politici naší zemi od revoluce nejenže neumějí řídit, ale přihlížejí jejímu rozkrádání.”

\(^{19}\) “Nejsme jako politici, makáme.”

\(^{20}\) „Já mluvím blbě česky.”
manager and regional managers (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013b). This gives Babiš rather unlimited powers and the democratic principles inside the movement might be questioned. Soon after new presidium was appointed, four vice-chairmen step down in March 2013 due to Babiš’s allegedly authoritarian rhetoric style (ihned.cz. 2013). ANO found itself without a complete management which implies that the movement had been violating its own rule book (DenikReferendum.cz 2014).

With Babiš as a strong leader, the movement struggled not to be overshadowed by its chairman during the campaign. Despite a recruitment of famous people, the movement was associated solely with Andrej Babiš (Králová and Komínek 2014:106) as ANO had already distributed billboards in order to “present” Babiš and the movement to the public before the regular 2014 elections. ANO started with its campaign fairly early during the July of 2013 given the fact that the elections were supposed to take place in fall of 2014. Due to PM Nečas’s resignation snap elections were held on 25 and 26 October 2013 which gave the parties very limited time to run the campaigns. ANO definitely benefited from its personal contact campaigning. Babiš ventured and went out on a limb with giving his voters personal treats such as ice cream which was unexpected and foremost different from other parties. Apart from typical meetings and conventions with movement’s officials, Babiš was not afraid to give away doughnuts in Prague’s underground. Another important and original moment in ANO’s campaign was its billboards on straw bales.

ANO soon became very active in gaining supporters on social media as well. ANO hired many experts and managed to gain 68 thousands followers (compared to 2 thousands of ODS) (Králová and Komínek 2014: 110). This success would not be possible without the excessive amount of resources because funding threshold could limit newly formed parties as they usually cannot afford campaign materials. Babiš was ready to pay all the expenses and according to the website Transparentnivolby.cz which monitors parties’ spendings the total bill reached 120 million crowns (Transparentnivolby.cz 2013). The movement focused on paid advertisement on Facebook and active profile pages of its leaders (Macková and Gregor 2014: 67). Andrej Babiš was especially popular on twitter due to his peculiar communication style. Also, ANO did not lack professional management either. The movement’s campaign was thoroughly planned and most importantly professionally led. Market analyses, public surveys, professional web design, and catchy slogans almost all willingly paid from Babiš’s personal resources guaranteed ANO to be ahead of the game (Macková and Gregor 2014: 71).
All in all, ANO’s professional campaign, almost unlimited budget, and clear and simple message have finally paid off and lead into gaining 47 seats in the Chamber of Deputies.
5. POS IN CZECH POLITICS-EXTERNAL SUPPLY

5.1 DEALIGNMENT AND REALIGNMENT PROCESS

After 1989 there has been one dominant cleavage in Czech politics as the initial party system had been created by the competition between Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (KSČ) and Civic Forum (OF), which was a very broad movement consisting of various streams and personalities. Prior to the 1990 general elections, the cleavage of transformation-determining the character of the regime – dominated and characterized the conflict between Communist Party and its opposition (firstly OF) (Hloušek 2000: 38). Yet after Civic forum winning the elections (obtained over 50% votes) this communism vs. anti-communism cleavage lost its importance (Kopeček and Hloušek 2005: 8). Although the 1990 elections were seen as a “referendum” on Czech society staying under the communist rule, other cleavages proved to have some, although marginal, meaning. Such as church vs. state based on existence of Christian Democrats (KDU-ČSL) or nationalistic cleavage driven by Moravian separatists (Hloušek and Kopeček 2005: 9).

The following years proved as highly important for shaping the Czech party system. The socio-economic cleavage continued to strengthen and kept its dominant position especially in the period 1992-1996 (Hloušek and Kopeček 2005: 10) due to formation of two strong parties on both sides of the spectrum. On the right side it was the Civic Democratic Party (ODS) – the most important successor of OF. Whereas on the left charismatic leader was needed. Miloš Zeman helped to raise the importance and election potential of the Czech Social-Democratic Party (ČSSD). Social Democrats benefited from the fact that KSČM chose to hold onto its strictly communist face, thus discrediting itself in eyes of many voters and giving ČSSD the opportunity to create a strong left oriented position in the spectrum (Hloušek and Kopeček 2005: 10). All in all, the Czech party system has been somewhat established. There had been two dominant parties on both sides of the spectrum with ODS on the right and ČSSD on the left. The system was completed by Christian democrats KDU-ČSL, and KSČM. Technically it was a five-party system as the chamber of deputies had always been supplemented by one small party (with the exception of 1996/98 SPR RSČ). Since 1996 to 1998 it was ODA, till 2006 US-DEU, and in 2006 The Green Party.

Up to recently no topics have had significant influence on the dominant position of socio-economic cleavage in the Czech society. Even though various attitudes towards European Union and European integration have been resonating among people, no study
showed that voters would really decide on the basis of these topics thus it would be exaggerated to speak about any new cleavage in this sense. Similarly, the resurrection of Green Party in 2002 has not left any significant signs to speculate about the importance of materialistic vs. post-materialistic cleavage. Also the party system has been considered as relatively stable up to recent years. However, the 2010 and 2013 parliamentary elections has brought significant changes in terms of new parties rapid electoral breakthrough and downfall trend in preferences for established parties. These elections shook with the foundation of Czech politics and left many scholars to question the stability of multipartism with one dominant party on both sides of the spectrum and the dominance of socio-economic cleavage. Is the stability passé or have we just witnessed rotation and exchange of old parties for new ones without disruption of main cleavages and party system transformation?

The stability was secured by the dominant socioeconomic cleavage. Although other cleavages did exist, their importance had been decreasing and right-left orientation represented the dominant cleavage (Havlík and Voda 2014: 7). In 2010 new parties entered the Parliament and old established ones have lost its support. Both TOP 09 and VV (Věci veřejné- Public Affairs) entered the arena as the “project of newness” (Hanley 2011: 124) and wanted to express the existing traditions by more authentic form of governance, yet not presenting new ideology. TOP 09, originally led by M. Kalousek split from KDU-ČSL in 2009 hence the nine in the title. Its electorate was mainly comprised by former ODS voters as both parties share similar attitudes and put emphasis on same traditional values. Since aiming at the same electorate, ODS has lost the position of unique political option (Havlík 2010). Similarly, VV based their program on anti-establishment appeal and loathed established parties. Originally and initiative oriented on communal politics in Prague, the party presented corruption solution and elements of direct democracy in its first parliamentary elections.

The 2013 general elections adopted a very similar scenario leading into destabilization of the party system. Historical established parties have been significantly weakened and new protest parties have entered the Parliament. ANO 2011 came second and similarly as VV criticized previous governments and refused to commit either to left or right. Another successful project was the Dawn of Direct Democracy (Úsvit) led by Czech-Japanese businessman Tomio Okamura which came up with a program based on direct democracy. Unlike in 2010, neither VV nor LIDEM (its separated platform) ran in 2013 elections. In contrast to new parties, traditional ones have suffered another historical drop of support. Both ODS and ČSSD (although a winner) have suffered the biggest defeat in its history. Such
change in traditional parties’ preferences and rapid breakthrough of new parties building on voters’ dissatisfaction were represented by relatively low turnout.

5.1.1 Party identification

One of the less standard operationalization to measure party identification is to analyze sets of two follow-up elections and focus on the question about the voted party. If we do so the results show that party identification in Czech politics was until the new millennium almost a perfect example of mutual relationship between party system formation and real voter behavior (Vlachová 2003: 492). Vlachová in her study shows that from 1992 to 1998, the majority of people voted for the same party in the follow-up elections as in the previous ones. The results from the post-election survey (Graph No.2), which have been treated the same way as proposed by Vlachová or Kunštát, show that in 2002 almost 75% of respondents stated to have voted for the same party as in the previous elections. All in all, party identification was particularly high which could be explained by newness of democratic elections and consolidation of democratic party system. On the other hand, in 2010 the changes in voters’ preferences increased quite significantly. This could be seen as a result of dealignment process. In comparison with previous set of elections, number of people who had voted for the same party dropped by almost 15% and the trend continued in the next elections where the percentage of people who voted for the same party stayed around 55%
.

Graph No.2 Changes in voters’ preferences, 1998-2013

![Graph showing changes in voters' preferences, 1998-2013](image)

Note: Respondents were asked after the elections: “Which party did you vote for?” and “Which party did you vote for in the previous elections?”. The results are sum of people who stated to have voted in both elections in the particular set.

The data using another type of operationalization - CSES version are available from years 2002, 2006, 2010, and 2013 were collected by Public Opinion Research Center. According to the results party identification was relatively low in the observed period (Table
No.1). In 2002 only 35% of respondent stated to have felt very or rather close to a particular party they named in the previous question in the survey. The number of respondents who have felt very close to the party they answered in previous question has been very low throughout the whole period decreased to the minimum in 2010 (5%). In all observed years the percentage of people who did not identify with either of parties is higher than those who did (with the highest number 65% in 2002 and 2013).

Table No.1 How close do you feel to the party?, 2002-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very close</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather close</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very close</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without party identi</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: values are weighted.

Rose and Mishler (1997) have found out that in case of post-communist countries negative party identification is even more important as the positive one tends to be quite low among these countries. In 1996 and 1998 82% and 83% of people named a particular party which they would have never voted for (KSČM being on top of these results) yet at the same time the strongest preference towards particular party was found in case of KSČM and ODS (Vlachová 2003: 495-497). This is a typical case for party system which was established after a long period of non-democratic rule. KSČM is historically rooted in Czech (Czechoslovak) party system and has built a strong relationship with its voters throughout its existence. Apart from positive rapport, it is obviously a party towards which voters feel negative identification as well (particularly right-wing voters) due to its historical hegemonic position in the system. Similarly, ODS is also a party voters identify both positively and negatively with since it was Civic Democrats who contributed hugely to the formation of the socioeconomic cleavage as the opposite to left parties.

5.1.2 Party membership

According to van Biezen et al. average levels of party membership in Europe are considerably lower today compared to 1980s and 1990s. With the turn of the century, majority of European democracies have witnessed decline in their membership levels, “both absolute numbers as a percentage of the electorate” (van Biezen- Mair- Poguntke 2012: 31).
The study also shows that party membership in the Czech Republic\(^2\) is actually one of the lowest failing to reach even 2 per cent (van Biezen- Mair- Poguntke 2012: 29). In fact, the party membership is much lower in all post-communist countries where the democracies were established after 1989.

Membership in the Czech Republic has decreased by 40% compared to 1990s (van Biezen- Mair- Poguntke 2012: 33). This can be explained by rapid drops in the Communist Party membership. As the monopoly of KSČ (now KSČM) was disrupted promptly, the absolute membership dropped rapidly as the consequence of the weakening position of the party. However, it is not only the case of former communist parties and its satellites that have fallen into pieces. The level of party membership has been descending also in case of other parties. The decline is clearly visible in Table No.2. When comparing the percentage of membership in 1993 and 1999, it has dropped by 3.6%. In this case it is much more useful to look at absolute values. We can see that in 1993 there were 545,000 members of various political parties, whereas in 1998 only 278,985 which is almost half less of the total number of electorate. This trend continued in the following years. In 2008 the number of party members dropped under 200 000. This trend has led to some scholars (see e.g. van Biezen 2003: 144) proposing that Czech parties are not interested in members and do not actively seek to gain new ones. Actually, it is rather the opposite as Linek proves. Parties are very much interested in new members, especially young ones. What is more, these drops do not go just one-way, particular parties have shown that people simultaneously join and leave the parties thus membership is changing (Linek 2004: 180). The real reason why parties have been losing their members lies in the anti-party mood in society. Voters are discontent with the performance of political parties and feel that parties do not care about people’s opinion; they simply need their votes (this will be discussed later in chapter 5.1.3). As Graph No.3 shows, the number of people, who participated in survey done by Public Opinion Research Center (CVVM), and who think that by entering a political party some changes can be made has stayed on low levels, not exceeding 42%. The data shows that in the last decade, overall majority of respondents have been stating that they disagree with this statement showing the distrust in joining a particular party.

\(^2\) Data from 2008, 27 European countries compared
Table No.2 Party members’ change, 1993-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Total party membership</th>
<th>Membership as % of the electorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7,738,891</td>
<td>545,000</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>8,116,836</td>
<td>278,985</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8,333,306</td>
<td>165,425</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Van Biezen – Mair – Poguntke 2012: 42.*

Graph No.3 Some changes can be made by entering a political party, 2005-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>dnt know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note: “Agree” is the sum of “totally agree” and “rather agree”; “disagree” is the sum of “totally disagree” and “rather disagree”*

The declining numbers of members are clearly visible in case of particular parties in table No.2. The biggest decline in case of KSČ (KSČM) is attributed to its lost monopoly in 1989 and disruption of its electorate in first democratic elections in 1990. The Christian Democrats as a former satellite of KSČ gained nearly half of its members as result of massive and predictable decline in the membership of KSČ. However, since the following elections in 1996 the numbers are falling gradually as for KSČM. If we were to exclude these old historic parties, levels of membership would show a slight increase between 1993 and 1998. However, this ought to be attributed exclusively to Social Democrats. The decline of members for ODS in 1998 is due to the split off when a section of members left the party and created a new one-The Freedom Union (US).
Table No.3 Change in membership of political parties, 1990-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSČM</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>354 549</td>
<td>171 323</td>
<td>142 490</td>
<td>113 027</td>
<td>88 400</td>
<td>67 200</td>
<td>53 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSSD</td>
<td>10 785</td>
<td>12 468</td>
<td>13 043</td>
<td>17 343</td>
<td>17 026</td>
<td>17 650</td>
<td>24 486</td>
<td>22 881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>18 577</td>
<td>22 002</td>
<td>22 095</td>
<td>18 188</td>
<td>26 800</td>
<td>31 011</td>
<td>21 591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDU-ČSL</td>
<td>48 037</td>
<td>88 737</td>
<td>71 600</td>
<td>60 460</td>
<td>50 657</td>
<td>42 504</td>
<td>34 875</td>
<td>29 976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>7 553 477</td>
<td>7 738 981</td>
<td>7 990 770</td>
<td>8 116 836</td>
<td>8 264 484</td>
<td>8 333 305</td>
<td>8 415 892</td>
<td>8 424 227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* not available


Graph No.4 Change in membership of political parties, 1990-2013

ANO started with roughly 700 members and the number has been increasing ever since. Although the membership is not the most accurate value as these numbers are given by political parties themselves, the trend in the Czech Republic is quite clear either way. Old established parties have been in crisis- they have been constantly losing their members due to voters’ distrust and protest characteristics of last two parliamentary elections. The anti-party atmosphere created perfect conditions for ANO to rise. ANO presented itself as a movement, not a party, strongly distinguishing itself from established parties, offering a new way of doing politics.
5.1.3 Level of trust in political institutions and democracy

Trust is generally the best indicator of the state the particular society is in. It influences everyday life, it facilitates interpersonal relations and sets positive atmosphere. Trust can make people want to participate in public life that is why it is so important in politics. Trust influences togetherness of people and political institutions. “Trust is necessary so that individuals may participate voluntarily in collective institutions, whether in political institutions, such as political parties, or in economic and social institutions, such as labor unions, business associations, and churches” (Mishler and Rose 1997: 419). It is the foundation stone of legitimacy and effectiveness of democratic government. If the government is trusted by the public, it can rely on such trust in hard times when in need of unpopular steps or measurements. On the other hand if voters do not trust its government, it might be left with no other option than to use the power of coercion (Mishler and Rose 1997: 418-419). If the confidence in national governments and satisfaction with how democracy works is decreasing over a long period of time, it can have significant negative effect on the stability of the system (Norris 2011: 4).

A decreasing trend in satisfaction with how democracy works is visible in the Czech Republic. In 2004, only 45% of people were content with how democracy works (Eurobarometer 2004). The maximal contentment was measured in 2006 reaching 58% just above the average of 56% in the rest of the European Union. Since then the decreasing trend has started and continued. In 2012 dissatisfaction prevailed with record highs (Eurobarometer 2012) including the Czech Republic (70%).

Graph No.5 Are you satisfied with how democracy works in your country?,2004-2013

Source: Eurobarometer 2004-2013
Note: “Total satisfied” is the sum of “very satisfied” and “fairly satisfied”
The decline of satisfaction with political institutions and political parties is dependent on the particular context of the country. Corruption scandals, affairs, economic crisis, or approaching elections can all have a significant effect on people’s confidence in political institutions and its members. In case of the Czech Republic the post-communist context must be taken into consideration as well. In all post-communist countries the level of trust in political institutions is rather low. It is the consequence of decades under non-democratic rule where the regime, in order to control all aspect of lives, had systematically been trying to distort natural social relations (Mishler and Rose 1997). If we add the secret police and constant undermining of trust among all citizens the current dissatisfaction seems to be rooted in the heritage of communism. Mishler and Rose (1997) analyzed the trust in nine post-communist countries including the Czech Republic and have come up with interesting results showing that the typical categories trust- distrust are not enough in such countries. They added a new value skepticism containing respondents who did not actively support nor refuse political institutions. They also found out that in these countries parliament and political parties are trusted the least (Mishler nad Rose 1997).

The data from surveys conducted by Czech Public Opinion Research Center show the decreasing tendency in voters’ trust in political institutions. The strongest position is occupied by President. It is the only institution that has overcome 50% mark, meaning that more than half of respondents trust President (in September 2010 even 72.3%). Historically, the post of Czech President has always been somewhat rare compared to other European statesmen-as it has always been a strong, charismatic personality associated with a specific charm (Kopeček and Mlejnek 2013). Thus this might explain why voters trust President the most. However, in 2013 the numbers dropped significantly to 25.8% (compared to 53% in December 2012). This can be explained by the amnesty issued by the former president Václav Klaus in January as this survey was conducted just around the time of releasing the news. The amnesty was heavily criticized because it concluded many cases of serious economic crimes and corruption.

The Chamber of Deputies and the Senate have been scoring similar low numbers (around 20%) in the last decade. Nevertheless we can see a significant change again in 2013 where the level of trust for the Chamber of Deputies dropped to 10.8%. Actually, the trust has never gotten back to its previous maxim of 30.8% in January 2002 and has continued to decrease with its lowest point recorded in October 2012 where only 9.9% of respondents stated to have trusted the Chamber of Deputies. This might be connected with the government
crisis of Petr Nečas and his cabinet and more precisely personal changes in Public Affairs in spring of 2012, which led to the party split and leaving for a new platform LIDEM. At the same time, the level of confidence has dropped in case of Government as well. These numbers show the decreasing level of trust in political institutions in general and people’s discontent with political situation.

The results in case of people’s confidence in Government might be able to explain more. In 2002 45.3% of respondents stated to have trusted Government which is quite high number compared to other values. Since 2006 the decline in satisfaction is visible. This might be connected with deadlock election results and following lengthy negotiations (it took eight months to form the government) when politicians seemed to fight among each other to gain the greatest profit not to solve the situation. On the other hand, in 2010 rapid increase of government trust can be seen. In January 71% of voters answered the question about trusting Government positively. However, in this particular survey the question was concerned directly with Jan Fisher’s caretaking government. Fisher as a statistician and non-party candidate was appointed to lead the cabinet after Topolánek (ODS) and his government had lost confidence vote in Chamber of Deputies. Since the beginning the cabinet had been called “government of professionals” (iDnes.cz 2009) and was framed rather positively in the media. According to opinion polls, three quarters of people were much satisfied with this government and only 3% of respondents stated total discontent (CVVM 2010, STEM 2009). This confidence remained high till June 2010 and proves that voters were much satisfied with its performance. Whilst in September 2010 the numbers dropped significantly as shown in Graph No.6. In this case respondents were asked: “Do you trust P. Nečas and his cabinet?” The increasing distrust is seen also in Graph No.6 showing voters contentment with political situation. At the beginning of 2011 the amount of voters who were discontent with the general political situations started to grow. According to CVVM 81% of respondents were rather or totally dissatisfied with politics in January 2011 and the numbers stayed more or less the same throughout the whole spring. This might be connected with the government crisis of PM Nečas and his cabinet followed by several attempts to use the constructive vote of no confidence. The outbreak of this government crisis dates to April 2011 and is connected with bribery scandal of Public Affairs (VV). Vít Bárta, the Minister of Transport at that time, was accused of bribery by his colleague party members Jaroslav Škárka, Stanislav Huml, and Kristýna Kočí. They were all expelled from the party and Bárta was accused by the State Prosecution which led later to party’s split and creation of new party LIDEM- Liberal Democrats. If we look at Graph No. 7 showing people’s confidence in Government, the
numbers are considerably lower in April and May 2011 compared to January as the preferences dropped by 11.8%, or rather 12.8%. People’s trust continued to drop according to the survey, hitting its minimal toward the end of the year 2012 (11.9% in October 2010) and the beginning of 2013 (11.8% in January 2013).

**Graph No.6 Are you content with current political situation?, 2009-2013**

![Graph showing content levels from 2009 to 2013]

*Source: author, data: CVVM, Our Society survey*

*Note: “content” is the sum of answers “totally content” and “rather content”; “discontent” is the sum of answers “totally discontent” and “rather discontent”; recalculation to 100% o is the answer “dnt know”.*

**Graph No.7 Trust in political institutions, 2002-2013**

![Graph showing trust levels from 2002 to 2013]

*Source: author, data: CVVM, Our Society survey*

*Note: The values are the sum of the answers “totally trust” and “rather trust”. Missing values were not available.*
What is more, after serious corruption and bribery scandals followed by ÚOOZ\textsuperscript{22} arresting several politicians (including Jana Nečasová (Nagyová) - chief executive of PM’s cabinet) Nečas’s cabinet had to resign. Thus the proportion of those who claimed to have little confidence in Government followed to increase. It is visible how these developments had destabilizing effect on the party system and facilitated the rise for ANO as voters were clearly displeased with the political situation and showed to have trusted non-political government the most. ANO could then mobilize voters on the basis of no affiliation with any party responsible for the scandals and crisis. Movement’s leader Babiš issued a letter containing criticism of system corruption and established parties calling for building a prosperous state once again which led into creating a new movement- ANO- Action of Dissatisfied Citizens which later became the political movement ANO 2011. Second of all, the overall situation prepared perfect conditions for ANO to gain the protest votes since the movement was formed just in time were voters’ distrust and uncertainty was the greatest. In October 2013 just couple of days prior to the elections, 21% of respondents stated they were not sure which party to vote for (CVVM 2013b). Babiš and ANO could have benefited from great mobility, political distrust, and frustration.

If we concentrate on voters’ confidence in political parties, it is visible that the distrust has been overall very high in the last eight years. In 2012 87% of respondents agreed to the statement that “Political parties are corrupt” which is noticeably higher than 54% in 2003. The proportion of those who think that ”Political parties care about what people think only during elections” stayed more or less the same around 80% in the last decade. The increase in distrust is visible in case of the statement: “Political parties care solely about benefits and interests of their members” with which 64% agreed in 2003, however 81% in 2013. What follows is that a long-term trend showing people’s distrust exists. More voters are confident that political parties are corrupt (the percentage increased by 33% in 2003-2012) and care about people just prior to the elections.

\textsuperscript{22} Organized Crime Investigation Office
Table No.4 Trust in political parties, 2003-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Agree/disagree</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties are corrupt</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties care about what people think only during the elections</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political parties care solely about benefits and interests of their members</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.1.4 Voter turnout

Voter turnout has been decreasing constantly worldwide. Especially in the post-communist countries the trend has been much more visible than in western countries (e.g. Tucker 2009), not excepting the Czech Republic. In the first democratic elections whopping 97% of people came to vote. In the following elections the number dropped to 85% and the trend followed in the rest of the 90s. In 2002, no more than 58% of people used their right to vote and the overall turnout in parliamentary elections decreased by 16%. In the last ten years voter turnout has not even reached 65% meaning that “every third citizen with right to vote has not come to elections”23 (Linek 2013: 17).

Graph No.8 Voter turnout in parliamentary elections, 1990-2013

Source: Author, data: volby.cz.

The exceptionally high turnout in the first democratic elections might be explained as the “big boom” when things were finally changing and people had high hopes for the future.

---

23 If we compare the numbers with other types of elections the decreasing tendency cannot be confirmed yet only a small number of voters attend these elections.
In this “transition period” (e.g. O’Donnel and Schmitter 1986) elections which resulted in establishing a new order took place. Soon after the turnout began to drop as the enthusiasm from too great expectations was to fade away. If we add deteriorated economic conditions, corruption, and general discontent voters’ uncertainty was at its highest (Linek 2013: 21).

From Linek’s analysis the decrease in voter turnout in the Czech general elections cannot be explained by the generational exchange, and explanations based on voters’ motivation and mobilization are in place. Even though the percentage of the youngest generation (that is less likely to attend elections) is reducing and the number of people with higher education is increasing, the voter turnout is still from some reason decreasing albeit it should be the opposite (Linek 2013: 230). The decrease in voter turnout in the period of 1990-2010 was caused especially by two factors regarding the motivation: valence and lack of meaningfulness of voting (Linek 2013: 239). According to Linek’s findings there was a tendency towards negative ratings of incumbents at the beginning of the 21st century compared to those ratings in 1990s. People’s negative valence of political parties was caused by general distrust and discontent with their performance. What is more, gradually more voters claimed that there is no point in voting and the elections became somewhat meaningless. If we look at the results in particular years it shows that in 2002 the decrease in voter turnout was caused predominantly by the decrease in normative motivation (the meaningfulness of voting) (Linek 2013: 267). This might be connected with “opposition agreement” (opoziční smlouva) between the two biggest parties ČSSD and ODS. Klaus (ODS) and Zeman (ČSSD) agreed to cooperate after the 1998 elections despite claiming the opposite throughout the campaigns. This led to ČSSD creating minority government and successfully holding the office till 2002 with ODS tolerating it. Such course of actions might have left voters feeling that there is no point in choosing either of parties if they cannot influence the end result. On the other hand, in 2006 and 2010 the decrease in voter turnout was connected with the decline in voters positively rating political parties (Linek 2013: 267). People’s distrust and uncertainty was at its highest point as they could not choose anyone who they would want to govern. This created perfect conditions for new parties to distinguish themselves from those “old” established ones and offer a new way of governing. In 2010 VV and TOP 09 benefited from those uncertain conditions and in 2013 it was ANO that used open niches to its profit. Also, election results show that it was ANO that gained the most voters who did not participate in 2010 elections (Gregor 2014: 207).
5.1.5 Summary

To conclude, so far we have seen that at the time of ANO’s electoral breakthrough new favorable opportunity structures were created. Old established parties continued to lose preferences as new parties entered the Parliament. The position of historical parties has been weakened which created breeding ground for new parties such as ANO to mobilize the voters. As the consequence of the dealignment process voters’ preferences have changed significantly in 2010 and the percentage of people who have voted for the same party in follow-up elections continued to drop thus the bond between political parties and voters started to weaken. What is more, the results from post-election surveys showed that the number of people with no party identification has remained quite high during the last decade.

Other variables showed that parties have constantly been losing their members. This was caused predominantly by anti-party atmosphere in the society. Numbers show that voters have been discontent with the performance of political parties and feel that parties care solely about their votes. Old established parties have been in crisis – they have been constantly losing their members due to voters’ distrust and protest characteristics of the last two general elections. The anti-party atmosphere created perfect conditions for ANO to rise. ANO presented itself as a movement, not a party, strongly distinguishing itself from established parties, offering a new way of doing politics.

Since 2007 a decreasing trend in satisfaction with how democracy works has been visible in states of the European Union including the Czech Republic. Apart from trust in democracy the overall confidence in political institutions has been decreasing as well. The level of trust has been quite low anyway as the result of decades under non-democratic communist rule and has not much increased after the transformation either. The only exception is presented by President as historically the most trusted institution (we showed his rare position compared to other post-communist countries). This chapter also showed that people trusted the apolitical government the most and their confidence decreased in times of political scandals (especially connected with PM Nečas). The last part of the chapter showed that voter turnout in parliamentary elections has been decreasing. This is connected especially with two factors - valence and lack of meaningfulness of voting as many voters have grown to trust political parties less and claimed that the elections became somewhat meaningless.

It is visible how these developments had destabilizing effect on the party system and facilitated the rise for ANO. ANO could mobilize voters claiming to have nothing in common
with those political parties responsible for the scandals and crisis. Second of all, the overall situation prepared perfect conditions for ANO to gain the protest votes since the movement was formed just in time when voters’ distrust and uncertainty was the greatest.
5.3 THE DEGREE OF CONVERGENCE IN POLITICAL SPACE

The convergence in political space took place from 2002 onwards where the ideological difference of observed parties (with ODS being most right and KSČM most left) was the highest compared to other years (54.5 points). Since then, the difference has decreased and maintained it position around 40 points as the parties tend to move closer to each other except for anti-system KSČM which is the only party that has continued to grow towards left. If we look at the first “protest” elections from 2010, it is clear that parties’ position on the right-left scale was quite close. The range between the most left and the most right party is “just” 39 points on this scale out of 100 (ODS being the most right and KSČM most left) which says that all relevant Czech parties were according to their manifestos in 2010 quite moderate. Their manifestos are thus issues-balanced as the parties try to aim at the median voter. This seems quite logical and “normal” as they opt for balanced mix to address great variety of voters. However, it must be stressed that these findings might explain parties’ position in case of values they would like to stand for rather than the nature of their pre-election promises (Eibl 2010: 85).

If we go back to the theoretical park of this thesis, it was stated that convergence is when policies of two or more of the major mainstream parties approach each other. Bearing that in mind, position of the biggest mainstream parties- ODS and ČSSD is of our interest. Up to recently, the Czech party system was a “rare” and “malformed” type of open party system (e.g. Strmiska et al. 2005) with big ideological distance between two main parties ODS and ČSSD. The existence of anti-system KSČM and such a distance between the two poles made it impossible to characterize the system as moderate or polarized pluralism. However, the 2010 elections changed the situation quite significantly. According to the data from the Manifesto project, it is visible that ODS and ČSSD have moved closer to each other in years 2006-2010. In 2002 the difference between their positions reached 50.21 points whereas in 2010 it has decreased by 28.36 points to 21.85. However, in 2013 their distance grew back and reached 32.66 points. This might be connected with a long-lasting problem in case of ODS. After several scandals (see the previous chapter) the party has found itself in crisis. It has lost 15.58% in the 2010 elections compared to its historically best result in 2006 and continued to weaken (volby.cz). In its campaign ODS tried to restore its impaired legitimacy by using twitter hashtags #VoteForTheRight, yet due to lack of clarity of these billboards (firstly, they appeared without the logo of ODS) and due to lack of twitter popularity among Czech voters, the attempt to restore itself as the biggest right-wing party was not
accomplished, resulting in only 7.72% in the 2013 elections (volby.cz). Although according to CMP data ODS shifted to the center in 2013 compared with 2010, it might be connected with ČSSD shifting to the left.

Table No.5 Right-Left Position, 1996-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>30.28</td>
<td>40.04</td>
<td>20.79</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSSD</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-10.18</td>
<td>-12.58</td>
<td>-10.66</td>
<td>-26.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSČM</td>
<td>-3.40</td>
<td>-9.44</td>
<td>-14.51</td>
<td>-22.18</td>
<td>-28.36</td>
<td>-34.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDU-ČSL</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>-6.11</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-23.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>39.72</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>39.55</td>
<td>41.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, data CMP
Note: -100= total left; 100=total right

Graph No.9 Right-Left Position, 1996-2013

Apart from their similar position on right-left scale, converge on particular matters and taking similar stand on the most important political issues is also of our interest. As suggested by the Comparative Manifesto Project, the analysis should be completed with parties’ positions on three main areas- Economy (Planned and Market) and Welfare, and how often where these mentioned in the manifestos. These numbers show a little bit different results than just comparing the right-left position. Here it is clear that the main parties were not in total agreement in these conflict issues (Table No.6). In case of market economy, right parties such as ODS and TOP 09 were accenting the need of free market. Whereas left parties’ manifestos traditionally contained more sentences about maintaining or extending social system services. Expectedly, KSČM’s manifestos contained the most information regarding
the need of planned economy and the least sentences about market economy (zero in 2010). These findings could be supported by the results of Eibl’s research (Eibl 2010) of the 2010 elections where he carried out qualitative, in-depth analysis of particular manifestos. Even though the numbers from right-scale position suggest convergence of the mainstream parties, their position on conflict and in-media-accented issues quite differed as explained above. However, parties’ positions were surprisingly almost identical in case of other not exposed issues (Eibl 2010: 94-95).

Table No.6 Parties’ position in main areas, 2002-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PlanEco</th>
<th>Markeco</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>PlanEco</th>
<th>Markeco</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>PlanEco</th>
<th>Markeco</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>8.079</td>
<td>4.668</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>6.442</td>
<td>8.492</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>6.270</td>
<td>7.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSČM</td>
<td>5.594</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>12.413</td>
<td>9.178</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>22.180</td>
<td>9.455</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>17.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDU-ČSL</td>
<td>2.026</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td>8.103</td>
<td>3.097</td>
<td>1.511</td>
<td>9.592</td>
<td>5.802</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>8.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZ</td>
<td>7.077</td>
<td>2.338</td>
<td>9.723</td>
<td>7.311</td>
<td>2.554</td>
<td>10.966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.987</td>
<td>6.858</td>
<td>6.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.677</td>
<td>3.559</td>
<td>6.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>5,919</td>
<td>7,637</td>
<td>15,244</td>
<td>8,519</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>13,688</td>
<td>8,661</td>
<td>6,858</td>
<td>11,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, data CMP

Note: The number is the share of favorable mentions of the issues stated.

If we look separately at the 2013 elections, it can be observed that the position between the party on the total left and total right remained similar compared to 2010, exactly 41.338 points (Table No.7). In case of particular issues, the range between the most favorable mentions of issues remained very similar in 2013 compared to 2010 in all three issues, in case of welfare state the difference between parties is even decreasing. Moreover, we can compare the results by proposing three categories- right (ODS, TOP 09); left (KSČM, ČSSD); and center (KDU-ČSL, SZ, ANO) (Graph No.10). The biggest difference is seen in terms of market economy, yet the proportional favorable mentions in parties’ manifestos of the observed issues are of similar values.

It is believed that it takes at least three follow-up elections to prove a particular trend so it is not overestimated to say that generally, mainstream parties’ manifestos do not longer offer antagonistic ideas. Rather they reflect voters’ vision of prosperous, functional, safe, and anti-corrupt state. Since the vision is somewhat similar, they only differ in offered solutions and means to secure this functional state (Eibl 2014: 23). These findings based on CMP data can be supported again by Eibl’s research. He carried out similar analysis in the 2013 elections as in previous ones (also based on CMP method. However, he worked only with
sentences, not quasi sentences, limiting them to 7 categories; see Eibl 2014) and found out from both quantitative and qualitative analysis that parties tend to assimilate their manifestos, and in some cases the concordance rate of their manifestos exceeds 70%.

**Table No.7 Parties´ position in main areas. 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planned Economy</th>
<th>Market Economy</th>
<th>Welfare State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODS</td>
<td>8,221</td>
<td>6,376</td>
<td>9,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSSD</td>
<td>6,512</td>
<td>0,233</td>
<td>16,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSČM</td>
<td>13,910</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>17,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDU-ČSL</td>
<td>11,078</td>
<td>0,898</td>
<td>11,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZ</td>
<td>11,964</td>
<td>0,677</td>
<td>16,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP 09</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>4,682</td>
<td>11,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>6,077</td>
<td>0,967</td>
<td>8,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,893</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,376</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,591</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author, data CMP*

*Note: The number is the share of favorable mentions of the issues stated.*

**Graph No.10 Parties´ position in main areas (Left-Center-Right). 2013**

*Source: Author, data CMP*

*Note: The number is the share of favorable mentions of the issues stated.*

To conclude, the convergence took place before the rise of ANO 2011 which was explained in both right-left orientation observed in case of parties´ manifestos as in case of particular issues. It can be stated that the main parties are really somewhat moving together and incorporating many different issues in their manifestos in order to aim at the median
voter. Big parties tend to offer the same service as small parties stating to be able to enforce such services due to their power (Eibl 2010: 96). From the Table No.6 it seems that all mainstream parties have shifted to the left regarding values they stand for represented in their manifests. While the convergence might have created a favorable opportunity for new parties such as ANO, the crisis on the Right was as much important in explaining ANO’s success. ODS, as historically the biggest party on the right, has suffered a loss in last two elections, and has found itself in personal and political crisis, which was the consequence of government scandals. If we add personal crisis of Public Affairs and damaged reputation of TOP 09 as part of this non-functional cabinet, it created a vacant niche for ANO 2011 to become the new trustworthy political option on the Right.
5.4 THE DEGREE OF CLOSURE OR OPENNESS OF POLITICAL SYSTEM

The Czech Republic has a bicameral Parliament consisting of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate. In the Chamber of Deputies 200 members are elected through proportional representation system which is relatively open despite the 5 per cent threshold (Ústava ČR, odd. 2). In addition, each elector is allowed to cast four preferential votes to individual candidates on the list of the voted party. There are 14 multi-member constituencies and mandates are distributed according to the D’Hondt formula to those lists that overcome the five per cent threshold nationally (Zákon č. 247/1995 Sb.).

There was an attempt in 2008 by then PM Topolánek to change the voting system so that the result from 2006 would not happen again. In the 2006 elections no party block had gained the majority and the legislation organ was struck down. The proposals wanted to make the system more proportional and to secure a bonus for a winner party in case of mandates cast in the second vote count (e.g. Charvát 2009). However, these attempts were unsuccessful and no changes were made.

As the threshold was the same since 2006 and the number of districts was already limited to 14 in 2002, the rise of ANO could not be considered the consequence of changes in the mechanical effect according to principles identified by Duverger (see chapter 2). Although polling agencies had put ANO into the “other” category, containing parties that did not reach 2%, after the announcement the movement would run in the elections, the psychological effect, that makes people feel that their vote for a small party is wasted one, was not of an obstacle for ANO as it was scoring from 11.60% (Sanep) to 16.90% (Médea) in the polls just prior to the elections.

Regarding the effect of voting system, proportional representation increases the possibilities of small political parties to enter the parliament. However, Czech variant of proportional representation favors bigger parties to the prejudice of small parties, especially in smaller districts where they sometimes do not gain even 1 mandate if they do not score over 10% (Navrátil 2013). The current voting system leads to the overrepresentation of big parties, in case of the 2013 elections two biggest parties to the prejudice of three smallest parties.

24 The threshold is 10% in case of a coalition of two parties, 15% for a coalition of three parties, and 20% for a coalition of four or more parties.
25 The number of preference votes that voters are allowed to cast was increased back to four, where it had been before 2000 (Renwick).
According to the advantage ratio (AR) ANO 2011 was the most overrepresented party in the 2013 elections. To gain one mandate the movement needed 19 729 votes compared to the weakest party The Dawn that needed 24 453 votes (Šedo 2014: 292-293). The possibility to cast preferences, even though Czech voters generally do not make use of these preferences as often, did not influence ANO’s electoral breakthrough as its voters were among those who used this possibility the least. Only 10.5% of deputies (which is only five mandates) got elected due to preference voting (Kneblová 2014: 257). It can be therefore concluded that the effects of the voting system were not particularly fundamental in explaining ANO’s overall success.
5.5 COLLABORATION WITH MAINSTREAM PARTIES

Collaboration with mainstream parties could be either beneficial or deadly for new anti-establishment parties. In the latter case, the cooperation with mainstream actors could be seen as party’s alienation of its anti-establishment principles. However, if the mainstream parties show support for a newly emerging party, it may make it legitimate in voters’ eyes, especially in case of future coalitions. This is particularly important for Czech voter as Czech governments have been all coalitions except for the minority government of ČSSD tolerated by ODS and secured by the opposition agreement in 2002.

The initial reaction of mainstream parties to the rise of ANO 2011 was definitely negative. At first, total refusal as mainstream parties did not attach big importance to this initiative. Similarly, polling agencies did not see the movement as much important either, neglecting it in their polls till the elections were approaching. However, as the elections were coming closer, established parties showed perhaps wariness of what the movement could bring. Generally, almost all mainstream parties could not imagine cooperating with ANO in case of its possible success. The right-wing parties were among first to declare possible collaboration in September 2013. The then leader of ODS, Němcová, refused the possibility of even cooperating not to talk about common coalition with ANO. She labeled the movement and other new subjects as “non-systematic parties that violate democratic principles” (Novinky.cz 2013b). The vice-chairman of TOP 09, Ženíšek, went even further and stated that he could not imagine working together with the movement in a coalition as its chairman was a “communist informer” (Novinky.cz 2013c). The biggest party on the left, ČSSD did not use such harsh language although its leader Sobotka admitted that the movement’s manifesto was not clearly defined and that his party is generally cautious in case of cooperation with “disposable” movements. However, Sobotka concluded that ČSSD would hold talks with any party that would get elected (Novinky.cz 2013d). KSČM also showed disapproval of the movement’s non-transparency. Basically, KDU-ČSL was the only party that did not categorically refuse to hold talks with Babiš and its movement.

For ANO, the cooperation with mainstream parties was out of option at the beginning. The movement clearly declared its anti-establishment position by voicing its opposition attitude. Its leader, Babiš stated that he had not wanted to govern; rather he saw his movement

---

26 In 2013 Babiš was accused of collaborating with StB during the communist regime in Czechoslovakia by the Nation's Memory Institute in Slovakia. He denied the accusations and sued the Institute. In 2014 the court ruled that Babiš was registered as an agent wrongfully (lidovky.cz 2015).
in the opposition. Similar statements were issued by the vice-chairman Jourová or Stropnický saying they would rather prefer to stay in the opposition and tolerate the government than to join the cabinet (rozhlas.cz 2013). However, as the elections were approaching, the movement started to slightly change its rhetoric. Suddenly, statements confirming possible collaboration appeared. Right after the elections Babiš claimed that it was not in his interest to start holding talks, yet the whole movement was about to discuss it. Finally, after quite long negotiations and with crisis in ČSSD leadership overcome, the talks led to creating a new coalition government consisted of ČSSD, ANO, and KDU-ČSL.

ANO 2011 was likely to benefit from other parties’ initial refusal. The mainstream parties could not imagine cooperating with such anti-establishment player which probably even strengthened its position in the political arena. Since voters were dissatisfied with established parties and the way politics was conducted, they might have found it easier to trust the movement as basically all the mainstream parties were opposing it, thus creating the feeling that Babiš and his movement was different, perhaps “better”. It is now too soon to assess whether ANO joining the cabinet have shed negative light on the movement and its anti-establishment appeal. To push through particular issues and measurements it is sometimes necessary to cooperate with other parties as well. For ANO, it will be crucial to maintain this fine line between being effective policy wise and not betraying its anti-establishment origins or the voters might be left disappointed once again.
5.6 CRISIS

5.6.1 Crisis identified

Following the theoretical part of this thesis, the issues that were most salinized by ANO were the corruption in public administration, dissatisfaction with mainstream politics and a long-term economic recession which can be generally identified as a crisis. In order to create the feeling of failure, AEP must identify the displays of the crisis. Prior to the elections, ANO had been mainly criticizing the **state of public finances** and **business environment**.

According to ANO, our country is in a huge debt because the public administration is inefficient: “*The country is not economical.*”27 (ANO.2013d). Before declaring to stand for the elections, Babiš compared the Czech Republic to a company which had been running its business inefficiently: “*The Czech Republic is a company (…), company in a crisis.*”28 (iDnes.cz 2011). Babiš claims that it did not have to be that way. The Czech Republic could have been a prosperous country like Germany or Austria with visions and goals: “*Our country was not in debt, on the contrary others used to own us.*”29 (ANO.2013a). However, it does not apply today. According to Babiš, the current state of public finances has reached such point that bankruptcy might be inevitable: “*And a current goal? Perhaps not to go bankrupt.*”30 (Babiš 2012). The budget deficit is still increasing and the debt reached more than 1 500 billion crowns. “*Our original property has decreased significantly and is being systematically stolen.*”31 (Výzva ANO 2011). This inefficiency of public administration is according to Babiš connected with the incapability of state to collect taxes:

> “If it is not possible to save more (the Government is incapable to do it), more money must be collected. Yet even this is beyond the capability of government. Therefore the government does the easiest thing- it raises taxes.”32 (Babiš 2012b)

Also, frequent changes in the tax system are not efficient either according to ANO. In the departmental manifesto its objective is to stop such changes that make life for entrepreneurs more difficult (ANO.2013d). This issue was previously addressed by

---

27 “Stát není dobrý hospodář.”
28 “Česko je firma (…), firma v krizi.”
29 “Naše země nebyvala zadlužená, naopak jiní dlužili nám.”
30 “A dnešní cíl? Zřejmě abychom jako stát nezkrachovali.”
31 “Náš původní majetek se výrazně zmenšil a je nadále systematicky rozkrádán.”
32 „Když není jak ušetřit (vláda to neumí), musí se víc vybrat. Jenže to vláda také neumí. Pomáhá si tedy nejjednodušejí, jak to jde- zvyšováním daní.”
Babiš himself in his blog where he explains how the state is ineffective and unfair to self-employed people and small and medium-sized enterprises. Therefore those people are forced to get around laws and levies on social and health insurance:

“Taxes are collected from people who cannot defend themselves (employees with average or below-average earnings). They are collected from just a small amount of enterprises who do not seek to get around the revenue authority by having their company based abroad (...)” (Babiš 2012c).

“However, many self-employed people are put into such situation (VAT is constantly being raised and changed, prices of propellant are raising, levies are being raised) that they try to get around the tax laws and offices in any way necessary.” (Babiš 2012c).

ANO has dealt with questions regarding small and medium-sized businesses repeatedly and it is one the main objectives in its manifesto to improve the conditions for entrepreneurs. Babiš claims that small enterprises are typical for the Czech Republic and “make up more than 95% of all enterprises.” (Babiš 2013). They thus create a backbone of Czech industry and are vital to our economy. If it were to raise taxes, Babiš fears that businesses would have to close down and the unemployment would increase:

"If the next government raises taxes for enterprises and self-employed people, those small Czech businesses on which the economy and employment depends today, will have to dismiss employees and close down." (Babiš 2012c).

Unemployment was also one the main issues that ANO stressed in its manifesto (in several articles such as unemployment in culture, sport, etc). In its manifesto, ANO makes an appeal to the need to deal with unemployment and help enterprises and self-employed people not to be afraid to work and invest: “Unemployment is by far the highest in recent years. (...)

---

33 „Daně se totiž vybírají jen od lidí, kteří se nemohou a nechtějí bránit (zaměstnanci s průměrnými a podprůměrnými platy), vybírá se jen od několika podnikatelů, kteří se nesnaží obejít finanční úřady parkováním svých firem v zahraničí (...)“

34 „Valná část živnostníků se ale v situaci, kterou jim naše vlády nastolují (zvyšující se a neustále měnící výše DPH, zvyšující se ceny pohonných hmot, zvyšující se odvody na zdravotní a sociální pojištění), snaží úřady a daňové zákony obejít, seč mohou."

35 „Zvýší-li příští vláda daně firmám a živnostníkům, budou české malé firmy, tedy ty, na kterých dnešní ekonomika a zaměstnanost v Česku stojí, postupně propouštět a zavírat provozy.“
Employees must not be afraid for their positions and businessmen must not be afraid for their investments” (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013a)

Czech economy is therefore stagnating and not reaching its full potential as: “today’s state is bothering people and imposes new and new duties, rather than to serve the people, and exacts these duties on those who cannot defend themselves.” (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013a). ANO also stresses the historical success of the Czech businessmen as Baťa or Škoda who used to elevate the country’s economy: “During the first Republic, we used be one of the most prosperous industrial countries in the world. Names like Baťa, Škoda, Křižík, or Kolben and Daněk resonated worldwide.” (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013d) However, this does not apply nowadays. According to ANO, former governments have not secured such conditions for Czech business to thrive and systematic inefficiency in public administration caused the economic crisis. ANO therefore call for a change:

“It is time to create favorable conditions so that the industry can evolve once again and so that our country reaches the top quantity-wise and quality-wise again.” (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013d)

5.6.2 The root of the crisis

Now as the failure was identified, the cause of the crisis must be found and articulated. ANO used its anti-establishment appeal to blame incompetent politicians for the crisis. The root of the problem is according to ANO the system corruption and corrupt elites.

Contrary to other issues, corruption is a valence topic (i.e. the one about which voters share the same preference). It is therefore very unlikely to have a party which would not be against corruption per se. AEPs must therefore stress their competence “to achieve the things that everyone agrees need to be done (i.e. fight corruption) and accordingly accuse the opponents for incompetence and for being corrupt” (Bågenholm 2011: 8). ANO definitely used its newness and having nothing to do with corrupt elites to emphasize the need to tackle corruption and mobilized voters by blaming the mainstream politicians. Corruption is

36 „Nezaměstnaných je nejvíc v historii naší země. Tisíce lidí žijí v obavě o práci, o zajištění sebe a své rodiny. To vše přispívá k obrovskému napětí ve společnosti. Zaměstnanci se nesmějí bát o svoji práci, podnikatelé se nesmějí bát o své investice.“
37 „Dnešní stát, místo aby lidem sloužil, lídří otravuje, uvaluje na všechny nové a nové povinnosti, které pak vymáhá jen po těch, kteří se nemohou bránit.“
38 „Za první republiky jsme byli jednou z nejvyspělejších průmyslových zemí světa. Jména jako Baťa, Škoda, Křižík nebo Kolben a Daněk měla světový zvuk.“
39 „Je na čase vytvořit předpoklady k tomu, aby průmysl mohl opět rozvinout své možnosti a země se vrátila mezi špičku nejen v kvantitě, ale i kvalitě.“
mentioned several times in ANO’s manifesto as well as in personal blog of its leader Babiš where he writes: “Our country really needs to get a grip on system corruption and tackle the godfathers.”

It is broadly acknowledged that corruption has a negative effect on economy and society and the transformation in the CEE region has definitely created opportunities for corruption to flourish. As Jordan (2002) claims: “corruption was endemic to the Communist system of the Soviet bloc prior to its collapse in 1989, and Czechoslovakia was no exception. In the postcommunist Czech Republic, corruption remains a deeply rooted problem.” So what do we mean by corruption? According to Transparency International “corruption is the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. It can be classified as grand, petty and political, depending on the amounts of money lost and the sector where it occurs.” (Transparency.org)

Since corruption in the Czech Republic is perceived as a serious problem, a special board of government for tackling corruption was founded. The board defines corruption as “a transaction between two parties. One side offers or demands undue advantage for decisions on matters of public interest.” (korupce.cz 2011) While corruption can occur on many levels (see e.g. Lízal and Kočenda 2001), voters are most influenced and mobilized on the basis of government and parliament scandals as other types of corruption might not be known to the general public. Although governments have repeatedly declared to fight corruption, both ODS and ČSSD as the two major parties could not be seen as credible as they were in the past “under investigation for use of illegal funds, misuse of economic information and tax evasion” (Lízal and Kočenda 2001: 143). From the recent bribery scandals, the Rath’s case captured the attention of public and media. Rath, then governor of Central Bohemian region and member of the Parliament (ČSSD), was arrested in 2008 “in a police sting operation while carrying a box stuffed with seven million (crowns)” (wsj.com 2012) and later charged with receiving bribes. Or the case of Prague’s powerful godfather Janoušek. The seriousness of these corruption scandals are demonstrated by the interest of foreign newspapers. The Wall Street Journal reported:

“Leading daily newspaper Mlada Fronta published transcripts of what it said were secretly recorded phone conversations between Mr. Janousek and the then mayor of Prague, Pavel

---

40 „Naše země hlavně potřebuje vystoupit z kmotrovského sevření systémové korupce.“
41 „Korupce je transakce zpravidla mezi dvěma stranami. Jedna strana nabízí nebo poptává neoprávněnou výhodu za rozhodování ve věcech obecného zájmu.“
The seriousness of corruption can be supported by public opinion polls. Looking at the survey done by Eurobarometer in September 2011, the majority of respondents from all EU countries thought that corruption was a serious problem (90% in the Czech Republic). What is more, 70% of respondents from the Czech Republic thought that the level of corruption had increased. Also the majority of all EU countries agreed that their governments were inefficient in fighting corruption, 87% of Czech respondents thought that those efforts were ineffective and 72% thought that EU does not help either (Eurobarometer 2011). These beliefs can be supported by the Transparency International’s annual corruption perception index (CPI). As Hanley and Sikk (2013: 9) states: “although CPI is often criticized as poorly reflecting ‘real’ levels of corruption, it is arguably a meaningful measure of the type of public concerns we wish to highlight.” In 2013 the Czech Republic scored 48 points and ranked on the 57th place worldwide sharing the place with e.g. Bahrain (Transparency.org 2013). Even though this index might be criticized, it shows the importance and seriousness of tackling corruption expressed by voters’ dissatisfaction.

Corruption is usually linked to organized crime, which is the belief of 82% of Czech respondents. Although 88% of Czech respondents thought that corruption is part of Czech business culture, the Czech Republic was the only country of all 27 member states where the majority disagreed that corruption was unavoidable and had always existed (Eurobarometer 2011). This proves that even though Czech voters might feel that corruption has become a normal part of everyday politics, they still believe it can be tackled. ANO thus definitely benefited from this open niche in the political arena and could mobilize voters by offering new solutions.

For any protest party it is vital not only to identify who is responsible for the crisis but also to “set them against the people” (Moffitt 214: 13) It is also often much easier for AEP to declare who they are not rather then who they are (Taggart 2000: 94). It gives them objective reasons to target the enemy. ANO thinks that the crisis was caused by the incompetence of political elites rather than their immoral intensions. ANO wanted to point out that offices and political institutions are run by people lacking experience or competence. Such statements appeared on official slogans and billboards: “We are a competent nation. The only problem is
that we are governed by duffers."^{42} (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013) or "Our country needs experts. 
Hire us."^{43} (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013) ANO therefore presented itself as a competent movement to fight the system corruption and substitute incompetent elites who lack both expertise and experience.

### 5.6.3 The guilty party

As the root of the problem lies in incompetence, someone has to be specifically made responsible for the failure. ANO made it clear that the culprit of the crisis does exist and it is not just no-name figures: "(our country) was not being embezzled by godfathers whom nobody knows as they hide themselves behind incompetent politicians."^{44} (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013a) Babiš has repeatedly stated that it did not matter who was running the country, ČSSD, ODS, or others, all the mainstream parties were to be blame: "ODS and ČSSD are not possible to reform and are paralyzed"^{45} (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013e) or

"ODS, ČSSD, TOP 09, VV, KSČM and other post-communist parties have primary responsibility for total disintegration. Their failure is what threatens democracy in our country."^{46} (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013e)

However, he spared no criticism for the previous government ODS-TOP 09-LIDEM either: "We have a Prime Minister without its own judgement."^{47} (Babiš 2012d) or "Non-operational Nečas’s government is harmful to Czech economy."^{48} (Babiš 2013) As a consequence ANO demanded for the government to resign and call snap elections:

"The existence of Petr Nečas’s government, who changes his decisions every week, makes no longer any sense, not to mention voters ‘confidence. Prime Minister should draw consequences from his personal politics."^{49} (AnoBudeLip.cz 2012)

---

42 „Jsme schopný národ, jen nás řídí nemehla.“
43 „Naše země potřebuje zkušené. Najměte si nás.“
44 „Naše země nebyvala zadlužená (…). Nebyla systematicky rozkrádána bezjmennými kmotrovskými uskupeními a těmi, jejichž jména nikdo ani nezná a kteří se kryjí tvářemi neschopných politiků.“
45 „ODS a ČSSD jsou nereformovatelné a paralyzované.“
46 „ODS, ČSSD, TOP 09, VV, KSČM a ostatní polistopadové strany nesou hlavní díl odpovědnosti za totální rozklad. To, co ohrožuje demokracii v naší zemi nejvíce je právě jejich selhání.
47 „Máme premiéra bez vlastního úsudku.“
48 „Neakceschopná Nečasova vláda české ekonomice škodí.“
49 „Existence kabinetu Petra Nečase, který mění svá rozhodnutí každý týden, přestává dávat jakýkoli smysl, o důvěře občanů v tuto vládu ani nemluvě. Premiér by měl ze své personální politiky vyvodit zásadní důsledky.“
The crisis was not solely caused by the mainstream parties, ANO imputed blame to influential godfathers who run their business behind-the-scenes. Moreover, Babiš claims that the whole politics is run by a system in which every godfather controls their politician and that their influence is so big that they directly influence all actions:

“Their system has been refined to such perfection that it is run by behind-the-scenes groups and godfathers. A godfather has their own politician whom he helps to the office and the politician rewards the godfather with a government contract.”

To sum up, ANO has blamed the established mainstream parties for the economic and political crisis that has shown itself in a form of alarming state of public finances and unfair business environment caused by the system corruption and politicians’ incompetence to solve it. All in all, ANO placed the blame on all parties even though in some cases, the movement distinguished the competent ones from the corrupt ones: “It is fair to say that even among current parliament members are those who are capable and honest.”

Yet such statements were unique and the movement generally denounced the whole political elite differing just in their share of guilt. Those parties and individuals who were engaged in the corruption scandals were from obvious reasons under ANO’s criticism the most.

5.6.4 Solutions presented

Once the crisis was analyzed, ANO took advantage of that open niche and provided voters with solutions to fulfill the demand with its supply. According to ANO, personnel changes as well as system changes needed to take place. Initially, in the open letter to public-Výzva ANO 2011, Babiš made an appeal to all people to join the initiative and suggest how and who should make these changes:

“That is why I call upon all of you to join the ANO 2011 initiative and present your ideas how our public administrative and economy should work, and propose trustworthy and respected individuals (...) who should put this project into practice.”

50 „Jejich systém zde byl doveden k takové dokonalosti, že ho ovládá pár zákulisních skupin a kmotrů. Kmotr má svého politika, kterému pomůže do funkce, politik se odvděčí tím, že pak svému kmotroví nebo jeho spřízněné firmy přihraje státní zakázku.“
51 „Je poctivé přiznat, že I mezi stávajícími poslanci a senátory jsou schopní a slušní lidé.“
52 „Proto vás všechny vyzývám, abyste se zapojili do naší iniciativy ANO 2011 a předložili svoje představy, jak by měla naše veřejná správa a ekonomika fungovat, a navrhnulí důvěryhodné a uznávané osobnosti (...), které by měly tento projekt realizovat.“
Following its anti-establishment rhetoric, ANO continued to show its competence to offer these professionals unlike the established parties: “The movement ANO calls for a different kind of politicians. It offers people who have achieved something.”\(^53\) (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013a) and to tackle the corrupt elites as well: “We will support the creation of a specialized Anticorruption Office at the Supreme Public Prosecutor's Office.”\(^54\) (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013d)

Regarding the rectification of public administration, Babiš wanted to carry through the idea of running state as a firm: “The Czech Republic is a company with 10 million stakeholders. It is a company in debt, with bad management who steals.”\(^55\) (Aktualne.cz 2012c) He went on to criticize the current state of governing even more: “There should be politicians in the Parliament and managers in the Government.”\(^56\) (Aktualne.cz 2012c) The Czech Republic is according to Babiš lacking visions or aims. Moreover, no real strategy exists and the state is ineffective as everything is being adjusted according to whom governs: “(everything) stumbles based on who is currently in power and whoever from the godfathers is being politically protected.”\(^57\) (Babiš 2012a) After strongly distinguishing from non-functional, ineffective former governments, Babiš proposed how he thinks the country should be governed: “My vision is that this state must immediately finish building transport infrastructure and present an investment plan to kick-start the economy.”\(^58\) (Aktualne.cz 2012c) A part of the plan to kick-start the economy and run the state as a business is to “streamline the tax system” that makes life for entrepreneurs so complicated, “reduce administrative burdens and bureaucratic obstacle” to enforce only those laws that make life for people easier, and “ensure efficient use of all European subsidies” \(^59\) (AnoBudeLip.cz 2013d)

\(^{53}\) "Hnutí ANO požaduje zcela jinou kvalitu politiků. Nabízí proto lidi, kteří něco dokázali.“

\(^{54}\) "Podpoříme vznik specializovaného protikorupčního úřadu při Vrchním státním zastupitelství.“

\(^{55}\) “Jednoznačně. Česká republika je firma, která má deset milionů akcionářů. Je to zadlužená firma, s blbým managementem, který ještě krade.”

\(^{56}\) “V parlamentu mají být politici a ve vládě manažéři.“

\(^{57}\) “Klopýtá podle toho, kdo je zrovna u moci, podle toho která kmotrovská klika má zrovna politické hnutí.“

\(^{58}\) “Moje víze je, že tento stát musí okamžitě dobudovat dopravní infrastrukturu a předložit investiční plán, aby nastartoval ekonomiku.“

\(^{59}\) “ANO zpřehlednění současného komplikovaného systému daňových výjmek. ANO výrazněmu snížení administrativní zátěže a byrokratických překážek; Zajistíme efektivnější využití veškerých evropských dotací.“
6. THE 2013 GENERAL ELECTIONS

The case of ANO 2011 matches well the previously mentioned notion that anti-establishment parties “have the potential to reach overnight electoral breakthrough”. If we focus on pre-election polls, rapid growth in preferences towards the end of September 2013 can be seen. ANO started its campaign in late June with its leader Babiš appearing on billboards across the country. These were, however, meant for regular elections which were set to 2014. Given the political scandal, snap elections were due to take place seven months before the expiry of then elected parliament. These elections were somewhat similar to the previous ones in 2010 as both showed that numbers for established parties were decreasing and new parties and movements were on the rise. Due to lack of time, campaigns had to be presented quickly which proved as unfortunate for government parties. On the contrary, ANO benefited from the early elections as its campaign had already started by the time the election date was announced (Gregor and Macková 2014: 59). And it was ANO- the new movement and the biggest surprise of those elections that was best prepared. Well-timed media and billboard buying guaranteed ANO the biggest advantage among all (Gregor and Macková 2014: 58).

Apart from Sanep, other agencies had been neglecting ANO 2011 in their polls till late September. Perhaps due to movement’s newness and not knowing what to expect, most of the agencies have put ANO into the “other” category, containing parties that did not reach 2%. Regarding the polls in October, just couple of days prior to the elections, agencies have differed significantly in the percentage of ANO preferences. Graph No.11 shows that the estimated results ranged from 11.60% (Sanep) to 16.90% (Médea). Sanep’s model predicted according to its polls 7.1% lower result than ANO actually scored. The closest forecast was made by Médea. It is visible that the preferences for ANO were rising in the last days before elections and the movement probably continued to increase the number of supporters as all of the models showed lower percentage than ANO actually got.

---

Sanep is not a member of SIMAR (Association of Agencies for opinion polling) and has been criticized for conducting surveys on the Internet.
Finally, ANO scored 18.65% and placed second. Although ČSSD won the elections with 20.45%, it suffered the biggest defeat in its history. KSČM and TOP 09 followed with 14.91% and 11.99% whereas former strongest party on the right ODS suffered the ultimate loss scoring just 7.72%. The parliament was completed with KDU-ČSL and The Dawn of Direct Democracy with results just under 7% (volby.cz 2013). The biggest outflow of voters is visible on the side of previous cabinet. TOP 09 lost one third of its voters and ODS almost two thirds compared to 2010 (Havlík 2014: 146). The 2013 elections demonstrated the changes that occurred in the Czech party system. The old established parties have lost voters’ support tremendously while new parties have managed to shake the rigid arrangement. What is more, these were the first elections in which the two most supported parties did not gain the majority of votes (Havlík 2014: 157). Also, changes occurred in terms of third and fourth place where the position of these parties has strengthened and they no longer present a makeweight, rather a strong political alternative.

Source: Author, data: iDnes.cz 2013d
7. ELECTORATE OF ANO 2011

As was observed, some factors proved to be good predictors for explaining the vote for new anti-establishment parties. It could be said that in the previous chapters empirical evidence was found to support the notion that ANO’s success was heavily influenced by political discontent, a newly establishing niche, and a shift to the center in case of cleavage dimension. To attempt to support these claims, an analysis of electorate of ANO 2011 based on the data from the Czech post-electoral research was conducted.

Firstly, the socio-demographic characteristics of ANO’s voters are presented. The post-electoral research of 2013 shows that 53% of respondents who voted for ANO were men and the majority of respondents, who declared they voted for ANO, fall into category of middle-age voters (25-34 years of age). Looking at the adjusted residuals, the middle-age voters have statistically more frequently than randomly stated to have voted for ANO. Whereas the number of respondents older 65 or older is significantly smaller than would be expected.

The typical voter of ANO acquired, according to the survey, secondary education with/or without the GCSE (Czech “maturita”) - total of 72.7%. The observed frequency in case of voters who finished secondary education with diploma is greater than the expected frequency which means they were statistically more likely to vote for ANO. On the other hand, voters with primary education were less likely cast their vote for ANO. 37.5% of ANO’s voters live in a smaller city. The results thus show that ANO’s voters live in urban areas. This goes against the notion that anti-establishment voters are typically from rural areas as they feel neglected by the standard mainstream parties.

Regarding the occupation, the survey shows that 62.2% of voters of ANO work in private sector compared to 37.8% who work in public sector. Looking at the job scale, it can be said that more than half of the voters have full time job (59.7%). Economically Inactive (such as students and seniors) play a significant role as well (29.4%). Here the adjusted residual indicates that the number of employed voters is significantly larger than would be expected if the null hypothesis were true. The biggest group of ANO’s voters (60.8%) earns according to the survey monthly up to 14,999 CZK.
Table No. 8 Voters of ANO, socio-demographic characteristics, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Woman</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>47,0%</td>
<td>53,0%</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18 - 24</th>
<th>25 - 34</th>
<th>35 – 44</th>
<th>45 – 54</th>
<th>55 - 64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>11,20%</td>
<td>23,60%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16,40%</td>
<td>17,60%</td>
<td>9,20%</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>-5,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Primary (without GSCE)</th>
<th>Secondary (with GSCE)</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>8,8%</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
<td>39,4%</td>
<td>18,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-2,0</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>-0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job status</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Businessman</th>
<th>Economically Inactive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
<td>59,7%</td>
<td>8,5%</td>
<td>29,4%</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted residual</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>-1,0</td>
<td>-3,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>62,2%</td>
<td>37,8%</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>-1,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (CZK)</th>
<th>0-14,999</th>
<th>15,000-24,999</th>
<th>25,000-34,999</th>
<th>35,000-59,000</th>
<th>over 60,000</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>60,8%</td>
<td>30,7%</td>
<td>7,5%</td>
<td>1,0%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>-1,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Big City</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
<th>Smaller City</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Secluded Place</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>29,2%</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
<td>37,5%</td>
<td>28,5%</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
<td>-1,2</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>-0,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the author, data: Czech post-electoral research (2013)

From the voter-behavior point of view, results from the previous 2010 elections can be compared. The questioners asked the respondents which political party they voted for in the previous general elections. The results show that 27.1% of voters, who declared to have
voted for ANO in 2013, have stated that they gave their vote to the Social Democratic Party (ČSSD) in the previous elections. The second largest percentage share goes for the Public Affairs (VV), 21.5%. Regarding the parliamentary parties, the least of ANO’s voters come from previous communist supporters who constitute only 0.6%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>VV</th>
<th>KSČM</th>
<th>ČSSD</th>
<th>TOP 09</th>
<th>KDU-ČSL</th>
<th>SZ</th>
<th>ODS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Residual</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the author, data: Czech post-electoral research (2013)

It follows that ANO gained its voters from both established political parties such as ODS as well as from populist protest party the Public Affairs. Even though highly successful new parliament party in 2010, the Public Affairs lost all its support in the 2013 elections and its voters (10.88%) (volby.cz) had to be distributed among other parties. Gregor, from citizen’s association kohovolit.eu (Who to vote for) that deals with ecological interference, found out that the majority of ANO voters really does come from the Public Affairs as well as from ODS and TOP 09 (Gregor 2014) which somewhat confirms the results from the post-electoral research from the Institute of Sociology. Moreover, if we look at the adjusted residuals, it becomes clear that the observed frequency in case of VV is greater than the expected frequency which means they were statistically more likely to vote for ANO. The results, however, diverge in case of ČSSD’s voters transfer. Gregor’s analysis shows that ANO electorate is diverse, yet most of its voters came from VV, ODS, and TOP 09 and it was only very limited number of previous ČSSD voters that went over to ANO. Similarly, Pink and Voda finds out from the official election results that the highest positive correlation is seen between ANO and VV voters, followed by former coalition partners ODS and TOP 09 (Pink and Voda 2014: 229).

ANO also benefited from floating voters or voters that did not attend previous elections. All in all, its electorate consists predominantly of voters from the former government coalition (ODS-TOP 09-VV). Regarding the left-right orientation, majority of ANO’s voters is situated on the right side of the spectrum, yet not exclusively as the electorate of VV was diverse and contained voters across the whole spectrum. It is also certain that ANO did not attract voters from big parties on the left (Gregor 2014: 209).
These findings correspond with respondents’ answers in the post-electoral research. They were asked to identify themselves in terms of left or right position on the political scale from 0 to 10, 0 being the absolute left and 10 the absolute right. The results show (Graph No.12) that respondents who claimed to have voted for ANO put themselves mainly on the right side of the spectrum. Most respondents (32.4%) have ranked themselves as number 5 which corresponds with the political center. 43.2% voters put themselves somewhere between 6-8, completely towering the left side of the spectrum.

**Graph No.12 Voters of ANO, right-left scale, 2013**

Source: the author, data: Czech post-electoral research (2013)

As it has been proved in the previous chapter, political scandals and corruption in public sector played an important role in mobilizing the voters in the 2013 elections. Level of trust in political institutions and democracy turned out to hit its bottom as well as voters’ confidence in political parties. When we compare this to the data about ANO’s voters, it follows that 55.1% respondents were rather or very discontent with how democracy works. Looking at the adjusted residuals, those voters who were rather content have statistically more frequently than randomly stated to have voted for ANO. Whereas the number of respondents being very discontent is significantly smaller than would be expected.

What is more, 51% of voters of ANO stated to be discontent with overall political situation compared to 19.8% who were very or rather content. In this case the adjusted residual shows that the number of voters who were very discontent is significantly smaller than would be expected if the null hypothesis were true. On the other hand, there are more cases of voters who were rather content than would be expected if the 2 variables were independent.
Table No.10 Voters of ANO, satisfaction with how democracy works, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very content</th>
<th>Rather content</th>
<th>Rather discontent</th>
<th>Very discontent</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted residual</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the author, data: Czech post-electoral research (2013)

Table No.11 Voters of ANO, contentment with the political situation, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very content</th>
<th>Rather content</th>
<th>Neither content, nor discontent</th>
<th>Rather discontent</th>
<th>Very discontent</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANO 2011</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted residual</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the author, data: Czech post-electoral research (2013)

From the geographical point of view, voters of ANO were distributed quite evenly across the whole country. Most of the supporters were located in Eastern and Northern Bohemia. It is visible from the map that whilst greatly successful in Bohemia in general, ANO was lacking some voters in Moravia, especially its southern part and also in southern Bohemia (Pink and Voda 2014: 231).

Map No.1 – Voters of ANO, 2013

Source: kohovolit.eu
When conducting a logistic regression analysis, it becomes clear that job status, interest in economic manifesto, and self-placement on the left-right scale were the best predictors for explaining the vote on ANO. Regarding employment, the most significant seems to be the fact if a voter was a businessman or not. In fact, businessmen were less likely to vote for ANO. What is more, contrary to contemporary populist and protest parties (e.g. Elster 2015), if the voters were unemployed they were less likely to vote for ANO. All in all, if the voter was a businessman or employed, there was a greater probability that they would have voted for ANO.

Particular issues that mobilized the voters were even better predictors for explaining the vote on ANO. Respondents were asked how important particular issues were in the chosen party’s manifesto which influenced their vote. Voters that were very much or much interested in economic manifestos were almost three times more likely to vote for ANO than those who were not.

The strongest relations were, however, found in case of voters placing themselves on the left-right scale. This variable turned out to be the best predictor of vote for ANO. Those voters who placed themselves in the political center or on the right side of the spectrum were significantly more likely to voter for ANO 2011. The probability of voting for ANO was higher in case of respondents who identified themselves as right-wing voters. These voters were more than fifteen times more likely to vote for ANO.

Nevertheless the model failed to support the hypothesis that political discontent was a key factor in explaining the vote for ANO. The variable contentment with democracy was not significantly associated with odds higher than one62. The same holds true for education. Similarly, voters for whom the manifesto which was focused on corruption was of high importance were actually not more likely to vote for the movement. The model did not show significant association between voting ANO and being interested in corruption issues in the manifesto.

62 The variable “contentment with current political situation” was not included as the survey was conducted right after the elections and the answers may have been influenced by the results therefore not measuring the (dis)contentment which might have favored ANO. However, “contentment with democracy” might show long-term belief.
Table No. 12 Voters of ANO 2011, logistic regression analysis, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (18 – 24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (25 – 34)</td>
<td>1.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (35 – 44)</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (45 – 54)</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (55 – 64)</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (65+)</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low Education)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (With GSCE)</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (Without GSCE)</td>
<td>1.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Level Education</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content (Democracy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Content (Democracy)</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues: Economic Manifesto (Yes)</td>
<td>2.859 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues: Corruption (Yes)</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Public Sector)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Economically Inactive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>0.553 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Left)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>14.764 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>15.209 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>- 704.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox &amp; Snell R Square</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the author, data: Czech post-electoral research (2013)
Note:  * Significant on the 0.05 level
** Significant on the 0.01 level
*** Significant on the 0.001 level
CONCLUSION

The aim of the thesis was to analyze the factors that gave rise to the Movement ANO 2011 in the 2013 general elections. Based on the theoretical framework, the presence or absence of political opportunity structures was assessed. The thesis focused on finding out which political opportunities favored the movement and how ANO used those opportunities. On the grounds of the outcome of the thesis, it can be stated that the three main conditions were met- the movement presented ideological profile that met the available niches in the political arena; the movement was well organized and obtained sufficient resources so as to fulfill the presented profile; and there existed a favorable opportunity structure.

Although a favorable POS was presented, not all factors were of the same importance for explaining ANO’s electoral breakthrough. It became clear that the dealignment and realignment process was the most fundamental factor in explaining the movement’s success. The position of old established parties has weakened and voters´ preferences have changed as the consequence of the dealignment process. Moreover, the analysis showed that people’s confidence in political institutions and the way democracy works had been shattered, party identification had been weakened, and party membership had been declining. As a result of such anti-party atmosphere, the perfect conditions for the rise of new anti-establishment parties were created as ANO could mobilize the voters on the basis of no affiliation with the mainstream parties. The importance of previously dominant socio-economic cleavage has decreased and the last two elections showed signs of a newly emerging protest dimension. ANO has made use of such bad sentiment in the society and aimed its manifesto at declaring to remedy the situation. Regarding the voter turnout, it proved to have some, although not a major, effect on the rise of ANO. Even though the voter turnout had been decreasing, no significant changes were noticed compared to the two previous elections and it could be generally considered as the consequence of people’s distrust with political institutions and parties’ electoral offers.

Another factor which was considered to have a particular effect on ANO’s rise was the convergence in political space. As follows from the analysis, the convergence took place before the rise of ANO and although the mainstream parties tend to offer same service as they had moved towards the political center, the crisis on the right side of the spectrum was as much important in explaining ANO’s electoral success. In case of collaboration with mainstream parties, it was proved that the initial hypothesis might have been flipped in case
of ANO in a way that the movement actually benefited from no collaboration and other parties’ initial rejection as it helped to create a special aura in voters’ eyes. Having a strong leader proved to be vital for ANO as well. Even though the movement had been called a “one-man party”, Babiš’s communication style and strong anti-establishment rhetoric together with the professional campaign and almost unlimited budget finally paid off. On the other hand, the voting system proved not to be fundamental in explaining ANO’s overall success as it tends to favor big parties and no arrangements had been made in comparison with the previous elections.

Last but not least were the open niches to help clarify the success of the movement. The most salient issues in the Czech politics have been the economic crisis and corruption scandals which are both connected with people’s distrust in political institutions and political parties in general. ANO blamed the mainstream parties for the economic crisis which was caused by the system corruption and politician’s incompetence. ANO benefited from this open niche as the movement was formed in time when voters’ distrust and uncertainty was the greatest. ANO used its anti-establishment appeal and mobilized voters by presenting its members as professionals who were able to tackle the burning issues by introducing simple solutions. The crisis thus worked in ANO’s favor since it created a source of anger towards the established elites and the opportunity that the anti-establishment party could not miss.

The last part of the thesis focused on analyzing the electorate of ANO. From studying the socio-demographic characteristics, it follows that the typical voter of ANO is married, 25-34 years of age, lives in a city, finished secondary education, works in private sector, and is earning monthly up to 14,999 CZK. From the logistic regression analysis, it became clear that if a voter was a businessman and interested in economic manifestos they were significantly more likely to vote for ANO. Moreover, the best predictor of vote for ANO was found in case of left-right orientation. If the voters put themselves on the right side or the center of the spectrum, they were fourteen (fifteen) times more likely to vote for ANO 2011. However, the model did not prove support the hypothesis that discontentment with politics was a key factor in ANO’s electoral breakthrough.

As the thesis was focused on analyzing the rise of ANO in the 2013 snap elections, no general conclusion about the movement’s future success can be made. It seems that it will be of vital importance for ANO to maintain the fine line between being effective in the coalition and not losing its anti-establishment origins.
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Diplomová práce se zabývá volebním vzestupem hnutí ANO 2011 v parlamentních volbách v roce 2013. Práce vychází z teorie struktur politických příležitostí a klade si za cíl zjistit, které struktury byly přítomny a jak jich ANO využilo.
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Abstract

The thesis focuses on the Movement ANO 2011 and its electoral rise in the 2013 general elections. The framework is based on the theory of political opportunity structures and the aim is to find out which POS were present and how ANO made use of them.
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