

NATIONALISM VERSUS EUROPEAN INTEGRATION: THE CASE OF ATAKA

Yannis Sygkelos
DEI College¹

Abstract

Since the Maastricht Treaty (1992) much research has been engaged in the study of Euroscepticism, mainly in its typology and varieties. This article sheds light on one of the most significant, decisive and formative determinants of euroscepticism: nationalism. It explores the brand of ethnic nationalism that ATAKA, a far-right political party of Bulgaria, espoused in the aftermath of Bulgaria's accession to the EU (2007-2009). It argues that such nationalism is incompatible with the economic and political internationalization that the project of European integration and unification generates. Indeed, even though ATAKA did not openly demand the withdrawal of Bulgaria from the European Union, it advocated a totally different, strongly intergovernmentalist, scheme that a priori excludes any ceding of national sovereignty to a supranational body.

Keywords: nationalism, Bulgaria, European Union, ATAKA, Euroscepticism

Introduction

European integration is not smooth and unchallenged. Since the Maastricht Treaty (1992), opposition to European unification fuelled by Eurosceptic parties from all sides of the political spectrum has gained ground. An incremental scholarship pursues to understand and classify the diversity of the opposition to European integration: from hard/principled versus soft/contingent Euroscepticism (Szczerbiak & Taggart 2008) to scepticism versus rejection (Kopecky & Mudde 2002) to rejectionist versus revisionist versus minimalist approaches (Flood & Usherwood 2007) to political versus instrumental Euroscepticism (Lubbers & Scheepers 2005). Indeed, far-right parties have

¹ A registered teaching institution of the University of London (International Programs).
Author's correspondence e-mail: yannissygkelos@hotmail.com

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

articulated several Eurosceptic discourses on European integration drawing on a variety of theories, ideologies, and jargons (Mudde 2007). Turning to the rather under-researched area of ideologies and discourses which reinforce and sustain opposition to European integration and unification, this article intends to refine Euroscepticism studies and explain the centrality of nationalism in the far-right opposition to European unification. It argues that the discursive centrality of ethnic and cultural identities and the prominence of nationalism prove to be incompatible with a supranational vision and the economic and political internationalization that it generates. More specifically, this article explores and investigates the stance of the Bulgarian extremist right political party, ATAKA (Attack), towards the EU by shedding light on the decisive and formative determinant of its Euroscepticism: nationalism. Besides, it argues that ATAKA availed itself of and made an extensive use of national discourses, and, more especially, discursive strategies and topoi such as the construction of an internal frontier, the re-drawing of social boundaries, cultural confrontation, the shift of blame and responsibility, victimization, threat-phobia-disaster, treachery, external constraints and dependence. Such a systematic national discourse advances and flourishes Eurosceptic attitudes and discourses.

To investigate the dimensions of ATAKA's nationalism, I rely on primary sources such as ATAKA's official newspaper and website, Siderov's books, European Parliament documents (speeches, motions, declarations, and questions), speeches and texts of prominent politicians and journalists affiliated to ATAKA, and ATAKA's manifestos of the 2005 national, 2007 EP and 2009 national and EP elections. To gather, study, and interpret ATAKA's partisan texts, I used qualitative content analysis, critical discourse analysis, and interpretative textual analysis to investigate both themes that ATAKA shares with other European far-right parties as well as its particular discursive strategies and topoi. Indeed, several core far-right themes were adopted and articulated by ATAKA: preservation of the "heartland", that is, a conception of an idealized and romanticized community untainted by globalization, Europeanisation, intellectuals, politicians, and bureaucrats; defense of national sovereignty; national narratives; territorial nostalgia; nativism; monoculturalism; anti-Semitism; religious fundamentalism; economic nationalism and protectionism; and welfare chauvinism (Taggart 2003, p.6-7; Mudde 2007; Rydgren 2008; Arter 2010; Pelinka 2013, pp.10-13). Yet, ATAKA did not promote themes characteristic of Western European far-right parties: anti-immigration discourses, New-Right theses, and Europhobic utterances. ATAKA is not openly and expressly against EU membership as several Western European far-right parties, even though it espouses only negative views on the EU.

My analysis focuses on the aftermath of Bulgaria's accession to the EU (2007-2009), a period brimming with euphoria and seemingly unpropitious to Eurosceptic discourses, when the Bulgarian society was rather favorably disposed towards the EU (81% and 52-67%, depending on the issue: Pew Global Attitudes Survey and Standard Barometer 68, respectively). In this context, nonetheless, ATAKA's Eurosceptic, nationalistic discourse proved successful in attracting considerable support in successive elections for the European Parliament², as ATAKA availed itself of a set of factors conducive to the electoral swelling of the far-right. First, Bulgarians mistrusted the domestic elites (83% of Bulgarians were discontent with the state: Pew Global Attitudes Survey; slightly over 10% trusted the Bulgarian political system: Standard Barometer 68); as a result, a far-right rhetoric, replete with anti-establishment, anti-liberal, and anti-corruption references was cast before a receptive audience. Second, most possibly due to the so-called 'Bulgarian ethnic model' the far right of the political spectrum was marginal; however, by 2007 the "Bulgarian ethnic model" ebbed (29% of Bulgarians considered Turkey as the major threat, while 56% and 15% were unfavorable towards Roma and Jews respectively: Pew Global Attitudes Survey). ATAKA made significant inroads by mainstreaming issues related to Roma and Islam as well as value issues such as culture and "law-order-punitiveness" (demand and supply-side models on the rise of the far-right: Mudde 2007, ch.9-11; Pauwels 2011, pp.63-66). Third, in the so-called transition period, Bulgarian society witnessed low turnouts in elections, uncertain party loyalties, weak political allegiances, rapid upturn and decline of fledgling parties, electoral wonders and a high level of voter volatility (Lewis 2000, pp.83-87; Spirova 2007; Gherghina 2014). These political circumstances have been explained by the impact of sharp welfare retrenchment, unemployment, social marginalization, impoverishment, and social status loss (modernization theory: Betz 1993; Mudde 2007, p.297 ff). Fourth, a dearth of either a moral or a strategic cordon sanitaire in a country which had not experienced the rise of the far-right left the electoral success of ATAKA unabated.

Within such a fertile breeding ground for the rise of the far right, ATAKA took advantage of the reconfiguration of the political field due to the end of the bipolar political model, the emergence of new social cleavages caused by globalization and Europeanisation, the disillusionment of voters with the transition elites, and the flourishing of national discourses that Bulgarian society had been coached in long ago (Azmanova 2009; Sygkelos 2010; Efremova 2012;

² ATAKA gained 14.2% of the vote and three seats in 2007 (Slavi Binev, Desislav Chukolov, and Dimitr Stoyanov) and 11.96% of the vote but two seats in 2009 (Slavi Binev and Dimitar Stoyanov). However, in 2014 its percentage declined dramatically to 2.96%.

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

Gurov and Zankina 2013), and gained popularity by stereotyping and polarizing perceptions of the Self and the Other. In the period under question, another fledgling but moderate right-wing party, *Citizens for the European Development of Bulgaria* (GERB), had adopted nationalist discourses similar to those of ATAKA³. Apart from the intensity of nationalist discourses, ATAKA clearly differed from GERB in its deployment of Eurosceptic theses. Eventually, albeit for a few years only as it later split, ATAKA managed to voice and dominate the far right but lost less radicalized voters, while GERB, in the event, functioned as a strategic *cordon sanitaire*, albeit unwittingly (Pauwels 2011, pp.78-79; Pirro 2015, pp.88-90).

The first section of this article presents ATAKA's origin and political inclinations. The second section conceptualizes the substantive element and major source of ATAKA's Euroscepticism: a peculiar brand of ethnic nationalism that comprises discourses of claiming the homeland back, national self-determination, defense against foreign enemies and national apostates, autochthonism, economic nationalism, and an etatism flagging a mono-cultural state capable to realize national interests and goals. The third section introduces the argument that this peculiar nationalism is rather incompatible with the political and institutional edifice of the European Union and most importantly, with its constitutional base, goals and values. What is more, the EU is portrayed as a threat to the nation. The fourth section explains why in some instances ATAKA appears as favorable towards Bulgaria's membership of the EU: only as a means for promoting nationalistic demands and castigating the domestic elites. Actually, ATAKA strives for a peculiar type of a highly uncompromised intergovernmentalist project, namely a *Europe for Europeans*, a scheme that a priori excludes any ceding of national sovereignty to a supranational body.

The political profile of ATAKA

In 2005, an alliance of far-right groupuscules⁴ formed ATAKA, a self-proclaimed nationalist/patriotic leadership party of a post-communist-variant under the charismatic but controversial Volen Siderov⁵. In Brussels, ATAKA joined the

³ Borisov readily adopted discursive topoi such as the re-drawing of social boundaries, cultural confrontation, threat-phobia-disaster, and Romaphobia; his branding of Roma, Turks, and retirees as "bad human capital" is telling (Efremova 2012, pp.47-48)

⁴ The National Movement for the Salvation of the Fatherland, the Bulgarian National Patriotic Party, and the New Dawn circle.

⁵ He began his political career as a *Union of Democratic Forces* (UDF) candidate and the editor-in-chief of its newspaper, *Democracy*, with a poor performance. In 2001, he became involved in the *National Movement of Simeon II* (NDSV) and, later on, campaigned for

transient far-right and nationalist group “*Identity, Tradition, Sovereignty*”, along with the French *National Front* of Jean-Marie Le Pen, the *Greater Romania Party* of Corneliu Vadim Tudor, the *Social Alternative* of Alessandra Mussolini, the Austrian *Freedom Party* and others. After the group’s dissolution, ATAKA remained non-inscrit. According to researches, ATAKA attracts small-city dwellers, the middle class, the elderly and people apathetic to politics (Ghodsee 2008, p.31; Genov 2010, p.42), a rather heterogeneous electorate.

ATAKA’s discourse is fraught with pathological nationalism, anti-Semitism (Siderov n.d; 2002; and 2010), ethnic and religious intolerance as well as Islamophobia and Romaphobia, that is, a xenophobic reaction to indigenous minorities caused by the belief that it is ‘natural for people to live among others of their own kind’ (Mudde 2007, p.19; Rydgren 2008, p.740). ATAKA identifies itself with Bulgarian nationalism/patriotism, as its own emblem manifests. The central mantra of ATAKA, ‘*to take our Bulgaria back*’⁶, crystallizes the spearhead policies of its manifestos: genuine national self-determination by the cleansing of the government from “anti-Bulgarian” elements; the abolition of ethnic parties and ‘separatist organizations’; the safeguarding of territorial integrity against an alleged systematic and deliberate Turkification of the country; economic nationalism, encapsulated in a project of constructing a “pro-Bulgarian economy”; and the development of a genuinely national foreign policy. Embarking on a quasi-anti-imperialist discourse, ATAKA demands the withdrawal of Bulgaria from NATO, the withdrawal of the military bases from Bulgarian territory, the cessation of relations with the IMF and the World Bank, resistance to EU directives detrimental to Bulgarian interests, such as those requiring the shutdown of two units of the Kozloduy nuclear plant, and the interdiction to foreigners to buy land in Bulgaria. As for symbols, ATAKA is careful enough to refrain from Nazi symbols, style and phrasing, despite Siderov’s inclination towards Führerism⁷ and his book title, *My Battle for Bulgaria*, which is reminiscent of Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*. Instead, the name of the party invokes Siderov’s popular TV talk show at SKAT TV and connotes the Bulgarian

Sofia’s mayorship with pitiful results. His popularity, though, was catapulted by his TV broadcasting, laden with nationalistic, anti-Turkish, anti-Roma and conspiracy rhetoric at SKAT channel.

⁶ Similar slogans have been deployed by the Dutch Pim Fortuyn List, “*to give the country back to the people*” and the Latvian National Alliance, “*Latvians must feel at home in their ethnic homeland*”.

⁷ He constantly overemphasises his personal role and dynamics in the leadership of ATAKA, e.g. “ATAKA will not be the same without its leader” (Siderov 2008a).

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

attack and capture of Edirne in 1913, alluding to the national struggle against the Turks (Genov 2010, p.44).

ATAKA's nationalism

ATAKA conceives Bulgarian nationalism as defensive; neither aggressive nor chauvinistic. It claims that Bulgarian nationalism neither implies hatred nor strives for the capture of other people or territories except for unredeemed lands. It rather strives for the unification of ethnic Bulgarians within state borders. It is argued that Bulgarian nationalists are motivated by Levski's aphorism: "*We do not want anything foreign, we do not give ours*". Nationalists, it is argued, are all those who love and defend their homeland, who want national independence and a firm and responsible national government.

ATAKA, in effect, uses the reclaiming-the-country metaphor by suggesting that for some reason Bulgarians were devoid of their homeland; it addresses a calling for a national liberation movement against those who plundered and ruined Bulgaria, against those who committed genocide against the Bulgarian people, against separatists and those who impose aggressive forms of Islam by coercion and deception, against impoverishment, misery, and corruption (*Program of ATAKA for Parliamentary Elections 2009*). Indicative of the nature of ATAKA's nationalism are slogans such as "Bulgaria uber alles!", "neither left, nor right, but Bulgarian", "Bulgaria is once again under the Turkish yoke! The liberation must keep going on" and "we want equitable, honest, free, people's Bulgarian Bulgaria!" and ATAKA's oath:

we, Bulgarian nationalists, take the oath... to serve the national interest, to defend the Bulgarian nation and faith from foreign hands, to prevent partition of Bulgaria, to place liability on national traitors, to work for a unified Bulgaria, ruled by Bulgarians, under Bulgarian rules, in the name of all the Bulgarians.⁸

ATAKA's nationalism conflates religious, anti-Semitic, and anti-Western aspects. ATAKA presents itself as the genuine defender of Orthodox Christianity and a party protected and blessed by God (Siderov 2009a). The Orthodox Christian faith is considered to be indispensable for the Bulgarians to obtain their freedom and become invincible (Siderov 2008b). Sofia is depicted as one of the oldest centers of Christianity, "where even today churches and ruins of temples dated back to the 4th and 5th century are visible" (Siderov 2008c). ATAKA insisted on the introduction of the teaching of the Orthodox doctrine into school curricula

⁸ The oath was taken in front of Levski's monument in Sofia on the occasion of its anniversary on the 19th February, (*Torches Lit up... and New Membership of ATAKA...*).

(Binev 2008a).⁹ Orthodox Christianity is perceived to be in an eternal collision with Judaism (Siderov 2010 and 2002), personified by the cult of Mammon that is the usurious capital. Speculative, money-lending capitalism, it is argued, is situated outside the Greek-Orthodox East, whose foundations lay in the Byzantine Empire, and is associated with the “cult of Mammon” (Siderov 2010) that is a Jew-ridden economic model. Privatization was seen as a side-effect of Jew-ridden “unbridled capitalism” seeking to colonize the Orthodox East (Siderov n.d.). Encapsulating globalization as well as international legal, economic and military institutions, the West is seen as a threat to Bulgarian sovereignty. Within a discursive framework of “threat-fear-disaster”, the West is seen as the birthplace of “all perverted ideologies, such as materialism and communism” (Siderov 2010). ATAKA called for the breakdown of Bulgaria’s dependence on the “pillars of the Judeo-cosmopolitan conspiracy”, the IMF and the World Bank, whose policies ATAKA denounced as colonial, genocidal, plundering and restrictive to the sovereignty of Bulgaria (Program of ATAKA for Parliamentary Elections 2009; Siderov 2010; and Siderov 2008d). Neutrality and equal footing in the international arena were interpreted as a guarantee of sovereignty and national security, while the purportedly servile attitude toward NATO and the USA was castigated as a policy incompatible with national interests, since it leads to the deterioration of Bulgaria’s military capacity (Tasheva 2008a; Siderov 2008e). By and large, any membership to international entities is seen as a curtailment of sovereignty and, hence, an anathema.

Significant instances of ATAKA’s national discourse are its own narrative of Bulgarian history, irredentism, and a national struggle against a treacherous political establishment. The nationalist-inspired narration of the past has a twofold purpose. First, an ‘as-then-so-now’ theme is unfolded, in which ATAKA’s nationalists are portrayed as the heirs of Bulgarian national heroes such as Levski, Rakovski, Botev, and Hitov, all “fighters for liberty and for a homeland free from foreign influence and Turkish yoke” (Siderov 2008f), whereas the political establishment is compared to historical national enemies (Siderov 2008g). Second, a discourse of Bulgarian genocide committed by the Ottoman rule (1396-1913), which was described as unparalleled in world history in terms of scale, time, and effects, was effectively deployed. This genocide, it was argued, choked off the population growth and the cultural development of Bulgaria.

⁹ “For we remember the prophetic statement of the bishop Kliment, better known with its secular name, Vasil Drumev: If there is Orthodoxy, Bulgaria exists! If there is no Orthodoxy, Bulgaria does not exist!” (*Why the Holy Synod...*).

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

ATAKA articulated irredentist claims as it laid claims to “unredeemed lands”, that is, the Western Outlands and the region of Strumitsa (currently part of Serbian and Macedonian territories, respectively) lost by the “shameful and onerous” Neuilly Treaty in 1919 (ATAKA *Insists in the Neuilly Treaty’s Annulment*). Irredentism also concerned the Bulgarian (sic) churches in Kosovo built by “our [Bulgarian] great rulers such as Ivan-Asen II” and raised reparation demands of over 10 million dollars from Turkey for the “forfeited properties of Thracian Bulgarians, who were slaughtered and chased from their lands in 1913” (Siderov 2008h; Siderov 2008i).

The last but not the least instance of the national discourse of ATAKA concerns a strategy of constructing an internal frontier as well as topoi of treachery and threat-fear-disaster, which call for a national struggle to prevent the danger of national devastation and calamity threatened by an indeterminate treacherous amalgam of political elites, the economic oligarchy and the mafia. Drawing on a Schmittian-style friend-foe distinction (Mouffe 1993), ultra-nationalists embarked on a Manichaean division between the Bulgarian people, consisting of peasants, farmers, miners, workers, pensioners--all Bulgarian patriots-- and the ruling coalition of “Stanishev, Dogan and Simeon”, the Turkish mafia, the “gypsy criminals”, the drug dealers, the oligarchy of millionaires--all exploiters of the Bulgarian people (Siderov 2008j). Hence, ATAKA opposes “us” --the unprivileged and oppressed Bulgarian nation-- to “them” --the oligarchs and the privileged at home or the bureaucrats in Brussels (Laclau 2006). More specifically, treacherous political elites are blamed for Bulgarophobia (Siderov 2003) and a peculiar type of genocide they committed in the transition period against Bulgarians by depriving them of educational and medical access (Siderov 2009a). The so-called Turkish-communist tripartite government of the *Bulgarian Socialist Party* (BSP), the *National Movement of Simeon II* (NDSV), and the *Movement for Rights and Freedoms* (DPS), as well as the President, Georgi Parvanov, were all demonized. More specifically, the BSP was historically linked to the terrorists who blew up the Sveta Nedelia church and the “communist executioners of over 200,000 people”; the DPS to the Islamist terrorist act of 1985; and the NDSV to the national catastrophes of WWI and WWII, since Simeon is the son of Boris, who collaborated with the Nazis, and the grandson of “bisexual Ferdinand” (Siderov 2008k; Siderov 2008l; Chukolov 2008a). Thus, ATAKA portrayed itself as the opponent of communism, Islam, and fascism respectively. Having been empowered by the Bulgarian patriots and aiming at implementing a “clean-hands-policy”, ATAKA promised to render the ruling national apostates accountable “for all their scandals – for plundering, for banditism, for mafiotization of Bulgaria, for Turkification of Bulgaria”. The advance of ATAKA to power, it is argued, will mark a new, patriotic period for

Bulgaria, in which the corrupt and traitorous ruling government would be severely punished (Siderov 2008a).

Bulgaria is seen as belonging to Europe par excellence, notably “one of the oldest European nation-states and the founder of the first state” in Europe (Siderov 2008m). It was proclaimed that “Christian, European Bulgaria delivered the Orthodox gleam and literature, faith and script to over half of Europe” (Program of ATAKA for Parliamentary Elections 2009; Siderov 2009a); whereby, it reputedly realized a civilizing mission to Europe. Siderov was explicit that the autochthonous Bulgarians lived in the same lands for 7,800 years, where they created the most ancient culture in Europe and civilized the largest part of Europe. He stated that Bulgaria had already been founded when [other European] states did not even exist; Bulgaria is the only country all over Europe that has not changed its name for over a millennium, it is praised of, and has survived under historical adversities (Siderov 2008i).

ATAKA’s nationalism contests Europeanization

“Being European” is, of course, at its best a contested identity construction. Interpretations of Europe decisively depend on political, social, and cultural institutions as well as discourse agents. The European identity could be described as a “tradition of argumentation” (Shotter 1993, p.200), a “work in progress” (Duchesne 2008, pp.400-401), or a battlefield for hegemony. Yet Europe has already acquired tangible symbols, such as a flag, an anthem, an official day, and a common currency, which all provide citizens with shared images; it also lays its institutionalization on texts, such as the Lisbon Treaty and the Copenhagen criteria. The process of European unification implies values and principles, such as peace, cosmopolitanism, diversity and pluralism, the rule of law, free market economy, democratization, free movement, and human rights (Gastelaars & Ruijter 1998; Pagden 2002; Bruter 2003; Chiara 2005; Risse 2005).

ATAKA presents the EU as the new center of globalization, deploying topoi of external constraints and dependence that inflict sovereignty loss. Due to the necessary relinquishment of sovereign rights, Brussels is portrayed as “the master of the Bulgarian territory” (Chukolov 2008b) or the center of Directives. Siderov depicted the EU as a “new Roman Empire with a President and a Foreign Minister”, a centralized, inertial and highly bureaucratized supra-state. He also maintained that a new council or a latent Masonic lodge has been established to determine the domestic affairs of member-states and render national parliaments’ will and intentions void. Therefore, Bulgaria, deprived of its sovereignty, would be transformed into an ordinary province (Siderov 2008n; Siderov 2008o; Siderov 2010). The EU, it is argued, regulates the national

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

economies even more decisively than COMECON, and serves the interests of multi-national corporations (Siderov 2008p). For all these reasons, ATAKA wholly rejected and voted against the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty. Shopov, the deputy chair of ATAKA, contended that MPs who voted for the Lisbon Treaty “stitched twelve five-pointed stars [on Bulgarians], but this time they are not red but yellow” (*MPs ratified the Lisbon Treaty 2008*). Drawing parallels between the EU and the accursed Soviet Union is a core theme of far-right leaders such as Istvan Csurka, Umberto Bossi, and Jean-Marie Le Pen (Mudde 2007, pp.160-161). The same skepticism was demonstrated concerning joining the euro-zone which, it is argued, was used as an instrument to weaken national economies. Reservations against the euro were grounded in its incapability of safeguarding euro-zone economies from a deep financial crisis. All in all, the Maastricht Treaty with its goal of an “ever closer union”, the Lisbon Treaty with its further institutionalization and the euro were vehemently opposed as major threats to national sovereignty.

Skepticism over Bulgaria’s membership of the EU was articulated by ATAKA’s nationalists. First of all, unmet expectations for economic development and increased living standards allowed for severe criticism of the doctrine of the “common European home”. This triggered complaints on low incomes, low purchasing capacity, poor health care and a poor-quality education system as well as a populist outcry to Commissioners to try to live with 100-200 leva, as Bulgarian pensioners do (ATAKA’s 20 Principles; Siderov 2008q). Taking advantage of the frustration caused by the high expectations of Bulgaria’s accession to the EU, Siderov embarked on capitalizing on its alleged repercussions for the national economy, e.g., the losses Bulgaria suffered in the domains of energy, food and textile industry (*We Became Sponsors of the EU*). Within this framework, the function of the Kozloduy nuclear power plant¹⁰ acquired connotations of national pride and sovereignty. In one of his twenty principles, ATAKA demanded the “cancellation of any agreements, accords or memoranda implying or demanding the decommissioning of the Kozloduy NPP” (ATAKA’s 20 Principles). ATAKA’s MEPs were mobilized to achieve a revision of clauses relating to Kozloduy and petitioned the EP on the re-opening of Kozloduy, which would guarantee Bulgaria’s energy independence and stability. Siderov maintained that Bulgaria is the only member-state, which is a “net donor

¹⁰ The Kozloduy nuclear plant was launched in 1974 with crucial Soviet assistance. Simeon Saxecoburggotski conceded the closure of two reactors amid BSP’s opposition and the public perception that this was a European directive. To mitigate reactions, Saxecoburggotski’s government, then, took the initiative to build a nuclear power plant near Belene, but eventually Borisov’s government opposed the project.

to the EU” (sic), since it gives more than it receives, if suspended funds and the imminent contribution of Bulgaria to the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) are counted. The EU is also criticized for non-interference with rapacious privatization of public assets. This is why, Siderov explains, the *Ode to Joy* is not listened to in Bulgaria (*We Became Sponsors of the EU*). Thus, accession to the EU, having proved to be harmful for Bulgaria, and the process of European integration were both castigated.

The topos of external constraints was used to frame pivotal European values, such as diversity and multiculturalism, which were explicitly seen as endangering partition of Bulgaria along religious, ethnic or cultural lines. ATAKA understands Bulgaria as a unitary, homogenous and monolithic nation-state (ATAKA’s 20 Principles). ATAKA is an exponent of the monocultarist norm of “*our own state for our own nation*”, marking internal homogenization along with external exclusiveness, which many far-right and fascist parties have propagated: “Britain for British” (British National Party), “Slovenia for Slovenes” (Slovene National Party), “Denmark for the Danes” (Danish People’s Party), “Hungary for Hungarians” (Jobbik) and “Greece for Greeks” (Golden Dawn).

One other essential European value that ATAKA is skeptical of is the international protection and promotion of minority and human rights. Not only did ATAKA underestimate the gross violation of human rights committed in the so-called “Renaissance Process” of the mid-1980s, but also characterized the post-communist transition “political saturnalia” which gave the DPS the opportunity to loot and partition Bulgaria (*An Islamic Wave Overflows*). Using a victimhood narrative, minority rights have been translated into concession of privileges to minorities, which entails the establishment of double standards and the consequent discrimination against the Bulgarians. Siderov opposed the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, which under the Lisbon Treaty is now enforceable by the EU and its member-states, and Stoyanov applauded the UK, Poland, and the Czech Republic for opting-out from the Charter (Stoyanov 2008a).

Within this framework, ATAKA demanded bans and rigorous sanctions against ethnic parties (ATAKA’s 20 Principles), first and foremost the DPS. In addition, the Macedonian organization, OMO “Ilinden Pirin”, was portrayed as anti-Bulgarian, secessionist, anti-constitutional and treacherous for having ostensibly been financed by Serbian (sic) intelligence (Siderov 2008r). A political party representative of Pomaks was implicitly portrayed as being backed by the USA and supervised and funded by Ankara with the assistance of the DPS; this was denounced as an anti-constitutional action, requiring the interference of the

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

public prosecutor. Siderov claimed that the thesis of a separate Pomak identity relies on the speculative fusion of religious faith and ethnic origin, which constitutes a falsification of history (Siderov 2008s; Siderov 2008t). In this way, religious and ethnic diversity, as well as initiatives conducive to free political expression, were presented as induced by foreign speculation and destructive to the loyalty owed to the ethno-cultural state regime. In contrast with ATAKA's mono-culturalism, Europe has witnessed the flourishing of ethnic, even separatist, parties such as the Flemish Vlaams Belang, whose alliance ATAKA has sought. The protection of minority linguistic rights within the context of EU's regional policies is realized in autonomous regions, such as South Tyrol, where three official languages have been institutionalized: Italian, German, and Ladin.

By upholding cultural racist schemes, which perceive national culture as natural, homogeneous and unchanged and stand for mono-cultural societies, ATAKA was seeking the elimination of any manifestation of cultural diversity. It demanded the prohibition of fifteen-minute broadcasts in languages other than Bulgarian from state-funded media (ATAKA's 20 Principles). Furthermore, ATAKA strongly opposed the introduction of Turkish in Bulgarian administration. As Siderov (2008i) stated:

I am against speaking Turkish in the Bulgarian Ministry of Agriculture [under Nihat Kabil of the DPS]. I am against speaking Turkish in the regional administration and municipalities of Kardzhali, Razgrad, Targovishte, Shumen and Silistra

ATAKA presented cultural sites for minorities as hotbeds of fundamentalism, espionage, treachery and would-be insurrectionism. The President and the leaders of the tri-partite government were accused as Turkey's abettors in its strategy to introduce Turkish as a second official language in multi-ethnic Bulgaria and subsequently to reform the Bulgarian administrative system by establishing autonomous areas along ethno-religious lines (*Stanishev Prepares a Pogrom*). Inaction and ineptitude of the executive and the judiciary to cope with gypsy criminality is, inter alia, attributed to EU directives and minority policies. Impunity of "gypsy criminal gangs", it is argued, is owed to deterrence of ethnic conflict and the responsibility for such a favorable treatment of minorities lays with Europe (*ATAKA: the EP should not Want Gypsy Privileges*), which eventually bolsters the ever-growing gypsyfication of the country. Under the topos of the shift of blame and responsibility, the high unemployment rate of Roma people is used as proof of their "parasitic nature" and the Roma were blamed for evading taxes and payment of public utility bills, escalating criminality, impunity,

and indolence.¹¹ Racist discourses were intuitively cloaked in a victimhood narrative according to which, Bulgarians were falling victims of discrimination in their own country (Chukolov et al. 2009) owed to double-standard policies imposed by the EU.

Economic nationalism and state protectionism, promoted by ATAKA,¹² collide with the EU concept of an internal market, as this concept was introduced by the Single European Act 1986 and is now described in Article 26 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union as “an area without internal frontiers in which the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital is ensured”. ATAKA favors a type of “nativist economy”, which is neither purely liberal nor purely socialist (Mudde 2007, p.122) and encompasses policies such as: national monopoly on production, commerce and banks; state protectionism “until Bulgaria’s living standards reach the average European level”; renationalization of privatized companies; and state intervention in favour of Bulgarian businesses (ATAKA’s 20 Principles). Therefore, ATAKA depicted the privatization of national assets, such as the national BGA Balkan airlines to a “fraudulent firm”¹³ and electricity distributors to so-called “foreign suspicious firms”, as treacherous. A more extreme nationalist economic ideal is the pledge that ATAKA would ban foreigners from buying agricultural land in Bulgaria (ATAKA’s 20 Principles).¹⁴ ATAKA’s manifesto stands for a “state-regulated, nationally sovereign, and socially just economy” which ensures positive entitlements in the fields of education, health care and pension system (Program of ATAKA for Parliamentary Elections 2009), but unequivocally for Bulgarians only (welfare chauvinism). This form of economic nationalism is reminiscent of the infant-industry doctrine and of economics adjusted to nationalist ends advocated by

¹¹ The comment of Yuvev, the speaker of Citizen’s Initiative Committee, is revealing of grass-roots racist prejudices: “Gypsies remain hungry and thirsty, because they have no money to buy water; therefore, they drink rakiya (a traditional strong alcohol drink)”, cited in *Zaharna Fabrika again in Riots against Gypsies*. For a series of anti-Roma theses, see Siderov 2007.

¹² Similar approaches are shared by other populist ultra-right parties, such as the Czech Republicans and the Slovak National Party, in Mudde 2007, p.126.

¹³ In 1999, BGA “Balkan airlines” was sold to a unique international bidder of questionable profile, which was interested in selling out the company’s property. Certain UDF ministers (1997-2001) were enriched through the privatization process, in Ghodsee 2008.

¹⁴ During Saksoburgotski’s premiership (2001-2005), foreign investors bought coastal properties and agricultural land from impoverished rural Bulgarians. Similar theses have been articulated by other far-right parties, such as the Freedom Party of Austria (“our land for our children”).

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

List, whereas prohibition of ownership of land and industries by aliens invokes a core theme of early National Socialism.

A nationalism taking advantage of EU membership for short-term ends

Instances where ATAKA articulates a discourse placatory to the EU constitute, in essence, opportunities for promoting the role and the image of Bulgaria or serving national demands and goals or opposing the elites. To begin with, Bulgaria is conceived of as a cultural fault line that divides Europe and the Islamic world and the spearhead, both in the past and the present, in the battle against the Islamification and Turkification of Europe and its “cultural contamination” resulting from Turkey’s potential accession to the EU (Nationalism – ATAKA 2007; Siderov 2008u). From this perspective, ATAKA develops a topos of cultural confrontation. Attuned to this strategy, Desislav Chukolov argued that Bulgaria is once again at the front line of Europe, where the advance of Islam should be contained (Chukolov 2008c). Tasheva speaks of an “Islamist aggression in [Europe, which comprises] the primordial lands of Christian civilization” (Tasheva 2008b; Tasheva 2008c). To resist, ATAKA suggested the adoption of regulations concerning the building of non-Christian religious edifices and the removal of loudspeakers from mosques (Siderov 2008v). ATAKA condemned the construction of a second mosque at the centre of Sofia, presenting it as part of an Islamification project aiming to make Bulgaria resemble a Muslim state or to forcibly transform Sofia into a multi-religious center, and the foundation of an Islamist educational institute, presenting it as a Trojan horse of Islamic fundamentalism (ATAKA *Stops the Construction*).¹⁵ The local group of ATAKA in Stara Zagora opposed even the conservation and restoration of the local Eski mosque built in 1409, which has been declared as a national monument of culture (Declaration of ATAKA-Stara Zagora). To make this stance convincing, ATAKA glosses over the inner conflicts and deep divisions of Islam in Bulgaria, notably a generation gap manifested in traditional forms of Islam backed by aged hodzhass versus “purified or orthodox” forms (the so-called “Wahhabism”) evidenced in the worldviews of young imams who studied in Arabic countries such as Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Jordan (Ghodsee 2009). The moderate strand of Islam is consistently downplayed to allow for Islam’s projection as inherently fundamentalist, intolerant, aggressive, and violent - that is totally inconsistent with European values.

With regard to the EU, the outmost goal of ATAKA is to prevent Turkey’s accession. Turkey, it is argued, is incompatible with European values and

¹⁵ Not being unique in its stance over Islamic edifices, ATAKA’s views reflect those of the British National Party, the Lega Nord, and the Vlaams Belang.

principles; incapable of progress; racist and xenophobic; ruled by Islamists; a transgressor of human rights; the perpetrator of an illegal war to destruct the Kurds; militarized; and the occupier of territory of another EU member-state, Cyprus.¹⁶ What is more, Turkish politics turn against the Christian peoples in the Balkans, and the Bulgarians in particular, who are threatened by Turkification.

This project is supplied by a narrative of fifth column in which the DPS is presented as the putative orchestrator of methods of infiltration and assimilation: construction of mosques; employment of symbols such as the Crescent Moon and fezzes; opening of more Muslim schools; use of Turkish in Bulgarian schools; cleansing of school textbooks and of the public discourse from any term or concept hostile to Turkey; funding of projects aiming to falsify Bulgarian history, e.g., the project “the myth of Batak” or the movie “Stolen Eyes” (Abramov 2008a; *An Islamic Wave Overflows; Mockery! They Exculpate Turkish Terrorists*). All in all, this so-called project of Turkification is likened to a counter-Renaissance Process under the auspices of the DPS, which was systematically described as an ethnic, anti-constitutional, Bulgarophobic and separatist political formation, and was often being reproached for involvement with Turkish intelligence services and mafia (Abramov 2008b; Siderov 2008w). As a result, ATAKA called for a struggle to liberate “Bulgaria from the new Turkish yoke, from the Turkish rule of the DPS” (Siderov 2008i). To make its allegations plausible, however, ATAKA masks the contentious relations between Muslim figures and the DPS, which is criticized for political speculation, as well as the reluctance of Pomaks to be represented by Turks due to their hybrid and fluid identity (Ghodsee 2009, pp.115-129). By resisting Turkification and Islamification in Bulgaria, ATAKA allegedly defends the cultural purity of Europe.

The EU is also manipulated into a forum where Bulgaria strove to secure and promote its own national interests. As Binev (2009a) has stated, ATAKA “has neither left, nor right, nor centrist orientation; [its] colors are the white, the green, and the red... we struggle to promote Bulgaria’s interests in the EU”. Siderov (2008i) employed a similar socio-biological perspective, pointing out that “[the national idea] is above the political spectrum, because an organism cannot have only right or left hand or centre”. Indeed, even the most far-fetched nationalist demands were placed before the EU institutions, such as the recognition of a Bulgarian genocide committed by the Ottoman rule (1396-1913). Binev pointed out in the European Parliament that

¹⁶ ATAKA’s MEPs held firm in speeches and debates on the floor of the EP that Turkey is totally unqualified to accession into the EU, see Stoyanov 2009a.

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

for almost five centuries, under the rule of the Ottoman state, the violence against the Bulgarian people was marked by the features of genocide. A considerable part of the Bulgarian population was taken away into slavery, exterminated or forcibly converted to Islam, which is basically a purposeful ethnic cleansing (Binev 2008b)

In the same vein, all ATAKA's MEPs embarked on making their colleagues aware of the "unacknowledged Bulgarian genocide" (Stoyanov 2009b; Binev et al. 2009). Chukolov also demanded that negotiations for the accession of Serbia and Macedonia to the EU should be conditioned on the return of the Western Outlands and the region of Strumitsa, where ethnic Bulgarians live, to Bulgaria (Chukolov 2008d; *ATAKA will Demand the Return*).

European elections were manipulated for the promotion of nationalist purposes and the articulation of nationalist slogans. The fundamental motto in the elections of 2009 was "No to Turkey in Europe", while the election campaign opened up in Batak, a place of high national symbolism. The campaign for the EP elections focused plainly on national priorities, e.g. blockade of Turkish accession to the EU, recognition of Bulgarian genocide, payment of Turkish reparations, defense of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, and energy independence. Within this framework, Stoyanov was presented as an advocate of the re-commission of the Kozloduy nuclear plant, Binev as the proponent of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, and Chukolov as an activist for the cause of Bulgarian pensioners (Chukolov 2009; Siderov 2009b). On the contrary, candidate lists of other parties were presented as treacherous and anti-national, e.g. BSP's list was ostensibly controlled by the Jews and comprised of candidates indifferent to national causes; *Citizens for the European Development of Bulgaria* (CEDB) candidates were criticized for espousing globalization, federalism and Turkey's integration; NDSV candidates were presented as brokers who had betrayed national interests in the course of EU negotiations; and proponents of the "Turkish cause" comprised DPS's list (Tasheva 2009a; Tasheva 2009b). Bulgarian MEPs, by default, ought to serve, raise and defend national interests.

Whenever it was politically beneficial, ATAKA effectively manipulated incidents of divergence from European standards and the *acquis communautaire* in the fields of the legal and judicial reform, prosecution of corruption, and the rule of law in order to undermine the coalition government and to condemn the domestic political elites. Within this framework, European Commission reports relating to organized crime and corruption in Bulgaria were often exploited to

criticize the tripartite government¹⁷ and more specifically the Home Department and the leader of the DPS, Ahmed Dogan. MEPs of ATAKA also deployed allegations for Dogan's illegal business engagements, his association with corruption, and his involvement in vote-buying (*The Nationalists in the EP*). In the EP, they also reported the sluggishness of the coalition government to reform the judiciary and the legislation related to the public order, as well as vote-buying (Binev 2008c).¹⁸ One other field conducive to criticism against the political elites and the DPS, in particular, is the embezzlement of EU funds and the suspension of EU funds from PHARE and SAPARD programs which, it is argued, deprived the ordinary people of essential funds and led creative entrepreneurs to immigration (Binev 2008d; Stoyanov 2008b). Nevertheless, the fact that European subsidies imply relinquishment of part of national sovereignty is purposefully omitted.

Conclusion

Between 2007 and 2009, when Bulgaria relinquished part of its sovereignty to join a supranational organization in exchange for growth, stability, safety and better living standards, ATAKA espoused an ethnic nationalism informed of nativism, economic nationalism, cultural racism, monoculturalism and ethnocracy, welfare chauvinism, religious fundamentalism, autochthonism, anti-imperialism, reclaiming-the-country arguments, and defensive motives against putative regional and global enemies. In parallel, an obsession with national sovereignty fostered a principled opposition to the transfer of competencies to a supranational institution and a rejection of European integration and unification. Similar to the stance of other Eastern European far-right parties, ATAKA did not oppose Bulgaria's membership of the EU, given that it was taken for granted from the overwhelming majority of the Bulgarian people. This overarching consensus, though, did not deter ATAKA from advocating the halting of the EU project and, most interestingly, from taking the opportunity to assail the domestic political establishment for multiple shortcomings in crucial political domains and promote national goals using the EU as a forum of national contest. The case of ATAKA offers explanations of how long-established national themes and "common-sense truths" can be used to break a pro-EU consensus and accommodate opposition to an "ever closer union among the peoples of Europe". It also demonstrates how nationalism, and more especially its ethnic version, is antagonistic to European integration and unification. Most

¹⁷The following headings are indicative: *A Devastating Report by the European Commission is in the Process; MEPs are shocked by the Corruption in Bulgaria*.

¹⁸ In his speech, Chukolov even suggested Pöttering to take measures rather than to "sit apathetically and support neo-communists in Bulgaria" (Chukolov 2008e).

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

interestingly, national discourses convenient and expedient for adroit political agents are very well embedded and entrenched in all European societies.

Instead of the current EU model, ATAKA favoured an alternative highly and strictly intergovernmentalist scheme, an international forum of co-operation and partnership between sovereign and equal nation-states: a *Europe of nations* consisting of Christian national communities (Binev 2008e). This scheme of *Europe for Europeans* is reflected in the “*Vienna Declaration of Patriotic and National Movements and Parties in Europe*”, with ATAKA being among its signatories, and encapsulates a confederation of fully sovereign nation-states which will protect Europe against “dangers of terrorism, aggressive Islamism, superpower imperialism, and economic aggression by low-wage countries” (Liang Schori 2007, pp.13-16). Within such a peculiar intergovernmentalist project, ATAKA sought alliance and partnership with other eurosceptic, nationalist, far-right parties, such as the French Front National, the Austrian Freedom Party, the Flemish Vlaams Belang, the Italian Lega Nord, the Dutch Party for Freedom, and the British National Party. The culmination of these efforts was the Vienna conference in 2008 with the goal to establish a *European Patriotic Party*. Common denominators and goals were the opposition to Turkey’s accession to the EU, the containment of Europe by Islam, and the frustration of US plans in Europe. Hence, ATAKA’s nationalism advanced a xenophobic, Islamophobic, racist, ethnicist, nativist, fundamentalist, and authoritarian Europe: a Europe-fortress.

Thus, without explicitly rejecting Europe as a concept and European integration as a strategic scheme, ATAKA as other eurosceptic, far-right parties capitalizes on phobias latent in European societies to a greater or lesser degree, such as anti-communism in Eastern Europe, anti-Americanism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, cultural contamination, threats that immigration from Asia and Africa, and militant Islam ostensibly pose. At the same time, they articulate discourses on cultural re-birth and integrity, ethnopluralism, (re)Christianization, traditional family values, ethnic homogeneity and purity, national identity and sovereignty. Within this framework, nationalism substantially deters European identity-building. Each member-state champions its own narrative concerning its invaluable contribution to the entire European civilization, which, of course, is portrayed as so dignified that it overrides by far any contribution of other nations; thus, sustaining national myths of civilizing mission or myths of being the first Europeans.

There is a misleading asymmetry between the electoral support and popularity of far-right parties on the one hand and the level at which their discourses have

actually been ingrained in society. Very often, far-right rhetoric is adopted and addressed by mainstream parties in their attempt to attract or repatriate a part of the electorate that has gravitated towards the far-right; as a result, far-right rhetoric is getting increasingly legitimate and popular. Further research needs to be conducted to study and detect the extent to which far-right discourses have shaped the “common sense” and re-mapped social boundaries on a country basis. Besides, an in-depth research of the discourses of mainstream parties would be interesting to explore the scope of contagion effect that far-right themes and strategies may result in. For instance, the leader of GERB, Borisov, the Mayor of Sofia at the time under research and the next Prime Minister, articulated the topos of ‘*bad human capital*’ to shift the blame for Bulgaria’s hardships onto Roma and Turks (Efremova 2012, pp.47-48).

Bibliography:

- Arter, D., 2010. The Breakthrough of another West European Populist Radical Right Party? The Case of the True Finns, *Government and Opposition*, 45(4), pp.484–504.
- Azmanova, A., 2009. 1989 and the European Social Model. Transition without Emancipation?, *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 35(9), pp.1019-1037.
- Betz, H.G., 1993. The New Politics of Resentment: Radical Right-Wing Populist Parties in Western Europe, *Comparative Politics*, 25, pp.413-427.
- Bruter, M., 2005. *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bruter, M., 2003. On what citizens mean by feeling “European”: Perceptions of news, symbols and borderless-ness, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30(1), pp. 21-39.
- Chiara, V., 2005. The Promotion of European Identity. In Lehtonen, D. & Petkova, J., (eds.) *Cultural Identity in an Intercultural context*, University of Jyväskylä: Dept. of Communication, pp. 196-213.
- Duchesne, S., 2008. Waiting for a European Identity... Reflections on the Process of Identification with Europe, *Perspectives on European Policy and Society*, 9(4), pp. 397-410.
- Efremova, G., (2012). Integralist Narratives and Redemptive Anti-Gypsy Politics in Bulgaria. In Stewart, M. (ed.), *The Gypsy Menace: Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics*, London: Hurst, pp.43-66.
- Flood, C. & Usherwood, S., 2007. Ideological Factors in Party Alignments on the EU: A Comparison of Three Cases. In *European Union Studies Association: proceedings of the 10th Biennial International Conference*, Montreal.

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of ATAKA

- Gastelaars, M. and Ruijter, A. (eds.), 1998. *A united Europe: the Quest for a Multifaceted Identity*, Maastricht: Shaker.
- Genov, N., 2010. Radical Nationalism in Contemporary Bulgaria, *Review of European Studies*, 2(2), pp. 35-53.
- Gherghina, S., 2014. *Party Organization and Electoral Volatility in Central and Eastern Europe: Enhancing Voter Loyalty*, London: Routledge.
- Ghodsee, K., 2009. *Muslim Lives in Eastern Europe: Gender, Ethnicity, and the Transformation of Islam in Postsocialist Bulgaria*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ghodsee, K., 2008. Left Wing, Right Wing, Everything: Xenophobia, Neo-totalitarianism, and Populist Politics in Bulgaria, *Problems of Post-Communism*, 55(3), pp. 26-39.
- Gurov, B. and Zankina, E., 2013. Populism and the Construction of Political Charisma: Post-Transition Politics in Bulgaria, *Problems of Post-Communism*, 60(1), pp. 3-17.
- Kopecky, P. and Mudde, C., 2002. The Two Sides of Euroscepticism: Party Positions on European Integration in East Central Europe, *European Union Politics*, 3(3), pp. 297-326.
- Laclau, E., 2006. *On Populist Reason*, London: Verso.
- Lewis, P., 2000. *Political Parties in Post-Communist Eastern Europe*, London: Routledge.
- Liang Schori, C., 2007. *Europe for the Europeans: The Foreign and Security Policy of the Populist Radical Right*, Hampshire: Ashgate.
- List, F., 1841. *The National System of Political Economy*.
- Lubbers, M. and Scheepers, P., 2005. Political versus Instrumental Euroscepticism, *European Union Politics*, 6(2), pp. 223-242.
- Mouffe, C., 1993. *The Return of the Political*, London: Verso.
- Mudde, C., 2007. *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Novaković, I., 2008. *The Rise of Political Extremism in Bulgaria – The Political Party “ATAKA”*, Bologna: MIREES.
- Pagden, A. (ed.), 2002. *The Idea of Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pauwels, T., 2011. Explaining the strange decline of the populist radical right Vlaams Belang in Belgium: The impact of permanent opposition, *Acta Politica*, 46(1), pp.60-82.
- Pelinka, A.R., 2013. Right-Wing Populism: Concept and Typology. In Wodak, R., Khosravinik, M. & Mral, B. (eds.), *Right-Wing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourses*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Pirro, A., 2015. The Populist Radical Right in the Political Process: Assessing Party Impact in Central and Eastern Europe. In Minkenberg, M. (ed.),

Transforming the Transformation? The East European Radical Right in the Political Process, London: Routledge.

- Risse, T., 2005. Neo-functionalism, European Identity and the Puzzles of European Integration, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12(2), pp. 291-309.
- Rydgren, J., 2008. Immigration sceptics, xenophobes or racists? Radical right-wing voting in six West European countries, *European Journal of Political Research*, 47(6), pp.737–765.
- Shotter, J., 1993. *The Cultural Politics of Everyday Life*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Spirova, M., 2007. *Political Parties in Post-Communist Societies. Formation, Persistence, and Change*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Szczerbiak, A. and Taggart, P., 2003. *Theorising Party-based Euroscepticism: Problems of Definition, Measurement and Causality*, Sussex: Sussex European Institute.
- Szczerbiak, A. and Taggart, P., 2001. *Parties, Positions and Europe: Euroscepticism in the EU Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe*, Sussex: Sussex European Institute.
- Sygkelos, Y., 2010. Playing the Patriotic along with the European Card: Saksoburggotski's Discourses, 2001-2005, *SLOVO*, 22(1), pp.21-37.
- Taggart, P., 2003. *The Populist Turn in the Politics of the new Europe*, 8th Biannual Conference of the European Union Studies Association, Nashville.
- Zhecheva, K., 2007. АТАКА – between Nationalism and Populism, *Politicheski Izsledvaniya*, 3, pp. 49-68.

Primary sources

- Abramov, D., 2008a. Турската експанзия срещу България се прицелва и в духовността (The Turkish Expansion against Bulgaria Aims at the Spiritual Domain as well). АТАКА, 13 November
- Abramov, D., 2008b. ДПС забрани Деня на независимостта в Родопите (The DPS Forbade the Celebration of the Independence Day in the Rhodope mountains). АТАКА, 27 September.
- АТАКА, 2009. Програма на партия АТАКА за парламентарни избори (*Program of АТАКА for Parliamentary Elections*). Available at: <http://www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2817&Itemid=61> [Last Accessed February 3, 2014].
- АТАКА, 2008. ЕП да не иска привилегии за циганите у нас (АТАКА: the EP should not Want Gypsy Privileges in our Country). Available at: www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=162&Itemid=61. [Last Accessed April 14, 2014]
- АТАКА, 2008. "Захарна фабрика" отново на бунт срещу циганите ("Zaharna Fabrika" again in Riots against Gypsies). 11 June.

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of АТАКА

- АТАКА, 2008. АТАКА настоя за разваляне на Ньойския договор (*АТАКА Insists in the Neuilly Treaty's Annulment*). 27 November.
- АТАКА, 2008. АТАКА спира градежа на втора джамия в София (*АТАКА Stops the Construction of a Second Mosque in Sofia*). 03 December.
- АТАКА, 2008. АТАКА ще иска връщане на Западните покрайнини и Струмица в пределите на България (*АТАКА will Demand the Return of the Western Outlands and Strumitsa to Bulgaria*). Available at: www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2452&Itemid=74. [Last Accessed April 21, 2014].
- АТАКА, 2008. ГАВРА! Оневиняват турските терористи (*Mockery! They Exculpate Turkish Terrorists*). 09 February.
- АТАКА, 2008. Декларация на АТАКА - Стара Загора срещу реставрирането на Ески джамия (*Declaration of АТАКА - Stara Zagora against the restoration of Eski mosque*). Available form: www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=954&Itemid=1. [Last Accessed April 22, 2014].
- АТАКА, 2008. Евродепутати шокирани от корупцията у нас (MEPs Shocked by the Corruption in Bulgaria). 05 November.
- АТАКА, 2008. Защо Светият синод иска да въведе исляма в българското училище (*Why the Holy Synod Wants to Introduce Islam into Bulgarian Schools*). АТАКА, 14 May.
- АТАКА, 2008. Ислямска вълна залива Родопите (*An Islamic Wave Overflows the Rhodope Mountains*). 07 November.
- АТАКА, 2008. Народните представители ратифицираха Лисабонския договор, гласувайки с чужди карти (*MPs ratified the Lisbon Treaty, voting with foreign cards*). Available at www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=376. [Last Accessed February 10, 2014].
- АТАКА, 2008. Националистите в ЕП: Разследването на корупцията в България трябва да започне от Доган (*The Nationalists in the EP: the Investigation on Corruption must Begin with Dogan*). 17 June.
- АТАКА, 2008. Новите членове на АТАКА се заклеха като Левски върху Библия, револвер и нож (*New Membership of АТАКА Took the Oath on a Bible, a Revolver and a Sword like Levski did*). 21 July.
- АТАКА, 2008. Станахме спонсори на ЕС (*We Became Sponsors of the EU*). 27 November.
- АТАКА, 2008. Станишев готви погром върху българския език (*Stanishev Prepares a Pogrom against the Bulgarian Language*). 04 April.
- АТАКА, 2008. Факли осветиха София в памет на Левски (*Torches Lit up Sofia in Memory of Levski*). 20 February.
- АТАКА, 2007. *Nationalism* (video clip). Available at:

- www.youtube.com/watch?v=KTFqei4oYnU. [Last Accessed May 15, 2014].
- АТАКА, 2005. *АТАКА's 20 Principles*. Available at: www.ataka.bg/en/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=14&Itemid=27. [Last Accessed February 10, 2014].
- Binev, Sl., Chukolov, D. & Stoyanov, D., 2009. *Written Declaration on the Upsurge in Ethnic Hatred against Bulgarians in Bulgaria*, [EP, P6_DCL0006].
- Binev, Sl., 2009a. Националистите ще бъдат трета сила в Европарламента (The Nationalists will be the Third Party in the EP Elections). АТАКА, 04 June.
- Binev, Sl., 2008a. Слави Бинев: Нека православието стане официална държавна религия в България (Let the Greek Orthodox Become the Official State Religion in Bulgaria). АТАКА, 15 May.
- Binev, Sl., 2008b. Proposed Hearing of the Commission on Crimes of Genocide, Crimes against Humanity and War Crimes Committed by Totalitarian Regimes [EP, P6_CRE04-21 15].
- Binev, Sl., 2008c. Бинев пред ЕП: Премиер, прокуратура и МВР са се сраснали с мафията у нас (The Prime Minister, the Attorney General and the Home Secretary have been Fused with Mafia). АТАКА, 22 May.
- Binev, Sl., 2008d. Парите от ЕС не достигат до народа (EU Money do not Reach the People). АТАКА, 26 November.
- Binev, Sl., 2008e. Единна Европа може да се гради само върху християнските ценности (A unified Europe can be Built on Christian Values only). АТАКА, 07 June.
- Chukolov, D., 2009. Най-важни са нашите национални интереси (Our National Interests are the most Important). АТАКА, 27 May.
- Chukolov, D., 2008a. Evaluation of EU sanctions as part of the EU's actions and policies in the area of human rights (EP, P6_CRE09-03, 13).
- Chukolov, D., 2008b. Докладът на ЕК е изготвен в полза на управляващите (The report of the European Commission is Prepared to be Beneficial for the Government). АТАКА, 05 February.
- Chukolov, D., 2008c. Управляващите в ЕС не искат да работят със Станишев (The Heads of the EU do not Want to Work with Stanishev). АТАКА, 04 December.
- Chukolov, D., 2008d. One-minute Speeches on Matters of Political Importance [EP, P6_CRE12-03(18)].
- Chukolov, D., 2008e. One-minute Speeches on Matters of Political Importance [EP, P6_CRE01-30(21)].
- Siderov, V., 2010². (2004¹). *Властта на Мамона (The Power of Mammon)*, Sofia: Bălgarska. Available at: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/141591639/Vlastta-Na-Mamona-Volen-Siderov> [Last Accessed June 30, 2014].

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of АТАКА

- Siderov, V., 2009a. “Не” на Турция в ЕС, икономическият ятаган е надвиснал над България (‘No’ to Turkey in Europe, an Economic Yatagan is Hanging over Bulgaria). АТАКА, 18 May.
- Siderov, V., 2009b. АТАКА заложи на сигурни имена в евроизборите (АТАКА stakes on certain names in the European elections). АТАКА, 16 May.
- Siderov, V., 2008a. Управляващата мафия у нас се страхува само от АТАКА (The Ruling Mafia is Afraid only of АТАКА). АТАКА, 27 May.
- Siderov, V., 2008b. За свободата се воюва всеки ден, няма да ни я подари Брюксел (Fight for Freedom is a Daily Task, Brussels will not Endow it to us). Available at: www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1454&Itemid=46. [Last Accessed April 25, 2014].
- Siderov, V., 2008c. Без център за ислямски фундаменталисти и потенциални терористи (Without an Institute of Islamist Fundamentalism and Potential Terrorists). Available at: www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2397&Itemid=61. [Last Accessed April 15, 2014].
- Siderov, V., 2008d. Глобализацията обслужва олигарсите, време е за промяна (Globalisation Serves the Oligarchs, it is Time for Change). АТАКА, 19 November.
- Siderov, V., 2008e. Паси, Гоце, Симеон и Доган на съд за Ирак (Pasi, Gotse, Simeon and Dogan in Trial for Iraq). АТАКА, 18 November.
- Siderov, V., 2008f. Днес Ботев щеше да се бори срещу новото турско робство (Today Botev would have Fought against the New Turkish Yoke). АТАКА, 03 June.
- Siderov, V., 2008g. Първанов не се поклони на Левски, защото сложи неговите убийци на власт (Parvanov did not Pay Respect to Levski, because he has Put Levski’s own Assassimators in Power). АТАКА, 21 July.
- Siderov, V., 2008h. Гангстерите на Тачи ще посегнат и на Македония (Gangsters of Thachi will Strike at Macedonia). АТАКА, 11 February.
- Siderov, V., 2008i. Да сложим край на турската власт (Let’s Put an End to the Turkish Rule). АТАКА, 04 March.
- Siderov, V., 2008j. В европейска България полицията мачка инакомислещите (In European Bulgaria, the Police Crushes Dissidents). АТАКА, 14 August.
- Siderov, V., 2008k. Станишев, ако искаш война с опозицията, ще я имаш (Stanishev, if you Want War with the Opposition, you will Have it). АТАКА, 09 September.
- Siderov, V., 2008l. Сергей, кажи колко струваше гейпарадът на Бузлуджа (Sergei, give an account for the cost of the gay parade in Buzludzha). АТАКА, 07 August.

- Siderov, V., 2008m. САЩ и Русия пренебрегват България (*The USA and Russia Brush Bulgaria off*). Available at: www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1078&Itemid=61 [Last Accessed February 04, 2014].
- Siderov, V., 2008n. Европа става свръхдържава, а България - провинция без глас (Europe is becoming supra-state, while Bulgaria an unvoiced province). АТАКА, 22 March.
- Siderov, V., 2008o. Договорът от Лисабон трябва да бъде подложен на референдум (A referendum on the Lisbon Treaty must be held). АТАКА, 21 March.
- Siderov, V., 2008p. Глобализацията се провали, нужна е алтернатива (Globalisation has failed; there is a need of an alternative). АТАКА, 18 November.
- Siderov, V., 2008q. Защо Брюксел не пита как се живее с 50 евро пенсия (Why does not Brussels Ask how it is Possible to Live with a Pension of 50 Euros). АТАКА, 29 August.
- Siderov, V., 2008r. Регистрирането на ОМО „Илинден ПИРИН” е експеримент, който не трябва да допускаме (Registration of ОМО “Ilinden Pirin” is an Experiment that we should not Allow). Available at: www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2683&Itemid=74. [Last Accessed February 03, 2014].
- Siderov, V., 2008s. Който иска помашки етнос, нарушава Конституцията (Who wants a Pomak Ethnicity Breaches the Constitution). АТАКА, 27 October.
- Siderov, V., 2008t. Цяла България се "атакизира", което значи, че се българизира (The Entire Bulgaria is “Atakised”, Meaning that it is Bulgarised). АТАКА, 30 October.
- Siderov, V., 2008u. България спря турското нашествие, ще спре и днес Турция към ЕС (Bulgaria stopped Turkish invasion, it will stop Turkey from the EU today). АТАКА, 25 January.
- Siderov, V., 2008v. Пак ли Доган ще управлява България? (Will Dogan rule Bulgaria again?). Available at: www.vestnikataka.com/?module=displaystory&story_id=47822&format=print&edition_id=802. [Last Accessed February 07, 2014].
- Siderov, V., 2008w. Станишев и Първанов са марионетки на Доган (Stanishev and Parvanov are Puppets of Dogan). Available at: www.ataka.bg/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1510. [Last Accessed April 22, 2014].
- Siderov, V., 2007. Моята битка за България (*My Battle for Bulgaria*), Sofia: Bumerang.
- Siderov, V., 2003. Българофобия (*Bulgarophobia*), Sofia: Bumerang.

Nationalism versus European Integration: The case of АТАКА

- Siderov, V., 2002. Бумерангът на злото (*The Boomerang of Evil*), Sofia: Obektiv. Available at: www.rulit.net/books/bumerangt-na-zloto-read-285000-1.html [Last Accessed June 30, 2014].
- Siderov, V., n.d. *Globalisation – the Last Stage of the Colonization of the Orthodox East*. Available at: www.radioislam.org/conferences/#volen [Last Accessed June 30, 2014].
- Stoyanov, D., 2009a. Explanations of vote: Motion for Resolution on Turkey's Progress Report [P6_CRE03-12(8)].
- Stoyanov, D., 2009b. One-minute Speeches on Matters of Political Importance [EP P6_CRE03-23-13].
- Stoyanov, D., 2008a. Европейските институции предадоха очакванията на българите (European Institutions Betrayed the Expectations of Bulgarians). АТАКА, 26 June.
- Stoyanov, D., 2008b. Мафията на Доган краде парите от ЕС за бедствията (Dogan's Mafia Steals EU Subsidies for Disasters). АТАКА, 18 June.
- Stoyanov, D., 2008c. Чака ни унищожителен доклад на ЕК (A Devastating Report by the European Commission is in the Process). АТАКА, 26 March.
- Tasheva, M., 2009a. Останалите 95% от българския народ ще бъдат представлявани в ЕП единствено от депутатите на АТАКА (The Rest of 95% of the Bulgarian People will be Represented only by АТАКА MEPs'). АТАКА, 16 May.
- Tasheva, M., 2009b. Доган праща в ЕП роднини на криминали (Dogan Sends Relatives of Criminals to the EP). АТАКА, 16 May.
- Tasheva, M., 2008a. България е вече легитимна мишена на руски удари (Bulgaria is already a Legitimate Target of Russian Blows). АТАКА, 19 August.
- Tasheva, M., 2008b. Натискът за строеж на джамии в Европа е координиран от Рияд (Pressures to Build Mosques in Europe is Coordinated by Riyadh). АТАКА, 01 December.
- Tasheva, M., 2008c. Продажни политици стават оръдия на ислямизацията (Venal Politicians Become Instruments of Islamisation). АТАКА, 02 December.