University of Glasgow

Gustaffson, Anna (2015) *United in diversity? Framing solidarity in the 2014 European Parliment manifestos* [Undergraduate Degree]

http://endeavour.gla.ac.uk/24/

Deposited on: 5 November 2015

Enlighten: Dissertations
http://endeavour.gla.ac.uk/
theses@gla.ac.uk

United in Diversity?

Framing solidarity in the 2014 European Parliament manifestos

1101650

Presented in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of

Politics M.A. (Honours)

School of Social and Political Science

University of Glasgow

March 2015

9809 words

Abstract

The European Union motto "United in Diversity" signifies how Europeans from diverse backgrounds are coming together in solidarity to work for peace and prosperity. Using frame analysis, this paper will analyse the diverse solidarity concepts found in the 2014 European election manifestos. The main research aim is to describe, compare and contrast these solidarity frames and link them to traditional political ideologies. The analysis showed that the solidarity frames were influenced by the parties' respective political understandings of the concept. It also showed the lack of engagement in the election by some of the Europarties. Assessing the third aim, to analyse whether the lack of engagement in the election endangered European solidarity, this paper found the emergence of 'vertical solidarity'. Forces of Europeanisation and individualisation has created a new foundation of European solidarity where solidarity is shown for different causes, policies and ideologies at the same time. This development is not separate from the 'de facto' solidarity that founded the European project, but a continuation of it.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Eamonn Butler who introduced me to the complex and intriguing world of solidarity.

And I would also want to thank Tom Bladskog for keeping me sane while writing this.

Table of Contents

Tables

Introduction

"United in Diversity" came into use in the year 2000 as the motto of the European Union (EU). It signifies how Europeans from all cultures, traditions and languages come together as one to work for peace and prosperity on a continent with a history of war. The foundation of unity in the EU is thought to be solidarity between European states and between European citizens. By constructing a unique model of frame analysis, this paper will build a signature matrix for the solidarity frames found in the 2014 election manifestos of the six largest Europarties. Due to the limited scope of this paper, not all election manifestos will be analysed. The election manifestos included in this paper are the manifestos of the European People's Party (EPP), the Party of European Socialists (PES), the Alliance of European Conservatives and Reformists (AECR), the Alliance of Democrats and Liberals for Europe Party (ALDE), the European Green Party (EGP) and the Party of the European Left (PEL).

The research questions that will guide this analysis are (1) How are the concepts of solidarity framed in the 2014 election manifestos of the European political parties?, (2) Are these frames influenced by traditional political understandings of the concept?, and (3) Is the lack of engagement in the European elections endangering European solidarity? These research questions will be answered through three self-contained chapters. Chapter 1 will answer the first research question by first constructing a signature matrix for the solidarity frames found in the manifestos, and then describe, compare and contrast these frames. Similarly, chapter 2 will assess the influence of traditional political concepts of solidarity by linking the respective political ideology of the respective parties with the solidarity frame found in chapter 1. The final chapter will examine whether European solidarity is endangered by the lack of engagement in the European Parliamentary elections by critically analysing the findings from chapter 1 and 2.

The Lisbon Treaty has legally made solidarity one of the common values of the EU. The decision to incorporate the concept into European law should mean that it is a value with some sort of objective definition. This is found not to be the case. Charting the development of the concept of solidarity from the theory of mechanical and organic solidarity in Durkheim (1997) [1893], Brunkhorsts's (2005) argument that solidarity is inherit in modern democracies, and Stjernø's (2004) ideological map of the concept, the literature review will conclude that there are several conceptual understandings of solidarity in Europe today. However, no literature exists on how solidarity is constructed in the European Parliament. Therefore, this

paper will use frame analysis to construct a signature matrix of the solidarity frames of the six largest Europarties in the 2014 election. The signature matrix builds on a framework constructed by Gamson and Lasch (1983), but will be adopted to fit the format of election manifestos.

Chapter 1 will construct and analyse the solidarity frames found in the signature matrix. The analysis of these frames show that some of the solidarity frames share certain similarities but that none of them are identical. The choice made by the AECR not to produce a manifesto is noted. Even though the party refers to their Reykjavik Declaration as their manifesto, this text is less than 300 words long, which make frame analysis difficult. Chapter 2 will take these solidarity frames and cross-reference them with the solidarity concept of their respective political tradition. This section will show that even though some of the parties include some of the values of their political tradition, most of these solidarity frames are incomplete. For example, the Christian Democratic EPP did not include the subsidiarity principle, which arguably is the most important European value for Christian Democracy.

The final chapter will examine whether the lack of complete solidarity frames, or overall engagement in the European Parliamentary elections is endangering European solidarity. It will conclude that this is not the case. Even though solidarity is facing difficulties to thrive in the European Parliament, it is not completely lost. Individualism and European integration has created the foundation of a new type of solidarity. Contemporary solidarities are increasingly transnational and 'vertical'. This paper will suggest that solidarity in Europe today should be thought as 'vertical solidarity' where a European citizen can show solidarity for different causes, policies or ideologies at the same time. This development was made possible by the 'de facto' solidarity that the Schuman Declaration introduced 65 years ago. In conclusion, this paper will argue that solidarity is still prospering in the EU, just not in the European Parliament or through the lens of traditional political ideologies.

Part I: Literature Review

*"The Union is founded on the values of respect of human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, **solidarity**, and equality between."* (European Union, The Lisbon Treaty (2007), Article 1a, emphasis added).

As of December 2009, the Lisbon Treaty has legally made solidarity a common value of the Member States of the EU. This might seem ironic in the light of the difficulties that the Lisbon, or originally Constitutional Treaty, faced before it was finally ratified in December 2007. Values, such as freedom, democracy and equality are notoriously hard to define as they usually have a reflexive meaning for each individual, informed by his or her cultural, political or economic point of view. The aim of this paper is not to provide a European definition of the concept of solidarity, which would be impossible, but rather illustrate the state of solidarity in contemporary Europe, especially in the context of the European Parliament.

I.   Sources of solidarity in society

Invigorated by the re-emergence of solidarity in the wake of the economic and financial crisis, the academic literature provides multiple competing conceptual understandings of solidarity in Europe today. Several authors begins with an assessment of the theory of solidarity presented by Emile Durkheim (1893) in *The Division of Labour in Society*. Durkheim's theory of solidarity is constructed as an historical narrative, where he distinguishes between mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. The theory emerged from Durkheim's observation of how industrialisation and modernisation was changing the divisions of labour. Before, most Europeans lived in small, stable, peasant communities where the survival of the community was more important than the needs of the individual. People mostly lived all of their lives in the same community, creating a "collective consciousness" (Durkheim, 1997 [1893]: 39). It is this type of solidarity that Durkheim calls mechanical solidarity, "by analogy with the cohesion that links together the elements of raw materials" (Durkheim, 1997 [1893]: 84).

Industrialisation completely transformed these communities. The stable tight-knit communities dissolved as a large numbers of Europeans moved into cities to be closer to the new labour market. The Europeans that found themselves in urban areas no longer had access

to the 'natural feeling of belonging' that characterised mechanical solidarity. Instead, the new division of labour facilitated a new form of solidarity that was founded in functionality. Durkheim called this new type of solidarity organic solidarity, which was solidarity "by differences" (Gofman, 2014: 46). This type of solidarity does not build on a common heritage or a history of unity, which explains its appeal to researchers of solidarity in the EU. However, there are several problems with Durkheim's theory which can be explained in two arguments. First, the cohesion of post-industrial societies were mostly founded on nationalism, where cultural 'sameness' were emphasised over the differences brought on by the division of labour. Second, following Brunkhorst (2005), solidarity did not morph into a functional form of solidarity after industrialisation. Instead, while urbanisation forced the emergence of a new type of social integration, it was constitutional democracy that created a renewal of solidarity.

Acknowledging the work of Durkheim, Hauke Brunkhorst (2005) argue that industrialisation, urbanisation and modernisation brought about "the emergence of the functionally differentiated society" (Brunkhorst, 2005: 81). However, the construction of a new type of solidarity did not happen automatically, but was prompted by the reappearance of constitutionalism. One of its most important principles that encouraged new forms of solidarity was the introduction of equal democratic citizenship (Thuesen Pedersen, 2006: 118). Solidarity did not have to be reinvented in modern democracies, since they are constructed on the "traditions of Judeo-Christian brotherly solidarity and Greco-Roman civic solidarity" (Brunkhorst, 2005: 55). Thereby, solidarity was already inherited in constitutional democracy. Most importantly, democratic solidarity solves the problem of dual-inclusion that industrialisation and new division of labour have caused. The rich and powerful had become over-included and the poor and uneducated had been sub-integrated (Brunkhorst, 2005: 95-97).

Here, it is important to realise that even though constitutional democracies created the foundations of one type of solidarity, this is not the sole source of solidarity in Europe. Despite the increasing secular nature of European democracies, religion has been, and still is, an important resource of solidarity (Brunkhorst, 2007). The religious understanding of solidarity has also been an important contributing factor in the creation of the European project. Robert Schuman, one of the founding fathers of the European Community, was influenced by the Christian philosophy of solidarity (McCauliff, 2012). The Schuman Declaration on the 9th May 1950 proposed the establishment of a High Authority to administer the production of coal and steel between France and Germany. This economic

interdependence would in time result in solidarity between Europeans. "Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievement which will create a de facto solidarity" (Schuman, 1950). Even though Schuman was influenced by a Christian ethic, there are clear traces of early liberal philosophy in this statement. Brunkhorst points out that liberals such as Adam Smith or Jeremy Bentham regarded capitalism, free markets and economic growth as positive forces that would eventually provide equality and solidarity in society (Brunkhorst, 2007: 93-9).

II.   Conceptual definitions of solidarity

Although constitutionalism helped renew a sense of unity within modern democracies, it also provided a stage for competing ideological ideas of cohesion to emerge through parliaments. Party politics has been an important force in European democracies and had real impact on the structure and characteristics of states in Europe. In *Solidarity in Europe* (2004), Steinar Stjernø traces the theoretical origins of solidarity through political ideologies and comes up with three political traditions of solidarity; Marxism, Social Democracy and Christian Democracy (Stjernø, 2004: 43-47). In the context of the EU, social democracy and Christian democracy have been the most influential political ideologies. The Christian Democratic European People's Party (EPP) and the Social Democratic Part of European Socialists (PES) represent the two biggest parties in the European parliament.

Both of these parties have a positive stance towards the EU and believe that social integration is the main objective of solidarity (Stjernø, 2011: 168). Due to its abstract nature, solidarity has not produced any dividing lines between the parties. Since both parties agree on the goal of solidarity and embrace the benefits of European interdependence and integration, the different conceptual understandings of the concepts have not been debated. However, the lack of political attention to solidarity has not changed the fact that their parties hold competing ideas of the motivation and inclusion of the concept. For example, the Christian Democratic concept of solidarity is founded on ideas originating in Catholic social teaching, while the Social Democratic concept comes from the ethics created by social revisions of Marxism (Stjernø, 2004: 43-2). The motivation behind Christian Democratic solidarity is the idea that all men and women are equal before God, and therefore their human dignity has to be respected. For Social Democrats, all human beings deserve to be equally treated because it is ethically right to do so. Whereas the Christian Democratic and Social Democratic concepts of solidarity emphasise the importance of social unity of the whole society, the Marxist concept

is more focused on the social unity of workers. These political and ideological distinctions are important, but represent only one interpretation of the concept of solidarity.

Solidarity is not solely expressed in the form of party politics, but in everyday actions of individuals and institutions. Fenger and von Paridon (2012) identify four types of solidarity, moral individual solidarity, reciprocal individual solidarity, moral institutional solidarity, and reciprocal institutional solidarity (Fenger and von Paridon, 2012: 50-52). Essentially, an individual or an institution can be the agents of solidarity, and their motivation can be either moral or reciprocal. Moral individual solidarity could be exemplified with an individual's choice to give to charity, as the individual then does not expect anything in return. Reciprocal individual solidarity, on the other hand, is a self-interested solidarity. A self-interested individual give to charity since it is in their own interest to fund free health care, in case the individual would need it one day. Fenger and von Pardons' research examines whether any of these types have been affected by the forces of globalisation or Europeanization. While they only found some effects in individual forms of solidarity, they found significant change in institutionalised solidarities. The changes in reciprocal institutional solidarity were only found in the EU. For example, the economic and financial crisis of 2008 gave rise to the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF), created by the European Commission, European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The fund is funded by GDP from the other EU Member States, and has for example been useful in keeping Greece from default on its debts.

In the light of the economic crisis in Southern Europe, it is not surprising that most of the debate on solidarity in Europe has surrounded European institutional reciprocal solidarity. However, the other type of solidarity, called moral solidarity (Fenger and von Paridon, 2012) or affectionate solidarity (Fabry, 2010) has not been examined to the same extent. A roundtable discussion organised by the pro-integration think tank Notre Europe found that in the discussion on affectionate solidarity, the discussants remarks on the topic were both "spontaneous and disinterested" , even though it was considered the EU's "main raison d'être" (Fabry, 2010: 2).

Research questions

The lack of engagement on important aspects of solidarity represents a clear gap in the literature. Solidarity is not just an economic concept that dictates reciprocity, but a social concept that offers a justification of the social and political experiment that is the European Union. The concept of solidarity has to be reclaimed from economics and brought back to social and political thought.

This dissertation will analyse how the Europarties constructed the concept of solidarity in their party manifestos for the 2014 European elections. The main objective is to compare and contrast the competing narratives found in the manifestos. The subsidiary aims are to relate these concepts to their political traditions and assess whether the lack of engagement in the European election endangers solidarity.

Thus, the research questions are as follows:

➢ **How are the concepts of solidarity framed in the 2014 election manifestos?**

➢ Are these frames influenced by traditional political understandings of the concept?

➢ Is the lack of engagement in the European elections endangering European solidarity?

Part II: Design and Methodology

I.   Epistemology and design

The main aim of this research is to analyse how solidarity is framed in the European Parliament today by analysing the election manifestos of the Europarties that were produced for the 2014 European election. Subsidiary aims are to examine if the solidarity frames found in the manifestos are linked to any traditional political traditions, and if the lack of engagement in the European elections endanger solidarity.

This research presented several challenges. First, the concept of solidarity is an undefined concept that has mostly been used as a rhetorical term to symbolise abstract political unity. Second, solidarity is a concept that has a different conceptual definition in different ideologies. However, the concept was extensively used in the inception of the European project in the 1950's, and has recently made its way into several European treaties. It is therefore important to analyse what position and perspective the Europarties have on the issue. Unfortunately, the European parties are not as vocal as they perhaps should be, and many of them do not even produce political platforms. The European Parliament have 751 seats, which are distributed to MEPs elected from the European Member states. These MEPs can then decide to join a Europarty or stay independent or unaffiliated. Since the European Parliament is constructed around Party Groups, many Europarties form groups together. In order to form a group, 25 MEPs, representing at least one quarter of the Member States are needed. The 8th European Parliament include 13 Europarties, divided into 7 Europarty groups. The 'group' system of the European parliament sometimes clouds the positions of the political parties within the groups. The 2014 European election presented an opportunity to compare the messages of the actual political parties instead of the party groups.

The manifestos provide coherent text directed to the same receiver (the electorate), which makes comparison of the message possible. Manifestos do not only present the party's position on specific policies and agreements, but more abstract views on what the party believe is the nature of the EU. Using a type of frame analysis building on a constructivist interpretive epistemology (Bryman, 2008: 19), the party's view on solidarity will be illustrated, compared and contrasted. The election manifesto's represents a collection of coherent ideas which makes it an appropriate piece of empirical evidence to analyse (Creed et al., 2002, Snow and Benford, 1988, Gamson and Lasch, 1983 etc.) The manifestos are official documents, collected from the official websites of the respective European political party. The

reliability of the information presented in the texts is therefore very high (Bryman, 2008: 522). There are also no ethical issues involved since only already written material will be used in the research.

Even though the European Parliament represents one of the supranational legislative bodies in the European Union, voting turnout is usually very low, down to 13% in Slovakia 2014. Since the European political parties do not campaign as their parties in all of the European states, many voters might only have read the manifesto for the national party, and not the European party manifesto. The reasons for the low turnout and the continued national character of the European elections are many, and they are all outside the scope of this paper. The election manifestos are available for free on the party websites for all Europeans. Due to the limited scope of this paper, only the manifestos of the six largest European parties will be subjected to frame analysis.

II.   Frame analysis

Frame analysis first appeared in the works of Erving Goffman (1974) who argued that we use frame analysis to organize and make sense of the world around us. The method has since then been adopted by several fields within the social sciences as a tool to analyse text and communication. Entman (1993) suggest that framing was essentially a method to detect *selection* and *salience* – "to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described" (Entman, 1993: 52). Frame analysis thus exposes the rationale behind the selection and emphasis of themes in text.

This empirical analysis of this paper is highly influenced by the framing method outlined in Gamson and Lasch (1983). In their paper on the constructions of frames in the debate over the Family Assistance Plan in the US in 1969, they suggest that frames can best be detected through the construction of a signature matrix (Gamson and Lasch, 1983: 397). This matrix consists of two parts, framing devices and reasoning devices. Framing devices consists of metaphors, exemplars, catch-phrases, depictions and visual images, which together suggests a frame to view an issue through (Gamson & Lasch, 1983: 399). The justification devices provides reasoning behind the frame and consists of roots, consequences, and appeals to principle. In essence, Gamson and Lasch provided a rich methodology which can easily be applied for in-depth analysis on different types of texts in many different fields of academia.

III. Application to this research

In most types of frame analysis, the analysis is done on position papers where only one question or policy is discussed. This paper will apply it on election manifestos, which are texts with several different policy messages. However, even though the manifestos develop arguments on a wide range of policies, European solidarity is the uniting factor for all of the political parties. Due to the abstract nature of the concept, it is often hidden within other symbols and messages. The party position and definition could, for example, be hidden in its policy on European integration (more or less solidarity), youth unemployment, pensions and environmental protection, and the immigration and asylum policy (international solidarity). In this paper, the framing devices used in Gamson and Lasch (1983) has been adapted to better detect frames in the political manifestos. The following section will illustrate how these devices have been adopted for this research.

Visual construction

The first two framing devices in Gamson and Lasch (1983) are metaphors and exemplars. While metaphors "rely on imagined events", exemplars are constructed to mirror real events (Gamson and Lasch 1983: 399). These two framing devices have been replaced by 'Visual construction'. Metaphors and exemplars are probably better suited for position papers and political speeches, as no written metaphors or exemplars were found in the manifestos. The metaphors were instead presented in the form of pictures, which constructed a narrative of how the political parties viewed Europe today and in the future.

Catch-phrases

Subsequently, the category of 'catch-phrases' are adopted to only capture the slogans of the election manifesto. Gamson and Lasch (1983) define catchphrases as snappy sentences and short statements that emphasise a particular desired frame, which the election slogans clearly do. It provides a powerful symbol to the overall message of the manifesto.

Self-image and Description of Opposition

The following section serves as a section for depictions of the opposition. Gamson and Lasch (1983) give the example of Lyndon Johnson calling the critics of his Vietnam policy "nervous nellies". The way that a text positions itself against its critics is interesting. However, since the material under analysis are election manifestos, it is unlikely that any of the parties would

have resorted to name calling (even if it is possible, and likely, that this could happen during a parliamentary debate). For these reasons, this section has been modified and divided into two sections, Self-image and Description of opposition.

Party Logo

The party logo serves as an important symbol for the frame of the party. It is especially interesting to note if the European party has chosen to incorporate the 'circle of stars' that are found on the European flag, since these stars symbolise solidarity.

Roots – Why is solidarity important today?

Roots are one of three reasoning devices in Gamson and Lasch's (1983) framework. As the name suggests, roots emphasize the root of the problem. In this analysis, roots represent the reason why the political party have their particular frame of solidarity. The root that we are after here is the reason why solidarity is important today, and not why the election manifesto is written, which is of course for the election.

Consequences - What is the future of solidarity?

This section record the consequences that the parties argue will happen if their view of solidarity is not implemented. It will therefore not specifically include the, for example, the consequences of a specific economic or foreign policy. Instead, it will focus more on the abstract aspects of solidarity – if European solidarity is not restructured as the political party prescribes, what will happen then?

Appeal to principle

Gamson and Lasch (1981) write that "packages rely on characteristic moral appeals and uphold certain general precepts (Gamson and Lasch, 1981: 401). This section will therefore capture the essence of each political party's solidarity frame, illustrated by the use of other values and moral concepts.

IV. Material

This paper will analyse the election manifestos of the European People's Party (EPP), the Party of European Socialists (PES), the Alliance of European Conservatives and Reformists (AECR), the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats in Europe Party (ALDE), the European Green Party (EGP) and the Party of the European Left (PEL). These parties were chosen since

they are the six biggest parties in the European parliament after the 2014 election. AECR has been included even though it did not produce an election manifesto because it is the third largest political party.

The comparison factor is made more difficult by the different shapes and formats of the manifestos. The EPP and PES manifestos both use an A5 format, but the EPP manifesto is double the length as the PES one, with 22 pages versus 11 pages. They are however the most complete manifestos of the selected manifestos with a clear layout and overview of their values and commitments. The Reykjavik declaration, which is being analysed instead of a manifesto for the AECR, is just 277 words long and fits under the "Principles" headline on their website. The rest of the manifestos use an A4 format. The ALDE manifesto is 8 pages long and the PEL is 13 A4 pages. The EGP manifesto is by far the longest, with 37 A4 pages. It is more similar to a political platform than a manifesto, and therefore weight is put on the first introductory pages where their commitments for the European elections are outlined. The layout of the EGP manifesto looks much more professional than the ALDE or PEL manifestos, who look more like documents for internal use.

Some of the manifestos use pictures to complement the text. The EPP and ALDE manifestos are the only ones that shows political figures. There are three pictures in the EPP manifesto, and two of these are of Jean-Claude Juncker. The third picture is of a group of young Europeans on a street. The ALDE manifesto only include one a picture of their party members 'doing the wave'. The PES has chosen pictures displaying people in relaxed settings or in working environments. The EGP manifesto includes the most pictures, portraying young European relaxing or demonstrating, green landscapes and workers installing sustainable energy technics. AECR and PEL do not include any other pictures than their party logos.

Part III: Findings

  ➢ **Chapter I: Solidarity frames in the election manifestos**

This chapter will describe, compare and contrast the solidarity frames found in the 2014 election manifestos of the six largest Europarties. The complete signature matrix for the solidarity frames are found in Table 1 and Table 2. The first section will compare and contrast the solidarity frames of the EPP and ALDE. Their solidarity frames are similar in that respect that they both view solidarity as the foundation of the EU. The second section will examine the AECR, a party that completely lacks a frame to discuss since it has not produced an election manifesto. Third, a comparison of the PES and EGP manifestos show that their solidarity frames are similar. The foundation for solidarity in their frames is in the moral support for the disadvantaged in society. PEL represents a final frame which emphasises the need for solidarity to originate from the people, and not from the institutions. It will conclude that some frames form clusters of frames, but that there is no overall consensus over the definition of the concept of solidarity among the Europarties.

  I. **Solidarity is the foundation of the European Union:**
      Solidarity frames in the manifestos of the EPP & ALDE

The signature matrix of the solidarity frames of the EPP and ALDE can be found in Table 1. It is evident that the solidarity frames constructed in the EPP and ALDE manifestos share certain similarities. The most evident visual similarity is in the design of their party logotypes. Both parties have chosen to incorporate the EU twelve golden stars in their logo. According to the EU website, "the stars symbolise ideals of unity, solidarity and harmony among the peoples of Europe" (Europa.eu (1), 2014). The stars were originally used by the European Council, but were later adopted by the European parliament and other EU institutions. Since the ideas of solidarity in the EPP and ALDE are the most similar to those that founded the EU, it is not surprising that they have chosen to incorporate the twelve golden stars into their logos. Further, as the choice of logotype suggests, both parties perceive solidarity as the social foundation of the European Union. Solidarity is the result of increased economic interdependence and political integration in the EU.

As shown in Table 1, the EPP manifesto slogan, "Experience.Solidarity.Future", is the only slogan that explicitly mentions the concept of solidarity. Solidarity regularly reappears through the manifesto.

Table 1

Signature Matrix for Solidarity Frames in the 2014 Election Manifestos of the European People's Party (EPP) and the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Party (ALDE)

Framing & Reasoning devices	European People's Party (EPP)	Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Party (ALDE)
Visual construction	Three young Europeans on a sun-lit street; Jean-Claude Juncker, ready to lead the European parliament.	Members of the ALDE party doing the wave symbolizing their unity.
Catch-phrase	"Experience. Solidarity. Future."	"A Europe that works."
Self-image	The responsible descendants of the founding fathers of the European project who are continuing their great work.	Protecting the liberal heritage of the EU by protecting civil liberties and defend the Single Market.
Description of opposition	Irresponsible socialists who believe spending more is the answer to everything.	Those who want to divide Europe by spreading fear.
Party Logo		
Roots	The financial and economic crisis has given rise to anti-Europe sentiment and division	Forces are working to highlight and exploit Europe's differences for their own gain.
Consequences	If solidarity is not enhanced, Europe will become a weak political entity and the European Union will not be able to face the challenges of globalization.	If solidarity is not enhanced in a more responsible way, Europe will become weak and its values and interests will be unprotected.
Appeal to principle	"We want people to live in a safe and stable world, in freedom and with dignity. To achieve this we have to make the right choices now, and renew our sense of solidarity."	"We believe our shared values and unity allow us to defend our common interests"

The EPP takes pride in being the 'descendants' of the founding fathers, who's commitment to peace and prosperity was grounded in their understanding of solidarity. As protectors of this

heritage, the EPP proudly proclaim that they have steered Europe through the crisis and that the Union has made it through intact.

ALDE's manifesto slogan, "A Europe that works" does not immediately evoke the same historical narrative as the EPP slogan (Table 1). However, the slogan relates to ALDE's dedication to European interdependence, which is forwarded by the Single Market. The main emphasis of the manifesto is unemployment, which they argue is "the greatest social and economic crisis now facing Europe" (ALDE, 2014: 3). In the manifesto, ALDE presents itself as the liberal voice in Europe. Their concept of solidarity is deeply connected to transnational trade and companies, making it more economic than social concept. It is only with strong values and a strong economy that the European internal market and European values can be protected. The only explicit mention of solidarity is in the term "fiscal solidarity" under the headline "Restoring stable finances" (ALDE, 2014: 5).

II.   Rejection of solidarity as a European value: The lack of a solidarity frame in AECR

The view that solidarity is connected to the EU is strongly rejected by the AECR. As evident by the signature matrix in Table 2, AECR did not produce a manifesto for the 2014 European elections. Even though AECR was the fourth largest party after the 2009 European elections (and became the third largest after the 2014 election), it still chose not to produce a manifesto. Instead, AECR adopted the "Reykjavik Declaration" on March 21. The declaration presents the ten main commitments of the AECR. There is no clear catch-phrase or slogan, but concepts such as national sovereignty are emphasised. Solidarity is not mentioned once, not even as in social unity within nation states. Special emphasis is put on preserving the differences between the nation states in Europe. "AECR believes in a Europe of independent nations, working together for mutual gain while each retaining its identity and integrity" (AECR, 2014: 1).

Unlike EPP and ALDE, the AECR logo does not incorporate the twelve golden stars. Instead, the AECR logo is a standing blue lion. The AECR website does not offer any explanation to its choice of logo. The blue colour is mostly connected to conservatism (Sassoon, 1989: 373), but the lion could be interpreted in many ways. One possible explanation as to why AECR chose a blue lion as their logo, is that the party wished to reject the unifying EU symbol and instead emphasise their difference. This would be in line with their main commitments as outlined in the Reykjavik Declaration.

Table 2

Signature Matrix for Solidarity Frames in the 2014 Election Manifestos of the Alliance of European Conservatives and Reformists (AECR), the Party of European Socialists (PES), the European Green Party (EGP) and the Party of the European Left (PEL)

Framing & Reasoning devices	Alliance of European Conservatives and Reformists (AECR)	Party of European Socialists (PES)	European Green Party (EGP)	Party of the European Left (PEL)
Visual construction	No data.	Pictures illustrating the diversity of European citizens; young, old, women and men; all working together for a better Europe.	The European flag, green landscapes, sustainable energy sources.	No data.
Catch-phrase	No data.	"Towards a new Europe."	"Change Europe, vote Green."	"Escaping austerity, rebuilding Europe"
Self-image	Defending the unique democratic legitimacy of the nation-state.	The protector and defender of citizen's social, economic and political rights.	Reformer that stands for sustainability and social and economic justice.	The party that will rebuild Europe in the light of cooperation and solidarity.
Description of opposition	No data.	Neo-liberals who introduces austerity policies without caring about the citizens.	Neo-liberals with their austerity measures.	The 'Troika' that "lower our wages and pensions, slash public services, privatize and plunder."
Party Logo				

Roots	No data.	"The right wing has created a Europe of fear and austerity", where precarious contracts are common and Europeans are harmed.	Deregulations had increased social division and injustice.	The Troika has forced Europe into social and democratic regression.
Consequences	No data.	If solidarity is not enhanced, workers will continue to be exploited, social rights will continue to be disregarded and discrimination will persist.	If solidarity is not enhanced, Europe will not be able to face the challenges of tomorrow.	If solidarity is not enhanced, Europe will continue towards 'ultraliberalism'.
Appeal to principle	No data.	"The principle of equality must be at the heart of what it means to be a European citizen"	"Social justice against social exclusion, sustainability against austerity".	"Our goal is to renew hope: a new ambitionfor cooperation and solidarity at a European level in the service of our peoples and the peoples of the world.

III. Solidarity as an ethical obligation:
Solidarity frames in the manifestos of PES & EGP

Even though the 'rejection of EU symbols' seems like a plausible explanation for the AECR logo, the argument is not so clear when it comes to the PES and the EGP. For the PES and EGP, the decision not to include the twelve golden stars has probably more to do with positioning themselves as political rivals to the EPP.

The signature matrix in Table 2 shows that the solidarity frames presented by the PES and EGP are quite similar. According to the frames laid out by the PES and EGP in their manifestos, solidarity is not a value uniquely inherited in the structure of the EU, but represents a moral and ethical standpoint. The consequences of the decline of solidarity is perceived to be an increase in injustice and social divisions between the rich and the poor. The concept of solidarity is explained as the moral motivation to defend the economic, social and political rights of vulnerable groups as well as helping those in need. The austerity policies introduced by right-wing governments and the European 'Troika' are especially targeted as the reason for the recent decline in solidarity.

As shown in Table 2, the slogan of the PES manifesto is "Towards a new Europe" and the slogan of the EGP manifesto is "Change Europe, vote Green". These slogans clearly argue for some sort of transformation of the EU. "The right wing has used neoliberal policies to cut provisions that have helped people bounce back after rough times" the PES state in their manifesto (PES, 2014: 5). "We will fight for a Europe that leaves no one behind". The same reasoning device can be found in the EGP manifesto. "The medicine of austerity that has been prescribed to countries in crisis for several years now has increased social division and injustice, jeopardised the well-being of many of our fellow citizens, undermined the capacity of our societies to prosper, and crucially, weakened democracy" (EGP, 2014: 8).

IV. Solidarity as the people's power
Solidarity frame in the manifesto of the PEL

Analysis of Table 2 shows that the leftist PEL frame is similar to the PES and EGP in that it rejects austerity policies, but that it is much more radical in its motivations and language.

One example is in their slogan "Escaping austerity, rebuilding Europe". The rights of workers are central to the PEL manifesto. In their view, in contrast to the PES and the EGP, solidarity cannot be rebuilt by more rights or a change in legislation. Solidarity is found within the working classes of Europe and has to be a bottom-up procedure. It is therefore surprising that the PEL has chosen to incorporate the twelve European stars into their logo. It does not, as AECR, completely reject the premise of politics in Europe, but seeks to restructure it completely. Whereas a strong supranational state is always unwanted in the eyes of the AECR, a strong socialist supranational state is the goal of the PEL. What can be said is that the design of the party logo is not a sufficient indicator of whether the party is for or against European solidarity.

In conclusion, this chapter has shown that there are some similarities between certain solidarity frames in the election manifestos. The EPP and ALDE represent one cluster of frames, characterised by their view of solidarity as a feature of the European project that is motivated by the interdependence of its citizens. The PES and the EGP represents another alternative view of solidarity. For them, solidarity is an ethical obligation to help those who are disadvantaged by the social, economic and political system. The PEL solidarity frame is linked to frames in the PES and EGP frames, except for the 'source' of solidarity. PEL argue that solidarity must come from the working people, while the PES and EGP believe that state protection of worker's right provides a basis for solidarity. AECR do not engage with either manifesto writing or on the discussion of European solidarity. Overall, the signature matrixes has highlighted that there is no broad consensus of what the concept of solidarity actually entail.

➤ **Chapter II: The concept of solidarity in political ideologies**

This chapter will analyse the connection between the solidarity frames found in the previous chapter, and political ideologies. It will first analyse the Christian democratic concept of solidarity and contrast it with the solidarity frame found in the EPP manifesto. Thereafter, it will link the Social Democratic concept of solidarity to the PES and EGP manifestoes, followed by an examination of the Marxist fragments in the PEL solidarity frame. Subsequently, the ALDE frame will be compared to the understanding of solidarity in liberalism. Finally, it will assess the AECR solidarity frame, as it presents a challenge to the previously examined solidarity frames. It will conclude that the solidarity frames described in chapter one almost never correlate with the full concept of solidarity found in the political ideologies.

I. **EPP: Christian Democratic Solidarity**

The political concept of solidarity found in the Christian Democratic idea tradition is heavily influenced by Catholic social teachings. Christian Democracy has existed since the beginning of the 20th century, but did not gain mass support until the end of WWII. The German Christian Democratic Party (CDU) has been very influential, especially in influencing the politics of the EPP and its predecessors. The most important aspect of solidarity in Christian Democratic thought is its function as the motor of social integration, which is the 'goal' of any society. The creation of social harmony is essential for a society that works for the common good and the dignity of human beings regardless of gender, occupation or status. In this ideological tradition, solidarity is meaningful since it makes people stand up for each other since "both the individual and society are left to each other" (Stjernø, 2011: 166). The strength and prosperity of a society is measured in its level of solidarity between individuals, a sentiment which is present in the EPP manifesto. Under the headline "Creating a better Europe for all citizens", the EPP states that "We can only tackle many challenges together and not in isolation. Either we become stronger together, or weaker apart" (EPP, 2014: 5).

The core values that make up the Christian Democratic ideas of solidarity are freedom, justice, human dignity and subsidiarity. To serve the common good is both a Christian vocation and a political goal for Christian Democrats. The EPP fulfils this goal by committing to the Social Market Economy, which they will create and protect by combining freedom and solidarity. "We understand that the advantages of a free market must serve the common good, so that social cohesion is achieved", the EPP states in their manifesto (EPP,

2014: 9). The frequent mention of the respect of human dignity as an intrinsic goal for the EU is also in line with its Christian Democratic ideology. However, some of the most important Christian Democratic values, justice and subsidiarity, are missing from the EPP manifesto. The omission of the subsidiarity principle is especially curious since it represents one of the most influential contributions from Christian Democracy to EU law. The subsidiarity principle dictates that political decisions should be taken at the lowest appropriate level and is an important function of the EU. The principle is only implicitly mentioned once in the manifesto: "… we do not want a centralised Europe that deals with every detail of people's lives" (EPP, 2014: 5). Overall, the EPP engages with the solidarity concept but is not fully explaining their understanding of it in their manifesto.

II.   PES and EGP: Social Democratic solidarity

The Social Democratic concept of solidarity is fundamental to the whole political tradition. Originating from the Marxist revisionist Eduard Bernstein and Ernest Wigforss, the concept focuses on the balance between equality, community and freedom (Stjernø, 2004: 50). The foundation for any Social Democratic society is the interdependence between workers and employers. Solidarity must therefore come from society as a whole, from both the workers and the employers. This realisation of interdependence takes concrete forms in trade unions and regulation and legislation that protect the workers, since it is in the interest of both the worker and the employer to keep their production going. The Social Democratic concept of solidarity is therefore often state-centric, emphasising the negotiating role of the state between the workers and employers. The PES clearly embraces this understanding in their manifesto when they argue for better regulation of the European labour market. "We will insist on strong rules to guarantee equal pay for equal work, the protection of worker's rights and quality jobs; on reinforcing trade unions' rights, social dialogue and anti-discrimination legislation, improving the protection of workers posted in a different country by revising the Posting of Workers Directive; and promoting better cooperation at European level on labour inspections (PES, 2014: 1).

 At the core of the Social Democratic understanding of solidarity lies the moral obligation to accept peoples' differences. The struggle for solidarity is therefore essentially the struggle for equality between genders, occupations, status etc. The PES explicitly mentions this idea in their manifesto: "The principle of equality must be at the heart of what it means to be a European citizen" (PES, 2014: 6). The fight for equality in a Social Democratic

understanding means fighting for the rights of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups in society. This ethical commitment is present in the EGP manifesto's rejection of austerity policies. "Today, 25% of Europeans are at risk of poverty and social exclusion; 27 millions are unemployed, including almost one in five young Europeans! The most fragile end up paying the heaviest price for the crisis" (EGP, 2014: 8). The core values of Social Democratic solidarity; equality and justice, are well represented in both the PES and the EGP manifestos. The practical nature of Social Democratic solidarity makes it more convincing than the more abstract and spiritual Christian Democratic solidarity presented in the EPP manifesto.

III.   PEL: fragments of Marxist solidarity

Claiming that the PEL build their understanding on a concept of Marxist solidarity would definitely take the analysis too far. There are some hints to more revolutionary ideas and rhetoric, for example the chapter called "Give power to the people, for a citizens' revolution", and the fact that they claim to be against capitalism (PEL, 2014: 2). Solidarity in Marxist ideological thought was not discussed under the concept 'solidarity' but rather on concepts such as unity and fraternity, the forefathers of the modern solidarity concept. For Karl Marx, solidarity was both the uniting feeling between people in the working class that made them stick together, and the description of the social cohesion that would appear in a communist society (Stjernø, 2004: 47).

However, the understanding of solidarity as a social cohesive force exists in all political concepts of solidarity. Additionally, even though the PEL writes extensively about the workers of Europe, it is not especially addressed to this group. Instead, the PEL address their manifesto to all individuals and groups who are against austerity: "… we propose to all workers in Europe, to all citizens on the left, to trade unionists and social movements in Europe that struggle against austerity and capitalism for democracy and peace, that we unity our forces" (PEL, 2014: 1). The concept of solidarity presented in the PEL manifesto is better understood as a continuation of Karl Kautsky's theory of solidarity. "Kautsky maintained that the goal of social democracy was to transform society where the economy was based upon solidarity" (Stjernø, 2004: 48). The main message of the PEL manifesto fits the statement made by Kautsky, as the party wants to reform the European economy and end austerity policies. For example the PEL proposes "a critical evaluation of how we produce today", and states that a main aim should be "towards the public and democratic control of strategic sectors of the economy in Europe" (PEL, 2014: 5). The understanding of solidarity in the

PEL is therefore closer to the late Marxist Kautsky's definition of the concept than a clear Marxist or Marxist-Leninist definition.

IV.   ALDE: Liberalism and solidarity

The solidarity frame in ALDE was found to be very EU-centric with a particular focus on the economy. Here, a connection to early liberal philosophy is found, where deregulation of the capitalist market are seen as mechanisms towards solidarity (Brunkhorst, 2007). Arguably, reason behind ALDE's focus on the completion of the Single Market is their dedication to equality and democracy, which will eventually produce solidarity. Nevertheless, the subsequent liberal tradition has failed to engage with the concept of solidarity. To explain this avoidance, scholars have pointed to the systematic avoidance of social matters by liberal theorists. Baker et al. (2004) explains this lack of engagement with the concept of solidarity in his book on liberalism and equality. Love, care and solidarity have been neglected by liberal theory since "liberals tend to see these as private matters that individuals should work out for themselves" (Baker et al. 2004: 28). This seems to be a reasonable assessment. On the first page ALDE argues that civil liberties are the biggest achievement of the European project. "Civil liberties are the very foundation of our wealth and we need to defend them when they are threatened. We want a Europe that respects and encourages individual choices and keeps its promise that everyone has the opportunity to improve their own life" (ALDE, 2014: 1). The only reason why ALDE engages with the concept is to make a point for the economy. The one mention of the word solidarity in the ALDE manifesto is in the term fiscal solidarity (ALDE, 2014: 5). The concept of solidarity in the ALDE manifesto is therefore very close to the liberal understanding of the concept – that it is a matter of individual choice if people like the EU or not.

V.   AECR: An ideological challenge

Although most of the Europarties assessed in this dissertation represents a different view of solidarity, they all have some type of position on the concept. Instead of presenting a challenge to old political traditions of solidarity, the AECR represents a challenge to both the EU and the very notion of solidarity. Stjernø (2011) calls these parties "a new type of challenge". These parties do not conform to the established rules of the game, and do not engage in traditional political practices, such as writing an election manifesto. These parties "do not preach the individualism of traditional liberalism, but a new kind of mixture of individualism and a nationally oriented collectivism" (Stjernø, 2011: 175). The first point of

the AECR Reykjavik Declaration illustrates this point: "The Alliance of European Conservatives and Reformists brings together parties committed to individual liberty, national sovereignty, parliamentary democracy, the rule of law, *private property, low taxes, sound money*, free trade, open competition, and the devolution of power" (AECR, 2014: 1, emphasis added). Instead of trying to promote their interest, these parties are especially anti bureaucracy and what they believe to be the Brussels elite. The only EU concept that they endorse seem to be the subsidiarity principle. The fourth point of the Reykjavik Declaration reads "AECR favours the exercise of power at the lowest practical level – by the individual where possible, by local or national authorities in preference to supranational bodies" (AECR, 2014: 1). The fact that AECR endorses the subsidiarity principle is of course not the same as them engaging in the debate on solidarity in Europe.

In conclusion, the chapter has shown that the solidarity frames described in chapter one are coherent with the solidarity concept of the respective political tradition. This is of course not true for AECR since it is a party built on policy goals and not an overarching political tradition. The failure of some of the manifestos to include a full description of their understanding of solidarity is disappointing, considering that the 2014 election presented a unique opportunity to communicate their values. Most importantly, this chapter has illustrated the differences between the solidarity concepts of the Europarties. A call for European solidarity is therefore not as easy as it might seem since each proponent of solidarity is going to be informed by his or her ideological understanding of the concept.

> ➢ **Chapter III: The emergence of 'vertical solidarity'**

This chapter will argue that solidarity cannot simply be understood through political traditions or through its functional nature, but should be understood as a collection of concepts. Illustrated by the EU motto, "United in Diversity", solidarity can both be understood as the belief in the idea of the EU and as showing compassion with other individuals or causes. It will conclude that the search for a unifying concept of solidarity is misguided. It is in the nature of a diverse union to accommodate a wide range of explanations and definitions to concepts, especially those of social nature.

I.   United in Diversity?

The EU motto "United in Diversity" is supposed to symbolise the will of the European people to unite in peace and prosperity despite their differences (Europa.eu (2), 2014). As previous analysis of the election manifestos has shown, there is a diversity of conceptual understandings of solidarity in contemporary Europe. This does not have to be a negative finding. Europe is by its nature diverse, and this diversity is arguably its greatest strength. This view is of course not shared by everyone. The German philosopher Jürgen Habermas has commented extensively on the decline of solidarity in Europe. His view is similar of Brunkhorst (2005) in that is believes that solidarity and democracy is intrinsically linked. The failure of the Constitutional Treaty and its re-emergence as the Lisbon Treaty has illustrated the undemocratic nature of the EU, Habermas argues. Until then, the EU had been moving in a democratic direction, which it has since then abandoned. The emphasis on intergovernmental solidarity instead of social solidarity after the economic and financial crisis has contributed to the lack of solidarity by Europeans to the European institutions. In a lecture at Leuven University, Habermas argues that "what unites European citizens today are the Eurosceptical min-sets that have become more pronounced in all of the member countries during the crisis" (Habermas, 2013). Judging from the low voter turnout figures of recent election, his assessment seem to be correct. Voter turnout in the 2014 election was the lowest in EU history, with only 42.61% (Europarl.europa.eu, 2014). The 2009 election had only a marginally better turnout rate with 42.97%.

The increase in anti-Europe Europarties and voter apathy are of course not entirely due to the low quality or incoherence of the election manifestos. Some scholars have argued that it is the 'extension' of Europe through enlargement that has made solidarity more difficult to achieve in a European context (Hartwig and Nicolaides, 2003: 19). The answer is not as simple as that.

It is not only the extension of Europe's borders that is making Europe more diverse, but the diversification of previously stable European nation-states. One contributing factor to the decline of solidarity is the pervasiveness of individualism. Stjernø (2004, 2011) see the rise in individualism as one of the greatest dangers facing solidarity today. The destructive power of individualism in Europe is especially voiced by the election manifesto of the smallest Europarty, the European Christian Political Movement (ECPM 2014), who claims that individualism has destroyed cohesion on all levels in society. The threat of individualism is also visible in the manifestos analysed in this paper, even if it is not explicitly linked to their concept of solidarity. The PES, EGP and PEL manifestos especially connects individualism to neoliberalism, which is blamed for the weakening of solidarity in Europe. Neoliberalism is often connected to the 'racing to the bottom' tactic, where national welfare states are stripped bare, ultimately destroying the old foundations of solidarity for economic gains (Hirst, 1998: 2, Barry et al, 2012: 87). Even though the destructive power of neoliberalism has disadvantaged many European citizens, the destructions of old foundations of solidarity might just make room for new ones. As argued by Axel Honneth, the motivation for solidarity movements is not stability and cohesion but "the moral feeling of indignation against various forms of disrespect" (Honneth, 1996; Wilde, 2007: 176).

II.   Vertical transnational solidarity

"*This is not a homogeneous, neat, managed, stable and coherent European identity but, rather, a diverse vibrant set of European identities based on multiple sources of solidarity and complex networks of social interactions across national borders.*" (Barry *et al.* 2012: 95).

European identities are becoming more diverse. Instead of becoming more European, identities seem to have become much more individual. One does not just identify with being European, but as being Europe in addition to being a member of a nation state, and being from a particular city. Jonathan White (2003) distinguishes between the horizontal and vertical approach to identity. The horizontal approach measures if an individual identifies with being European citizen rather than being a citizen of a Member State. This approach is for example used by the Eurobarometer. Results from the Standard Eurobarometer from autumn 2014 found that only one third "feel like a European citizen" (Eurobarometer, 2014). White argues that a more fruitful enquiry into modern identities should use an issue-based vertical approach (White, 2003: 54). One individual can identify with a range of different identities, and can show solidarity with different movements, causes or people. Gould (2007)

calls these overlapping solidarity networks. Solidarity is Europe is not dependent on the EU to be truly European solidarity.

Building on the argument in Barry et al. (2012), solidarity might still prosper in an environment where it has been in decline. Individualism and modern complex identities have also given rise to the emergence of new platforms where solidarity flourishes. As parliamentary party politics is losing its appeal, politics is also transferring into a new environment (Dalton, 2008). The future of European solidarity might not lie in the standardisation of Europarty manifestos but in the complexities of contemporary European identities. Solidarity does not need to be equal to loyalty to the EU, but an expression of support for a wide variety of policy issues (White, 2003). European solidarity is not a concept, but a myriad of concepts, made possible by the original concept of the European founding fathers.

In conclusion, this chapter has argued that the lack of engagement in the European Parliamentary elections is not endangering solidarity. The election presented an opportunity for the Europarties to direct solidarity towards the European Parliament, which the Europarties failed to seize. However, as party politics and party identification is in an overall decline, it is not enough to attract the complete attention of the European citizens. The pervasiveness of neoliberalism and individualism might have weakened the old foundations of solidarity but it has also created the foundation of a new type of solidarity. This paper suggests that a contemporary concept of solidarity is therefore better understood as vertical solidarity, where each individual shows solidarity with several issues, instead of with only one complete ideology.

Conclusion

The European Union is truly a Union by differences. Albeit guided by ideas of European integration, social integration has been undertaken in a functional sense. The EU has thereby achieved its original objectives of a Europe of peace and prosperity built on 'de facto' solidarity that Schuman envisaged in 1950. The tumultuous experience of the economic and financial crisis in 2008 shook the very foundations of Europe's perceived achievements. It laid bare social, political and economic divisions that threatened to undo many of the EU's achievements. Solidarity was partially recast as a legal intergovernmental concept which dictated financial responsibility and reciprocity. This was not popular among the European population that demanded more democracy, solidarity and justice.

The Lisbon Treaty, which was ratified before the economic and financial crisis, had given the European Parliament more powers in order to make it more democratic. The 2014 European election therefore provided the Europarties with the unique opportunity to communicate their message of solidarity and social unity. Using frame analysis, this paper set out to describe, compare and contrast the solidarity frames presented by the Europarties in their 2014 election manifestos. A subsidiary aim was to detect whether these frames were influenced by traditional political ideology. The main finding is that the solidarity frames found in the election manifestos represented different perspectives on the concept of solidarity. These concepts were influenced by the understanding of solidarity found in their respective political ideology. However, most of the solidarity frames presented in the election manifestos represented an incomplete concept of solidarity. Additionally, some Europarties did not even engage in the practice of producing a manifesto. The final research aim was to analyse whether the lack of engagement with the European elections endangered European solidarity. This is found not to be the case. This paper found that the new contemporary concept of solidarity is transnational, at least within the European Union.

One uniting aspect in the solidarity frames of the left-leaning Europarties is their critique of neoliberalism, which is perceived to be the largest threat to social cohesion today. This claim is only partially accurate. Neoliberalism does promote individualism and lower taxes, which has had detrimental effect on state-centric concepts of solidarity. It is however wrong to claim that individualism is a result of neoliberalism. Individualism is a product of many wider societal forces facing Europe today, including globalisation and European integration. As this paper has shown, individualism should not only be perceived as a destructive force,

but as the basis of a new concept of solidarity. As identities become more complex, so will ultimately the concept of solidarity. The best way to understand modern solidarity is to think of it in a vertical sense (White, 2003). An individual can express solidarity with many overlapping issues at the same time, many which might contradict each other.

This paper suggest that the 'new' type of European solidarity should be thought of as 'vertical solidarity'. This development does not make the European Parliament obsolete, far from it. Many of the political concepts of solidarity has incorporated individualism as a core value. The role for the Europarties is to communicate their view of solidarity and have it construct some levels of the European citizen's identity. Even though feelings of party affiliations are declining, the Europarties can fill an important gap in contemporary European identity. The new transnational vertical solidarity is linked to Europeanisation and European integration. These forces are not at odds with each other, but are parts of the same trajectory. The original 'de facto' concept of solidarity presented in the Schuman Declaration has not been abandoned. The development that we see today is not separate from it, but represent an unforeseen continuation of it.

Bibliography

Empirical data: 2014 election manifestos

Alliance of European Conservatives and Reformists (AECR) *The Reykjavik Declaration*, Available at: http://www.aecr.eu/principles/ [Accessed 2015-02-27]

Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Party (ALDE) *A Europe that work,* Available at: http://www.aldeparty.eu/sites/eldr/files/news/10204/2014_alde_party_manifesto.pdf [Accessed 2015-02-27]

European Green Party (EGP) *Change Europe Vote Green*, Available at: http://europeangreens.eu/sites/europeangreens.eu/files/2014%20Manifesto.pdf [Accessed 2015-02-27]

European People's Party (EPP) *Why vote for the European People's Party?* Available at: http://www.epp.eu/sites/default/files/content/documents/EPPMANIFESTO_EN_SPREADH R.pdf [Accessed 2015-02-27]

Party of European Socialists and Democrats (PES) *Towards a new Europe*, Available at: http://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/partyofeuropeansocialists/pages/1/attachments/original /1397230958/110001306_PES_Manifesto_UK.pdf?1397230958 [Accessed 2015-02-27]

Party of the European Left (PES) *Escaping austerity, rebuilding Europe*, Available at: http://www.european-left.org/sites/default/files/final_platform_en_7.pdf [Accessed 2015-02-27]

References

Baker, J. et al (2004) *Equality – From Theory to Action*, Palgrave Macmillan

Barroso, J.M.D. (2010) *State of the Union 2010*, Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-10-411_en.htm?locale=en [Accessed 2015-02-27]

Barry, J, et al. (2012) "Embedding European identity in context: changing social solidarities in Europe" in Ellison, M. (2012) *Reinventing Social Solidarity across Europe*, University Press Scholarship Online

Brunkhorst, H. (2005) *Solidarity – From Civic Friendship to a Legal Community*, translated by Jeffrey Flynn, Cambridge: MIT Press

Brunkhorst, H. (2007) "Globalizing Solidarity: The Destiny of Democratic Solidarity in the Times of Global Capitalism, Global Religion, and the Global Public" in *Journal of Social Philosophy*, Vol.38 (1), Spring 2007, pp.93-111

Bryman, A. (2008) *Social Research Methods* 3rd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press§

Creed, et al. (2002) "A Picture of the Frame: Frame Analysis as Technique and as Politics" in *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 5 (1) January 2002, pp.34-55

Dalton, R.J (2008) *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies,* CQ Press

Durkheim, E. (1997) [1893] *The Division of Labour in Society*, New York: The Free Press

Entman, R.M. (1993) "Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm" in *Journal of Communication* Vol. 43 (4) Autumn, pp.51-58

Eurobarometer (2014) "Public opinion in the European Union: First results" *Standard Eurobarometer 82 Autumn 2014*

Europa.eu (1) (2014) *The EU motto*
Available at: http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/symbols/motto/index_en.htm
[Accessed 2015-02-27]

Europa.eu (2) (2014) *The EU flag*
Available at: http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/symbols/flag/index_en.htm
[Accessed 2015-02-27]

European Union, *Treaty of Lisbon Amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty Establishing the European Community* (2007) 2007/C 306/01

Europarl.europa.eu (2014) *European Parliament / Results of the 2014 European elections*
Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2014-results/en/election-results-2014.html [Accessed: 2015-02-27]

European Christian Political Movement (2014) "For a Europe of Dignity, Freedom and Responsibility" *Election Manifesto for the European Parliamentary elections 2014*
Available at: http://ecpm.info/sites/default/files/news-attachment/Election%20Manifesto.pdf
[Accessed 2015-02-27]

Fabry, E. (2010) "European Solidarity: Where do we stand? Should we foster it and how?" *Synthesis of the 2010 European Forum of Think Tanks organised by Notre Europe in Barcelona 2010*

Fenger, M. and van Paridon, K. (2012) "Towards a globalisation of solidarity?" in Ellison, M. (2012) *Reinventing Social Solidarity across Europe*, University Press Scholarship Online

Gamson, W.A. and Lasch, K.E. (1983) "The Political Culture of Social Welfare Policy" in Spiro, S.E. and Yuchtman-Yaar, E. (ed) *Evaluating the welfare state: Social and political perspectives*, pp.397-415, New York: Academic Press

Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*, New York: Harper

Gofman, A. (2014) "Durkheim's Theory of Social Solidarity and Social Rules" in Jeffries, V. (2014) *The Palgrave Handbook of Altruism, Morality, and Social Solidarity – Formulating a Field of Study*, United States: Palgrave Macmillan

Gould, C.C. (2007) "Transnational Solidarities" in *Journal of Social Philosophy,* Vol. 38 (1), Spring 2007, pp.148-164

Habermas, J. (2013) "Democracy, Solidarity and the European Crisis" *Lecture delivered by Professor Jürgen Habermas on 26 April 2013 in Leuven*
Available at: http://www.kuleuven.be/communicatie/evenementen/evenementen/jurgen-habermas/en/democracy-solidarity-and-the-european-crisis
[Accessed 2015-02-27]

Hartwig, I. and Nicolaides, P. (2003) "Elusive Solidarity in an Enlarged European Union" *Eipascope 2003/3*

Hirst, P. (1998) *Can the European welfare state survive globalization? Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands in comparative perspective*, Working Paper series in European Studies, 2:1, London: Birkbeck College, University of London

Honneth, A. (1996) *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*, Cambridge: Polity

McCauliff, C.M.A. (2012) "Union in Europe: Constitutional Philosophy and the Schuman Declaration May 9, 1950" in *Colombia Journal of European Law*, Summer 2012

Sassoon, J. (1989) "Colors, artifacts and ideologies" in *Social Science Information*, Vol. 28, (2) June 1989, pp.367-384

Schuman, R. (1950) *The Schuman Declaration – 9 May 1950*
Available at: http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/symbols/europe-day/schuman-declaration/index_en.htm
[Accessed 2015-02-27]

Snow, D. and Benford, R. (1988) "Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization" in *International Social Movement Research* 1, pp.197-217

Stjernø, S. (2004) *Solidarity in Europe – The History of an Idea*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Stjernø, S. (2011) "The idea of solidarity in Europe" in *The European Journal of Social Law* (3), pp.156-176

Thuesen Pedersen, F. (2006) "Global Solidarity as Global Constitutionalism" in *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, Vol.7 (1), pp.117-126

White, J.P.J. (2003) "Rethinking Transnational Solidarity in the EU" in *Perspectives*, No. 20, Summer 2003, pp.40-57

Wilde, L. (2007) "The Concept of Solidarity: Emerging from the Theoretical Shadows? In *British Journal of Politics and International Relations,* Vol. 9 (1), pp.171-181