Why There is (Almost) no Christian Democracy in Post-Communist Europe

Anna Grzymala-Busse

Department of Political Science

University of Michigan

Ann Arbor, MI 48109

abusse@umich.edu

August 2010

Introduction

In examining the political landscape of post-communist democracies in Europe, one striking observation emerges: in contrast to Western Europe, there is little support for Christian Democracy, or Christian Democratic parties.[1] Even in the most religious of post-communist democracies, no Christian Democratic party has claimed a large portion of the electorate. They certainly have not dominated politics the way that post-war Austrian, Belgian, Dutch, German or Italian Christian Democratic parties have. Post-communist Christian Democratic parties have not come anywhere near the achievements of their western counterparts, "rightly considered the most successful western European political movement since 1945." (Kalyvas 1996, 2)

There are two aspects to this puzzling absence: first, post-communist Christian Democratic (CD) parties averaged less than a third of the support of their West European counterparts, as Table 1 shows. In several post-communist countries, CD parties failed to arise at all—if we average the support for CD parties across all countries, post-communist Christian Democracy obtains less than a fifth of the West European support. Second, within the consolidated post-communist democracies, there is a considerable range in average electoral support from 1990-2010, from .7% in Estonia to as high as 18.4% in Slovakia (See Table 1.) Christian Democratic parties have been most successful in Slovakia, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, and Lithuania, countries with very different patterns of religiosity and state-church cleavages.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

---

[1] I follow here the traditional (and loose) definition of Christian Democratic parties as influenced by Catholic social doctrine of universality (and thus anti-nationalism), solidarity and subsidiarity, and a concern with family as the basic unit of social organization, a "social market" and a relatively conservative social stance.

Of course, the context in which post-communist political parties emerged differs from that of their Western counterparts: post-communist parties were founded (or resurrected) overnight, rather than developed gradually over decades. Post-communist parties arose at a time when technology and media campaigns trumped mass organizations and local roots. Unlike their Western counterparts, they did not have explicit and material Church support, nor were they the main anti-communist bulwark. Finally, both West European and post-communist CD parties faced severe policy constraints and "the impossibility of maintaining a centrist stance on economic-distributive policy issues when faced with a status quo baseline of large, comprehensive, and moderately redistributive welfare states facing the new technological and demographic challenges of the 1990s and beyond" (Kitschelt 2004, 10.) Thus both context and genealogy seem to conspire to preclude post-communist Christian Democracy.

Yet the variation in support for post-communist Christian Democratic parties suggests these factors did not "bite" equally. Some parties were able to overcome these obstacles. How, then, can we explain the variation? To summarize, Christian Democratic parties succeeded where they were perceived as more Democratic than Christian: specifically, where they had favorable historical reputations as state- and nation-building parties rather than as agents of clericalism. Christian Democracy was not perceived in the same terms as in Western Europe: it was one of many anti-communist options, and its distinguishing feature was its religious agenda—unless the party could claim a past as a secular nation-builder. Few parties could claim this legacy, and it proved evanescent for those who could: after the first two elections, the interwar record faded as a source of party support. As a result, Christian Democracy failed to take off as a widespread post-communist political movement.

Potential explanations

There are several reasons to expect the rise of Christian Democratic parties in post-communist countries: popular religiosity and clerical-secular cleavages, the parties' historical representation of Church-State conflict and their anti-communist stance, and the organizational and material resources the Churches could have offered nascent parties. Yet, as we will see, none of these factors explains either the relative absence of CD parties in post-communist democracies, or the variation in their success.

First, in Western Europe, "there was no secret to the post-war electoral success of Christian democracy: it relied primarily on the successful yoking of political choice to religious commitment." (Conway 2003, 48.) Given the high rates of religiosity (and a church-state cleavage) in countries such Poland, Croatia, Lithuania, and Slovakia, we might expect Christian Democratic parties to represent these cleavages. Yet the relationship between religiosity and Christian Democracy is not a simple translation of religious belief into political mobilization. Even "the presence of large Catholic populations in a country is analytically and empirically insufficient for predicting the emergence of a common Catholic identity in politics, even less the formation of a political party" (Kalyvas 1996, 10.) Support for post-communist Christian Democratic parties illustrates the loose relationship between religiosity and the demand for its political manifestations. Thus, the most religious of post-communist countries, Poland, may have a self-identified 95% Catholic population, but over 80% of poll respondents disagree with the notion that the Church should have an influence either on government policy or on popular votes.[2] Postcommunist Polish clerical parties rapidly lost electoral support after

---

[2] 81%, according to both the World Values Survey and International Social Survey Programme data, 1999-2000 and 2004-5.

1991. More broadly, the electoral success of all post-communist Christian Democratic parties is not correlated to religious belief or attendance, Church influence on policy, or the "demand" for a more politically active role for the Catholic Church, as Table 2 shows.

TABLE 2 HERE

Alternatively, we might expect a curvilinear relationship between religiosity and the rise or success of Christian Democratic parties: in profoundly secular countries, CD appeals would be irrelevant, while in deeply religious ones, they would be taken for granted. In *moderately* religious societies, Christian Democratic parties could gain support and mobilize in defense of religious interests. Yet again, there is no such pattern in post-communist countries. The Czech Republic is among the most secular countries in Europe, yet its Christian Democratic party had successfully maintained its electoral support (averaging around 8%) until 2010. Similarly secular Estonia, on the other hand, had no CD to speak of. A secular-religious cleavage did arise in Poland and in Hungary (Kitschelt, Mansfeldová, Markowski, Toka 1999), yet no party explicitly represented it beyond the first few years—instead it was subsumed in broader cultural cleavages. This is a reminder that many social, political, and economic cleavages are simply left unexpressed (Sartori 1976). Instead, the strategic interactions of politicians, especially in the early elections, help to establish "which social cleavages will be depoliticized and which will be established as permanent bases of political conflict." (Zielinski 2002, 201.) What we need, then, is an account of why elites try to mobilize some of these cleavages, and which of these efforts are most likely to succeed with the voters.

A second explanation of Christian Democratic success focuses on the parties' genealogy, and the role of Church-State conflict. Particular historical configurations

produced Christian Democratic parties in Western Europe in the 19th century: thus, these "parties can only be understood historically. Arising in the second half of the nineteenth century, they were essentially parties of religious, that is Catholic, defence." (Hanley 1996, 3.) Kalyvas 1996 also argues that the rise of the parties began with a liberal and secular attack on the Catholic Church in the 19th century. The secular state moved to assert control over education and family in the process of the consolidation of the nation-state, and a threatened Church fought back by mobilizing Catholics. This political mobilization then enabled newly autonomous and politically active Catholics to form Christian Democratic parties, *in spite* of Church intentions. CD parties are thus the contingent outcome of conflict between the Church and its liberal opponents (Kalyvas 1996.)

Subsequently, where Christian Democratic parties were resurrected in post-war Europe, key reasons for their support included their anti-communist stance (in Italy) and their freedom from the taint of wartime collaboration (Italy, Austria, Germany.) After the collapse of communism in 1989 in East Central Europe, Christian Democratic parties could argue that they, too, were a bulwark against the return of communism and its aggressive secularism and denial of national traditions. Similarly, a popular fear of a potent anticlericalist left is among the conditions enabling Christian Democratic success (Bale and Szczerbiak 2008 also include competition on the right that was delegitimized by its association with totalitarianism, a church hierarchy that threw its considerable weight behind the Christian Democratic party, and a party structure that allowed the Christian Democratic parties to offer policy concessions in exchange for Church support while maintaining autonomy.)

A reproduction of the exact historical configurations would be unlikely, if not impossible, after 1989 and the collapse of communism. Nonetheless, if Church-state

conflict is the central force in the creation and success of Christian Democracy, we would expect that where a secular state tried to limit church privilege, or where the Church and its adherents saw religion was in danger from leftist secularism, we should see greater potential for Christian Democratic parties (Kalyvas 1996, 97.) Yet neither genealogy in Church-State conflict nor the parties' anti-communist stance explains their success (or lack thereof). Where Christian Democracy arose in post-communist democracies, there was little anticlerical or secular mobilization: the Slovak Church did not come under political fire until a decade into the democratic transition, long after its Christian Democratic parties had arisen and succeeded. The Czech Catholic Church faced considerable problems in obtaining favorable economic rulings, including restitution of Church property, but the ostensibly Christian Democratic party did not arise out of either Church mobilization or to protect Church privilege. Finally, the Slovenian and Lithuanian churches faced no hostility, yet CD parties did relatively well.

Nor were the Christian Democratic parties the main anti-communist force, either during the collapse of communism or as the main competitor to the communist successors afterwards. Poland had a powerful anticlerical Left party that was a direct successor to the former ruling communist party—yet several parties, not just the clerical ZChN, opposed it, and were much more successful than the ZChN. Despite the religiosity of its populace, its large agricultural sector, and a church hierarchy that initially favored political parties close to its conservative views, no Christian Democracy emerged. It may be that competition for the traditional anti-communist and Christian Democratic electorate (women, rural, conservative voters) led to low support for the proto-CD parties (Bale and Szczerbiak 2008, 492). But this only pushes the question further: why did other parties succeed in obtaining that traditional electorate, and Christian Democratic parties did not? Meanwhile,

CD parties succeeded in the considerably more secular, urbanized countries with moderate Left parties, such the Czech Republic and Slovakia, where CD parties were neither the result of a state-church conflict nor the main anti-communist voices.

A third explanation, therefore, changes the focus to the strategic interactions of Church and party. As they emerged after World War II in Germany, Italy, and elsewhere, Christian Democratic parties were an obvious ally for the Roman Catholic Church, given the ideological similarities and affinities to Church teaching (Warner 2000, 10.) Political parties in these new democracies also faced multiple challenges: "parties need to establish roots quickly; they need to differentiate themselves from competitors, becoming a known entity distinct from others; and they need to reconcile the ideology of their founders with the perceived demands of the new political context. Interest groups help…"(Warner 2000, 10.) Not surprisingly, then, we might expect nascent post-communist parties to exchange policy concessions for Church support (mobilizing its adherents and even material resources.) Of course, caveats abound: the Church discriminates among potential political partners,[3] and alliances with Christian Democratic parties are hardly automatic, not least because of the tenuous connection between Christian Democratic party interests and that of the Church.

We would therefore expect that Christian Democratic success would be predicated on the expected value of the exchange of party policy concessions and Church mobilization. Where the Church sees a political party as both the one way to enforce its policy preferences and likely to enter government, the Church is willing to both mobilize

---

[3] Specifically, if the Church acts as an interest group, then four considerations influence whether it will form an alliance with a political party: a) asset specificity (the extent to which it can obtain its goals elsewhere), b) transaction costs (of supplying own politicians), c) market uncertainty (stability and popularity of the potential ally), and d) core competencies (Warner 2000, 30.)

its adherents through both exhortation and coercion, and to more generally throw its support behind party goals. It can provide access to its organizational resources, reputation, training of campaign staff, voter education, votes, and financing (Warner 2000, 29.) This was the case in postwar Italy, where the Church provided enormous organizational resources (and the support necessary to ensure democracy would survive) in exchange for legislative concessions, including anti-Left and anti-communist stances, financial privileges, and so on. Where either the party can obtain support elsewhere, or the Church can turn to other policy channels, the exchange does not take place and Christian Democracy fails to benefit.

Yet this kind of alliance presented three problems. First, active church support for political parties, even in very Catholic Poland, was no longer acceptable in 1990 the way it had been in 1945. The times (and the political context) had changed, the result of Vatican II and broader social and political shifts that occurred in the 1960s. Second, where parties are new, it is unclear which ones will become pivotal or powerful—and thus useful to the Church. Thus, even as post-communist parties could greatly benefit from organizational and material resources of the Church, the Church did not have the same clarity. Established parties should stand a better chance, since their likely support is clearer—for example, even if its degree of continuity with pre-war parties was questionable, the Italian Christian Democratic party was a known quantity, a party whose support and likely reach were already known. Third, even if they could benefit from the organizational reach and material support of the Church, political parties, especially Christian Democratic ones, may not want too close an alliance. If they become too dependent on the Church for electoral support, they are vulnerable to Church policy blackmail, and their appeal may be limited to voters who espouse Church preferences. Thus, shortly after establishing its

alliance with the Church, the Italian DC began its efforts to gain greater autonomy from the Church, bringing huge swathes of the economy under state control to establish networks of clientelism and voter dependency that then substituted for Church support and obviated the need to placate the Church's policy demands.

In post-communist democracies, Christian Democratic parties succeeded *without* the support of the Catholic (or other) churches, as in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, or Slovenia. If anything, the support of church hierarchy for specific parties subtracted from their broader support, as in the unsuccessful efforts to establish self-declared Christian Democratic parties in the early 1990s in Poland (Bale and Szczerbiak 2008.) And while individual priests and even bishops spoke out in favor of certain political options, none of these nascent Christian Democratic parties received the full and open backing of the church, much less access to its organizational or material resources. The one place where we see a CD party explicitly try to enact Church preferences (and even push for policies more radical than the Church had envisioned) is in Slovakia, where the KDH was trying to differentiate itself from a broader, more moderate Christian Democratic rival, the SDKÚ. Here, party competition, rather than an alliance with the Church, drove the embrace of Church policy preferences. Nonetheless, this account draws our attention to the strategic considerations of party and church elites—and their willingness to invest in particular identities, coalitions, and constituencies.

An Alternative Account

Popular cleavages, genealogy, and church alliances thus do not explain the curious dearth of Christian Democratic parties, suggesting we turn to the parties themselves, and the circumstances that dictated the choice of party identity and its resonance within post-

communist societies. In the newly competitive democratic party systems that arose after 1989, political entrepreneurs invested in party labels and identities. Their own political origins and preferences clearly played a role—but so did the costs and benefits associated with particular party identities in an uncertain and volatile electoral environment. Such party labels mattered in post-communist politics from the very beginning. For example, "despite the informational noise that exists in Poland's fluid party system, party labels … act as markers of political responsibility, and as such they constitute an important link between citizens and their representatives" (Zielinski, Slomczynski, Shabad 2005, 392.)

One tradeoff facing these elites was that distinctive political labels would provide greater certainty in identifying voters and alliances—but they could cost the new parties broader electorates and coalition potential. Specific party labels were relatively risky, for both elites and voters: "even if parties declare themselves to stand on one end of the political spectrum, voters lack the years of experience with the parties necessary to build up confidence that the parties will behave in the manner they promise." (Tucker 2006, 40) The more uncertain and volatile the electoral environment, the riskier a narrow party identity or label, both because a narrow identity could mean a very narrow electorate and because it could limit the pool of potential governing coalition partners. As a result, parties in post-communist Europe tended to pursue glittering generalities rather than specific commitments. Beyond the "regime divide" between parties from the communist and anti-communist camps, early ideologies were amorphous. The modal party name was Democratic, possibly Liberal, definitely Civic, rather than Social Democratic, Christian Democratic, or Socialist, all names with a storied (and more distinctive) history.[4]

---

[4] In the exception that proves the rule, parties emerging from the former anti-communist opposition explicitly identified themselves as such, certain that this identity would benefit their electoral results.

A Christian Democratic label tended to be seen as particularly narrow and controversial. The distinct post-communist political context after 1989 changed the meaning (and value) of the Christian Democratic label, compared to its postwar Western European counterparts. In postwar Western Europe, an investment in Christian Democracy was a relatively certain proposition. The CD parties emerged as a chief counterweight to potential radical Left threats, yet their image was untainted by wartime collaboration. Their anti-communist stance meant critical material and organizational support from both the United States and the Roman Catholic Church, support that allowed the parties to survive and to establish themselves after the war. West European parties could thus rely on more stable electorates and on positive associations with their labels during the return of democracy after World War II.[5]

In the post-communist context, Christian Democracy closely identified the party with clericalism and the policy preferences of the Church (Markowski 1997, Tworzecki 2002.) It specified an intended (and likely limited) electorate, associated the party with the Church, and suggested a pro-clerical doctrine. This identity therefore limited the strategic flexibility of the party, committing it ideologically (or at least symbolically) with the Church and its conservative social teachings. Nor were CD parties the one credible anti-communist bulwark: instead, they were but one of several anti-communist democratic parties. Precisely because their anti-communism made them indistinguishable from several other (bigger, more credible) parties, the one distinguishing characteristic of post-communist CD parties was their tie to religion. And here, as noted earlier, Vatican II and

---

[5] (This is not to say that the parties themselves were "lifted out of storage" and simply returned to their prewar existence. Prewar CD parties were more paternalistic and less committed to democratic competition, to the point that the 19th century parties are said to be precursors in name only (Buchanan and Conway 1996, 11.) Nonetheless, the postwar CD identity was stable and attractive enough for voters to coalesce around them.)

broader socio-demographic shifts precipitated a widespread popular (and legal) rejection of an active role for the Church in politics. Across the post-communist world (and across Europe), broad majorities after 1989 rejected the proposition that the Church should be involved either in governance or in voting decisions (Grzymala-Busse, 2008.) As a result, a CD identity was not as *a priori* valuable in post-communist countries after 1989 as it was in the postwar period in Western Europe. Not surprisingly, "religion as an electoral magnet is very much like a real magnet: it has the disposition to both attract and repel. Strictly speaking, then, having religion as an electoral asset means that Christian Democracy can never become a full-blown catch all party" (van Kersbergen in Hanley 1994, 35.)

Yet some Christian Democratic parties could transcend these narrow and controversial identities, by dint of their historical reputation as very different, moderate and generally secular parties. The interwar period of independence in East Central Europe saw several Christian Democratic parties arise and compete—and political leaders could hope to invoke these pasts in persuading post-communist voters (as did the leaders of other resurrected historical parties.) Even if used instrumentally and cynically, these reputations could convince voters, at least at the outset. And here, the specific historical context of democratic politics in the region mean that one source of more favorable reputations that could build support for the parties beyond the religious milieu would be the parties' performance during the interwar episode of independence, nation-building, and (in some countries) democratic politics.

Throughout the region, national sovereignty and democratic competition arrived (however briefly) in 1918-1938. Where these interwar reputations were less about clerical connections than about capable governance, they would increase the parties' coalition potential and ability to portray themselves as moderate governing parties. Such state- and

nation-building would consist of the parties' continued participation in governments, their record in these governments, and their stances towards independence and democracy. Where CD parties were seen as stable and fundamental pillars of interwar independence and governance, they could claim a favorable historical record after 1989, even if they had been were subjugated after 1945 and rendered powerless for the next four decades. In the early post-communist elections, at least, voters could use these historical endowments to guide their choices. An interwar history of state or nation building, of competent governance or moderation, could ensure at least a trace of a favorable reputation, a reassurance that the party had once ably governed and defended national interests and could do so again.

These historical reputations, if made salient and if credible, could serve as an initial short-cut for voters faced with an array of unfamiliar parties. The past was a source of both party reputations, and symbolic references for all resurrected historical parties. To be sure, the correspondence between interwar and post-communist reputation was imperfect. For all historical parties, the danger was that their earlier identity no longer jibed with the preferences and demands of contemporary voters: parties had to reinvent themselves as relevant without losing their traditional electorate and worse yet, without losing credibility. All parties had to adapt to the changed political and economic context. As a result, several "historic" parties differed considerably from their predecessors. For example, the Hungarian Smallholders' Party became a single-issue party focused on reprivatizing land seized by the communist state, rather than the broader center-Right coalition of the prewar era (Wittenberg 2006, 32, Sukosd 1992.) And in several cases, "the symbolism of the precommunist party is seen as little more than a calculated elite strategy to mimic traditions they see as providing ready-made, easily recognizable identities." (Wittenberg

2006, 33.) The difficulties in adapting and in maintaining credibility are part of the reason why *all* historic parties average only 10% of electoral support in 1990-2010. Nonetheless, a reputation for moderation, competence, and protection of national tradition could prove a powerful initial draw for voters in search of informational shortcuts and reassurance.

These historical resources, however, have a half-life. Over time, parties develop their own political records that supplant historical reputations. Their statements, governing patterns, policy decisions, and choice of coalitions all influence voter perceptions and loyalties, replacing the parties' historical reputations. These subsequent governing records and their position vis-à-vis other parties' electoral offers would play a greater role in determining the voters' decisions. And here, the main concerns of post-communist voters centered on the economy and pocketbook issues, rather than on solely cultural or religious views (Whitefield 2002, Kitschelt et al 1999, Tucker 2006.) The more "clerical" the parties' profile, the greater their ability to attract a religious electorate, but at the cost of strategic flexibility and pursuing new voters.

Thus, we have a two-stage explanation: the distinct political context and uncertainty of the early post-communist years help to explain why fewer parties with clear Christian Democratic labels could succeed. An investment in post-communist Christian Democracy had far lower expected utility than it would have in postwar Western Europe. *Among* post-communist Christian Democratic parties, those with favorable interwar records of building the state and defending the nation could count on greater initial support than those with no such records. Governing records and ideological commitments explain subsequent support. Reputational effects will matter most in the first elections, when the interwar history can guide voters more than the parties' governing or electoral records.

Empirical patterns

As noted above, a major difference between the postwar Christian Democratic restoration in Western Europe and in post-communist democracies was the uncertainty facing the political parties. Political parties in Italy or in Germany returned after a shorter authoritarian period, with voters and electorates that were more intact. Parties themselves had greater continuity of personnel and ideology. In short, CD (and other) parties could be more certain of the payoff from particular party labels. In post-communist democracies, the levels of uncertainty were higher. For example, one frequently noted aspect of the post-communist political environment has been the very high rates of electoral volatility, rates that were twice as they were in Western Europe. From 1885 to 1985, the heyday of Christian Democracy, electoral volatility in Western Europe averaged 8.6% (Bartolini and Mair 1990), rising to 12.6% in the 1990s (Mair 2002). In post-communist democracies, volatility averaged around 30%, and has not decreased over time (Sikk 2005, see also Tucker and Powell 2009.) If volatility indicates the kind of political uncertainty that leads political parties to shy away from clearly cut ideological profiles in order to preserve strategic flexibility in both vote seeking and coalition building, it is one reason why post-communist parties hesitated to adopt the Christian Democratic label.

The most successful post-communist Christian Democratic parties were the KDU-ČSL in the Czech Republic, the KDH and then the SKDÚ in Slovakia, the SKD in Slovenia,[6] and the LKD in Lithuania.[7] One striking correlation is between the existence of

---

[6] Until the late 1990s, when it became the New Slovenia, NSI.

[7] Two other parties called themselves Christian Democratic. The Moldovan Christian Democratic People's Party (Partidul Popular Crestin Democrat, PPCD) is a right-wing nationalist successor to the anti-communist Moldovan Popular Front. The OSCE concluded that its extreme populism means it should "be regarded as a 'anti-system party'." (Neukirch 2002.) The party entered the coalition with its former enemies, the Communists, and failed to enter parliament in 2009. The Georgian Christian-Democratic Movement (K'ristianul-Demokratiuli Modzraoba, KDM), a quasi-clerical party, was founded in early 2008 by a television personality. Its stated priority is to make Orthodox Christianity the state religion of Georgia

a pre-World War II Christian Democratic parties and the success of Christian Democratic parties in the post-1989 democracies, as suggested in the Appendix. Success here is relative: Christian Democratic parties in post-communist democracies did not command large catch-all electorates. They were unable to gain the plurality of votes in any election, even where the party systems were highly fragmented. Another striking correlation is that all four of these countries regained their independence as states in 1989, emerging from the Czechoslovak, Yugoslav, and Russian communist federations.

In the absence of governing records or contemporary identities (which would have determined support for communist successors and the anti-communist opposition), support in the first free elections was influenced by historical reputations. In all the cases of relative Christian Democratic success, the parties could claim direct ties to predecessors that advanced the cause of state-building and independent nationhood, serving in democratic governments, building administrative institutions, and defending independent state status in the interward period.

These eputational effects are most salient as informational shortcuts in the first elections. During the time of the greatest electoral uncertainty, volatility, and risk for both parties and voters, the interwar history could guide voters—signaling the Christian Democratic parties' anti-communist stances, a relatively conservative societal orientation, and a continued support for independent statehood. Subsequently, all parties would be more subject to judgments based on their records as parliamentary parties, coalition partners, and electoral competitors. Note that this argument does not presuppose an

---

(http://www.civil.ge/eng/article.php?id=17060, 7 February 2008, Accessed 14 April 2010.) It entered parliament in the May 2008 elections, and remained as the main opposition party after other opposition parties quit in protest of what they saw as fraudulent election. Neither adhere to broad CD tenets, but both are members of the Christian Democratic international organization, the Centrist Democrat International.

extensive socialization into the Christian Democratic milieu, the development of strong political norms or party loyalties, or even an understanding of Christian Democratic doctrine as practiced elsewhere (see Wittenberg 2006, Darden forthcoming.) Instead, it simply assumes that the Christian Democratic label identifies a nascent party as non-communist, and resonates with a favorable historical reputation for the party.

Thus, historical support for Christian Democratic parties in free elections during the period of independence prior to communism correlates to the results of the first free elections after communism's collapse (.58 correlation, at .014 p level.) Interwar support is a strong predictor of the electoral success of CD parties in the first election. However, beyond the first or two elections, the parties' historical reputations, no matter how favorable, lost their power to attract voters, in keeping with the expectations of the model. As Table 3 shows, the impact of historical support lessened with each election, losing its power to draw an electorate.[8] By the third democratic election, the impact of interwar support is negligible: and instead, other considerations began to determine whether or not the parties would continue to receive support.

TABLE 3 here.

Christian Democratic support in the first free elections, moreover, does not predict future CD success. The first free electoral results do not correlate with subsequent CD support, religiosity (as measured by belief, religious attendance, or denominational

---

[8] To examine how the impact of interwar Christian Democratic support on the post-communist Christian Democratic vote changed over time, I include all post-communist countries with free elections after 1989.[8] I estimate the impact of the interwar vote on post-communist support using OLS as follows:

$$V_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 V_{t0} + \beta_2 N_{2-5} + \beta_3 V_{t0}N + \varepsilon$$

Where V is the vote share, β_0 is the intercept, V_{t0} is the CD support in the interwar period, V_{t1} is the support in the first free elections, N is a vector of dummy variables for the 2nd through 5th free elections, and $V_{t0}N$ is the interaction term for CD support in the interwar period and the second through fifth free elections.[8] The coefficients reported in Table 3 are the linear combinations of coefficients for the interwar support and for the interwar support interacted with successive results of the post-communist free elections.

affiliations), or subsequent electoral volatility or fragmentation. It is further not simply a result of broad support by religious societies, nor is it an indicator of a lasting "anchoring" effect of the CD parties on the electoral system: as noted earlier, the most religious post-communist societies did not produce Christian Democratic parties (in fact, the contrary is true), and in most of these countries, the first free elections featured broad communist and anti-communist forces, with little opportunity for Christian Democratic parties to determine the rules of the game or the contours and cleavages of competition.[9]

Even as they could rely on a favorable reputation at the outset, Christian Democratic parties, quickly had to obtain support based on their contemporary record. And here, they were in a bind: their historical reputation was that of moderate coalition partners, not close allies of the Church. Yet the conservative Christian voters were the one mainstay of their support—as a result, the CD parties were caught between drawing on a religious electorate, which called for relatively narrow sets of appeals and attempting to broaden their strategic flexibility and coalition potential, which demanded a more centrist, broader vision. Their very moderation, as we will see, made them vulnerable to competition from other center-right parties.

Beyond this dilemma, the policy options of Christian Democratic parties everywhere were constrained. In the West European case, the traditional Christian Democratic cross-class coalitions were increasingly fragmented. It was increasingly difficult to reconcile the parties' long-standing commitment to a conservative welfare state and a protective social market with a newly liberalized economy (Kitschelt 2004.) In the post-communist case, neither a social market or a conservative welfare state (the mainstays of CD support) were even available in the first place as policy options after 1989. Instead,

---

[9] Hungary is a notable exception.

the demands of privatizing and liberalizing the state-owned economies, the legacies of the communist welfare state (Inglot 2009, Orenstein 2003), and the strictures of accession to European Union membership limited policy options for all political parties.

Rather than offering a distinctive set of policy options, then, Christian Democratic parties in post-communist democracies relied on a reputation for coalition experience and relative ideological moderation, combined with a more conservative Christian social stance. Instead of forming close alliances with the Roman Catholic Church (or other churches) and translating Church preferences into policy, these parties tried to steer a course between appealing to a narrow and relatively conservative constituency and broadening its appeals. Where they did not command overwhelming popular support, churches were loathe to get involved politically for fear of appearing partisan and losing privileges such as tax-exempt status. In the one case of explicit convergence with Church policy demands (the KDH after its split with the SDKÚ in Slovakia), the party, not the Church, was behind the translation of church preferences into policy, as an attempt to distinguish itself from its more liberal competitor, the SDKÚ. In general, however, since they could offer little in the way of distinctive policies, and since their past reputations could not serve them indefinitely, post-communist Christian Democratic parties steered clear of close alliance with the Church. Even if it meant greater certainty of support, such a tie would undermine the parties' historical claims of moderation, state-building, and representing broader constituencies than the faithful alone.

The Success Stories?

Where political parties had firm bases of support in the pre-war era, the benefits of resurrecting such historical identities included broader positive societal associations, an existing (if elderly) electorate, and the transmission of familial political traditions. All

these factors could all work to build both the size and the loyalty of these parties'
electorate. Thus, post-communist Christian Democracy became most successful initially
where it had historical roots in prominent political parties that built the newly independent
states, repeatedly governed, and helped to defend national aspirations in the prewar era.
The four Christian Democratic parties with the greatest initial post-1989 support (in
Slovakia, Slovenia, Lithuania, and the Czech Republic) all explicitly identified themselves
with powerful interwar predecessors that built both the nation and the state. They could
thus build on favorable reputations for defending national interests and for the ability to
govern, claims that were even more relevant given the new post-1989 independence.

Thus, in Slovakia, the main Christian Democratic party (and the most popular party
overall) was the Hlinkova' Slovenska L'udová Strana, or the Slovak People's Party led by
Monsignor Andrej Hlinka. It polled as much as 34.3% in 1925, and steadfastly began to
advance Slovak autonomy within Czechoslovakia. Its central role in proposing greater
administrative and political independence meant it would become "*the* repository of
Slovak national aspirations." (Rothschild 1974, 96). It served in the Czechoslovak
government from 1927-1929, but otherwise maintained a steadfast opposition to what it
saw as the trampling of Slovak rights. The party became embroiled in controversy during
World War II: Monsignor Hlinka died in 1938, and his successor, Jozef Tiso, led the party
in forming the pro-fascist Slovak government, as Slovakia gained autonomy from the
Czech Republic during the war (only to become a Nazi puppet state.) Critically, then, the
party's buttressing Slovak independence and statehood did not amount simply to interwar
moderation, even if the two went hand in hand in the other cases.

Post-communist Christian Democrats in Slovakia (the KDH and its more successful
splinter, the SKDÚ) explicitly drew attention to the tradition of Hlinka and the HSL'S

support for Slovak autonomy—with Ján Čarnogurský, the head of the KDH, notoriously declaring in 1991 (when Czechoslovakia was still a united country) that Slovakia should have "its own little star" on the EU flag. The importance of the party's association with Slovak autonomy meant that, boosted by the Pope's visit in April 1990, the KDH received 19% of the Slovak vote (its highest posting) in the first free elections in June 1990. The outcome was disappointing to party leaders, who had expected to become the next CDU (Gabal 1996, 95-6), but it was the beginning of a steady 8-10% support for the party.

Yet a favorable reputation did little to alleviate the pressure of contemporary competition. The Slovak KDH tried to steer a course between portraying itself as building on the HSL'S traditions as a nation- and state- building party, and building alliances with the Catholic Church. Thus, the leader of the KDH insisted that Christianity is "the source of our internal stability, the inspiration for our decisions, and the source of our supporters" (Haughton 2005, 38.) At the same time, the KDH was one of the key opposition parties against the increasingly autocratic rule of Vladimír Mečiar and the Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (HDZS.) In 1997, the party joined an alliance of anti-Mečiar parties, the Slovak Democratic Coalition (SDK.) After the coalition's victory in 1998, the KDH began to pursue pro-Church policies in earnest, against the wishes of some of its leaders who saw these projects as divisive and too narrow.

The result was twofold: first, the party split over electoral strategies, with several more moderate leaders departing to form the SDKÚ in 2000, led by Mikuláš Dzurinda. It was this split in the party that prompted the KDH to move even more closely to the Church in an attempt to differentiate itself from the splinter and retain its conservative religious electorate. Abortion, religion in schools, stem cell research restrictions, and same sex marriage regulations were all first legislated by the KDH, who then sought the Church's

support for its stances. Second, the KDH received half the vote of the much broader and moderate SDKÚ-DS in 2002 and 2006. The SDKÚ obtained 15% in 2002 and 18% in 2006, against the KDH's 8% in both elections. The SDKÚ ran not on Christian values, but on continuing economic reforms and the country's readiness to enter the EU (Haughton and Rybár 2008.) Thus, its success was not due to a Christian identity, but to its broadly attractive policy stances, and its focus beyond church-state relations. The KDH attempted to moderate its rhetoric in the 2006 elections, emphasizing family and justice rather than religious values, but this shift came too late and was not credible. The broader, more moderate SDKÚ option showed itself to be more attractive to the electorate, while the KDH catalyzed coalition crises and pursued controversial pro-clerical policies.[10] The KDH retained its narrow religious electorate, but obtained no new support in 2010, either.

Similarly, the Czech counterpart of the KDH, the KDU-ČSL, also drew on strong prewar roots, in the form of the Czech People's Party. The ČSL was a major governing party in the interwar Czechoslovak republic, serving in the government from 1921-1938, and a regular member of the informal five-party consultative coalition (petka.) Its interwar record of 8-10% of the vote was reflected in the post-1989 support of its successor, which averaged nearly 8%, and in the party's image, which was that of a consistently centrist, administratively competent, moderate governing party (Tworzecki 2003.)

At the outset, KDU-ČSL was the party to most successfully balance the tradeoff between the certainty and the breadth of support. The Church has traditionally been weak

---

[10] For example, in 2002, the KDH went to the Constitutional Court to argue that Slovakia's liberal abortion law was unconstitutional. One of its coalition partners, the Alliance for a New Citizen (ANO), reacted by trying to strengthen the legal right to abortion, and KDH declared it would leave the coalition if the law were passed. In December 2007, he Constitutional Court declared abortion on demand up to the 12th week constitutional, rendering the proposed change moot. In 2006, the KDH left the governing coalition with SDKU, over complaints about Dzurinda's leadership style and KDH's strict Christian views. See Haughton and Rybar 2008.

and other parties remained uninterested in exploiting a church-state cleavage (Houghton and Rybár 2008, Hloušek and Kopeček 2008.) As a result, the KDU-ČSL did not face as steep a tradeoff between appealing to religious voters and to the broader electorate. It emphasized its agrarian and moderate character, and the party was perceived in largely positive terms, both as far as its historical reputation and current programmatic efforts were concerned (Tworzecki 2003.) Its electorate remained relatively small (6-9%) and mostly Catholic, but the party repeatedly entered governing coalitions as a moderate center-right party, rather than as a clerical or narrow formation. Even so, the Czech Christian Democrats succumbed to new competition from other moderate, right-centrist parties in the 2010 elections, who offered the promise of moderation without the taint of participation in the controversial governing coalitions of the 1990s and beyond. If moderation broadened the KDU-ČSL's support, it also left the party vulnerable.

Much like their Slovak counterpart, the Slovene Christian Democrats also made a name for themselves by advocating national autonomy. Unlike the Hlinka party, however, they were successful: the Slovene People's Party (*Slovenska ljudska stranka*) was an effective organization, and its considerable political skill allowed it to adroitly exploit the divides between Serbs and Croats in the interwar Yugoslavia to gain "virtual autonomy" for Slovenia, advancing self-administration, Christian-social culture, education, and Slovene self-government (Rothschild 1974, 212.) Its alliance with the Church was in the name of national protection, rather than advancing clerical policies. The SLS's explicit and formal successors, the Slovenian Christian Democrats (*Slovenski krščanski demokrati*, SKD and subsequently the New Slovenia-Christian People's Party, NSI), together averaged a bit over 9% of the vote, and participated in several governments (1990-1996, briefly in 2000, and in 2004-8) on the strength of their association with moderate center-

right policies and their ability to sustain a state-building reputation in light of post-communist Slovenia's economic and political success as an independent country.

The final party to benefit from a strong prewar precursor was the Lithuanian LKD, which became the TS-LKD in 2008 (*Tėvynės sąjunga-Lietuvos krikščionys demokratai.)*A historical party since 1905, the LKD was closely associated with the Roman Catholic Church, and seen as a critical nation-building force in the interwar Lithuanian Republic (until the 1926 coup.) The LDK was the most powerful among the interwar parties, shaping both the state and the institutions to its preferences (Rothschild 1974, 379.) It was an anti-Polish and nationalist party, which was the source of its support—and its downfall. When the party was unable to prevent the Vatican from recognizing Vilno as a Polish city, the humiliation cost it dearly at the polls: the party lost its majority in 1926, allowing an anti-clerical coalition of Populists and Socialists into office. The LKD then supported an ultra-nationalist coup later in the year: and by the time it realized its mistake, the coup perpetrators had entrenched themselves in office (Rothschild 1974, 379.) Re-established in 1989, still under the Soviet Union (the party relied on Catholic networks to recruit members and supporters), the LKD served in the government in 1996-1999 with the Homeland Union (TS, *Tėvynės sąjunga*), with whom it merged in 2008.

Yet all these Christian Democratic parties saw their support drop over time, partly as a result of their participation in government and the internal party debates over strategy prompted by the experience. In the Lithuanian case, much as its predecessor suddenly lost votes after 1926, the LKD's 1996-9 participation in a ruling coalition that vowed to continue austerity policies led to a decisive backlash against the party. The result was that the LKD split, with the rump gaining only 1.4% of the vote in 2006, and the core running an election with TS in 2004 and 2008, obtaining nearly 15% and 20% of the vote,

respectively. Similarly, in Slovenia, the SKD and then the NSI had their greatest base of support in 1990-2 (13-15% of the vote), and then declined to 8-9% in 1996-2004, dropping below 4% in 2008. Moderation was no insurance against competition.

Weak Legacies and Weak Support

In contrast to the these parties, whose relative success can be traced back to a positive reputation that dates back to their earlier performance as defenders of national interest, we see no such favorable legacies in the other cases. Three weaker Christian Democratic parties also trace their roots to historical parties, in Romania, Hungary, and in Poland. The Romanian CD party, the *Partidul Naţional Ţărănesc Creştin Democrat*, PNŢ-CD, saw itself as the successor to the *Partidul Naţional Ţărănesc* or *PNŢ,* a monarchist party in power from 1928-1933, with no real Christian Democratic identity. The PNT-CD was refounded by some of the PNT members. The party leaders, many of whom had been imprisoned by the communist regime, were respected for their moral rectitude: but their constant focus on the purity of their membership and hardline opposition to communism meant that the party had little influence on the policy process or in parliament more broadly (Stan 2005, 188). It was at its most successful in the local elections of 1996, but subsequently hemorrhaged both supporters and parliamentarians, who defected en masse. By the 2004 elections, it was widely ignored.

The other two cases, Hungary and Poland, have interwar Christian Democratic roots: but these legacies are decidedly mixed. In both cases, as in Romania, Christian Democratic parties arose after 1989, only to quickly lose support and become eliminated from the political scene as independent entities. The Hungarian Christian Democrats (*Kereszténydemokrata Néppárt*, KDNP) were refounded by some of their original leaders in 1989, having been earlier established in 1943-4. The historical party, the Democratic

People's Party (DNP) briefly competed after the war, and won over 16% of the vote in 1947. An earlier predecessor was part of the Hungarian interwar government. In post-communist Hungary, the KDNP made explicit connections to the postwar DNP, and many of its politicians had been active in the party during 1945-7 (Wittenberg 2006, 60.) It promulgated itself as the defender of broader Christian morality (both its leaders and voters, however, were mostly Catholic.) Among the smallest parliamentary parties, its highest votes were in 1990 and in 1994, at 6.5% and 7%, respectively, and its electorate was clearly profiled as religious and center-right, just as the party "defined itself in Christian terms" (Wittenberg 2006, 60, see also Körösényi 1999.) It was perceived as chiefly focused on religious and moral issues (Tworzecki 2003), rather than on broader economic or social problems. The KDNP was in the governing coalition from 1990-4, and helped to pass several laws that favored Church positions. While its religious voters remained loyal, the party leadership split over differences in strategy after the party's electoral performance did not improve in 1994. The more moderate faction that sought a broader electorate was largely absorbed by Fidesz, which transformed itself from a liberal party into the dominant Right party (Enyedi 2003). The more conservative, nationalist faction joined extremist right parties, and the rump KDNP received only 2.3% in 1998.

The main post-communist Polish party affiliated with the Catholic Church, the Christian National Union (*Zjednoczenie Chrześcijańsko-Narodowe, ZChN*),thus had little historical capital to call upon. It is not the case that there was no Christian Democracy in interwar Poland (Bale and Szczerbiak 2008): rather, there was no *favorable* record of administrative competence, governance, or nation-building. The Polish Christian Democrats, led by Wojciech Korfanty as the PSChD (*Polskie Stronnictwo Chrześcijańskiej Demokracji,* also known as Chadecja), rapidly became part of the Christian Union of

National Unity (*Chrześcijański Związek Jedności Narodowej*, known as Chjena.) The party governed briefly in a coalition after winning the 1922 elections with 29% of the vote and 163 out of 444 parliamentary seats. Ostensibly centrist, it then assumed a right wing and clerical orientation (Rothschild 1974, 31.) These close links to the Church were controversial: anticlerical sentiment in interwar Poland ran high. After the 1926 coup of Marshal Józef Piłsudski, it joined other opposition parties in the Centrolew coalition, designed to balance the pro- Piłsudski forces (BBWR), resulting in the 1930 arrest of the party's leaders. It never served the role of a stable, nation-building governing party that its Czech, Slovene, or Slovak counterparts could claim.

Subsequently, under communism, the role of the Roman Catholic Church solidified in the 1970s as the protector of the opposition and the repository of Polish national identity. Church attendance became a political act, a way of demonstrating that there were domains beyond the reach of the communist regime (which had already recognized Polish Catholicism by not dissolving the monasteries, liquidating Church property, or engaging in open animosity, as was the case in the Czech Republic, for example.) The result was a postwar identification of Polishness with Catholicism, a powerful symbolic marriage that meant almost all politicians would respect the Church and pay heed to its representatives.

Yet the postwar identification of Pole and Catholic, however powerful, did not translate into either simple partisanship or into demands for Church influence on politics. Popular support for the political influence of the Church was far more limited, and conditional on the domain: moral authority and national identity was one thing, specific government policies another. As a result, Polish Christian Democracy was highly controversial from its very beginning as a splinter group from the anti-communist Solidarity parliamentary grouping in 1990-1, and its immediate and public support for

Church preferences. Meanwhile, the Polish Church sought to translate the political capital it had earned under the communists as an umbrella for the opposition into political influence in a sovereign democracy. As the Church pushed for changes in the laws regarding abortion, divorce, and education in the early 1990s, Church moral authority was so great that few parliamentarians initially dared to risk its disapproval—but ZChN was seen as the pivotal coalition player actually responsible for these policies. The party received some of the worst evaluations in public opinion, garnering nearly 70% negative views. (Tworzecki 2003.) This was a direct consequence of its clericalism: "the very negative reaction to ZChN had much to do with the perception that it was doing the bidding of Poland's powerful Catholic Church, and that through it the Church was trying to exert undue influence on the political process" (Tworzecki 2003, 149.)

Its parliamentary and electoral activity on behalf of the Roman Catholic Church meant it became widely (and negatively) perceived as a handmaiden of the Church. As a result, while it gained nearly 9% of the vote in the 1991 elections, its support dropped to 6.4% in 1993, and it has not held any parliamentary seats since. It participated in the victorious AWS (Akcja Wyborcza Solidarność) center-right coalition in 1997, but both its policy influence, and its public image, never recovered from its earlier activity. While it attempted to reassemble again in successive elections, its reputation remained as a narrow, very conservative, clerical party, and it was unable to gain broader support. The conservative and nationalist mantle had been assumed by other parties, including Law and Justice (Prawo i Sprawiedliwość, PiS). Thus, even where the electorate is overwhelmingly religious, close ties to the Church limit its electoral appeal. Given the increasing importance of governing records in successive elections, proximity to the Church was

especially damaging, as the Polish ZChN and the Slovak KDH show: parties that hoped to gain legitimacy with this alliance were seen as simply doing the bidding of the Church.

The Dangers of Clericalism

Finally, while no explicit Christian Democratic party arose in Croatia, it illustrates how even parties that earlier sought Church legitimation abnegate the association in the name of electoral appeal. The dominant Croatian Democratic Union (Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, HDZ) established close ties to the Church during its 1990-2000 rule under the increasingly autocratic Franjo Tudjman. The Church supported the Tudjman government, even when it was accused of human rights violations and crimes against humanity. Tudjman, in turn, "never fail[ed] to bring up another of the church's virtues: its strong link with the Croatian people…interlacing the church with the very idea of Croatian statehood and nationhood is not unique to Tudjman but common to the Croatian traditional mentality" (Lovrenovic 1998.) The alliance would legitimate HDZ rule and provide further support for the country's participation in the wars of the Yugoslav succession. However, once Tudjman died and full democracy returned in 2000, the HDZ then severed its close links, as part of its campaign to reinvent itself as a fully democratic party. By the 2007 elections, the two main parties running, SDP and HDZ, "broadly agree[d] on a number of hot social issues. Neither would restrict abortion rights, nor does either advocate an outright ban on Sunday work, two frequent demands from the Catholic Church in Croatia…The increasingly vocal clergy, whose social attitudes often verge on extremism, knows very well that neither conservatives nor social democrats will fulfill some of their most deeply held desires" (Loza 2007.) The HDZ thus explicitly turned away from an association with the Church as a way to broaden and to legitimate its electoral appeals.

The general pattern that emerges, then, is that post-communist Christian Democracy could make the greatest gains (at least initially) in post-communist democracies where it had the most positive historical legacies. Without such identities, Christian Democratic parties could not count on initial electoral support, and found efforts to broaden their appeal hamstrung by either a lack of historical capital or by the parties' alliances with the Church. As a result, they either failed to arise, or where they did, lost both electoral and parliamentary relevance (and presence.)

Thus, it is not the case that all Christian Democratic parties in post-communist democracies simply appeal to voters on the basis of their religious identity (Tucker 2006, 186-7.) Instead, CD parties span the range from conservative, nationalist, and clericalist formations (the Polish ZChN) to more moderate centrist parties that with sparser religious appeals and commitments (the Slovak SDKÚ, Slovene SKD/ NSI or the Czech KDU-ČSL.) While no CD party claimed the plurality of the votes, some were able to obtain a larger electorate, provided they did not become too closely aligned with the Church and pro-clerical ideology. Most, however, steadily lost support as either historical resources ran out or as the parties became too closely associated with the Church. It was only in the Czech Republic and in Slovakia that Christian Democratic parties were able to survive—and even there, these moderate parties were vulnerable to competition from new parties.

Conclusion

A historical reputation for state- and nation-building helped to build support for post-communist Christian Democracy in ways that religious cleavages, party genealogy, and Church support could not. Yet this was a fragile basis for building durable parties. Even favorable historical reputations have transitory effects: by the second or third elections, the impact of interwar support rapidly faded. Even if the impact of prewar

democratic experience continues to structure the quality of democracy after the collapse of communism (Pop-Eleches 2007), the more fine-grained legacies of party reputations and support turn out to be remarkably fragile.

CD parties were faced with the choice of preserving strategic flexibility—or addressing a narrower but potentially more loyal religious electorate. Much of the literature on post-communist party systems has emphasized the initial fluidity of party politics and the ill-defined nature of party identities. Yet we can turn the question around, and ask why parties might not *want* to adopt a clear and salient identity, such as a Christian Democratic label. Christian Democracy turned out to be a narrow and restrictive identity that limited both the target electorate and the party's strategic flexibility.

Finally, the political context had changed since the years of the post-war Christian Democratic success in Western Europe. Even before policy challenges arose, post-communist Christian Democrats faced an electorate that saw "Christian" as associated with cultural cleavages (such as abortion, religion in schools, clerical influence on politics) rather than a broad social market and support for traditional values. An alliance with the Church was no longer acceptable—and given the changes in electoral technology, parties were no longer as dependent on extensive organizations and civil society support. Even favorable historical reputations that promoted (perhaps misleadingly) the parties' initial electoral success were not enough to sustain the parties in this far less favorable environment.

Table 1. Average support for Christian Democracy

	Post-communist Europe	Western Europe
Avg vote for CD in countries where CD competed	8.3%	28.6%
Avg vote for CD across all countries	3.6%	18.5%
Avg vote for CD 1990-2010	3.6%	16.0%

Table 2. Pairwise correlations among vote for Christian Democratic parties and populations characteristics. (p level in parentheses)

	CD vote	belief	belong	attend	efficacy
CD vote	1.00				
Belief in God	-0.17 (.506)	1.00			
Belonging to a religious denomination	-0.03 (.916)	0.67 (.000)	1.00		
Attendance at religious services	0.22 (.387)	0.77 (.000)	0.46 (.000)	1.000	
Church influence on public policy	0.43 (.291)	0.69 (.007)	0.74 (.003)	0.87 (.000)	1.00
Popular support for Church influence on politics	.35 (.393)	.12 (.555)	0.0003 (.999)	0.15 (.448)	.26 (.449)

Table 3. Decreasing impact of interwar voting in postcommunist democracies

Post 1989 Election Round	Effect of interward CD support (std errors)	p value
1st	.352 (.090)	.000
2nd	.304 (.091)	.001
3rd	.118 (.096)	.221
4th	.056 (.091)	.542

Appendix A

Country	Historical CD party?	Average CD Vote[11]	Highest CD vote	Avg historical CD vote[12]	Weekly religious attendance
Slovakia	HSL'S	18.4	19.2 (1990)	8.5[13]	50
Slovenia	SLS	9.7	14.5 (1992)	5.7[14]	31
Czech Rep.	ČSL	7.8	9 (1998)	10.4[15]	12
Lithuania	LKD	6.9	12.6 (1992)	40.5[16]	32
Moldova	No	5.5	9.1 (2005)	0	29
Hungary	KDNP	5.0	7 (1994)	10[17]	18
Poland	"Chadecja"[18]	4.1	8.7 (1991)	18.6[19]	78
Romania	(PNT)	2.6	2.6 (1990)		47
Latvia	No	2.2	5.0 (1993)	0	15
Georgia	No	2.1	8.7 (2008)	0	26
Estonia	No	.7	2.4 (1999)	0	11
Ukraine	No	.6	3 (1998)	0	17
Albania	No	.4	1.3 (1996)	0	29
Croatia[20]	No	0	0	0	53

[11] Not including coalitions.

[12] In democratic interwar elections.

[13] 11.3% in 1920, 10% in 1925, 5.7% in 1929, 6.9% in 1935 in united Czechoslovakia. Source: Rothschild 1974.

[14] 5.8% in 1923, 5.4% in 1925, 5.9% in 1927 in Yugoslavia. Source: Rothschild 1974.

[15] 11.3% in 1920, 7% in 1925, 8.4% in 1929, 7.5% in 1935 in united Czechoslovakia. Source: Rothschild 1974

[16] 46% in 1920, 41% in 1922, 43% in 1923, and 32% in 1926. Source: Eidintas, Alfonsas, Vytautas Žalys, Edvardas Tuskenis. 1998. Lithuania in European Politics: the Years of the First Republic 1918-1940. New York: St. Martin's.

[17] 1920 elections, Legitimist vote (20%), and 1945 elections, KDNP (0%).

[18] Includes Chrześcijańska Demokracja - Stronnictwo Pracy, Polskie Stronnictwo Chrześcijańskiej Demokracji, and the Chrześcijański Związek Jedności Narodowej (Chjena) coalition.

[19] 29.1% in 1922 and 8% in 1928. Source: Rotschild 1974.

[20] The Croatian Democratic Union (Hrvatska demokratska zajednica, HDZ) is not counted as a Christian Democratic party, despite forming an alliance with the Roman Catholic Church. The party was largely the electoral engine of Franjo Tudjman until his death in 2000, without espousing CD doctrine. The Croatian Christian Democratic Party, a right-wing formation, ran as part of the Coalition of People's Understanding in 1990. It then became the Christian Democratic Union (HDKU) in 1992, along with the Croatian

Armenia	No	0	0	0	29
Bosnia-Herzegovina	No			0	
		0	0		45
Bulgaria	No	0	0	0	20
Russia	No	0	0	0	9
Serbia	No	0	0	0	20
Post comm. Average		**3.6%**			**30.1%**
West European		**18.5%**			**30.8%**

References:

Bale, Tim, and Szczerbiak, Aleks. 2008. "Why is there no Christian Democracy in Poland—and why should we care?" *Party Politics*., 14, 4: 479-500.

Crowther, William, and Matonyte, Irimina, 2007. "Parliamentary elites as a democratic thermometer: Estonia, Lithauania, and Moldova compared," Communist and Post-Communist Studies 40: 281-299

Enyedi, Zsolt. 2003. "The contested politics of positive neutrality in Hungary." *West European Politics*, 26(1).

Kalyvas, Stathis. 1996. *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kitschelt, Herbert. 2004 "Diversification and Reconfiguration of Party Systems in Postindustrial Democracies," Bonn: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung International Policy Analysis Unit, FBS Online.

Körösényi, András. 1999. *Government and Politics in Hungary.* Budapest: CEU Press.

Pop-Eleches, Grigore. 2007. "Historical Legacies and Post-Communist Regime Change," *Journal of Politics* 69, 4: 908-926.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1976. *Parties and Party Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Warner, Carolyn. 2000. *Confessions of an Interest Group.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Whitefield, Stephen. 2002. "Political Cleavages and Post-Communist Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 181-200.

Wittenberg, Jason. 2006. *Crucibles of Political Loyalty*. Cambridge: CUP.

Democratic Party (HDS), and ran as part of the United List in 1995. The HSP and the HKDU ran together in an electoral alliance in 2000, 2003, and 2007.

Zielinski, Jakub. 2002. "Translating Social Cleavages Into Party Systems," *World Politics* 54: 184-211.

Zielinski, Jakub, Slomczynski, Kazimierz, and Shabad, Goldie. 2005. "Electoral Control in New Democracies." *World Politics*, 57: 365-395.