Table 1: Conditions Shaping Political Divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Missing Middle'</th>
<th>Comparative Communism</th>
<th>Modes of Transition</th>
<th>Post-communist elites</th>
<th>Political Institutions</th>
<th>Macro-societal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The key prior condition in this account is that communism destroyed civil society or that it emerged in countries without a pre-existing developed civil society. In some case, an exception is made for Solidarity in Poland.</td>
<td>This approach emphasises the differences in the character of communist regimes themselves, in particular the form of authoritarianism, the extent of effective state organisation, the role of the working class, and the involvement of non-communist organisations and interests in the policy process. These factors produce three distinct types of communist system: i. bureaucratic-authoritarian, including Czechoslovakia ii. national-accommodative, including Poland and Hungary iii. patrimonial, the other countries in the study</td>
<td>From this perspective, the manner of the transition from communist rule - which is not a function of the character of that rule per se - differs in ways that affect the nature of the ensuing party system. Chief among the differences in the modalities of the move from authoritarianism to democracy are the extent to which elites or masses gain ascendancy in the process, and whether strategies of compromise or confrontation are pursued. From these distinctions four types of transition emerge: i. reform: Poland, Lithuania, Bulgaria ii. revolution: Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia iii. imposition: Romania, Russia iv. pact: Hungary, Moldova, Ukraine</td>
<td>The emphasis here is on the strategies of the communist-successor and anti-communist reform parties in the post-communist period, and whether they choose to focus on the communist past or distance themselves from it. Three types emerge: i. Reform: Hungary, Slovakia ii. Hard-line: Russia, Ukraine, Czech Republic, Moldova, Estonia, Latvia, Romania and Bulgaria iii. Mixed: Poland and Lithuania</td>
<td>This approach focuses on differences in the institutional structures of countries in the region, principally between i. Semi-presidential systems: Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russia, and Ukraine ii. parliamentary systems: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, and Slovakia</td>
<td>Differences in social factors. i. Market development (high in Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, low in Russia, Ukraine and Moldova) and differentiated experience based on market reform (everywhere). ii. ethnic diversity: Baltic states, Romania, Bulgaria, Moldova, Slovakia, Ukraine iii. religious traditions, especially Catholicism: Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Slovakia, which contrasts with Orthodoxy (Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, Romania, Bulgaria). iv. Insecurity of statehood: Baltic states, Moldova, Slovakia, Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Missing Middle'</td>
<td>Comparative Communism</td>
<td>Modes of Transition</td>
<td>Post-communist elites</td>
<td>Political Institutions</td>
<td>Macro-sociological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. With civil society absent in post-communist states, minimal social and ideological bases to partisanship are expected. Little structure.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Imposition</strong>: Russia, Romania Relatively weak social divisions, single weak ideological division based on various associated liberalism versus authoritarianism.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Presidential systems</strong>: Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russia, and Ukraine Comparatively weak structure to social and ideological divisions, limited number of divisions</td>
<td>1. General: structured social and ideological divisions in all countries, with the number depending on the presence of relevant divisions below</td>
<td>2. Market divisions: all countries i. Ideological division based around economic liberalism. ii. in all states, differentiated market experience gives rise to social divisions between winners (young, educated, middle classes) and losers; iii. In states with more developed marketisation (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland) class divisions more clearly evident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>National-accordative states</strong>: Hungary, Poland, Baltic states Ideologically, weak differences on the economy and democracy versus authoritarianism; stronger divisions on identity dimensions, such as social liberalism and ethnic rights. Socially, class differences are likely to be weak, and those over religion, age, and ethnicity, strong.</td>
<td>2. <strong>Parliamentary systems</strong>: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Estonia and Latvia Comparatively strong divisions, programmatic differences in partisanship, underpinned by social differences</td>
<td>2. Parliamentary systems: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Estonia and Latvia Comparatively strong divisions, programmatic differences in partisanship, underpinned by social differences</td>
<td>3. Religious divisions, especially Catholicism: Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Slovakia, which contrasts with Orthodoxy (Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, Romania, Bulgaria Social divisions based in church attendance and denomination in Catholic countries; in these countries, an independent ideological division based in social liberalism; in non-Catholic states, social liberalism will be associated with economic liberalism, with similar social bases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Patrimonial states</strong>: Bulgaria, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Ukraine Weak ideological and social divisions, Any structure that emerges should be based around opposition to the old order.</td>
<td>3. <strong>Mixed</strong>: Poland and Lithuania Structured divisions, socially on age and class, ideologically on market and associated liberalisms</td>
<td>3. Mixed: Poland and Lithuania Structured divisions, socially on age and class, ideologically on market and associated liberalisms</td>
<td>4. Ethnic divisions: Baltic states, Romania, Bulgaria, Moldova, Slovakia, Ukraine: i. Ethnic bases to parties ii. Ideological divisions over ethnic rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <strong>Revolution</strong>: Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Slovakia Strong divisions; socially class based, ideologically about the market</td>
<td>4. Revolution: Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Slovakia Strong divisions; socially class based, ideologically about the market and associated forms of liberalism</td>
<td>4. Revolution: Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Slovakia Strong divisions; socially class based, ideologically about the market and associated forms of liberalism</td>
<td>5. ‘Stateness’ divisions: Baltic states, Moldova, Slovakia, Ukraine Stronger basis to ethnic division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Predicted Social and Ideological Bases of Partisanship