# Intro

# Theory

## 2.1. What is populist about populism?

### 2.1.1. A minimalist definition: Moving away from the confusion between populism and the Right

* Populism allgemeine (state oft he art) Literaturüberblick. Verschiedene Ansätze von Populismus (political style, organisational style, thin ideology) -> Belgium text (Pauwels)
  + Thin ideology: the people, the corrupt elite and the general will (Mudde 2017: 8 ff.)
  + Political style: Hierbei wird eine spezifische Rethorik genutzt (Provokationen, spectacular acts…), welche dazu dient eine breite Masse zu mobilisieren und sich gleichwohl stets auf „the people“ bezogen wird. A definition of populism as a political style was made by scholars like Jagers 2007, Taggert 1995…But not all scholars think about populism as a rhetorical style. More a ideology than a style…see mudde…
  + Organisational style: hierarchische Struktur der Partei, charismatische Führung und Darsetllung als „Verlierer“ um die Nähe zu den Menschen zu demonstrieren (vgl. Pauwels 2011: 99 f.)
* „the dominant tendency in scholarly literature has been to identify … the rise of populism …

as **a phenomenon exclusively of the Right”** (ie Betz, 1994)…especially in the case of Europe

* Kritik Vermischung Populism & Radical Right (Inglehart & Norris Bashing) -> thin centered
  + *Inglehart & Norris (2017) define populism with three core concepts: ant-establishment, authoritarianism and nativism as Mudde did in his publication/work “populist radical right in Europe”. But it’s important to mention that Mudde define the populist radical right with these core concepts, not the populism as general. Therefore Mudde use the following three core concepts, as previously mentioned: the people, the corrupt elite and the general will (Mudde 2017: 6). #micdrop*
* Inglehart & Norris definieren Populismus mit drei Kernkonzepten: Anti-Establishment, authoritarianism and nativism = “Cas Mudde has been influential in the literature, suggesting….three core features: anti-establishment, authoritarianism, and nativism.” (vgl. Inglehart 2017: 6) 🡪 Voll der Schwindel…. Muddes Buch heist “RADICAL RIGHT BLA”! Mudde bezieht sich hierbei auf rechte populistische Parteien in Europa, nicht auf Populismus im Allgemeinen. Dann bezug auf Muddes allg. Definition von Populism…
  + Populism = **a [thin-centered] ideology** that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite’, and which argues that politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people” (Mudde 2004: 543)[[1]](#footnote-1) / (Mudde/Kaltwasser 2017: 6)[[2]](#footnote-2)
* Minimal Approach: Grund: Populismus kann in verschiedenen Formen aufkommen, ist Kontextabhängig.
* => Literatur behandelte zwar auch links und rechtspopulismus, doch oftmals regional getrennt (Latin America vs Europe); qualitative >Untersuchungen bezüglich linkspopulisten in Europa (Typ1 hta Syriza untersucht, Typ2 Podemos…bla bla qualitativ…wo is der andere shit?), jedoch fehlende quantitative Arbeiten mit klarer Trennung/Konzeption zwischen links- und rechtspopulismus…umso wichtiger in Anbetracht der aufkommenden linkspopulistischen Parteien wie Syriza und Podemos dies nicht zu ignorieren und „beide Seiten der Medaille“ in einer quantitativen Arbeiten versuchen zu betrachten…wir sind besser als Inglehart ;)
* Erläuterung der Definition people, corrupt elite and general will
  + Wichtig zu betonen, dass man eine neutrale Definition des Begriffs Populismus haben möchte, die, so gut es geht, von politischen Ideologien unberührt bleibt. Erst durch Einbezug anderer Komponenten kann dann eine Differenzierung verschiedener Arten von Populismus erfolgen (hier: progressive und traditonalism populism)
* What are the people/elite? => verschiedene Klassen, Ethnien etc. pp.? // auf was bezieht sich der general will?
* **WICHTIG**: Betonen, dass die Arbeit sich explizit auf die EU bezieht und nicht auf Latein-Amerika!
  + was im popular discourse links und rechtspopulismus genannt wird….erscheint in vers Formen
  + die haben vers charakter, was man aber auf jeden sagen kann, ist dass die vereint (weshalb minimalist definion eben so wichtig ist): anti.eu, anti blabl. 🡪 „what makes populism populist =/ authoritarianism etc (NEIN!)
* => Hier kommt dann Anti-Eu und Anti Establishment talk (interests oft he EU over those oft he country…(short introduction page 13)…Begründung für die Variablennutzung => Ebenso Euroskeptizismus.
* General will -> impliziert durch Anti-EU und Anti Establishment (Anti-Eu und Anti Establishment begründet durch verfehlte politik, die nicht mehr den Interessen von „the people“ entgegenkommt…)

**Übergang (Nga)**: 🡪 Wir glauben AUCH das die gleichsetzung right=populism unsinn ist. Sieht man ja zB bei Inglehart & Norris. Deshalb…“we seek/propose to establish a new framework that sharply distinguishes between these different types of populism….” (oder so ähnlich). Dann die ↔ (left-right) Dimension aufmachen…. Wir brechen die ↨ auf und fügen die ↔ Dimension ein. Wir schauen dann, welche Leute in dieses Konzept passen.

### 2.1.2. The essential distinction: Moving towards a comprehensive conceptualization of progressive and traditionalist populism

* Vertical dimension ↨ definiert. Nun geht es an ↔ Dimension

Fabios Wille: Was vereint Links und Rechtspopulisten? Gemeinsamkeiten (Anti-EU, Anti-Establishment und Anti-Globalization & Unterschiede

* Gemeinsamkeiten/Kern = Anti-EU (anti-establishment, euroscepticismus), anti-elite
* Unterscheidung: Aus vers. Logiken = wer gehört zu den people, wer gehört zur elite und dementsprechend unterscheidet sich auch das Verständnis vom „volonté générale“. 🡪 Verschiedene Ideologien, die zum thin ideology / political strategy hinzugefügt werden. (liberalism, socialism etc):
  + “Until now, **populism was almost exclusively linked to the radical right**, leading to an incorrect conflation of populism and xenophobia… Practically, populist politicians almost always combine it with other ideologies, such as **nativism on the right** and **socialism on the left**.” (Mudde, Cas (2015)[[3]](#footnote-3)
  + Merge populism with more ‘established’ ideologies (i.e. liberalism, nationalism, conservatism, federalism and socialism) 🡪 this occurs as part of a broader mission to restore democracy and government to the people. …(Albertazzi & McDonnell 2008[[4]](#footnote-4):4)
  + 🡪 Difference in values that define who belongs to the “pure people” and who doesn’t (the elite in cooperation with the others)
* Kontroverse Diskussion: Different authors have different notions to describe the different forms of populism.
  + Some call it left/ right, liberal & illiberal, inclusionary & exclusionary, cosmopolitan vs populist + economic right/left (WTF??) i.e. to describe this diversion of populism:
    - Inclusionary vs exclusionary: “Populism’s black and white views and uncompromising stand leads to a polarised society […] and its majoritarian extremism denies legitimacy to opponents’ views and weakens the rights of minorities. … While **leftwing populism is often less exclusionary than rightwing populism**, the main difference between them is not whether they exclude, but whom they exclude, which is largely determined by their **accompanying ideology (eg nationalism or socialism).**
  + „left-right“ spectre. We want to distance ourselves from the term „left & right“ terms often used in the literature, because the left/right has shifted over time.
  + The reason: left = communism/soz 🡪 not necessarily liberal!
  + Would rather describe it as liberal/illiberal. But the problem: liberal can be understood in the Millian or Lockean sense 🡪 socialists would not describe themselves as liberals. Also too normative. Would not call themselves liberal/illiberal either. “oktroieren”, Elfenbeinturmbegriffe.
  + Also: we strive for a term that the respective populist actors would use to describe themselves. Progressive vs. traditionalist seems to describe it very well without normative judgement. Also, progressive does not mean liberal either. The definition of populism depends on the context (i.e. can the vox populi strive for more liberal or illiberal values in society, more or less religiosity i.e.). Strictly speaking, the political tradition in the “west” is rather “liberal” while it is progressive in countries like China??
* We call it „prog. Vs trad. Populism“, terms that are free of normative biases and that would be employed by the populists themselves (contrary to i.e. “liberal“ or „illiberal“) 🡪 Progressive vs traditionalist populism definieren (Kaltwasser 2012 etc):
  + Rückständig 🡪 cosmopolitisch, kulturelle incklusion noch nicht weit genug fortgeschritten. Wirtschaftlich abgehängt, vs „Banken & Multinationals & das große Geld, die die Arbeiterklasse unterdrücken“
  + Vielleicht galtan, soc. Lifestyle & civib\_law\_order & PATRIARCHAL VALUES erklären?
  + i.e. anti-Globalisierung / anti-EU:
    - L: vs. Bankenelite/ Undermining working class
    - R: vs. Fremdbestimmung/Undermining values & national sovereignty
* 🡪 maps quite well with the left/right classification often employed by other authors
  + Traditionalists 🡪 kulturelle inklusion zu weit fortgeschritten. Wirtschaftlich abgehängt, vs „Billige Arbeitskräfte der Ausländer, die den Einheimischen die Arbeit wegnehmen“

**Übergang**: Populists are the same in essence (making a distinction between people & elite), but whether they belong to the progressive or traditionalist type depends on who they consider to be the elite/the people and what they interpret as the general will.

## 2.2. What explains populists’ populism?

### Economic deprivation 🡪 erklärt wie hoch die Wahrscheinlichkeit ist, zur Kategorie establishment oder populist zu gehören (degree of populism = quantitative dimension = sehr oder weniger populism)?

* Economic deprivation theory
  + Anti-globalisation, but different logics: Halikiopoulou, Nanou Vasilopoulou 2012: Arten von Nationalismus: Civic oder ethnic nationalism
* Variablen erklären 🡪 gleiche Hypothese für links und rechts
* Gleichläufige Hypothese für beide Populisten-Fraktionen:
  + H1: 🡪 The less economically fortunate, the higher the chance of being a populist, either left or right?

**Übergang**: Same conclusion, but different interpretations of who causes economic trouble (Focus on multinationals vs workers or natives vs immigrants?) 🡪 This is where the populism finds their divergence: cultural values.

Unterscheidung:

* + Cultural inclusion/exclusion bzw openness. Who belong to the people? (ie Belgian text = Manifesto how often people is used 🡪 beyond the scope of this study)
  + Interpretation of why the economy is suffering

**BUT what explains whether an individual feels closer to progressive populist or traditionalist populist parties?**

### Cultural values 🡪 erklärt wie hoch die Wahrscheinlichkeit ist, zur Kategorie prg. oder trd. Populist zu gehören (type of populism = qualitative dimension = progressive oder traditionalist populism)?

* Cultural backlash theory mainly explain who might become a right wing/ traditionalist populist. 🡪 Iglehart wieder kritisieren? But what about left-wing/ progressive populists?
* Nativismus (etc. von Inglehart/Norris die Literatur evtl übernehmen aber auf gegenläufige Tendenzen zw L/R unterstreichen)
* Verschiedene Hypothesen für links und rechts pop
* Cultural inclusiveness vs. Cultural exclusiveness (Kaltwasser 2012) definieren
  + Evtl. type of nationalism? Civic oder ethnic nationalism = “Radical right-wing and radical left-wing parties have consistently opposed the project of European integration and have succeeded not only in distinguishing themselves from mainstream parties on this dimension, but have also managed to mobilise voters in European Parliament (EP) elections and win considerable support.” (Halikiopoulou, Nanou, Vasilopoulou 2012: 1)
* Variablen erklären & gegenläufige Hypothesen aufstellen:
  + H2: 🡪 The more culturally inclusive, the higher the chance of being a progressive populist?
  + H3: 🡪 The more culturally exclusive, the higher the chance of being a traditionalist populist?
  + H4: 🡪 Interaction effects when economic & cultural factors are combined?
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