# Vorläufiger Plan: Rose of populism

## I) Intro

Hook:

Relevanz der Studie:

* Politisch: Populismus ganz schlimm, Aufstieg pop Parteien in den letzten Jahren blabla
* Theoretisch: Dismay vs Ingl & Norris → Verständnis vom Populismus-Konzept
* → hat Einfluss auf Methode: multinominal

Fragestellung

## II) Conceptualization

### 2.1. Populism as we understand it

a) Minimalist definition of populism = pure people vs corrupt elite + volonté générale

b) Spektrum = progressive vs traditionalist populism

### 2.2. Erklärungsansätze

a) Erklärungsansatz 1 = cultural values

b) Erklärungsansatz 2 = economic deprivation

## III) Methodology

### 3.1. Data & Operationalization

### 3.2. Methods/Model

## IV) Analysis

### 4.1. Results

### 4.2. Discussion

## V) Conclusion

### Implications

### Criticism

## VI) Bibliography

# Nützliche Literatur & Zitate

## Populismus allgemein

### Definitions

* 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)
* “Populism has **three core concepts: the people, the elite, and the general will**” (Mudde/Kaltwasser 2017:9)
  + 1. The people:
    - “While “the people” is a construction, which allows for much flexibility, it is most often used in a combination of the following three meanings: **the people as sovereign, as the common people, and as the nation**. In all cases the main distinction between “the people” and “the elite” is related to a secondary feature: political power, socioeconomic status, and nationality, respectively”
    - This notion is closely linked to the American and French Revolutions, which, in the famous words of U.S. president Abraham Lincoln, established “a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.” (ebd: 9)
  + 2. The elite (kb mehr zu zitieren, nachschlagen auf Seite 9)
  + 3. Volonté générale (kb mehr zu zitieren, nachschlagen auf Seite 9)
* „Hence, actors or parties that employ **only an anti-elitist rhetoric should not be categorized as populist.** At the same time, discourses that defend the principle of popular sovereignty and the will of the people are not necessarily instances of populism. In summary, the concept that we propose assumes that populism is a common set of ideas, but not that all political actors and constituencies adhere to the populist ideology“ (Mudde 2013: 151)[[3]](#footnote-3)
* „Populism is best defined as a **political strategy**. Political strategies are characterized by the power capability that types of rulers use to sustain themselves politically. Under populsim the ruler is an individual, a personalistic leader, not a group or organization“ (Weyland 2001: 18)[[4]](#footnote-4)
* „However, the crucial points of the PRRP’s *[Populist Radical Right Party]* program are their **populist rhetoric** (evoking emotions, blaming the ‚elite‘ and using aggravating wording), and their radical exclusionism based on cultural markers of distinction through democratic decision-making, as captured by the term ‚illiberal democracy‘“ (Lochocki 2018: 7)[[5]](#footnote-5)
* Is populism an Ideology? 95 ff. => Kritisiert die Definition von Mudde (populism = thin ideology), da die Kriterien einer Ideologie nicht gegeben sind und führt eine alternative „Beschreibung/Definition“ aus => populism as a discursive frame (Aslanidis 2016: 98 ff.)[[6]](#footnote-6)
* Inglehart: Stellen Populism und cosmopolitian liberty gegenüber => Populismus ist hierbei stets illiberal. Inglehart schließt folglich einen liberalen Populismus von Beginn an aus (so erklärt sich teils auch die dümmliche Operationalisierung). (p 7) => definiert Populismus prinzipiell exakt so wie man rechtspopulistische Parteien definieren würde…

### Mudde, Cas (2015)[[7]](#footnote-7): Left wing vs right wing populism

* + “Mass political movements such as Syriza in Greece and Podemos in Spain have an obvious appeal, but in **their illiberalism** there is an undeniable dark side” 🡪
  + Lack of thematization of left wing populism:
    - “Until now, **populism was almost exclusively linked to the radical right**, leading to an incorrect conflation of populism and xenophobia. In its original form, populism is an ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogenous and antagonistic groups: “the pure people” and “the corrupt elite”, and argues that politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people. Practically, populist politicians almost always combine it with other ideologies, such as **nativism on the right** and **socialism on the left**.”
  + Mouffe, Chantal & Laclau, Ernesto:
    - populism actually constitutes the essence of democratic politics
    - populism is good for democracy
  + pro/contra populism
    - ☺ populism brings to the fore issues that large parts of the population care about, but that the political elites want to avoid discussing (i.e. immigration for the populist right or austerity for the populist left)
    - ☹ “populism is a monist and moralist ideology, which denies the existence of divisions of interests and opinions within “the people” and rejects the legitimacy of political opponents.” 🡪 vox populi = voice of the people, anyone with a different view speaks for “special interests”, ie the elite. “Any compromise would lead to the corruption of the people and is therefore rejected.”
    - Summary: “populism is an illiberal democratic response to undemocratic liberalism. It criticises the exclusion of important issues from the political agenda by the elites and calls for their repoliticisation”
  + Populism = always illiberal

“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).**

### Albertazzi & McDonnell 2008[[8]](#footnote-8): Spectre of populism

* “the dominant tendency in scholarly literature has been to identify … the rise of populism … as **a phenomenon exclusively of the Right** (ie Betz, 1994) [..] we believe that the equivalence of populism with the Right can be misleading. […] (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. … “whatever their positioning on the Left/Right spectrum, the key feature of populists is their claim to be the ‘true democrats’, fighting to reclaim the people’s sovereignty from the professional political and administrative classes (be they in regional or national capitals, or at supranational level in Brussels), as well as other elite ‘enemies’ who, through the sleight of hand of representative and deliberately arcane and complex politics, have stolen and perverted democracy.” (4)
* Populism’s essential questions: “what went wrong; who is to blame; and what is to be done to reverse the situation”? (Betz and Johnson, 2004: 323). Answers (4 f.)
  + 1. the government and democracy, which should reflect the will of the people, have been occupied, distorted and exploited by corrupt elites;
  + 2. the elites and ‘others’ (i.e. not of ‘the people’) are to blame for the current undesirable situation in which the people find themselves;
  + 3. the people must be given back their voice and power through the populist leader and party. This view is based on a fundamental conception of the people as both homogeneous and virtuous.

# Fragen\_thread

#Frage: Gibt es Autoren (irgendnen berühmten klassischer Autor?) der explizit auf diese links/rechts Dimensionen, bzw liberal/illiberale Unterscheidung eingehen?

=> Bisher noch keine Autoren gefunden, die explizit mal zwischen links/rechts oder liberal/illiberal differenziert haben so wie wir es angehen, aber es gibt arbeiten, die bisschen in die Richtung gehen bzw. auf left/right populism behandeln  
z.B.: Ramiro, L., & Gomez, R. (2017). Radical-left populism during the great recession: Podemos and its competition with the established radical left. *Political Studies*, *65*(1\_suppl), 108-126.

Hier noch evtl. ‘n Paper was in die Richtung geht:  
Brett, W. (2013). What's an elite to do? The threat of populism from left, right and centre. *The Political Quarterly*, *84*(3), 410-413.
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