

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	x
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xi
1 Introduction: The Sceptre and the Spectre <i>Daniele Albertazzi and Duncan McDonnell</i>	1
Part I	
2 Populism and Democracy <i>Gianfranco Pasquino</i>	15
3 Politics against Democracy: Party Withdrawal and Populist Breakthrough <i>Alfio Mastropaolo</i>	30
4 Populism and the Media <i>Gianpietro Mazzoleni</i>	49
Part II	
5 Austria: The Structure and Agency of Austrian Populism <i>Reinhard Heinisch</i>	67
6 Italy: A Country of Many Populisms <i>Marco Tarchi</i>	84
7 Switzerland: Yet Another Populist Paradise <i>Daniele Albertazzi</i>	100
8 Germany: Right-wing Populist Failures and Left-wing Successes <i>Frank Decker</i>	119
9 Sweden: The Scandinavian Exception <i>Jens Rydgren</i>	135
10 The Netherlands: Populism versus Pillarization <i>Paul Lucardie</i>	151
11 France: The <i>Front National</i> , Ethnonationalism and Populism <i>Jens Rydgren</i>	166

12	Britain: Imperial Legacies, Institutional Constraints and New Political Opportunities <i>Stefano Fella</i>	181
13	The Republic of Ireland: The Dog That Hasn't Barked in the Night? <i>Duncan McDonnell</i>	198
14	Conclusion: Populism and Twenty-First Century Western European Democracy <i>Daniele Albertazzi and Duncan McDonnell</i>	217
	<i>Bibliography</i>	224
	<i>Index</i>	245

1

Introduction: The Sceptre and the Spectre

Daniele Albertazzi and Duncan McDonnell

Ghița Ionescu and Ernest Gellner (1969: 1) began their classic edited collection on populism by paraphrasing Marx and Engel's famous opening line: 'A Spectre is haunting the world – populism'. However, it was not quite the entire world that was being haunted in the late 1960s. Looking through the case studies in Ionescu and Gellner's book, we find chapters on North America, Latin America, Russia, Eastern Europe and Africa, but nothing on that part of the world in which most of the contributors lived and worked: Western Europe. By contrast, the present volume focuses exclusively on that area. This reflects the fact that while the likes of Ross Perot in the United States, Preston Manning in Canada and Pauline Hanson in Australia have all attracted sporadic attention as new populist leaders, the main area of sustained populist growth and success over the last fifteen years in established democracies has been Western Europe.

The rise of populism in Western Europe is, in large part, a reaction to the failure of traditional parties to respond adequately in the eyes of the electorate to a series of phenomena such as economic and cultural globalization, the speed and direction of European integration, immigration, the decline of ideologies and class politics, exposure of elite corruption, etc. It is also the product of a much-cited, but rarely defined, 'political malaise', manifested in steadily falling turnouts across Western Europe, declining party memberships, and ever-greater numbers of citizens in surveys citing a lack of interest and distrust in politics and politicians. Fostered by the media, an antipolitical climate is said to have grown throughout Western European societies in which people perceive politics to be more convoluted, distant and irrelevant to people's lives and politicians to be more incapable, impotent, self-serving and similar to one another than in the past. This perception has in turn affected electoral behaviour as increasing numbers of de-aligned and disillusioned voters either simply do not bother participating or become available and open to new, more radical, alternatives (Mastropaolo, 2005). In particular, these alternatives have emerged in the shape of populists who offer straightforward, 'common sense' solutions to society's complex

problems and adopt forceful ‘man in the street’ communication styles which are able to galvanize at least some of those who have lost faith in traditional politics and its representatives. They offer a ‘politics of redemption’ in contrast to the Establishment’s ‘politics of pragmatism’ (Canovan, 1999). They claim that radical changes for the better are possible and that they can make them happen. In short, they promise to make democracy work. Indeed, while people may have less regard for politics and professional politicians, they continue to believe that democracy is the best form of government (Stoker, 2006) and populists vowing to reclaim the sceptre for its rightful owner – the sovereign ‘people’ – have been able to present themselves not as threats to Western European democracy, but as its saviours.

As a consequence of a combination of more favourable opportunity structures and astute agency, since the early 1990s in Western Europe, populist movements have achieved their best ever results in countries like France, Switzerland and Denmark and have entered national government for the first time in states such as Italy, Austria and the Netherlands. Moreover, as traditional parties increasingly seek out and promote telegenic figures who can communicate simple, all-embracing, crowd-pleasing messages directly to the public through the media rather than through Parliament, we can see evidence of a broad populist *Zeitgeist* in Western Europe in which not only have dyed-in-the-wool populists been successful, but where many other mainstream political leaders, such as Tony Blair and William Hague in Britain, for example, have regularly dipped into populism’s box of tricks (Mudde, 2004). Nonetheless, despite the existence of broadly similar political and socio-economic landscapes and conditions across Western Europe, populism has clearly been far more successful in some countries than it has in others. The aim of this book is to provide explanations for this by showing how, why and in what forms contemporary populism has flourished (or failed) in Western European democracies. Before we go any further, however, we should make it clear what we understand by the term ‘populism’.

Populism

Much like Dylan Thomas’s definition of an alcoholic as ‘someone you don’t like who drinks as much as you’, the epithet ‘populist’ is often used in public debate to denigrate statements and measures by parties and politicians which commentators or other politicians oppose. When an adversary promises to crack down on crime or lower taxes and yet increase spending on public services, it is ‘populist’. When one’s own side does so, it is dealing with the country’s problems. ‘To each his own definition of populism, according to the academic axe he grinds’ wrote Peter Wiles (1969: 166) in Ionescu and Gellner’s volume and among scholars the term is often employed in loose, inconsistent and undefined ways to denote appeals to ‘the people’, ‘demagogy’ and ‘catch-all’ politics or as a receptacle for new

types of parties whose classification we are unsure of. Due to these inflationary, vague and partisan uses of 'populism', there are scholars who have discarded the term altogether in favour of other labels (for example, Collovald, 2004). Another factor held to diminish the value of 'populism' is that, as Margaret Canovan (1981: 5) notes, unlike labels such as 'socialist' or 'conservative', the meanings of which have been 'chiefly dictated by their adherents', contemporary populists rarely call themselves 'populists' and usually reject the term when it is applied to them by others. However, if this were a good enough reason to stop researchers from using a category they found useful, then the same treatment should be extended to 'far', 'radical' and 'extreme' – all labels that are rarely, if ever, willingly embraced by parties of the Right or Left. We believe, therefore, that if carefully defined, the term 'populism' can be used profitably to help us understand and explain a wide array of political actors.

We define populism as:

an ideology which pits a virtuous and homogeneous people against a set of elites and dangerous 'others' who are together depicted as depriving (or attempting to deprive) the sovereign people of their rights, values, prosperity, identity and voice.¹

Like those of Ernesto Laclau (2005) and Pierre-André Taguieff (2002), this view deliberately avoids conceiving of populism in terms of specific social bases, economic programmes, issues and electorates. Put simply, we believe that populism should not just be seen *against* such backgrounds, but *beyond* them. Consequently, our aim in this volume is to look at populism *per se* in contemporary Western European democracies, rather than exclusively as an appendage of other ideologies to which it may attach itself, for to do so is, as Yves Mény and Yves Surel (2002: 17) rightly argue, to miss out on populism's 'crucial specificity'.

In recent years, the dominant tendency in scholarly literature has been to identify and analyse the rise of populism in Western Europe as a phenomenon exclusively of the Right (for example, Betz, 1994). While this reflects the kind of issues, such as immigration and taxation, which populists have sought to capitalize on, we believe that the equivalence of populism with the Right can be misleading. In fact, the claim that the people (however defined) are the only legitimate sovereign and have been deprived of power can sit quite easily with leftist ideologies. Moreover, unlike Fascism, for example, populist propaganda insists on the values of equality (among the people) rather than hierarchy and it is the community rather than the state which is said to be paramount.

If they are not necessarily of the Right, then populists obviously cannot always be classified as 'extreme' or 'radical' Right either. According to Piero Ignazi (1994), in order for a party to be catalogued among the 'extreme

right', its electorate must position itself at the extreme Right of the political spectrum (relative to other parties) and this must be combined with an ideology based or reliant on fascist values and ideas and/or one which positions itself as alternative and in opposition to the democratic system. Following this logic, labelling parties such as the Lega Nord as 'extreme right' is, at best, highly problematic, as Ignazi himself acknowledges (Ignazi, 2003). Moreover, in general terms, we find that:

- (a) voters who support populist parties do not always position themselves on the extreme Right (quite the opposite in fact);
- (b) a discernable link between certain parties and Fascism, while sometimes present – as in the cases of the *Front National* in France and the Freedom Party in Austria – is by no means the rule (Biorcio, 2003a: 7);
- (c) in some instances, populists fight not for the demise of an existing liberal-democratic system, but for its preservation (see the example of the *Schweizerische Volkspartei/Union Démocratique du Centre* in Switzerland).

We believe, therefore, that this insistence on making 'populist' and 'extreme right' synonymous or lumping all populists under the 'radical Right populist' banner for ease of comparison (for example, Norris, 2005) is detrimental to our understanding both of specific mislabelled parties (the *Lega Nord* and the *Lega dei Ticinesi* to name but two) and populism itself. Like Taguieff (2002: 84), we also view populism as being highly compatible 'not only with any political ideology (Left or Right, reactionary or progressive, reformist or revolutionary) and any economic programme (from state-planned to neo-liberal), but also with diverse social bases and diverse types of regime'.

That said, as the reader will see, the populists discussed in this book do not generally seek legitimacy through the adoption of internationally recognized 'sacred texts'. Rather, while they merge their populism with more 'established' ideologies, notably liberalism, nationalism, conservatism, federalism and socialism, this occurs as part of a broader mission to restore democracy and government to the people. Ultimately, 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.

Like all ideologies, populism proposes an analysis designed to respond to a number of essential questions: 'what went wrong; who is to blame; and what is to be done to reverse the situation?' (Betz and Johnson, 2004: 323). Put simply, the answers are:

- (a) the government and democracy, which should reflect the will of the people, have been occupied, distorted and exploited by corrupt elites;

- (b) the elites and 'others' (i.e. not of 'the people') are to blame for the current undesirable situation in which the people find themselves;
- (c) 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.

The people constitute a community, a place where, as Zygmunt Bauman (2001) says, we feel 'warm' and 'safe' and where there is mutual trust. Moreover, the community is a place where 'it is crystal-clear who is "one of us" and who is not, there is no muddle and no cause for confusion' (Bauman, 2001: 12). By contrast, the enemies of the people – the elites and 'others' – are neither homogeneous nor virtuous. Rather, they are accused of conspiring together against the people, who are depicted as being under siege from above by the elites and from below by a range of dangerous others. The strength of the people, and the reason that they will triumph over their enemies – if they make their voice count through the populist leader/party – is precisely their homogeneity and virtue. This view of the people as an exclusive community is linked to what Paul Taggart (2000: 95) refers to as the populist 'heartland' in which 'a virtuous and unified population resides'. This is not a Utopia, but a prosperous and harmonious place which is held to have actually existed in the past, but has been lost in the present era due to the enemies of the people. By vowing to return sovereignty to the people, the populist leader/party also commits to restoring this heartland and, with it, the 'natural order'. In this way, populists play on the idea of communities which have lost what they once had and will lose everything if they do not find their voice now and make it heard – rather than remaining as the silent, oppressed majority.

Populists therefore invoke a sense of crisis and the idea that 'soon it will be too late'. However, while they preach impending doom, they also offer salvation. Populism and its leaders offer the people, as Francisco Panizza (2005: 23) says, the 'promise of emancipation after a journey of sacrifice'. This journey is usually led by a charismatic leader who is portrayed as knowing instinctively what the people want. As Canovan says, 'populist politics is not ordinary, routine politics. It has the revivalist flavour of a movement' and 'associated with this mood is the tendency for heightened emotions to be framed on a charismatic leader' (Canovan, 1999: 6). The cornerstone of the relationship between charismatic populist leaders and the people is that while they remain one of the people (whether in terms of their vocabulary, attire, declared pastimes etc.), their unique qualities and vision mean that only they can be the saviour of the people.

Of course, the greatest sacrifice is made by the populist leaders themselves who are forced to put to one side their normal (and preferred) profession and instead enter the dirty arcane world of politics in order to save democracy. Seeing the normal procedures of parliamentary politics as frustrating the popular will (Crick, 2005), the populist advocates a direct relationship

between ‘the people’ and their government. This can be reflected in calls for more ways for the people to express their opinions and for directly-elected leaders and reductions in the powers of parliament and other bodies. Most of all, however, as Cas Mudde says, populist voters want leaders they can trust and who give them hope: ‘they want politicians who know (rather than “listen to” the people), and who make their wishes come true’ (Mudde, 2004: 558).

On the basis of the definition of populism provided above, we see four intertwined principles at the core of this ideology:

(1) *The people are one and are inherently ‘good’.*

They are a homogeneous and virtuous community. Divisions within them are false, created and nurtured by the intellectual and political elites, and can be overcome as they are of less consequence than the people’s common ‘nature’ and identity. Who constitutes the people (and, by extension, ‘the others’) can be decided on the basis of race, class, local/national identities etc. or a mixture of various categories; however, what is common to all populist discourses is this juxtaposition of the ‘good’, besieged people with the ‘bad’ elites and dangerous ‘others’. While the latter category may include groups sharing regional/national identity with the people, the main ‘others’ in contemporary Western Europe tend to be immigrants, due to the threat they are said to pose to native cultures and the social and economic problems they allegedly cause.

(2) *The people are sovereign.*

Those who govern are morally obliged to do so in the interests of the people who must once more become ‘masters in their own homes’, in the widest sense of the term. If the people unite and make their voice heard through the populist leader and party, then they can make democracy work as it should: as a pure reflection of the will of the people. As Gerry Stoker puts it, populism ‘posits that the people are one, and their voice, if properly understood, has a unified and unifying message’ (Stoker, 2006: 139).

(3) *The people’s culture and way of life are of paramount value.*

This is (alleged to be) rooted in history and tradition and is thus solid, ‘right’ and conducive to the public good – hence the need to ‘love’, ‘save’, ‘protect’, ‘treasure’ and ‘rediscover’ *our* culture. Populism’s ideological flexibility also originates from this principle. When populism meets exclusionary forms of nationalism and regionalism, loving one’s culture translates into rejecting ‘others’ – those who are not of the community.

(4) *The leader and party/movement are one with the people.*

Populism celebrates ‘the ordinariness of its constituents and the extraordinariness of their leaders’ (Taggart, 2000: 102). As Max Weber says, whether or not charismatic leaders really possess the qualities claimed is not so relevant, the important point is that their followers are convinced that they are

their man (or, occasionally, woman) 'of destiny' (Weber, 1978). They 'incarnate' the people's culture, articulate the will of the people, 'say what people are thinking', can see through the machinations of the elites and have the vision to provide simple, understandable solutions to the problems portrayed by the elites as complex and intractable. However, while blessed with qualities which are far beyond the norm, these leaders have remained in all other ways 'one of the people' and, hence, one 'with the people'. Two consequences of this principle are that the charismatic bond between leader and follower is absolutely central to populist parties and that populist leaders, since they need to be seen to be still ordinary men and women untainted by their association with the murky world of politics, tend to break the conventional linguistic registers and codes employed by the political class, adopting instead a 'direct' and at times even offensive language and style of communication. Finally, loyalty to the leader equals loyalty to the people. As a result, those within the party who disagree with the leader tend to be swiftly branded as traitors and added to the list of the 'enemies of the people'.

The book

As mentioned earlier, while almost all Western European democracies have seen populist actors emerge, not all of these have enjoyed the same levels of success or have been able to insert themselves as fixed points in the political lives of their countries. This is despite the fact that many of the same economic and social conditions apply across Western European states, most of which are members of the European Union. One of the reasons we embarked on this project therefore was to explore the question of why populism is not present in every Western European country in the same way and with the same degree of success and/or durability. Hence, unlike the overwhelming majority of work on contemporary populism, this study focuses firmly on countries, rather than parties. We are not concerned with providing descriptions of specific parties *per se* so much as understanding what kind of populism (if any) is present in a country and investigate why that is, or is not, the case. In particular, we are interested in the structural conditions which facilitate, or hinder, the rise of populism and the successful (or flawed) agency of those populists who try to exploit these conditions.

Studies of populism have tended, understandably, to focus on those cases where populist movements have been significant political forces, rather than question those in which they have not. Given the logic of this book, however, alongside countries in which populists have enjoyed unprecedented levels of success and even participated in government such as Italy, Holland and Switzerland, we felt it necessary also to consider those like Britain, Sweden and Germany where the new wave of populist parties has apparently affected politics to a far lesser degree. After all, fears about the effects of globalization and feelings of disenchantment towards political institutions can

be found in both Britain and Sweden and yet no populist party has managed to establish a significant and lasting parliamentary presence in these countries. To what extent is this due to an electoral system that heavily penalizes new political formations (structure) rather than simply the lack of a charismatic and capable populist leader (agency)? Or is it the case that populist key words and strategies have permeated the political discourse of the main parties to such an extent in Britain that the space for a more obviously populist challenger has been greatly reduced? Or is it that the political culture of the country makes it more impregnable to populism, as Gianfranco Pasquino argues in this volume? As for Sweden, the first question that springs to mind is: why has no populist party akin to those which have been so successful in Norway and Denmark taken root? Is this because the major Swedish parties have managed to isolate populist challengers with a *cordon sanitaire* to such a extent that anyone attempting to go down the populist route can instantly be successfully branded and dismissed as 'extremist'? Finally, and moving on to another country apparently immune from populism, can strong populist leaders emerge at all when the political environment is so 'historically encumbered', as Frank Decker notes in his chapter on Germany?

As these brief examples show, more work is needed on the structural conditions which provide fertile ground for populism, how they interact with or even negate each other in different national contexts and how they have (or have not) been exploited by political entrepreneurs. It is only by studying how political actors, armed with specific and varied resources, are at the same time both constrained and enabled by a variety of structural factors, in ways peculiar to specific national contexts, that we can explain why populism has spread swiftly and relatively easily in some places, while making apparently few inroads in others.

The aims of this book therefore are:

- (1) To assess the degree of 'openness' of Western European democracies to the new populist *Zeitgeist*;
- (2) To examine the general Western European and country-specific structural factors which have created increasingly favourable conditions for the growth of populism or which, by contrast, have impeded its emergence and success;
- (3) To identify the role of agency in the fortunes of populist movements. How have they exploited favourable structural conditions? How have they turned unfavourable conditions to their advantage?
- (4) To discuss the degree to which populist themes and methods have been adopted by mainstream political actors, whether as a reaction to populist challengers or not.

With these aims in mind, contributors in part I were invited to set the stage for the country case studies of part II, by dealing with a number of key

general topics that we have already touched on here: the relationship between populism and democracy (Chapter 2); the extent to which the rise of populism has been facilitated by the metamorphosis of traditional parties (Chapter 3); and, finally, the role of increasingly tabloidized media in facilitating the emergence of populism (Chapter 4).

Contributors to part II were asked to look at the interplay between structure and agency in promoting (or hindering) the appearance and growth of populist movements in specific countries. Among the structural factors to be considered (where relevant) were political culture; issues of religion and identity; immigration; the economy; the electoral system; disenchantment with politics and institutions; the party system; the role of the media; European integration; corruption. To be clear, we have followed Herbert Kitschelt's definition of opportunity structures as 'specific configurations of resources, institutional arrangements and historical precedents for social mobilization, which facilitate the development of protest movements in some instances and constrain them in others' (Kitschelt, 1986: 58). While structures constrain however, they also make possible and enable by defining 'the potential range of options and strategies' (Hay, 1995: 200). 'As their name implies', adds Sidney Tarrow, they 'emphasize the exogenous conditions for party success and, in so doing, contrast to actor-centred theories of success' (1998: 18). However, as Giovanni Sartori (2005) has famously argued in relation to parties, we believe that actors both influence and are influenced by structures so it is therefore important to understand the relationship and interaction between structure and agency rather than arbitrarily favouring the explanatory value of one over the other.

The usefulness of this approach can be tested by considering two of the countries discussed in this volume where populists have performed particularly well over the last decade: Switzerland and Austria. In Switzerland, the 'agent' Christoph Blocher, a prominent leader of the SVP/UDC who has led the radicalization of the party, successfully reorganized its Zurich branch, arguing that more professionalism was needed (also, importantly, in communicating with prospective voters). A consequence of the electoral success of the SVP/UDC in Zurich was that the example soon spread to other cantonal branches of the party, which also set out to reorganize themselves along the same lines. Blocher's work, therefore, has now left a lasting legacy that goes beyond his electoral success at the local and national levels. In a political environment that is still characterized by some degree of voluntarism, the SVP/UDC is now a much more professional election-fighting machine at the national (and not only cantonal) level. This is an excellent example of how agency, in its turn, affects structure. The Freedom Party (FPÖ) in Austria provides us with an example of the opposite development, i.e. how structural developments may be essential in order to trigger changes at the level of agency. As Reinhard Heinisch notes in this volume, it was in fact the structural reforms of the FPÖ which, by exacerbating the party

orientation towards its leader, effectively enabled Jörg Haider's leadership to 'flourish'. Once free to take control of the party and unencumbered by internal opposition, Haider led the FPÖ to considerable electoral success.

Discussion of structural factors in the country case studies has therefore served as a platform for the analysis of populist agency in this book, by which we mean how populists have taken advantage of the opportunity structures present along with factors such as leadership, party cohesion, use of media, relations with other parties, etc. Furthermore, we asked authors to reflect on, where relevant, the degree to which populism has influenced and permeated mainstream politics in specific countries and, in particular, the question: 'who borrows from populism and how?' Where applicable, contributors were also encouraged to examine what happens to more moderate and traditional forces when they participate in government with populists for, as Meny and Surel (2002: 19) note, populist parties 'can also contaminate the other parties by influencing the style of leadership, the type of political discourse and the relationship between leader and followers' and this remains, in our view, an under-explored area of study.

The Spectre of Western European Democracy?

While Canovan (1999: 3) argues that 'populism is a shadow cast by democracy itself', Benjamn Arditi objects that 'we might want to refer to populism as a spectre rather than a shadow of democracy' as the reference to a spectre 'addresses the undecidability that is inbuilt into populism, for it can be something that both accompanies democracy and haunts it' (Arditi, 2004: 141). Using the same metaphor, Sir Bernard Crick recently wrote that 'populism is indeed a spectre haunting democracy from which it is hard, perhaps impossible, to escape entirely in modern conditions of a consumption-driven society and a populist free press' (Crick, 2005: 631). Irrespective of their different interpretations, what is clear from the above is that populism and democracy are inextricably linked. Moreover, like Crick, we too believe that Western European democracy's spectre will be around for some time. Indeed, the evidence so far in the twenty-first century is that, while Taggart's (2004: 270) observation that 'populist politicians, movements or parties emerge and grow quickly and gain attention but find it difficult to sustain that momentum and therefore will usually fade fast' may apply to cases such as that of the *Lijst Pim Fortuyn* in Holland, it is also true that populists like the *Lega Nord* in Italy, the Freedom Party in Austria and the Front National in France have all been significant members of their national party systems for decades now.

Moreover, not only have populists in Western Europe been more successful in the twenty-first century than ever before, but they have also entered government. Yves Mény and Yves Surel asserted in their 2002 volume that

'populist parties are by nature neither durable nor sustainable parties of government. Their fate is to be integrated into the mainstream, to disappear, or to remain permanently in opposition' (Mény and Surel, 2002: 18). Yet, events in recent years suggest that this may no longer be the case. Against all expectations, in 2005 Silvio Berlusconi became the longest continuous serving Prime Minister in the history of the Italian Republic, supported by a centre-right coalition which also included the Lega Nord. Moreover, neither Berlusconi nor Umberto Bossi (leader of the Lega Nord) did anything to shed their populist identities and become more like mainstream, traditional politicians. Furthermore, although it has long been believed that charismatic leaders are almost impossible to replace (Weber, 2005), the 2006 general election result of the post-Haider Freedom Party in Austria suggests that, while charismatic populist leadership is difficult to pass on, in the right circumstances, it can be seized and the party can go on to further successes (see Reinhard Heinisch in this volume). Populism has thus proved far more dynamic, resilient, flexible and successful than many commentators imagined. As we will see in this volume, in twenty-first century Europe, in the name of the people, the spectre continues to pursue the sceptre.

Note

1. To be clear, we understand ideology as a system of beliefs, values and ideas characteristic of a particular group (adapted from Williams, 1977: 55). Used in this way, the term refers to belief systems whose function is to explain why things are as they are by providing an interpretative framework through which individuals and/or organizations make sense of their own experiences, relate to the external world and plan the future.

Index

- Aarts, Kees 161
abortion 146, 148, 201
accountability 18, 45
Action for an Independent and Neutral
Switzerland (AUNS / ASIN) 104–6,
109–12
Adams, Gerry 212
ageing population 114
agency and structure 9, 100, 116,
120–1
Ahern, Bertie 208–11
Åkesson, Jimmie 149
Akkerman, Tjitske 159
alienation, sense of 174, 204, 222–3
Alleanza Nazionale (AN) 30, 90, 98,
146, 212
anti-globalization 97
anti-politics 34, 109, 215
anti-Semitism 74, 77
Arditi, Benjamin 10
Argentina 16, 25, 28
Aristotle 200
Arzheimer, Kai 36
asylum-seekers 127, 143–4, 148,
183–6, 190–5, 206, 213; *see also*
racism; immigration issues
Austria 53, 59, 62, 67–83, 109, 115–16,
125, 141, 146, 203, 213
authoritarianism 24, 78–9, 135,
148, 190

Barking 194
Barnett, Anthony 189–91
Bauman, Zygmunt 5, 112, 219, 221
Bélanger, Eric 161
Belgium 53, 56, 60, 109, 127
Berlusconi, Silvio 11, 27, 49, 53, 56, 58,
61, 84–6, 89, 92–8, 116, 212
Betz, Hans-Georg 3–4, 83, 142
Bignasca, Giuliano 110, 116
Bild (newspaper) 133
Bischof, Günter 72
Bisky, Lothar 132
Bjørklund, Tor 136

Blair, Tony 2, 47–8, 58, 183–4,
188–91, 197
Blank, David Eugene 26
Blocher, Christoph 9, 49, 52, 100,
103–6, 110, 114–17
Bluhm, William T. 72
Blumler, Jay 54
Blunkett, David 186, 190
Bodei, Remo 53
Bolivia 32
Boréus, Kristina 137–8
Bossi, Umberto 11, 55–6, 60–3, 85,
89–98, 101, 210–12
Brandenburg, Heinz 215
Brandt, Willy 217
Breen, Michael 206
Britain 22, 181–97, 200, 206, 212–13,
220–1
British National Party (BNP) 30, 181,
183, 192–4, 197, 220
Bromley, Catherine 184
Brubaker, Rogers 169
Brunner, Manfred 130
Budge, Ian 143
Bündnis Zukunft Österreich
(BZO) 81–3
Burger, Rudolf 72
Burgstaller, Gabi 75
Bush, George W. 97

Calise, Mauro 221
Canovan, Margaret 2–5, 10, 15, 32, 47,
101, 158, 189, 199, 209, 215
capital punishment 148
Carinthia 71–3, 77–82
'cartel parties' 40
Carter, Elisabeth 36
Casa delle Libertà (CDL) 85, 96
Castelli, Roberto 85, 91
charismatic leaders 5–7, 11, 21, 49–50,
61–2, 116, 121, 123, 129–34, 157–8,
179, 195–7, 203, 212, 214, 221, 223
Chávez, Hugo 26, 32
Cherribi, Oussama 53, 59–60

- Chirac, Jacques 58, 168, 178
 Church, Clive 107
 citizenship laws 169–70, 206
 civil liberties 190–1
 civil society 34, 43
Clann na Talmhan 209, 214
 class politics 200
 class voting 141–2
 Coakley, John 215
 Coddling, George A. 111
 Coleman, Marc 211
 Collier, David 17
 Collings, Daniel 192
 Collins, Stephen 204, 208
 communication strategies and
 styles 55–60
 community 3–6, 23–5, 34–5, 48, 75,
 84, 90–4, 111–12, 122
 confidence in political
 institutions 140, 155
 Conservative Party 30, 145, 181–93,
 197, 213
 consociationalism 110–11, 115,
 161–5
 constitutional reform 189–92
 consumerism 218–19
 corporatist democracy 110
 corruption 86–7, 91, 95, 98, 105, 135,
 175–6, 184–5, 199, 208, 211
 cosmopolitanism 138
 Countryside Alliance 192
 Crick, Sir Bernard 10
 Crouch, Colin 218
 Crozier, Michel 43
 Curtice, John 184
 cynicism about politics 155, 215
- Dahl, Robert 19, 218, 222–3
Daily Mail 184–5
Daily Telegraph 184–5
 Dalton, Russell 217
 d'Ancona, Matthew 192
 Danish People's Party 61, 119, 146
 de Beer, Patrice 54
 de Benoist, Alain 171
 de Valera, Eamon 210
 deference, culture of 22
 demagoguery 2
 Demker, Marie 144
- democracy
 definitions of 17–18
 liberal interpretation of 17–18, 22,
 35, 221–2
see also direct democracy; liberal
 democracy
 Den Ridder, Josje M. 161
 Denmark 61, 127, 135–6, 141, 146
descamisados 16
 Dewinter, Philip 60
 Di Pietro, Antonio 85, 98
 direct democracy 95, 97, 101, 107–11,
 115, 125, 176
 divorce 148, 201, 214
 'domestication' of politics 53
 Duncan Smith, Iain 192
- Eatwell, Roger 166, 179
 Ekman, Mikael 148
 electoral systems 88–9, 124, 151–2,
 178, 181–2, 192, 195–7
 electoral turnout 110, 202–3, 220
 elites 4–7, 32, 51, 20, 22, 184, 218–19
 Engels, Friedrich 1
 Entman, Robert M. 63
 ethnonationalism 166–72, 176, 179
 Euro currency 192
 European Convention on Human
 Rights 190
 European Economic Area (EEA) 104,
 110
 European Parliament elections 30, 76,
 119, 167, 178, 181–2, 194, 214
 European Union (EU) 73, 92, 97,
 103–5, 112, 136, 139, 164, 170, 183,
 186–7, 195–6, 198, 207–8, 212–15
 Europhobia 114
 Euroscepticism 112, 139, 164, 187, 199,
 207–8, 213
 'evaluation bias' (Entman) 63
- Farage, Nigel 196
 Farlie, Dennis 143
 Fascism 3–4, 30, 33, 38, 86, 146
 federalism 19, 124–5
 Fianna Fáil (FF) 198–9, 203–4,
 208–11
 Fine Gael (FG) 198, 202–3, 207–9, 214
 Fini, Gianfranco 97, 212

- Finland 220
 Formentini, Marco 89
 Fortuyn, Pim 49, 59–63, 151, 154–64, 212
Forza Italia (FI) 30, 53, 86, 92–8, 105–6, 116
 fox-hunting 191–2
 France 16, 40, 53–4, 58, 61, 122, 127–8, 139–49, 166–80, 203, 208, 220
 Frankfurt 119
 Freedom Party, Austrian (FPÖ) 4, 9–11, 31, 62, 67–73, 76–83, 105, 146, 213, 223
 Frey, Gerhard 119, 129
 Friedrich, Carl 17
Front National 4, 10, 33, 53, 58, 61, 119, 130, 139, 146–9, 166–80, 193, 221, 223
 fuel tax protests (2000) 192
 Fukuyama, Francis 222
 Furedi, Frank 218
- Gallagher, Michael 202, 204
 Galloway, George 182–3
Die ganze Woche 77
 Garry, John 204
 Garvin, Tom 203, 209
 Gellner, Ernest 1, 222
 Germani, Gino 25
 Germany 38, 40, 119–34
 unification of 127, 131
 Gifford, Chris 187
 Giscard d'Estaing, Valéry 171
 Gitlin, Todd 57
 globalization 37, 64, 77, 91, 97, 99, 104, 112, 115, 147, 179, 190, 212, 219, 222
 Goldsmith, James 195
 Goul Andersen, Jørgen 136
 Green Parties 75–6, 82, 117, 127, 136, 203–4, 207–8, 214
 Green-Pedersen, Christoffer 202
 Gresham's law 46
 Griffin, Nick 193
 Gysi, Gregor 132–4
- Habermas, Jürgen 222
 Hague, William 2, 191–2
- Haider, Jörg 9–10, 49, 53–63, 67–8, 71–82, 101, 212
 Hamburg 131
 Hanson, Pauline 1
 Harney, Mary 213
 Haughey, Charles 208
 Hay, Colin 9
 healthcare 142
 heartland 5, 58, 188, 201, 210, 212, 219, 222
 Heath, Edward 187
 Herben, Mat 162–3
 Hermet, Guy 84, 93
 Hipfl, Brigitte 53, 55, 59
 Hirschmann, Gerhard 76
 Hitler, Adolf 158
 Hobsbawm, Eric 218, 220
 Horsfield, Bruce 59
 House of Lords 190
 Howard, Michael 192–3
 human rights abuses 213
 Human Rights Act 190
 Hungary 120
 Huntington, Samuel 43
- 'identitarian' democracy 35
 identity, national *see* national identity
 ideology, definition of 11, 159
 Ignazi, Piero 3
 immigration issues 6, 49, 64, 74–7, 88, 97, 99, 105–6, 109–13, 117, 126–32, 135–49, 156, 159, 163–4, 170–8, 183–6, 190–6, 198–201, 206–7, 211–15; *see also* racism; asylum-seekers
 individualization 152–3
 inequality 205–6
initiatives 108–9
 Ionescu, Ghița 1, 222
 Iraq war 48, 58, 183
 Ireland 198–215, 220
 Irwin, Galen 161
 Islamic fundamentalism 97
 Islamic religion and culture *see* Muslim communities
 Italy 11, 18, 30, 38, 53, 56, 58, 61, 63, 84–99, 108, 115–16, 125, 149, 198–9, 205, 208, 220

- Jagers, Jan 58
 Jansson, Mikael 146, 148
 Johnson, Carol 4
 Johnson, Mark 186
 Jospin, Lionel 168
- Karapin, Roger 125
 Karlsson, Bert 136–7
 Kastell, Torbjörn 147
 Katz, Richard 40
 Kavanagh, Dennis 54
 Kellner, Douglas 53
 Kelsen, Hans 38
 Kenny, Enda 214
 Kestilä, Elina 198
 Kilroy-Silk, Robert 195, 197
 Kircheimer, Otto 39
 Kitschelt, Herbert 9, 143
 Kjærsgard, Pia 61
 Klima, Viktor 76
 Kobach, Kris W. 100
 Kohl, Helmut 126–7
 Kok, Wim 153, 157
 Koopmans, Ruud 178–9
 Kornhauser, William 20, 24
 Kosovo 91
 Krainer, Josef 75
 Kreisky, Bruno 70
 Kriesi, Hanspeter 108
Kronen Zeitung 61
- Labour Party
 British 30, 181–94, 197, 218–19
 Irish 198–202, 214
 Lachat, Romain 107
 Laclau, Ernesto 3
 Ladner, Andreas 100
 Lafontaine, Oskar 132–4
 Lane, Jan E. 101
 Larsson, Stieg 148
 Latin America 1, 17, 25–8
 Lauro, Achille 86
 Laver, Michael 204, 209
- leaders
 charismatic *see* charismatic leaders
 cult of personality 75
 of parties *see* party leaders
 trust in *see* trust in politicians and
 political institutions
- Left Party of Germany 121, 133
- Lega Nord* 4, 10–11, 30, 55–6, 61,
 84–98, 110–16, 119, 205, 221, 223
Lega dei Ticinesi 4, 103–4, 110, 112, 116
 Lehbruch, Gehrhard 68
 Le Pen, Jean-Marie 49, 54–6, 61–2,
 167–8, 172–5, 179–80, 212
 Levitsky, Steven 17
 liberal democracy 18–20, 35
 Liberal Democratic Party 189
 life-cycles of populist
 movements 59–63
Lijst Pim Fortuyn (LPF) 10, 59, 151, 154,
 157, 160–4, 205, 221, 223
 Lincoln, Abraham 15, 19
 Linz, Juan 20
 Livingstone, Ken 182
 localism 111–12
 London
 bombings on 7 July 2005 186
 directly-elected Mayor 182
 Long, Huey 23
 Lowry, Michael 208
 Luhmann, Niklas 43
 Lukacs, John 218
 Lynch, Jack 210
- Maas, Ed 163
 McCarthy, Joseph 23
 McCreevy, Charlie 210
 McDowell, Michael 206, 213
 McLaren, Lauren 186
 McLaughlin, Mitchell 213
 Madison, James 18–19
 Maillot, Agnès 211, 213
 Mair, Peter 40, 189–90, 198, 200, 202,
 210, 220
 Major, John 185
 malaise, social and political, sense
 of 24–6, 50, 59, 215
 Malexander 148–9
 Manning, Preston 1
 Mao Zedong 154
 Marchais, George 172
 Maroni, Roberto 85, 91
 Marquand, David 188–9
 Marsh, Michael 202
 Martin, Hans-Peter 76
 Marx, Karl 1
 Mastropaolo, Alfio 109
 Mathis, Franz 72

- Mauroy, Pierre 177
 Mazzoleni, Gianpietro 50–1, 59
 Mazzoleni, Oscar 100, 102
 media influence 43, 114–15, 178–9,
 184–6, 220–1
 populist strategies for securing
 of 55–7
 and the rise of populism 50–5
 Mégret, Bruno 167
 Mény, Yves 3, 10–11, 15, 57–8, 218
 Mexico 209
 Milan 89
 Mitterrand, François 178
 Morales, Evo 32
De Morgen 60
Movimento Sociale Italiano 30
 Mudde, Cas 6, 15, 54, 85, 158,
 184, 188, 191
 Muhammad the Prophet,
 cartoons of 61
 multiculturalism 80–1, 97, 111,
 123, 127, 135, 145, 147, 177,
 185–6, 193, 196
 multinational corporations 170, 219,
 222
 Murphy, Gary 209
 Muslim communities 31, 36, 49,
 59–60, 91, 97, 113, 156–7, 165, 173,
 183, 186, 194, 221; *see also*
 immigration issues; religion

 National Front (NF), British 146, 149,
 185, 193–4
 national identity
 Austrian 72
 British 196
 French 170, 177
 Swedish 147
Nationaldemokratische Partei
 Deutschlands (NPD) 119–20
 nationalism 72–3, 77, 79, 111–12, 139,
 159–60, 182, 185, 197, 209, 213; *see*
 also ethnonationalism
 Nazism 23–4, 71, 125, 129, 132–3,
 146–9, 194–5
 neoliberalism 42, 45, 82, 137–8
 Netherlands, the 53, 59–60, 151–65,
 202, 205
Neue Kronenzeitung (*Krone*) 76–7
 Neustadt, Richard E. 19

 New Democracy 135–40, 143
 New Labour *see* Labour Party
 news media 49–64
 ‘newsroom populism’ 59
 Nice Treaty 207, 210
 Nolan, Brian 205–6
 Norris, Pippa 4
 Northern Ireland 183, 202, 208
 Norway 119, 127, 135–6, 220

 Ociepka, Beata 52, 56, 62
 O’Connell, Philip J. 205–6
 Ó Cuiv, Éamon 210
 opportunity structures 9–10, 107–11,
 115, 126–8, 138–40, 144–5, 149,
 199–201, 211
 Orlando, Leoluca 85

 Padania 90, 94
La Padania 57
 Paisley, Ian 183
 Panebianco, Angelo 179
 Panizza, Francisco 5
 Pannella, Marco 85
 Pantelic, Irena 158
 Papadopoulos, Yannis 111
 Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS),
 German 121, 131–4
 party leaders 41, 78–9, 220–1; *see also*
 charismatic leaders
 partyocracies 124–7
 Pasqua, Charles 178
 Pelinka, Anton 72
 people, the
 definition of 15–16, 67, 92, 122
 homogeneous notion of 3–6, 90,
 158, 164, 176, 200, 212, 219
 romantic notion of 122
 sovereignty of 4–5, 15, 37, 44, 47,
 93–6
 Perón, Juan 32
 Peronism 25
 Perot, Ross 1, 23, 92, 199
 Perrineau, Pascal 174
 personalization of politics and political
 leadership 53, 116
 Peter, Friedrich 77
 Pharr, Susan 217
 pillarization 152–4, 165
 Plasser, Fritz 62

- Plato 200
 Poland 62, 120
 political correctness 59, 72, 148, 184, 191, 194
 political culture 125–6
 political parties 21, 38–43, 124–5, 201–5, 219–20
 convergence of 144–5
 identification with 141, 174, 182, 199
 legitimization of 145–6, 178
 membership of 155, 220
 reasons for change in 42–6
 politicization 143–4, 219, 222
 politics and politicians
 mediatization of 52–3, 57
 rejection of 21; *see also* anti-politics
 populism
 characteristics of 84, 176
 definitions of 2–6, 16, 19, 32, 121–2, 158, 181–2, 189, 209
 ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ 58, 63
 left-wing 123, 134
 organisational and political
 failures of 128–31
 as perjorative term 2–3, 34
 political conditions for success of 26–7
 and popular culture 21
 principles of 6–7
 reasons for success of 36–8
 right-wing 121–5, 128, 133–4
 and social conditions 23–6
 ubiquity of 46–8
 Portugal 220
Poujadist movement 122, 167
 power-sharing 101, 115, 134
 privatization 73
 Prodi, Romano 98
 Pröll, Erwin 75–6
 propaganda 45
 protectionism 190–1
 protest voting 124, 127, 174
 Putnam, Robert 87, 217
- racism 212–13
 Reagan, Ronald 137
 referendums 107–10, 189, 206–7
 religion 9, 23, 39, 97, 99, 102, 152–3, 156–7, 173, 183, 222
- Republican Party, German 129–30, 146
 Riedlsperger, Max 71
 right, the
 extreme 4, 31, 36, 60, 90, 177, 181, 185, 193, 195
 radical 3–4, 31–3, 83, 135–6, 140, 143, 166, 178, 181, 183, 195–6
 Riker, William H. 18–19
 Robinson, Mary 203
 Roosevelt, Franklin 158
 Russia 24
- sans culottes* 16
 Sarkozy, Nicolas 58, 179
 Sartori, Giovanni 9, 17–18, 33, 152
 Scallon, Dana Rosemary 214
 Schain, Martin 172
 Schill, Ronald (and Schill Party) 120, 130–1
 Schlesinger, Arthur 19
 Schlierer, Rolf 139
 Schmid, Heide 79
 Schmitt, Carl 35, 38
 Schönhuber, Franz 129–30, 146
 Schumpeter, Joseph 17–18
 Schüssel, Wolfgang 81, 83
*Schweizerische Volkspartei / Union
 Democratique du Centre (SVP/
 UDC)* 4, 9, 31, 52, 100–17, 213, 222
 Scotland 182, 189, 192
 secularization 87, 152–3, 198, 201, 203, 211, 214
 Selb, Peter 107
 Seldon, Anthony 192
 September 11th 2001 attacks 91
 Sheridan, Tommy 182
 ‘silent majority’ 22, 213
 Sinn Féin (SF) 199, 204–7, 211–15
 Skenderovic, D. 108, 111
 Slovakia 120
 socialism 188
 Söderberg, Björn 148–9
 Spain 220
 Springer, Axel 130
Statt-Partei 130–1
 Steger, Norbert 77
 Stewart, Julianne 59
 Stoiber, Edmund 133

- Stoker, Gerry 6, 217
 Strache, Heinz-Christian 81–3
 Straw, Jack 190
 structure and agency 9, 100, 116, 120–1
The Sun 184, 192
 Surel, Yves 3, 10–11, 15, 57, 218
 Sweden 8, 135–50, 222
 Sweden Democrats 146–9
 Switzerland 9, 52, 100–17, 220

 tabloidization 57
 tactical voting 44–5
 Taggart, Paul 5–6, 10, 21, 176, 210, 219, 222
 Taguieff, Pierre-André 3–4, 52, 85
 Tarchi, Marco 16, 25
 Tarrow, Sidney 9
 television 24, 52–4, 59, 61, 114–15, 221
 Thatcher, Margaret (and Thatcherism) 137, 183–9, 197
 theocracy 24
 Thomas, Dylan 2
 Thomassen, Jacques 153
 Ticino 103, 110
The Times 184–5
 Tourret, Paul 52
 trade unions 206
 transitional societies 24–7
 trust in politicians and political institutions 155, 174–5, 184, 187, 204, 215
 Turkey 92, 164

 UK Independence Party (UKIP) 30, 181–3, 187, 195–6, 222
 Ulram, Peter 62
 ‘underdog’ role 55–6
 United Kingdom *see* Britain
 United Nations
 Declaration of Human Rights 149
 Human Development Reports 205
 United States 19, 22–3, 122, 199–200
 Constitution of 15–18

 van der Brug, Wouter 161
 van Holsteyn, Joop J.M. 161
 van Zoonen, Liesbet 64
 Vargas, Getúlio 32
 Venezuela 26, 32
 Veritas 195–6
 Vienna 74, 80, 82
Vlaams Blok / Vlaams Belang 33, 53, 56, 60, 119
 Voigt, Udo 129
 Vranitzky, Franz 76

 Wachtmeister, Ian 136–8
Wahlalternative für Arbeit und soziale Gerechtigkeit (WASG) 132
 Waldheim, Kurt 72
 Wales 182, 189, 192
 Walgrave, Stefaan 58
 Wallace, George 23
 Walnöfer, Eduard 75
 Watanuki, Joji 43
 Weber, Max 6–7, 38, 176, 180
 Wegner, Markus 130
 welfare state provision 126–7, 139, 142, 145, 147, 219, 222
 Whelan, Christopher T. 205–6
 Wiesli, Reto 112
 Wijnschenk, Harry 163
 Wilders, Geert 164–5
 Wiles, Peter 2
 Wilson, Woodrow 19
 Windeskog, Jimmy 148
 Winock, Michel 169
 Wischenbart, Rüdiger 71
 working class 36, 142, 154, 183, 193–6, 201, 204, 211–13
 Worsley, Peter 200

 xenophobia 60, 74, 80–3, 88, 102, 120, 128, 132, 138–9, 143–4, 147, 166, 170–5, 179, 195; *see also* asylum-seekers; immigration issues; racism

 Zilk, Helmut 75–6
 Zurich 116–17

