

DOI: 10.46340/eppd.2020.7.2.35

Andrii Zhytko

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7003-5562>

H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

«MODERN POPULISM» AS A PROBLEM FIELD OF MODERN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

This article attempts to analyze the phenomenon of «modern populism» from the position of theoretical pluralism of scientific researches of modern Western and Ukrainian political science. The author traces the evolution of populist discourse in the science community, within which an attempt is being made to approach the categorical and conceptual definiteness of the phenomenon of «modern populism». Depending on the unique combination of specific features, it can act as an ideology, a method of political struggle, social and political movement, manipulative technology, way of political behavior, etc. It also makes an attempt to determine the «unified» determinants of «modern populism» such as «accumulation of discontent», «play on emotions», «polarization of society», «democracy», «politics of simulacra», «national authenticity».

Keywords: populism, modern populism, globalization, globalization challenges, anti-globalist sentiment, socio-political crisis, liberal-democratic values, democratic risks.

Constructing of political reality in the context of the «New World Mess»¹, the main markers of which are democratic divergence and antinomies, turbulence and hyper-dynamism of political processes; populism, nationalism, and radicalism as dominant in political behavior; permanent threat of terrorism, numerous military-political conflicts, systematic financial and economic crises; unmanageable migration processes; rising unemployment and poverty; irreversibility of climate change, etc. require from a cohort of modern political scientists to update their research intentions to find the latest theoretical constructs, improve methodological tools, and develop effective counteraction strategies.

According Richard Haas' aptly comments: «The situation in many regions of the world is more like a new world mess. ... Worst of all, the general tendency indicates a further increase of disorder»² and also a separate point in the challenges of the 21st century defines the «rapid rise of populism», emphasizing at the same time that «Populism and nationalism are obviously rising today. We are witnessing and seeing with our own eyes the widespread rejection of globalization and international cooperation, which are the ground for doubts about the values of previous positions and previous politics»³.

Challenges for the modern liberal-democratic tradition of the 21st century were socio-political phenomena – Brexit (UK), D. Trump (USA), «Yellow Vest Movement» (France), «Five Star Movement» (Italy), «Podemos» (Spain), Syriza (Greece), J. Haider (Austria), G. Wilders (Netherlands), V. Orban (Hungary), P. Genson (Australia), R. Erdogan (Turkey) and many other versions of modern populism. «What used to be seen as a marginal phenomenon and is inherent in other eras or only as to some parts of the world, it has today become the basis of modern politics of the world»⁴. The 21st Century is the source of unique «research material» for contemporary political science. Political forces that have been on the backyards of political life for a long time, using populist rhetoric on globalization, the financial and economic crisis, migration and social policy, corruption and social policy, authorities, multiculturalism, etc., to become real political players, with the support of voters, to gain access to government institutions, thus, having come

¹ Бауман, З. (2008). *Глобалізація. Наслідки для людини і суспільства*. Київ: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 48.

² Хаас, Р. (2016). *Мировой беспорядок. Американская внешняя политика и кризис старого порядка*. Москва: Геополитика: АСТ, 13.

³ Хаас, Р. (2016). *Мировой беспорядок. Американская внешняя политика и кризис старого порядка*. Москва: Геополитика: АСТ, 10.

⁴ Moffitt, В. (2016). *Global Rise of Populism: Performance, Political Style, and Representation*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2.

to the front of the big politics. Thus, according to the leading Western researcher K. Mudde, «populism from the» normal pathology» of Western society (that is, a phenomenon common to this society, existing on its political backyard and characterizing the views of marginalized social groups) has been transformed into a certain «athological norm» of the pathological social normality), only by presenting in more or less radical ways ideas that are shared by the general population and are part of the political mainstream»¹.

The ideological and theoretical foundations of the study of «populism» were determined by the leading theorists of socio-political discourse of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in particular A. Valitsky, M. Weber, M. Jakes, D. Macri, J. Mancini, K. Marx, R. Michels, G. Mosca, R. Owen, W. Pareto, K. Renner, X. Segon-Watson, A. Thuren, S. Fourier, S. Hall, R. Hofstadter, L. Shapiro and others. Further theoretical and methodological constructs of Western researchers have positively influenced the irradiation of the nature and essence of the phenomenon of «populism», in particular, the work of G. Ionesco and E. Gellner «Populism: Its Meaning and National Characteristics» (1969), D. Bell «Populism and Elitism: Politics in the Era of Equality» (1992), M. Kenovan «Populism» (1981), P. Tagart «Populism» (2000), E. Laclau «The Causes of Populism» (2005), F. Panizzi «Populism and the Mirror of Democracy» (2005), I. Me and I. Sorel «Democracy under the Prism of Populism» (2007) – recognized as «strong points» In contemporary populist discourse.

However, the detailed theoretical and methodological explication of the concept of «populism» and the conceptualisation of the phenomenon of «modern populism» happened thanks to the latest research projects of outstanding theorists of Western humanities such as Z. Bauman, U. Beck, B. Becker, Art. Van Kessel, K. Weiland, F. Venturi, K. Wernicke, J. Garcia, M. Godwin, A. Griminal-Buss, K. Davyst, J. Judis, U. Eco, B. Emmott, S. Zizek, F. Zachariah, D. Ziblatt, R. Itwell, M. Casin, J. Keiteb, R. Kenneth, J. Klose, E. Kolb, E. Craig, M. Cruz, P. Kuperusa, S. Levitsky, K. Madde, S. Muff, J.-V. Muller, P. Norris, E. Paparelli, R. Polets, D. Rodrick, S. Sabal, T. Snyder, H. Torreblanca, A. Umland, N. Urbini, S. Fischer, F. Fukuyama, I. Hoffman, R. Jurado and many others.

In the Ukrainian academic communities the problematic field of the phenomenon of «modern populism» is in the focus of research attention of T. Andrushchenko, O. Babkina, V. Bebika, S. Bulbenyuk, K. Vashchenko, O. Vinnychuk, D. Vidrina, D. Havrylyuk, M. Golovaty, I. Gorbatenko, S. Datsyuk, M. Demyanenko, S. Denisyuk, I. Dzyuba, O. Dubyny, I. Kiananka, V. Kornienko, V. Krivosheina, G. Kuts, N. Latiginoy, O. Lisnichuk, L. Matlay, S. Migal, O. Novakova, M. Ostapenko, I. Pobochniya, A. Pogorelova, V. Poltorak, T. Pryadko, T. Rady, N. Rezanova, O. Stogova, M. Tomenko, Yu. Shcherbak, I. Yukhnovsky, O. Yarosh and others.

It is important to note that despite the extensive theoretical discourse and thorough research projects of Western and domestic researchers, the definition of the concept of «modern populism» remains a matter to discuss, due to the complexity and «versatility» of the object of study. «Intuitively, we know what we are talking about when we name movements or ideologies as populist, but we experience significant difficulties in trying to convert intuition into concepts»², that is why, in our opinion, contemporary humanities perspectives of a high level of categorical and conceptual clarity of the phenomenon of «modern populism» are generated and only with the involvement of a wide range of theoretical and methodologist platforms.

In alternative interpretations of modern researchers populism is understood as: «a movement that appeals to the «people», opposing itself equally to existing power structures and to the dominant ideas and values in society»³; «the incomplete, unfinished ideological current and method according to which «the people» are presented as a certain organic integrity and the bearer of a certain rightness and morality, a source of power which he must «gain back». The «people» are thus excluded from certain groups that are considered as «hostile»: elites, immigrants, intellectuals, etc.⁴; «the phenomenon is disperse, that is, it is a component of many political phenomena, embodied in various ideological forms and political strategies»⁵; «an ideology that considers society to be radically divided into two homogeneous and

¹ Mudde, C. (2010). The Populist Radical Right: A Pathological Normalcy. *West European Politics*, 33(6), 1167-1186, 1176-1181. <<https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2010>>.

² Laclau, E. (1977). *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory: Capitalism-Fascism-Populism*. London: NLB, 143.

³ Canovan, M. (1999). Trust the People! Populism and The Two Faces of Democracy. *Political Studies*, 47(1), 3. <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-9248.00184>>.

⁴ Дейвикс, К. (2012). Популизм. <<http://www.gefter.ru/archive/6800>>.

⁵ Ярош, О. (2002). Політичний популізм: теорія і практика передвиборного «флірту». *Контекст*, 2, 22.

antagonistic groups – the «common people» and the «bribeable elite» and argues that politics must express the unity of the people»¹; «defining an irrational policy of ignoring the objective tendencies of social development and speculating on the feelings of citizens in order to achieve their own goal and win over opponents»²; «manipulative technology used in the communication process to influence the minds of citizens to achieve the desired results in the struggle for power and in the process of its implementation», and specifies «the attribution of populism to faulty technologies» is explained by the fact that it manifests itself as a set of illegal or ethically questionable means, methods, techniques of organizing and conducting campaigns aimed at creating superiority over rivals»³, etc.

In the context of this problem, the considerations of a domestic political science expert T. Rad deserve a complimentary assessment. T. Rad states the following «The range of the use of the term «populism» is so wide that it is difficult to deduce a scientific definition»⁴. However, he makes a bold attempt to unite all definitions according to their specific features. The result of his research reflection is the following definition: populism is: 1) an ideological current that reflects most common feelings, people's aspirations; 2) a political movement that seeks to gain power for the benefit of the whole nation, resulting from the reaction of social elements to rapid economic, social, political, and cultural changes in order to restore (or adapt) simple traditional forms and values; 3) a certain kind of ideology that supports the idea of a strong state with the direct participation of the people in public administration, while taking into account national social traditions and their specific interests; 4) the type of behavior of the politician, the tendency to gain popularity, to define his socio-political activity, using simple, understandable to the population reasons and propositions; 5) a set of slogans and actions, as well as the forms, methods and technologies used by political figures to gain and deepen support from the country population⁵. It should be emphasized, the analysis and description of the variational-interpreting perceptions presented in contemporary political discourse, convincingly demonstrates the transcendence of the phenomenon of «modern populism», the approximation of which to the epistemological nucleus becomes possible only under the conditions of theoretical pluralism based on an interdisciplinary approach.

However, to justify the determinants that provoked the «global explosion of modern populism» in the twenty-first century, academic communities mostly express unity and consolidated position. Globalization processes and anti-globalization sentiment have become an impulse that provoked a powerful «populist wave» able to expand in the whole political world in the future. In this context, it is difficult to disagree with the competent opinion of the renowned contemporary theorist Zbigniew Brzezinski, according to whom in the modern world there is an irreversible demarcation of countries into two camps: the «political club of successful and prosperous countries» and the political club of outsiders in other words the weakest and the worst countries therefore, socio-political feelings are increasingly becoming negative and protest-colored, what is typical in both camps: «It is a protest against a future that is fearful, and against the present that arouses indignation»⁶.

Through the view of globalization processes and challenges other experts of contemporary political science discourse analyze the phenomenon of «modern populism», in particular. «Globalization, economic crisis and other structural circumstances lead to frustration in certain social groups, forcing them to join populist politics»⁷; «populism, protectionism, or «incarnation policies» can be seen as a reaction to fear and dissatisfaction with globalization,... as a sort of rebellion against economic and cultural liberalism, which is the ideology of modern professional elites»⁸; «The blind commitment of the political establishment

¹ Ганспетер, К. (2018). Випробування популізмом: у чому особливості ситуації у Східній Європі.

<<https://voxukraine.org/uk/viprobuвання-populizmom-u-chomu-osoblivist-situatsiyi-u-shidnij-yevropi/>>.

² Новакова, О.В. (2017). Тренд популізму у сучасному політичному процесі. *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету. Серія Філософія, Соціологія, Політологія : збірник наукових праць, 1(35)*, 140.

³ Дем'яненко, М. (2015). *Популізм як політичний феномен і маніпулятивна технологія*. Київ, 150.

⁴ Радь, Т. (2009). Теоретичні засади популізму. *Науковий Вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Політологія, Соціологія, Філософія, 13*, 290.

⁵ Радь, Т. (2009). Теоретичні засади популізму. *Науковий Вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Політологія, Соціологія, Філософія, 13*, 289-293.

⁶ Бжезінський, З. (2006). *Вибір: світове панування чи світове лідерство*. Київ: Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 140.

⁷ Taggart, P. (2000). *Populism*. Buckingham PA: Open University Press, 20.

⁸ Cuperus, R. (2004). The Fate of European Populism. *Dissent, 51(2)*, 17-20, 155.

to the principles of political correctness, which led to a long taboo of the problems of ethno-cultural confrontation, nullity in the non-alternative policy of multiculturalism, allowed populists to become the only spokesmen of people's concern caused by cultural antagonisms new to Western society. In the antiglobalistic feeling the whole range of social dissatisfaction (as socio-economic and socio-economic character) is reflected, which becomes a nutrient to strengthen populism in all its political nuances»¹.

In the foreground of the discussion space of contemporary Ukrainian political science, we pose scientific solidarity in the views on defining the driving forces of «modern populism», so the majority express the thesis according to which populist politicians openly speculate on «socially acute topics» of the 21st century such as poverty, migrants, the environment, etc., by shattering criticism of state institutions, questioning liberal democratic values and provoking radical feelings in the minds of modern people. The role of populism is indicative of the gradual loss of attractiveness of liberal decisions in the fields of politics, economy and culture. And if populism in the «old» countries of Europe can be considered a consequence of the disappointment of democracy, in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe it is based on the unjustified expectations related to democracy, that is, its incomplete implementation²; proves that the populist movement intensified in the period, when countries experienced critical milestones in their history. With dramatic socio-economic shifts, especially when the old foundations were broken and the new ones were not yet clearly defined, populist figures enter the political arena.

«Populism is most widespread among those with a low level of political and legal culture and in the circumstances of not yet strengthened structures of democracy. The inability of people to distinguish demagoguery from realistic proposals, the black and white vision of the world, the willingness to idolize next idol and hate its competitors are the symptoms of a low political culture quite actively used by populist leaders to mobilize public support»³. «The periods of social crises, when new focuses of tension arise due to the formation of new objective conditions (economic processes, socio-cultural, international, etc.), and which are not immediately reacted by main political forces, always actualize populism»⁴.

We emphasize, in the presented theoretical constructs of modern researchers, we notice a certain «universality» of the determinants of the phenomenon of «modern populism», so let us try to outline them from our own research position:

- «accumulation of dissatisfaction» means that a power that is unable to effectively respond to the demands and requests of society, in certain time loses its legitimacy, since ignoring public needs leads to the accumulation of negativity about existing power institutions, and as a result civil dissatisfaction becomes a source of «powerful political» populists;

- «emotion game» is when populist politicians use the «state of crisis» of the state / society, speculating on «socially acute» topics (war, terrorism, unemployment, migrants, crime, ecology, etc.), appealing to the irrational feelings of voters such as confusion, disappointment, disdain, fear, anger and more;

- «polarization of society» is when there is a clearly defined demarcation of society into two antagonistic groups: «elites» and «people», «left» and «right», «ours» and «strangers», etc.;

- «democracy» – «ordinary person», «average citizen», «people» are the main tool of populist politicians in the struggle for power. Manipulating the socio-political feelings they accuse the «old» elites of excessive elitism, corruption, involvement, inaction, ie, the restoration of «just democracy» forms the basis of the political platform of modern populists;

- «simulacra policy» we watch this when populist politicians «play» with voters by offering «simple solutions to complex problems», promising various benefits, new jobs, solutions to problems with migrants or the environment, and other demagogic slogans that do not have a «real political and economic basis» for implementation, and therefore will not be fulfilled in the future;

- «national authenticity» – populism always has a certain «national specificity», each state has its own history, socio-economic indicators, level of political culture, social groups «accumulate dissatisfaction», it can be «middle class», unemployed, migrants, eco-activists, farmers, etc., that is, a set of unique features that determines the nature and specificity of modern populism in a particular country.

¹ Вайнштейн, Г. (2017). Современный популизм как объект политологического анализа. *Полис. Политические исследования*, 4, 79.

² Кіршенблат, С. (2008). Популізм і ліберальна демократія в державах Центрально-Східної Європи. *Український науковий журнал "Освіта регіону"*, 1-2, 109. <<http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/>>.

³ Ярош, О. (2002). Політичний популізм: теорія і практика передвиборного «флірту». *Контекст*, 2, 21.

⁴ Прядко, Т. (2017). *Популізм як ризик демократичного розвитку і засіб політичної мобілізації електорату*. <https://npu.edu.ua/images/file/vidil_aspirant/dicer/D_26.053.12/dis_Priadko.pdf>.

Therefore, based on the theoretical pluralism of modern Western and Ukrainian researchers, we propose our own definition: «modern populism» is a political multivariate phenomenon, which, depending on the unique combination of specific features, can act as an ideology, a method of political struggle, a sociopolitical movement, technology, political behavior, and more. Despite the plurality of theoretical structures presented, the undeniable quality and depth of research projects of modern scientists, in our opinion, in the recent political science space there is a shortage of prognostic studies capable of simulating and calculating the consequences of the phenomenon of «modern populism» for the future, both as individual states / societies and as a whole, for the world political order; therefore, it is advisable to justify the prospect of continuing theoretical exploration and involving a broad range of contemporary humanities experts in active political science discussion.

References:

1. Bauman, Z. (2008). *Globalization. Implications for man and society* [Globalization. The Human Consequences]. Kyiv: View. House of «Kyiv-Mohyla Academy». [in Ukrainian].
2. Brzezinski, Z. (2006). *Vybor: mirovoe gosподstvo ili mirovoe liderstvo* [The Choice: The Global Domination or Global Leadership]. Kyiv: «Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House». [in Ukrainian].
3. Weinstein, G.I. (2017). *Sovremennyi populizm kak ob'ekt politologicheskogo analiza* [Modern populism as an object of political science analysis]. *Polis. Politicheskie issledovaniya* [Policy. Political studies], no. 4, 69-89. [in Russian].
4. Hanspeter, C. (2018). *Viprobuвання populizmom: u chomu osoblivist situatsii u Skhidni Yevropi* [The test of populism: what is the specificity of the situation in Eastern Europe]. <<https://voxukraine.org/uk/viprobuвання-populizmom-u-chomu-osoblivist-situatsiyi-u-shidniy-yevropi>> (2020, February, 13). [in Ukrainian].
5. Deiviks, K. (2012). *Populizm* [Populism]. <<http://gefter.ru/archive/6800>> (2020, February, 27). [in Russian].
6. Demyanenko, M. (2015). *Populizm yak politichnii fenomen i manipulyativna tekhnologiya* [Populism as a political phenomenon and manipulative technology]. Kyiv. <http://idpnan.org.ua/files/dem_yanenko-m.m.-populizm-yak-politichnii-fenomen-i-manipulyativna-tehnologiya-d_doc> (2020, February, 19). [in Ukrainian].
7. Kirshenblat, S. (2008). *Populizm i liberal'na demokratiya v derzhavakh Tsentralno-Skhidnoi Yevropy* [Populism and Liberal Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe]. *Ukrainskii naukovi zhurnal "Osvita regionu"* [Ukrainian scientific journal "Education of the region"], no. 1-2, 109-114. <<http://www.nbu.gov.ua>> (2020, February, 22). [in Ukrainian].
8. Novakova, O. (2017). *Trend populizmu u suchasnomu politichnomu protsesi* [Trend of populism in the current political process]. *Visnik Dnipropetrovs'kogo universitetu. Seriya Filosofiya, Sotsiologiya, Politologiya: zbirnik naukovikh prats* [Bulletin of Dnipropetrovsk University. Philosophy Series, Sociology, Political Science: Collection of Scientific Papers], no. 1 (35), 137-145. [in Ukrainian].
9. Pryadko, T. (2017). *Populizm yak rizik demokratichnogo rozvitku i zasib politichnoi mobilizatsii elektoratu* [Populism as a Risk of Democratic Development and a Means of Political Mobilization of the Electorate]. <https://npu.edu.ua/images/file/vidil_aspirant/dicer/D_26.053.12/dis> (2020, February, 22). [in Ukrainian].
10. Rad, T. (2009). *Teoretichni zasadi populizmu* [The theoretical foundations of populism]. *Naukovi Visnik Uzhgorods'kogo universitetu. Seriya: Politologiya, Sotsiologiya, Filosofiya* [Scientific Bulletin of Uzhgorod University. Series: Political Science, Sociology, Philosophy], no. 13, 289-293. [in Ukrainian].
11. Khaas, R. (2016). *Mirovoi besporyadok. Amerikanskaya vneshnyaya politika i krizis starogo poryadka* [World disorder. American foreign policy and the crisis of the old order]. Moscow: Geopolitics: AST. [in Russian].
12. Yarosh, O. (2002). *Politichnii populizm: teoriya i praktika peredvibornogo «flirtu»* [Political Populism: The Theory and Practice of Election Flirting], *Kontekst* [Context], no. 2, 21-25. [in Ukrainian].
13. Canovan, M. (1999). *Trust the People! Populism and The Two Faces of Democracy*. *Political Studies*, no. 47(1), 3-12, <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-9248.00184>> (2020, February, 21). [in English].
14. Cuperus, R. (2004). *The Fate of European Populism*. *Dissent*, no. 51(2), 17-20. [in English].
15. Laclau, E. (1977). *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory: Capitalism-Fascism-Populism*. London: NLB. [in English].
16. Moffitt, B. (2016). *Global Rise of Populism: Performance, Political Style, and Representation*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press. [in English].
17. Mudde, C. (2010). *The Populist Radical Right: A Pathological Normalcy*. *West European Politics*, no. 33(6), 1167-1186. <<https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2010>> (2020, February, 13). [in English].
18. Taggart, P. (2000). *Populism*. Buckingham PA: OpenUniversityPress. [in English].