

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEO-POPULIST DISCOURSE

**Razvan Victor Pantelimon, Assist. Prof., PhD, "Ovidius" University of Constanța,
Assoc. Prof., PhD, Institute of History, Pontifical Catholic University of Valparaiso,
Chile**

Abstract: This article tries to analyze some of the characteristics of the populist and neo-populist discourse in actuality. In the beginning we present a very short description of the neo-populism, and some of the famous definition of this concept. The second part of our paper is dedicated to analyze the neo-populist discourse in order to clarifying his characteristics and build a possible pattern of analyze of this type of discourse. In the last part of our work we applied the theoretical model of the neo-populist discourse on the Latin American case, especially on some discourses of Hugo Chavez in order to see if we can speak, in his case, of a neo-populist discourse.

Keywords: populism, neo-populism, discourse, charismatic leader, Hugo Chavez.

Populism is one of the categories used extensively by sociologists, historians, political analysts and economists who study societies. There is no doubt about the importance of the concept for the social sciences, and especially for the political ones¹. Resurgence of populist practices (political movements, speeches, symbols and mythology) is seen by some analysts as the main feature of the politics after the Cold War².

Populism is one of those concepts (the other is for example democracy) commonly used in the study of politics and has different meanings depending on the context or the author³. All experts recognize the difficulty, if not the impossibility of finding a definition capable to cover the common characteristics of some very different events in time and space⁴.

Meanwhile, exactly this possibility to define different realities, often contradictory, made the term "*populism*" to be used intensively and to gain popularity among researchers. Only a concept as vague and indefinite as populism can give us the ability to perceive and analyze the radical political transformations that take place in a lot of places in the world. More than any other concept frequently used today, populism captures the type of trials (tests) through which is crossing democracy today⁵.

Another major difficulty in defining the term "*populist*" is that this concept ambiguous and evasive sometimes becomes an anathema, being perceived as pejorative connotations⁶.

The first systematic theoretical work dedicated to populism is edited by Ghita Ionescu and Ernest Gellner in 1969, being today also the fundamental referent study of populism. In

¹ Ghiță IONESCU, Ernest GELLNER (eds.) *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1969, p. 1

² Vladimir TISMĂNEANU, "Hypotheses on Populism: The Politics of Charismatic Protest", *East European Politics and Societies*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2000, p. 10

³ Robert H. DIX, "Populism: Authoritarian and Democratic", *Latin American Research Review*, vol. 20, no.2, 1985, p. 29.

⁴ Guy HERMET, *Les populismes dans le monde. Une histoire sociologique XIX – XX siècle*, Librairie Arthème Fayard, Paris, 2001, p.19

⁵ Ivan KRASŢEV, "Momentul populist", *CriticAtac*, 13 of January 2011, available at <http://www.criticatac.ro/3817/momentul-populist/>.

⁶ Alexandre DORNA, *Le Populisme*, PUF, Paris, 1999, p. 4

the chapter on Latin American populism is defined as “*an organizational weapon that synchronizes divergent group interests and applies to any movement that is not based on a specific social class.*”⁷

In the same work Peter Wiles believes that populism is not a doctrine but “*all faiths or movement based on the following major premise: virtue is rooted in ordinary citizens, who are the vast majority, and its collective traditions.*”⁸ As such for Wiles populism is more of a syndrome than a doctrine or concept. Populism tends to put leaders in mystical contact with the masses, while having an unorganized and undisciplined character.⁹

Recent analyzes generally use the same terms to define this concept. Thus Vladimir Tismaneanu defines populism as: “*A political strategy that generates mass mobilization and enthusiastic support for a leader and a party (or movement) among heterogeneous social groups in opposition to the existing political establishment, demanding its regeneration, often on the expense of the human rights and freedoms or a minority, of the political, social and economic life.*”¹⁰

An experienced sociologist, as André Touraine states that “*populism is the call made by a leader towards the people against politicians and intellectuals who betrays them. A call to the simple people against evil representatives; the evocation of what defines and unites against what divides and against the oblivion of what is essential.*”¹¹ We can see that this definition of Touraine emphasizes the discursive conflict component of populism. This raises the dual character of the populist phenomenon, on one hand he separates masses and “traitor” elite and on the other hand is used as a mean to identify belonging to a large community, it is about people.

For political analysts populist are those leaders who achieved political campaign built on populist premise, so this term is associated more with a style of doing politics and with a style of discourse, than the politic itself.¹² In the present it often talks about populist style of some leader or politician, even if he is not ideologically or programmatically a follower of this phenomenon.

For the purposes of this study we believe that the most relevant meaning is the one that identify populism as a heterogeneous political movement without a well-defined social base, characterized by the existence of a leader more or less charismatic, trying to make a direct contact with the masses by applying a particular style of politics that combine the call to the people as a whole with criticism and rejection of existing political establishment and with the promise of dealing with various problems, especially social ones. Otherwise

⁷ Alistair HENNESSY, “Latin America” in Ghita IONESCU, Ernest GELLNER (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 29

⁸ Peter WILES, “A Syndrome, not a Doctrine: Some Elementary Theses on Populism” in Ghita Ionescu, Ernest GELLNER (eds.), *op. cit.*, 1969, p. 162

⁹ Idem, pp. 167 – 171.

¹⁰ Vladimir TISMĂNEANU, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

¹¹ André TOURAINE, *La parole et le sang*, Jacob Odile, Paris, 1988, p. 117.

¹² Patricio NAVIA, “Partidos Políticos como Antídoto contra el Populismo en América Latina”, *Revista de Ciencia Política*, vol. XXIII, no. 1, 2003, p. 20.

expressed, in populism the leader turns to the people against the existing political system in order to achieve a utopian project¹³.

Pierre-André Taguieff believes that the main “*condition for the emergence of a populist mobilization is a crisis of political legitimacy that affects the whole representative system.*”¹⁴

Alexandré Dorna interprets psychologically the factors that led to the populist processes because, in his view, the emergence of this phenomenon is generally associated with a syndrome of disappointment. When you reach a certain cultural exhaustion, lack of confidence in the future when traditional markers are no longer functioning, and the great national institutions (government, parliament, political parties, etc.), are drained of contents, then appears the possibility of a populist current development. The same author notes that populism is associated with the failure of democratic regimes, therefore the democratic disillusion push the masses to choose other ways, one of which being populism.¹⁵

Despite all the differences and difficulties in analyzing the concept of the populism there are however a number of common elements which can be applied to all populist discourses which, by their frequency can be seen as some exclusive characteristics of a populist discourse.

A more complex “sketch” of populist discourse is conducted by Alexandre Dorna in a series of papers dedicated to this topic.¹⁶ The fact that the main feature of populism is the existence and the active presence of the charismatic leader whose personal style marks his situation and his era, him incarnating the providential man, the savior, the mythical hero, is undoubtedly. His relationship with the people is direct, warm, spontaneous, making him not only his speaker, but also its vivid symbol. His style is rhetorical, but not demagogic, because his speech links a real diagnosis with an emotional vision which offers hope. For most researchers this charismatic character is a *sine qua non* condition of the existence and definition of the concept of populism

The most important characteristics of this charismatic populist leader are the critic discourse against the *status quo* and the *establishment*. When the citizens realize the gap between reality and the speech of those who govern, when they feel that they have no effective way to be listen, when realizes that elites do nothing to alleviate their changing situations, then the number of unsatisfied people increases until reaches a critical mass capable of erupting. It is not necessary that this eruption to occur, more often populism is just a warning and not a violent explosion against authority.

¹³ Razvan Victor PANTELIMON, “Populism și Neo-populism. Concept și practici” in *Tendințe Actuale în Filozofia Politică*, Editura Institutului de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale al Academiei Române, București, 2006, p. 223.

¹⁴ Pierre-André TAGUIEFF, “Le populisme et la science politique du mirage conceptuel aux vrais problèmes”, *Vingtième Siècle*, no. 56, Oct. – Dec. 1997, p. 10.

¹⁵ Alexandre DORNA, *Le Populisme*, PUF, Paris, 1999, p. 8.

¹⁶ See Alexandre Dorna DORNA, *Le Populisme*, PUF, Paris, 1999; Alexandre DORNA, *Le Neopopulisme et le charisme*, Text colloque Université de Grenoble: La tentation populiste, September 2001; Alexandre DORNA, *La democracia: un espejismo?*, Lumen, Buenos Aires-Mexico, 2003; Alexandre Dorna, “Quand la démocratie s’assoit sur de volcans: l’émergence des populismes charismatiques”, *@mnis Revue de Civilisation Contemporaine de l’Université de Bretagne Occidentale*, no.5, Caen, 2005.

The main ideological orientation of populism can be considered the one that is his “negative” nature which must be understood as total rejection of all those who exercises a different *credo*, seeking dialog partners just inside its loyal audience. Populist discourses reject almost all principles, institutions or political and social practices existing in that society. No specific political practice is challenged or a political leader but rejects in its entirety the existing system and challenge the legitimacy of the existing political and social order.

In general, in its essence, the populist speech is one of complete renewal: political system cleaning; corrupt and mediocre politicians elimination; anti-bureaucratic revolution; the emergence of a new really popular order thanks to the efforts and merits a providential leader, selfless, heroic and patriot.¹⁷

From this absolute and utter denial results another ideological feature of populism its anti-elitist attitude, targeting bureaucrats and technocrats, held responsible for a number of problems in the functioning of that society. Appears also an anti-intellectual attitude, intellectuals being seen by populist as “servile and perfidious” propagandists who propagates an orientation in favor of the interests and desires of those which represents the rejected system.

Although enemies of the existing administration, populists are at the same time, because of their multiple class nature, supporters of a “large national union discourse” that would bring together all social classes and strata, the only ones to be really excluded being the corrupt politicians and the inefficient and incompetent bureaucrats. The populist movements are not anti-state nor in ideology nor in action, they oppose the state in its current forms, especially the type of specific parliamentary system policies.¹⁸ A feature of populism is that addressing the entire nation, by necessity has to use each nation's great founding myths, so the symbols and collective imagination itself plays a definite role in a populist speech.

Often the populist discourse is a short-term one, their programs supporting immediate objectives, tangible and rapid gains being of a greater interest than major structural changes or the proposal of a well defined project for development or modernization of the society. Besides, although often populist movements were considered as modernizing, in most cases they self-proclaim their major affinity to traditional political culture of those countries. There are also situations where populist movements attempts to outline a rational program of economic, social and political development.¹⁹

Another dimension of populist discourse is the solidarity, nationalistic and moralistic one, which has as a corollary the support of the existence of a perpetual conspiracy against the people, which implies and justifies the establishment of a state of emergency, which actually hide the authoritarian temptation of populism. The appeal to the people, as holder of sovereignty that needs to be protected, has as real aims legitimizing negative and critical messages towards the existing structures and institutions, because speaking on behalf of the people, populist deemed to have a superior authority to that of their opponents.

One last feature of populist discourse is given by its futuristic, utopian, even millenarian nature. All populist discourse is based on the promise of a bright, positive future

¹⁷ Vladimir TISMĂNEANU, *op. cit.*, p. 12

¹⁸ Angus STEWART, ‘The Social Roots’ in Ghita Ionescu, Ernest Gellner (eds.) *op. cit.*, p. 192

¹⁹ Robert H. DIX, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

in which all society's problems will be solved and all the people's hopes will be fulfilled. Populist utopia constitutes as an ideal of life, social justice, respect of the other, security and especially as a founding national unity ideal.²⁰

We've talked before about the concept of “populism” and about various aspects of the populist discourse and will continue with analyzing the concept of neo-populism. This concept should not be understood as totally different and independent from previous populisms, but as an evolution of those from which varies in some aspects. We do not talk about a complete break from previous experience and about a totally new form of politics, so our analysis will focus on those issues in which the new manifestations of populism differs from what we might call “*classic populism*”.

One of the results of the political and cultural transformation of the last decade of the XX century was the emergence of new political leaders, anti-political leaders, *outsiders*, etc. They seek to build a political space in which the fundamental separation will be the one between the political class and the people, supporting the people and presenting themselves as the incarnation of the popular will, as saviors of the nation, etc. Therefore one of the main features of these leaders is authoritarian trends, messianic and paternalistic attitudes, Manichaeism and opposition to all forms of organization with precise rules. They try to obtain the support of the masses through a speech which is messianic, protector, interpersonal, directly and without intermediaries.²¹

The neo-populism is seen as a high form of political voluntarism and decisionism, developed in the context of a weakening of institutions and decadence of politics, rooted in a deep crisis of democratic institutions (political parties, the executive and parliament etc.). This phenomenon exacerbates an authoritarian and anti - institutional style of politics, which in turn derives from a paternalistic political culture which feeds undoubtedly from the presidential regime type.²²

A synthetic definition of neo-populism “*a style of action perceptible through specific forms that assume speech and political action: a primacy of personal charisma in political representation, poor formal institutional mechanisms, the influence of cultural factors in political changes and ideological precariousness.*”²³ It can be seen that on defining the neo-populism, compared with populism, the emphasis is put on the idea that this phenomenon is a style of politics, characteristic of certain political leaders.

Other definitions of neo-populism focus on how the politics is made through the use of media and other modern techniques. Thus Guy Hermet believes that this term designates “*populist electoral techniques on the political marketing level, but liberal and fair to democratic orthodoxy in which regard the intentions of the leaders who use them. This media marketing is the common denominator of a neo-populism media-liberal which is only a*

²⁰ See Alexandre DORNA, *Le Populisme*, PUF, Paris, 1999, p. 45

²¹ Mercedes GARCÍA MONTERO, “La década de Fujimori: ascenso, mantenimiento y caída de un líder antipolítico”, *América Latina Hoy*, no. 28, Salamanca, August 2001, p. 52.

²² René MAYORGA, *Antipolitica y Neopopulismo*, Centro Boliviano de Estudios Multidisciplinarios, La Paz, 1995, pp. 17 – 20.

²³ Fernando MAYORGA, “Neopopulismo y democracia en Bolivia”, *Revista de Ciencia Política*, vol. XXIII, no. 1, 2003, p. 99.

*technical resource. This neo-populism merely cultivates a citizenship based on facile emotions using seductive proposals and particularly photogenic candidates for election.”*²⁴

Perelli believes that the emergence of the *outsiders* can be explained by the following factors: the crisis of political parties, the lack of confidence in prior political leaders, the need of a large part of the population to receive a message of hope, the existence of a person who can easily communicate with the masses, mainly by means of mass communication and proposing vague actions involving especially a symbolic activity oriented towards taking into consideration the interests of the people.²⁵

Analyzing the neo-populist phenomenon from a psychological perspective, Alexandre Dorna believes that among the causes of this phenomenon are: the absence of a joint project for the future of humanity, the failure of both liberal and communist explanatory theories, the monopolistic presence of a neo-liberalism at the governmental level, the erosion of solidarity bases, the increasing demand for security in an more dangerous world, plus the demand for providential leaders and charismatic figures able to oppose the *status quo* that oppresses the silent majority.²⁶

In neo-populism the leader stands and wins elections by the intrinsic attraction it possesses and which is reflected in a stunning over the masses. As we have seen in most studies, the populist leader is presented as a *self-made man*²⁷ who needs no outside power structure except his unshakable conviction. His attitude is that of a close older brother, who seek direct contact and dialogue with everyone. Communication is horizontal, which gives the illusion of natural and direct approach. Dialogue is always accompanied by big open gestures and charming words, spoken with vivacity and spontaneity often worthy of a renowned actor, which leaves, even in the memory of unknown interlocutors, a lasting impression of sympathy. Enthusiasm is continually revived due to the multiple forms of contact: from the blinking of an eye or friendly handshake to direct interpellation²⁸.

A very important role in this equation lies in the massive use of mass-media communication. The main vector of the new populism is the perverse use of the media and especially television, the use of new techniques and of the media is one of the defining characteristics of the new populism, constituting also an important element of differentiation from previous populist experiences.²⁹ But neo-populist strategy seeks to overcome the elective routine so that once in power the neo-populist leaders have the ambition to retain a wider audience relying on a personal style, on bringing in the public discussion of issues rejected or not addressed by the previous political parties.³⁰

²⁴ Guy HERMET, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

²⁵ Carina PERELLI, “La personalización de la política. Nuevos caudillos, <<outsiders>>, política mediática y política informal” in Carina Perelló, Sonia Picado and Daniel Zovatto, (eds.), *Partidos y clase política en América Latina en los 90*, IIDH-CAPEL, San José, 1995, p. 192

²⁶ Alexandre DORNA, “Quand la démocratie s’assoit sur de volcans: l’émergence des populismes charismatiques”, *@mnis Revue de Civilisation Contemporaine de l’Université de Bretagne Occidentale*, no.5, Caen, 2005, p. 12.

²⁷ Alexandre DORNA, *Liderul carismatic*, Ed. Corint, București, 2004, p. 58.

²⁸ Idem, pp. 58-59.

²⁹ Diana BURGOS-VIGNA, “Alberto Fujimori: le populisme de l’efficacité”, *@mnis Revue de Civilisation Contemporaine de l’Université de Bretagne Occidentale*, no.5, Caen, 2005, p. 2.

³⁰ Idem, p. 6.

Neo-populist leader now relies heavily on the use of the innovations in the field of mass communication and, in particular, that of television. But it required that the leader know how to use these tools to meet their interests, how to make them “work” for him and how to be always vigilant in order not to let the media turn into a double-edged weapon. Given this interdependence between the leader and the media, especially television, many experts have labeled as neo-populism, in fact, a *tele-populism*.³¹ We observe, therefore, that the neo-populism has made the transition from a direct address to one mediated by technical means from new technologies of mass communication. Neo-populist leader is presented generally a simple man of the people, who tries to establish feelings of camaraderie and closeness to the people, which often makes the language and speech to be of a low level, perhaps even vulgar, to establish this connection and communion with people.³²

The electoral campaign, especially how it is designed and conducted, is another expression of the neo-populist speech, because the crowd, however irrational and impulsive as it is today, is taken his few moments of reflection to discern between all the utopias and promises that are circulating. Therefore it is necessary for motivational speeches and vibrant leader of the neo-populist to be coupled with a continuous stream of information coming from the media to reiterate the words of the leader and fixed in the collective mind of this proposed new course. This idea is supported by Alexandre Dorna going up there saying that “*technological innovation and mass-media communication are so commonly used in electoral campaigns of neo-populist orientation that it have become virtually inseparable one from each other.*”³³

Ideologically the neo-populist speech reveals itself as ambiguous and eclectic. It is a mixture of elements which appeal to the masses, to the oppressed people and to the nation threatened by internal and external enemies, and which at the same time show their support for neo-liberal values and economy transformation strategies based on the market economy. Neo-populist abandon themes like anti-imperialism, economy nationalization, development based on own resources and distributive ideas, to provide a set of policies which restrict the role of the state in the economy; which militate for privatization, the export orientation of the economy and towards the opening to world trade.³⁴

Neo-populists leaders present themselves at the same time as the personification of order, of the ability to govern and to take decisions, but also as paternalistic protectors of the people, watching for those that represent and protect against the rigors of economists and technocrats (mostly brought to power by themselves), compared to a world insensitive to the suffering of people and a society where the inequalities have been deepened by the competition and free market and generalizing thus the feeling of uncertainty and personal insecurity.³⁵

³¹ Alexandre DORNA, “Faut-il avoir peur du populisme ?”, *Le Monde Diplomatique*, November 2003, available at <http://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/2003/11/DORNA/10680>

³² Sergiu MIȘCOIU, “De la populism la neopopulism? Câteva repere empirice pentru o delimitare conceptuală” in Sergiu GHERGHINA, Sergiu MIȘCOIU, Sorina SOARE (editori), *Populismul contemporan*, Ed. Institutul European, Iași, 2012, p. 35

³³ Alexandre DORNA, “Faut-il avoir peur du populisme ?”, *Le Monde Diplomatique*, November 2003, available at <http://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/2003/11/DORNA/10680>

³⁴ René MAYORGA, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 – 20.

³⁵ Marcos NOVARO, “Los populismos latinoamericanos transfigurados”, *Nueva Sociedad*, no. 144, July – Aug. 1996p. 15.

The neo-populists choose as the target of their speeches, which use considerable technological resources that are based on fears, anxieties and frustrations, of those that who now feel threatened their status and position due to globalization, the latest avatar of modernization, particularly the marginalized sectors, excluded and discriminated economic, political, racial, cultural, social, etc. This explains the importance gained in the neo-populist movements of social groups such as indigenous people, *mestizos*, immigrants, unemployed, etc.³⁶

Despite the differences between various models of neo-populism, and also between neo-populist leaders, there are some recurring linguistic, behavior and semantics markers common to all these speeches. Thus neo-populist discourse is simple, with few technical terms, easily comprehensible for all. The style is direct, with a frankness which put in inferiority traditional wooden language used by politicians, officials and technocrats. Discursive logic is one belonging to common sense, the arguments used are not in any case abstract and the gestures are large and warm. There is a strong presence of promises, constructed in the passive voice, that describe with energy and passion a positive future. Speech is the bi-polarized type: we and the others, the latter often receiving negative connotations. People praise and identification, sometimes folkloric, of its roots, is crossing permanently the speech. Criticism of the ruling elite becomes a *leitmotif* correlated with it fight against the *status quo* imposed by the *establishment*, by the political class and the illegitimate forces that have seized people power. The main terms used are: nation, people, “we”, the elite (with negative connotation), the motherland, our country, the powerful, the rich, the weak, the poor, work, family, national effort, sovereignty, traditional values, individual security and so on. Heavily use of rhetorical figures such as: repetition, metaphor, allegory, irony, antithesis, parable, permanent reference nation's history to emphasize the participation to a community, the call to national cohesion around the symbols and the keywords that refer to the old ideological cleavages, the evocation of the great founding myths and the skillful exploitation of legends and popular imagery. The vocabulary, grammar and semantics are so used to produce a musicality of speech, an exhilarating rhythm.

We will try to see how the elements of neo-populist speech, previously mentioned, may apply to Chavism. Hugo Chávez's style was from the beginning the rupture candidate, of a person who was not part of the ruling elite and which is different from it. His speech claimed, in a revolutionary logic, the destruction of a system perceived as negative, to rebuild a new and just society. To make him easier to understand he used metaphors that refer to popular or the sport culture. Chávez has adopted an anti-system rhetoric, aggressive and sometimes martial, to distinguish himself better from other politicians, whom he accused of being at the origin of all evils suffered by Venezuela.

He exploited popular resentment against the establishment, using a Manichaeic rhetoric that opposes the one on the bottom against the one on the top. As such, he will favor the development of a strong antagonism in society. In this opposition the enemies (the opposing political elites) are designated by the pronoun “them” and a series of derogatory terms; “traitors, oligarchs, counter-revolutionaries, corrupt, etc.” while friends (people and

³⁶ Michael L. CONNIF, “Neo-populismo en América Latina. La década de los 90 y después”, *Revista de Ciencia Política*, vol. XXIII, no. 1, 2003, p. 32.

supporters) are defined by the pronoun “we” and takes a number of positive features: “motherland rescuers, Bolivarian, patriot, brave people, glorious and noble people of Simon Bolivar etc”.

Referring to Bolivar and naming himself as “Bolivarian” Chávez appeals to one of the most powerful founding myth of Venezuela, as well as a golden age, the one of “great Bolivar”, “Pater Patria” to legitimize himself. For him the Bolivarian doctrine is the main source to which returns to discover remedies for current problems. Using permanent reference to Simon Bolivar and quoting from him, he stopped his opponents to criticize him, because such criticism could be seen as an interference with the figure of the one who was “El Libertador”.

At the same time, to legitimize himself and to challenge the opponents had to advertisements as an emanation of an authority that cannot be challenged or denied. For this he appealed to the people, as the main factor of his legitimacy, the people being seen as the main protagonist and transformation agent that he wants to achieve. The call to the people is best illustrated by his speech upon his investiture as president when he said: “*Today I'm converted into your instrument. I exist only to fulfill the mandate you entrusted me. Get ready to rule!*” The role that the “people” had in legitimizing Chávez's “Bolivarian revolution” that he was trying to put into practice, it is demonstrated also by the fact that in the new constitution approved by referendum in 1999, the term “people” has replaced the old concept of 'citizen'. Meanwhile his rage against political parties is reflected by the fact that in the same Constitution, the term “party” never appears.

He kept in touch with people particularly through television and other mass media. Chávez's had a weekly program on the national television called “*Alo Presidente*” where he talked for hours with the citizens, so he could be called a “TV-populist”, characterized by emotional and media mobilization of the masses.

We want to end this article with a few considerations from Ivan Krastev' analyze on European populisms. According to Krastev the “populism” is often associated in current debates with an impressive speech, simplistic and manipulative, addressing “primary emotions” of people with opportunistic policies aimed at “buying” support. But appeal to people's emotions is banned in democratic politics? Or who decides which policies are “populist” and which are “reasonable”? As Ralf Dahrendorf observed “*the populism of one's is the democracy of the others and vice versa.*” Thus, according to Ivan Krastev's view “*the core challenge is represented by the rise of populist political parties and movements that appeal to "the people" to the detriment of the alleged representatives of the people, thus threatening the political parties, the interests and values which are consolidated.*”³⁷

BIBLIOGRAFIE:

- BURGOS-VIGNA, Diana, “Alberto Fujimori: le populisme de l'efficacité”, @mnis *Revue de Civilisation Contemporaine de l'Université de Bretagne Occidentale*, no.5, Caen, 2005.

³⁷ Ivan KRASSTEV, *op. cit.*

- CONNIF, Michael L., “Neo-populismo en América Latina. La década de los 90 y después”, *Revista de Ciencia Política*, vol. XXIII, no. 1, 2003.
- DIX, Robert H., “Populism: Authoritarian and Democratic”, *Latin American Research Review*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1985.
- DORNA, Alexandre, “Faut-il avoir peur du populisme?”, *Le Monde diplomatique*, November 2003, available at <http://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/2003/11/DORNA/10680>
- DORNA, Alexandre, *La democracia: un espejismo?*, Lumen, Buenos Aires-Mexico, 2003.
- DORNA, Alexandre, “Quand la démocratie s’assoit sur de volcans: l’émergence des populismes charismatiques”, *@mnis Revue de Civilisation Contemporaine de l’Université de Bretagne Occidentale*, no.5, Caen, 2005.
- DORNA, Alexandre, *Le Neopopulisme et le charisme*, Text colloque Université de Grenoble: La tentation populiste, September 2001.
- DORNA, Alexandre, *Le Populisme*, PUF, Paris, 1999.
- DORNA, Alexandre, *Liderul carismatic*, Corint, Bucuresti, 2004.
- GARCÍA MONTERO, Mercedes “La década de Fujimori: ascenso, mantenimiento y caída de un líder antipolítico”, *América Latina Hoy*, no. 28, Salamanca, August 2001.
- GHERGHINA, Sergiu, MIȘCOIU, Sergiu, SOARE, Sorina (editori), *Populismul contemporan*, Institutul European, Iași, 2012.
- HENNESSY, Alistair, „Latin America” in IONESCU, Ghita, GELLNER, Ernest (eds.) *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1969.
- HERMET, Guy, *Les populismes dans le monde. Une histoire sociologique XIX – XX siècle*, Librairie Arthème Fayard, Paris, 2001.
- IONESCU, Ghita, GELLNER, Ernest (eds.) *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1969.
- KRASTEVEV, Ivan, “Momentul populist”, *CriticAtac*, January 13th 2011, available at <http://www.criticatac.ro/3817/momentul-populist/>
- MAYORGA, Fernando, “Neopopulismo y democracia en Bolivia”, *Revista de Ciencia Política*, vol. XXIII, no. 1, 2003.
- MAYORGA, René, *Antipolitica y Neopopulismo*, Centro Boliviano de Estudios Multidisciplinarios, La Paz, 1995.
- MIȘCOIU, Sergiu “De la populism la neopopulism? Câteva repere empirice pentru o delimitare conceptuală” in GHERGHINA, Sergiu, MIȘCOIU, Sergiu, SOARE, Sorina (editori), *Populismul contemporan*, Institutul European, Iași, 2012.
- NAVIA, Patricio, “Partidos Políticos como Antídoto contra el Populismo en América Latina”, *Revista de Ciencia Política*, vol. XXIII, no. 1, 2003.
- NOVARO, Marcos, “Los populismos latinoamericanos transfigurados”, *Nueva Sociedad*, no. 144, July – Aug. 1996.
- PANTELIMON, Răzvan Victor, “Populism și Neo-populism. Concept și practici” in *Tendințe Actuale în Filozofia Politică*, Editura Institutului de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale al Academiei Române, București, 2006.

- PERELLI, Carina, “*La personalización de la política. Nuevos caudillos, <<outsiders>>, política mediática y política informal*” in PERELLI, Carina, PICADO, Sonia and ZOVATTO, Daniel, (eds.), *Partidos y clase política en América Latina en los 90*, IIDH-CAPEL, San José, 1995.
- STEWART, Angus, “The Social Roots” in IONESCU, Ghita, GELLNER, Ernest (eds.) *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1969.
- TAGUIEFF, Pierre-André, “Le populisme et la science politique du mirage conceptuel aux vrais problèmes”, *Vingtième Siècle*, no. 56, Oct. – Dec. 1997.
- TISMĂNEANU, Vladimir, “Hypotheses on Populism: The Politics of Charismatic Protest”, *East European Politics and Societies*, vol 14, no.2, 2000.
- TOURAINE, André, *La parole et le sang*, Odile Jacob, Paris, 1988.
- WILES, Peter, “A Syndrome, not a Doctrine: Some Elementary Theses on Populism” in IONESCU, Ghita, GELLNER, Ernest (eds.) *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1969.