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**Abstract**: The purpose of the present paper is to understand what roles Populism can have, which would explain why it is currently on the rise in the world. The appearance of populism has been related to a crisis in society, based on economic, such as unemployment (Algan et al, 2017), or political reasons, e.g. distrust in the decisions made by the elites, such as those of the European Union. At the same time, researchers such as Moffitt (2017) have considered that Populism can lead to provoking various crises. Populist leaders and parties offer an alternative to mainstream politics, and this is why they can be of various orientations, such as left or right. Populist leaders and parties can be seen as an adaptation to the individualist or subculture trends in society, since they address the needs of certain communities which are against the mainstream politics, or feel excluded by them. Society has found various means of preventing violent social rebellions under the form of allowing protests where citizens express themselves, as well as populist leaders and parties, as if to ensure stability in society. Yet, does this happen in all cases? Is Populism a means of ensuring stability in society or a means of creating itself social unrest? The paper will give examples from various countries.
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*Introduction*

Nowadays, mainstream trends coexist with sub-trends or niche trends in various fields, including literature (e.g. young adult, self-published books), the medical field (alternative food pyramids, e.g. vegan, vegetarian), fashion (e.g. Rock, Goth subcultures), and even science (e.g. alternative solar and wind sources of energy). Politics is no exception: we notice that there is less reliance on mainstream ideologies, or even one single ideology. Anyone can start their own political party and, if they manage to get enough signatures, they can then be on the list of candidates for elections.

While in literature and the arts we can speak about individualism, and the right to personal expression, and while in the subculture lifestyles made possible by alternative diets, fashion styles, and energy, we can speak of the right to individual choice, in politics we can speak of a similar situation. We should consider the way in which politics and ideology have to accommodate various needs, especially during our current times when individualism is on the rise everywhere in the world (Santos et al 2017). Individual differences cannot be overlooked, since in our times individuals are no longer pressured to be like the others, but encouraged to be themselves. At least, this is part of the ideological discourses, or of the promises we have through the aims, values, principles, and policies of supranational organizations such as the European Union. Multiculturalism, respect for diversity, rights for minorities, all of these have in common the component of dealing with a world that is becoming increasingly diverse, encouraged to continue on this way, and which is acknowledged as a fact.

The consideration of individual needs has become visible in the way that political parties begin to consider each and every social group. While political leaders are expected to consider the interests of the people and to represent them, through the very definition of their profession, we can see how this aspect is further stressed when it comes to the ideology of Populism. With Populism, the political leader shares with the people the same concerns about the elites and about the mainstream society and politics. We could call Populism a means of going against mainstream political culture, against the elites, and as a means of focusing on what has been left out by the mainstream politics and by the elites. Populism can compensate for a certain lack, which can be achieved either through peaceful means, or through more rebellious, and even violent means. At its best, Populism can be understood as a means to appease conflict in society by addressing the needs of a neglected segment of citizens, while at its worst it can be a rebellious, unruly means of attacking mainstream politics.

The idea of allowing freedom of expression is achieved through Populism. Populism could be seen as a means of free expression of certain issues through a means of organization of a group that does not feel is being taken into consideration. A solution could be that of tolerating the Populists as a subculture within the mainstream culture in the world of politics, in a similar way in which various subcultures, starting from diets, fashion, professions, alternative energy usage can lead to a completely different lifestyle than the mainstream one. Once the concerned segment of population realizes that more people and even a political leader think like them, they may feel psychologically reassured and stop at their rights to self-expression. In some cases, however, the members of the minority population segment may wish to have their rights clearly established and resort to active action and even express themselves through violence.

Crises in society, be they economic (e.g. unemployment) or political (e.g. due to not trusting the elites’ choices, for instance in the case of the European Union) have been considered causes leading to the emergence of Populism (Algan et al, 2017). Other researchers (Moffitt, 2017) see Populism as a means of creating such crises, and stirring social unrest movements.

Populism already sounds controversial from what we have presented so far, to the point where we begin to wonder about its definition. We can reach easily the conclusion that it is not easily defineable as an ideology in the same way that other ideologies can be defined, such as liberalism, nationalism, democracy, individualism, and multiculturalism. Populism depends on whether it is left or right wing oriented, and even then it depends on the approach of the respective country to these orientations. Populism can be seen as providing an alternative for what is missing otherwise from the elites’, mainstream or other represented ideologies and political approaches. Populism offers a utopic, empathetic, and sympathetic approach from political leaders, who are stirred by the same political issues, yet which political approach does not emerge from similar starting points? Populist speech and ideology presents itself through the perspective of populist leaders and representatives being the saviours (Kissas 2020: 268-284; Cover et al 2022: 118-128) offering the much wanted solutions to otherwise unsolved issues by mainstream politics. They present themselves through the clear opposition of values based on good vs evil, well-intended vs corrupt. All the positive traits belong to the Populists, while all the negative ones belong to mainstream politics. Populist leaders and personalities are, thus, the heroes we want and we can rely on as citizens.

Does Populism offer stability or can it be considered as a means of threat to a society’s stability? This is the main research question, alongside which we are going to consider definitions of Populism, together with situations related to Populism in various countries.

*Materials and Methods*

Populism can be considered as adaptable to the current situation, and to the current needs of the people. Since its definition is not clear and since Populism can be so diverse all over the world, an examination of Populism from the point of view of its consequences in society can be beneficial in order to know what to expect from it. It is an ideology that is here to stay, present in the entire world (Mudde & Kaltwasser 2017), and we may need some key ideas and approaches to identify it by. Its definition can vary together with its characteristics function of country and specific context.

We could define Populism as a mixture of ideologies, as well as a compensation for various issues missing from mainstream political orientations, and also as a left or right-wing orientation which certain segments of the population believe are under-represented in the mainstream political life. While Populism can be seen as a combination of ideologies, it has as a common element the opposition between the people and the corrupted elites (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017), or simply between the people and the elites treated in opposition (Savage, 2016). Otherwise, Populism is a heterogenous, not homogenous, movement, to the point where “Individual populist actors can be left or right, conservative or progressive, religious or secular” (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). It all depends on the orientation of the establishment and on the way the populists can act anti-establishment, function of the country and its political mainstream systems. Stockemer (2019) shows how various populist leaders during various times fight against various establishment values and principles. In Argentina, populist leaders and parties fight against the establishment represented by European elites. In France, Hungary, Poland, the Phillipines, and Turkey they fight against the European elites as well, especially against the international, globalist tendencies, and against the European Union. They go against the European Union policies involving refugees and migrants, as well as against the consequences of their population being mixed with other nations. In Turkey, we find a society divided between the Westernization of Turkey and of preserving traditional Turkish culture, with its religion. In the United States, they fought, through Donald Trump’s speeches, against the politically correct values established as world-level. By fighting against external influences of globalism and of the European Union, the strong nationalist components are visible in these countries.

Some populist leaders may be considered populists by some researchers, and not by others. Vladimir Putin has been considered populist by Stockemer (2019: 5) as he fought against external influences coming from the West. While Russia has a strong nationalist component and while Putin presents himself as rebellious against the world tendencies to control their country, March (2023) has pointed out that it is debatable whether he is populist, anti-populist, or pseudo-populist. According to Lassila (2018), he is a non-populist autocrat. He does not classify as a populist (Mamonova 2018), as he works together with the state and its institutions, not against them.

The opposition between the people and the elites is just a main classification, using general terms. According to Mirza & Azhar (2021: 17), we have the oppositions “us versus them, common man versus elite, nationalist versus anti-nationalist, citizens versus outsiders, patriots versus traitors, white Christians versus coloured populations,” which have “led to the rise of populist leaders in the United States.”

Populism both emerges from distrust of mainstream political systems, leaders and institutions, and reinforces this feeling of mistrust among the citizens. The mistrust in democracy of citizens along time can be exploited by populism, while it also seems to offer an alternative and even a complete solution to this problem. De Witte (2020) writes about the dangers populism can bring to democracy, through the way it builds mistrust towards its mainstream institutions for the citizens. The basis on which populism goes against mainstream institutions and against the establishment is social justice, the latter being a feature noticed by researchers such as Anderson (2018).

The common man is defended by populism. Populism promotes leaders that are themselves part of this category. They share similar backgrounds, of being of poor origins, with not much education, or making efforts to get past their current situation and succeeding. The leaders borrow the behaviour of the common man in their attitude towards the political elites, by swearing and showing obscene gestures (e.g. Philippine president Rodrigo Duterte cursing the Pope and Barrack Obama, as well as showing his finger to the European Union (Stockemer 2019: 49)). At the same time, these leaders are raised by the common man to the status of hero to be worshipped. We notice the sense of equality being created as the social and status distances are erased in an extreme way. The basic notions and foundation of democracy are underlined to the highest point, until they seem to be a dream come true. Social and political stability are, however, threatened since, once they reach the establishment positions and institutions, populist leaders and parties can focus on the needs of a segment of the population and leave out certain groups which they consider elitist or in a negative light. Then leaders from the disfavoured groups can rise to power.

Even the common man can belong to various social classes or professions. The common man does not have to be part of the working class, doing physical work, and having had access to little education. The common man can very well be an intellectual, and then we can speak of intellectual populism (Stob, 2020).

Indeed, certain segments of society can be neglected function of those who are in power at a certain time. As an example, populism in Romania represented by Traian Băsescu’s presidency (Dragoman & Ungureanu 2017) had as consequence the times when salaries for the educational sector became lower, especially with the economic crisis that occurred at international level. His speech was “anti-communist and pro-European” (Dragoman & Ungureanu 2017).

We can compare, in Romania, where the author of the present paper lives, the AUR Party (the Alliance for the Union of Romanians) led by George Simion, and DEMOS Party (2024), led by Claudiu Crǎciun, lecturer, PhD from the National University of Political Sciences and Public Administration (Bucharest, Romania). Crǎciun is clearly an intellectual, and we could include his party into Intellectual Populism. George Simion speaks from another class’ position.

Mudde & Kaltwasser (2017) claim populism has emerged in recently developed democracies. This could be explained since democracies are expected to allow freedom of personal expression. Populism can fulfill its role by expressing common concerns with the people related to various issues.

The AUR party in Romania can be included in this category, as it has had a considerable role in voicing some citizens' concerns with the negative and long-term effects against COVID-19 vaccinations. We notice here the disagreement with the mainstream idea that vaccination is beneficial for our health. Mainstream medicine research and vaccination history is being questioned. Alternative opinions and theories are being voiced.  One role of this populist party is to show the other side of this state of affairs regarding vaccination and mainstream perspectives on it. In the meantime, it can lead to negative effects as it can stir social conflict due to creating further feelings of mistrust in the state and its institutions. Crăciun & Ţǎranu (2023) detail how circumstances have led to the rise of AUR populist party in Romania, starting from the opportunity of the COVID-19 vaccine and other movements which are struggling to become part of the mainstream, such as gender rights and same-sex marriages to which they opposed the traditional family. AUR had its appeal with the most religious communities. AUR also promoted a strong nationalist feeling, to the point where they wanted Romania to unify with the Moldavian Republic. It reached a very high position as a candidate for Parliament elections. Crăciun and Țăranu (2023) draw attention to the negative side of their discourse: AUR’s discourse is of a scandalous type, which can be seen as an aggressive type of discourse. AUR, thus, treats in an aggressive manner the mainstream politics of which Romania is part as a member of the European Union.

In the meantime, the DEMOS party is concerned with the democratic left, as opposed to the PSD Party (the Social Democratic Party). DEMOS (2024) sustains equality and freedom, through both rights and access to health services and economic equality, as well as to cultural activities. DEMOS (2024) defines itself as a party in opposition to the elites, and promotes the interests of social and professional categories left aside by the mainstream politics, such as the teachers, who have drawn attention to their situation and salary issues recently. The party is based on a common sense action taking, considering the well-being of society by reducing economic inequality.

https://ssl.gstatic.com/ui/v1/icons/mail/images/cleardot.gifWe could argue that the state and its institutions need to be trusted by the citizens to cooperate and ensure stability in society. Populist parties can stir conflicts which can lead to social unrest and instability. While expressing opinions and having alternative perspectives taken into account and represented, as well as being open to debate political situations and decisions can be considered a rightful part of liberal democracies, this can lead to unstable political situations. Society can avoid conflict by allowing different opinions to be taken into account. Scapegoating can work to prevent violent social outbreaks. Allowing freedom of expression through protests and negotiating with the political leaders and state for higher salaries for certain professional groups can be one thing, but eroding trust in and sabotaging state institutions can be another.

Populism can allow for a sense of community for those nostalgic about certain aspects in society which had existed in the past, e.g. patriotic feelings. This can be achieved through populism promoting nationalism.

Populism has the advantage of combining several other ideologies and, in this way, it ensures resonating with at least one group that is against what is being promoted in mainstream politics. Mainstream society and with it mainstream politics can feel restrictive for the individual, not allowing the individual enough options. Populism allows, for instance, more liberalist views in otherwise authoritarian political regimes, and promotes parties with more authoritative views in liberalism mainstream society. Freedom may be wanted or a more organized society, which can be discussed and achieved through populist parties.

Traditional parties have, worldwide, declined in popularity. Populist parties have, instead, been on the rise worldwide (Zaslove 2008). We can think that society is changing and, with it, populist parties and populist ideology are becoming more and more present.

We could draw a parallel suggested by the Freudian psychoanalytic theory mentioned by (Savage 2016: 16) according to which a political leader, as a figure of authority, can be identified with a father figure. Indeed, we can consider the way we can deal with authority figures based on our early childhood experiences, when we can find ourselves more or less in conflict with parental figures. If we cannot come to terms with authority and with the power our parents have over us, we can become adults lacking confidence in ourselves or adults always at conflict with authority figures such as bosses at work, political leaders, managers, and with the decisions taken by the entire state.

We could also consider the way in which previous experiences with authoritarian political regimes can make us react to restrictive measures at various times. As an example, former communist countries appear to be more receptive to populist parties and rhetoric. This could be since in former communist countries the relationship with the mainstream politics of the common people was more conflicting. Thus, the rhetoric of the populist parties and leaders, who create their image as the common man and as outsiders (Stockemer 2019) can have the merit of showing that they are situated as equals in position to the usual citizen.

In the meantime, the discourse refers to social phenomena based on a collective level, and on an individual level (Savage 2016: 4). Thus, an ideological discourse should consider resonating with both a collectivity, or a certain group, and with the individual. Savage approaches populism, therefore, by taking an individualist perspective into account as well. The individualist dimension can be applied to our contemporary society worldwide. Nowadays, in America, populism is the main ideology, just as individualism is its main frame of mind.

The phenomenon of populism has been noticed, according to Savage (2016: 3) since Hostadter (1964) and Hicks (1961) in America and since Germani (1963, 1978) in Latin America. At the time, according to Savage (2016: 3), these researchers expected populism to be a unitary movement and an ideology like any other one. Yet, they could not find “rhetorical or organizational characteristics that would unite the People’s Party of the 1890s and Perón.” Laclau (1977) was the first to find “a set of structural components of populism as discourse” (Savage 2016: 3). The situation was, thus, similar to what we have available nowadays.

Analysing populism all over the world can lead us to understand why certain leaders have been considered appealing by certain countries, and why they have different images than the leaders of other countries. The situation in Romania with the surprising success of AUR party can be understood in the context of the political situation worldwide. We nowadays live in an international context and we cannot isolate ourselves from it. The AUR party is one of the most recent examples of Populist parties and leaders.

It can happen that the very international context becomes a subject of conflict. Populism can fight against supranational organizations such as the European Union and to oppose precisely the tendencies going on at international level, such as multiculturalism, respect for minorities, allowing individual differences, allowing same-sex marriages, allowing refugee rights, etc.

We may be surprised how the world leaders in the present or not so far away from present times can be included under the label of populism. According to Stockemer (2019), examples of such leaders can be the following: Donald Trump, US president, Vladimir Putin, the president of Russia, who is now an active actor in history, as well as Emmanuel Macron, Mélenchon and Marine LePenn in France, and Erdoğan in Turkey. In Greece, Podemos and Syriza are well-known populist parties.

It can be surprising the large extent to which contemporary politics can be included within the populist trend. Even more so, it can be surprising as how far back the tradition can go, as ever since ancient times we can talk about the opposition between the people and the elites in ancient times, when the people were opposed to the aristocracy and when political parties defended such different interests (Stockemer, 2019).

The dissatisfaction with mainstream politics can lead to the need to feel that the political leaders are like us and that they act for common interests. In turn, this leads to a cult of personality, which can go as far as to have an almost religious and mystical worship of political leaders, such as in the case of Peronism and especially of the political personality of Evita Peron, a young woman of very humble origins. Her cult remains today as powerful as during her lifetime. Her husband was also of low class origins and they both appealed to the working class. As we can imply from Stockemer (2019), populism in the Philippines has taken a form of strong opposition towards the international influence. Nationalism has become stronger, to the point where populist Phillippine leaders have started using violent language against what is imposed from external sources.

We can draw a parallel between the scandalous language developed recently by AUR party in Romania and the international context with the example of populism in the Philippines. We frequently notice violent language in the case of the citizens with respect to the political elites, claiming that they are corrupt and that they do not represent their interests. Populist leaders show citizens how they are like them in this respect, which offers them a strong emotional connection with them.

We could claim that the main purpose of politics in general can be either that of ensuring stability, or that of bringing change, the latter which starts with emotional reactions the population has or which are further prompted by political leaders. Political speeches including the strong emotional component of pathos (Kastely 2004) are not unusual. Still, populism can distinguish itself as having in common the following landmarks: it is anti-establishment, against internal or against external factors, it opposes the pure people to the corrupt political elites, the leader is generous and honest while the elites are self-centred and dishonest with the people, and it depicts negatively the opponent. It is likely to trigger change at the level of the entire society at some point, since its leaders try to raise awareness to problematic issues in society.

*Results*

We could consider Populism as an alternative to the mainstream political scene. Still, the consequences of Populism, Populist leaders and parties on society as a whole can be related to situations including the extent to which it attacks the mainstream and reaches a conflicting relationship with it or one of coexisting peacefully for a target group. Problems may appear once Populist parties and leaders struggle to take over positions in mainstream institutions and to become part of the mainstream themselves. As we hear of AUR party’s plan to candidate for Parliamentary elections in Romania in 2024, we may consider the implications of such an action, since we can consider that their actions will be large-scale, bringing change to the entire Romanian society. Once a Populist party may reach access to mainstream institutions such as the Parliament, it can have far-reaching consequences. Populist parties seem to have a radical programme and to offer solutions to situations of crises present following mainstream politics decisions. Populist parties and leaders echo distrust, disillusionment and anger towards the mainstream politics and their unfulfilled promises, as well as unsuccessful actions. Populist representatives, while putting forth an authentic discourse, are not always fulfilling their promises or they are taking some decisions based on a rush and even on a whim. Such an example is Donald Trump, who, after bringing himself into attention as acting against political correctness and helping America become great again, free from foreign influences, proved not to solve social inequality by putting up taxes and by favoring the rich.

The opposition between the people and the establishment can only be associated with strong emotional reactions. Populism leads to offering people a niche of expressing their emotions, and also of feeling understood by political leaders who are themselves against the establishment.

The general tendency for populism is the focus on representing the lower class citizens and their interests, which can take the forms of less educated population segments, rural population, and those members reminding of the working class. The working class, which had been at the centre of the concerns of Communist societies, has been put aside. Populism brings its members back as central actors.

Populist leaders have, as a main feature, total empathy and sympathy for the segments of population ignored or not taken so much into account by the political elites of the establishment. Populist leaders are portrayed as establishing a strong emotional bond with the citizens not being part of the establishment elites.

The anti-establishment can include not only internal concerns and disagreement, such as the uneducated, common, physical working members or the intellectuals, but also external ones and the way that the citizens of a country relate to the international context and the way supranational organizations such as the European Union fail to promote their own interests.

*Discussion*

Politics, for the people, is fuelled by emotion. The discourse and speech of political leaders in general rely on the emotional reactions they stir in the audience to persuade them. Populism relies in prompting emotional reactions, and, currently, contemporary Populist present-day leaders such as Erdoğan, Trump, Putin, who have reached mainstream institutional influence rely on such reactions, just as populist parties and personalities who have not entered the mainstream leading positions do. Function of the cleavage in society, the interests of various groups are taken into account, based on the idea that the citizens are the ones making the decisions, not the elites who act in their own interest and who are corrupt. The basic scenario is that of a clear-cut division between good and evil, the people being good, together with the populist leader and parties, and the establishment, elites, mainstream institutions and politics being evil, and corrupt. Populist parties and leaders build up a speech based on honest intentions, on sympathy and empathy with the people, which belong to those classes that are not advantaged by the establishment and who need a change in order to improve their lives.

The populist leaders and parties are invested with heroic qualities, to the point where they are extremely idealized. One such example are the personalities of Perron and his wife Evita, the Argentinian popular leaders. The influence of Evita can be seen until nowadays in populism, as she has become an example of political personality worship in the way she is emulated as a role model until present times, based on her looks (Stockemer 2019). She has achieved a legendary aura due to her being of very low origins, having become a star in showbiz and then dying young. The Perrons’ inspiring discourses were visible as far as their strong emotional component was concerned due to the image of masses of people gathered around them and approving them. These populist leaders have become popular culture and political landmarks, as films and other items featuring them have become known at international level.

Other populist leaders resort to a very down-to-earth, rough image by using scandalous and violent verbal language and behaviour. From this point of view, we can see how, as far as Romania is concerned, which is the space that the author of the present paper lives in, the AUR takes over such models. Populist leaders in the Philippines had, previously, adopted such strategy, directing their anger and at the same time expressing the people’s anger towards external, international influences.

Nationalist populism can be seen as an attack or as a defence, or simply as a reaction against the worldwide tendencies of globalization, or supranational organizations such as the European Union which, through their policies, can bring dangers to the economy of the countries, since citizens of a country can go and work abroad, depopulation, as citizens of a country can not only work but also establish themselves abroad, and be asked to accommodate migrants and refugees, with various conflicts that can arise among different populations of different ethnicities, cultures, and religions.

Thus, populism can go against an internal establishment or against an international, or world-level establishment. The world-level established liberalist democracies, multiculturalism, diversity, can all be sources of deep disagreement. The same can be said about unfulfilled promises for a better standard of life made by the elites in power.

Populism relies on beliefs which go against what is going on at the present moment on the mainstream political scene and on the strong reactions of revolt and disappointment of the citizens. For instance, the word corruption has a very general and neutral meaning, yet it can stir function of the context and of the circumstances in which it is used against the elites strong reactions and bring together people in actions of protest.

*Conclusion*

The question regarding Populist ideology and leaders can be summed up as follows: to what extent are populist ideology and the actions of populist leaders oriented towards bringing change in society? This question can be further on details into other derivating questions. To what extent do they intend to maintain their place as an alternative and address themselves to a restricted group, and to what extent are they thinking of changing society in its entirety? How much are they willing to change the mainstream political scene and society by entering its institutions and imposing their ideas at large-scale level?

We may be surprised to see to what extent the world we know today and the political moments we use as landmarks in the development of today's structures and current situations, as well as the symbolic political personalities in the world are relatable to populism. The reactions of masses of people in choosing, obeying and raising some political leaders to the role of saviours to the point where they look as if worshipping them can be understood through a deeper understanding of populism. The appeal of populism can be related to strong emotional reactions to external events on the political scene. Populist thinking and acting can be compared to revolutionary and rebellious behaviours and mindsets throughout history. Populist leaders have in mind a desired change at least by a group of people.

The consequences of populist actions can result in further conflict, in radical change by the populists' entering mainstream institutions and political life, changes which may or may not satisfy certain groups.

Through the provoked strong emotional reactions in citizens, populist leaders wish to make them to actively participate in political life. Otherwise, citizens may be tempted to set political life aside and not take it into account, to the point where they can become completely passive and not even feel motivated to vote.

The present paper relies on the understanding of the mechanism of the way in which Populism works: based on noticing which social and professional groups have been left out and motivating them emotionally to act in order to bring about change, as well as by making them feel that the leaders are like them, of the same social category and completely sympathetic with them. Doing social justice is another feature associated with populism. The consequences of the actions of populist leaders and parties are as diverse as there are varieties of populism, in reaction to the establishment institutions and governing, as well as institutions. In some cases, types of populism can develop in reaction against others, such as the case of intellectual populism, opposing the efforts of the low education classes.
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