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Good morning to everyone. I am Marina Busygina, and I am professor at the Department of Political Science and International Relations at the Higher School of Economics and St. Petersburg, Russia

And today we are going to discuss to talk about populism with a special focus on populism and in democracies and autocracies, and the difference between those. But prior to talking about the rise of the populists, we would need to discuss what is particularly on the rise. If we say this is the rise of populism, and this is the consensus issue about this rise.

Uh, among scholars and frankly practitioners, and we can also note the large geographic scope of this rise, since there are a lot of populist leaders and a lot of populist parties.

And these political parties are located. We can find them everywhere in all the continents in Latin America and Africa and Eurasia in Europe. And in North America, America as well. But again, what is on the rise and how we can very briefly determine what is populism? Populism is an ideology. This is what this call is, the those who study populists would.

Tell us, but this is a special ideology. This is an ideology which is based on two primary claims. First, this is the about the true people and the country's true people. Those who true people living in the country they find themselves in permanent conflict with the outsiders, including establishment elites.

And the second claim is that nothing should constrain the will of the true people. Look, there are very simple claims. There are only two of them, and what does that mean? That means that the concrete ideas which are which construct Populist ideology of a populist leader or of a populist party will be very much the matter of national context and will be very much conditioned by the national set of factors. So, this is what does that mean. This means that the populism, the modern populism is very... This also means that populism holds specific view on politics.

Populists do not see the politics as a battleground between different policy positions and the questions of bargaining and so.

On and so forth.

On the contrary, they attribute a singular common good to the people and not to the people, but to their true people.

Moreover, the populism emphasises a direct connexion with its supporters, so this the populist and their supporters, and this connexion is very, I would say, intimate. It's not mediated by the institutions, be it political parties beat, civil society group or the media or the others.

Populism is directed primarily against political elites, but not necessarily, and what is also important is that populist leaders tend to reach their votes in a personalistic way.

Why is populism so attractive indeed when they see this this picture, these 33 countries being you know links and be being with populists with different versions of populism, then we can very reasonably ask ourselves what is the reason? Why is it so attractive? This thin scented ideology

One of the reasons would be I will name you two. One of the reasons will be and this is the kind of the Very logic reason is the failure of governing Co. Established parties or leaders to deal effectively with the current challenges. However, the other and I think this is not less important, reason is related to globalisation and to the uncertainty the uncertainty caused by complex problems and complex challenges which can't come so fast and then certainty is growing so fast, and changes are coming so quickly that the people have no time to accommodate them, and the populism, and this is this is here the attraction. So here for me this is lies the secret of populism, of its attractiveness, that populism propose simplistic view on this on our complex and diverse world.

And allows the supporters to see this complex problem as simple ones. So, in the in the more or less black and white manner and to very easily identify enemies who are against the true people to have better and happier life. So, in a way, populism creates a refuge for the people.

It's also creates demand for strong and unconstrained leader, unfettered by inconvenient institution like other branch of power and the other institutions of the media, political parties, and the agencies, and so on and so forth. So, it means this art contains leadership, so the leader. Who would tell you what to do, and you would understand what to do in a very simple way. So, this is this personal, personalistic way of communicating with the supporters. what is also important., And here we come to the to our focus. This is the populism affects both democracies and autocracies. All the political regimes can be affected by populism because these considerations, which was in the previous slide. They are valid for all the societies, for other democracies, and for their atrocities. If you want some examples. So here they are. This is Bulgaria, Germany, France, United Kingdom, Greece, and the other countries I took. I just to take some from Europe. This is on the democratic side of populism and then you would see some examples on the like, Belarus, Russia, Georgia, Turkey, and this will be from there. From the, uh, I wouldn't. I wouldn't now not call Turkey. Not a democracy, but not autocracy, but nondemocratic. I would say kind of camp so you would have the populism affecting both democracies and autocracies, how there are significant differences between authoritarian and democratic populism. And to these differences we will come to the Part 2 and now I finish part one. Thank you very much.
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I finished just saying that populism affects both democracies and autocracies, and there is significant difference between them. Let's look first in the democratic populism. What we will see there.

There we will see anti establishment populism as a rule. as a rule because there are cases, then you would have not anti establishment populism, but as a rule you would have the anti establishment one.And the claim of the anti establishment. Populism would be that these true people which I mentioned before, they are victims of this state which is run by special interests, and they established elites are corrupted. They are not only corrupted, they can only also be described by populists as non professional, as just greedy as noncapable of doing things and noncapable of making real real really really good decisions. Then the claim would be about unfair redistribution schemes used by the state, used by the established elites, meaning these schemes, which are not in favour of the true people between which but that would favour the other groups. Then the common argument of the anti establishment populism and democracies would be about with regard to make grants. It will be said and claimed that Nigrans will take your jobs.
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And you will go unemployed. So this is. This is something very short, something very brief with regard to anti establishment populism, which we very often meet in democracies. What is in autocracies? These populism is very different in my view. This is about discursive populism. The true people will be the native members of the state. And the outside is there. This will be the groups like immigrants, criminals, some minorities and also cosmopolitan elites.

The discursive populism will tend to emphasise to play special value on their religious traditionalism on the solar energy. This called sovereign ISM and on the stability the state may be described and is described oftenly as the absolute and the highest value of the.

And the role of incumbent would be also very large as an embodiment of the true people he adjusts few example, like the slogans that Putin is the state. This is about Russia.

And Chavez is the people, as this is this is this is the Hugo Chavez, the former president of Venezuela.

One very small thing is that populism is not not not not. Also, we can observe the difference between democratic and outer tyrant populism. But also populism can contribute to the transition to a territorial rule. Populism was a factor claim Levitski and Loxton was affected, contributing to transitions from weak democracies to competitive outer terrorism and they build their argumentation on the cases in Latin America. However, further such research has been conducted also on the case of Turkey.

This is the crucial slide. Where I try to summarise the factors which make a difference between democratic and outer turned populism. The first thing I would like to stress is the different strategic aims of populism. So if you so this is about the difference between coming to power and this is with regard to anti-establishment populism.

When you want to replace the ruling elites or to maintain the power and this is not anti establishment but this is pro establishment or state populism. Where the ultimate aim would be the political survival of the incumbent through populism. Then what is specific for the authortairan regimes is are restrictions on political competition. So there is no anti establishment populism in autocracies and consolidated autocracies are possible. Look at the fate of Navalny in the Russian Federation.

Navalny was described by many as populists and as anti establishment populist, populist, so and his you know his strength and his support is now destroyed in Russia. What is under current restrictions in of the political competition and dockers is what is possible is not anti establishment populism but just more populist wings inside the ruling coalition against the again the.

An example from Russia would be Liberal Democratic party in Russia A headed by Vladimir Nowski.

Also in autocracies, we can expect the expressed external dimension of populism, while the elites which are against the true people of my country would be found not in my own country but external. external animals and the ruling elite of the ruling elite of the other countries and what is also important then In autocracies ah. State populism works very well through information manipulation and framing of the universal discourse, and generally this information manipulation is crucial for the modern. For modern autocracies, this is much more, not much more, but this is also along with the. With the coercion, the information manipulation.

Would be crucial. And we can think about the theory of grief and treysman, about the informational autocracies. So this would be crucial.

All in all, what I would like to say, and here I would like. I would like to finish, indeed, democracies and autocracies. They do have populisms, and these populisms are very different. However, what is?

In common with regard to populism, to all the populism first, the populism is about conflict. It does emphasises conflict and this is about conflict and very simple. Recites how to solve this.

And then the populism is about finding and kind of claiming.

The existence of the.

Final tools and these final tools is attained to the.

True people, this means that the populism is not about discussions.

Thank you very much and let's stop here.