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Abstract

This essay develops a theory for the explanation of the differences in success of Radical Right Populist Parties in Western Europe. In order to create a successful radical right populist movement and thus a successful radical right populist party, three elements are needed; ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’.

Because the creation of a radical right populist movement is different than the creation of other political movements, the specific ‘supply’, ‘demand’ and ‘mobilisation’ of radical right populist movements are different as well. In order to analyse the specific elements, factors are given that contribute to the specific creation of radical right populist ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’. Moreover, the theory of social constructivism is analysed to see how it could contribute to the created model.

To support and test the theory, the theoretical framework will be tested on the political situation regarding Radical Right Populist Parties during the last two decades in Denmark and the Netherlands. While Radical Right Populist Parties in the form of the Dansk Folkeparti and Fremskridtspartiet has been present in Denmark, radical right populism has only been successful for a short term in the Netherlands in 2002 with the Lijst Pim Fortuyn. These two case studies support the theory described in this essay and show that Radical Right Populist Parties only can be successful if there is the right ‘supply’, ‘demand’ and ‘mobilisation’.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td><em>Centrum Democraten</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td><em>Christen Democratisch Appel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td><em>Dansk Folkeparti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td><em>Fremskridtspartiet</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPF</td>
<td><em>Lijst Pim Fortuyn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PvdA</td>
<td><em>Party van de Arbeid</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRPP</td>
<td>Radical Right Populist Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVD</td>
<td><em>Volksparty voor Vrijheid en Democratie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW II</td>
<td>World War Two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

1.1 Subject and purpose of study

In this paper the relatively successful rise of Radical Right Populist Parties (RRPP) in Western Europe in the last decades will be discussed. During the last decades RRPP has been more prominent in politics and themes like anti-immigration have been put on the public agenda. The new parties on the far right have often been described as fascist or extremist, while most of the new parties on the right differ in their ideologies from the extreme-right and can be classified as RRPP. However, the success of RRPP differs between the countries in Western Europe quite a bit. In countries like Denmark and Belgium, the RRPP have been a constant factor during the last decades; while in countries like The Netherlands and Sweden, RRPP have only played a marginal role in national politics.1

The purpose of this study is first to classify the new parties on the far right and explain the ideology of radical right populism. Secondly, I want to explain the differences in success of the different RRPP in Western Europe the last decades.

In order to explain the differences in success of the different RRPP in Western Europe, I will develop a theoretical framework of ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ and I will test the use of this theory on a case study in Denmark and the Netherlands.

Moreover, I will analyse how the theory of social constructivism could be of help to find an explanation for the differences in success of RRPP in the different West-European countries.

1.2 Relevance

Researchers and party strategists are all wondering and ask themselves the same question, why RRPP do have more success in some countries than in others? There have been many attempts in literature, to explain why RRPP do better in certain countries than others. How for example, can we explain the sudden success of Pim Fortuyn in 2002 in the Netherlands? Since RRPP have been playing an important rule in national politics in many different countries in Western Europe, it is both interesting for the field of political science and the society in general, to analyse the reasons of success of RRPP.

1.3 Hypothesis

In an attempt to describe the rise of RRPP in Western Europe, many authors are focusing on the identity construction among the people. Focus has been laid on the forming of RRPP identities and this is often directly linked to the rise of RRPP parties in different countries. Before writing on this topic however, I have been convinced that the success of the rise of RRPP doesn’t only depend on RRPP identities among the people of a certain country but that actual success in parliament depends on much more.

By writing this essay and developing the theory, I want to prove my thesis that the success of RRPP depends not only on the political opinion formation of the people, but that this ‘demand’ only results in a strong political movement if there is sufficient ‘supply’ that use the right ‘mobilisation’. Even if there is a radical right populist ‘demand’ or latent radical

1Until the rise of Pim Fortuyn, far right parties hardly played any role in Dutch politics. In Sweden they didn’t either with one exception, the short success of New Democracy in 1991 with 6.7 % of the votes.
right populist ‘demand’ in society, the actual success of a radical right populist party in national politics will depend on the party itself and its use of mobilisation.

1.4 Plan of the study

This paper basically consists of three major parts. In the first part I will basically analyse the ideology of radical right populism. By writing on the topic of right-wing and anti-immigrant parties, I have to be clear on definitions. I will describe the characteristics of RRPP, how it differs from other parties on the right and in the end of the chapter I will classify the different RRPP in Denmark and the Netherlands.

In the second part of this essay I will describe and analyse the theoretical framework I developed to analyse the success of a political movement like radical right populism. I constructed the theoretical framework by taking parts from the theory and ideas from writers like Hans de Witt and Herbert Kitschelt and I modified these different parts into a complete theoretical model. The theoretical framework exists of three different elements that are all needed in order to create successful RRPP; ‘supply’, ‘demand’ and ‘mobilisation’. According to this theory, the creation of radical right populist identities by the people will only result in a successful radical right populist movement if both the elements ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ are present to complete the ‘demand’. To be able to analyse the existence of radical right populist ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ I will also describe the different factors that contribute to the creation of radical right populist ’demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’. In the second part of the theory, I will analyse the theory of social constructivism and discuss how this theory could contribute to the explaining model of ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’.

In the last part of this paper, I will test the theory and the hypothesis by using the empirical data from a comparative study.

To test the hypotheses and theory it seemed desirable for me to choose a ‘most similar approach’ by comparing two small West European countries. While a country like France, Germany or Italy are very interesting cases to investigate, it seems more desirable to test the theory on a country where the success of RRPP been various and of which there is enough empirical material to investigate. Both the Netherlands and Sweden would have been very interesting cases but due to the lack of material about the situation in Sweden I decided to take the Netherlands due to the available amount of empirical material and the recent happenings in this country. To collect more material for the testing of the theory and the comparing of the Dutch case, I have chosen Denmark as the second case. The countries of the Netherlands and Denmark have comparable size and geographical situation and moreover comparable political, economical, historical and social characteristics. However, despite all these similarities, the situation and development of RRPP has been rather different in these two countries, which make both cases a perfect study for a comparison and to test the theory. Denmark is a good example of a country where RRPP has played a significant role in politics since decades while RRPP only had success during a very short time in the Netherlands in recent history. So by choosing these countries I could neutralise some factors which they both have in common and highlight the things which are relevant for this essay. A comparison between relatively similar countries set out to neutralise certain differences in order to permit a better analysis of the other. (Dogan and Pelassy, 1990 p.133)
2. What is radical right populism?

To be able to write my theory on the rise of RRPP in Western Europe, I first have to describe what these RRPP actually are. To be able to explain and describe the rise of RRPP in Western Europe, we need to explain and describe the phenomenon of radical right populism. To what extent does the radical right populism differ from extreme-right or mainstream right?

Nowadays, many politicians and media tend to confuse labels and classifications of the different parties, right of the political centre. Some politicians even seem to abuse this confusion to label sudden right populist parties as ‘extreme right’ in order to demonize the political message of these parties.

To make clear descriptions and to distinguish between the different parties right of the political middle is actually not that easy, since many authors use different definitions in their works. However, it is possible to give an impression of the ‘average’ Radical Right Populist Party by describing their common features and to how they differ from extreme-right.

2.1 Contemporary extreme right

On the scale from the most right to the political middle, the ideology of the ‘extreme right’ comes after the ideologies like ‘fascism’ and ‘neo-fascism’. Although most ‘extreme right parties or movements don’t openly express nostalgia for the fascist period in the 1930’s and 1940’s, extreme right shares many features with the old fascist movements. Like the fascist movements and even the extreme left, extreme right parties do express ‘anti-democratic values’. Extreme parties like ‘extreme right’ have lost their faith in modern democracy and democratic individual representation and want to achieve their political goals by an extreme change of the political system. (Betz 1999, p. 305)

Extreme right is extreme as well because of the extreme values they supported. These parties reject the fundamental democratic rules and don’t respect the constitution and the constitutional democracies. Individual liberty, individual equality and equal rights are rejected while they search for harmony, exaltations of natural community, hierarchical structures and a strong state. Extreme right favours an authoritarian system in which rights are based on ascribed characteristics, such as race, ethnicity or religion and they accept violence as a necessary mean to achieve political goals. Nationalism, racism and xenophobia are in most of the cases important issues in the party ideology. (Zaslove 2004, p 65 and Betz and Immerfall 1998, p3)

2.2 Radical right populism

The new political wave in Europe of right parties is often characterised radical right populism since they are radical instead of extreme and most often follow a populist style of politics.

Since there doesn’t exist ‘one’ definition of RRPP, it is hard and hardly possible to give a general description which will cover all these parties. However, since we can consider them to belong to the same political family, I will try to describe the most common features of RRPP and their most common ideologies.

Although populism and populist style can be used by political parties with any kind of political background and ideology, populist style is nowadays often used by parties on the far right. As I will explain in this chapter, populism is a democratic way of politics, often lead by a charismatic leader, who pretends to come up for the ’people on the streets’, tries to speak
common language, comes up with popular solutions for complicated problems and often comes up against the role of the state, bureaucracy and the political elite. (Covanov 2004, p 242, Covanov, 1999 and Betz and Immerfall, p 4 ). These characteristics are than more or less combined with far right ideologies and thus creating RRPP.

In short, the majority of the RRPP, tend to blend a classical liberal position on the individual and the economy with some elements of the socio-political agenda of the extreme and intellectual right and deliver it in a concentrated and simplified form to those voters who are disenchanted with their individual life chances, with the direction of societal developments, and the political system in general. (Betz 1994, p 4)

One of the most common features of the RRPP, just like the extreme-right parties, is that they have adopted a strategy that relies primarily on the mobilisation of resentment (Betz and Immerfall 1998, p 4). This resentment nowadays however, comes mostly from changes in society like globalisation, immigrants and refugees or the arrogance and ignorance from the established political parties and politicians. Central here is the statement that in liberal capitalist democracies power has been usurped by self-serving political and cultural elite that pursues its own narrow agenda without concern for the legitimate concerns and interests of ordinary citizens. The result is a degeneration of representative democracy, which has ceased to function properly. (Bezt and Johnsson 2004, p 313)

Therefore another common feature, is the call for change of the existing socio-economic or political systems without, however, unlike the ‘extreme-right’ calling into question the basics of the constitutional democratic order. The RRPP favours a more direct democracy instead of the contemporary indirect democracy, since this only creates political elites, bureaucrats and corruption. Most of the RRPP, like to minimize the rule of the state as much as possible and are in favour of a free market economy. The public administration should be much smaller and much more efficient and should stick to their core-activities. Radical right populists have like all populists an aversion against the political ‘class’ and elite, their bureaucracy, high taxes and a big public sector. In that way, the radical right populist ideas are close of the neo-liberals and are in favour of personal responsibility. (Betz and Immerfall 1998, Taggart 2004 and Zaslov 2004)

A common populist feature of the RRPP is the fact that they try to appeal to the ‘common people’ or ‘silent majority’. Radical right populist parties have been increasingly successful in marketing themselves as champions of ‘true’ democracy and defenders of the values and interests of ordinary people, too often ignored if not dismissed by the political establishment (Bezt and Johnsson, p312). RRPP often state to speak for the normal person in the street and that they say what the normal people think. They often appeal to latent public sentiments of resentment, disillusionment, anxiety and defuse public sentiments. This ‘populist’ feature also means that RRPP politicians often speak in the language of the people and are not afraid to cross the boarders of the ‘political correctness’.

This brings me to another populist feature, the charismatic leader. Most the RRPP are depending heavily on the leadership, charisma and rhetoric talents of their leaders, rather than on their institutional party structures. Much of the success of the RRPP depends on the appeal to the people, the capability to hold the centralised party together and to set out the political and programmatic direction. (Betz and Immerfall 1998, p 9)

The last important features I will describe here is the emphasise the RRPP puts on questions of culture, values and identity and, with it, the recourse to claims of recognition.(Betz and Johnson 2004, p 316) Although the RRPP often are described as anti-immigrant, the RRPP position on the ‘foreigners question’ has been far more complex and ambiguous than most analysts have been prepared to concede.(Betz and Johnson 2004, p 318) It is true that most RRPP want to limit or stop the influx of non-western foreigners into their countries. The RRPP want to protect their ‘heartland’ and see the multicultural society as a
thread to their own national identity and national culture. Although it is hard to generalise, most of the RRPP are not racist or have something against foreigners per se, but just want foreigners to integrate or assimilate and adopt the dominant national culture. Besides, most RRPP are against those who promote universalism, Europeanization and ‘deracination’. (Betz and Johnson 2004, p 316)

Having described the characteristics of RRPP it is clear that they are mostly situated somewhere between the mainstream (conservatives or liberals) right parties and the extreme right. Although RRPP have often similarities with the mainstream right on economic topics, RRPP differ, apart from their populist style and ideas, in their opinions about direct and indirect democracy and immigration. On the other hand RRPP are less extreme than extreme right parties in that way that they often are less anti-immigration or racist, they don’t oppose liberal democracies and the constitutional order, they are not in favour of a strong state and they oppose the use of violence.
3. Classification of the different parties

Now that we know the features of RRPP and how they differ from other parties, we can define the parties in the different countries, in order to test the theory of this essay on these cases. Because this study is about contemporary rise of RRPP in Western Europe and I will test the theory only on the recent history and contemporary situation, I will analyse the parties on the far right of the last two decades only. As written before I will test the theory and hypothesis on the two countries Denmark and the Netherlands. Especially these countries are interesting due to the big differences in the success of RRPP and the many similarities between these countries in all kind of ways.

The only two right-wing parties that played more than a minimal marginal rule in Dutch national politics are the Centrum Democraten (CD) and the Lijst Pim Fortuyn (LPF). In Denmark Fremskredspartiet (FP) has been present in national politics from the 70’s to the 90’s and was more or less replaced by Dansk Folkepartiet (DF) in the middle 90’s.

3.1 Centrum Democraten in the Netherlands

The Centrum Democraten (CD), founded in 1984 by Hans Janmaat, positioned itself in the centre of the political spectrum, but focused primarily on the issue of foreigners and immigrants. Because of the threat of prosecution, the CD was officially not racist or anti-democratic, but party-members and insiders were often prosecuted for racist and anti-state attitudes and speeches. The party ideology was very nationalistic and almost racist, but the socio-economical ideas were called ‘social conservative’; strong rule for the state, lower taxes, high pensions and expansions on defence to protect the national identity. On the other hand, Hans Janmaat tried to use populist features by attracting the people from the street and his proposals for the lowering of taxes. With its racist and extreme-right features, the CD hardly fits in the Ideology of RRPP but tends more to be a very conservative party with racist, extreme-right, radical right and populist features. If we would classify the CD as radical right populist party it is one on the very far right.(Betz and Immerfall 1998, p 111-122 and De Witte 2000, p 705)

3.2 Lijst Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands

The Lijst Pim Fortuyn (LPF), founded and led by the charismatic Pim Fortuyn, won 26 seats in parliament in 2002 and became the second biggest party at once. Fortuyn was definitely a populist since he reacted against the un-democratic indirect democracy, bureaucracy, the political ‘left’ elite and ‘left’ media and favoured a more direct democracy, liberalisation and privatisation of most public services. Besides this all, the person Fortuyn is a good example of a charismatic leader, who appealed to many different people with his rhetoric qualities.

The LPF was not racist but partly anti-immigrant for reasons of defending Dutch liberal society against Islamisation of the Netherlands. LPF and Fortuyn defended differences in religion, race and sexual preference (he was homosexual himself) but warned society for the anti-pluralist, un-liberal and fundamentalist qualities of the Islam. However, Fortuyn hardly expressed nationalistic or nostalgic opinions and he had both left as right points of view. Moreover Pim Fortuyn himself didn’t want to be compared with right radicals like Le Pen or J. Haider. So the LPF can be defined as RRPP but with the notion that it was definitely populist but less radical than most other RRPP in Europe (Ellemers 2002 and Janssen 2002)
3.3 Fremskridtspartiet in Denmark

*Fremskridtspartiet* (FP) was founded in 1972 and became the second biggest party in Denmark with 16 percent of the votes in its debut elections. At that time, party founder and leader, Mogens Glistrup, was an example of the charismatic leader and he expressed populist rhetoric, style and viewpoints. The party started as an anti-tax party but most of the ideologies of the far right can be found in its program as well. Apart from changes in the tax-system, the party had many subjects on its agenda like the cutting down of bureaucracy, the reducing of laws and regulations, the use of referenda, anti-European integration and later anti-immigration. All these subjects together gave *Fremskridtspartiet* all the characteristics of RRPP. The party however has been victim of many political conflicts and especially during Glistrups time in prison (for tax fraud) the party made a move from the far right to a more moderate liberal position, which however later on changed back again. Despite these changes in party policies, the party has always been the most right and radical in Denmark and together with its unconventional style of politics, the party can be classified as RRPP. (Betz and Immerfall, p.77-91)

3.4 Dansk Folkeparti in Denmark

*Dansk Folkeparti*, who is led by Pia Kjærgaard can be considered as populist since it posses populist characteristics such as a charismatic leader, a populist discourse, populist mobilisation tactics and a hierarchical party organisation (Zaslove, p.70).

The party ideology however seems less radical than the one of *Fremskridtspartiet* since the party tries to become a serious actor in national politics and the party likes to be positioned in the political middle and it tries to come up for the common people and the elderly. Despite this image of a mainstream party, Pia Kjaersgaard has put immigration high on the political agenda and she even warned for the threat from an invasion of Muslims who intent to destroy the Danish culture. Besides, *Dansk Folkeparti* is known for its strong opposition of further integration of Denmark within the European Union. (Zaslove, p.75) Moreover, *DF* has strong RRPP characteristics like the strong voice against globalisation, economic corporate elites, the Americanisation of European culture and moreover its populist style and its focus on anti-immigration policies. (Zaslove, p.76).
4. The theory

In order to analyse the success of RRPP and explain the possible reasons for the different success of RRPP in Western Europe it might be useful to use a conceptual framework or theory. In literature, most authors describe and analyse the identity and opinion formation among the citizens in order to explain the rise of RRPP. In these theories and descriptions, the ‘demand’ for radical right populism is explained and often directly linked with the rise of RRPP as the only important factor for success.

However, it is my hypothesis that the explanation and analyse of the opinion formation or ‘demand’ is not enough to cover the whole process of the creation of a successful political movement like the RRPP. Besides the different processes and factors that contribute to radical right populist identities, there are also other factors like party-structure that contribute to the success of RRPP but can’t be classified as a part of the ‘demand’ or the process of identity formation.

To give a complete overview of the whole process and to be able to add all the factors that contribute to the process of RRPP creation, I will describe this theoretical framework that describes all the aspects of the successful rise of a Radical Right Political movement.

Therefore, in this chapter I will describe and explain the theoretical framework that I will use to explain the process of the creation of a successful political movement like radical right populism, by analysing three different elements; ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’. The model I will describe is mostly based on the literature written by Herbert Kitschelt and Hans de Witt who have described these different elements as well. Where most authors concentrate on the ‘demand side’ of the political success of RRPP, Kitschelt is one of the writers that actually mention the importance of the ‘supply side’ of the success of RRPP. In order to express political identities, people need to have a choice, one that has to be reasonable as well. De Witt is the author who uses the element ‘mobilisation’ as a part of the process of the rise of RRPP. In order to bring the ‘demand’ and ‘supply’ together, ‘mobilisation’ is necessary. All these three elements, described by the different authors will be the base for the theoretical model that I will use in this essay. So although the different elements of the model are not new, or unique, obviously it is a new way of approaching RRPP and a good description, deepening and analyse of this model might be useful in order to predict and analyse the rise of RRPP in Western Europe. This model of ‘supply’, ‘demand’ and ‘mobilisation’ however, could basically be used to explain and maybe even predict the existence of any political party in Western democracies. The model in this essay however, is very useful to explain the rise of RRPP in Western Europe since less attention has been paid to the factors ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ in the literature compared with the element ‘demand’ and especially for small, new and radical parties, the elements ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ are probably a ‘conditio sine qua non’ in order to create a successful RRPP. Besides, the model in this essay is specific for RRPP, since I have constructed different factors within the model which are specific for RRPP and this makes the model useful and specific for the analysis of RRPP and the explanation of the differences in success of RRPP. Moreover this model is specific for the small West European countries since the model is created for the economic, geographic and electoral situations in most of these countries. To be able to use this model for other countries with for example a two party system, the model should be slightly modified.

So, in order to be able to explain the rise of RRPP in West European countries, I will describe the model ‘demand’, ‘mobilisation’ and ‘supply’ for RRPP and I will explain how they differ from the ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ of other political parties in Western European democracies.
After the description of the theory, I will later in chapter five describe the theory of social constructivism and how it could contribute to the described model.

4.1 Demand, supply and mobilisation.

Supply, demand, and mobilisation are the three basic elements of any theory of participation, regardless of whether it concerns voting for a party associated with a movement or taking part in a demonstration (de Witte 2000, p 701). As I will show in the following, all three elements need to be constructed or developed in order to create a successful political movement like the radical right populist movement. Demand represents the political opinion of the citizens, ‘supply’ the platform or party through which these opinions can be expressed in politics, and ‘mobilisation’ represents the important communication and interaction between the two other elements. Every element is important and worth analysing, because I state that the missing of one of the elements ‘supply’, ‘demand’ or ‘mobilisation’ will make the chance for the creation of a successful political movement like radical right populism minimum.

In order to be able to analyse how the three elements ‘supply’, ‘demand’ and ‘mobilisation’ are created and how this creation is different for RRPP than for other parties, I will describe the specific factors that contribute to the construction of radical right populist ‘demand’ and radical right populist ‘supply’, and explain the specific features of radical right populist ‘supply’ and radical right populist ‘mobilisation’.

4.2 Demand

The ‘demand’ is one of the three elements necessary for the creation of successful RRPP in politics in my theory. ‘Demand’ will be created by the people or citizens, who form opinions or identities and want to express these opinions in politics. Social networks in society are the basis for success of a political movement (Tarrow 1994, chapter 1). As De Witte (2000, p 700) writes: the demand-side of participation covers the grievances, the perceptions of deprivation and injustice, the group identification and ideologies that spur people on to take part in the activities of an organised movement. In other words, the demand side of the creation of the success of RRPP is the explaining why actors are willing to vote for RRPP and how their radical right identities and opinion are constructed or formed.

This identity formation or the creation of ‘demand’ is for the biggest part a result of the unplanned convergence of meaning in social networks and subcultures, and takes place outside anyone’s direct control. These processes are mostly hidden and don’t develop into a political movement without the guidance of a leader or ‘supply’.

It depends on these communications, interactions and observations, what kind of political identity a certain person or group will develop. (Tarrow, p 124)

Like all other political movements, the radical right populist movement starts with identity-formation among citizens. Because the process of identity-formation takes place in mostly informal settings, it is probably hard to follow or control this process of political opinion-formation. As we will see later on, there are ways to influence this process, but real effects are not really predictable. The best way to know how the radical right populist identities are formed is simply to ask people what their political preference is on a certain moment. But since I’m creating a theoretical framework for RRPP, I will add some factors to the theory that can give a good indication if radical right populist ‘demand’ or radical right populist identities are likely to occur or not.
4.2.1 Factors contributing to the creation of RRPP ‘demand’

The framework of ‘supply’, ‘demand’ and ‘mobilisation’ is a good basis for the explanation of the success of political movements but there are specific factors that will make the model specific for RRPP and which will give a good indication if RRPP ‘demand’ is likely to occur or not. Without pretending to give a full account of all factors, I will analyse the four main factors that contribute to the creation of radical right populist ‘demand’.

The first two factors ‘economical crisis and unemployment’ and ‘globalisation and European Integration’ are two factors that create radical identities on both the right as the left side of the political middle. Economical crisis and unemployment create big changes in society. Some people blame globalisation and EU for this and link the two together. Because the mainstream parties are often in government and therefore often get blamed for the economical situation, and most of the mainstream parties support the EU and globalisation, the ‘demand’ for both the left and the right opposition will grow in this situation. The choice for the left opposition or RRPP then depends on the differences in people’s ideas how to solve these problems. The left ‘demand’ see the EU as a problem because they see it as a capitalist project, while the RRPP ‘demand’ mostly are afraid that the European integration will cause an influx of cheap labour and thus a thread of national identity and culture. Pia Knigge (1998, p 256, 257) has shown that unemployment has a positive effect of left-wing ‘demand’ but could have a positive effect on the ‘demand’ of RRPP if this unemployment comes together with the influx of foreigners. Unemployment has only a positive influence on RRPP if the level of immigration is high (Golder 2003). Thus factors like ‘economical crisis and unemployment’ and ‘globalisation and European Integration’ will both create a rise of demand for radical left as radical right. However, other factors like the amount of immigration and foreigners and people’s personal situation and historical political identity will influence the choice for left or right.

This brings me to two factors that are typically contributing to the rise of RRPP ‘demand’; ‘immigration’ and ‘dissatisfaction with the political situation and system’. These two factors are a specific indication, for a rise of ‘demand’ for radical right populist movements. Apart from the link some people seem to see between immigration and economical crisis, some people link the influx of foreigners and especially foreigners with a different culture, like non-western foreigners, with changes in society. People don’t need to have racist opinions to question the immigration-policies, a sudden change in the living environment of people, created by a big group of immigrants, can cause anti-immigrant feelings. If the habits, religion and culture of a group of immigrants come into conflict with the national or dominant culture in society, some people start to feel threatened. Therefore, people who are worried about the big influx of immigrants and don’t agree with the multicultural society, often don’t have many other options than to create a preference for RRPP, because discourse on immigration policy has traditionally been constrained in Western Europe by the mainstream parties. (Golder 2003, p 439)

The second factor that especially creates radical right populist ‘demand’ is the situation where people lose their trust in politics or the established political parties. Many countries in Western Europe face a legitimacy crisis in their representative politics. (Taggert 2004, 276-278) Especially where moderate left and right parties have converged towards centrist positions and may even cooperate in a coalition, people can feel a lack of choice or a lack of opposition (Veugelers 2005, p 841, Knigge 1998, p 259 and Kitschelt 1995, p 28).

Normally, actors in society who are dissatisfied with the current policies can contribute to changes in society by using their vote during elections. Disaffected and alienated voters will in this situation often use their vote as a protest-vote to show their dissatisfaction with the democratic political institutions and vote for extreme or radical parties. Both the
radical left as the radical right can gain electoral support depending on the actual political situation in the country and the strategies of the established political parties. However in the situation where people are sufficiently disaffected with existing moderately conservative and moderately leftist or social democratic parties, people without fundamental left or socialist backgrounds, could create radical right identities. In this way, people who are disappointed or structural disaffected by current politics, can express their dissatisfaction by voting for a radical party in the hope that that will change the situation. (Knigge 1998, p.258, 259)

4.3 Supply

However, as written above, in order to analyse and explain the rise of RRPP, we have to analyse the whole process and not only the ‘demand’ element of the process. The formation of ‘demand’ doesn’t automatically result in success for a political movement like radical right populism. Even if there is a significant part of the people or citizens with RRP identities or opinions, there won’t be a common vote or representation of these identities until there is a party which represents these ideas. Kitschelt states that the term ‘supply’ refers to the existence in a society of organisations that offer opportunities to participate in action to further a cause. Electoral results are produced by an interaction and existence of both ‘demand’ and ‘supply’ (Kitschelt 1995, p 5-24). Citizens who want to participate in politics to express their opinions and achieve their goals need organisations to offer them these opportunities. To have a relatively strong radical right populist vote, a country needs a party with a radical right populist platform and structural conditions that make such a platform appealing to voters. (Kitschelt 1995, p 5-24)

The discussion of the element ‘supply’ is important for the theory of the success of any political movement, but I state that it is even more important for radical right populist movements. Nowadays most RRPP are not belonging to the group of established political parties but are still small, young and sometimes very inexperienced in politics. On the contrary, most other political movements have established and well organised political parties since ages and they form a self-evident ‘supply’. Moreover, it is not that self-evident that people consider these small, young and inexperienced parties like most RRPP as a reasonable alternative for their vote.

4.3.1 Factors that contribute to Radical Right Populist ‘supply’

The ‘supply’ side of the model is different for radical right populist movements compared with other political movements, since they have a special way of appearing and their position in politics is quite different than the position of the mainstream parties as well. To analyse the radical right populist ‘supply’ and test if a radical right populist party can be considered as decent and sustainable ‘supply’ we can use the following factors; ‘the political situation in the country’, ‘the size of the party or potential party’ and ‘the organisation and structure of the party’.

4.3.1.1 Political situation in a country

The kind of electoral system does matter for the success of RRPP, since RRPP do much better in systems with proportional representation. (Knigge 1998, Golder 2003, and Norris 2004)
However, since I will test my theory on countries with more or less the same electoral system I will keep this factor out of this essay.

The party-political situation however, is a really important factor in this theory. Since most of the RRPP are relatively new and small in most of the national politics, I state that the success of such a party depends on the position, strategy and performance of the established parties in national politics. ‘Support for right-authoritarian parties ‘depends on the strategic interaction of competing parties in the party system’(Kischelt in Veugelers 2005, p 841). Only if voters are sufficiently disaffected with the established left and right parties will the reservoir of potential right-authoritarian voters rally around a new political force (Kitschelt 1995, p14). The success of RRPP thus, depends partly on the programmes, positions and actions of the established moderate right, conservative and liberal parties.

In the situation, where there is no reasonable radical right populist alternative in national politics, the moderate right and conservative parties could attract people with radical right populist identities and who normally might vote for RRPP. However when there exists reasonable RRPP, the success of it depends the most on the behaviour and strategy of the conservative, liberal and moderate right parties. The more a moderate liberal or right party moves to the right site of the political spectrum, the more potential radical right populist voters it will attract. This also means that the more these parties move to the centre, the less potential radical right populist voters feel attracted to this moderate right and conservative parties. When mainstream moderate left and right parties both move close to the political centre, they transform themselves in a ‘catch-all’ party and try to gain the support of the median voters. By doing so, the mainstream moderate parties leave a significant part of the electorate ‘homeless’ and in search for new political alternatives. (Knigge 1998, p 259)

The appearance of RRPP gives these disaffected voters and non-voters a reasonable alternative to use their vote and to express their radical right identities. The dissatisfaction with the moderate right and conservatives is likely to grow when radical left parties successfully appear at the left side of the political centre and the established moderate conservatives and right parties are not able to counter them adequately. (Kitschelt 1995, p14)

On the issue of immigration, in order to gain success, the RRPP are depending on the strategy of the established parties as well. The more established parties ignore immigration issues and immigration problems, the bigger the chance that people are dissatisfied and the bigger the chance RRPP will attract the votes of people who want to show their opinion about current policies. (Golder 2003, p 439)

4.3.1.2 Size of the party

To the extent that voters wish to influence policies and public decisions, normally they vote for the political party with which they agree the most and identify themselves the most with. However, most people think rational and tent to calculate, with the result that they might vote for another political party for strategic reasons. This happens the most when a party with which someone agrees the most, is too small and has hardly any political influence. Instead, these people will vote strategically on a party which is maybe not the nearest but which is much bigger and has more political influence. When voting for a party that is maybe not the nearest in its ideology, voters still expect to optimise their utility when it comes to political outcomes. So, it is not uncommon that actors or voters choose not to vote for the party which is ideologically the nearest, but vote for a party that has more expected power in parliament and with which they still agree to a large extent. Given the way parliamentary democracies
function, party size is a fairly good proxy measure of parliamentary power. (van den Brug 2000, p 80, 81 and 90)

We can conclude from this that small parties have a disadvantage compared with larger parties. Since most RRPP are relatively new parties and can’t be described as established parties, they will be influenced by this affect. So the amount of support form ‘demand’ depends on the size and influence the party has and the size and influence the ‘demand’ expect the party to get. An important reason why ‘demand’ would expect a big influence could be media-attention for the RRPP or good results in public polls.

4.3.1.3 The party and its organisation structure

Even in the situation in which there is ‘demand’ in form of a big potential support for RRPP, and the political structure in the country is propitious, no radical right populist party will be successful without a well organised organisation. Populist style, populist organisational structures and a charismatic leader are central for the success of RRPP. (Zaslove 2004, p 10,11)

The style of the party is important, to distinguish from the established parties in politics. However, in order to attract votes from a reasonable amount of voters and not only from the protest or issue voters, the political programme of RRPP should not only be focused on some issues but should give a serious opinion and policy proposals on all possible matters. The structure of the party should be good organised and well structured. One of the most important determinants of success for a political party is its party organisation. In order to create a political party which will be a reasonable alternative for voters, radical right political leaders should build a decent organisation and design the appropriate appeal that seizes the moment and exploits the strategic weakness of the existing parties. (Kitschelt 1995, p 14).

As written before, RRPP often depend a lot on the appeal, determination, political longevity and individual staying power of their leading figures (Betz and Immerfall 1998, p 9). Because the political programme and the direction of RRPP often depend on the leadership of one charismatic leader, it is important that the internal organisation of RRPP is well organised and structured in order to build a sustainable party (Zaslove 2004, p11). There should be a well organised party behind the leading figure, so the whole movement is not depending too much on the existence of that only central person. Much of the success of a new RRPP depends on the trust people have in the party and its sustainability.

4.4 Mobilisation

As shown before, in order to establish maximum political participation and creation of a big political movement, three elements are needed, ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’. In order to bring the ‘demand’ and ‘supply’ together there has to be interaction and communication. Interaction between the ‘supply’ (the party) and the ‘demand’ (potential voters) will cause mobilisation. In other words, the element ‘mobilisation’ is the linking element to bring the ‘supply’ and ‘demand’ together in their attempt to create a big radical right populist movement. (de Witte 2000, p 701)

In order to organize a strong radical right populist organisation in the form of a political party, the creation of ‘demand’ and ‘supply’ only won’t result in a successful rise of a political movement. Even if both the elements are present in a certain social setting, another element is necessary in order to gain maximum output or profit out of the political
opportunity. The theory of ‘supply’ and ‘demand’ has to be completed by the element mobilisation.

The element of ‘mobilisation’ and the mobilisation campaign are especially important for the analyses of the success of radical right populist movements in Western Europe, probably more than other political movements. Because RRPP are mostly not considered as one of the established parties, especially parties like RRPP depend more on mobilisation and mobilisation-campaigns compared to the mainstream established parties. In general, parties which are not an important actor in national politics and government are getting much less media attention than the big opposition parties and the government-parties. In order to make their potential voters aware of their existence and to attract votes, RRPP are depending strongly on mostly unconventional mobilisation campaigns. As we read in the second chapter, because of the very unconventional way of making politics, it lies as well in the nature of most of the RRPP to gain their support in a different way than the other parties.

A very important factor in this mobilisation and mobilisation-campaign is the charisma and rhetoric qualities of the persons at the top of the party. The best results are gained if the RRPP are represented by a charismatic leader who has the talent to persuade people to express their radical right populist identities and vote for a radical right populist party. The party and the charismatic leader should use a personal campaign, in order to convince the ‘ordinary’ people that the RRPP really would translate their political identities in political deeds. The biggest purpose of these campaigns is to convince the people that the RRPP is different from the other established parties, and that they will represent the people from the street and that the politicians within the party are ‘one of them’. The charismatic leader should talk with all kind of people, have a campaign anywhere in the country, to show that all people are equal and that every vote counts. (Zaslov 2004, p 12)

The RRPP in the form of a charismatic leader can raise certain issues in the media or public debate in order to get attention for the radical right populist issues. If the charismatic leader or RRPP succeed in putting certain issues on the national political agenda, it will depend on the reactions and strategy of the established parties if this will create radical right ‘demand’ among the people. If the established parties don’t react adequately on the issues raised by the RRPP, there is a big chance that people agree with the RRPP issue, will blame the established parties for this, and might change their opinion. So RRPP should start the debate on certain issues in order to get attention for their claims and gain the interest of the people that agree with the political statement on the issues by the RRPP.

The media plays an important role as well in the mobilisation of the demand by the supply. Through the mass-media, the ‘supply’ can inform the ‘demand’ on the existence of the party and especially through TV, image building has become an important element. The media can help movements to gain initial attention, and this may be the most important impact of media. Through media the political parties can establish a public image, and discuss the political opponents. Since in our western capitalist societies, media just report what the editors think the people find interesting, the charismatic person should come with ordinary dramatic events and speeches and use the language from the streets, in order to get as much media attention, as possible. (Tarrow 1994, p 126-128)
5. Social Constructivism

In this essay, a theoretical model has been used to explain the rise of RRPP in Western Europe. Unlike many other studies, the actual outcome in national elections has been analysed, rather than a deep analyses of the social reasons of radical right populist identity construction. The development and creation of radical right populist identities has been just a part of the model, since the aim is to explain why and how radical right populist identities result in actual political power in national politics. In the theoretical framework that I’m using, the emphasis has thus been put on the need of a good ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’, in the situation where there exists radical right populist demand. In this model I have given different elements that give a good indication on the existence of radical right populist demand, rather than a deep explanation on how these radical right populist identities are constructed.

In the following section however, I will describe the theory of social construction and how this theory can contribute to the created model and how it can help understand and predict the rise of RRPP in Western Europe.

5.1 The theory

The choice of the social construction theory is not a strange one, since it is used for the explanation of different political or sociological phenomena. The social construction theory explains the process of identity construction, identity change and the creation of political preferences and could therefore be used to understand the actual rise of RRPP and the rise of radical right populist identities among the people. (Checkel 2001, p.220)

All the social and cultural phenomena are constructed by human interaction, practices, communications and social interaction. Actors have been communicating with each other through time and space and the social world we all live in is socially constructed. Checkel defines social interaction as a process during which agents interact, and perhaps identities change. Thus, people and actors don’t just get their political opinions or identities at once, or by a certain entity, but the formation of identities and political opinions occurs in a process of social interaction and social learning. Identities that were thought to be given naturally are also socially and culturally created, maintained, modified or even re-created, whether as individual, group, place, landscape or nation-state, through human activities. (Iwashita 2003, p 333 and Checkel 2001, page 220)

5.2 Social learning

Like social constructivist say, identity construction and identity change occur through social learning, a process of social interaction in a certain context.(Checkel 1999 and Iwashita 2003) This means that the creation of political opinions and identities by citizens depend on the social context in which they find themselves and not on a fixed nature.(Iwashita 2003, p 333) This means in other words, that people create their political preferences through communications with others and through observations of their living environment. The social constructivists state that social learning is the way how actors form their identities and political opinions. Social learning involves a process whereby actors, through interaction with broader institutional contexts, acquire new interests and preferences, in the absence of obvious material incentives (Checkel 1999, p.548). This type of learning is different from
another sort of learning where agents acquire new information, alter strategies, but than pursue given fixed interests. (Christiansen p. 53). Identities are thus shaped by interaction between different actors in society. People behave, react or respond in the way they do, because the process of social learning has told them how to act in their social world and which rules to follow. The norms and rules, that people are following, are formed by social learning and are developing over time. Big changes however, do not often occur. The reasons and circumstances under which changes occur is however really interesting for this essay. A change in social learning can cause differences in norms, rules, values, identities and political preferences.

Checkel acknowledges persuasion as an important factor within the social learning and sees persuasion by actors in society as an important process under which preference change and thus political opinion might occur. (Checkel 2001, page 221) To support his theory, Checkel has given five hypotheses under which social learning and preference change are most likely to happen.( Checkel 2001, p.222) Argumentative persuasion is more likely to be effective when;

- the persuadee is in a novel and uncertain environment and thus cognitively motivated to analyse new information.
- the persuadee has few prior, ingrained beliefs that are inconsistent with the persuader’s message. Put differently, agents with few cognitive priors who are novices will be more open to persuasion.
- the persuader is an authoritative member of the in-group to which the persuadee belongs or wants to belong.
- the persuader does not lecture or demand, but, instead, ‘acts out principles of serious deliberative argument’.
- the persuader-persuadee interaction occurs in less politicized and more insulated, in-camera settings.

5.3 The use of the theory

Having read the theory and its possible applications it is now interesting how it could influence the model that has been used in this essay.

Hereafter, I will use the five hypotheses written by Checkel and examine to what extant his hypotheses fit into the model used in the essay, and to what extant the theory of social constructivism can be of use for the research question.

Checkels first hypothesis, argumentative persuasion is more likely to be effective when the persuadee is in a novel and uncertain environment and thus cognitively motivated to analyse new information, seems to give support to theory for the creation of ‘demand’ that is used in this essay. While Checkels theory primarily put focus on identity construction and thus on the creation of ‘demand’, especially the first hypothesis corresponds quite well with the theory and the factors used in the theory of ‘demand’ in this essay. All the four factors, (immigration, unemployment, globalisation and dissatisfaction with politics) create a ‘novel or uncertain environment’ what results in a situation where changes in RRP identities are most likely do occur.

Globalisation and unemployment bring change that can be considered as an uncertain situation or crisis for the people who experience the bad side effects of globalisation and/or unemployment.
Dissatisfaction with the political order can certainly be considered as an uncertain situation as well. Checkel himself has classified this situation even as an important situation where social learning is likely to occur. (checkel in Christiansen 54)

The last factor, immigration however, which is the strongest factor for RRP demand creation in my model, is not directly supported here. This could mean that the construction of RRP identities in this theory depend on the way people are dealing with immigration and the kind of experiences they have had with immigration and immigrants. In the case where people live in the a social environment where immigrants are considered as negative or in cases where actors actually have had real negative experiences with immigrants, immigration can by some people be considered as something negative and as a crisis in their live and their living environment.

The second hypothesis, argumentative persuasion is more likely to be effective when the persuadee has few prior, ingrained beliefs that are inconsistent with the persuader’s message, supports the assumption written in the essay that people without strong political preferences will more easily consider to vote for RRPP when dissatisfied with the political situation than people with strong political opinions and people who have a strong preference for the left wing.

Checkels third, fourth and fifth hypothesis seems to put strong emphasis on the role of the persuader. According to the theory, this persuader can be any actor in society as long as it is in interaction with the persuadee. This persuader can be someone in an actor’s personal environment but to some extent public as well actors who are in interaction with the public. The persuader is, according to Checkel, supposed to be ‘a member of the in-group to which the persuadee belongs or wants to belong’. Depending on the style, performance and background, a party leader could be considered as an in-group member and, thus able to influence social learning. This persuasion however, is most likely to be successful when ‘the persuader does not lecture or demand’ but instead ‘acts out principles of serious deliberate argument’. This argument means that the interaction should be as informal as possible and the persuader should pretend to act in the interest of the persuadee. This argument complement the last argument that persuasion should take place in ‘less politicized settings’.

These three hypotheses could partly support a theory that the party and its leaders could be an actor in the social learning process of the ‘demand’. Especially the 4th and the 5th hypothesis predict that public political persons are not likely to be effective persuaders in the theory of social learning. However, populist parties and leader have such a different style of politics and propaganda that it might be possible that people would consider populist leaders more within their in-group, see their speeches less as lecturing and demanding and most of all, most people won’t consider populist leaders as traditional politicians. As written before, populist leaders have such a different style of politics when they pretend to be ‘one of the people’ and expressing the ‘opinions of the normal people in the streets’ that they maybe could take the successful role of persuader.

Checkels theory thus could give a second function to the ‘mobilisation’ element. Where in this essay ‘Mobilisation’ only had one function, bringing ‘demand’ and ‘supply’ together, a good mobilisation campaign can have a second function as persuader in the social learning process of the people. The party and its party leaders can use the element ‘Mobilisation’ as a second function and they can, under the conditions expressed by Checkel, take the role of a persuader and influence people’s social learning and preference changes. In other words, the element ‘mobilisation’ can, under certain conditions, contribute to the process of social learning and identity creation and influence the ‘demand’ in the essay.
5.4 Conclusion

The goal of this chapter on the theory of social constructivism was to investigate how this theory could be of use for the research question in this essay and how and where it gives a new dimension to the theory of ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’.

This chapter has shown, that the theory of social construction mainly analyses the construction of identities and preferences and that the theory actually support the element ‘demand’ as how I described it. The four analysing factors that I used for the ‘demand’ actually fit quite well in the theory of social construction and social learning. Social construction could for that reason be a perfect tool when focussing on ‘demand’ and identity creation in possible further research.

This, however, means at the same time that social constructivism isn’t of any help for the analyses or support of the ‘supply’ element of the model. The only new impulse that the theory of social constructivism gives to the model is an extra role for the party and its party leaders. According to Checkel does identity and political preference change occur during the process of social learning and do persuaders play a big role in this. Parties and party leaders can under certain circumstances take the role of persuader and be able to have influence in people’s social learning process. This thus, could mean that the ‘mobilisation’ element could have a second function. Not only does the ‘mobilisation’ bring existing RRP ‘demand’ to the RRP ‘supply’, in the second function ‘mobilisation’ can influence the growth of existing RRP ‘demand’ by persuading others to change their political opinions. However, the importance and actual influence of party leaders and party propaganda is even according Checkel questionable since persuasion by public and political actors is not likely to occur. Party preference change and political opinion formation is most likely to happen in informal settings and the task of the ‘mobilisation’ is mostly just to bring the existing ‘demand’ and ‘supply’ together.

The second function of ‘mobilisation’ thus is a very interesting new impulse on the theory, but modification of the model seems undesirable at this point. Even if social constructivism suggests that it might be possible under strict circumstances that the factor ‘mobilisation’ has a second function, it is doubtful that this second function will exist in RRP politics. Further and deeper research should be done in order to analyse this function and its influence on the model of ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ before applying it on the model at this point. However, further research and a closer look at persuasion influence by political actors could be very interesting, especially in the case of populist mobilisation styles.

As a final remark I can thus conclude that the theory of social constructivism is a very useful tool to analyse and study opinion and political preference formation. The space of this essay and the amount of time available however are too short to go deeper in the persuasion process and the way RRP identities are created. Further research on both political preference construction and the possible second function of ‘mobilisation’ could be very interesting and useful. The theory of social constructivism however, won’t get a place in the created model of this essay, since social constructivism is of little use for answering the research question that I like to answer in this thesis. Social constructivism is a good way to explain RRPP identity construction, but doesn’t give an explanation for the absence of RRPP in the national parliaments of different countries. Where social constructivism focus on identity and thus ‘demand’ does the model of ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ show that the ‘supply’ side of the model is more important than the ‘demand’, in the search for an explanation why RRPP is more successful in some countries than others.
6. RRPP in the Netherlands and Denmark

The political situation in the Netherlands and Denmark regarding RRPP is perfect for the testing of the theory, because the success of RRPP the last decades has shown huge differences over time, in and between these countries. The existence of RRPP in the Netherlands has normally been very rare and marginal through the years, with one short exception, the sudden success of the radical right populist party Lijst Pim Fortyn (LPF) in 2002. Thus this case could give us facts and insight about what factors changed during this year 2002, what made the rise of RRPP suddenly possible, and what factors created the downfall of the LPF after 2002. Because of the sudden rise of RRPP, the Netherlands is a good case to test the theory on.

In Denmark however, RRPP has been present for more than three decades and is therefore interesting for comparison. Two different parties have been present in national politics but both with changing success which makes the case even more relevant. So, by describing the situation in the Netherlands and Denmark I can analyse three different situations regarding RRPP and the rule of ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ in it.

6.1 A marginal rule for RRPP; the Netherlands before 2002

Traditionally, RRPP have played a marginal rule in The Netherlands. As written in chapter 2, the only radical right populist party that played any rule before 2002 in the Netherlands was the Centrum Democraten (CD) with 1 seat in parliament in 1989 and 3 in 1994. The Dutch political situation has since decades been dominated by three big parties and several medium and small parties. Until 1994 the Christian Democratic Party CDA has been in every government since the WW II often in coalition with either the social democrats PvdA or the liberal democrats VVD. From 1994 till 2002 however, a ‘purple’ coalition of the liberals and the socialists excluded the Christian democrats eight year from government.

The last two decades however, the high use and abuse of the social security and the healthcare system made the Dutch welfare state too expansive and the government tried to make reforms step by step. The political arena stayed relatively stable despite these economical problems, the high criminality rates and the social problems with the fast growing groups of non-western immigrants; neither in the years of economical prosperity as economic recession, the three big political parties have been threatened by extreme left or extreme right parties from any significance.

The only RRPP in those years that made it to the Dutch parliament, the CD, tried to speak for the Dutch who were dissatisfied with the political system and threatened by the big group of non-western foreigners. In many areas in the Netherlands, immigrants and foreigners formed over 20 % of the population and in cities like Rotterdam this percentage is even over 40%. However, unlike other West-European countries, the RRPP never played any rule of significance. The Centrum Democraten (CD) led by Hans Janmaat had it biggest success in 1994, with 3 seats in national parliament and 77 seats in municipal elections. This success however, also became the end of the CD since there were not enough appropriate representatives to fill the unexpected number of seats and many of them turned out to be failures. Hans Janmaat was not able to lead the party and scope with the internal conflicts and all the scandals which were appearing around the party and its representatives, and with the next elections, the CD disappeared from the political stage.(Betz and Immerfall 1998, p.115)
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6.2 The sudden rise of RRPP; the *Lijst Pim Fortuyn* (LPF) in the Netherlands

After eight years of a ‘purple’ coalition between 1994 and 2002, the elections in that year would bring big chances in the political proportions/relations in the Dutch national politics. The coalition the left PvdA and the Right/liberal VVD had been relatively successful, but at the same time had led to a shift to the middle of all big mainstream parties. Real big differences between left and right disappeared and all the parties seemed more and more the same to many Dutch.

After the political success of the charismatic gay sociology professor Pim Fortuyn in the local elections in Rotterdam (he won 35% of the vote), Pim Fortuyn decided just some months before the national elections to campaign with his own political party, the *Lijst Pim Fortuyn* (LPF). Pim Fortuyn’s campaign was mostly about the reformation of the political system, immigration, integration, security and crime. Despite the economic prosperity during the last decades, Pim Fortuyn accused politics of ignoring the voice of the people and ignoring the troubles many have with the great join influence of non-western immigrants in the Dutch society. (The Economist London, 30 nov 2002, vol 365, iss 8301 p 39) Although the LPF became extremely popular in a short period of time, mainstream parties and politicians ignored him, judged him or even accused him for being fascist or racist, which Fortuyn wasn’t after all. Fortuyn had the support of some rich businessmen and together with his charisma and his popular message Fortuyn got a lot of media attention. With his ‘performance’ he clearly showed the different approach he had towards politics compared with the self-interested, arrogant and old fashion politicians from the mainstream parties. Compared with Hans Janmaat from the CD, Pim Fortuyn was much more moderate and had most of all much more charisma and political feeling. Two weeks before the national elections (in the polls Fortuyn seemed to become the second or largest party in the Netherlands) Pim Fortuyn was shot by a left radical. The LPF, however continued its national campaign and won 26 seats (17%) at once and became the second largest party in parliament and joined government together with the CDA and VVD.

The three months old LPF however, turned out to be a group of individuals without political experience rather than a well organised political party without its leader and founder Pim Fortuyn. Without clear leadership and the differences in political opinions within the party, the LPF and the government collapsed one year after its start. In the elections afterwards the LPF was reduced to only 8 seats in parliament and at the moment the LPF doesn’t get more than one seat in the different polls. (Ian Bruff 2003 and Ellemers 2002)

6.3 The rising power of RRPP; *Fremskridtspartiet* and *Dansk Folkeparti* in Denmark

Like in the Netherlands, the extreme-right and far-right have traditionally played a minimal role in Denmark but in 1972 *Fremskridtspartiet* entered national politics and became relatively successful with 16 percent of the votes. The party, which was founded and lead by Mogen Glistrup, was mainly anti-tax and anti-bureaucratic but the immigration issue became more and more important. (Betz 1994, p 78) The founding of the party came just after a coalition of the bourgeois parties. This coalition wasn’t a success for the right due to strong divisions between the parties and this might have disappointed ‘right’ voters. Due to these divisions between the different parties right from the political middle, the Danish social democrats had been able to dominate governments most of the time, while the moderate right
never really could perform a good opposition due to its fragmentation. *Freskidspartiet* however, was largely ostracized and never joined a governing coalition, and it was considered by the established parties to be an unreliable partner. (Kitschelt, p.124, 125)

Despite significant success in the early 70’s, the electoral success declined considerably in the late 70’s and 80’s and at the moment the party s not represented anymore in national politics. Although the party got less votes almost every years, it still got between 13,6 and 3.6 percent of the votes between 1975 and 1994 (Betz and Immerfall, p.85). The party and its politicians where never really taken serious in parliament and things only got worse due to misbehaviour of parliament members and internal conflicts. During and after Glistrups time in prison, (he was successfully convicted of tax-fraud) internal conflicts harmed the party and a division started to occur between a radical group supporting Glistrup and a more moderate group lead by Pia Kjearsgaard. (betz, 1994, p. 77,78)

After Glistrups comeback in 1987 the party had a small revival but the internal battle between Glistrup and Kjeargaard continued until Glistrup left the party and he failed in starting up a new one. *Fremskridtspartiet* however still got 6.4 percent of the votes in 1990 but after Kjaergaards departure and founding of *Dansk Folkeparti* the party lost many votes and finally disappeared from national politics. (Hainsworth p. 193)

It was in 1995 that Pia Kjaesgaard as party prominent of *Fremskridtspartiet* left the party due to the internal conflicts and started a new party on the far right, called *Dansk Folkeparti* (DF). During its electoral debut it gained 13 seats and during the elections of 2005 it gained 22 seats which is 13,3 % of the votes.4 *Dansk Folkeparti* doesn’t deviate much from *Fremskridtspartiet*, has more or less the same ideology but tries to position itself more as a middle party, coming up for the normal people and especially the elderly5. Unlike *Fremskridtspartiet*, the *Dansk Folkeparti* tries to get the image of a reliable and serious party who just puts anti-immigration and anti-Muslim issues on the political agenda. Since its founding, the party has been growing steadily and it is much more successful and popular than *Fremskridtspartiet* had been the last 20 years (Bjorklund, p.1 and homepage6) While people didn’t trust the politicians who were ruling the FP, DF managed to gain the trust of the people by good leadership and with a more mainstream political ideology, but managed to gain influence and to push anti-immigration issues on the political agenda of Denmark. (Betz and Immerfall, p 78 and Zaslove, p. 70)

The position of the *Dansk Folkeparti* is a little special since the conservative-liberal government depend often on the party for minority decisions. In this way, the party can have a lot of power but can still be critical to the government, its politicians and its style of politics. In most of the issues the party support the government in almost all proposals and the party seems to belong to the political middle. However, in return for the support for the government on most of the issues, the party claims a lot of influence when it comes to the special radical right issues such as immigration and the EU. Kjeargaards critics towards immigration and the Islam moreover have caused a change of discourse and even the moderate parties take over anti-immigration issues nowadays.

---

4 homepage Dansk Folkeparti; http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/ 01-05-2006
5 homepage Dansk Folkeparti; http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/ 01-05-2006
7. Analysis

The description of the RRPP in Denmark and the Netherlands shows us big differences in the success of RRPP in these countries where the political and socio-economic factors are more or less the same. Even if there would be some differences in the socio-economic and political systems in these two countries, the huge difference in the success of RRPP couldn’t be explained by that. The RRPP in Denmark have been present for more than two decades and at the moment Dansk Folkeparti is a stable and successful party. In the Netherlands however, the existence of a strong RRPP seemed to be impossible, until the short success of the LPF. Hereafter, I will apply the theory of ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ to explain this situation.

7.1 Demand

In Denmark, the existence of RRPP ‘demand’ can easily been assumed because of the electoral success of RRPP during the last 20 years. Moreover the influx of immigrants has been quite high\(^7\), unemployment rates have been high during the 70’s and 80’s\(^8\), there has been a lot of discussion about the membership of the EU, Denmark has a strong welfare state, taxes are high and there is a big bureaucracy (Kitschelt, p121-131). These factors represent perfectly the four factors contributing to RRPP ‘demand’.

Unlike Denmark however, RRPP ‘demand’ didn’t seem to exist in the Netherlands because of the marginal vote for the CD. However, the sudden success of the LPF in 2002 showed that unlike most people thought, there was radical right populist ‘demand’ at that moment. In my theory it is likely that this demand already existed for years but that it was never ‘mobilised’ by the right ‘supply’. As written before, radical right populist ‘demand’ is most likely to occur if two specific elements are present: a big amount of non-western immigrants in the country and dissatisfaction with politics and the political system. Like in Denmark, the Netherlands has attracted many foreign labour, immigrants, guest workers and refugees who form a big part of the population, especially in the urban areas.\(^9\) Dissatisfaction with politics and the political system could be assumed as well since election turnouts have been historically low the last decades in the Netherlands with a 73% turnout only in 1998 for national elections and 59% for local elections.\(^10\)

Even if these elements have created a ´demand´ for RRPP in the Netherlands, the CD never got more than 1% or 2 % of the national votes. Without any big chances in the number of immigrants, unemployment or obvious dissatisfaction with the political system, radical right populist LPF suddenly got almost one out of 5 votes in national elections in 2002. This sudden success of RRPP in the Netherlands must have been a result in a chance of radical right populist ´supply’.

---

\(^7\) The number of foreigners in Denmark was more than 400,000 in 2002 and represents almost 8% of the population.

\(^8\) http://www.eurofound.eu.int/emire/DENMARK/UNEMPLOYMENT-DN.html

\(^9\) The number of non-western inhabitants in the Netherlands has reached almost the 1.8 million, which is almost 12% of the Dutch population. (www.cbs.nl 22-12-2005) The number of foreigners in Denmark was more than 400,000 in 2002 and represents almost 8% of the population. (http://www.inm.dk/publikationer/aarbog2002_english/english_2002.pdf)

\(^10\) http://www.digischool.nl/gs/community/histoforum/stembus/#opkomst
7.2 Supply

The fact that there wasn’t successful RRPP in the Netherlands before 2002, even though there probably was radical right populist ‘demand’ could support my hypothesis that without a decent radical right ‘supply’, radical right populist ‘demand’ won’t result in a successful radical right populist movement.

In the two decades before 2002, there was however RRPP in the form of the Centrum Democraten. However, the CD didn’t fulfil the three elements necessary to create a successful radical right populist ‘supply’. At that time, the political situation in the Netherlands was probably not ready for RRPP. Since the left PvdA and the right VVD never formed coalitions together there was always a clear division between the left and right and the VVD was placed more to the right of the political spectrum than nowadays. VVD’s leader Frits Bolkestein even mentioned the problems high criminality, unemployment, school drop-outs and abuse of the social security by immigrants and attracted many right-wing voters by doing so. However, the problems of the multicultural society were practically ignored and silenced in Dutch national politics and everyone who mentioned to link criminality and unemployment with immigration was often labelled as racist. This attitude to the problems of the multicultural society caused the labelling of the RRPP CD as racist party and gave it a very bad image. Apart from this political situation, the party structure of the CD was far from optimal. The party was bad organised, there were many internal conflicts, the leader Janmaat had no charisma and the party was probably too much a one-issue party.

The success of the LPF in 2002 however, can be explained by changes in the ‘supply’ side of the model. When Pim Fortuyn entered politics the political situation was changed quite a bit. The left PvdA and the right VVD had been in government together for 8 years and the difference between the two were getting less and less obvious. During that time the communistic/socialistic party SP gained success and the existing parties on the right didn’t really have an answer. This situation made it easy for Pim Fortuyn to enter politics with his right-populist party and the polls before the elections showed he was gaining a lot of support which compensated the disadvantage that the LPF was a small and new party. Because the LPF was one of the biggest parties in the polls, people were convinced that their vote would be useful and could really change the political situation. Because of the very young age of the party (3 months old before the elections) the LPF was more a one-man show than a well structured party with a good organisation. But because the charisma and rhetoric qualities of Pim Fortuyn and the broad political programme, this bad organisational structure was well compensated. However, after the murder of Pim Fortuyn, the bad structured and bad organised party collapsed within months without the leadership of its founder Pim Fortuyn.

In Denmark, the radical right populist ‘supply’ have had support of radical right populist ‘demand’ since decades. The success of the two parties discussed in this essay however, has been different. Apart from the beginning of the 70’s, Fremskridtspartiet was losing more and more voters and it was finally Dansk Folkeparti who gained big success again and formed a stable successful RRPP. The relative success of Fremskridtspartiet and the big success of Dansk Folkeparti can probably be explained by the three elements of successful radical right populist ‘supply’ as well. Fremskridtspartiet was first doing well due to the strong leadership within the party and the political situation in Denmark at that moment. Danish politics had been dominated by the social democrats and the right parties had never been able to give a strong opposition due to the strong division between the different parties. The downfall of the party can however be explained with the use of ‘supply’ arguments. Although the party had success in the beginning, internal conflicts, extreme radical remarks and misbehaviour by some members and the eventually bad organised party structure had such a bad impact that the party was loosing more and more votes. Dansk
Folkeparti however, has nowadays a hierarchical and well organised party, lead by a small group of political experienced members and the party has a good financial position. The party is lead by the charismatic Pia Kjearsgaard and through the years the party has developed a more balanced and broader political programme than Fremskridtspartiet had and the party tries to be a stable party in national politics. Moreover, under the leadership of Pia Kjearsgaard, Dansk Folkeparti has not been in simple opposition to all other parties; instead it sought to a large degree co-operation and practical compromises with the bourgeois government. (Hainsworth, p.195)

Apart form the existence of the first RRPP ‘supply’ factor, the two other ones can be found as well. The fact that the Dansk Folkeparti is one of the biggest parties in Denmark helps the party gaining votes. Moreover, the political situation, with coalitions of the left and fragmentised coalitions of the middle and right parties has given the party the position to distinguish itself from the existing parties and to criticize the political situation. (Zaslove, p.75, Björklund, p.1 and homepage)

7.3 Mobilisation

As written in the theory, the factor ‘mobilisation’ has an important role in the creation of a successful RRPP as well.

The last decades the radical right populist ‘demand’ and radical right populist ‘supply’ in Denmark have been connected in Denmark by the relatively successful mobilisation. The ‘mobilisation’ of Fremskridtspartiet in the beginning of its existence was quite successful when it used an inventive and humoristic mobilisation campaign and the party got a lot of media attention. Moreover, Glistrup was a charismatic person and he got a lot of attention due to his ‘war against tax’. During the 80’s and 90’s however, the media attention became more and more negative due to Glistrup time in prison, the internal problems and the extreme opinions of some of the MP’s. (Hainsworth, p.195)

It seems like Dansk Folkeparti had learned from the mistakes of Fremskridtspartiet during the last two decades and the party has build a strong hierarchical organisation under the leadership of a small group of experienced politicians. Moreover, the party is clear and uniform in its messages nowadays and it seems like the party leaders take well advantage of the media possibilities they get. Dansk Folkeparti seems to know exactly how to use the media in the right way, and Pia Kjearsgaard and the other party leaders make sure that a common and clear message is spread to the public. Because Dansk Folkeparti has sufficient financial resources, the election campaigns have always been well organised and they have used controversial campaigns. Moreover the charisma and rhetoric qualities of the political leader of Dansk Folkeparti, Pia Kjearsgaard, have created a successful mobilisation. The fact that Dansk Folkeparti has been politically active with local party meetings and the fact that the party can depend on a strong network of activists has brought the party close to the ‘demand’ as well. (Zaslove, Bjorklund and homepage)

In the Netherlands, the ‘mobilisation’ has played an important role in the difference in success between the LPF and CD. The LPF used almost all elements contributing to a successful mobilisation, while the CD lacked almost all of them.

The political leader of the CD, Janmaat didn’t have enough charisma to persuade and convince potential voters to support RRPP. Moreover, most media completely ignored each and everything the CD did or said and they only reported negative issues about the party and

---

11 http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/ 02-03-2006
12 http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/ 02-03-2006
its members. Many members were successfully accused for racism or criminality and the party wasn’t able to speak with one clear voice to the potential voters.

Fortuyn however took maximum advantage of all the media attention he got. First of all, he had a weekly column in a big magazine, he was guest speaker in a weekly business-program on TV and when Fortuyn joined national politics almost every TV-show was willing to interview him. With his common language, his controversial style and his charisma, Fortuyn got a lot of attention of the people in the Netherlands and he became more and more popular. Pim Fortuyn had also the luck that some rich businessmen supported his campaign financially.

7.4 Social Constructivism

By studying the cases of the RRPP in the Netherlands and Denmark it has become clear that ‘mobilisation’ by the ‘supply’ has been extremely important especially in the case of the LPF. The case study shows that there is and has been a quite big RRPP ‘demand’ in the Netherlands that however never was ‘mobilised’ by the right’ supply’ until the LPF came up. The interesting question however is, which percentage of the LPF voters in 2002 had already radical right populist identities before Pim Fortuyn entered the political arena and what percentage changed their political preferences due to the ‘persuasion’ of Pim Fortuyn. Research has shown that Fortuyn mobilised a big amount of RRPP ‘demand’ that already existed but now finally had a chance to express their political preferences. There is however little research evidence that Fortuyn managed to change other peoples political preferences with his ‘persuasion’. Although, Fortuyn got a certain amount of votes from former PvdA voters, most votes for the LPF came from, protest voters, extreme right, voters who never voted before and from people who used to vote for VVD and CDA, and who thus probably already were having radical right populist identities. This study isn’t therefore of help to prove the ‘second function’ of ‘mobilisation’. Checkel already acknowledged that identity changes due to persuasion by politicians are not very likely to occur, and this case study seems to support this.

13 http://www.parlement.com/9291000/modulesf/g61leshz
8. Conclusions

In this essay I have tried to prove my hypothesis that the success of RRPP depends on three different elements ‘supply’, ‘demand’ and ‘mobilisation’. To this theoretical model I have added different factors that contribute to the creation of radical right populist ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ in order to be able to analyse the theory. I have tested this theoretical model on the different political-parties in Denmark and the Netherlands, (FP, DF, CD and the LPF) that I classified as RRPP at the beginning of the essay. Moreover, the theory of social constructivism has been analysed but apart from a possible second function of the element ‘mobilisation’, this theory hasn’t given us extra tools or insights to be able to solve the research question.

The situation in Denmark has given good support for my hypothesis. The success of *Fremskridtspartiet* in the 70’s gives support for the theory since all the factors ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ were present. The changes in the different factors of the ‘supply’ during the 80’s and 90’s however give support for my model as well, since the party became less and less successful due to these changes in the ‘supply’. Moreover, the great success of *Dansk Folkeparti* during the last decade, shows the existence of radical right populist elements ‘demand’, ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ as well because the particular factors that cause radical right populist ‘demand’, supply’ and ‘mobilisation can be found.

The situation in the Netherlands however could give us an even better support for the hypothesis since the success of RRPP changed here and by analysing the different elements and factors, the theory could be tested quite well. Before the rise of the LPF in 2002, no any radical right populist party has been successful even though factors can be found that contribute to the creation of radical right populist ‘demand’. The sudden rise of the LPF in 2002 gives a proof for this as well since the factors that influence radical right populist ‘demand’ hadn’t changed that much until than, but the LPF was successful at once anyway. The ‘supply’ and ‘mobilisation’ however had changed a lot and were very different at that moment than they had been before. In contrary to the LPF, the CD didn’t have a good ‘mobilisation’, and at the time of the LPF, there were much more typical factors that contribute to a successful radical right populist ‘supply’ than during the 20 years before with the CD. The LPF had a well structured political programme, mainstream parties had moved to the political middle and it was doing well in the polls. The CD in contrary was more or less a on-issue party, had concurrence form the moderate right and was never a big party, not even in the polls. The statement that successful RRPP not only depends on ‘demand’ but also on ‘mobilisation’ and ‘supply’ is moreover supported by the fact that the LPF collapsed again after the dead of Fortuyn and thus its charisma and the positive media attention disappeared and the party turned out too be a bad-structured and bad organised party.

Although it is hard to prove a theory by a small case study like this, this essay has showed at least that the success of RRPP depends not only on the political identities of the people (demand) but probably even more on factors like the political situation and party structure (supply) and on the charisma of party leaders and the role of the media (mobilisation).
8.1 Future research

Because of the limited amount of pages a deeper research on social constructivism haven’t been possible. The function of ‘mobilisation’ as a ‘persuader’ for the ‘supply’ is a very interesting issue which is worth deeper analyses. Further more, an analysis of the situation in Sweden with the help of the model used in this essay would be very interesting since RRPP has hardly been successful in Sweden the last decades although the political, social and economical circumstances seem to be similar to a country like Denmark where RRPP is quite successful.
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