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ABSTRACT

The recent upsurge of electoral success from the Brexit Leave campaign and Donald Trump’s presidential campaign 2016, confirm that populist politics has taken a greater role in Europe and in the U.S. The purpose of this research is to see to what extent each of the two campaigns are populist, and whether their statements are similar to each other. This will increase further knowledge about the populist phenomenon and its complexity. Hence, comparative analyses of six speeches from Brexit’s Leave campaign and Trump’s presidential campaign have been conducted through the framework of Mudde’s minimal definition of populism. The results show that both campaigns have populist features and that they have some commonalities, but still vary in the details, due to the countries’ historical, social and economic backgrounds. The two campaigns’ representatives are using similar populist strategies in order to reach their audiences. It is further recommended to expand this research and examine Trump’s presidency and its impacts with the UK’s process of leaving and its outcomes, which will provide further understanding of the populist upsurge as well as its consequences.
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1. Introduction
1.1 Problem Statement & Research Question(s)

Populism has recently attracted many social and political researchers in the scientific world. It is a concept that is both widely used and widely contested. The increased interest is mainly because populist politics have recently gained prominence across the world. Additionally, it is worth reevaluating literature on populist politics, not only because of its occurrence in the latest social science literature, but also because “populism does leave an imprint on important political phenomena”. What makes populist politics important for research is its influence on the political sphere. It has the ability to stimulate new forms of political commitment at a time of decline in political participation such as voting and party membership. It can erode democratic institutions and create instability between parties. It is also related to political polarization, and may under certain circumstances push party systems into a collapse. Lastly but not least, populist politics creates political changes where moral boundaries between groups and categories such as ‘us’ and ‘them’ arise.

In this context, it is clear that populism is a concept of ‘contextual sensitivity’. What has so far been produced is research focused on populist actors within a single case. Consequently, researchers have not yet managed to create a systematic approach to empirically measure populist behavior cross-regionally. This further means that less research has been done on populist actors using a comparative approach, mainly because it is complex to analyze comparatively. However, Cas Mudde and Rovira Kaltwasser argue that it is possible despite its complexity. What one must do is to define populism with a ‘minimal definition’, making the definition wide enough to address cases that are otherwise relatively different.

Furthermore, interest in populist research has increased because there has been an upsurge of populist actors in all parts of the world. 2016 is considered as “the golden year” for many populist actors, and it appears this populist rise will continue on the same path in 2017 and beyond. Two clear examples that have arguably received most attention are the American presidential election of 2016, and Britain’s EU referendum of the same year. What

---

5 Laclau, E. 2005.
many perhaps hoped not would happen actually happened; Donald Trump, with his populist agenda, was elected as president, and took office on January 20, 2017. Meanwhile, on June 23rd 2016, the majority of the British population voted to leave the EU. Britain is thus to be the first member state to leave the EU. Both of their campaigns reveal clearly populist elements, which makes it worth comparing the campaigns with each other to see to what extent they are populist, and if the campaigns share any particular similarities. Exploring this would not only contribute to the understanding of what has been said during the campaigns, and what the two campaigns actually contain, but also whether populist phenomena have cross-regional similarities. This could hopefully contribute new knowledge to the study of populism, its complexity, as well as consideration of populism in comparative context.

It is, however, important to clarify that I do not aim to compare the phenomenon of Brexit with Trump. Instead, I look at these as two recent phenomena or political happenings, which have been widely labeled as populist, both in popular and academic discourse. My aim is rather to consider to what extent Mudde’s definition of populism in fact fits with what is more widely (or popularly) considered being populist. I thus aim to ‘test’ the two phenomena or political happenings against Mudde’s definition. The purpose of this research is therefore to explore and compare the extent to which speeches by each campaign’s primary representatives contain directly or indirectly populist statements, and whether said statements share similarities across both campaigns. This is done using Mudde’s minimal definition of populism (since a minimal definition makes it possible to compare populist actors cross-regionally). Hence, the central research question is as follows:

- What are the main commonalities and differences between Donald Trump’s presidential campaign and the Brexit Leave campaign, as expressions of populist politics?

In order to answer the central research question above, two sub-questions have also been formulated:

- To what extent do statements in the key speeches from the Brexit Leave campaign correspond to Mudde’s minimal definition of populism?
- To what extent do statements in the key speeches from Trump’s presidential campaign correspond to Mudde’s minimal definition of populism?
1.2 Background

In the following section, a brief description of Brexit and Donald Trump will be provided. This is done partly to increase understanding of their origins, but also in order to get a deeper knowledge about their campaigns and the reason for their emergence.

1.2.1 Understanding the Brexit

The referendum on Britain’s EU membership, European Union Membership Referendum 2016, was an advisory British referendum about whether Britain should remain or leave the previous European Community, i.e. today’s EU. The vote was conducted on June 23, 2016, and the result showed that a majority of British citizens, i.e. 51.9 per cent, voted to leave.7

Historically, this is not a new phenomenon. Ever since Britain became a member of the EU in 1973, they have questioned whether to continue as a part of it. It was, however, not until 1975 that a referendum was held about its EU membership, whereby the results showed that 67 per cent were in favor and 32 per cent were against.8 Regardless of the results to remain in the EU, it still seems the uncertainty that has existed from the outset has not yet disappeared. This is demonstrated by the former Prime Minister David Cameron’s assurance in 2013, when he promised to organize a referendum on continued membership if his party, the Conservative Party, would take office. After the victory in 2015 he kept his promise and announced on February 20, 2016, that the EU referendum would be held on June 23, 2016. Cameron strategically thought that this referendum would hinder the threat of the UKIP (UK’s Independence Party) to overtake in the parliamentary elections.9 He further believed that the EU referendum would unite the Conservative Party even further, since its party members were divided in this particular “EU membership” matter. He also repeatedly stated that the result of this EU referendum would be followed, even though British referendums in general are only advisory.10

The final result showed that 51.9 per cent voted to leave the EU and 48.1 per cent voted to stay. The EU referendum attracted a record of vote participants seeing that approximately 46.5 million British citizens registered to vote. However, the results were differentiated
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7 EU Referendum Results. “Logo the Independent Body which oversees Elections and Regulates Political Finance in the UK.” The Electoral Commission, 2016
depending on which region it was. In London for instance, all but five electoral constituencies voted to stay, i.e. 59.9 per cent; meanwhile, in Northern Ireland 55.7 per cent voted to leave. The referendum also showed clear differences between age groups voters between ages 18 to 24 voted to stay, while a clear majority of all the people from 50 years and older voted to leave.¹¹

The days after the EU referendum, several changes were to be made. For instance, David Cameron announced that he would resign as Prime Minister. He believed that someone more suitable should lead Britain in the process of negotiating an agreement with the EU in connection with Britain’s exit. On June 29, 2016, five people had signed up as candidates for taking over the party leadership. Amongst those interested were the Home Secretary Theresa May, the Justice Secretary Michael Gove, as well as, London’s former mayor Boris Johnson.¹² On July 4th, UKIP’s leader Nigel Farage resigned as party leader, since the referendum results fulfilled much of the party’s policies. On July 13th, Theresa May was elected as the new party leader for The Conservatives as well as the new British Prime Minister. She was seen as a compromise candidate. Even though she was previously a “Remain” advocate, May announced that she accepted the referendum result and then appointed “Leave” representative Boris Johnson as the new Foreign Minister.¹³

Furthermore, on October 2, 2016, Theresa May announced that she planned to trigger Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty in March 2017. The country’s exit from the EU will thereafter automatically take place two years later, unless the other EU members unanimously decide upon something else. May formally notified Britain’s intention of withdrawal under Article 50 through a letter handed over by the UK Ambassador to the President of the European Council on March 29, 2017.¹⁴

Against this background, the EU referendum that was held on June 23, 2016, was an event that produced a lot of demands and changes that are still in progress today. The referendum result has confirmed that the EU referendum and its impacts will most likely influence the EU’s future cohesion, and thus affect all its member states. As argued by Steven Blockmans: “Brexit sets a precedent for disgruntled electorates in other nations to rescind

¹¹ EU Referendum Results. 2016.
¹³ Ibid.
their respective political, legal and economic arrangements and to build walls against the perceived negative forces of globalization.”\textsuperscript{15} He states that the British EU referendum has thus influenced other EU member states, which are now calling for “In/Out” referenda in their own countries.\textsuperscript{16}

1.2.2 Understanding Donald Trump

Donald Trump became politically active in the late 1980s. On October 7, 1999, it was confirmed that he tried to get nominated as a candidate of the Reform Party for the presidential election in 2000.\textsuperscript{17} On January 1, 2000, Trump launched his campaign book “The America We Deserve”. Trump discussed Usama Bin Laden, and argued that a major terrorist attack would happen in the near future in the U.S., therefore he believed that he was the perfect presidential candidate because he can “sense things”. He further highlighted problems with illegal immigration, describing the country’s immigration policy as dumb and disrespectful.\textsuperscript{18} On February 14, 2000, Trump withdrew his candidacy following a failed primary election and disputes within the party.\textsuperscript{19}

Trump’s dissatisfaction with the Obama administration in 2012 made him decide to run in the presidential election in 2016. On June 16, 2015, during a speech at the Trump Tower in NYC, Trump announced his candidacy for the 2016 presidential election in the Republican’s primary election. In the speech, Trump focused on issues such as illegal immigration, offshoring of US jobs, the US government’s debts and terrorism, all of which later became key issues in his election campaign. He also presented his campaign as “Make America Great Again”. During his presidential campaign, Trump portrayed himself as one of the ‘people’ against the ‘establishment’. He argued that the system was rigged against him and the American citizens, and that his campaign should rather be seen as a movement.\textsuperscript{20} On November 8, 2016, Donald Trump won the presidential election over his opponent, the Democratic Party candidate Hillary Clinton. He received over 62 million votes, which is the highest result a Republican candidate has ever received. On January 20, 2017, Trump was

\textsuperscript{15} Blockmans, Steven. "Brexit, Globalisation and the Future of the EU.” Intereconomics 51, 4: 182.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid: 182-183.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
installed as the 45th President of the USA when he succeeded the Democrats Barack Obama.\textsuperscript{21}

1.3 Social & Scientific Significance

It is a critical time for the study of populism. The recent rise of populism has thus become a global interest in the past year, mostly due to the upsurge of populist parties, movements and actors across the world. For example, populist leaders such as Marine Le Pen, Nobert Hoffer, Nigel Farage, and Geert Wilders are, amongst others, all prominent figures representing populist politics that surely will have a certain impact within the political sphere at the domestic, national, as well as the international level, if or when they win the public vote.

This upsurge has, however, led to the difficulty of defining populism in its entirety, especially since it is concluded that populist movements have arisen because of different reasons. Taki S. Pappas argues that each populist party, movement or actor within a country/region has occurred due to the country’s or region’s specific economic, social and political status, which all have been shaped by the country’s or region’s historical circumstances.\textsuperscript{22} This further demonstrates the complexity with comparing populism cross-regionally and why scholars have had difficulty finding a common definition between these populist phenomena. Nevertheless, many scholars, including Mudde and Kaltwasser,\textsuperscript{23} have concluded that one should not believe that it is impossible to compare them, rather, it is an encouragement to do so as they can bring new perspectives that can be crucial to the study, as well as, to the understanding of populism as a whole. One such example is Mudde’s statement that there seem to be a similar pattern between populist phenomena across the world such as citizens’ dissatisfaction about the establishment. He states that citizens that vote for populist parties is primarily due to the strong feeling that they are out of priority by the elite.\textsuperscript{24} This is surely one of many contributing factors to the understanding of what populism is in a cross-regional context.

\textsuperscript{22} Pappas, T. S. 2016.
\textsuperscript{23} See Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C., R. 2011.
\textsuperscript{24} See Mudde, C. 2004: 542–563.
As mentioned previously, 2016 seem to be the golden year of populism, seeing that Trump won the presidential election, and that the UK has voted to leave the EU. Both of these political happenings are most likely to have a major impact at the global level, when they enter into force. Since these two particular events are very current, it is thus hard to predict what consequences that may follow. Furthermore, Trump’s presidential campaign and the UK’s EU referendum have both been widely discussed in the public debate and have been considered as two political happenings being labeled as two populist victories. This makes it interesting to see whether their labeled ‘populist characters’ really are as populist as the public debate portrays them to be. This research thus aims to put it into test, scientifically, by the use of Mudde’s minimal definition of populism.

In addition, I am of the opinion that if I examine their campaigns and what statements they contain, I will be able to understand to what extent they are populist and if their populist statements share the same view. This will not only increase knowledge about populism cross-regionally, but it will also enable me to draw conclusions on whether their supporters voted for these campaigns because of similar reasons. I thus believe that the study of the two campaigns will contribute to further knowledge about populism. I also believe that the findings will form a good basis on which to start thinking about contemporary populism in a global context, and why it seems to expand and increase voting support. Because so far, there has been little comparative research that could offer a generalized answer to what is actually causing the continuing populist rise. The chosen framework of this research is designed to seek answers in order for future research, within similar contexts, to be able to use the results drawn here and continue to clarify the complexity of populism in a comparative context.
2. Prior Work on Populism

Recently, a populist upsurge has been visible in different parts of the world, and for that reason populism has gained greater prominence in academic and policy research, especially due to the recent success of populist parties and leaders.\(^{25}\) It is, however, important to mention that populism has existed for a longer period of time, and the earliest studies on populism originated in the late 1960s. Pappas explains that populism has occurred in at least four distinct waves, and scholars studying this phenomenon have proved that each wave alone corresponds to a particular timeframe consisting of economical and sociopolitical events that have influenced and thus caused an upsurge of populism at the time.\(^{26}\)

The concept of ‘populism’ is both extensively used and extensively contested.\(^{27}\) It has been defined on the basis of political, social, economic and discursive countenances,\(^{28}\) and has been analyzed from different theoretical perspectives, such as structuralism, post-structuralism, modernization theory, social movement theory, party politics, political psychology, political economy and democratic theory.\(^{29}\) It has also been analyzed using different methodological approaches, such as qualitative content analysis, discourse analysis and formal modeling.\(^{30}\) As argued by Wiles: “to each his own definition of populism, according to the academic axe he grinds”.\(^{31}\)

Although the study of populism has advanced significantly in recent years, and is today one of the most popular areas of study within academic research, it still suffers from theoretical and methodological shortcomings. This has resulted in issues with how to establish general agreement as to what constitutes this phenomenon.\(^{32}\) Populism research lacks a coherent theory and a systematic approach that can be applicable and relevant to all liberal democracies currently found across the world.\(^{33}\) For instance, Ionescu and Gellner questioned whether populism should be seen as a unitary concept or not. They did this by asking if populism should best be described as an ideology, i.e. a “recurring mentality appearing in different historical and geographical contexts as the result of special social

\(^{26}\) Pappas, T. S. 2016.
\(^{27}\) Gidron N., & Bonikowski B. 2013: 1.
\(^{28}\) Weyland, K. 2001: 1.
\(^{29}\) Gidron, N. & Bonikowski, B. 2013: 1.
\(^{30}\) Ibid: 1.
\(^{31}\) Ibid: 2.
\(^{33}\) Papas, T., S. 2016.
situations faced by societies in which the middle social factors were either missing or too weak”. 34 Other scholars have elaborated on this, asking whether populism should be included under categories such as nationalism, socialism, or peasantism. 35 For instance, Canovan created a typology of populism consisting of two categories; agrarian populism and political populism. These two were further divided into seven subcategories, though what these had in common was left for the reader to ponder. 36 In response, Taggart argued that Canovan’s conceptualization of populism should be seen as “the most ambitious attempt to get to grips with populism”37, but that she, amongst others, still fails to propose a common core of the populist phenomenon in terms of how she conceptualized it. 38

Berlin et al. created a more restricted definition using only six characteristics, emphasizing the importance of the people and the rejection of the elite. They further determined that modernization should be seen as one of the contributing factors that may provoke the upsurge of populism within a society.39 In contrast to Berlin et al., Mény and Surel argue that the characteristics of populism can be divided into three elements, starting with ‘the people’, which they argue is the focal point of populism. They further explained that the existing horizontal cleavages (left-right) within societies are causing the exclusion of certain groups such as immigrants. They also noted that populist politicians claim the elite is betraying ‘the people’ through corruption and power misuse, and therefore they have the intention to replace the current elite with populist leaders who would act for the good of the people, and not for personal benefits.40 Taggart agreed with the definitions that Mény and Surel made, and elaborated upon them further. In his definition of populism, ‘the people’ is central and identified with a ‘heartland’, which represents an idealized conception of the community to which they belong.41 The second feature is the antagonism toward a constructed ‘other’, which Panizza also highlighted in his study of populism.42 Moreover, Taggart concludes that the hostility towards representative politics is another central

34 Ionescu, G., & Gellner, E. eds. 1969: 3.
37 Taggart, P. 2000: 18.
38 Diewiks, C. 2009: 2.
42 Panizza, F. 2005.
characteristic, and therefore stated that populist politicians claim that ‘representative’ politics is used by ‘the elite’ in order to steal the power from the people.\textsuperscript{43}

Hence, through the discussion of these properties of populism, one can illustrate the confusion that automatically arises in the study and understanding of the populist phenomenon. Thus, the potentially problematic aspect of populism as a scientific concept is its ‘contextual sensitivity’.\textsuperscript{44} For instance, populist actors in Latin America are defined by different populist features than European populists, whilst populists in Italy are distinguishable from populists in France or other European countries with populist movements.\textsuperscript{45} This further complicates the difficulty in determining how to best clarify populism as a concept. Consequently, scholars and researchers have not yet managed to create a systematic approach to empirically measure populism in different cases and over time. What has been produced thus far is research emphasizing a single case, as the scholars mentioned above have done. Hence, a systematic and comparative approach is still lacking, which is problematic considering that this research intends to compare two cross-regional cases in the context of populism.

However, the available literature on the subject can be seen to converge towards three core characteristics of populism, which are considered to provide a justifiable conceptual and analytical unity. This research therefore seeks to provide new insights on how to potentially compare different cases in the context of populism, i.e. cross-regionally, and over time. Mudde and Kaltwasser believe that this is possible, as long as the operationalization of populism is justifiable.\textsuperscript{46}

\subsection*{2.1 The Concept of Populism}

As will now be outlined, in this research populism as a phenomenon will primarily be conceptualized through Mudde’s minimal definition of populism. Hence, the theoretical framework will firstly introduce how the conceptualization will be made, and further discuss why the chosen characteristics are thought to be the most appropriate ones, why they are interrelated with each other, and lastly, how they will be applied in my analysis of the two

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{43} Taggart, P. 2002: 69f. \\
\textsuperscript{44} Rooduijn, M. 2013: 54. \\
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid: 72. \\
\textsuperscript{46} See Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C., R. 2011.
\end{flushleft}
campaigns. The research aims to provide further insight into what populism as a phenomenon is, and if there are new aspects that emerge when it is measured cross-regionally and over time.

2.2 A Comparative Approach

Scholars have concluded that populism can be defined as an ideology, a strategy or a discursive style, all of which can be applied to different populist actors.\(^{47}\) Depending on the actor, the situation and the region, existing literature provides a variety of understandings about the complexity of the populist phenomenon. Hence, it becomes clear why most of the definitions are limited to one specific geographically selected case. As argued by Pappas, this is mainly because each country/region has experienced its own unique historical, political, economic and social influences, all of which have contributed to the country’s/region’s social structure.\(^{48}\) Hence, using populism as a concept in comparative studies is quite hard to do. However, it does not mean it is unachievable to carry out cross-regional comparisons; rather it demonstrates that it is important to operationalize populism thoroughly, making it possible to apply the concept to cross-regional comparisons, as this research intends to. This approach is indeed supported by existing work by Mudde and Kaltwasser.\(^{49}\)

Mudde and Kaltwasser argue that, despite the amount of country-specific academic and non-academic research on populist leaders and movements, it is still possible to do comparative analysis cross-regionally. It is of course difficult to find cross-regional patterns, due to the many differences offered within each state and region.\(^{50}\) As explained by Mudde and Kaltwasser: “a cross-regional comparison is often like comparing apples with oranges”.\(^{51}\) Although there is significant uneasiness when doing research of a comparative nature, Mudde and Kaltwasser argue that it is sometimes favorable, as potential gains from cross-regional comparisons may appear which would not be detected from an examination of only one case. By observing a phenomenon out of its own context, one could potentially develop new insights about the phenomenon itself. Cross-regional comparison can therefore help to explain generic aspects of populism, i.e. possible common elements amongst all definitions of the populist phenomenon. It can also shed light on the diverse characteristics that each

\(^{48}\) Pappas, T., S. 2016.
\(^{50}\) Ibid: 1.
\(^{51}\) Ibid: 1.
definition of populism has, which can further contribute to a clearer depiction of the complexity of populism.\textsuperscript{52}

Mudde and Kaltwasser further argue that populism as an ideology can best be understood in comparison with its counterparts, i.e. other ideologies. Thus, the reasons populism has similar ideological features to other ideologies is mostly due to the sociopolitical context in which it finds itself.\textsuperscript{53} The authors further propose that the consolidation of populism is influenced by national, regional and historical circumstances.\textsuperscript{54} Thus, before it is possible to compare potentially populist features of Trump’s presidential campaign with the Brexit ‘leave’ campaign, one must first determine what populism is and what it is not. Hence, a clear definition of the concept of ‘populism’ must be made before it is possible to use it as an analytical tool, which I will do in section 3: Analytical Framework.

2.3 A Minimal Definition of Populism

Ruth Berins Collier has noted that populism tends to carry a negative connotation in both scientific and public debate. Therefore, it is not an exaggeration to argue that populism is usually seen as a precarious concept, for example in emphasizing the idea of ‘sovereignty of the people’, which consequently excludes ethnic minorities and the erosion of horizontal accountability. In short, defining populism is a challenge, not only because of the lack of consensus on core features, but also because of the normative assumptions of populism.\textsuperscript{55} So how can we develop a concept of populism that overcomes the normative and regional prejudices?

Mouzelis distinguishes three approaches for better defining populism. The first approach includes comprehending all the different definitions of populism at the expense of finding all the features they have in common. The second approach is to find a base definition of a prototype, i.e. one of the most oft-mentioned features; meanwhile, the third approach indicates an effort to build more inclusive definitions, which can account for most of the movements conventionally labeled as populist.\textsuperscript{56} Furthermore, the second approach is

\textsuperscript{52} Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C., R. 2011: 2-4.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid: 1.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid: 1.
\textsuperscript{55} Collier, R., B. 2001.
\textsuperscript{56} Mouzelis, N. 1985: 329.
close to Sartori’s concept of ‘minimal definitions’.\textsuperscript{57} The minimal definition approach has as its starting point to only incorporate those core features of a phenomenon that are argued to be the most essential in order to describe it, and to subsequently create a concept. This means the minimal definition has a high level of abstraction, since it does not include too many features. A minimal definition can therefore be applied in different cases, and in such manner as to make a phenomenon more comparable. This research will thus make use of Sartori’s minimal definition approach, and by extension Mudde’s minimal definition of populism, which sees populism as “a thin-centered ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogenous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite’, and which argues that politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people”\textsuperscript{58}

Mudde explains that the core aspects of the minimal definition of populism are, first and foremost, the focus on ‘the pure people’ and its sovereignty, e.g. the general will, and second, the antagonism between ‘the pure people’ and its ‘other’, e.g. the corrupt elite.\textsuperscript{59} However, it is important to mention that ‘the pure people’ and ‘the corrupt elite’ do not define populism per se, what defines it, is the conflict between the two. It is the conflict itself turns on a set of demands that the populists make of the elite; these demands are what the populists believe the establishment will be indisposed to grant the people.\textsuperscript{60} Moreover, both categories are thus to a certain extent ‘empty signifiers’,\textsuperscript{61} as it is the populists who constructs the exact meaning or definition of ‘the corrupt elite’ and ‘the pure people’.\textsuperscript{62} Canovan explains this by arguing that populism is based on a moral distinction between ‘the pure people’ and ‘the corrupt elite’, whereas the former is a homogeneous and virtuous community and the latter as a homogeneous but pathological entity. Populists have thus different perspectives when they define or specify who belongs to ‘the pure people’ and who belongs to ‘the corrupt elite’.\textsuperscript{63} Equally important, the moral distinction between the two is the appeal to the general will. What is often mistaken is that populism is not about attacking the elite and defending the interest of the people; but rather populism is about the idea that the people of a given community should be able to unify their wills with the aim of proclaiming popular sovereignty as the only legitimate source of political power. This is what Mudde and

\textsuperscript{58} Mudde, C. 2004: 543.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{60} Judis, B., J. 2016.
\textsuperscript{61} Laclau, E. 1977.
\textsuperscript{62} Stanley, B. 2008.
\textsuperscript{63} Mudde, C. & Kaltwasser, C., R. 2012: 151.
Kaltwasser define as populist, i.e. a set of ideas about how politics should function according to populism.64

It is thus concluded that populism is a thin-centered ideology that has three core concepts such as the pure people, the corrupt elite and the general will. What is also important to mention is the fact that these three concepts represent the necessary criteria for defining something that is populist. Mudde and Kaltwasser explain that all of these three must be present in order to categorize a phenomenon as ‘populist’.65 Hence, for example, actors or parties that employ only anti-elitist rhetoric should not be categorized as populist.66

Furthermore, these three features conceived by Mudde seem to be three definitional bases that can help conceptualize the phenomenon. They can further enable a comparative analysis to achieve an academic consensus. Hence, using the minimal definition of populism will help my research to apply populist definitions to the empirical cases, which will further allow me to determine to what extent and in what way the two chosen cases are populist. The minimal definition approach provides a firmer grasp of what populism is, and thus creates a theoretical discussion that will be less confusing. These concepts, following Mudde’s minimal definition of populism, are presented below.

64 See Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C., R. 2011.
3. Analytical Framework: Core Characteristics of Populism

My research will consist of a cross-tabulation analysis, which will help to distinguish what kind of populist features the two cases have and do not have. However, before a cross-tabulation can be made, the characteristics of populism must be distinguished and introduced. These characteristics are argued to be the most common features previous scholars have operationalized, on the basis of Mudde’s idea of ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite’ and the ‘general will’. The following section will explain the core characteristics of each concept in order to make the analytical framework as clear as possible.

3.1 The General Will

One of the three core concepts of Mudde’s minimal definition of populism is the notion of the general will. Populist actors and constituencies are often using this notion as a tactical strategy in order to reach out to the people and gain votes. This notion is closely linked to the famous philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s work. He distinguished the general will (volonté générale) from the will of all (volonté de tous) by arguing that the former is about the people’s ability to join together as a community in order to enforce their common interest and legislate it at the governmental level. In contrary, the latter refers to the people’s common and particular interest at a specific moment in time.

Furthermore, Mudde and Kaltwasser explain that populism’s moral distinction, between the pure people and the corrupt elite, strengthens the idea that a general will exists. Populist parties, movements and actors have therefore the tendency to often refer to the general will by arguing that the people’s common interest can only be legislated if the people form into a cohesive community. This notion is thus strongly linked to the other two core concepts, because populist actors often portray themselves as the ones representing the people’s or ‘the silent majority’s’ voice, by arguing about the failures of the corrupt elite. This further demonstrates that populist actors share the same critique of representative government, i.e. citizens are treated as ‘passive entities’, who are only mobilized occasionally when it is elections, in which they do only influence the policies by choosing their representatives.
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Hence, populist actors believe in direct democracy, or self-government. They therefore believe that the citizens are able to make the laws as well as execute them.\textsuperscript{71}

This additionally demonstrates that populist actors often criticize the establishment for their incapacity of prioritizing the people’s common interests. This critique is framed in a certain way. They do so by both aggregating different demands at the same time as they identify a common enemy. This further enables the formation of a popular subject with a strong identity, i.e. the pure people, who together with their general will can challenge the status quo, i.e. the corrupt elite. From this perspective, Mudde and Kaltwasser explain that populism can be seen as a democratizing force, since it puts the people at first and, especially their right of popular sovereignty against the political establishment.\textsuperscript{72}

In other words, as Abts and Rummens argue, the populist notion of the general will is about the people who should have an inalienable right to provide power, and all policies should be “based on the immediate expression of the general will of the people”.\textsuperscript{73} Populist actors thus commonly accuse the ruling elite of having deprived the people of their rights, and therefore make ‘the general will’ the central subject of any dispute. It is also this argument that makes populists believe that they are the only representatives who can restore the lacking popular sovereignty, by replacing the elite and all other representative and intermediary institutional arrangements that are considered to be part of the ruling elite.\textsuperscript{74}

3.2 The Pure People

‘The common people’ or, to use Mudde’s term, the ‘pure people’, is argued to be the most central concept within populism.\textsuperscript{75} As Jagers and Walgrave argue: “populism always refers to the people and justifies its actions by appealing to and identifying with the people”.\textsuperscript{76} As mentioned above, populists stand for the fact that people should have the right to sovereignty.\textsuperscript{77} Hence, ‘the people’ are argued to be ‘democratically sovereign’.\textsuperscript{78}
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Furthermore, ‘the people’ are seen here as a homogenous or monolithic group, who form a social unit or a community together. Taggart argues that populists portray the common people as individuals that act in accordance with common sense, and that they should be considered as ‘the silent majority’ within a society. This populist concept is part of a drive to give ‘the people’ the possibility to be heard above ‘the loud minority’.

According to Mudde, the people are “neither real nor all-inclusive, but are in fact a mythical and constructed subset of the whole population”. This artificial understanding of ‘the people’ is derived from the concept of ‘the heartland’, as first introduced by Taggart. Taggart describes ‘the heartland’ as an invented area which is ‘different from ideal societies or utopias because it sees populists casting their imaginative glances backwards in an attempt to construct what has been lost by the present’. In doing so, the populists are trying to develop a perspective consisting of a virtual place occupied by the pure people, which furthermore represent the center of the community that is excluding the marginal and extreme people. ‘The heartland’ is thus seen as the basis for populists’ engagement when it comes to ‘the people’. Moreover, it is defined as a society where the individual is a hard working, conservative, and a law-abiding citizen. This individual, who is a part of the ‘silent majority’, has a growing anger, and perceives society as being controlled by people including progressives, criminals and foreigners.

Considering the many different interpretations of ‘the pure people’, it is nearly impossible to find a single definition of the concept. As stated previously, they can mean different things depending on which context or circumstances they are in. Kriesi explains ‘the common people’ as being sovereign, or as Canovan defines them: a ‘united people’. The “distinguishing feature of the people as sovereign is the people as the demos”, which further includes all people in a nation being in opposition to fragmentation. “The people could also be understood from a cultural perspective, whereas the common people is

---
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understood as a nation or as ‘our people’

91, and differs in an ethnic sense between those who belong and those who do not belong, therefore excluding people that are not considered part of the ‘national community’, such as immigrants, people of another race, criminals, religious and other minorities, all of whom are seen to threaten the ‘purity’ of the people.92 ‘The pure people’ can also be portrayed based on economic aspects, which describe people in terms of ‘class differentiations’, such as ‘the ordinary people’ and ‘the big shots’, the latter meaning the privileged, educated elite. The former group is seen as the oppressed people, whilst the latter is exploiting these people.93 This complex concept is, according to Mudde, one of the core aspects of the minimal definition, because ‘the pure people’ is a concept that makes it easier to understand whether the peoples’ sovereignty is represented enough on the governmental level or not. This is mostly done by putting ‘the pure people’ against its other, i.e. ‘the corrupt elite’.94

3.3 The Corrupt Elite

In scholarly work dealing with populism, ‘the pure people’ are as being in opposition to what is most commonly summarized under the label ‘the elite’.95 The antagonistic relationship between these two concepts is essential for each type of populism, i.e. right-wing, left-wing and centrist populism.96 The pure people and the elite are argued to be from two different worlds, whereby the elite is self-centered and corrupt, which does not prioritize the interests of the people but primarily their own wellbeing. This is also mainly the reason populists argue ‘the elite’ should be seen as ‘the enemy of the people’.97 ‘The elite’ is also a concept that could be defined in different ways, depending on what context and circumstances it finds itself. Consequently, the definition of ‘the elite’ becomes problematic, and is thus argued to be diffuse and seen as a non-homogeneous group.98 ‘The elite’ can range from political, such as the ruling government or the political establishment, to economic, such as bankers and executives, as well as cultural, such as the media, or as intellectual, including scholars and authors. Lastly, it can be legal, such as courts or
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administrations. These different parts of ‘the elite’ have one thing in common; according to populists, the elite is argued to be a negative influence on society, and is therefore often portrayed as ‘corrupt’ and ‘manipulative’, or as ‘immoral’, ‘selfish’, ‘irresponsible’, and incompetent. ‘The elite’ is thus not genuine or rational, and definitely not good. Since it is the antagonist toward ‘the pure people’, ‘the corrupt elite’ is often accused of betraying its people, and that they are unable to fulfill the promises they have given and are thus the bigger reason why ‘the pure people’ is in an undesirable situation.

Furthermore, ‘the corrupt elite’ only thinks of itself and does not have a perception of what the people wants and desires. They are therefore argued to have abused the power they originally received from the people and have transformed it into something that is exploiting the democratic system. ‘The pure people’, who according to populists are to be seen as democratic and sovereign, have lost control over this power, and consequently this has led to the relationship between the pure people and the corrupt elite becoming a relationship of dependence. The elite exploits the pure people for their own profit at the expense of the people's sovereignty, which is another reason why populists often are pro-direct democracy rather than representative democracy.
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3.4 Cross-Tabulation Analysis

Beckman argues it is important to be sure which arguments, statements and/or representations in the selected material (the two campaigns’ speeches) you are looking for in order to be as clear as possible. My research will therefore create a cross-tabulation, which is a tool for reconstructing the idea system of the populist phenomenon. The core characteristics presented in the cross-tabulation will serve as ‘theoretical glasses’ when I analyse the speeches. Consequently, it will enable me to categorize the political messages from the speeches in relation to the core characteristics of populism in the created cross-tabulation. It then becomes possible to position the political messages from the speeches with the core characteristics of Mudde’s minimal definition. It will thereafter enable me to see assess to what extent the speeches are populist.

Furthermore, in the cross-tabulation, the left column consists of defined categories (Mudde’s minimal definition of populism), and the right column consists of questions asked towards the two campaigns. This will demonstrate what similarities and dissimilarities the two campaigns have in line with each core characteristic, and in comparison to each other. While these are the first steps of the analysis, the second step will then be to look at how the two campaigns line up alongside the theory in terms of populist visions. This will thereafter enable the answering of the research question(s) of this thesis.
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3.4.1 Cross-tabulation of the two campaigns based on Mudde’s minimal definition of populism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Characteristics</th>
<th>Populism</th>
<th>Brexit Leave Campaign</th>
<th>Trump’s Presidential Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The General Will** | - It is opposed to the current democratic representation of sovereignty of the people.  
- The rule of the people is crucial.  
- It promotes ‘direct democracy’.  
- Politics should be governed by the general will.  
- The elite should be replaced with populist leaders. | What do the speeches from Brexit ‘leave’ campaign argue about the ‘the general will’? | What do the speeches from Trump’s presidential campaign argue about ‘the general will’? |
| **The Pure People**  | - ‘The people’ are central.  
- Always prioritize ‘the pure people’ in their politics.  
- The pure people should have the right to sovereignty; they should be democratically sovereign.  
- The pure people are seen as homogenous.  
- They are the ‘silent majority’.  
- Dissatisfied with the ruling elite.  
- Often described in terms of a movement, a party or a charismatic leader.  
- Embodies the people in its politics.  
- Knows best for the people. | What do the speeches from Brexit ‘leave’ campaign argue about ‘the pure people’? | What do the speeches from Trump’s presidential campaign argue about ‘the pure people’? |
| **The Corrupt Elite** | - The pure people are the opposite of the ruling elite.  
- The elite is selfish and corrupt.  
- The elite is betraying the common people.  
- The elite is exploiting the current democratic system. | What do the speeches from Brexit ‘leave’ campaign argue about ‘the corrupt elite’? | What do the speeches from Trump’s presidential campaign argue about ‘the corrupt elite’? |
4. Research Design

4.1 Case Selection: The Brexit Leave Campaign & Trump’s Presidential Campaign as Cases of Populism

This research aims to test to what extent the statements from each campaign are populist and to distinguish whether they share similar/different core features. This is done by means of qualitative content analysis. Furthermore, Mudde states that the most common method when comparing political parties, movements and actors is qualitative content analysis. However, a qualitative analysis is more appropriate if the purpose is to bring forth the core ideological features of the material, which my research intends to do.\textsuperscript{114}

Jagers and Walgrave were two of the first scholars that managed to produce a systematic quantitative analysis of populism. They defined populism as a political communication style, and measured it with the help of an analysis of political party broadcasts by Belgian political parties.\textsuperscript{115} Even though Jagers and Walgrave contributed to new insights about how to measure populism, their study was still only applied to a single case. Rooduijn and Pauwels, who peer-reviewed this research, concluded that it is unknown whether this approach would work on cross-regional comparisons and other data than political party broadcasts. Additionally, they also argue that the reliability and validity was missing, which makes it questionable whether Jagers and Walgrave’s approach is replicable and measurable.\textsuperscript{116} Furthermore, Hawkins used a similar approach, whereby he conceptualized populism as a political discourse, and measured it with the help of a holistic grading of speeches by chief executives from Latin America. Holistic grading means that the material is examined holistically in order to see if it has too many or too few errors compared to another anchor paper. In this case, Hawkins used an anchor paper, which he believed captured the core elements of the populist discourse.\textsuperscript{117} Rooduijn and Pauwels argue that the main issue with Hawkins’ approach is that it might not be possible to measure holistic classifications completely, which further raises questions about its validity.\textsuperscript{118}

My thesis differs in at least two important respects in comparison to Jagers and Walgrave’s research and Hawkins’ research. Firstly, it defines populism as a ‘thin-centered’
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ideology, through use of Mudde’s minimal definition of populism, which furthermore means that populism here neither is regarded as a political discourse nor a political style but as a set of ideas. This type of minimal definition, as argued by Gidron and Bonikowski, allows populism to frame “various social and political contexts, by different actors and through diverse mechanisms. Political parties and politicians may be populist, and this can be traced through their statements”\footnote{Gidron, N., & Bonikowski, B. 2016: 7.}, which this thesis intends to do. This will be elaborated on further in the following section.

4.2 Material: Criteria for Selecting Speeches

The minimal definition of populism as a thin-centered ideology emphasizes the importance of political statements as expression of populism used by certain actors. This is what I am to analyze, i.e. I am going to explore and compare the extent to which speeches by each campaign’s primary representatives contain directly or indirectly populist statements, and whether said statements share similarities across both campaigns. My choice to use speeches is based on two reasons. The first reason is that speeches, as primary sources from the two campaigns, are materials that provide a clear overview of what the actor/movement/party stands for, at the time it was stated. Speeches are also a way of direct communication between the speaker and the audience, which makes the speeches more persuasive and crucial. The speaker’s words are thus more loaded, since the aim is to convince the audience in order to increase one’s votes. Therefore, I believe that studying speeches instead of other material, such as debates, interviews and party programs, is more appropriate. The second reason is that speeches from the two campaigns can be seen as suitable material to analyze cross-regionally, as they are reasonably comparable between countries and over time.

4.2.1 Selection speeches from the two campaigns

I have restricted my speeches by focusing only on the prominent representatives in connection with the two campaigns. I used the Internet, more precisely Google, in order to identify the most relevant speeches. I did so by using terms as ‘Brexit’, ‘the EU referendum’, ‘Trump’s presidential campaign’ and ‘key speeches’, as my search tools. As for the official Leave campaign, it was easy to find key speeches since its official website had already pre-
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selected some of the prominent key speeches. One crucial thing I would like to mention is that it was hard to decide on which representatives to choose seeing that the official Leave campaign has several. I, therefore, collected the data by, first and foremost identifying which representatives that have been seen mostly in the public debate. I, thereafter, selected speeches from these primary representatives according to their topics, and chose the ones that I believed were the most reliable to analyze in order to answer my research question(s). I used a similar approach for Trump’s presidential campaign, except I did not have to choose its primary representatives, seeing that Trump is his own primary representative of his presidential campaign. However, it is important to mention that the consequences of using this approach increases the possibility that other essential information is being left out, which perhaps, could have strengthen the results of this research. Given that I aim to examine to what extent they are populist, I do not see a reason to include other information, since it may take me beyond the scope and purpose of my research. Moreover, as my research uses transcripts from each speech, I made sure that every translated speech was consistent with what was said in each video. In order to vary the data, I decided to use three speeches from each campaign, which I believe will balance the uneven number of representatives. I would have chosen more speeches, but given that I intend to perform a detailed analysis, six speeches are sufficient for the scope of the thesis. A larger study could account for a more extensive selection of material and due to the limited amount of words that can be used in this research; I believe that it is not possible to use more than six speeches. This further makes it important to select the most relevant speeches that can enable me to answer the research question(s).

The temporal demarcation in the selection extends from the time Trump announced his candidacy for president, June 16, 2015 and when David Cameron announced that the EU referendum will take place on February 20, 2016, and up to both dates on which voting took place. I argue that the variation of the chosen speeches is necessary to avoid the risk that a specific audience or situation affects the speeches. These speeches thus include valuable information that will enable my research to analyze both campaigns in a comparative matter in the context of populism. My research focuses in a smaller number of speeches because it intends to have a deeper character rather than being too broad and generalized, which is also the reason I chose the method of qualitative content analysis.

---

4.3 Method: Qualitative Content Analysis

Bryman and Bell argue that content analysis aims to analyze documents and texts by quantifying the content of the material in the creation of predetermined categories in a systematic and reproducible manner. Content analysis can therefore be an important component for quantitative research, as it is considered to be flexible and includes a wide range of usability. In contrast, Bryman and Bell argue that qualitative research is “the emphasizing of words rather than quantification in the collection and analysis of data”. As argued by Esaiasson et al., qualitative content analysis can help the researcher identify the main content of the chosen material. Through a careful reading of the chosen material, examining its parts, its totality, and the context in which it is found, the researcher can bring forth the most essential information of the material, which will both contribute to the formation as well as the regulation of the analysis. Using qualitative content analysis as a method is thus suitable in the sense that it reduces the amount of text, identifies categories, and discovers an understanding around them. As argued by Krippendorff: “It is a researcher technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the context of their use.”

This study will perform an in-depth analysis of Donald Trump’s presidential campaign and the official Leave campaign based on Mudde’s minimal definition of populism, in order to find similarities and dissimilarities in their standpoints. Through a careful reading of the selected material, it will thus be possible to bring forth their characteristics, such as what their political standpoints are. The separate components that will be identified will enable me to answer the overall research question: - What are the main commonalities and differences between Donald Trump’s presidential campaign and the Brexit ‘Leave’ campaign, as expressions of populist politics?

The first step of conducting qualitative content analysis is to raise a number of questions that can be used as analytical tools for the examined material. After clarifying what this study wants to find out, specific questions must be asked of the material. Given that this research first wants to find out what populist features the two campaigns have, the
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The questions asked will be derived from the categories created out of the conceptualized minimal definition on populism (see section 3.4). The second step is to organize and develop meaning from the data collected; by answering the questions created in the cross-tabulation analysis (see section 3.4.1), it is possible to draw conclusions about the analyzed material, and to answer the research question in light of the conceptualized minimal definition of populism as outlined in Chapter 3 (above).

4.4 Validity and Reliability

As my research also aims to see whether the conceptualization of populism created here can be employed cross-regionally, the validity and reliability become two important aspects to consider. Validity refers to the extent of which a test measures what we actually wish to measure and reliability refers to a measurement that supplies consistent results. Validity, in correlation to reliability, is more essential because if a research is not valid, it hardly matters if it is reliable. These two aspects play a crucial role when using qualitative content analysis, since “to stand on indisputable ground, content analysts must be confident that their data (a) have been generated with all conceivable precautions in place against known pollutants, distortions, and biases, intentional or accidental, and (b) mean the same thing for everyone who uses them”. As I was selecting the most relevant speeches from each campaign that I thought were suitable to put into test within the populist context, I thus argue that the validity of my research measures what it aims to measure. Hence, the reliability of the findings will be consistent.

Furthermore, in connection with hermeneutics, it is important to look at the material as impartially as possible. Bergström and Boréus believe that a researcher’s perception can affect the results that he/she gets when observing a given text. The discussions about Trump and Brexit are two contested subjects. Depending on what perspective the research is based on, it is important for the researcher to be aware of which lenses to apply. The aim is to relate to the text as neutrally as possible, which is achieved through a clear and structured approach to the processing of the selected data, as well as by selecting various primary representatives from both campaigns.

5. Analysis

In the first part of the analysis, each of the six campaign speeches will be viewed through Mudde’s minimal definition of populism. However, as in the theory section, I will continue to use other authors’ descriptions so that I can justify why I believe that the specific statements I decide to analyze can be correlated to Mudde’s definition. I will, however, only select certain statements of each speech that I think are crucial for this analysis research question(s). Hence, the first part of the analysis will answer the two sub-questions: To what extent do statements in the key speeches from the Brexit Leave campaign correspond to Mudde’s minimal definition of populism, and to what extent do statements in the key speeches from Trump’s presidential campaign correspond to Mudde’s minimal definition of populism?

In the second part, the findings from each speech will enable me to examine what commonalities and differences the campaigns have. This will be done through the use of the cross-tabulation analysis. It will then be possible for me to answer my central research question: What are the main commonalities and differences between Donald Trump’s presidential campaign and the Brexit Leave campaign, as expressions of populist politics? It is, however, important to note that there are many stances from both campaigns that are excluded in this analysis, partly due to the limited framework this thesis has, but also because certain expressed political standpoints are not relevant or sufficiently close to Mudde’s definition of populism.

5.1 To what extent do statements in the key speeches from the Brexit Leave campaign correspond to Mudde’s minimal definition of populism?

5.1.1 Speech 1: The Facts of Life Say Leave: Why Britain and Europe will be better off after we vote leave

Michael Gove is a British Conservative politician, and has been a Member of Parliament for Surrey Heath since 2005. He is also one of the founders of the official Leave campaign. He delivered this speech on April 19, 2016, whereby his main argument was that
Britain would be better without a EU membership. He does so by contrasting the Leave campaign with the In campaign.\textsuperscript{133}

\textit{The Pure People}: In connection to Mudde’s definition, populist actors have the tendency to refer to the people because it enhances their arguments becoming more powerful. It also becomes easier for the audience to relate to the statements because it is about them, which further increases the populist actors popularity.\textsuperscript{134} This populist view could be related to Gove’s speech since he expresses the idea about ‘the people’ throughout the whole speech, mostly by arguing that the British citizens will be better without a continuing integration with the EU. He does so by giving diverse examples of how leaving the EU would benefit the country and what consequences there may be if they vote to stay in the EU.

One of the examples is when he draws a comparison between the Leave and In campaign. He does so by portraying the Leave campaign being the only solution for Britain to have a good future, which would not happen if the Britons vote to stay. He says:

In contrast, the In campaign want us to believe that Britain is beaten and broken, that it can’t survive without the help of Jean-Claude Juncker and his Commission looking after us and if we dare to assert ourselves then all the terrors of the earth will be unleashed upon our head. It treats people like children, unfit to be trusted and easily scared by ghost stories.\textsuperscript{135}

This constructed idea could be viewed from two perspectives. First, it could be seen as Gove criticizes the In campaign for describing the Britons as ‘children’, which could make them offended seeing that it indirectly could define them as political inexperienced and ignorant. Second, it could be seen as Gove strategically portrays the In campaign not treating the Britons as they should be treated, i.e. giving them more influence within the political sphere. His expressions such as “it treats people like children”, and, “unfit to be trusted”, seems to construct the indirect idea that he puts the Britons’ interests at first in comparison to the In campaign. This example can further be connected to Mudde’s definition of ‘the pure people’ and the way Gove approaches his arguments could be connected to Jagers and Walgrave’s argument, that populism always refers to the people and justifies its actions by appealing to and identifying with the people.\textsuperscript{136}
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Another example that could be indirectly related to the people, is when Gove talks about the EU’s unsuccessful economic dynamism and social progress. He does so by giving facts of the EU’s failures in particularly Spain, Portugal and Greece. He says: “It’s a fact that youth unemployment in Spain is 45.3%, in Portugal it is 30.0%, and in Greece it is 51.9%. It’s a fact that in Spain, Portugal and Greece eurozone austerity policies have meant cutting spending on health, welfare and public services.”¹³⁷ He then continues to argue:

It’s a fact that euro bailouts have meant taxpayers money from across the EU has gone into paying off the bankers who got European nations into a mess in the first place. And yet we are somehow expected to believe that if Britain left the organization which gave us the economic disaster of the euro and turned the world’s richest continent into its slowest growing, that it’s this country which would be acting irrationally.¹³⁸

By portraying the EU’s economic and social policies as failure and giving examples as the ones mentioned above, could make Gove’s statements’ particularly strong. If an institution as the EU cannot provide with economic dynamism and social progress, which perhaps are two of the most important political issues for a citizen, the citizen will then automatically vote for someone that raises those concerns. Once again, Gove’s statements’ could be viewed from Mudde’s definition of ‘the pure people’. Gove’s way of winning the interest of the audience could be associated with Taggart’s argument about populists portraying the people as ‘the silent majority’ within a society.¹³⁹ From this perspective, Gove’s argument could indirectly be viewed as ‘the people’, in this case ‘the British citizens’ that will have the possibility to be heard above ‘the loud majority’, which in this case is the EU.

Another example that could be connected to the populist argument about ‘the silent majority’ is Gove’s emphasis on ‘taking back control’. As he says at the end of his speech: “Our vote to Leave will liberate and strengthen those voices across the EU calling for a different future - those demanding the devolution of powers back from Brussels and desperate for a progressive alternative.”¹⁴⁰ This statement could be linked to the populist view of ‘the pure people’ through Gove’s use of ‘the voices’; again, he seems to describe the British people, including others in the EU, as ‘the silent majority’ and that they are not being taken into consideration in the current EU policies. Hence, from Mudde’s definition, it could be viewed that a EU withdrawal will lead to a better representation of the British people. This would further lead them to no longer feel like ‘the silent majority’ or as ‘people like children’.

¹³⁸ Ibid.
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who constantly seem to be drowned out by ‘the loud majority’, i.e. the EU. In connection to this, Gove raises the issues that EU has somehow unsuccessfully managed to handle and how these issues have affected certain member states and how leaving the EU will lead to a better future:

For Greeks who have had to endure dreadful austerity measures, in order to secure bailouts from Brussels, which then go to pay off bankers demanding their due, a different Europe will be a liberation. For Spanish families whose children have had to endure years of joblessness and for whom a home and children of their own is a desperately distant prospect, a different Europe will be a liberation. For Portuguese citizens who have had to endure cuts to health, welfare and public services as the price of EU policies, a different Europe will be a liberation. For Italians whose elected Government was dismissed by Brussels fiat, for Danes whose opt-out from the Maastricht Treaty has been repeatedly overridden by the European Court, for Poles whose hard-won independence has been eroded by the European Commission, a different Europe will be a liberation. For Britain, voting to leave will be a galvanising, liberating, empowering moment of patriotic renewal.\(^{141}\)

Furthermore, even though the Leave campaign particularly talks about the British people, it seems like it also wants to raise interest in other countries in order to strengthen its arguments that the EU is a failing model and that there must be a change across all of Europe. As the examples mentioned above indicate as well, it seems like Gove formulates his arguments by using the phrasing ‘the elite’ as something bad, in this case the EU, in order to strengthen his statements. This could be linked to Mudde’s definition of ‘the corrupt elite’, which will be discussed below.

The Corrupt Elite: Gove seem to portray the EU as the primary elite that the Leave campaign is evidently against. He describes the EU as: ‘[a] multi-national federation with no democratically elected leader or Government, with policies decided by a central bureaucracy, with a mock parliament which enjoys no popular mandate for action, and with peripheries which are either impoverished or agitating for secession.’\(^{142}\) With that stated, Gove indirectly seems to argue that the EU is not democratic enough, and thus lacks coherence between its member states. As he describes it further: ‘It is hardly a model for either economic dynamism or social progress. Which is why we should not be surprised that the countries of the EU are proving neither particularly economically dynamic or socially progressive.’\(^{143}\) Once again Gove indicates that the EU’s way of governing is not focusing on issues that are probably more essential to its member states and its people, such as economics and social welfare. The way Gove describes the EU could be connected to the populist view of the elite, which in this
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case would be as Jagers and Walgrave argue, a political establishment being portrayed as a negative influence on the society.\textsuperscript{144} The reason behind Gove’s argument is that an organization like the EU should be seen as an anomaly and not a success. He continues this argument by comparing the EU with: “[A]ustralia-Hungary under the Habsburg, the Russian Empire under Nicholas the Second, Rome und its later Emperors or the Ottoman Empire in its final years”\textsuperscript{145}, and therefore concludes that the real danger is if the UK will decide to stay in the EU. This created image of the EU could be connected to Mudde’s definition about ‘the elite’ being accused for betraying its people\textsuperscript{146}, that they are unable to fulfill the promises they have given\textsuperscript{147} and are thus the bigger reason why ‘the people’ is in an undesirable situation.\textsuperscript{148} In conjunction to this perspective, it is indirectly understood that the Britons are in fact in an undesirable situation seeing that the EU referendum is taking place.

Later in his speech, Gove continues to explain what Britain’s future would look like if the Britons vote to stay in, by saying:

If we vote to stay, the EU’s bosses and bureaucrats will take that as carte blanche to continue taking more power and money away from Britain. They will say we have voted for ‘more Europe’. Any protests on our part will be met with a complacent shrug and a reminder that we were given our own very special negotiation and our own bespoken referendum and now we’ve agreed to stay in and that’s that.\textsuperscript{149}

Gove seem to explain that the Leave campaign is in opposition of further integration, or as he calls it, ‘more Europe’. In connection to the populist view, Gove’s standpoint could be understood as the EU is having too much power and influence on the UK, which is also the reason that the decision-making, on the national level, has become more complicated. One such example is the UK’s relation to the European Court of Justice (ECJ):

[t]he supreme court of the EU – can force us to submit to the judgment of others regardless of what our population, our parliament or even our own judges might think is right. It is a fact that the European Communities Act 1972, and subsequent judgments make clear that EU law, as decided by QMV and interpreted by the ECJ, trumps the decisions of, and laws passed by, democratically-elected politicians in Britain. Further, the European Court now has the perfect legal excuse to grab more power – the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which goes even further than the older post-war European Convention on Human Rights.\textsuperscript{150}
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This example could be connected to the Mudde’s definition about the corrupt elite. It seems like the EU has taken the people’s power, which has further led to that the Britons have lost their control.\textsuperscript{151} Another argument that Gove seems to think is crucial is: “[e]ver closer union offers no protection […]. The Court has the power and freedom to interpret the Treaties as it wishes - which are always in the service of greater European Integration, regardless of what our deal might say about “ever closer union.”\textsuperscript{152} The inclusion of the phrase has not been a driving factor in the EU’s expansion. Removing it makes no difference and will not stop the next EU power grab.” Not only does the ECJ have the supremacy to decide, but this also hinders Britain from having a say in it, which in the long run threatens the people’s sovereignty. This is also one of several examples, which Gove mentions in his speech about the deprived national power to supranational institutions. He therefore wonders: “How long before the ECJ uses other provisions in the Charter to erode even more of our independence?”\textsuperscript{153} And he continues: “It has consistently ignored and overruled anybody which stands in its way. Even decisions made and agreed by every EU state have been overturned if the court thinks they impede integration.”\textsuperscript{154} He concludes his statement about the EU by saying that if Britain decides to vote ‘Leave’, Britain will be able to: “Take back control.”\textsuperscript{155} This further indicates that Gove along with the other Leave campaigners believe that less integration, less Europe and more of self-government is what the UK needs in order to take back control, i.e. give the power back to the Britons.\textsuperscript{156} This argument could further be connected to Mudde’s definition of the general will, which is discussed below.

\textit{The General Will:} According to Mudde, the notion of the general will is that populist actors have the tendency to criticize the ruling elite by arguing that they have deprived the citizens sovereignty, or their ‘general will’. This further means that populist actors are often against representative governments because the citizens have only the power to influence the policies occasionally by election. They therefore believe in ‘direct democracy’ or ‘self-government’, because populist actors believe that citizens are able to participate in politics continuously.\textsuperscript{157} Furthermore, as the previous sections about Gove’s speech have demonstrated, the Leave campaign seem to have a dissatisfaction towards the EU and its incapacity of prioritizing the people’s common interest. One such example that could be
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strongly linked to the notion of the general will is Gove’s statement about self-government. He argues that in contrast to the In campaign, which according to him, seem to be against self-governing, is actually what the UK should be striving for.\textsuperscript{158} He says:

\textit{Democratic self-government, the form of Government we in Britain actually invented, has been a roaring success for most of the nations who’ve adopted it. While we enjoy democratic self-government we developed the world’s strongest economy, its most respected political institutions, its most tolerant approach towards refugees, its best publicly funded health service and its most respected public broadcaster.}\textsuperscript{159}

What he seems to portray is that the UK will in the long run gain economic growth, stronger control over global influence and the country’s borders. Furthermore, issues such as globalization, loss control of borders, the migration flow and the refugee crisis are issues that are, according to Gove, not dealt with on the supranational level and have thus caused unfavorable concerns on the domestic level.\textsuperscript{160} These concerns are what the Leave campaign seems to believe should be raised and highlighted in order for the EU to realize that it is time to make a change. Hence, Gove’s description of the EU’s regulation seems to portray the EU as a failed democratic model, which has negatively influenced its member states. This further creates the image of the Leave campaign being the representative of ‘the silent majority’s common interests, i.e. that the EU has failed as an organization. This reasoning could be linked to the notion of Mudde’s definition of the general will, where it has been clear that the Leave campaign portrays itself as the one representing the people and their common interest, which should be taken care of by the people themselves by voting ‘leave’ in order for the UK to have a better future. This is also something that Gove mentions in his speech. He says: “We would be starting a process, a happy journey to a better future. But, crucially, a journey where we would be in control, whose pace and direction would determine for ourselves. And whose destination we could choose […] Leaving means a fresh start.”\textsuperscript{161}

\textit{5.1.2 Speech 2: The Liberal Cosmopolitan Case to Vote Leave}

Alexander Boris de Pfeffel Johnson is a British politician who has served as Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs since 2016, and has been a Member of Parliament for Uxbridge and South Ruislip since 2015. On May 9, 2016, he provided a speech
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about the liberal cosmopolitan case and its relation to the Leave campaign.\textsuperscript{162}

\textit{The Pure People:} In the context of Mudde’s definition, Jagers and Walgrave’s argue that populist actors always refer to their people and justify their actions by appealing to and identifying with the people.\textsuperscript{163} One can see that Johnson’s speech includes such patterns as well. When Johnson refers to the people, his arguments are based on the perception that the EU is the reason why the British people cannot live their life the fullest, as they perhaps should and possibly could without a EU membership. Johnson gives several examples throughout the speech focusing mainly on the economic aspect in relation to the British people. He firstly argues, that the country’s gross contribution to the EU budget are running at about £20bn a year, that the net contribution is £10bn, and that the British government has no control over how that contributed money are spent on the EU level. He thereafter continues on the same path, arguing that this contribution could rather be used on assets for the British people such as hospitals, schools, jobs and so on. He then develops his argument about the country’s economic situation by saying that the migration flow is causing less job opportunities for the citizens, which is mainly because of further integration, globalization and opened borders within the EU.\textsuperscript{164} As he says:

\begin{displayquote}
[w]e have absolutely no power to control the numbers who are coming with no job offers and no qualifications from the 28 EU countries. I am in favour of immigration; but I am also in favour of control, and of politicians taking responsibility for what is happening; and I think it bewilders people to be told that this most basic power of a state – to decide who has the right to live and work in your country – has been taken away and now resides in Brussels.\textsuperscript{165}
\end{displayquote}

He continues his argument by saying:

\begin{displayquote}
[a]s I say, that is only one aspect of a steady attrition of the rights of the people to decide their priorities, and to remove, at elections, those who take the decisions. It is sad that our powers of economic self-government have become so strained that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has to go around personally asking other finance ministers to allow him to cut VAT on tampons, and as far as I can see we still have not secured consent.\textsuperscript{166}
\end{displayquote}

This statement contains a great example about how the British government has to reach
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to the EU level in order to make a change, such as the example about the difficulty ‘to cut VAT on tampons’. It also reveals the issue with peoples’ right to choose, because as far as it goes with today’s EU, it is neither the people nor the British government who has the full control of the British political regulation. As Johnson argues: “More of the same will not bring the European Union any closer to its citizens. More of the same will just produce more of the same – less competitiveness, less growth, fewer jobs.”¹⁶⁷ That being said, Johnson concludes that a continued membership of the EU will: “[m]ake our countries weaker not stronger.”¹⁶⁸

These mentioned examples expose several issues that are being raised as concerns not taken care by the EU, which further exposes that the EU does not emphasize its policies on the domestic level but rather on the supranational level. This, as Johnson tries to explain, consequently influences the member states citizens.¹⁶⁹ Along with Mudde’s definition of the pure people, Johnsons’ arguments about the EU’s way of governing, reveals a connection to Mudde’s definition and Jagers and Walgraves argument that populist actors stand for the fact that people should have the right to sovereignty, which is not the case with the EU.¹⁷⁰ To develop this idea further, Johnsons’ statements create a picture of the Leave campaign as the one representing ‘the silent majority’, which now has the possibility to be heard from above if they vote to leave. This could be connected to Mudde’s definition and Taggart’s argument that populist actors have the tendency to emphasize on the elite’s mistakes and failures in order to portray themselves as the politicians that are giving the people the possibility to be heard above ‘the loud majority’¹⁷¹, which in this case is the EU. In conjunction to this argument, it is therefore seen that the EU in the context of Mudde’s minimal definition, is the corrupt elite. This argument will be further elaborated below.

The Corrupt Elite: Johnson emphasizes that the main issue Britain is facing right now is its relationship with the EU, and that this skepticism has been present for quite some time.¹⁷² He says: “For many of us who are now deeply skeptical, the evolution has been roughly the same: we began decades ago to query the anti-democratic absurdities of the EU”¹⁷³, and continues to say:
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We can see the sunlit meadows beyond. I believe we would be mad not to take this once in a lifetime chance to walk through that door because the truth is it is not we who have changed. It is the EU that has changed out of all recognition; and to keep insisting that the EU is about economics is like saying the Italian Mafia is interested in olive oil and real estate.\textsuperscript{174}

In conjunction to these statements, it is believed that Johnson seems to argue that today’s EU has become more centralized, interfering and anti-democratic than ever. The way he compares and links it to the Italian Mafia could be seen as a metaphor describing the EU as an organization claiming to be something which it is not in reality. This could be linked to Mudde’s definition of the corrupt elite, which according to populist actors is often accused of betraying its people\textsuperscript{175}, and that they are unable to fulfill the promises they have given\textsuperscript{176} and are thus the bigger reason why ‘the people’ is in an undesirable situation.\textsuperscript{177} It is true that the UK voted to become a member of the EU because it was argued that the country would gain from it, but instead, as Johnson describes it, the membership has rather led to that:

Brussels now has exclusive or explicit competence for trade, customs, competition, agriculture, fisheries, environment, consumer, protection, transport, trans-European networks, energy, the areas of freedom, security and justice, and new powers over culture, tourism, education and youth. The EU already has considerable powers to set rates of indirect taxation across the whole 28-nation territory, and of course it has total control of monetary policy for all 19 in the eurozone.\textsuperscript{178}

This argument could be understood as the Leave campaign tries to highlight that the EU and its regulation has taken over each member states power. This has consequently led to that member states are not able to proceed their policy making without the EU’s involvement. This further means that it has become harder for member states to run its administration and fulfill the citizens’ demands. One such example, as mentioned previously, is when the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to ask for allowance from all other finance ministers in order to cut VAT on Tampons.\textsuperscript{179} This shows that the decision-making has become more complicated ever since the UK became a member of the EU. This issue could further be connected to Mudde’s definition of the corrupt elite, seeing that most of the UK’s power has been given to the EU institutions, which do not seem to always agree with their decisions. It further leads to that citizens perceive the EU institutions as remote from them, and that they feel powerless in the face of complicated decision-making processes that impact their
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everyday lives. From this perspective, it could be seen as the EU is unable to fulfill the promises it has been given by the people,\textsuperscript{180} and is therefore the main reason why the people is in an undesirable situation.\textsuperscript{181} This can also be connected to Mudde’s minimal definition of the general will, seeing that the people can only influence the decision making processes occasionally by election,\textsuperscript{182} which therefore causes people’s common interests not always being represented both at the national as well as the EU level.

Another example, in relation to the argument above, is when Johnson’s says: “We were told many times – by the PM, Home Sec and Chancellor - that we were going to get real changes to the law on free movement, so that you needed to have a job lined up before you could come here. We got no such change.”\textsuperscript{183} In other words, Johnson’s statements could be viewed as the Leave campaign portrays the EU as a failed institution. As Johnson concludes in his speech: “It is a choice between getting dragged even further into a federal super state, or taking a stand now.”\textsuperscript{184} The latter argument could be connected to Mudde’s minimal definition of the general will, which will be elaborated below.

\textit{The General Will}: Johnson explains that the main reason he is engaged in the Leave campaign and why he believes that Britain would be ‘better off’ is due to: “[t]he independence of this country […] being seriously compromised. It is this fundamental democratic problem – this erosion of democracy – that brings me into this fight.”\textsuperscript{185} In connection to Mudde’s minimal definition, one could argue that Johnson’s statements could be linked to ‘the general will’. The words ‘the erosion of democracy’ clearly indicates a connection to Mudde’s definition that the law should be perceived as a supreme authority and a notion of the will of the majority as a main source of legitimization.\textsuperscript{186} Johnson seems to argue that this does currently not exist within the EU. It is rather that the EU has ‘deprived the people of their rights’.\textsuperscript{187} He further argues that a continued relationship with the EU will be:

\begin{quote}
[s]piritually damaging, and socially risky – and the economic benefits of remaining subject to the Single Market law-making machine, as opposed to having access to the
\end{quote}
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Single Market, are in fact very hard to detect [...]. What we want is for Britain to be like many other countries [...], but not to be subject to the vast, growing and politically-driven empire of the EU law.\(^{188}\)

In connection to Mudde’s minimal definition, it can be seen that Johnson argues that today’s EU is not presenting ‘the general will’ of the people. As Mudde and Kaltwasser argue, populism seems to emerge because of the unbalanced power between two institutions.\(^{189}\) In this case, the EU would be perceived as the supreme authority having the main source of legitimization, and not the British government. This could indirectly be linked to why there is an upsurge of anti-EU movements. Furthermore, Johnson seem to indicate that leaving the EU is the only way to get back to what Britain once had before; a working democracy where the common will of the people is the main prioritization.\(^{190}\) The Leave campaign can thus be seen as a campaign focused on primarily representing the people. This could be linked to his argument: “This is about politics, and a political project that is now getting out of control. To understand our predicament, and the trap we are in, we need to go back to the immediate post-war period […].”\(^{191}\) As well as: “The answer to the problems of Europe today is not “more Europe”, if that means more forcible economic and political integration. The answer is reform, and devolution of powers back to nations and people, and a return to intergovernmentalism, at least for this country […].”\(^{192}\) Again, as in Gove’s speech, ‘more Europe’ is mentioned again. This seems to be the central subject within the campaign, which indirectly could be understood as the main issue with the current EU regulation. In connection to the general will, it could be argued that the Leave campaign believes that it rather should be ‘less Europe’ and thus more self-governing in order for the UK and the British citizens to ‘take back control’.

5.1.3 Speech 3: Are We In This Together?

Ian Duncan Smith is a Conservative Party politician, and has previously been Leader of that party and Leader of the Opposition from 2001 to 2003. On May 09, 2016, he delivered a speech about why the EU should be seen as a force of social injustice.\(^{193}\)

*The Pure People*: Smith explains in his speech that the reason he thinks Britain should
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leave the EU is because the EU-project has become a force for social injustice and that membership prevents the development of British politics.¹⁹⁴ As he says: “[l]eaving provides a vital opportunity for us to be able to develop policies that will protect the people who often find themselves at the sharp end of global economic forces and technological change.”¹⁹⁵ He continues to explain this further by saying: “My plea to better off Britons who have done well in recent years is to consider using their vote in the referendum to vote for a better deal for people who haven’t enjoyed the same benefits as them. Because the EU, despite its grand early intentions, has become a friend of the haves rather than the have-nots.”¹⁹⁶

His very first paragraph could be linked to Mudde’s definition of ‘the pure people’ and that some of the Britons could be viewed as ‘the silent majority’¹⁹⁷, who are excluded from the EU. Even though Smith does not refer to all of the British people, he still mentions that some of them actually feel that they are not gaining from a EU membership, but rather the opposite. Smith’s view of the Britons could still be connected to Mudde’s definition because these people that feel unrepresented could indirectly be understood as the silent majority. With that being said, this proportion of the British people that are unrepresented could be linked to Taggart’s argument that the priority should be about ‘uniting the people’¹⁹⁸, not to divide them between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have-nots’, as Smith describes it. He argues that the EU is rather emphasizing to collaborate with Germany, for banks, for big corporations and for public affairs companies with large lobbying operations in Brussels, rather than including others such as small businesses, or lower-paid and lower-skilled Britons, which are the ones that feel excluded.¹⁹⁹ He seems to argue that these excluded people must now compete with people from abroad for jobs, which is not what they perhaps voted for in the first place. As he describes it: “Everyone should have the opportunity to own their own home, but as the EU continues to expand to other countries such as Macedonia, Albania, and Turkey, the population pressures that remaining in the EU would bring can only make that prospect less likely.”²⁰⁰ This statement somewhat tells us that these people are victims of power taken by foreigners, who are now influencing and controlling the British job market. This could further be connected to Smith’s argument:
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[y]ou may have done ok from the EU -- think about the people who haven’t and, just as important, think about the economic changes that are coming fast down the track and ask, very seriously, whether a Britain in charge of all policy levels will be better equipped to cope with those changes than a Britain that is still part of what, all evidence suggests, is the dysfunctional, declining, high unemployment EU.  

Not only can this be connected to the notion of Mudde’s description of ‘the silent majority’ being overrated by foreigners, but also to the notion of ‘the corrupt elite’. The EU, seen as the corrupt elite in this context, seem to be the main reason why some of the people feel excluded from the benefits of an EU membership. It indirectly means that the EU prioritizes bigger companies and businesses that it can gain from, and therefore ignores the ones that are not able to compete with them. Hence, in connection to Mudde’s definition of the corrupt elite, this could be seen as the EU is acting for its own benefits rather than the peoples’. This reasoning can further be linked to Smith’s description of the EU when he argues that it is ‘dysfunctional and declining’. It is also seen that Smith tries to appeal to his audience by justifying his argument about the EU by constantly identify himself with the people, and portraying the Leave campaign as ‘the only representative of the silent majority’. Such populist features of Smith’s argument are further identified when he says:

> [i]f we are not careful, we are going to see an explosion of have-nots. We are going to see increasing divides between people who have a home of their own and those who are, to coin a phrase, at the back of a queue – lengthening queue – to ever get on the housing ladder. People who have jobs that aren’t threatened by automation and people who live in the shadow of the impact of technological innovation. People who benefit from the immigration of cheap nannies and baristas and labourers – and people who can’t find work because of uncontrolled immigration.

His way of using ‘explosion’, ‘have-nots’ and ‘immigration’ could be seen as terms he uses in order to enhance the problem that there exists a division between the people and the elite. In summary, by connecting Mudde’s definition of the pure people to Smith’s arguments, it is seen that his speech still have populist characteristics, even though he only talks about a certain part of the British population. It is for this reason, which makes his arguments easier to connect to the pure people, since he could be viewed as the representative trying to make the silent majority’s voice, i.e. the have-nots voice, to be heard.

The Corrupt Elite: Later, Smith changes direction and focuses on those that do not share the same EU stances as himself and the Leave campaign, such as the Labour Party. He says:

---
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“I find the Labour party’s current position ironic. As Frank Field has pointed out, in saying they are now in favor of staying in the EU, they are acting against the interests of the communities they purport to serve.”\textsuperscript{205} What Smith seem to argue is that they become contradictory because the In campaign had previously admitted that immigration cuts the pay of the poor, and that if immigration would be restricted, the wages would go up for many Britons. So by favoring of staying in the EU, becomes contradictory to their previous statements, particularly with the immigration issue. This strategic way of portraying the In campaigners as ‘acting against the interests of the communities’, indicates that they do not include what is beneficial for the nation. Especially when Smith argues that many Britons will be affected if the immigration flow continues, and foreign nationals continue to ‘overtake’ the job market. This could be connected to Mudde’s definition of the corrupt elite seeing that the EU and the In campaign seem to not take this issue seriously. They rather prioritize what they could gain from, i.e. by focusing on big corporations and businesses, as Smith states it.

He thereafter continues along the same path and argues that EU migration has increased by 50 per cent since 2010, and if further enlargement will continue, the number of EU jobseekers will increase and thus decrease employment for Britons.\textsuperscript{206} He explains this further by saying: “[w]ith 5 more countries to join, that number looks conservative. This would be the equivalent of a city the size of Glasgow.” He thereafter continues to say: “Another big negative economic effect of the level of immigration that the British people have never voted for – and do not want – is on house prices.”\textsuperscript{207} The words, ‘never voted for’ and ‘do not want’ do not only connect to the Mudde’s definition of ‘the corrupt elite’, but also to the other two concepts. It is connected to ‘the corrupt elite’ by indirectly blaming the current national government as well as the EU for creating concerns about ‘too much immigration’. It is further connected to ‘the pure people’, since Smith seems to try to ‘represent’ the people by constantly referring to them when stating his arguments. It is also connected to the notion of the general will since Britons obviously would not vote for foreigners taking over the job market.

Furthermore, Smith says: “Britain avoided the high unemployment and savage austerity that many Eurozone nations suffered because we wisely ignored the advice of groups like the
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CBI and retained sterling.”

He continues to say: “The principle that it is better to be in control of our own destiny can and should apply to all areas of national life, starting with our borders.” Once again, Smith mentions ‘the other’ by arguing that the focus should be to enhance British national life, which only can be done by securing the borders. This argument could be linked to Mudde’s definition that ‘the corrupt elite’, in this case the EU, does not prioritize the Britons interests but rather its own. This is because there has not yet been a sufficient solution to the immigration flow, which is further causing too many domestic issues for Britons. The perception of immigrants could also be linked to ‘the pure people’, seeing that Smith believes that Britain would be better off without them. This could further indirectly be understood that he is trying to say that there should be less immigration. Above all of this, Smith continues to mention other crucial issues that the EU does not seem to handle. He says:

Just look how it’s losing its share of world trade at twice the rate of the U.S. There are many reasons for this, but one key reason is that its institutions have become irredeemably unwieldy. EU leaders and the Brussels army of bureaucrats can’t agree on how to fix the euro. They can’t agree on what to do about refugees. They cannot agree on what kind of transatlantic trade partnership they want with the USA […]. They cannot agree on the kind of steel and industrial policies that will ensure that Europe doesn’t lose even more of its manufacturing base.

This paragraph could be connected to ‘the corrupt elite’, given that Smith mentions several issues that the EU failed to handle, which further affects the member states negatively, at the national as well as the domestic level. This reasoning could be connected to Smith’s other argument: “EU leaders and ministers spend so much time in Brussels, not agreeing decisions, that they aren’t focused on the challenges back in their home nations.” In connection to the corrupt elite, the EU could be seen as a political establishment that has abused the power they originally received from the people and have transformed it into something that is exploiting the democratic system for their own benefits.

The General Will: Smith’s speech about the fact that EU should be seen as a force of social injustice is primary because it has excluded people that it cannot gain from. As he argues:
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[w]e are at a point in the development of the world economy where, if we are not careful, we are going to see an explosion of have-nots. We are going to see increasing divides between people who have a home of their own and those who are, to coin a phrase, at the back of a queue – a lengthening queue - to ever get on the housing ladder. People who have jobs that aren’t threatened by automation and people who live in the shadow of the impact of technological innovation. People who benefit from the immigration of cheap nannies and baristas and labourers – and people who can’t find work because of uncontrolled immigration.\textsuperscript{214}

This seems to be the key point of his statement, which also could be connected to the notion of the general will. In accordance with Mudde’s definition, the general will is not only a common interest by the people, it should also serve as an immediate expression influencing all types of policies.\textsuperscript{215} This, as Smith has stated throughout his whole speech, is not the case for many Britons, and perhaps many other EU citizens.

Another example that could be connected to the general will is when Smith says: “No matter what those who want to remain say about the EU as a market place, the reality is that it is first and foremost a political project; the aim of which is the creation of an overarching federal power, above the nation state.”\textsuperscript{216} This statement, especially ‘above the nation state’ could be understood as that the EU has become a supranational organization whereby its policies are above the member states policies. This could indirectly be seen as ‘the power of the people’ has been deprived, which also means that their common interests are not comprehended at the EU level. This is probably also the reason why Smith argues that the EU should be seen as anti-democratic, as it only thinks about its own benefits because there have been several occasions when the British government has tried to influence its own national policies but has not been able to do because of the EU regulations. As Smith explains it:

If we want to cut VAT on fuel to help families afford to heat their homes, we should be free to do so. We should be able to choose how we spend the £350 million that we currently send to Brussels every week. It would in any normal world be a strange choice to make for a British government that whilst bearing down on welfare spending and other budgets since the election we continue to send to this wealthy EU hundreds of millions of taxpayers money. This is money that could help fund the NHS. It could fund extra training and infrastructure to help every Briton to thrive in the coming economic age.\textsuperscript{217}

These examples that Smith raises could be seen as several issues that are not prioritized by the EU, it is clear that if they are not taken care of, the Britons will continue to be
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dissatisfied. This, in conjunction to Mudde’s definition of the general will, further demonstrates that citizens, in this case the Britons, could be seen as ‘passive entities’ only having the possibility to influence the policies occasionally by election. In this context, the Britons interests are thus unrepresented at the EU level, which therefore justifies why the Leave campaign criticizes it as an organization and wants the UK to leave. As Smith explains it:

Yet outside of the EU, an independent Britain can design migration, agricultural, environmental, budgetary and trade policies that the rest of Europe seems sadly incapable of agreeing upon. [I] hope I’ve persuaded you that leaving the EU is in the clear interest of social justice within Britain. [i]nside the EU our politicians can only talk of what we would like to do to change things knowing that will achieve very little. Outside the EU we can change our destiny and dare to believe in the greatness of all our citizens.\footnote{Smith, I. D. 2016.}

Hence, it becomes understandable why Smith’s speech is called “Are we in this together?”, given that the EU does not seem to comprehend the consequences that comes along with continuing the pursuit of ‘more Europe’.
5.2 To what extent do statements of the key speeches from Trump’s presidential campaign correspond to Mudde’s minimal definition of populism?

5.2.1 Speech 1: Presidential Announcement Speech

In June 16, 2015 Donald Trump announced that he would be one of the Republican candidates running for the presidential election in 2016.219

*The Pure People:* Mexico seems to be one of the most prominent issues Trump uses as a factor in order to reach out to the American people. In the announcement speech, he argues that the U.S. is being exploited by Mexico, primarily due to the constant migration flow: “They’re laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friends, believe me. But they’re killing us economically.”220 He further explains that the biggest issue with the Mexican migration flow is that they are sending their people that are: “not their best” and further says that: “they are not sending you.”221 The latter comment in combination with the statements above could be connected to Mudde’s definition of ‘the pure people’. In this particular case, Mexicans could be understood as an excluded group exploiting American citizens by ‘stealing their jobs’. Trump could be viewed as a political actor who aims to portray and distinguish the American citizens’ identity as something that is good, which is often done by comparing them with something that is negative, in this case the Mexicans.222

In conjunction to this, Trump says: “They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.”223 This type of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ approach is also used elsewhere in the speech. For instance, he mentions other examples in the context of migration by saying: “It’s coming from more than Mexico. It’s coming from all over South and Latin America, and it’s coming probably – probably – from the Middle East.”224 He further argues: “[B]ut we don’t know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, we don’t know what’s happening. And it’s got to stop and it’s got to stop fast.”225 This could be linked to Mudde’s
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definition of the pure people given that Trump seems to criticize foreigners depriving American citizens’ basic needs by taking over, especially, the job market. As Trump says: “[o]ur real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent. Don’t believe the 5.6. Don’t believe it. That’s right. A lot of people up there can’t get jobs. They can’t get jobs, because there are no jobs, because China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs. They all have jobs.”

In relation to Mudde’s definition and Taggart’s argument that populist often portray the people as individuals that act in accordance with the common sense; Trump could be viewed as the populist actor that represents ‘the silent majority’, i.e. the American citizens, and is thus giving them the possibility to be heard above ‘the loud minority’, i.e. foreigners. Furthermore, the way Trump argues that foreigners are the main reason why the citizens are feeling deprived could be connected to Mudde’s definition and Taggart’s notion of the heartland. The American citizens, as has been stated by Trump, have been deprived their rights and are living in a society mainly controlled by progressives, criminals and foreigners. As Trump says: “The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else’s problem.”

Furthermore, Trump’s argument about the migration flow and the increased foreign influence in the U.S. could also be connected to Mudde’s definition of the corrupt elite. Especially when Trump says that the U.S. does not have any protection or enough competence to handle issues with external actors such as Mexico, Latin America, China and Japan. It could, therefore, indirectly be seen as Trump accuses the current Obama administration having failed to cope with this. This could be connected to Mudde’s definition that populist actors often accuse the elite, in this case the Obama administration, of betraying its people. This further leads to that they are unable to fulfill the promises they have given and are thus the bigger reason why ‘the people’ is in an undesirable situation.

The Corrupt Elite: The elite seem also to be a reoccurring theme throughout the announcement speech. For example, Trump compares the U.S. with Japan and China, two countries that he argues are taking over the market: “When was the last time anybody saw us
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beating, let’s say, China in a trade deal?”233 And continues asking: “When did we beat Japan at anything? They send their cars over by the millions, and what do we do?” He then concludes by saying: “They are killing us.”234 This is a good example of the notion of ‘the corrupt elite’, especially given that this criticism is probably towards the current Obama administration and its failure on international trade. It is also a reoccurring theme throughout the speech; Trump continuously mentions the current government’s failures, asking for example: “How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they?”235 This could be best understood as another strategic attempt to gain voters, by portraying the failures the current regime has undergone. It could further be linked to Mudde’s definition that populist actors attempt to portray the elite as irresponsible and incompetent.236 In this case, following Trump’s arguments, it is thus easy to connect his expressed statements having the attempt of portraying the Obama administration as irresponsible and incompetent. This could also indirectly be linked to the notion of the pure people since the Obama administration, as Trump seems to portray it, is accused of betraying its people237, and is therefore unable to fulfill the promises it has been given238 and is thus the reason why ‘the pure people’ is in an undesirable situation.239 In other words, ‘they’ (China and Japan) are the ones that are evil and are taking over the American market, and ‘we’ (the American citizens) are the ones who are affected by this, mainly because ‘they’ (the Obama administration) has failed. He continues to develop this argument, stating that China and Japan are not “[o]ur friends, believe me. But they’re killing us economically.”240 This can again be connected to the notion of the corrupt elite, based on economic concepts, given that Trump’s argument expresses the idea that the American people are being exploited by ‘the big shots’.241

Then he goes on to criticize the current Obama administration’s domestic policies and explains his dissatisfaction against ‘Obamacare’ by saying: “We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare […]”242 The use of the words ‘the big lie’ could be linked to the notion of the corrupt elite. Mainly because Trump’s argument indirectly expresses that it is a big lie
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because it favors the government rather than the American citizens. Another similar example is when Trump says: “Yesterday, it came out that costs are going for people up 29, 39, 49, and even 55 percent and deductibles are through the roof. You have to be hit by a tractor, literally a tractor, because the deductibles are so high, it’s virtually useless. It’s a disaster.”243 He, thereafter, continues to explain that this is one of the reasons why the U.S. “[n]eeds somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing’s going to get done. They will not bring us – believe me – to the Promised Land. They will not.”244 This can be connected to Albertazzi and McDonnel’s argument about the elite. The Obama administration does not seem to have a perception of what the people want and desire, the Obamacare is in this case a failed attempt of meeting their demands. This can further, indirectly be seen as the Obama administration has rather abused the power, which originally was received by the Americans, and has transformed it into something that exploits the democratic system rather than the opposite.245

Furthermore, the way Trump expresses his arguments about the Obama administration shows that he dislikes it, especially when he says: “You’re certainly not very good. And that’s what we have representing us. They will never make America great again. They don’t even have a chance. They’re controlled fully – they’re controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by the special interest, fully.”246 Trump’s expression about the Obama administration, and its relations with foreigners, can be connected to Mudde and Kaltwasser argument about the corrupt elite. A populist actor, in this case Trump, has the tendency to emphasize on the elite’s failures in order to reach out to the people and gain votes. He therefore believe that he is the only political representative who can meet the people’s desires and needs, i.e. their common interest, in this case ‘to make America great again’.247

The General Will: In the end of this speech, Trump concludes: “So ladies and gentlemen, I am officially running for president of the United States, and we are going to make our country great again.”248 The latter sentence is what Trump seems to believe will happen if he gets elected as president. As he continues to say:
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So, just to sum up, I would do various things very quickly. I would repeal and replace the big lie, Obamacare. I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believe me, and I'll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall. Mark my words. Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody. I will find -- within our military, I will find the General Patton or I will find General MacArthur, I will find the right guy. I will find the guy that's going to take that military and make it really work. Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around. I will immediately terminate President Obama's illegal executive order on immigration, immediately.249

Not only does this paragraph summarize what the current Obama administration has failed with, it also demonstrates Trump’s constructed idea about how he will make America great again. These are several examples that could be connected to the notion of the general will. First, it gives several examples about the current government’s failed attempts, such as the Obamacare, which was suppose to be beneficial for the Americans, as well as the ISIS and the immigration issue. Second, these issues could be viewed as examples of why ‘the general will’ is not being represented at the national level. Third, Trump’s constructed idea of how he will make America great again suggest that he is the right leader to solve these issues, which indirectly would lead to that he would put Americans interest at first.250 Especially when he says:

Our country has tremendous potential. We have tremendous people. We have people that aren’t working. We have people that have no incentive to work. But they’re going to have incentive to work, because the greatest social program is a job. And they’ll be proud, and they’ll love it, and they’ll make much more than they would’ve ever made, and they’ll be – they’ll be doing so well, and we’re going to be thriving as a country, thriving. It can happen.251

In accordance with this paragraph, it seems like Trump’s arguments are based on the idea that he will not be able to make America great again without ‘his people’. It also provides the idea that they will gain from having Trump as president; seeing that they’re common interests will be met. In this case, the common interest could be seen as the people are getting their jobs back, which correlates to more satisfaction and successful economy. Furthermore, as Trumps continues: “Nobody can do that like me. Believe me. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought.”252 This could be seen as Trump constructs an idea that he is ‘key’ in order for people to finally be heard from above.
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5.2.2 Speech 2: Donald Trump Gives First Campaign Speech since Hiring Bannon & Conway

Trump spoke at an event at the Charlotte Convention Center. This was his very first campaign event, taking place on August 18, 2016.\(^{253}\)

*The Pure People:* Already at the beginning of this first campaign speech, Trump expresses his sincere interest to talk about: “the heartbreak and devastation in Louisiana […],”\(^ {254}\) and continues to say: “We are one nation. When one state hurts, we all hurt and we must all work together to lift each other up. Working, building restoring together.”\(^ {255}\) He expresses his interest in the American people, and that it is important to understand that America is: “[o]ne country, one people, and we will have together one great future […].”\(^ {256}\) He concludes this by saying: “Tonight, I’d like to talk about the New American Future we are going to create together.”\(^ {257}\) These two sentences constructs an idea of which Trump could be seen as the perfect leader of his people that will manage to rebuild America. He discusses ‘his people’ in the following terms: “Every single citizen in our land has a right to live in safety. To be one united nation, we must protect all of our people. But we must also provide opportunities for all of our people. We cannot make America Great Again if we leave any community behind.”\(^ {258}\) This paragraph seems construct an image that includes all members of the American society, except those that are illegally there. As Trump describes it:

Nearly four in ten African-American children are living in poverty. I will not rest until children of every color in this country are fully included in the American Dream. Jobs, safety, opportunity. Fair and equal representation. This is what I promise to African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and all Americans.\(^ {259}\)

In this paragraph, Trump expresses the idea that if he becomes president, he will include all Americans in one unity in order to improve their living standards. This could be linked to Baumann’s argument about the pure people forming ‘a social community’.\(^ {260}\) As Trump further says:

I will always tell you the truth. I speak the truth for all of you, and for everyone in
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this country who doesn’t have a voice. I speak the truth on behalf of the factory worker who lost his or her job. I speak the truth on behalf of the family living near the border that deserve to be safe in their own country but is instead living with no security at all.\textsuperscript{261}

This paragraph could be connected to the pure people as well as the corrupt elite. Trump’s expressions seem to portray him as ‘the people’s representative’, which is not the case with the current Obama administration. Not only does Trump’s expressions construct the idea that the majority of the American people are unrepresented and thus forgotten; it also indicates that ‘the corrupt elite’, i.e. the current government, is the reason behind it. As he expresses it: “These are the forgotten men and women in our society, and they are angry at so much on so many levels. The poverty, the unemployment, the failing schools, the jobs to other countries. I am fighting for these forgotten Americans.”\textsuperscript{262} In connection to the pure people, Trump’s expressions gives the idea that Trump portrays himself as the political leader that will give voice to ‘his people’, which can further be linked to Mudde’s definition and Taggart’s notion of the ‘heartland’. Trump’s statements such as ‘the poverty, the unemployment, the failing schools, the jobs moving to other countries, the vague security at borders,’\textsuperscript{263} are very much indirectly connected to the description of the ‘heartland’. Especially when Taggart describes the heartland as an imagined society where law-abiding citizens are being deprived their basic needs from criminals, foreigners and others.\textsuperscript{264} Which in this case would be foreigners and criminals from countries such as Mexico, Latin America, China and Japan. According to Trump’s previous speech, these countries are the ones controlling the current American society.\textsuperscript{265}

Furthermore, Trump goes on saying: “[I] declared my campaign for the Presidency on the promise to give our government back to the people.”\textsuperscript{266} This particular sentence could be linked to Mudde’s definition of the pure people as well as the corrupt elite. Especially when Trump refers to the idea that the current government holds all of the Americans power, which probably was not what the Americans expected to happen when they voted. It also indicates the idea that the current elite, i.e. the Obama administration, has stolen the people’s power and thus their sovereignty, which further makes it to be selfish and corrupt.\textsuperscript{267}

\textit{The Corrupt Elite}: Trump thereafter continues his speech by expressing the failures of
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the current government’s regulation. As he says: “Our whole country loses every time a kid doesn’t graduate from high school, or fails to enter the workforce or, worse still, is lost to the dreadful world of drugs and crime.” He thereafter argues:

When I look at the failing schools, the terrible trade deals, and the infrastructure crumbling in our inner cities, I know all of this can be fixed - and it can be fixed very quickly. In the world I come from, if something is broken, you fix it. If something isn’t working, you replace it. If a product doesn’t deliver, you make a change.

This paragraph constructs the idea that that the current government does not tackle or solve these issues, which are perhaps the main issues that could provide change and thus make ‘America great again’. He continues to say: “I have no patience for injustice, no tolerance for government incompetence, no sympathy for leaders who fail their citizens.” This could further be connected to Mudde’s definition of ‘the corrupt elite’, for it suggests the current government is not prioritizing what is best for the people, but rather what is best for themselves. In connection to Mudde’s definition, Albertazzi & McDonnell explain the elite as people being self-centered and do not have a perception of what the citizens want and desire. They are argued to have abused the power they originally received from the people, and have thereafter transformed it into something that is ‘exploiting the democratic system for personal benefits’.

Furthermore, as Trump thereafter says: “That’s why I am running: to end decades of bitter failure and to offer the American people a new future of honesty, justice and opportunity. A future where America, and its people, always - and I mean always - come first. Aren’t you tired of a system that gets rich at your expense?” Once again, Trump points towards the current regime’s perceived failures as well as its corruptness, and emphasizes that he is the one that will make sure this corruptness and failure will come to an end. This could be connected to Mudde’s definition and Reinsmann argument; the existing system of governance has led to the people and the elite’s relationship being built upon ‘dependence’, i.e. the elite exploits the people for personal benefits, at the expense of the people’s sovereignty. In connection to this reasoning, Trump’s expressions construct the idea that he is capable of changing the current administration if he becomes president. This could especially
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be connected to when Trump questions whether the audience is ‘tired of a system that gets rich at their expense’. This is another example of how the corrupt elite tends to exploit their power, which in the long run affects their citizens, who ends up in an undesirable situation.\textsuperscript{275}

\textit{The General Will:} Trump continues to say: “Aren’t you tired of arrogant leaders who look down on you, instead of serving and protecting you? That is all about to change - and it’s about to change soon. We are going to put the American people first again.”\textsuperscript{276} In accordance with this paragraph, Trump seems to put forward an idea about the current governments regulation, and how it does not serve and protect the Americans. This could be connected to the idea that populist actors often accuse the ruling elite of depriving the people’s power and sovereignty. In connection to the statement above, it could be understood as Trump tries to put forward the idea that the Americans’ power must be taken back in order for their ‘common interests’ to be fulfilled. He talks about change, which in this perspective could be interpreted as ‘changing or replacing the elite and all other representatives and intermediary institutional arrangements. This could also be seen as that Trump is trying to implement the idea that he can ‘restore’ their power and sovereignty. In accordance with Mudde’s definition, populist actors are presenting their arguments by portraying the failures of the current regime and that they are the only representatives who can restore the lacking popular sovereignty among the people.\textsuperscript{277} In connection to this, Trump also expresses his idea on how and in what he will make changes. As he says:

\begin{quote}
I am fighting for you. Here is the change I propose. On terrorism, we are going to end the era of nation building, and instead focus on destroying ISIS and Radical Islamic terrorism [...]. On immigration, we will temporarily suspend immigration from any place where adequate screening cannot be performed. All applicants for immigration will be vetted for ties to radical ideology, and we will screen out anyone who doesn’t share our values and love our people [...]. If you want to join our society, then you must embrace our society, our values and our tolerant way of life.\textsuperscript{278}
\end{quote}

This paragraph constructs the idea that Trump identifies himself with the people. This could further indirectly be understood as that the changes he proposes, will consequently enhance the chances of the people’s demands will now be met. This will also further lead to that the people’s common interests will finally be fulfilled. As Trump concludes: “We will promote our American values, our American way of life, and our American system of
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government, which are all the best in the world.”

5.2.3 Speech 3: Donald Trump’s Speech Attacking His Accusers

Trump speaks during his campaign rally in North Carolina on October 14, 2016. The Pure People: Trump begins his speech by straightforwardly referring to the people who at the time experienced Hurricane Matthew. His way of showing condolences are connected to his idea of how the “nation is going to be rebuilt”, which will be similar to the “same spirit” the people of North Carolina had when they recovered from the hurricane. This could be seen as a metaphor, seeing as Trump seems to compare the hurricane with the current state of America, and how the current government, just like Hurricane Matthew, took over and destroyed everything on its way. Perhaps this is what Trump means when he says: “we will rebuild our nation.” This statement could be connected to ideas of both ‘the pure people’ as well as ‘the corrupt elite’. Especially when Trump expresses his argument by constantly referring to the people as something positive and the current government as something negative. The people could therefore be seen as the ones that will help him to rebuild the nation as it was before, i.e. to make America great again. In addition to this idea, the Obama administration could be understood as the main reason why the U.S. must be rebuilt. Furthermore, Trumps way of expression his arguments shows a pattern in which he always seem to be clear that it is ‘his people’ who are the ones that will help him make America great again, and not others, particularly not foreigners, as perhaps the Obama administration has been thinking. The examples mentioned below will point toward this.

The Corrupt Elite: In conjunction with Hurricane Matthew, the idea of the corrupt elite can be seen to be further discussed when Trump says: “We’re going to renegotiate our disastrous trade deals and illegal immigration. Stop the massive inflow of refugees […]. And we’re going to repeal and replace the Obamacare, 100 percent. That is a disaster.” These are just several examples of how Trump constructs the idea about what ‘failures’ the Obama administration has caused. He thereafter says that: “Your jobs will come back under a Trump administration. Your income goes up under a Trump administration. Your taxes go way down
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Another typical feature of the notion of the ‘corrupt elite’ in the speech is when Trump says to the audience: “In the Trump administration we will end decades of policies that enrich special interests and foreign countries at our expense. We’re going to take on the big media, big business, and big donors that are bleeding our country dry. We’re losing our jobs.” The words ‘policies that enrich special interest’ could especially be connected to Mudde’s definition and Albertazzi and McDonnell’s argument that populist actors will often argue that the current government is abusing the power which it originally received from the people, and have transformed it into something that is exploiting the democratic system and should thus be seen as corrupt.\textsuperscript{286}

He further attempts to portray the Obama administration as: “Disgraceful. Honestly, it’s disgraceful. What’s going on in our country right now is a disgrace.”\textsuperscript{287} Along this path, Trump is explaining his standpoint toward his presidential competitor Hillary Clinton. The release of the e-mails, which she says she doesn’t remember anything about, is to Trump “[o]ne more reason that if I win I will ask my Attorney General to appoint a prosecutor. And we will also have to investigate the investigation itself.”\textsuperscript{288} He continues to argue: “The WikiLeaks documents show how the media conspires and collaborates with the Clinton campaign, including giving the questions and answers to Hillary Clinton before the date, OK. What a rigged system folks.”\textsuperscript{289} This somewhat indicates that Trump portrays himself of not trusting the current government or his counterpart Hillary. He portrays both Hillary and those that are investigating this case as unreliable. He does this in an unsurpassed manner that could be connected to Albertazzi and McDonnell’s view that populists seek to portray the elite as something that should be seen as ‘the enemy of the people’.

Trump thereafter continues on the same track, arguing about the media and how they clearly will not talk about the massive crowd of over 20,000 people in Cincinnati, where Trump gave a speech on a previous night:

\[\text{t}h\text{e media won’t even talk about the site of the crowd, the enthusiasm of the crown [...] It is horrible — it is really horrible. The corrupt media is trying to do everything in their power to stop our movement. Believe me, that don’t want this} \]
happening. We have one of the great movements — we have the great movement. We have the movement that’s never happened before.  

This statement could both be linked to ‘the corrupt elite’ as well as ‘the pure people’. Not only does he portray the current government as corrupt, but also everything else that stands in his way to gain voters, such as the media, which according to his statements is ‘corrupt’ because it tries to stop Trump and his ‘movement’ from being elected. His reference here to ‘our movement’ could further be linked to the concept of ‘the pure people’, or rather ‘the silent majority’. As argued by Mudde, the silent majority is made out to have growing anger, as they perceive society as being controlled by people that are progressive, criminals and foreigners. Another very powerful statement that might be argued as populist, in conjunction with ‘the corrupt elite’, is when Trump says in the middle of his speech: “Obama is an incompetent. He is an incompetent president. He doesn’t know what he’s doing […]” This argument seems to imply Trump’s dissatisfaction towards the current administration and that it must be replaced in order for a change to be made.

The General Will: At the end of his speech Trump says: “So — so, just to finish up — so just to finish up, you see what’s happening. The process is rigged. This whole election is being rigged. These lies, spread by the media, without witnesses, without backup or anything else […].” This accusation that Trump attempts to portray could be linked to all three elements of Mudde’s definition; the pure people, the corrupt elite and the general will. Trump portrays the corrupt elite, in this case the Clinton campaign and the media, which both seem to go against him and ‘the silent majority’, and implies this affects ‘the general will’ of the people. The words ‘the process is rigged’ show that ‘the sovereignty of the people’ is being denied, and the way to solve this is to choose Trump as president. As argued by Mudde and Kaltwasser, populist actors consider themselves as the only representatives who can restore ‘the sovereignty of the people’, by replacing both the elite, and all other representative and intermediary institutional arrangements that are considered to be part of the ruling elite, in this case the media and Clinton. Along the same lines, Trump says: “It’s a lie, a total lie […]. Sometimes they do it for fame, maybe they get money, who knows? The Clinton campaign is pushing it.” Again, Trump expresses that the Clinton campaign being rigged and that it
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cannot be trusted, he even goes so far by questioning ‘maybe they get money’.

Furthermore, in conjunction with notions of ‘the pure people’ as well as ‘the general will’ it is seen that Trump believes he is the only one who can bring back the ‘sovereignty of the people’. As he says:

> Hopefully, our great movement – and there’s never been anything like this in the United States, […] hopefully our great movement powered by the everyday citizens will overcome the sickness that is plaguing our politics and our media. And I’ll tell you what, our media is indeed sick and it’s making our country sick, and we’re going to stop it. 297

This statement continues to show Trump’s strong connection to populist features, implying that ‘they’ are depriving ‘our’ sovereignty and ‘I’m’ the one who can take that sovereignty back. He concludes his speech by saying: “This is a movement like nobody’s ever seen in this country before. Even our enemies admit that.” 298 He thus implies there is a conflict, a war taking place. Again, he sets up one of those ‘us versus them’ dichotomies. It could be understood as he tries to create in-groups and out-groups between himself and those who support him, and ‘the elite’. Furthermore, it is interesting that he chooses to use the word ‘movement’. He thus tries to avoid the idea of ‘party’, which relates perhaps to the more traditional political structures. He tries to distinguish himself from this, and give his campaign a more grassroots, bottom-up strategy, thus further cementing his claim to be a part of the people and for the people (the pure people, that is).

---
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5.3 Discussion of Results

In this part of the analysis, the results will be clarified by highlighting the distinguishing characteristics of each campaign in the cross-tabulation below, in order to see to what extent each campaign corresponds to each variable of Mudde’s minimal definition of populism. This tabulation has, however, been divided into three tables, in order to make it easier to distinguish each core characteristic. Thereafter the central research question will be answered.

5.3.1 Mudde’s minimal definition of the general will

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>POPULISM</th>
<th>BREXIT LEAVE CAMPAIGN</th>
<th>TRUMP’S PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| THE GENERAL WILL     | - Opposed to the current degree of democratic sovereignty of the people.  
                        - The rule of the people is crucial.  
                        - Promotes ‘direct democracy’.  
                        - Politics should be governed by the general will.  
                        - The elite should be replaced with populist leaders.  
                        - The British People are not represented well enough, hence there is not enough representation of ‘the general will’ at EU level.  
                        - The Leave campaign seems to have dissatisfaction towards the EU because of its incapacity of prioritizing the citizens’ common interests. The EU is therefore anti-democratic. It rather exploits democracy for personal gain.  
                        - The main issues that have cause a British dissatisfaction according to the Leave campaigns arguments, are primarily globalization, loss control of borders and the migration/immigration flow.  
                      | - The American citizens are not represented enough, hence not well enough representation of ‘the general will’ from the current Obama administration.  
                      | - The American citizens’ voice is crucial.  
                      | - Does not explicitly promote direct democracy.  
                      | - The current Obama administration should be replaced with Trump, who promises to represent the American people.  
                      | - Trump constructs the idea that the Obama administration is incompetent and self-centered |
- Taking back control on these regulations would lead to increased employment for Britons and decreased employment for foreigners, which according to the Leave campaign ‘is controlling the job market’.

- This will further lead to Britons having easier to meet their basic needs as it would be easier to get better economy.

- The Leave campaign constructs the idea that the EU controls the citizens’ power, which has caused complications with decision-making at the national level. This has also led to that it has become harder for the British government to meet the Britons’ demands.

- The Leave campaign therefore implies that self-government is the key for a better future.

- Hence, to fulfill Britons’ common interests, would only be possible if the UK ‘takes back control’.

because of its failed attempts with handling the immigration flow, its relations with foreign investments, lobbyists, and its big lie ‘the Obamacare’.

- These are issues that have caused an American dissatisfaction.

- Making America great again is the solution.

- A bigger focus on domestic issues such as the job market will lead to increased employment and thus for Americans to meet their basic needs.

- Trump is key in order for the Americans common interest to be fulfilled, since he will be their job president.
5.3.2 Mudde’s minimal definition of the pure people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Characteristics</th>
<th>Populism</th>
<th>Brexit Leave Campaign</th>
<th>Trump’s Presidential Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The Pure People**  | - ‘The people’ is central.  
- Always prioritizes the pure people in their politics.  
- The pure people should have the right to sovereignty; they should be democratic sovereign.  
- The pure people are seen as homogenous.  
- They are the ‘silent majority’.  
- Dissatisfied with the ruling elite.  
- Aims to give the pure people’s sovereignty back.  
- Often described as a movement or a party or a charismatic leader.  
- It embodies the people in its politics.  | - ‘The people’ is the primary focus, they are seen as ‘the silent majority’ that the Leave campaign tries to represent.  
- The Leave campaigners always refer to the people in their political arguments in order to justify their arguments about the EU, especially because the EU has made it complicated for Britons to influence the decision-making.  
- They argue to be the voice of the British peoples, ‘and that this EU referendum will give them the chance to finally influence the UK’s future, which potentially will lead to that their demands will be met.  
- The Leave campaign does not mention homogeneity, but they are often arguing that foreign influence is one of the main | - ‘The people’ is the primary focus.  
- Trump often identify himself with the people and is thus often basing his arguments of the people.  
- Trump constructs the idea that he is the only representative of the American citizens.  
- The people are not seen as homogenous, but Trump refers to the American citizens and wants them to be a united people, though he excludes immigrants, foreigners and others.  
- Trump argues that the current Obama administration has failed to represent the people. Other prioritizations must be made.  
- Trump refers his presidential campaign as the new movement of the American citizens. |

A. Avetisova
issues why most of the Britons are dissatisfied with an EU membership.

- The Leave campaign seems to construct the idea the EU is the main reason why the Britons are dissatisfied the current British regulation.

- The Leave campaign does not explicitly refer itself as a movement.

5.3.3 Mudde’s minimal definition of the corrupt elite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Characteristics</th>
<th>Populism</th>
<th>Brexit Leave Campaign</th>
<th>Trump’s Presidential Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE CORRUPT ELITE</td>
<td>‘The pure people’ is the opposite of the ruling elite.</td>
<td>The British people are dissatisfied with the EU, hence they are opposite to the EU-project and its wrong prioritizations.</td>
<td>The American citizens are dissatisfied with the current regime due to not enough jobs as Trump explains it. They are thus opposite to the Obama administration and its wrong prioritizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The elite is a non-homogeneous group.</td>
<td>The EU is not explicitly mentioned as a non-homogeneous group, but the leave campaigners include others in their view of the EU, such as immigrants and foreigners.</td>
<td>The Obama administration is not explicitly mentioned as a non-homogeneous group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The elite is selfish and corrupt.</td>
<td>The EU is argued to be prioritizing what is beneficial for them, and therefore does not favour other people such as small foreigner.</td>
<td>The Obama administration is argued to have the wrong priorities, more focus should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The elite is betraying the common people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploiting the current democratic system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The EU is argued to be anti-democratic, and is thus indirectly exploiting the sovereignty of the people.

- The Obama administration is not explicitly argued to be exploiting the democratic system. It is rather using it wrong and thus constantly fails.

5.4 What are the main commonalities and differences between Donald Trump’s presidential campaign and the Brexit official Leave campaign, as expressions of populist politics?

By using the categories of Mudde’s minimal definition of populism, such as the pure people, the corrupt elite and the general will, as my theoretical lenses, the results have demonstrated that both of the primary representatives’ statements in the campaigns have populist elements. However, this does not mean that the representatives themselves are populist. As I mentioned in the theory chapter, Mudde’s definition of populism is based on the idea to understand to what extent an expression is populist and not if a phenomenon is populist or not. As Mudde and Kaltwasser argue, everyone have populist features, but that
does not particularly mean that they are populist per se. Populism as a phenomenon should rather be seen as a set of ideas that the phenomenon is expressing.299

Furthermore, as seen in the cross-tabulation above, some elements of the two campaigns have either weaker or stronger connection with some of the populist categories’ variables. One example could be used from table 5.3.1, where it is seen that all of the variables within ‘the general will’ are corresponding to both campaigns’ statements. For example, the Leave campaigners construct the image of Britons’ not being represented from above, i.e. the EU, which is therefore the main reason why the Britons also feel dissatisfied with the current regulation, especially the regulation on immigration, EU integration, globalization and other foreign influences. Furthermore, Trump also seem to construct the idea of being the representative of ‘his people’, which are just like the Britons, dissatisfied with the current regulations. This, as Trump argues, is mainly because of the Obama administration’s failed attempts with handling the immigration issues and the government’s increased interest in foreign influences, such as its relationship with China and Japan. The clear distinction between the two campaigns in this context is that Trump’s arguments are mostly focused on the regulation between the domestic and the national level, whilst the Leave campaign focuses on the regulation between the domestic, the national and the EU level. This makes it somewhat harder for the Leave campaign to make ‘their people’ heard from above in comparison to Trump and ‘his people’.

Furthermore, what makes both of the campaigns strongly linked to not only the general will, but also to each other, are their statements: “take back control” and “make America great again”. I argue, that these two statements are both having strong connection to the notion of the general will. When looking from this perspective, the two statements seem to construct an idea that ‘it was better before’. What I mean is that it seems that the more a country integrates with other countries, the more hostile it becomes. It seems to be difficult to find a balance between a country’s foreign political relationship and its domestic policies in order to not ‘affect’ the citizens and their basic needs. It is when there is too much foreign influence that citizens begin to feel that they are loosing their basic needs, which are taken by the foreigners. Along the same pattern, the two statements also seem to portray the demand of ‘more power’ to the government. Even though Trump does not explicitly mention self-government, he still indirectly expresses this idea of ‘less foreign influence’ and more ‘control’ at the national

level, which could be connected to the Leave campaign’s argument about ‘less Europe and less EU’.

As for Mudde’s definition of the pure people, it is once again seen that both of the campaigns have connections to this concept’s variables. First and foremost, Trump and the Leave campaigners have the tendency to form their arguments mostly focused on the people and their relations to ‘the others’, which in this context is ‘the corrupt elite’ and other out-groups. On the one hand, it is believed that they do so strategically in order to gain votes. On the other hand, it is believed that they do so because their arguments are actually representing ‘the silent majority’. However, the silent majority in this context differs to an extent, when comparing it with the two campaigns. The Leave campaign divides the British population into ‘havers’ and ‘have-nots’. As the two terms already expresses it, some of the Britons are gaining from a EU membership, but the majority does not. One such example is the discussion that Smith puts forward in his speech. He argues that the EU does not seem to represent ‘all of the Britons’, mostly because it focuses on the ones that it can gain from, which indirectly has led to that many of the Britons nowadays feel excluded, forgotten and unrepresented. In connection to this, Trump argues about how foreign influences such as, especially the Mexicans, have taken over the job market, which for that reason has created competition for Americans to get hired. Another similarity is that Trump and the Leave campaigners identify their people by putting them against the corrupt elite and members of other out-groups. These people that are not sharing the same thoughts as them, are in similarly ways, labeled as foreigners, immigrants and so on.

However, what distinguishes the Leave campaign from the Trump campaign is that Trump actually says that that his campaign is not a campaign but a movement, which the Leave campaign does not. The main difference is that Trump’s campaign is about Trump’s pursuit to win the American presidential election, whilst the Leave campaign is a campaign aiming to make people vote ‘leave’ during the EU referendum. This further indicates the difference that if Trump becomes the new American president, he will have direct power to change what he implies he wants to change, meanwhile the Leave campaign only have limited power to argue why leaving the EU would be better for the UK, which does not mean that they have the power to actually make it happen if the Britons vote ‘Leave’.

Furthermore, in the context of Mudde’s definitions, the two campaigns could be argued to attempt to portray the current elite as the main reason why ‘their’ people are dissatisfied.
This is commonly done by constantly referring to the elites’ failures. This could further be seen as a strategic way of trying to gain votes, i.e. by identifying with ‘their people’ in each political issue they are raising. In doing so, it indirectly portrays them as the representatives of their people, which they attempt to portray as unrepresented in the political sphere. This further shows another similarity between the two campaigns, such as what kind of failures the elite have caused. Both attempt to emphasize on the current issues with especially foreign influences, such as immigrant, migrant and companies taking over the market. As they both have stated, the external pressure and influences have caused that citizens are having trouble finding jobs. However, the Leave campaign differs from Trump’s campaign in this matter. The Leave campaign tries to demonstrate the difficulty that citizens are experiencing when it comes to particularly decision making. Ever since the UK became a member of the EU, it has become more complicated to raise and solve political issues on the EU level. One such example is the argument about cutting VAT on tampons. This is not the case in the U.S., because it does not have a supranational institution that rules over the American government. However, what Trump has tried to imply, is that the increased foreign interest, such as Chinese and Japan relationships, have indirectly led to that some power has been lost to them. So from an overall perspective, it is seen that the two campaigns’ are somewhat against globalization, immigration, foreign influences, integration and so on, i.e. political regulations that they seem to argue the current governments do not have control over.

In other words, the campaigns’ commonalities shows that the leadership of the two countries is prioritizing the wrong areas, and should begin to think about the people, the have-nots, or the small businesses and so on, all of whom are believed to be currently excluded from policy-making. The representatives from both campaigns thus portray themselves as the ones that will always include the people, and decision-making will be based on ‘the general will’ of the people. Furthermore, other similarities in the context of the corrupt elite are that both campaigns mention the failed economic policies, the immigration flow, refugees, or foreigners stealing jobs. They also argue that these failures are the main reasons why citizens are feeling that they have been deprived of their ‘sovereignty’, and that open borders indirectly cause the high rates of unemployment within each country. The ‘general will’ is thus similarly portrayed, because the current governments have stolen the people’s sovereignty and have utilized the democratic system for their own benefits. All representatives from the campaign expose themselves as the ones that should replace the
current government, because they are the key to get the people’s as well as the nation’s sovereignty back.

However, even though there are several strong similarities between the two campaigns, it is important to mention that these comparable aspects are indirectly different at the same time. What distinguishes them the most is that even though they refer to ‘the pure people’, ‘the corrupt elite’, and ‘the general will’, they still refer to different variables of these concepts. For instance, ‘the people’ in America are not the same people as in Britain, and neither are ‘the others’. Another example is that Trump, who mostly discusses the Obama administration on the national level, argues that the U.S. is seen to be leaking jobs outside to other countries, so that jobs are not being created within the country. The Leave campaign discusses the issues from a EU level perspective, and argues that even though the UK is creating jobs, these jobs are being filled by those from EU member states, who drive down wages. Another difference is the view of ‘the corrupt elite’; the Leave campaign discusses the EU as anti-democratic, and governed by bureaucrats, while Trump portrays the Obama administration as disgraceful and incompetent.

Furthermore, after comparing the speeches with one another and with Mudde’s definition of populism, I can conclude that all of the speeches correlate with each of Mudde’s concepts, but that these correlations are either stronger or weaker depending on which concept it is. As for Trump’s speeches, I believe the strongest focus is ‘the pure people’ since he often justifies his argument by always referring to his people, and that they together can make America great again. Especially when he emphasizes that he will be his peoples’ ‘job president’. As for the Leave campaign, I would argue that the strongest focus is ‘the corrupt elite’ seeing that the representatives’ purpose of the campaign is to leave the EU. I also think that both campaigns speeches contain equally strong correlation to the general will seeing that they both argue that their people will have a better life if they vote for them.

Hence, in line with Pappas’ statement that populist actor's politics are, first and foremost, influenced by the country’s experiences, such as its historical, political, economic and social influences, the analysis does confirm that the content in Trump’s campaign differs from the content in the Leave campaign. However, as this research has shown, although these differences are present, the results still confirm the very fact that both campaigns use similar populist strategies to reach out to their citizens in order to gain votes,
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and both were indeed successful in doing so since Trump became Americas 45th president, and the UK is the very first member state to leave the EU.
6. Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to compare the Brexit leave campaign with Trump’s presidential campaign in the context of Mudde’s definition of populism. The aim was to see whether the two campaigns’ speeches contained populist features, as well as if similar strategies were employed in both campaigns. The results have confirmed that there are distinctive populist features in both campaigns, and that these features are similar but at the same time different. The main commonality is that both campaigns’ primary representatives used comparable strategies in order to reach their respective audiences. These similar strategies are further correlated with Mudde’s minimal definition of ‘the pure people, ‘the corrupt elite, and ‘the general will’.

Furthermore, by using Mudde’s minimal definition, it was possible to distinguish to what extent each characteristics in the two campaigns were populist. Some of the campaigns’ speeches characteristics demonstrated a strong connection to Mudde’s core characteristics, while others demonstrated weaker connections. This confirms that the two campaigns’ speeches contain populist features, and that they have several commonalities. Furthermore, this might indicate that citizens in the U.S. and Britain are voting due to similar dissatisfaction towards the current regimes, even though their dissatisfaction may differ depending on which political issue is observed.

It is also important to mention that if I would have chosen other concepts such as ‘Democracy’, ‘Nationalism’ or ‘Liberalism, the results of the research would most likely be different. But seeing as I wanted to examine to what extent the statements from each campaign were populist, and whether these statements were similar for each campaign, it was believed that focusing on only Mudde’s definition was enough to produce justifiable results. Furthermore, as I only decided to examine specific parts of each campaign that I believed where the most suitable for this research, I might have missed out on some essential information that could have contributed to a greater perspective of the two campaigns in the context of Mudde’s definition of populism. Even though it is seen that each campaign share similar arguments, these arguments still depend on which historical, social and economic context they are put it. Hence, I can conclude that the statements’ commonalities are simultaneously different but that they all correlate to Mudde’s definition of populism. Perhaps, this conclusion could be seen as too broad, but on the other hand, I have argued that Mudde’s definition is based on Satori’s model of conceptual stretching. Since there is a
complexity with comparing populist phenomena cross-regionally, I had to make sure that the definitions I used were as stretched as possible in order for me to compare the speeches from the two campaigns. I also believe that this is a setback, because it makes the results of this research somewhat generalized. I have, however, given clear examples of the two campaigns’ arguments and how their discourses can be related to Mudde’s definition of populism. As far as I can tell, this research has given new scientific perspective about the two campaigns, and also that their representatives’ statements have similar as well as different populist features.

In conclusion, one can see that Trump’s presidential campaign and the official Leave campaign contain similar political stances, such as the issue with immigration, foreign influences, lack of power, lost control of borders, globalization, integration and so on. These are also political issues that are very current issues in today’s politics. By comparing the two campaigns and what statements that have been made in connection to Mudde’s definition, indicates that citizens’ are voting for campaigns like this because they are dissatisfied with the current regime and thus demand a change within the political sphere. I believe that this cross-regional comparison, has thus contributed to further knowledge that populist actors, parties and movements, share similar political concerns on both sides of the Atlantic, in this case, the U.S. and the UK.

6.1 Further research

We live in an integrated world that could be seen as a multipolar system, consisting of multicultural societies and mutual interdependence. However, this has had consequences, such as the fear of being deprived of one’s sovereignty as well as identity. What the Brexit leave campaign and Trump’s presidential campaign have both shown is especially the fear of further integration with external actors. This has further led to the fact that xenophobia, anti-immigration, anti-integration and anti-globalization have all become prominent elements of the political discourse which citizens are voting for. Evidently, this has been confirmed, given that Trump has become the 45th American president, and Britain will be the very first member state to leave the EU. Hence, if populism will not be taken seriously, future threats will not only be a threat to, inter alia, supranational institutions such as the EU and their cohesion, but also a threat to external actors, such as for third countries like China, Japan and Mexico to integrate with the West. Thus, I believe that research on populism in a comparative perspective becomes very important, not only to find further components that explain the
complexity of the populist phenomenon, but also to understand why citizens are voting for such movements, actors, parties, referendums and so on.

Given that populism does not seem to decline in contemporary democracies, and rather the contrary, the phenomenon is thus more likely to continue to fascinate researchers in the coming years. If one wishes to continue on the same path as this research, one could possibly compare Trump’s presidency with the UK and its process of leaving the EU. This will most likely contribute to further essential information towards the understanding of the complexity of populist phenomena across the world, as well as why citizens are voting for them.
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