

HISTORY OF FORMATION FEATURES OF EARLY CONCEPTUALIZATION AND THE FIRST PRACTICAL MANIFESTATIONS OF POPULISM: SYSTEMATIZATION AT THE BACKGROUND OF NON-EUROPEAN CONTEXT

The article is dedicated to analyzing the history of formation, features of early or primary conceptualization and manifestations of the concept of “populism” in political practice and Political Science outside Europe. To do this, the author chronicled how the concept of populism arose, how it acquired different theoretical and normative connotations, and how it relates to other categories in different non-European countries, regions and parts of the world. It is argued that non-European populism should be talked about initially and historically on the example of such countries as the United States and the Russian Empire, and later primarily on the example of Latin America and (to a lesser extent) Africa. It was found that the concept of “populism” both theoretically and practically, as well as in a negative and in a positive senses and contexts is primarily based on the appeal to antagonism along the lines of “people” (as a positive category) and “political elite/dominant ideology” (as a negative category). These antagonistic opposites are analyzed in terms of their evolution, dynamics and changes, which actually testify to and demonstrate the history of populism in the non-European world. As a result, it has been shown that populism can be “elitist” (when it is mostly a mean of gaining and retaining power) and “popular” (when it is a mean of changing power and improving the status and rights of society) ones. It has been also shown that populism under autocracy can promote pluralism, democratization and democracy, but in the case of democracy it can generate risks of “erosion” of democracy and autocratization.

Keywords: populism, politics, people, elite, political struggle, political process.

HISTORIA POWSTANIA, CECHY WCZESNEJ KONCEPTUALIZACJI I PIERWSZE PRAKTYCZNE PRZEJAWY POPULIZMU: SYSTEMATYZACJA NA TLE POZAEUROPEJSKIEGO KONTEKSTU

W artykule przeanalizowano historię powstawania i cechy wczesnej/pierwotnej konceptualizacji i przejawów pojęcia „populizmu” w praktyce politycznej i politologii poza Europą. W tym celu odnotowujemy, jak powstało pojęcie populizmu, jak nabrało ono różnych konotacji teoretycznych i normatywnych oraz jak odnosi się do innych kategorii w różnych pozaeuropejskich krajach, regionach i częściach świata. Argumentowano, że o populizmie pozaeuropejskim

належy mówić początkowo i historycznie na przykładzie takich krajów, jak Stany Zjednoczone i Imperium Rosyjskie, a później przede wszystkim na przykładzie Ameryki Łacińskiej i w mniejszym stopniu Afryki. Stwierdzono, że pojęcie „populizmu” zarówno teoretycznie i praktycznie, jak i w sensie negatywnym i pozytywnym oraz w kontekście opiera się przede wszystkim na odwołaniu się do antagonizmu na wzór „ludzi” (jako kategorii pozytywnej) – „elita polityczna / dominująca ideologia” (kategoria negatywna). Te antagonistyczne przeciwieństwa są analizowane pod kątem ich ewolucji, dynamiki i zmian, które w rzeczywistości świadczą i pokazują historię populizmu w świecie pozaeuropejskim. W rezultacie wykazano, że populizm może być „elitarny” (kiedy jest głównie środkiem do zdobycia i utrzymania władzy) i „ludowy” (kiedy jest środkiem do zmiany władzy i poprawy statusu, statusu i praw społeczeństwa). Wykazano również, że populizm w demokracji może promować pluralizm, demokratyzację i demokrację, ale w przypadku demokracji może generować ryzyko „erozji” demokracji i autokracji.

Słowa kluczowe: populizm, polityka, ludność, elita, walka polityczna, proces polityczny.

ІСТОРІЯ СТАНОВЛЕННЯ ТА ОСОБЛИВОСТІ РАННЬОЇ КОНЦЕПТУАЛІЗАЦІЇ І ПЕРШИХ ПРАКТИЧНИХ ВИЯВІВ ПОПУЛІЗМУ: СИСТЕМАТИЗАЦІЯ НА ТЛІ ПОЗАЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОГО КОНТЕКСТУ

У статті проаналізовано історію становлення й особливості ранньої/первинної концептуалізації виявів поняття “популізм” у політичній практиці та політичній науці поза межами Європи. Для цього зафіксовано те, як виникло поняття популізму, як воно набуло різних теоретичних і нормативних конотацій як воно пов’язується з іншими категоріями різних неєвропейських країнах, регіонах та частинах світу. Аргументовано, що про неєвропейський популізм потрібно ініціально й історично говорити на прикладі таких країн, як США й умовно Російська імперія, а згодом передусім наприкладі країн Латинської Америки та меншою мірою Африки. Виявлено, що поняття “популізм” і теоретично, і практично, а також і в негативному, і в позитивному сенсі та контексті передусім ґрунтується на зверненні до антагонізму по лінії “народ” (як позитивна категорія) – “політична еліта/панівна ідеологія” (негативна категорія). Ці антагоністичні протилежності проаналізовано на предмет їхньої еволюції, динаміки й видозміни, які власне й засвідчують та демонструють історію розвитку популізму у рамках неєвропейського світу. У підсумку показано, що популізм буває “елітистським” (коли він здебільшого є засобом отримання й утримання влади) і “народним” (коли він є засобом зміни влади й покращення статусу, стану та прав соціуму). Також доведено, що в умовах недемократії популізм здатний сприяти плюралізму, демократизації і демократії,

а натомість у випадку демократії він може генерувати ризики “срозії” демократії і автократизацію.

Ключові слова: популізм, політика, народ, еліта, політична боротьба, політичний процес.

The end of the 20th – beginning of the 21st centuries certainly became milestones of formation and development of the populism phenomenon, both in Europe and abroad, and therefore populism has become a global phenomenon, albeit with different national and regional attributes. However, even though populism has traditionally had non-European roots, it is currently still associated primarily with various manifestations of the political process in the Western world, although, on the contrary, it has been very successfully conceptualized and continues to do so in other parts of the world. This certainly actualizes the agenda of the history of formation and features of early conceptualization and manifestations of the concept of “populism” in various political practices and political science outside Europe.

The stated scientific subject has been very successfully studied for a very long time by a number of scientists from different countries of the world. Among them such researchers as J. Allcock¹, I. Berlin, R. Hofstadter and D. McRae², M. Canovan³, M. Conniff⁴, C. De la Torre⁵,

T. Di Tella⁶, G. Germani⁷, J. Hicks⁸, G. Ionescu and E. Gellner⁹, R. Lowitt¹⁰, J. Mansbridge and S. Macedo¹¹, C. Mudde and C. Kaltwasser¹², D. Resnick¹³, P. Taggart¹⁴, A. Van Niekerk¹⁵, K. Weyland¹⁶ and many others. Of course, they have prepared extremely relevant and meaningful works on the issue of populism or even are its theorists, conceptualizers and practitioners. Our task is to describe and structurally

¹ Allcock J., Populism: A Brief Biography, “Sociology” 1971, vol 5, nr. 3, s. 371-387.

² Berlin I., Hofstadter R., McRae D., To define populism, “Government and Opposition” 1968, vol 3, s. 137-179.

³ Canovan M., Populism, Wyd. Junction Books 1981.; Canovan M., The People, Wyd. Polity Press 2005.

⁴ Conniff M., Latin American Populism in Comparative Perspective, Wyd. University of New Mexico Press 1982.

⁵ De la Torre C., Populism in Latin America, [w:] Kaltwasser C., Taggart P., Espejo P., Ostiguy P. (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Populism, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2017, s. 195-213.

⁶ Di Tella T., Populism and Reform in Latin America, [w:] Veliz C. (ed.), Obstacles to Change in Latin America, Wyd. Oxford University Press 1965.; Di Tella T., Populism into the Twenty-first Century, “Government and Opposition” 1997, vol 32, nr. 2, s. 187-200.

⁷ Germani G., Authoritarianism, Fascism and National Populism, Wyd. Transaction Books 1978.

⁸ Hicks J., The Populist Revolt. A History of Farmers’ Alliance and the People’s Party, Wyd. Greenwood Press 1931.

⁹ Ionescu G., Gellner E., Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969.

¹⁰ Lowitt R., Fred Harris: his journey from liberalism to populism, Wyd. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers 2002.

¹¹ Mansbridge J., Macedo S., Populism and Democratic Theory, “Annual Review of Law and Social Science” 2019, vol 15, nr. 1, s. 59-77.

¹² Mudde C., Kaltwasser C., Populism: A Very Short Introduction, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2017

¹³ Resnick D., Populism in Africa, [w:] Kaltwasser C., Taggart P., Espejo P., Ostiguy P. (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Populism, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2017, s. 101-120.

¹⁴ Taggart P., Populism, Wyd. Open University Press 2000.

¹⁵ Van Niekerk A., Populism and political development in Latin America, Wyd. Rotterdam University Press 1974.

¹⁶ Weyland K., Clarifying a Contested Concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics, “Comparative Politics” 2001, vol 34, nr. 1, s. 1-22.

systematize the history of formation and features of conceptualization and practical manifestations of populism on a non-European basis, especially in the context of early and primary conceptualization of the studied phenomenon.

We start to solve the research task by clarifying the preconditions for the formation and history of the concept of “populism”, including in the non-European context. Today, it is quite obvious, on the one hand, that politics is a category, activity and linguistic process (because political actions, competition and acts are possible and carried out through language) and evaluative-loaded (i.e. mobilized as political means to achieve certain goals), and, on the other hand, that political categories and concepts partially constitute political beliefs, actions and practices and vice versa, including in the framework of understanding, conceptualizing and practicing the democratic political process and democracies as political regimes¹⁷. Thus, the contradictions regarding the understanding and dissemination / implantation of democracy as such in different societies and contexts inevitably reflect certain contradictions between the desired political actions and the application of these actions in practice, including through political discourse. This means that both the world in general, and the world of politics in particular, and including the world of democracy are necessarily connected with language and discourse, because they are part of them, constructed by them and modified on their basis in different contexts and so on¹⁸.

It is in this sense that the notion of “populism” acquires special significance synchronously and diachronically, especially since it is not traditionally used in isolation, but it is studied, used and is determined mainly by such linguistic and political categories as “people”, “nationhood” and “democracy”. Accordingly, it follows that the etymology and perspective of the concept of “populism”, regardless of the part of the world in which it is used, cannot simply be reduced to communication. At the same time, the specificity of the populism understanding depends on the dynamics and changes in the ways of concentrating it on social and political reality¹⁹. That is why the etymological and diachronic feature of populism, also regardless of the geography of its application, is that this category is usually used not only to describe a phenomenon, but also to assess, approve, condemn and so on.

Given all this, it should be noted that sooner or later populism should be conceptualized (which it did) in virtually every geographical area, not just in Europe. However, the most interesting thing in this context is that populism did not appear in the region,

¹⁷ FarrJ., Understanding conceptual change politically, [w:] BallT., FarrJ., Hanson R. (eds.), Political Innovation and Conceptual Change, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1989, s. 26-29.

¹⁸ BallT., FarrJ., Hanson R., Preface, [w:] BallT., FarrJ., Hanson R. (eds.), Political Innovation and Conceptual Change, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1989, s. IX.

¹⁹ FrançoisP., De convergentie tussen de Angelsaksische ideeëngeschiedenis en de Duitse/continentale begripsgeschiedenis – een status questionis, „Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire“ 2005, vol 83-84, nr. 4, s. 1179.

but outside it, even though Europe has historically been home to other concepts – “people” and “democracy” (when the latter was understood primarily in a negative sense)²⁰, and only later, from the 19th century, but mainly from the second half of the 20th century, started to be perceived positively, in particular as people’s sovereignty and political equality²¹) – to which and / or against which often appeals populism as a kind of label of legality and legitimization of power. Perhaps the main reason for this fact is that in the socio-political process and social sciences was and remains ambiguous interpretation of the concept of “people”, whereas in one case they refer to “plebs” and “ordinary people” who, through illiteracy and absenteeism, can become a mob and disrupt the integrity of the political and social system, and in another case, the core of the so-called people’s sovereignty, which includes, first of all, the citizens of certain countries, who instead organize and consensualize the social and political system²².

Given this duality of the categories “people” and “democracy”, in particular when they came on the agenda of the political process and social discourse, at the end of the 19th century the phenomenon and concept of populism actually and initially appears not in Europe but in the United States.

It can be traced in the characterization of the American People’s Party²³, which was founded in 1892 and operated until 1909, and which was a reaction to the relative “failure” of the “Democrats” and “Republicans” (as basic and main parties) over workers’ and peasants’ protection in the country²⁴. The fact is that this political force of its time – almost for the first time in the world – opposed the unprivileged / oppressed position of ordinary people and began to appeal to the so-called “power of the people” as a whole²⁵. At the same time, one of the classics and theorists of populism J. Kicks in his work since 1931 – “Populist Uprising” commented that the terms “populists” and “pops” in the United States arose primarily as a mockery, because they, on the contrary, disqualify and criticized supporters of the People’s Party, and only later – due to the continuity of their use – became (with the exception of the term “pops”, which disappeared) self-description among populists²⁶. Although purely etymologically and historically it is recorded, that the term “populists” (as well as its negative journalistic counterpart – “Pops”) originated in the United States in order to abbreviate and name members and

²⁰ Dunn J., *Setting the People Free. The Story of Democracy*, Wyd. Atlantic Books 2005, s. 54, 60.; Przeworski A., *Democracy and the Limits of Self-Government*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 2010, s. 4.; Manin B., *The Principles of Representative Government*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1997, s. 1.

²¹ Hanson R., *Democracy*, [w:] Ball T., Farr J., Hanson R. (eds.), *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1989, s. 69.

²² Canovan M., *The People*, Wyd. Polity Press 2005, s. 69.

²³ Mansbridge J., Macedo S., *Populism and Democratic Theory*, “Annual Review of Law and Social Science” 2019, vol 15, nr. 1, s. 59-77.

²⁴ Taggart P., *Populism*, Wyd. Open University Press 2000, s. 29.

²⁵ Hicks J., *The Populist Revolt. A History of Farmers’ Alliance and the People’s Party*, Wyd. Greenwood Press 1931, s. 441.

²⁶ Hicks J., *The Populist Revolt. A History of Farmers’ Alliance and the People’s Party*, Wyd. Greenwood Press 1931, s. 238.

supporters of the People's Party (both positively and negatively), in particular by analogy with the "Democrats" and the "Republicans"²⁷, and therefore this term was clarifying and descriptive, but not at all conceptual, as it referred to the designation of a certain political force and, in part, negatively oriented, anti-systemic tactics of its participation in the electoral process.

However, in addition, it was in the United States that the terms "populists" and "populism" later became broader, albeit more negative, as they, however, within the functioning of the People's Party, began to denote labels in the form of an asymmetric opposition to democracy and the democratic political process. Based on this, populism as a kind of anarchism and tactics of the US People's Party appears to be a controversy of democracy and begins to be conceptualized, albeit relatively weakly. This creates a construct where the mainstream political forces in the United States are defined as democratic in methods and the populist political force as anti-democratic, and in many situations and countries it becomes the rule of the political process, although it was soon challenged conceptually, theoretically, methodologically and practically. However, at the same time, another – non-partisan – understanding of populism as a label of anti-intellectual nature and democracy in the United States is being formed, as non-partisan populists increasingly advocate "returning" power to the people and denying a number of principles of representative democracy, which contradict this desire and this requirement.

Accordingly, it is since this time in the United States, and later in other countries around the world a slightly different view of populism is formed, in particular, not as a denial or alternative to any form of democracy, but as a format of opposition of the "people" (positive side of the medal) to the "political elite" (negative side of the medal), but mainly within the distinction between "true" and "false" democracies. It is due to this (as well as the actual origin of the term "populism") that some significant progression and "whitening" of the phenomenon of populism starts and it begins to be conceptualized, and later tested and mobilized in political life²⁸.

At the same time, some similar processes, although not at all in a democracy, took place in other parts of the world in the second half of the 19th century, in particular in the Russian Empire, which was not perceived as part of Europe at all. At least this can be said purely conceptually and ideologically, including the concept of "narodnik movement", which is often used in this state, although in different senses. However, the connection can be traced when "narodnik movement" is understood not as a form of agrarian socialism in the Russian Empire, but as a specific attitude towards people who

²⁷ Hicks J., *The Populist Revolt. A History of Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party*, Wyd. Greenwood Press 1931, s. 239.

²⁸ Canovan M., *Populism*, Wyd. Junction Books 1981, s. 21.; Koselleck R., *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, Wyd. Columbia University Press 2004, s. 80.

were supporters of various radical movements against the empire or its certain policies. The fact is that the “narodniks” (as a kind of “Russian populists” for the empire) advocated a clear reality of state action, rather than an amorphous desire to achieve certain unrealistic and abstract goals through the interests of oppressed and enslaved segments of the population²⁹. It was thanks to this idea that they tried to mobilize these sections of the population for revolutionary action against the autocratic and monarchical regime and certain socio-political innovations, although nothing came of it due to the resistance of the czarism regime and bureaucratic apparatus³⁰. However, in general and purely conceptually, this format of understanding “narodnik movement” was positively oriented³¹, as it appealed to theorizing “hegemony of the masses over the educated elite” and therefore formed a form of “pragmatic theory of democratic action”³², albeit by promoting the essence of the concept of “people” as “mass” and “pebs”³³.

Although, on the contrary, Russian researchers mostly and for the most part hold a slightly different opinion, as they note that the period of “populist doctrine” we mentioned was not a form of populism at all, but rather an anti-systemic opposition to the autocratic political regime, instead, one should speak of “narodnik movement” in the format of populism, appealing to Lenin’s ideas, which gave “narodnik movement” more specific historical, political and sociological connotations as a manifestation of populist protest against capitalism and feudal forms of exploitation from the point of view of small producers³⁴. However, such ideas do not find sufficient support in the West, for it is argued that Lenin mainly used such ideas only to gain power, and only then to directly combat the manifestations of “narodnik movement”³⁵. However, in general, there is a rather interesting situation in this context, as Russian researchers used the term “narodnic movement” in the domestic arena, but translated it into Western languages, primarily into English, as “populism”, which significantly complicated the situation³⁶. But even though, neither Russian researchers nor their Western counterparts have in any way drawn parallels between the cases of American and Russian early populism, that is, between “populists” and “narodniks.” Although, in contrast, there was something common between these concepts, because some, and others, but through different

²⁹ Pipes R., *Narodnichestvo: A Semantic Inquiry*, “Slavic Review” 1964, vol 23, nr. 3, s. 441, 445; Pipes R., *Russia under the Old Regime*, Wyd. Weidenfeld and Nicolson 1974, s. 165; Taggart P., *Populism*, Wyd. Open University Press 2000, s. 47-48; Canovan M., *Populism*, Wyd. Junction Books 1981, s. 73.

³⁰ Taggart P., *Populism*, Wyd. Open University Press 2000, s. 53-54

³¹ Pipes R., *Narodnichestvo: A Semantic Inquiry*, “Slavic Review” 1964, vol 23, nr. 3, s. 443.

³² Pipes R., *Narodnichestvo: A Semantic Inquiry*, “Slavic Review” 1964, vol 23, nr. 3, s. 458.

³³ Lazari A., *Narod*, [w:] Lazari A. (ed.), *Idee w Rosji. Leksykon rosyjsko – polsko – angielski*. Tom 1, Wyd. Semper 1999, s. 268

³⁴ Walicki A., *Russia*, [w:] Ionescu G., Gellner E. (eds.), *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969, s. 63, 65-66.

³⁵ Berlin I., Hofstadter R., McRae D., *To define populism*, “Government and Opposition” 1968, vol 3, s. 139.

³⁶ Walicki A., *Russia*, [w:] Ionescu G., Gellner E. (eds.), *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969, s. 63; Milyoukov P., *Russia*, “The Athenaeum” 1895 (July 6), nr. 3532, s. 25.

channels, tried to appeal to the phenomenon of involvement of individuals and groups of people in decision-making, and thus to nationality and even democracy (in the latter – primarily in the US, although later in Russia)³⁷. Another common feature of early American “populism” and Russian anti-imperial “narodnik movement” was: they were purely populists analytically, as in both cases they represented predominantly grass-roots or even peasant appeals and demands for a change in the “progress” of capitalism, modernization or industrialization³⁸. Finally, the fact that sometimes in imperial Russia “narodniks” or representatives of conditional “populism” considered those intellectuals who not only opposed the tsarist regime, but also denied the expediency of reforming in the direction of socialism through capitalism in particular by offering an alternative to circumventing capitalism, deserves special attention.

The following, what should be noted in the context of the early progress of populism in countries outside Europe, concerns primarily the interwar period. In this case, it is important to note that in the interwar period, the term “populism” has almost never been used in them and almost in European countries, at least in relation to existing parties and movements. Although, on the other hand, instead of this concept, some European thinkers, philosophers and scholars have appealed to such a category as “popularism”³⁹.

(in particular, to outline the ideological platform of the Italian People’s Party, founded in 1919, which in the 1990s became the basis for the formation of the “Christian Democrats” in Italy). They marked, on the one hand, the tendency of political forces to represent not the corporate and group interests of certain clusters of society, but the whole society or all members of society, as well as, on the other hand, the ideological positioning of political forces between liberalism and socialism (within the ideas of the “secular intelligentsia”) and against radical ideologies (fascism, Nazism, etc.), which was very relevant after the First World War⁴⁰. At the same time, European philosophical and political thought of the interwar period still appealed to the phenomenon and apparition of populism, in particular in the 1920s and 1930s, when describing a group of French novelists who turned to the observations and sympathies of ordinary people on the basis of populism, and when historians evaluate the participation of ordinary people in the politically important events of certain countries⁴¹.

³⁷ AllcockJ., Populism: A Brief Biography, “Sociology”1971, vol 5, nr. 3, s. 372.; PipesR., Narodnichestvo: A Semantic Inquiry, “Slavic Review”1964, vol 23, nr. 3, s. 442-443.

³⁸ Ionescu G., Gellner E., Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics, Wyd. Weidenfeld1969, s. 134-135.

³⁹ Gramsci A., Selections from the Prison Notebooks (edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith), Wyd. International Publishers2010, s. 62

⁴⁰ Gramsci A., Selections from the Prison Notebooks (edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith), Wyd. International Publishers2010, s. 62.

⁴¹ AllcockJ., Populism: A Brief Biography, “Sociology”1971, vol 5, nr. 3, s. 372.

In contrast, the issue of populism began to be addressed quite actively – both in Europe and abroad – mostly after the Second World War, in particular against the background of interpreting popular support for various totalitarian movements, especially fascism and Nazism, as well as McCarthyism, which definitely gave rise to new fears of the masses of society and, accordingly, various new interpretations of populism in the world. On this basis, for example, in the United States, populism came to be understood primarily as an opposition to “ideal” or liberal democracy, and thus gained a mostly purely negative or even derogatory connotation. With this in mind, E. Shields stated that in such view populism as a negative construction is or can be very ambiguous, in particular as the populism of Nazism, the populism of fascism, the populism of Bolshevism, the populism of McCarthyism, and thus such different manifestations of populism took place both within and outside Europe, and populism itself was mainly interpreted as taking place only in the presence of an “ideology” of popular indignation against a certain order imposed on one or another society by the “old” and rather differentiated ruling class, which by all means had or has a monopoly on power, property, culture, etc.⁴². In this context, there has been reached the view that populism and populists are or at least should be “hostile to the intelligentsia, financial powers and politicians”, as the value of the wisdom of not the latter but the “people” who are superior to any other is stated. From this it was stated that within the populist perception of the political process, everyone is “higher” than his ruler and politicians in general, and therefore politics should not be privileged and should not provide for privileged actions and provisions.

This was precisely the critique of populism at the time by mainstream politicians, as it was argued that populism delegitimizes the democratic political process and its focus on representation (that is, in other words, undermines representative democracy). Although, on the contrary, it had positive effects, for it was obvious that populism was not completely unfounded, and therefore democracy had to become more liberal or focused on the protection of individual rights and freedoms of man and citizen⁴³.

In this context, some American historians and political scientists have returned to the practice and experience of the American People’s Party (as discussed above) and stated, that it (unlike its at least partial approval before) acted mostly negatively, as it even appealed to the mobilization of irrational political and military action, that is, to elements of anti-Semitism and xenophobia, in particular in the context of migration movements and flows in the United States. And this despite the fact that it was thanks to the People’s Party in the United States at one time, in particular to prevent its possible

⁴² ShilsE., *The Torment of Secrecy. The Background and Consequences of American Security Policies*, Wyd. The Free Press 1956, s. 100-101.

⁴³ ShilsE., *The Torment of Secrecy. The Background and Consequences of American Security Policies*, Wyd. The Free Press 1956, s. 102.

political success in the electoral context, that democratic views and democratic participation in the political process were intensified, especially at the grassroots or popular level⁴⁴. In other words, mid-twentieth-century American theorists generally agreed that populism, whether within the People's Party or within McCarthyism (albeit at different times, of course) led to the generation and application of an "irrational ideology of protest" rather than "an ideology to protect the American people"⁴⁵. Analogues of such manifestations of populism in the United States at one time were not only the mentioned political forces and processes, but also the phenomenon of the Ku Klux Klan, especially in the 1920s, or the positions / ideas of some American fascist movements in the 1930s, in particular under the leadership of then-Louisiana Governor and Senator Hugh Long⁴⁶.

In turn, the most famous or direct analogues or homologues of such processes and phenomena in other non-European countries were the actions and positions within the political leadership of H. D. Perón as President of Argentina during 1946-1955 and J. Vargas as President of Brazil in 1930 – 1945 and 1951 – 1954. The fact is that these politicians constructed and promoted political regimes similar to populist fascism in Italy, because they had a very strong anti-parliamentary orientation, especially considering that the power of the party and / or leader in the parliamentary structure is ineffective, for it is derived directly from people who are incompetent in politics, and therefore choose ineffective and corrupt politicians⁴⁷.

Therefore, on this basis, it can be stated that in the period focused on the early 60's of the 20th century, the term "populism" was used almost always in a negative sense and should be interpreted as a way to achieve, to gain or retain power, as well as a way of largely autocratic rule and governance and, consequently, as a direct threat to liberal or even representative democracy in general.

The next stage of early development and conceptualization of populism in the non-European space began in the 60s of the 20th century and lasted until the late 80s of the 20th century. At this time, for the most part, there was a colossal shift in the categorization of populism and its perception, because populism was often talked about in terms of appeals to the existence and functioning of various reformist or revolutionary political forces and politicians, although mainly in the underdeveloped countries of the world, which were characterized by a very changeable and unstable political process, even regardless of their political regimes – democratic, hybrid or autocratic ones. As a result, many political leaders and formal leaders of different parts of the world

⁴⁴ Canovan M., *Populism*, Wyd. Junction Books 1981, s. 47, 50-51.

⁴⁵ Lipset S., *Political Man. The Social Bases of Politics*, Wyd. Heinemann 1960, s. 172-173.

⁴⁶ Lipset S., *Political Man. The Social Bases of Politics*, Wyd. Heinemann 1960, s. 169.

⁴⁷ Lipset S., *Political Man. The Social Bases of Politics*, Wyd. Heinemann 1960, s. 173.

(especially in Latin America and Africa, not to mention Eastern Europe) were treated as populists, especially by Western scholars and politicians⁴⁸. In addition, a whole array of political parties and movements started to be formed, which, according to various interpretations, were described as populist, which did not happen in the previous stages of populism⁴⁹.

As a result, political science has for the first time begun to hold numerous and diverse seminars, academic conferences and conferences, which were focused on the topic of political populism and populism in the political discourse. At the same time, it was at this time that the world saw perhaps the most famous classical works on populism, including in countries outside Europe, in particular by such authors as G. Ionescu and E. Gellner⁵⁰, L. Shapiro, J. Allcock⁵¹, I. Berlin, R. Hofstadter, D. McRae⁵² D. Tell⁵³, G. Germani⁵⁴ and many others. But the most interesting thing is that both theoretically and practically it was found that populism has become a topic and problem primarily in the non-European space, for the European world, in contrast, by the end of the 1980s was positioned as ideologically structured and less (though definitely not absolutely) subject to populist discourse and the influence of populist politicians.

So, the bright manifestations of populism and populists in the world at that time or earlier were called various liberation movements in Africa, in particular, the African National Union of Tanganyika (now Tanzania) in the 1950s and 1960s, the Ghanaian military government in 1969, Indian activist and politician J. Narayan, Tamil separatists in southern India, Chinese leader Mao Zedong, and others⁵⁵.

In general, the main change that took place at that time was related to the fact that populism outside Europe began to be talked about not only negatively, but both negatively and positively, and thus the context of his perception changed significantly, and populism itself began to be perceived as a context-dependent. As an example, I. Berlin and his colleagues⁵⁶ stated that populism can be "false" and "true", or negatively and positively directed. At the same time, the former traditionally leads or appeals to the mobilization of certain populist sentiments, including hostility towards various social groups, on the basis of which, opposing political elites, it actually contributes to the formation of elitist political regimes (as in the case of Bonapartism, McCarthyism,

⁴⁸ Worsley P., *The Concept of Populism*, [w:] Ionescu G., Gellner E. (eds.), *Populism. Its Meanings*

⁴⁹ Ionescu G., Gellner E., *Introduction*, [w:] Ionescu G., Gellner E. (eds.), *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969, s. 5.

⁵⁰ Ionescu G., Gellner E., *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969.

⁵¹ Allcock J., *Populism: A Brief Biography*, "Sociology" 1971, vol 5, nr. 3, s. 378.

⁵² Berlin I., Hofstadter R., McRae D., *To define populism*, "Government and Opposition" 1968, vol 3, s. 137-179.

⁵³ Di Tella T., *Populism and Reform in Latin America*, [w:] Veliz C. (ed.), *Obstacles to Change in Latin America*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 1965.

⁵⁴ Germani G., *Authoritarianism, Fascism and National Populism*, Wyd. Transaction Books 1978.

⁵⁵ Berlin I., Hofstadter R., McRae D., *To define populism*, "Government and Opposition" 1968, vol 3, s. 138-155.

⁵⁶ Berlin I., Hofstadter R., McRae D., *To define populism*, "Government and Opposition" 1968, vol 3, s. 176-177.

Pujatism, rhetoric and the activities of Egyptian President G.A. Nasser or President of Pakistan A. Khan, etc.). Instead, the latter is usually characterized by a democratic egalitarian impulse, as it protests against the aristocracy and against hierarchical systems, thereby hinting at the need to develop the liberal values of representative democracies (which is relevant in the case of most democracies of the world, both past and present)⁵⁷. But one way or another, the concept of populism – both in its positive and in its negative sense – inevitably presupposes an appeal to antagonism along the lines of “the people – the political elite / dominant ideology”⁵⁸, however, with the difference to what consequences it leads and what is populism – only a means of achieving and retaining power (in the case of autocracies and democracies) or a means of achieving power, and modernization, and a bona fide influence on improving the place of man and citizen in the political sphere (primarily in democracies, but partly in the case of modernizing authoritarianism).

The very association of populism – mostly in its positive sense – with possible modernization, both socio-economic and socio-political, has been the subject of a number of theorizations and academic research of the analyzed time period. This is evidenced by the position of T. di Tella, who once stated that populism should be understood as a socio-political movement that enjoys the support of the masses of the urban working class and the peasantry, but which is not the result of an autonomous organized force of any of these groups⁵⁹. At the same time, populism is not always focused on the working or peasant class, because it can be defended and supported by other sectors of society, which rather come from the position of changing the status quo, what at one time was manifested in the example of the ideas and activities of such politicians, statesmen and political forces as H. D. Perón and K. Menem in Argentina, J. Vargas and F. K. de Mello in Brazil, the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement in Bolivia, L. Cardenas in Mexico, W. R. H. de la Torre and A. Fujimori in Peru, “Democratic Action” in Venezuela, H. Ibarra in Ecuador, J. Rawlings in Ghana, T. Sankara in Burkina Faso, GA Nasser in Egypt, M. Gaddafi in Libya, F. Harris, J. Wallis, J. Carter, R. Whitaker, F. Harris, and the American National Progressive Republican League in the United States, R. Muldoon in New Zealand, and many others⁶⁰.

⁵⁷ Canovan M., *Populism*, Wyd. Junction Books 1981, s. 172.

⁵⁸ Laclau E., *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory*, Wyd. New Left Books 1977, s. 165, 173.

⁵⁹ Di Tella T., *Populism and Reform in Latin America*, [w:] Veliz C. (ed.), *Obstacles to Change in Latin America*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 1965, s. 47.

⁶⁰ Lowitt R., *Fred Harris: his journey from liberalism to populism*, Wyd. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers 2002.; Mudde C., *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2017, s. 25-39.; De la Torre C., *Populism in Latin America*, [w:] Kaltwasser C., Taggart P., Espejo P., Ostiguy P. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2017, s. 195-213.; Cowen T., *Feisty, Protectionist Populism? New Zealand Tried That*, Wyd. Bloomberg L.P. (13 February 2017).; Resnick D., *Populism in Africa*, [w:] Kaltwasser C., Taggart P., Espejo P., Ostiguy P. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2017, s. 101-120.; Germani G., *Authoritarianism, Fascism and National Populism*, Wyd. Transaction Books 1978.; Conniff M., *Latin American Populism in Comparative Perspective*, Wyd. University of New Mexico Press 1982, s. 211.; Van Niekerk A., *Populism and political development in Latin America*, Wyd. Rotterdam University Press 1974.

These examples are mostly or once were cases of underdeveloped countries, where it was relatively easy to mobilize the population with the idea of prospects for socio-economic and socio-political modernization (although the idea of the influence of populism on the mobilization of the population today is largely refuted⁶¹). After all, the population in this case is or was definitely characterized by growing expectations, against which it is possible to form or release a kind of emotional collective enthusiasm⁶². Therefore, as stated by T. di Tella, populism in the underdeveloped countries of the world has become a kind of analogue or homologue of social democracy in the developed world, since it was focused primarily on improving the level of justice and social equality, and therefore was treated as positive. Instead, the scientist continues, if populism takes place in already democratic countries of the world, it can threaten the level of their democracy and socio-economic and socio-political progress, and so on⁶³. In other words, as some researchers have briefly written⁶⁴, in a non-democracy populism can, although not the norm, promote pluralism, democratization and democracy, instead, in the case of democracy, it can generate risks of “erosion” of democracy or, conversely, autocratization. In addition, populism can contribute to the development of a certain collective identity, because it appeals to the “people” and can serve as a channel for the “political elite” to defend the right to independence of a sub political unit. It follows that already in the early and classical manifestations and theorizations of populism, in particular from its origins to the late 80s of the 20th century, it was found that populism as such is “elitist” (when it is mostly a means of gaining and retaining power, including in the format of hegemony) and “people’s” (when it is a means of changing power and improving or at least hinting at improving the socio-political and socio-economic status and condition and political rights of the population and society⁶⁵), and that, through populist discourse, politicians try to be as comprehensive or inclusive as possible, especially if those politicians are “outsiders”⁶⁶.

Canovan M., *Populism*, Wyd. Junction Books 1981, s. 271.

In general, the study states that the phenomenon and phenomenon of populism in countries outside Europe has gone through several stages of early development, including initially from total negation of populism to its gradual introduction into a heterogeneous (or “elitist” or

⁶¹ Weyland K., Clarifying a Contested Concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics, “Comparative Politics” 2001, vol 34, nr. 1, s. 10.

⁶² Di Tella T., Populism and Reform in Latin America, [w:] Veliz C. (ed.), Obstacles to Change in Latin America, Wyd. Oxford University Press 1965, s. 51-53.

⁶³ Di Tella T., Populism into the Twenty-first Century, “Government and Opposition” 1997, vol 32, nr. 2, s. 200.

⁶⁴ O’Donnell G., Tensions in the Bureaucratic-Authoritarian State and the Question of Democracy, [w:] Collier D. (ed.), The New Authoritarianism in Latin America, Wyd. Princeton University Press 1979, s. 289-290.; Hennessy A., Latin America, [w:] Ionescu G., Gellner E. (eds.), Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969, s. 29.

⁶⁵ Laclau E., Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory, Wyd. New Left Books 1977, s. 173.

⁶⁶ Canovan M., *Populism*, Wyd. Junction Books 1981, s. 271.

“popular”) category, which should be understood either as negative or as positive. Accordingly, in one case, populism is traditionally considered a policy tool aimed at gaining and retaining power (both in democracies and mainly in autocracies), and in another case, as an incentive policy aimed at expanding direct democracy and the liberality of democracy itself (and not only within already democratic regimes). However, the development of populism did not end there, but instead developed further, which certainly needs further consideration and detail in other scientific studies.

REFERENCES

1. Allcock J., Populism: A Brief Biography, “Sociology” 1971, vol 5, nr. 3, s. 371-387.
2. Ball T., Farr J., Hanson R., Preface, [w:] Ball T., Farr J., Hanson R. (eds.), Political Innovation and Conceptual Change, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1989.
3. Berlin I., Hofstadter R., McRae D., To define populism, “Government and Opposition” 1968, vol 3, s. 137-179.
4. Canovan M., Populism, Wyd. Junction Books 1981.
5. Canovan M., The People, Wyd. Polity Press 2005.
6. Conniff M., Latin American Populism in Comparative Perspective, Wyd. University of New Mexico Press 1982.
7. Cowen T., Feisty, Protectionist Populism? New Zealand Tried That, Wyd. Bloomberg L.P. (13 February 2017).
8. De la Torre C., Populism in Latin America, [w:] Kaltwasser C., Taggart P., Espejo P., Ostiguy P. (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Populism, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2017, s. 195-213.
9. Di Tella T., Populism and Reform in Latin America, [w:] Veliz C. (ed.), Obstacles to Change in Latin America, Wyd. Oxford University Press 1965.
10. Di Tella T., Populism into the Twenty-first Century, “Government and Opposition” 1997, vol 32, nr. 2, s. 187-200.
11. Dunn J., Setting the People Free. The Story of Democracy, Wyd. Atlantic Books 2005.
12. Farr J., Understanding conceptual change politically, [w:] Ball T., Farr J., Hanson R. (eds.), Political Innovation and Conceptual Change, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1989.
13. François P., De convergentie tussen de Angelsaksische ideeëngeschiedenis en de Duitse/continentale begripsgeschiedenis – een status questionis, „Revue Belge de philologie et d’histoire” 2005, vol 83-84, nr. 4, s. 1175-1203.
14. Germani G., Authoritarianism, Fascism and National Populism, Wyd. Transaction Books 1978.
15. Gramsci A., Selections from the Prison Notebooks (edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith), Wyd. International Publishers 2010.
16. Hanson R., Democracy, [w:] Ball T., Farr J., Hanson R. (eds.), Political Innovation and Conceptual Change, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1989.

17. Hennessy A., Latin America, [w:] Ionescu G., Gellner E. (eds.), *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969.
18. Hicks J., *The Populist Revolt. A History of Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party*, Wyd. Greenwood Press 1931.
19. Ionescu G., Gellner E., Introduction, [w:] Ionescu G., Gellner E. (eds.), *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969.
20. Ionescu G., Gellner E., *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969.
21. Koselleck R., *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, Wyd. Columbia University Press 2004.
22. Laclau E., *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory*, Wyd. New Left Books 1977.
23. Lazari A., Narod, [w:] Lazari A. (ed.), *Idee w Rosji. Leksykon rosyjsko – polsko – angielski. Tom 1*, Wyd. Semper 1999.
24. Lipset S., *Political Man. The Social Bases of Politics*, Wyd. Heinemann 1960.
25. Lowitt R., *Fred Harris: his journey from liberalism to populism*, Wyd. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers 2002.
26. Manin B., *The Principles of Representative Government*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1997.
27. Mansbridge J., Macedo S., *Populism and Democratic Theory*, "Annual Review of Law and Social Science" 2019, vol 15, nr. 1, s. 59-77.
28. Milyoukov P., Russia, "The Athenaeum" 1895 (July 6), nr. 3532.
29. Mudde C., Kaltwasser C., *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2017.
30. O'Donnell G., *Tensions in the Bureaucratic-Authoritarian State and the Question of Democracy*, [w:] Collier D. (ed.), *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America*, Wyd. Princeton University Press 1979.
31. Pipes R., *Narodnichestvo: A Semantic Inquiry*, "Slavic Review" 1964, vol 23, nr. 3, s. 441-458.
32. Pipes R., *Russia under the Old Regime*, Wyd. Weidenfeld and Nicolson 1974.
33. Przeworski A., *Democracy and the Limits of Self-Government*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 2010.
34. Resnick D., *Populism in Africa*, [w:] Kaltwasser C., Taggart P., Espejo P., Ostiguy P. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2017, s. 101-120.
35. Shils E., *The Torment of Secrecy. The Background and Consequences of American Security Policies*, Wyd. The Free Press 1956.
36. Taggart P., *Populism*, Wyd. Open University Press 2000.
37. Van Niekerk A., *Populism and political development in Latin America*, Wyd. Rotterdam University Press 1974.
38. Wąlicki A., Russia, [w:] Ionescu G., Gellner E. (eds.), *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969.
39. Weyland K., *Clarifying a Contested Concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics*, "Comparative Politics" 2001, vol 34, nr. 1, s. 1-22.
40. Worsley P., *The Concept of Populism*, [w:] Ionescu G., Gellner E. (eds.), *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*, Wyd. Weidenfeld 1969.