

THE RISE OF POPULISM IN BRITAIN: THE BREAKTHROUGH OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM INDEPENDENCE PARTY IN BETWEEN 2010-2015

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MUSTAFA MELİH YILMAZER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EUROPEAN STUDIES

AUGUST 2018

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Mustafa Melih Yilmazer

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE RISE OF POPULISM IN BRITAIN: BREAKTHROUGH OF THE UNITED KINGDOM INDEPENDENCE PARTY IN BETWEEN 2010-2015

YILMAZER, Mustafa Melih

Master of Science, Department of European Studies

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Başak Zeynep ALPAN

August, 2018, 113 Pages

In this thesis, it is aimed to provide a comprehensive understanding with regards to the rise of populism in Britain, particularly in the years between 2010 and 2015 in the context of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP). Firstly in this respect, the concept of populism is investigated on in a detailed way; and its growing appearance in British politics is discussed in detail. In order to understand the rise of populism in British politics in the context of UKIP between 2010-2015, the enabling conditions which have created suitable political and social environment for a right-wing populist party, UKIP, were determined and examined. As a following step, UKIP's populist political agendas as response to those enabling conditions were presented and discussed. In the end, it is found out that the rise of populism in Britain in the context of UKIP between 2010 and 2015 is a result of unprecedented harmony and connection between enabling conditions and UKIP's responses to those conditions in this specific timeframe through featured populist political agendas. Additionally, the overall impact of the rise of populism through UKIP on British politics is evaluated in the thesis; and it is demonstrated that UKIP's rise has indirectly change the British mainstream

political party system by affecting major parties' policy choices and internal dynamics; also started to shape existing public agendas of British electorate.

Keywords: Populism, United Kingdom Independence Party, Euroscepticism, British Politics

ÖZ

BRİTANYA'DA POPÜLİZMİN KUVVETLENMESİ: BİRLEŞİK KRALLIK BAĞIMSIZLIK PARTİSİ'NİN 2010-2015 YILLARI ARASINDAKİ YÜKSELİŞİ

YILMAZER, Mustafa Melih

Yüksek Lisans, Avrupa Çalışmaları Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Başak Zeynep ALPAN

Ağustos 2018, 113 sayfa

Bu tezde, İngiltere'de popülizmin kuvvetlenmesi, Birleşik Krallık Bağımsızlık Partisi'nin (UKIP) 2010-2015 yılları arasındaki yükselişi temel alınarak incelenmiştir. Bu doğrultuda, siyasi bir kavram olarak popülizm tartışılmış, tezin değerlendirme aşamalarında faydalanılmak üzere kavramsal çerçevesi oluşturulmuştur. UKIP'in bahsi geçen yıllar arasında İngiliz siyasetindeki yükselişine yönelik kapsamlı bir anlayış oluşturmak adına öncelikle, bu dönemde ülke siyasetinde ve toplumsal düzlemde var olan ve bu yükselişe olanak tanıyan yardımcı koşullar belirlenmiş ve sunulmuştur. Bunu takiben, UKIP'in bu yardımcı koşullara cevaben uyguladığı popülist tabanlı siyasi aksiyonlar ve manevralar detaylı bir şekilde ele alınmış ve incelenmiştir. Sonuç olarak, partinin bahsi geçen süreçteki yükselişine mevcut yardımcı koşullar ve bu koşullara partinin verdiği popülist siyasi reaksiyonların bir arada etkili bir şekilde var olmasının olanak sağladığı görülmüştür. Buna ek olarak tezde, 2010-2015 yılları arasında UKIP aracılığı ile yükselen popülizmin İngiltere siyasetine olan etkileri de ortaya konmuştur. Buna göre, UKIP bahsi geçen yıllar arasında İngiltere ana akım siyasetine dolaylı olarak etkide bulunmuştur. Öyle ki bu süreçte İngiltere

siyasetinin en köklü ve büyük iki siyasi partisinin karar alma mekanizmaları, iç dinamikleri ve siyasi adımları UKIP'in yükselişinden etkilenmiştir. Benzer bir şekilde UKIP, bu dönemde seçmenin önem verdiği politik durum ve olayları belirleme görevi üstlenmiş ve İngiliz toplumunun siyasi gündeminin şekillenmesinde büyük rol oynamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Popülizm, Birleşik Krallık Bağımsızlık Partisi, Avrupa Şüphenciligi, İngiltere Siyaseti

To my lovely mother and lovely father

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The process of writing my thesis was one of the most interesting experiences I have ever experienced in my life so far. I am not going to try to describe it with limited words here. All I can say is that now, with all good and bad sides, it has turned into a unique memory that belongs entirely to me. During this process, I needed the physical, emotional and psychological help of others many times. At this point, I want to thank them all briefly.

First of all, my parents; thank you very much for always supporting and encouraging me throughout this process. Most importantly, thank you for making me know all the time that I am loved by you no matter what. Please accept this thesis as a gift from me.

All my friends, thank you for walking along with me in this process, making me laugh, dancing with me when I want to dance. A special thank to Meriç, for sharing many emotionally imbalanced times of writing a thesis with me.

Definitely, many thanks to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Başak Zeynep Alpan, for accepting to be my supervisor firstly, and also for leading me in this process and helping me to finish this thesis through her very vital and valuable suggestions. I also want to thank to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Gözen Ercan and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgehan Şenyuva for sharing their precious experiences and recommendations with me to make my thesis better.

I want to thank my 'Nej' as well, my grandmother, for being an important contributor of the early years of my academic career. Without those years, this thesis cannot be written at all.

Lastly, I want to thank to the heroes I do not know in personally like musicians, writers, actors, directors, dancers, shortly to 'the existence of art', for making this process easier when it is very very difficult.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIRISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. A BRIEF HISTORY OF UKIP.....	8
3. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	15
3.1. Conceptualization of Populism.....	15
3.2. Understanding the Support for Populist Political Parties.....	31
4. METHODOLOGY.....	38
4.1. Rationale of the Thesis.....	38
4.2. Selection of the UKIP and Data Sampling.....	41
5. EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE EMPRICAL FINDINGS.....	46
5.1. Enabling Conditions for the UKIP’s Breakthrough.....	46
5.2. UKIP’s Populist Political Agendas as Response to	

Enabling Conditions.....	60
5.3. Overall Impact of the Rise of UKIP on British Politics.....	78
6. CONCLUSION.....	84
REFERENCES.....	94
APPENDICES	
A. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	105
B. TEZ İZİN FORMU.....	113

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AfD	Alternative für Deutschland
AFL	The Anti-Federalist League
AKP	Justice and Development Party
APE	Anti-Political Establishment
BES	British Election Studies
BNP	British National Party
Brexit	British Exit from the EU
CMS	Continuous Monitoring Survey
DPP	Danish People's Party
ECHR	European Court of Human Rights
EP	The European Parliament
EU	The European Union
FN	Front National
LSE	London School of Economics and Political Science
MEP	Member of European Parliament
MP	Member of Parliament
NHS	National Health Service
PiS	Law and Justice (Poland)
PVV	Party for Freedom (The Netherlands)

UDCA	Union for the Defense of Traders and Artisans
UK	The United Kingdom
UKIP	The United Kingdom Independence Party
US	The United States
ÖVP	Austrian People's Party

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Populism, as a field of study, is very popular and also fruitful concept to work on among political science scholars particularly. It is actually not very surprising bearing in mind that different forms of populism (political ideology, political style, political strategy) affect different political systems of various countries around the world in an accelerating way in contemporary politics. Populism can be in the shapes of right, left, conservative, progressive, secular or religious political standings according to the political context it is living within (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017: 21). Despite the fact that, regardless of its form (ideology, political style, political strategy), populism touches upon the divergence between ‘the people’ and ‘the political elites’; therefore can be applied by both right and left of the political spectrum with differences depending on political history, culture and system of a country (Greven, 2016). Therefore, generalizations about populism on various regions and continents cannot be very helpful to understand the real scope of the concept. Rather, it should be thought in line with its specific context to analyze its real impact, limitations, success or failure in politics.

Populism can be an ideology, a political style through discourse or a political strategy through specific political choices of political organizations and actors. No matter what its form is, populism focuses on the antagonistic relationship between political elite and the people by underlining the importance of some particular notions and concepts such as the common sense, the general will

of the people, popular sovereignty, national sovereignty, nativism, culture, identity, authoritarianism and so forth. When those main focuses of populism are taken into consideration, it can be obviously claimed that populism is a widespread phenomenon in world politics and it is possible to see this phenomenon in North America, Latin America, Middle East, Russia or in Europe. In addition to this, populism can be observed in different positions and levels in different political systems and contexts depending on the political parties which adopt populism as political ideology, style or strategy. For instance, in Latin America as well as in Europe, it is possible to see that there are ruling populist parties like Chavez's United Socialist Party of Venezuela, Morales' Movement towards Socialism, Orban's Fidesz or SYRIZA from Greece. Also, there are opposition populist parties mainly in Europe such as National Front in France, ÖVP in Austria or AfD in Germany. In the end, it can be pointed out that populism is not either exclusive to specific regions of the world or to the particular levels/positions of the specific political systems.

Populism, as a rising phenomenon in politics, finds an exclusive place for itself in British politics as well. Actually, it can be pointed out that United Kingdom has an interesting political context to study on populism. It is because that populism generally is fed by anti-European Union ideas and movements in Europe; and in this respect, specific relationship between the United Kingdom and the Union makes the island really interesting field in terms of populism. It is known that the United Kingdom has a special relationship with the European Union (EU) since 1973, the date the country has become a member. This special relationship has always underlined the belief that United Kingdom is not exactly the part of European continent; and its ties with Europe depends on merely economic interests of the country. At the end of the day, this particular understanding and traditional distance of the United Kingdom towards the EU, shortly called as British exceptionalism, has created plenty opportunities for a populist party to rise by manipulating this specific relationship of the country with Europe. For instance, British exceptionalism makes easier to use nativist elements by drawing attention to the idea that the European Union causes threats towards British national

sovereignty and culture. In the end, it would not be wrong to claim that indeed British politics can be accepted as very suitable political environment for a populist party to exploit the particular relations of the country with the European Union.

In parallel with this, especially since 2010, populism has entered to British politics actively as a primary political stance of a political party which is United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP). UKIP has founded in 1993 by Alan Sked as a single-issue party. Indeed, the party's main objective was to accomplish withdrawal of the UK from the European Union (EU). This Eurosceptic standing of the party has been remained for years and maintains recently as well. However, particularly since 2010, UKIP has started to foreground its populist political nature which is actually coming from its foundation; and formed a very effective populist discourse along with creating various populist strategies as indicators of the party's populist ideological stance. Also, UKIP has successfully amalgamated its Eurosceptic nature with this foregrounded populism. In the end, the party has transformed into an effective right-wing populist political party from a single-issue pressure group.

The initial idea of the thesis is actually coming from the inquiry about what are the underlying reasons of UKIP's rise in very near past of British politics. Studies conducted in this context show that the intensity of this rise has gained momentum particularly between 2010-2015. Hence, in order to understand the reasons, it was realized that both dynamics of British politics and UKIP's relationship with those dynamics between 2010-2015 should be focused.

In the light of this, it can be found out that afterwards the second leadership era of Nigel Farage, UKIP has clearly braced main attributes of populist ideology through political strategies and rhetoric of its leader. Accordingly, UKIP has prominently highlighted its anti-political establishment stance in both national and European levels of politics. In this respect, Nigel Farage has criticized mainstream parties of Britain and their leaders as being disconnected from the people, their interests and concerns at every opportunity. He has blamed political elites of being 'corrupted' and of putting their interests and careers first over needs of the people.

Similarly, UKIP and its leader have expressed their dissatisfaction with EU bureaucracy and its ruling elites as well. Other than this, UKIP has put forward the indispensability of popular sovereignty and vital significance of general will of the people repeatedly. In this scope, the party has promoted referendums in any matters which people have concerns with and offered policies such as extending direct elections at the even levels of policy, education and health boards (UKIP, 2010). Moreover, UKIP has given a special importance to nativism pillar of populist ideology by underlining the values of British traditions, Commonwealth and national sovereignty of British people. The party has had recourse to traditional Euroscepticism coming from the foundation and tried to demonstrate alleged threats of remaining in the EU for the national sovereignty, British values and traditions. Alternatively, UKIP has reminded the ‘real strength’ of the United Kingdom by using Commonwealth analogies and claimed that Britain will be better and stronger outside the European Union. In addition to these, UKIP has formalized a “fusion strategy” (Ford & Goodwin, 2014) which aims to answer both traditional Euroscepticism of British people and growing public concern about rising migration from particularly Eastern Europe. In this context, UKIP insistently has tried to take attention to those rising numbers of immigration to the United Kingdom and proposed harsh policies to reduce the numbers. Moreover, the party has offered to inhibit immigrants from benefiting from social services such as National Health Service (NHS). On this issue, UKIP leader Nigel Farage has recommended a policy covering immediate five-year freeze on immigration for permanent settlement (UKIP, 2010). Not surprisingly, in the scope of fusion strategy, UKIP has accused the EU for being responsible of the influx of migrants because of the freedom of movement principle.

Along with those populist political approaches mentioned above, under the charismatic leadership of Nigel Farage and his “straight-talking” rhetoric, UKIP has tried to broaden its political message and to carry out party’s organizational development. In this respect, UKIP has started to concentrate on local elections and by-elections more effectively and raced for much more seats than they did in the past. In the end, particularly between 2010-2015, UKIP has gained a very

noteworthy momentum in every national elections including by-elections and local ones, and also very important success in European Parliament (EP) elections specifically. Such that, the party has positioned in the first place in 2014 EP elections, and gained %12,6 of the total votes and been the third largest party in 2015 General Elections. The rise of UKIP, and also the rise of populism in the shape of UKIP, have been observed not just as growing electoral strength but also as its consolidated impact on mainstream parties' policies and accordingly British politics in the period of 2010-2015. Hence, it would not be wrong to point out that UKIP has turned out to be an effective political party thanks to its strengthened populist stance; and not mentioned as single-issue pressure group of 1990s anymore in 2015.

In the light of these, this thesis aims to understand fundamental reasons of UKIP's rise in British politics as a right-wing populist party between 2010 and 2015; also to demonstrate the overall impact of this rise on British political context. The real question here is this: how should we read this rise of populism in United Kingdom in the shape of UKIP between 2010 and 2015? The most comprehensive and satisfactory answer of this question can be better provided through contextual based analysis of the UKIP itself. Success stories and uptrend periods of right wing or left wing populist parties cannot be understood by taking generalizations about the concept of populism into consideration. As it was mentioned earlier, populism can be seen in different forms (as ideology, as political style, as political strategy or all of them simultaneously), and can be located in both right and left sides of political spectrum. It is also definitely affected by the political history, culture and system in which it survives. Therefore, the rise of populism in the United Kingdom particularly between 2010-2015 will be investigated on by taking UKIP as a specific study field. Simultaneously, in order to provide good understanding with this rise, political, economic and social conditions of the period in question will be examined and the party's relation with those conditions in the line with its populist political stance will be discussed in detail.

In the light of this, one main research question and one interrelated sub-question will be answered in the thesis. The main question is stressed with what

are the fundamental reasons of the rise of populism in British politics in the context of UKIP between 2010 and 2015. On the other hands, the sub-question is concerned with what is the overall impact of this rise of populism through UKIP on British politics. In this way, this thesis aims to contribute to the literature by providing very detailed contextual based study concerned with rising populism in the United Kingdom by studying on United Kingdom Independence Party in the period of 2010-2015. By doing that this thesis targets to draw a valuable picture about political conditions of British politics helping the rise of populism in a time period in question; and UKIP's responses to those conditions as a right-wing populist party. Additionally, this thesis also intends to demonstrate basic changes in British politics originated from impact of UKIP's rise as well.

In the end, the findings portray in a nutshell that unprecedented harmony and connection between enabling conditions and UKIP's responses to those conditions in this specific timeframe through featured populist political agendas has led to the specified time frame. By being in the right place at the right time; and also responding to enabling conditions effectively through functioning populist political agendas, UKIP has achieved to be an important actor in British politics for five years. Moreover, during this five years, the party has accomplished to influence British mainstream politics and its relations with the European Union seriously.

The thesis is comprised of six chapters. The first chapter provides an insight for the starting point, subject, and main objectives of the thesis. The chapter also presents an overview of existing developments regarding the subject and main objectives. Also, it shortly indicates the aimed contribution of the thesis. The second chapter presents a basic background of UKIP by providing a brief history of the party. The third chapter draws the conceptual framework of the thesis by presenting a wide-range literature review about the concept of populism. The third chapter also gives information about the theoretical approaches which explain the success of populism in world politics. The fourth chapter demonstrates rationale of the thesis, informs about selection process of the UKIP as study field and introduce the primary and secondary sources. The fifth chapter focuses on the case of UKIP

as a rising right-wing populist political party in Britain between 2010 and 2015.
The sixth chapter presents the concluding remarks.

CHAPTER 2

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM INDEPENDENCE PARTY

The first steps towards to foundation of United Kingdom Independence Party has been taken by Alan Sked, a professor in LSE, in 1992. He has established a cross-party group called ‘Anti-Federalist League’ (AFL) in order to demonstrate the displeasure with the Maastricht Treaty (Ford & Goodwing, 2014). After one year, in 1993, Sked has mobilized AFL and turned it into a political party, UKIP, whose *raison d’être* to achieve withdrawal of United Kingdom from the European Union (Usherwood, 2008: 4; Abedi & Lundberg, 2009: 13).

Since the fundamental reason for the UKIP’s existence is making United Kingdom independent from the European Union, the party can be obviously described as Eurosceptic political party (Usherwood, 2008; Bale, 2013; Giffrod, 2006). At this point, it would be important to give information about the concept of Euroscepticism in relation to the notion of ‘populism’. Euroscepticism is a phenomenon existent in European politics explicitly and effectively for last 20 years. Although it is possible to talk about existence of different kinds of opposition and criticisms towards to European Union since its foundation. Euroscepticism, as an umbrella-term for all negative attitudes, tendencies and discourses of European political actors, has taken an important place in European politics at all (Vuorinen, 2015:6). Actually, due to its multifaceted nature, it can be pointed out that there are various definition for the term. However, in this thesis, the primary definition Euroscepticism will be that of Taggart and Szczerbiak.

In this regard, Taggart explains Euroscepticism as “[expressing] the idea contingent or qualified opposition, as well as incorporating outright and unqualified opposition to the process of European integration” (1998: 366). In their further works, Taggart and Szczerbiak has explained the concept in two various forms: *soft Euroscepticism* and *hard Euroscepticism*. According to this, hard Euroscepticism is defined as “principled objection to the project of European integration as embodied in the EU”, involving “outright rejection of both political and economic integration and opposition to their country joining or remaining members of the EU” (Szczerbiak & Taggart 2003: 12; Taggart & Szczerbiak 2008a: 7 –8). On the other hand, soft Euroscepticism is based on the idea “there is not a principled objection to the European integration project or transferring powers to a supranational body such as the EU, but there is opposition to the EU’s current or future planned trajectory based on the further extension of competences that the EU is planning to make” (Szczerbiak & Taggart 2003: 12).

In the light of these, UKIP can be categorized as hard Eurosceptic political party, since the party is seriously opposing the EU membership of the United Kingdom and suggesting policies in the line with the UK’s putative withdrawal from membership since its foundation. In this respect, it can be said that the UKIP has preserved its Eurosceptic stance since then. However, the party’s political stance in the line with extremism-radicalism-center ground has shifted in line with the leaders of the party. It can be argued that due to the given organizational, economic and leadership crises of the party particularly until 2010s, several different tendencies of UKIP have been observed in this regard. At this point, as Vuorinen (2015) does it in her work, UKIP’s history will be divided into five phases so as to provide a basic background of the party.

According to this, the first phase of the party’s history includes establishment process between 1993 and 1997. In this period, UKIP tried to be influential in British politics by formulating “core policies to support the EU-withdrawal” basically (Vuorinen, 2015: 17). During this period, the UKIP has contested for 1994 EP elections before even celebrating its first birthday and got only %1 of the total share by getting 150,251 votes. At that time, the UKIP has

tried to introduce its political messages to British public solely through television broadcasts since the party was troubled with lack of money and manpower to run a proper election campaign. Additionally, most of the figures who took control of high command in the UKIP lacked political and organization experience. As a result of this, the UKIP seemed as inadequate political organization to bring supporters together around a leader or a strategy (Ford & Goodwin, 2014). This also has influenced the party's performance negatively during the first phase. Indeed, 1997 general elections has not created any improvement in terms of the UKIP's performance. Due to mere focus on the EU-related issues and lack of interest in domestic ones, the party could not manage to reach its potential to be successful in 1997 general elections as well. When the growing complaints about founder Alan Sked regarding his bossism and his infiltration with right-wing extremists were added to the election results below the expectation, the change in leadership has become inevitable.

In the second phase, a rich millionaire, Michael Holmes has become the leader of UKIP as the successor of Alan Sked in 1997. It can be said that the arrival of Holmes has created a chance for UKIP to increase its financial resources. For the first time during 1999 EP campaign, under Holmes leadership, UKIP has linked the party's traditional Euroscepticism with some populist promises such as "using money saved by anti-fraud measures at the European level to build a fighting fund for British people who had been persecuted by Brussels" (Ford & Goodwin, 2014). Also in this phase, growing intimacy between right-wing extremists and some key UKIP figures has been published in the media more frequently than ever. As a result of this, prior to 2001 general elections, a serious internal division has emerged with regards to this alleged intimacy in question. As a response to this intra-party divisions, Jeffrey Tifrod has been elected as the new leader of the UKIP in 2000 and the party has experienced a relative internal peace period. Nonetheless, this peaceful environment within the party does not really reflect the 2001 general election results. The UKIP has only managed to get %1,5 of total vote share from the elections.

It can be argued that the third phase of the party's history has started with Roger Knapman's leadership in 2002. He was the first and 'really' experienced politician among UKIP leaders. He has served as an MP from Conservative Party for ten years and also as the government whip. Thus, his influence on the party could be felt even at a very early stages. Basically, he has tried to bring more simpler but a more offensive language to the party's campaigns. In the end, UKIP has produced *Say No* campaign for 2004 EP elections which portrays disadvantages of being a member of the EU clearly and comprehensively (Ford & Goodwin, 2014). In addition to these, new leader Roger Knapman has decided to include some well-known and attention-grabbing figures in the party. In this regard, Robert Kilroy-Silk, a former Labour Party MP, has quitted his broadcasting career and joined to UKIP. With the arrival of Kilroy-Silk, UKIP has achieved a remarkable convergence between protest politics and the celebrity culture[.]” Moreover, in this period, Kilroy-Silk has begun to dominate the UKIP's media coverage and increased party's appeal seriously among British electorate. Thanks to his presence at the party, UKIP's 2004 EP election campaign has received more attraction than expected and also party membership has tripled from around 8.500 in 2001 to 26.000 in 2004 (Ford & Goodwin, 2014). Although these all sound well, after a certain point, involvement of Kilroy-Silk within the UKIP staff has started to cause some serious problems within the party. For instance, Kilroy has attempted to take over the party leadership by relying on his reputation and without thinking that he has joined the party approximately six months ago. Furthermore, he has started to make some offensive declarations against Conservative Party; thereby damaging the UKIP's growing positive image in the eyes of British electorate. He once went so far to say that the UKIP should kill the Conservative Party (Porter & Gadhur, 2004). As the last step, Kilroy-Silk has tried to collect signatures from party members to replace himself with Knapman as the new leader of party. However, the existing leader has achieved to collect more signatures; and Kilroy has lost all remaining sympathy within the party (Ford & Goodwin, 2014). As a result of this process, he has resigned from UKIP and the party has saved itself from going towards a new and dangerous direction.

It can be said that the forth phase of the UKIP history has started with Roger Knapman's decision to step back from the leadership of the party. Under the circumstances of that period, Nigel Farage has been shined out as the most obvious successor and the candidate for the party's leadership. In the end, Nigel Farage has been elected as the leader of the UKIP in 2006. Immediately after he took the seat, he has put his first plan which was "to turn UKIP into a fully-fledged political party that welcomed traditional Conservatives who felt alienated by Cameron's liberal Conservatism" (Ford & Goodwin, 2014). Without any doubt, this plan has required that UKIP should present more detailed offers to the electorate. In this respect, along with the anti-EU politics, the UKIP has started to make new policy proposals including offers on a sharp reduction in immigration numbers, tax cuts, the restoration of grammar schools and opposition to Cameron's new climate change agenda. In addition to these changes in the appeal of the party, the so-called Expenses Scandal has broken out one month before the 2009 EP elections. Certainly, this development, which was claimed by The Daily Telegraph via published details of excessive parliamentary expenses, has also helped UKIP to attract angry Conservative and Labour voters for the election. As a result, the UKIP has achieved to get certain amount of protest votes from those supporters of major parties during the 2009 EP elections. According to the results, UKIP has gained %16,1 of total vote share by positioning at third place. Although the results of 2009 EP elections can be evaluated as positive, Farage surprisingly decided to resign in the very same year. Eventually, the party has decided to continue with Lord Pearson. In Pearson's short experience as UKIP leader, party has adopted more radical position by showing some islamophobic motives. For instance, burqa ban proposal has been included in UKIP's 2009 manifesto (UKIP, 2009).

In the fifth phase, Nigel Farage has been reelected as the party leader and he immediately attempted to reshape UKIP's political understanding and existence. Until Farage's second term of Nigel Farage, the UKIP's policies against the UK's EU membership were quite weak. However, the Party was still able to get some successful results from the European elections. Nevertheless, it was realized that in order to be assertive at general elections, the UKIP had to generate

some political solutions and policies for other political domains such as social services, economy or defense as well. It was also understood by the Party that pursuing only core anti-EU policies would not bring success to the UKIP because unlike other European countries and their political context, in Britain, mainstream parties can be also accepted as Eurosceptic parties at a certain level. For instance, the Conservative Party has showed quite Eurosceptic attitudes particularly during the term of Margaret Thatcher. Since then, the Conservatives did not hesitate to use soft-Euroscepticism cards under the rule of different leaders when needed. The Labour Party has also demonstrated anti-EU attitudes depending on the dynamics of the period in question. Therefore, it can be pointed out that Nigel Farage has realized that it is harder for a niche party in British politics to be heard by only playing Eurosceptic card as a political act, where the major powers of the system also can play that very effectively.

As a result, as will be discussed in a detailed way in Chapter 5, the UKIP could successfully extend the scope of its political message; focus on local elections and to create its own core constituencies; and strengthen the organizational structure of the party. In addition to these, most importantly, the UKIP has adopted a well-functioning populist ideology which prioritized an opposition towards the mainstream parties, the general will of the British people, the preservation of British culture, identity and national sovereignty through nativist policies. Moreover, under the leadership of Nigel Farage, the UKIP strengthened its populist political stance by manipulating some issues very effectively such as immigration or the economic crisis in the European Union. In the end, it can be obviously claimed that since particularly 2010, the UKIP has started to become a strong alternative to the mainstream parties thanks to its new and effective populist political understanding reinforced by hard-Euroscepticism.

In short, as in many other European countries, a populist party in the UK was able to employ a Eurosceptic perspective. Unlike many European countries, however, the traditional Euroscepticism of the UK, or shortly *British exceptionalism* (Glencross, 2014), has created much more opportunity for the UKIP more than expected which will be demonstrated and discussed in Chapter 5

in details. At this point, it would be reasonable to discuss the main concept of the thesis, populism, in detail. Hence, in the next chapter, the framework of the thesis will be drawn; and the answer to question of what the concept of ‘populism’ means for the thesis will be provided.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, theoretical and conceptual framework of the thesis will be presented in a very clear way. Since the main objectives of the thesis is to understand the reasons of the rise of populism in Britain in the period of 2010-2015 and to exhibit the overall impact of this rise on British politics, first and foremost it will be portrayed that what we should understand when it is called ‘populism’ throughout the thesis. After this conceptualization section of the chapter, related theoretical approaches which explain rising processes of populism as an ideology through particularly right-wing political parties will be discussed in detail. In the end, theoretical and conceptual frame of the thesis will be indicated by referring approaches and concepts investigated on throughout the chapter.

3.1. Conceptualization of Populism

It would not be wrong to say that populism is a concept that is frequently studied by scholars but can not be agreed upon completely. Due to its heterogeneous and contested nature, there are various approaches trying to categorize it and also several explanations to define concept’s meaning. In this section of the chapter, firstly contested nature of the concept will be discussed so as to demonstrate how populism is described differently in the literature. Secondly, heterogeneous nature of the concept will be elaborated in order to show how this phenomenon can be seen in both right and left wing politics, also in different continents of the world. Lastly, perspectives of this thesis related to those discussions will be presented.

3.1.1. *Populism as a Contested Concept*

Populism is also very contested and multi-faceted concept in terms of its meaning in the literature (Laclau, 2005). It can be argued that there is a consensus among scholars on prevalence of populism in contemporary world politics, however there is noteworthy divergence on forms or definition of populism indeed. At this point, it is possible to talk about three major explanations with regards to the question of *what populism exactly is*. According to this classification, the first answer to this question is that populism is an ideology (Mudde 2004; Ignazi 2003; Norris 2005; van der Burg et al. 2014; Hawkins 2010; Mudde and Kaltwasser 2012; Stanley 2008; Rooduijn et al. 2012),. As will be elaborated below, this line of thought sees populism as a system of ideas such as nativism, APE, direct democracy and so on. Another major explanation describes populism as a political style (Laclau 2005; Panizza 2005; Meny & Surel 2002; Albertazzi & McDonnell 2008; Kazin 1995). According to the second group of studies, populism is a political style in the shape of specific political discourse of political actors which contains anti-elite elements, nativist emphasis and promotion of general will of people through direct democracy tools like referendums. Lastly, the third approach to populism defines to concept as a political strategy (Jansen, 2011; Roberts, 2006; Wayland, 2001; Madrid, 2008; Acemoglu et al., 2011; Levitsky & Roberts, 2011; Pauwels, 2011; Pappas, 2012; Barr, 2009). According to this explanation, populism is a political strategy applied by a political party which includes political structuring, policy choices and leadership. Now, these three major explanations with regards to definition of populism will be portrayed respectively; and the explanation to be applied in the thesis will be stated in the end of the section.

3.1.1.a. *Populism as Ideology*

First group of these scholars explain populism as *ideology* (Mudde 2007; Hawkins 2010; Pauwles 2011; Mudde and Kaltwasser 2012; Stanley 2008; Rooduijn et al. 2012). At this point, it can be argued that the most influential and commonly accepted definition of populism as an ideology is facilitated by Cas Mudde. His focus is on predominantly European right-wing populist parties and he

defines 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 généralé* (general will) of the people” (2004: 543). In his definition, Mudde stresses mainly about antagonistic relation of ‘the people’ with the political elite which is a bucket of people holding power to shape political, economic and social structures of the society. Hence, this approach prioritizes the supremacy of popular sovereignty as a reflection of ‘the general will’ over those political elites (Gidrow & Bonikowski, 2013, 6).

Mudde categorizes populism as ‘thin-centered ideology’ by implying that populism as an ideology “does not possess the same level of intellectual refinement and consistency” as liberalism or socialism. According to him, since populism (as a thin-centered ideology) cannot answer to all major socio-political questions, it can be combined with full ideologies (can be classified as host ideologies) thanks to its compatible nature (2004: 544). It should be also mentioned at this point that Mudde’s explanation is actually based on Michael Freeden’s morphological approach on ideology which contains the description of a thin-centered ideology as “one that arbitrarily serves itself from wider ideational contexts, by the deliberate removal and replacement of concept, exhibiting a restricted core attached to a narrower range of political concepts” (1998: 750).

In order to provide better understanding of ideational approach, the concepts of ‘the people’ and ‘the elite’ mentioned in Mudde’s definition should be investigated on properly. These two concepts are defined as two separate and antagonistic group in the light of Manichean approach. Although there is no clear, straight-forward explanations to identify who included in the first group or the second one, there are still available examples to understand these two concepts’ scopes and contexts. Regarding ‘the people’, there are various explanations which indeed do not obviate vagueness of the concept completely. One of those explanations sees ‘the people’ as a rhetorical tool referring to any genuinely existing group of people. Another explanation highlights that ‘the people’ contains a particular class segment of the population. However, it should be considered that

the most convincing description of ‘the people’ comes from Paul Taggart who refuses class segmentation explanation and tries to fill in the concept by introducing the term ‘the heartland’ as a subsidiary concept. He presents the heartland as “a place in which a virtuous and unified population resides” in populist imagination (2000: 95). At this point, it is possible to liken the concept of the heartland to Benedict Anderson’s ‘imagined community’ by accepting it as a constructed sub-set of the whole population.¹ With regards to description of ‘the elite’, it is actually easier to identify the ingredients of the concept. It can be said that ‘the elite’ can be observed in several forms such as political (politicians, government, established political parties), economic (bankers, companies), or bureaucratic (technocrats, EU institutions) shapes. The common point of these different forms is that they are all associated with corruption. All these forms can be part of ‘the elite’ which are accused of prioritizing their own interests above the interests of ‘the pure people’. As a final point, this should be mentioned that descriptions of ‘the people’ and ‘the elite’ can be varied according to the region in which populism emerges. For instance, whilst ‘the elite’ containing oligarchy or imperialist powers in Latin America, ‘the elite’ can be the European Union or just a ruling mainstream party in Europe. Similarly, as Otjes & Louwse argues, who belongs to ‘the elite’ or ‘the people’ can be depended on the orientation of the political party (2013: 2). For instance, whilst a left-wing populist party includes working-class to ‘the people’ without exception, a right-wing populist party does not have to approach to the situation similarly.

According to the works of scholars studying on populism as ideology, it is possible to talk about common essential attributes of populist ideology such as anti-elite sentiments, anti-political establishment standing, promotion of popular sovereignty, significance of common sense and general will of the people, nativism, importance of national sovereignty and identity, and also authoritarian tendencies. All these features of the populist ideology are directly associated with

¹ For further information please see Anderson, B. R. (2016). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

the core domain of the ideational approach which is the antagonistic relationship between the people and the elite.

First of all, since the populist ideology stresses with the antagonistic relationship between ‘the people’ and ‘the elite’; and takes by side of the former one, anti-political establishment and anti-elite sentiments have very significant roles in populist ideology. In parallel with this, populist ideology is critical about political elite by matching them with corruption and categorizes them as pure examples of ‘the corrupted elite’. Additionally, populist ideology claims that mainstream political parties or other representatives of political elite are not capable of or willing to represent ‘the common sense’ because their members keep their interests ahead of the interests of ‘the general will’ (Mudde, 2004: 546). Moreover, populist ideology rejects established socio-cultural and political systems as a part of their anti-political establishment understanding (Betz, 1993). For instance, populist parties from both right and left sides generally are critical about their political system they are part of; and pledges to reform it for the sake of ‘the people’.

Secondly, populist ideology strongly prioritizes the principle of ‘general will of the people’, correspondingly ‘popular sovereignty’, and ‘the common sense’. In fact, it would not be wrong to say that ‘general will of the people’ is even more important than human rights or constitutional guarantees in the populist point of view (Mudde, 2004). In parallel with this, populists see ‘the people’ “as homogenous moral entity, and for them, the common sense of the people should always take precedence and be curtailed by undemocratic institutional constraints such as constitutional protections of minorities” (Many & Surel, 2002; Canovan, 1999; Mudde, 2010). This basically means that populist ideology rejects all kind of limitations on the expression of the general will and paves the way for ‘the people’ and to be heard by means of ‘popular sovereignty’ tools such as referendums. This huge emphasis on the principles of the general will and popular sovereignty brings us eventually to critics of European right-wing populist parties towards unelected EU bodies. It can be argued that populist ideology opposes bureaucratic and technocratic structures such as EU institutions which are not

elected by the 'the people' directly. Since populist ideology is strongly favor of popular sovereignty, their supporters fiercely refute the legitimacy of those type of institutions, particularly specific EU bodies such as the Commission.

Thirdly, another key feature of the populist ideology is nativism. Mudde describes the element of nativism in populism as "an ideology which holds that states should be inhabited exclusively by members of the native group ('the nation') and that non-native elements (persons and ideas) are fundamentally threatening to the homogenous nation-state (2007: 19). According to him, nativism is linked to the idea of 'the nation-state' which contains the logic that every nation should have its own state (2010: 1173). Actually, the most properly-extracted explanation regarding nativism comes from Koch, he defines nativism as "internal homogeneity and external exclusiveness" (1991). To be understood, the feature of nativism is directly related to the concept of 'the people' and in this scope, many populists associate native people with 'decency'. In this way, they describes native people of the nation as decent people and categorizes non-natives/foreigners as threat to integrity of nation state. Therefore, populist political parties promotes themselves as the guardian of an exclusive culture and an integrated –pure native-nation (Betz, 1993: 417). As a part of nativist feature, specifically European right-wing populist parties demonstrate strong anti-immigrant attitudes, even for some cases xenophobia as discussed via examples in previous section. Those parties such as FN from France or PVV from the Netherlands see migration as a serious danger for national identity, nation's culture and integrity. Therefore, those parties' main objective is frequently to reduce and, if possible, to prevent migration to their countries completely.

The last significant characteristic of the populist ideology is authoritarianism. As compatible with this feature, populist ideology emphasizes on importance of law, extensive legislation system and strict order management for the security and well-being of 'the people'. Therefore, it is a very worthwhile policy within populist ideology to consolidate police force, prison system as well as to limit compromise for anyone who acts against the law (Mudde, 2010: 1174).

3.1.1.b. Populism as Political Style

Other group of scholars approach populism as a *political style* in the shape of particular political discourse (Panizza, 2005; Laclau 2005; Kazin 1995; Many & Surel, 2002; Albertazzi & McDonnell, 2008; Filc, 2010; de la Torre, 2000). One of the important representative of this approach, Francisco Panizza, defines populism as “an anti-status quo discourse that simplifies the political space by symbolically dividing society between ‘the people’ (as the underdogs) and its ‘other’” (2005: 3). According to him, identities of both the people and the other do not represent the sociological categories but political constructs emerged as a result of antagonistic relationship of hegemony and the people (2005: 3).

Another famous supporter of this approach is Ernesto Laclau who claims that populism is a political logic that can be existed in any political movement and distinguish society into two as ‘the people’ and ‘the elite’ through the connection of different popular demands and the construction of a collective identity (2005). According to him, “populism starts at the point where popular democratic elements are presented as antagonistic option against the ideology of the dominant bloc (Laclau, 1977: 173). He also adds that minimal criterion for populist discourse is the prominent reference to ‘the people’.

Similarly, de la Torre describes populism by focusing on Latin America as “rhetoric that constructs politics as the moral and ethical struggle between the people and the oligarchy (2000: 4). Based on this antagonism, Panizza suggests that populism as a mode of identification can be applied by any political actor, “operating in a discursive field in which the notion of the sovereignty of the people and its inevitable corollary, the conflict between the powerful and powerless, are core elements of its political imaginary (2005: 4).

In addition to these, Michael Kazin shares the idea that populism refers to mode of political expression rather than to individuals or political parties and adds “the use of the term ‘populist’ should be understood not to signify that his subjects were populist, in the way they were unionist or socialist, liberal Democrats or conservative Republicans, but rather than all these people employed populism as a

flexible mode of persuasion to redefine the people and their adversaries” (1995). In the light of all these explanations, these group of scholars see populism as a discursive style which creates ‘us’ versus ‘them’ dichotomy within the society rather than an ideology followed by individuals (i.e. political leaders) or political organizations (i.e. political parties).

3.1.1.c. Populism as Political Strategy

The last dominant group in the field defines populism as *political strategy* (Jansen, 2011; Roberts, 2006; Wayland, 2001; Madrid, 2008; Acemoglu et al., 2011; Levitsky & Roberts, 2011; Pauwels, 2011; Pappas, 2012; Barr, 2009). According to this approach, it is possible to investigate on populism as political strategy in three ways as policy choices, political organization and forms of mobilization. In this regard, the first sub-group of scholars claim that political parties or their leaders build people/voter-driven policies and then promote and pursue those policies in order to get more attention from electorate, accordingly to articulate more vote. These scholars underline particularly economically disadvantaged segments of the society as target-voters of those political parties and leaders (Madrid, 2008). In their collaboration, Acemoglu et al. state that populism is a political strategy which aims “the implementation of policies receiving support from a significant fraction of the population, but ultimately hurting the economic interests of the majority” (2011). Therefore, they generally take pro-redistribution positions. Consequently, politicians benefits from populism (as a way of political strategy) by giving this message to electorate that “they will pursue future policies in line with the interests of the median voter” (Acemoglu et al., 2011: 31). The second sub-group advocates that populism is a political organization in the shape of charismatic leadership. In this perspective, Kurt Weyland describes populism as “a political strategy through which a personalistic leader seeks or exercises government power based on direct, unmediated, uninstitutionalized support from large numbers of mostly unorganized followers” (2001: 14). Thereby, he concentrates on the relationship between political actors and their supporters to identify populism, and disagrees with the ideas that populism is an ideology or a discursive style. They explain populism as personality politics based phenomenon

since it possess very limited coherence, ore concepts and values (Taggart, 2000: 101). These scholars give their focus on leaders' ability to attract electorate and capacity to transform this attraction into mass support, synonymously to more votes. According to this explanation, political parties are "centralized organizational structure headed by a strong charismatic leader", therefore the success of those political parties is directly related to identities, cognitive codes, charismatic possessions and managerial skills of the leaders in question (Taggart, 1995). The third group explains populism via modes of mobilization. For instance, Levitsky & Roberts define populism as "top-down political mobilization of mass constituencies by personalistic leaders who challenge established political and economic elites on behalf of an ill-defined people" (2011: 6-7). Robert R. Barr brings a new dimension to the definition of populism as political mobilization by adding impact of particular political language usage and describes it as "a mass movement led by an outsider seeking to gain or maintain power by using anti-establishment appeals" (2009). Another credible approach comes from Robert S. Jansen who introduce the concept of "populist mobilization" instead of usage of populism (2011). In this respect, he approaches populism as a mode of political practice. Accordingly, he defines populist mobilization as "a political project that mobilizes ordinarily marginalized social sectors into publicly visible and contentious political action, while articulating an anti-elite, nationalistic rhetoric that valorizes ordinary people" (2011: 82). According to him, populist mobilizations can be utilized by either challengers or supporters in pursuit of social, economic or political purposes. From this point of view, he supports the idea that populism is "a flexible way of animating political support rather than a movement, regime type or the way of particular leaders' speeches" (2011: 77). Additionally, he describes populist mobilization as the combination of 'popular mobilization' and 'populist rhetoric'. He notes that populist mobilization is different than popular mobilization and it needs populist rhetoric to turn out to be a 'populist mobilization' (2011: 83).

When it comes to contested nature of populism, as it was mentioned that there are three major explanations which describe populism respectively as

political ideology, political style and political strategy. In the literature, it can be seen that these three explanations are evaluated as rivals for each other. This basically means that there is a general tendency to describe populism by using one of those three explanations, to criticize the other two. Other than this, it is also possible to observe that there are some efforts to define and study populism by making generalizations about it regardless any consideration the fact that populism actually occurs differently in the different parts of world. Therefore, in order to provide a healthy and satisfactory understanding, populism will be focused on deeply by considering country based conditions, political system, culture and history of the study field which is United Kingdom Independence Party from Britain. When all of these are taken into account, populism will be approached as thin-centered ideology applied by UKIP with its main attributes such as APE, nativism, authoritarianism, favoring direct democracy and huge emphasis on corruption of political elites. However, populism as a political style and political strategy will not be ignored in the thesis as well. As some of scholars argue these three approaches can be benefited simultaneously in order to provide better understanding of populism (Pauwles, 2011; Pappas 2012; Hawkins 2009; Mudde 2004). For instance, Pauwles argues that if the aim of the populist leader pursuing populist ideology is to hand over power to common people, it is not surprising that this leader in question use language of people. According to him, it can be also expected that ideology may has impact on party organization, leadership and policy choices of the party as a party of political strategy (2011). Therefore, it will be claimed in the thesis by taking the case study into account that populism is a thin-centered ideology; and very naturally this ideology is reflected on actors' political style as populist discourse and party's political strategy as policy choices, leadership style or organizational structure as well.

3.1.2. Populism as a Heterogeneous Concept

In their work, Mudde and Kaltwasser mention about populism as a heterogeneous concept which basically means that it can be applied by both right-wing and left-wing parties, conservatives or progressive parties, secular or religious ones (2017). Indeed, it is eventual that there are various populist political

parties from different political backgrounds exercising in different continents. For instance, when it comes to populism in Latin America, it is appeared that populist tendencies of political actors and parties such as anti-elite sentiments, nativism or popular sovereignty are generally represented by left-wing political parties. Chavez's United Socialist Party of Venezuela and Eva Morales' Movement toward Socialism Party of Peru can be given as examples of those left-wing populist parties. Similarly, in North America, United States politics have witnessed populist waves of both Democratic Party and Republican Party camps. 1890s' People's Party, which is actually accepted as one of the earliest example of populist political organization in modern history, has defected to Democratic Party. Nowadays, it is possible to follow US President of Republican Party Donald Trump's populist attitudes through his uncompromising anti-immigrant standing. Conversely, in Europe, populism generally founds a political bodies through right-wing populist parties except for some left-wing populist parties such as SYRIZA in Greece and Podemos in Spain. Although majority of European populist parties are right-wing representatives, actually heterogeneous nature of populism shows itself in Europe through political parties positioning at different levels in political systems. For example, while National Front of French remains as an assertive opposition in French politics, FPÖ of Austria can be a junior partner of the government; or PiS of Poland and Fidesz of Hungary can rule the country. Variety of populism around the world can be proven as well by considering Justice and Development Party (AKP) of Turkey which is religious long-term ruling political party. The leader of the party, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, has used a populist rhetoric and taken a serious amount of votes for their first victory in 2002 by mentioning frequently about 'general will of the ordinary people' and 'direct democracy'. As all of these examples portray clearly that populism is a heterogeneous concept and can be applied by very different political formations in a very different ways as well. As following step, it will be categorized according to right-left political spectrum and main populist attributes of these two camps will be summarized respectively by giving related populist political party examples.

3.1.2.a. Right-Wing Populism

Right-wing populism is mostly effective in Europe. In contemporary European politics, it is possible to face with various populist political party presences in nearly every European countries' political contexts. However, this prevalence has not been observed actually until late 1990s. As first marks of populism, agrarian populism has gotten to the foreground in early 20th century. According to this, peasants has been seen as the main source of morality and the agricultural society; and as opposition to urban elite. When it comes to post-war era, Pierre Poujade's Union for the Defense of Traders and Artisans (UDCA) in France during 1950s can be given as an interesting populist movement example. Despite the fact that party has contested for just one election, today Poujadism is synonymous for populism in France (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017: 34). Since late 1990s however, it is possible to talk about populism by means of various political formations. Especially with the transformation of European politics as a result of Maastricht Treaty, European integration and immigration has given birth to powerful wave of populism in Europe. Definitely, those European right-wing populist parties possess common features and principles of populism such as anti-political establishment sentiments, anti-elite stance, emphasis on popular sovereignty and the general will of the people, nativism, national sovereignty and identity and anti-immigrant attitudes. Although these features will be presented in detail in the next section of the chapter, under the title of 'Populism as Ideology'; the features of right-wing populist parties in Europe in question will be summarized quickly in here as well; and specific political parties from different European countries will be examined.

Obviously, the most explicit attribute is to refer to the antagonism between 'the people' and 'the elite' by favoring 'the people'; and by accusing 'the elite' as being corrupted. Therefore, European right-wing populism holds very rigid APE position at both national level and European level. In addition to this, right-wing populism gives a tremendous importance to 'popular sovereignty' in order to be able to represent 'the general will of the people' truly. Therefore, those parties generally favor direct election tools like referendums. Another crucial feature of

right-wing populism in Europe is 'nativism'. By taking back from nativism feature, right-wing populist parties underline the significance of 'the national identity and sovereignty'. In parallel with this, 'anti-immigrant sentiments' play genuinely huge role in right-wing populist party's political standing, discourse and strategies. Lastly, these parties are known with special emphasis on authoritarianism by for example proposing policies to increase numbers of police officers, or to consolidate law and order.

Of course, there are many example political parties that show the above features in Europe; but it would be useful to look at a few of them more closely. One of the most remarkable examples is National Front in France (NF). Through its strict anti-immigration xenophobia, stable objection to elites, fear globalization and diversity came with it, the fear of mass Islamic immigration and European integration; NF is a pure example of right-wing populist party in Europe. The party now is accepted as a very strong opposition in French politics; also its leader Marine Le Pen has achieved party's best-ever result in presidential election by gaining %17,9 of total votes in April 2012 (Willsher, 2014). Particularly, NF shows nativism feature of populism clearly. Such that the party can be seen as "manifestation of French nationalism" (Dukanovic, 2014: 8). The party's main concern is preservation of French identity; thus NF gives huge importance to cultural issues (Cross, 2012) and strongly opposes immigration especially from Islamic counties which can create threats against national identity of French people. Lastly, NF favors restoration of state authority; and expect from consolidated authority to prevent mass immigration.

Another vivid example of right-wing populist party is The Party for Freedom (PVV) from the Netherlands. Through APE positon, anti-immigrant sentiments, opposition to integration, fear and anger with Islam and points to authoritarianism; Geert Wilders' PVV is fit for being categorized as European right-wing populist party. PVV is known with strong opposition to immigration and anger with Islam. In fact, the party describe Islam as a political ideology aiming to take control of world rather than a religion (Dukanovic, 2014). Additionally, PVV can be accepted as strongly nativist political party which promotes the idea

that Dutch language and culture should be devoted more in schools. The party also opposes the European integration and questions functioning of EU membership of the Netherlands; even proposes abandoning Euro. PVV also indicates its APE position by putting the expression in 2010 manifesto that “elites have lost touch with ordinary people” (Roodjin, 2014: 83). At this point, it is possible to prove PVV’s populism in a nutshell by quoting from Wilders himself: “the combination of Islam, mass immigration and European integration is the main threat to the independence of the Netherlands” (Dukanovic, 2014: 15).

In Denmark, Danish People’s Party (DPP) can be given as an example of populist political party through its anti-immigrant and anti-EU rhetoric. According to the party, Denmark and Danish people’s culture are endangered by immigration and supranational institutions like the European Union. DPP claims that Danish national sovereignty is limited by the EU. Other than this, the party has very rigid position against immigration. Such that the party had policies to prevent family reunification for immigrants through selective processes; and to deport foreigners with criminal background from Denmark (Dukavovic, 2014: 24). Alternative for Germany (AfD), a relatively new right-wing populist party in Germany, is now the third largest party of the country. Fundamentally, the party is strongly against immigration from specifically Islamic countries. Accordingly, the main motivation of AfD supporters is originated from dissatisfaction with Merkel’s immigration policies. On this, %89 of AfD supporters think that Merkel’s immigration policies ignore to concerns of ‘the people’. Furthermore, %85 of them want stronger national borders.² The party is also against same-sex marriage by labeling it as threat to family values of German people.

Right-wing populism can be encountered in Eastern Europe as well, even at stronger position. Fidesz of Viktor Orban is the ruling party in Hungary, and famous with its interference to judiciary system, the attempt to close very credible

² For further information, please see Mudde, C. (2017, September 24). *What the stunning success of AfD means for Germany and Europe*. The Guardian. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/sep/24/germany-elections-afd-europe-immigration-merkel-radical-right>

Central European University in Budapest. Fidesz is also clear example for right-wing populism through its firm anti-immigrant stance and nativist rhetoric. According to Orban, Hungarians' target should be ethnic homogeneity, and multiculturalism should not be accepted in the expense of natives of Hungary.³ Hence, the party opposes diversity came with the European Union as well. Moreover, Orban highlights "Catholicism as Europe's last hope"⁴ and promises to conserve natives of Hungary from 'dangerous and impure outsiders, especially Muslims'.

3.1.2.b. Left-Wing Populism

Left-wing populism is prevalently observed in Latin America. Actually, its persistence in modern European politics has relatively shorter history (March & Mudde, 2005). After all, according to some scholars, it is easier to gather left-wing populist parties into one basket because of their similar features (Olsen et al., 2010; Dunphy, 2004).

For instance in Latin America, populist presence and effectiveness in different countries' political contexts can be observed clearly. It can be argued that high level of socio-economic imbalance is the main driven of populism in Latin America. Basically, populism is grounded the antagonism between the people and the elite in various counties in the continent again; however the elite is generally identified with oligarchy here. Populist leaders have been and still are a champion of 'the people' suffering from different social grievances against the political establishment "to be technically incompetent and morally corrupt" (van der Burg et al., 2014: 69). As it can be seen in the right-wing populism discussed in the previous sub-title, the principle of 'common sense' or 'general will of the people' are very crucial populism in Latin America as well. In parallel with this, those

³ For further information, please see Hockenos, P. (2018, April 9). *Hungary is a beacon to Europe's populist strongmen*. CNN. Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/2018/04/09/opinions/viktor-orban-hungary-election-opinion-intl/index.html>

⁴ For further information, please see Buckley, N. and Byrne, A. (2018, January 25). *The rise and rise of Viktor Orban*. Financial Times. Retrieved from <https://www.ft.com/content/dda50a3e-0095-11e8-9650-9c0ad2d7c5b5>

parties are “acting in the name of the people and advocated the social and political integration of the protest members of society” (Albertazzi & McDonnell, 2008: 32). Additionally, some of left-wing populist parties put socialism or anti-capitalism in the center of their political stance. Those left-wing populist parties in Latin America object existing socio-economic construction and its main attributes such as income inequality, consumerism or even private poverty (March, 2011: Dalton, 2002). They favor reallocation of wealth and redistribution of resources from the elite to the people.

In Latin America, there have been really vivid examples of the rise of populism containing the parties and movements that have shown the basic features above. According to this, left-wing populism has started to be felt exceedingly with Hugo Chavez’s victory in the Venezuelan elections in 1998. Following that Evo Morales in Bolivia and Rafael Correa in Ecuador has become the new representatives of left-wing populism in the continent. All of these leaders has positioned socialism at the center of their political standing; and covenanted to fight against the free-market and to bring development to the poor. Moreover, both United Socialist Party of Venezuela of Chavez and Movement towards Socialism of Morales have emphasized on the notion of ‘Americanismo’ which supports the idea that all Latin Americans share a common identity and this identity has a struggle with imperialism (Muddde & Kaltwasser, 2017: 31). Furthermore, like the European counterparts, these Latin American left-wing parties have promised to ‘give sovereignty to the people’; and formed constituent assemblies in this sense.

When it comes to left-wing populist parties in Europe, it is possible to point out that SYRIZA in Greece and Podemos from Spain are the most prominent left-wing populist parties. Those parties which gained momentum especially as a reaction to tough austerity measures of Troika have actually share fundamental principles of right-wing populism such as emphasis on ‘the people’ and APE sentiments. However, these left-wing populist parties add anti-neoliberalist sentiments to their populist rhetoric too (Markou, 2018: 148). As further divergence, European left-wing populism see the EU as an elitist capitalist project which do not give importance to efforts of common working people, whilst right-

wing populism is uncomfortable with EU because it can endanger national sovereignty (Taggart, 2004: 281). Particularly, with intensive anti-austerity rhetoric, SYRIZA has gained huge support from the indignant masses and won the 2015 general elections in Greece. In Spain, although not as successful as SYRIZA, Podemos has reached %20,6 of total votes and become third largest party in the parliament. Lastly, Socialist Party from the Netherlands can be given as an example of left-wing populist political party in Europe through its direct, procreative and offensive populist rhetoric (Gerrits, 2014). The party has 15 seats of 150 in Dutch Parliament; and comes into prominence with its anti-immigration and anti-Islamic stance, also with its APE sentiments.

In the end of this section of the chapter, it can be understood that as it is mentioned earlier that populism can be applied by both right and left of the political spectrum. In terms of this heterogeneity of the populism concept, in the thesis, it will be focused on right-wing populist parties, not just because populist tendencies generally are accumulated to right-wing political parties in Europe; but also the study field of the thesis, which is United Kingdom Independence Party, is a right-wing political party from the United Kingdom. Therefore, populism will be investigated with right-wing political party traditions throughout the thesis.

3.2. Understanding the Support for Populist Political Parties

As it was argued in the Introduction Chapter, although there is a consensus in the academia that populism is rising phenomenon all around the world, there are different approaches on determining the factors that explain the causes of this rise. It is also possible to talk about different interpretations to evaluate what is meant by talking about ‘success’ of those parties’ insurgent. In order to provide good understanding of the reasons of the rise of populism in the shape of UKIP between 2010-2015 and to demonstrate overall impact of this rise on British politics, some featured theoretical approaches stressing with underlying reasons of populist insurgent will be discussed in this section of the chapter.

Before moving to approaches, it should be initially mentioned what is really referred with populist insurgent or rise of populism in the thesis. As it can be

estimated easily, first and foremost, growing electoral strength is referred to insurgent for populist parties, for UKIP, as the study field of the thesis. However, as a result of election system of some countries, as it is happening in United Kingdom's first-to-the-post system as well, it is very hard for niche parties like UKIP to send representative to parliaments or increase its votes dramatically. Therefore, the rise of right-wing populist parties of Europe like UKIP should be evaluated with considering not merely electoral success or presence in the parliament, but also by considering those parties' growing impact on mainstream politics as a whole. As Mudde and Kaltwasser stress out in their work (2017: 98), the ability to bring relevant topics to public agenda (agenda-setting) and the capacity to shape public policies (policy impact) should not be underestimated in the analysis of populist parties' rise. When considering the study field to be used in the thesis, all of these factors, which are electoral strength, ability of agenda-setting and capacity to shape public policy will be taken into account equally at the point of evaluating the rise of the party in question, UKIP, throughout the thesis.

The most common explanations with regards to understanding rise of right-wing populist political parties are originated from 'Supply and Demand Conceptual Framework' (March & Rommerskirchen, 2012). According to this, 'Demand-side approach' points out that support for populist parties is caused by profound economic, social and historical processes which bring genuine changes and reveal need for transformation in society (Mudde, 2007: 202). Shortly, according to this approach, when there is genuine changes in society or in the political context caused by a serious crisis or as a result of long-term transformation, the demand for right-wing populist parties increase among public. This basically means that these changes turn out to be enabling conditions for the rise of right-wing populist parties. On the other hand, 'Supply-side approach' underlines the significance of political party competition and establishment, political strategies, rhetoric and communications, leadership or financial and organizational capacity of political structure with regards to success of right-wing populist parties (Norris, 2005: 14). According to this approach, briefly, only changes in society or in the political context as enabling conditions are not

satisfactory enough to understand the rise of those parties, thus it should also be considered to investigate efforts of populist parties in terms of political actions through their organizational structure, leadership style or political discourse as responses to those enabling conditions of a particular political context. This basically means that growing public demand for populist parties as a result of crises or societal transformation is not merely enough to understand the rise of populism, the political agendas of those parties responding those enabling conditions are equally important to make that rise in question possible.

On process of those enabling conditions' formation mentioned above, as a kind of interpretation of 'Modernization Theory', Betz notes that "the success of the right-wing populist reflects to a large extent the psychological strain associated with uncertainties produced by large-scale socio-economic and socio-cultural changes" (1998: 8). According to modernization theory scholars, societal transformation caused by "some type of modernization processes and their consequences like globalization, [...], post-industrial society (Betz 1994; Beck 1991; Holmes 2000; Swank and Betz 2003; Loch and Heitmeyer 2001.) end with fragmentation, dissolution and differentiation in the society" (1994: 26-27). This approach argues that "society is transforming fundamentally and rapidly, this leads to division between (self-perceived) 'winners' and 'losers' and the latter will vote for the populist parties out of protest or support" (Betz 1994; Decker 2004; Berezin 2009; Bell 1964). Clearly, those winners and losers of modernity which are produced as a consequence long-term societal transformation serve the fundamental logic of populism, which is antagonism between 'the elite' (winners) and 'the people' (losers). Correspondingly, it can be concluded that the demand for populist parties grows among losers of modernity, this transformation in society turns out be an enabling condition for the rise of populism.

Demand-side approaches mainly investigate on explaining enabling conditions to understand positive voting behavior towards populist parties by analyzing existing changes in political context in the eyes of voters, and voters' responses to parties' political actions, or general relationship between electorate and political organizations actually. Hence for instance, Koopmans et al. argues

that enabling conditions for the rise of populism can be understood with the help of ‘grievance theories’ (2005). According to this approach, situations like political resentment with mainstream politics, policy failures or economic downturns, corruption scandals or unresponsiveness of political elites and institutional pressures like austerity measures of Troika can cause positive orientation of the electorate for right-wing political parties as an alternative to mainstream (Norris, 2005; Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). In addition to these, there can be positive changes in the society which encourage people directly or indirectly to vote for populist parties. For instance, Ronald Inglehart argues that “the social transformation of postwar Western democracies has created a process of ‘cognitive mobilization’ in the society which enable people more informed, independent and self-conscious (1977). In this way, people became more aware of their needs and expectations from political actors, and when they are not satisfied with the way they are governed, they can show their discontent via several ways including voting out for populist parties vis-à-vis mainstream ones. Additionally, some scholars argue that independence of media from political elites’ control can be also an important source for emancipation of the people, correspondingly dissatisfaction with existing political establishment and support for right-wing populist parties as an alternative (Mudde, 2007; Norris 2005).

Explaining the rise of right-wing populist parties with only crises or transformation originated enabling conditions is actually based on the idea that populism is a kind of pathology in mainstream politics. Therefore, when there is no enabling conditions in a political context of a country, there would be no support for those parties in question. This approach is called as ‘normal pathology thesis’ and claims that right-wing populist parties “constitutes a pathology in Western society and [their] success can only be explained by extreme conditions like crises” (Mudde, 2010: 1167). Normal pathology scholars discuss right-wing populist values as alien to western society values, therefore they explain the reasons of those parties’ rise as results of structurally determined pathologies show up under extreme conditions (Scheuch and Klingemann, 1967: 18). Basically, “they do not use concepts and theories of mainstream politics and explain populism outside of

the normal” (Mudde, 2010: 1171-1172). In his work, Pippa Norris gives several examples of conditions which can be perceived as crisis in the society such as new waves of immigration, asylum seekers, or immigrants; cultural backlash against settled values of the society or perceived threat against them; growing level of job insecurity and rising unemployment (2005: 11).

However, it is not possible to understand the rise of right-wing populist parties completely by approaching those parties as ‘pathologies’ of a ‘healthy’ political context. It is true that there should be some enabling conditions which are born as consequences of crises as normal pathology scholars argue, but there should be also some responses and political actions against those conditions of right-wing populist parties so as to talk about the rise. At this point, in opposition to normal pathology thesis, Mudde introduces his meta-theoretical approach called “pathological normalcy thesis”. According to him, success or failure of right-wing populist parties should be studied within mainstream politics, since what those parties do is radicalization of mainstream views (2010). He thinks the idea that the rise of populism needs for crisis is harsh, however he agrees that “the populist heartland becomes active only when there are some special circumstances such as persisting political resentment, perceived threat to “our way of life” or presence of an attractive leader (Mudde, 2004). Hence, in order to provide more satisfactory explanations regarding rise of populism, he favors including supply-side explanations in the calculation as well. Accordingly, this means that reactions of right-wing populist parties to enabling conditions play very important role in the rise of those parties as well. In this respect, Mudde underlines the usefulness of charismatic leadership and also issue saliency and positioning within mainstream politics (Mudde, 2010: 1179). With regards to issue saliency and positioning, Paul Lucardie states that both right wing and left wing populist parties should excite electorate’s attention to socio-cultural issues such as immigration instead of socio-economic issues like employment, in this way these parties can be able to change saliency within mainstream politics towards the issues such as corruption, immigration or security in which they have already strong position or ownership (2000: 175). Thus, it is very possible to claim that issue ownership and saliency

are very important for the success of these parties in question. Mudde points out that if there is a failure of issue ownership for populist parties, it is generally caused by internal insufficiency of those parties such as lack of organization and personnel or disputes and divergence within the party structure (2010: 1180).

Besides Cas Mudde, many other scholars also share the idea that concentrating on merely enabling conditions reveals limited outputs to have satisfactory understanding with regards to support for populist parties (Betz 2004; Carter 2005; Givens 2005; Norris 2005). For this purpose, they offer to study on political responses of populist parties which contain political party manifestos, relationship between radical and mainstream parties, political rhetoric and strategy, featured characteristics and ability of a leader, financial resources and organizational capacity of political establishments (Norris, 2005: 15). According to this approach, mainstream parties' positions in the political spectrum and populist parties' ability to take advantage from political positioning is one of the most important element to understand the rise of populism. Herbert Kitschelt points out that in countries where mainstream parties from both right and left of political spectrum reaches to the center and converge in terms of policies on particular issues or when these parties fail to touch effectively upon some salient issues such as immigration and economic recessions, it is possible to talk about new available political space for the right-wing populist parties (1995). Additionally, Carter argues that besides mainstream party positions, the ideological position, leadership and organizational capacity of populist parties to fulfill the available political space are also critical to be successful for those parties.

In short, it can be argued that it is not very likely to provide comprehensive and satisfactory explanation to understand the rise of right-wing populist parties by merely looking at enabling conditions, instead it would be more reasonable to combine both enabling conditions and populist parties' responses to those conditions in order to analyze the rise of populism in a better way. In this regard, it can be argued that the right-wing populist parties which identify societal grievances and needs and express these through populist discourse; and the ones try to politicize issues that are not addressed adequately by mainstream parties will

be successful (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017: 104-105). The populist parties which can brighten their charismatic leader with straightforward, effective rhetoric and create sense of crisis as result of a credible narrative of crisis via this leader will accomplish to be heard as a populist party (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017: 106). To conclude, as Norris notes “what is needed is a more comprehensive of this phenomenon which provides insights into the interaction of the distribution of public opinion (electoral demand) with how parties respond in their ideological locations (party supply)” (2005: 16).

Consequently, in the thesis, enabling conditions for the rise of populism in the Britain will be specified for the period of 2010 and 2015 firstly. Following, UKIP’s political agendas as responses to those enabling conditions will be discussed in detail. In conclusion, both enabling conditions’ impact on the rise of populism in British politics and UKIP’s political responses to those conditions in order to rise will be analyzed equally and simultaneously. In this way, the reasons for the rise of populism in the context of UKIP will be presented in years between 2010 and 2015 and overall impact of this rise on British politics will be evaluated.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

4.1. Rationale of the Thesis

In this chapter of the thesis, it is aimed to provide a concise and sufficient overview with regards to methods applied in the processes of collecting and evaluating the data used in the thesis with the aim of discussing findings in an efficient way. In this respect, it will be presented respectively in this chapter that basic structure of the thesis; deficiencies of the current literature on the concern of this thesis and expected contributions of this work; details about the scope of the thesis; underlying reasons and logic of case selection, considerations regarding data sampling and collection processes; introductory information about primary and secondary sources; general overview of the method of analysis used during the thesis and limitations of the work.

As it is already mentioned in the Introduction Chapter, two main objectives of this thesis is to demonstrate the reasons of the rise of populism between 2010 and 2015 in Britain and the overall impact of this rise on British politics by investigating on United Kingdom Independence Party as a study field, a British political party which is a good representative of the populist ideology with its political standing, discourse and strategy. First and foremost in this respect, demand-side approaches mentioned in Chapter 2 are benefited from in the processes of identifying enabling conditions of populist insurgent in Britain. As following step, supply-side approaches are investigated on to demonstrate UKIP's populist political agendas as responses to those enabling conditions. Lastly, each

and every developments and changes originated by the rise of populism through UKIP in British politics will be presented so as to evaluate the overall impact mentioned earlier.

Existing studies and evaluations regarding motives of populist uptrend generally have a tendency to focus on demand-side approaches merely, which namely concern with existing political, economic and cultural conditions – generally originated by a huge societal transformation or effective crisis- which enable the rise of populism. Although these enabling conditions contribute to populist insurgent without any doubt, solely concentrating on those conditions are not sufficient enough to provide multi-dimensional and comprehensive understanding for this rising phenomenon. For instance, despite similar effects of Eurozone crisis on some EU member states (i.e. difficulties due to severe austerity measures), reflection of populist ideology development and populist parties' levels of success stem from this crisis have been observed very differently from country to country. Indeed, the healthier way to reveal real causes of these differences is derived from concentrating on supply-side approaches equally. This basically means that in order to understand the rise of populism, it is equally important to focus on to the extent that populist party's capabilities to respond to those enabling conditions; and in which ways the party executes those responses in politics. Even though given literature focuses more on populist parties' political activities day by day, it is possible to claim that there is still few number of studies putting populist political parties' actions at the center of populism studies and specializing on a case study in this direction. Parallel with this, UKIP's breakthrough is also studied predominantly by considering enabling conditions such as migration crisis, modernization process of Conservative Party, decline of Labour Party's grassroots support for their own party or general socio-cultural and economic changes in Britain affecting electorate's behavior in last twenty years. In this thesis, it will be definitely touched upon all of these enabling conditions in a very detailed way, however in order to provide an effective evaluation regarding insurgent of the party, they will be combined with UKIP's populist agendas as responses to those enabling conditions so as to show to what extent UKIP manages to take advantage

of these conditions through its populist agenda to be arbiter within British politics. In the end with this thesis, it is aimed to present a comprehensive case study regarding reasons of the rising populism in Britain between 2010-2015 and its overall impact on British politics.

Other than these, it is possible to talk about another lacuna regarding available studies in the literature which reflect three main explanations of populism (ideology, discourse, political strategy) at once. Scholars often tend to concentrate on one of these explanations to offer an eligible definition for populism. In fact, it is even possible to observe that these three explanations are seen as competing approaches in the literature. Albeit directing criticism towards each other to show strengths and weaknesses of those explanations is a very normal process, dealing with these three explanations as they are rivals prevent to find out productive results. Indeed, it is more likely to reach more comprehensive and satisfying outputs regarding populism by benefiting from three approaches as they are facilitators for each other. In this thesis, it will studied on study field of UKIP within the populist context by demonstrating how key elements of populist ideology explaining in the Theoretical and Conceptual Framework Chapter appear in party's political standing, discourse and strategy. While doing this, it will benefited from other two explanations of populism –populism as discourse and as political strategy- as subsidiary concepts and use these two so as to show relations of UKIP's political discourse and strategy with party's ideological stance. In this way, it is aimed to provide a comprehensive analysis consisting of a detailed case study within the field of populism by mentioning three explanations simultaneously.

In addition to these, UKIP is generally studied by scholars with its hard-Eurosceptic standing but not with its populist ideology. Insurgent of the party and its impact on politics are addressed as a result of UKIP's hard-Eurosceptic attitudes in these studies. Accordingly, populism is generally dealt with as supporter concept for Euroscepticism, not main issue. However, features of populism such as nativism and anti-political establishment sentiments hold very significant place to explain UKIP's insurgent and impact within British politics. For this reason, unlike

previous studies, it is aimed to approach populism as a dynamo concept so as to explain insurgent and impact of UKIP in Britain; and address Euroscepticism as a subsidiary notion which feeds populist ideology of UKIP.

Moreover, explanations regarding insurgent and impact of UKIP within British politics are generally based solely on electoral success and vote share of the party in the existing literature. However, as Mudde mentions in his study (2010), while evaluating impact of a political party on a political context it belongs to, the capacity of agenda-setting and the ability to shape public policies should be definitely taken into consideration as well. In this respect, it is targeted to take all these three indicators, not merely electoral strength of the party, into account in order to present UKIP's impact on British politics in all-inclusive way. In the same line with this, although there are various studies investigating on insurgency processes of both right wing and left wing populist parties all around the world, indeed there is a lacuna with regards to overall impact of these processes on political context in general. In this thesis, by studying on impact of UKIP to Britain's political environment as a study field, it is intended to provide a process analysis which is giving information about not only prior to the insurgency but also afterwards.

4.2. Selection of UKIP and Data Sampling

While studying on overall impact of populist insurgent on a political context, it is very vital to determine the most proper political party as a study field in order to present and analyze prominent and eligible results. In this concern, after an in-depth pre-review of literature, it is decided that assigning United Kingdom Independence Party as my study field for this thesis. Now in this section of the chapter, it will be referred the underlying reasons of the selection of the study field in a detailed way.

Since it is stressed with rising populism and its impact on a particular political context, it is very important to choose a populist political party with a remarkable rise. In this respect, it is considered the all options among political parties in Europe with visible electoral strength primarily in European Parliament

elections and also in domestic elections of their countries. In this scope, UKIP can be accepted as a solid example with its momentum embracing nearly all kind of elections since 2009 EP election and until 2015 general election. Since then, UKIP has gained in EP elections respectively %16,5 of vote share and 13 MEPs in 2009 by placing second place⁵, and %27,4 of vote share and 24 MEPs in 2014 by placing first place⁶. Similarly, UKIP has performed very well and ascended in terms of vote share in general elections since 2010. The party has gotten %3.1 of votes in 2010⁷, and as a result of a big leap, %12,6 of total vote share in 2015 general elections⁸. It is also possible to observe similar rising trend of UKIP in by-elections and local elections 2010 onwards. Given this rise seen in every type of election since 2010, UKIP stands out as a fairly obvious and solid example among populist parties that have experienced rising electoral success in Europe.

Therewithal, since the main concern of the thesis is demonstrating overall impact of a populist insurgent in the shape of a populist party on a particular political context, that party to be selected needs to have prominent properties of populist ideology. Other than this, again the populist party in question needs to display other forms of populism which they are already explained in Chapter 2 as discursive style and political strategy to reach diverse results. A fruitful analysis in this manner can only be possible through a case study that reflects those ingredients of studies in the literature with regards to populism. To tell the truth, it is hard to find more suitable study field than UKIP in this concern. As a rising right wing populist political party, UKIP display all the key features of populist ideology prominently. Details will be given in the next chapter, however it can be shortly claimed that political ideology and also policy forming processes of UKIP contain anti-elite political standing, nativism, anti-political establishment sentiments and authoritarianism. Besides these key features of populism as ideology, UKIP as a

⁵ For further information please see http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/elections/euro/09/html/ukregion_999999.stm

⁶ For further information please see <http://www.bbc.com/news/events/vote2014/eu-uk-results>

⁷ For further information please see <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/election2010/results/>

⁸ For further information please see <http://www.bbc.com/news/election/2015/results>

study field enables us to approach towards populism as discourse and political strategy –will be facilitators for populism as ideology throughout the thesis- as well. Although the relevant information will be given with a great detail in the next chapter, it can be briefly mentioned that especially since 2010, UKIP has intensified the populist discourse severely and has benefited strategically from the charismatic leadership, especially during the Nigel Farage period. When all of these are taken into consideration, it can be put forward that UKIP is very suitable and fertile study field in order to provide analysis in concern with impact on rising populism on a country's political context.

UKIP is also very good example to show parallelism between rising of populism as a phenomenon at both domestic and global level. This basically means that although UKIP has always had populist roots in terms of ideology since the foundation in 1993, party's truly effective implementation of populist policy choices, discourse and strategy correspond roughly to the beginning of 2010s which populism as a phenomenon can be felt much more prevalently compared to it was in the past. Obviously, this parallelism makes UKIP more credible as a study field for a populism related thesis.

Unlike populism studies for other continents, Euroscepticism should also be considered as a subsidiary concept to help analyzing populism in Europe. The organic link between Euroscepticism and populism, as it will be discussed in the next chapter, can be said briefly as follows: it is very possible to observe that Euroscepticism can feed populist ideology by nature with its dimensions of nativism and anti-elite standing for instance. As a hard-Eurosceptic political party, UKIP is one of the rare examples in Europe due to its distinctive and remarkable ability to fusion its Euroscepticism with its populist ideology.

Additionally, it should be stated that both Eurozone and Migration Crises the European Union has been encountered since 2008 clearly has created political vacuum to be fulfilled by alternative political approaches like populism. Nonetheless, rising populism and its impact on political context should not be handled on this basis merely as the majority of studies in the literature have done.

These studies in question predominantly include populist political parties as case studies from countries suffering from severe austerity measures of the European Union or poorly-managed Syria-originated migration crisis. Whereas, UKIP as a study field selected from a country which have not affected directly from both crises, allow us to explore other dimensions of the subject such as domestic party competition, effect of charismatic leadership and so on. It should be also noted at this point that certainly it will be touched upon these crises and their influence on UKIP's insurgent as a right-wing populist party in Britain, yet with intense focus on other causes.

In terms of data selection, it is decided that both qualitative and quantitative data will be benefited from in order to provide rich, comprehensive and accurate analysis in concern with main objectives of this thesis mentioned earlier. Nevertheless, since the thesis will be based on interpretative approach, usage of qualitative data will be more dominant throughout the thesis. The thesis will be included speeches, press statements, interviews via Youtube broadcasts, social media posts of party staff; and also official manifestos –domestic and Euromanifestos-, website, conference documents and campaign materials of the party as primary sources. Additionally, the thesis will be incorporated numerous articles containing various studies regarding UKIP; and also survey studies and poll results from prestigious and credible organizations such as Continuous Monitoring Survey (CMS) of British Election Studies (BES) as secondary sources of the thesis. In the light of these, surveys and articles will be mostly used to identify existing conditions which allows populist insurgent in Britain. Moreover, primary sources mentioned above will be predominantly utilized so as to analyze UKIP's populist response to those conditions with focus on discourse of party officials and political strategy of UKIP. In parallel with time frame of the thesis, sources have been chosen mainly in accordance with the period of 2010-2015. Strengths and limitations of the sources can be sorted respectively as follows: since the study field is political party from United Kingdom, all sources are available in English which makes easier and quicker to analyze them. In addition, thanks to internet and social media, accessing process of many primary sources (interviews,

press statements etc.) has been quite easy and diverse. Owing to the fact that the thesis is based on mainly qualitative data, it has been possible to provide more detailed information and explanation options related to complex issues with regards to scope of the thesis. In contrary, since the surveys used throughout the thesis were not prepared by myself, there has been difficulties to access relevant ones via internet because of access limitations or cost requirements.

CHAPTER 5

EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION OF EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

In this chapter, findings will be discussed in a detailed way and with a broad sense of understanding in compatible with the framework which was portrayed earlier in Theoretical and Conceptualization Framework Chapter. In this light, I will separate this chapter into three sections. In the first section of Discussion Chapter, I will present particular events and enabling conditions existing within British political context which enable populist breakthrough in the shape of United Kingdom Independence Party. In the following section, I will demonstrate to what extent and how UKIP's populist agenda –political standing, discourse and strategy- took advantage of those conditions in an effective way to rise its effects in Britain politics. And in the last section of this chapter, I will discuss overall impact of rising populism in the context of UKIP on British politics. In short, the reasons of UKIP's insurgent between 2010-2015 will be investigated on during first two sections; and overall impact of this insurgency will be discussed in the last.

5.1. Enabling Conditions for the UKIP's Breakthrough

As it is already discussed in Chapter 2, an important group of scholars claim that there should be some specific conditions which are generally originated by a long-term societal transformation or an immediate crisis in order to talk about a suitable environment allowing rise of populist political parties. These conditions can be austerity measures, policy failures, economic downturns, consumption or corruption scandals, grassroots electorate' resentment, perceived threat towards national identity, cognitive mobilizations or unresponsiveness of mainstream

politics exemplarily (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). According to approach of those scholars, these types of particular developments and changes carve out convenient political environment for populist parties to attract worthwhile attention and explicit rise.

In the period of 2010-2015, it is also possible to observe these types of particular developments and changes within British political context and their influence on politics of the country. Specifically, reappearance of traditional Euroscepticism within British society fed by Eurozone and Migration Crises of the European Union, increase in net numbers of migration from particularly Romania and Bulgaria and also other EU countries to the United Kingdom, modernization process of Conservative party under the leadership of David Cameron, discontent and resentment of grassroots voters of mainstream parties and coalition government experience for the first time after 70 years can be listed as overriding conditions which have prepared suitable ground for UKIP to rise within British politics as a right-wing populist party. So as to recognize these conditions helping to create opportunities for UKIP well, I will portray details of each and every developments mentioned above one by one; and discuss opportunities made by those developments for UKIP in a comprehensive way.

5.1.1. Reappearance of Wide-range Euroscepticism within British Society

It would not be surprising to state that Britain has a distinctive relationship with the European Union compared to other member states since the day she became a member in 1973. Before that the country has been subjected to two times vetoes of French President Charles de Gaulle and then also experienced several internal opposition waves towards European Integration for decades. Most especially during Thatcher era, Great Britain has showed strong opposition to further integration within the EU except for economic aspects. This has led the country to the famous Bruges Speech of Margaret Thatcher in 1988. In the light of these developments, many scholars studying on Euroscepticism frequently refer to ‘traditional Euroscepticism’ of the island both at national and individual levels in

their works. Even some of them describe United Kingdom as ‘awkward partner’ of the European Union.

In brief, Euroscepticism has always had an important and respectable effects on contemporary British politics (Gifford, 2014). Particularly since the Maastricht Treaty, intensity of Euroscepticism of British public and political parties has been wavered depending on the saliency of EU issues within British politics. Nonetheless, it would not be wrong to say that there has been always a particular and fixed level of Euroscepticism among British electorate and political parties as a tradition regardless of their backgrounds, positions at mainstream politics or right-left spectrum. As Chris Gifford mentions “British Euroscepticism is most usefully conceived as systematic feature of British politics, not reducible to specific actors or ideologies” (2014: 519).

Basically, most of the Britons are sceptic about any kind of European Integration above than economic ones, specifically cultural-based merging of countries under the policy of the EU called ‘ever closer union’. Additionally, it can be argued that British Euroscepticism is underpinned by executive and legislative power transfers from British government and parliament to the EU institutions. Also, policy range of the EU over British daily life and political system are also criticized by British Eurosceptics. As Jeremy Richardson mentions in his work, “EU has expanded its power into what they term core state activities. Thus, there has been increasing involvement of EU institutions in key functions of sovereignty including money and fiscal affairs, defense and foreign policy, migration, citizenship and internal security” (2017: 123). This policy-making power of EU superior to national level generates discontent among citizens (who oppose the EU in particular) and political vacuum to be fulfilled by anti-EU populist parties like UKIP (Richardson, 2017).

As it is already mentioned, it is always possible to talk about some level of Euroscepticism within British society, however its intensity and influence over British politics change as depending on particular developments in relationship between EU and the United Kingdom or impact of membership on their daily lives

and so on. For instance, according to the Eurobarometer results, trust towards the European Union and overall image of the Union in the eyes of Britons have been changed dramatically in six years between 2006-2012 in a negative direction. I will share the results from 2006 (before rise of UKIP), 2009 (the year UKIP's breakthrough started) and 2012 (during UKIP's rise) surveys so as to demonstrate dissimilarities in three different eras of British politics with regards to EU perception. In 2006⁹, %31 of Britons declared that they have trust towards European Union (Average of EU is %48). Similarly, only %34 of Britons think that the EU have a positive image in the island (Average of EU is %50). This clearly shows that Britain society approach to the Union in a sceptic way when compared to average of EU member states. Indeed, it is getting worse even. In 2009¹⁰, trust level has dropped to %22 and similarly thoughts about EU's positive image has also decreased to %22. When it comes to 2012¹¹, it possible to observe that British society is sceptic enough towards the Union with %16 trust level and positive image perception.

Without any doubt, Eurozone and migration crises of European Union has contributed to the negative perception of the Union and created opportunities for Eurosceptic Britons to question its political and economic functioning (Wellings & Vines, 2015). Especially because of the Eurozone Crisis, Eurosceptic voice of Britain at both party and public level drew attention to the fact that "bail-outs for some member states would eventually end up pouring British taxpayers' money" (Bale, 2018; 8) They also indicated that "the unemployment that hit some of the largest EU member states provided hardly that UK will be better off out" (Bale, 2018; 8). Consequently, as Gifford states clearly that "the crisis in the Eurozone confirmed to British Eurosceptics that United Kingdom should decouple itself from a project that was now a proven economic and political failure" (2014: 520). Although Britain was not directly affected by the Migration Crisis originated from

⁹ Eurobarometer 65

¹⁰ Eurobarometer 71

¹¹ Eurobarometer 77

Syria, it still has foamed Eurosceptics in Britain. Even though government implies that UK is not in Schengen, they think that the burden is shared (Bale, 2018; 8).

Public skepticism in UK towards the EU fed by crises mentioned above was turned out to be a collective action as well. 'Fresh Start Project'¹² was established in 2011 "to work across party lines with civil society organizations to state that 'our citizens want more control over their own lives'" (Gifford, 2014: 520). Prime Minister David Cameron also admitted reappearance of effective Euroscepticism within British society by stating that "public disappointment with the EU is at an all time high" (Flamini, 2013: 37).

Positions of mainstream parties with regards to EU-related issues has also created space for UKIP. In fact, despite increased doubts in the European Union among British electorate, mainstream parties did not respond to these doubts directly and effectively. Especially during 2010 general election campaigns, "the EU issue was largely ignored by the main parties (Carey & Geddes, 2010). Most notably in 2010 Manifesto of Conservative Party, "overall proportion of statements about the EU has declined" explicitly (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013; 301). In this way, UKIP has found a profound political gap regarding EU issues in British politics in order to present its Eurosceptic populist political agenda to the British electorate.

To conclude, politics of European Integration and rising Euroscepticism within British society intensified by EU Crises have created plenty of opportunities for UKIP as an Eurosceptic political party with populist discourse to appeal British electorate with regards to EU-related issues on a large scale. (Bale, 2018; Lynch et al., 2011; Wellings & Vines, 2015).

5.1.2. Rising Immigration in United Kingdom

Before starting to discuss rising immigration as one of the enabling conditions for the UKIP's breakthrough, it should be mentioned that the actual reappearance of Euroscepticism within British society and rising immigration are closely linked and interrelated conditions. It basically means that it is possible to

¹² For further information please see: <http://www.eufreshstart.co.uk/>

read rising immigration as one of the reasons of rising British Euroscepticism in between 2010 and 2015. Consequently, they can be studied under the same ‘enabling condition’. However, since UKIP has been very interested in rising immigration and utilized this condition very effectively, this rising immigration issue should be discussed separately from condition of ‘reappearance of Euroscepticism’ in a very detailed way.

During the coalition government era, particularly between 2012-2015, immigration rose substantially in Britain (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015: 169). According to Migration Watch UK data, net immigration to the United Kingdom was 177.000 in 2012, 209.000 in 2013, 313.000 in 2014 and reached to 332.000 in 2015. As a result of this continuous rise, immigration and its effects on British society in terms of both economically and culturally has become an important debate in British politics and public. Indeed, it would not be wrong to claim that the importance of the issue has been even more intensified with the coalition decision of lifting of transitional controls over Bulgarian and Romanian workers in 2013 (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015: 172). Actually, this is not very surprising when considering rising migrant numbers from those two EU member states to the island. Total immigration from Bulgaria and Romania was 11.000 in 2012 and increased to 65.000 in 2015¹³. Naturally, this significant rise in immigration has also increased saliency of the issue. By the end of 2014, immigration has moved to the top in the list of significant issues of Britain and.¹⁴ According to Ipsos MORI research, in the end of 2010, %25 of the respondents think that immigration is the most important issue in Britain. It increased to %34 in mid-2013, %41 in early 2014 and reached the %56 in September 2015.

It can be pointed out at this point that these statistics clearly prove that Britons want the government to do something about rising immigration. Dennison and Goodwin argues that “British public is not divided on immigration issue” and “want levels of immigration reduced” (2015: 175). According to British Election

¹³ For further information please see: Migration Watch UK:
<https://www.migrationwatchuk.org/statistics-net-migration-statistics/#create-graph>

¹⁴ British Election Study (BES) - Study of Issue Saliency

Study data, %56 of respondents want little or lot reduction of immigration in 2013, and this number has increased to %70 in May 2015. Of course, the eyes of the public have turned to coalition government during 2010-2015 period in order to see some actions about the issue. In this respect, David Cameron has reminded firstly to settle anxiety among Britons that the UK did not sign the Schengen Agreement. However, as a counter attack from opponents, it has been reminded to Cameron that “UK still does permit Europeans from signatory states to enter the country and seek employment” (Flamini, 2013: 38). Therefore, David Cameron and coalition government has arranged some regulations in order to limit migration flow such as annual limitation on non-EU economic migrants, reintroduction of exit checks, minimizing abuse of student exchange programs and tougher rules immigration caused by spouses (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015: 170). In addition to those, David Cameron has promised to reduce immigration to the levels of 1990s. However, the statistics has mistaken David Cameron and net immigration has kept to increase in Britain. Consequently, as Bale claims, “Conservative Party has lost public confidence on immigration because they made promises on the issue they were unable to keep” (2018: 12). Indeed, lack of solutions to respond public concerns over rising immigration has damaged the trust towards mainstream politics’ abilities in Britain generally (McLaren, 2012). People have obviously started to question coalition government’s capacity to solve this problem. According to BES research in 2015, %69 of the respondents stated that coalition government handle with rising immigration badly. In contrast, only %8 of respondents think that the coalition was good at dealing with migration problem of the UK.

Without any doubt, those numbers proving rising immigration and British voters’ perception of mainstream parties are inadequate to solve this problem have created fabulous opportunity for UKIP. Immigration suddenly has turned out to be key issue for UKIP to appeal more votes from electorate who are not happy with current level of immigration regardless of their political background. As it will be presented in a very detailed way in the next section of this chapter, UKIP has prioritized rising immigration issue during their campaigns between 2010-2015

and helped to increase saliency of the issue in British politics. In the end, as Dennison and Goodwin argues, “immigration as an issue of major public concern helped push UKIP from the margins towards the mainstream, bringing party’s strongest general election results in 2015” (2015: 169).

5.1.3. Discontent and Resentment of Mainstream Parties’ Electorate

It can be obviously claimed that there are two major political party dominating the British political system for years. Liberal Democrats has been also accompanied these two major powers of British political party system as the third-coming. It would not be wrong to say that the island has been governed by Conservative Party or Labour Party predominantly and these two parties has never faced serious difficulties to get sufficient votes from the electorate to rule the country. However, especially since 2010, traditional core voters and supporters of these two parties have been turned their backs largely on their parties. Such that the United Kingdom has experienced a coalition government after 70 years because neither Conservatives nor Labours could not achieve to get majority in the parliament in 2010 general elections. Indeed, the total amount of votes of these two major parties has been calculated as the least in a hundred years of British political history. Obviously, there are different fundamental underlying reasons which explain the decline of Conservative and Labour votes such as David Cameron-led Modernization Process of Conservative Party and New Labour Movement of Tony Blair. In this section of the chapter, those underlying reasons which clarify falling numbers in voters of big-two of British politics will be discussed in a detailed way.

5.1.3.a. Modernization Process of Conservative Party

It is obvious that Conservative Party is one of the two main engines of British mainstream politics for decades. However, since 1997, the party has struggled to be front row arbiter in Britain political context. Due to the successive triumphs of Blair’s New Labour between 1997-2010, Conservative Party has sought to generate effective solution to break this uninterrupted success of Labour Party. As a consequence of this searching, David Cameron, a young and bright

Conservative politician, has been outshined as respectable hope for the party's comeback to British politics as foremost power. (Happell, 2008).

In order to bring success back to the Conservative Party, Cameron has followed a different path. He implied that the party needs to reconsider its political position in right-spectrum and to modernize its classical conservative values which party holds so as to embrace diversity in British society. In parallel with this, he has underlined that Thatcherism should be reinterpreted to reach more people in British society. Politician with the party such as Michael Portillo, Francis Maude, Oliver Letwin, George Osborne, Nick Bones and Steve Hilton have back up for David Cameron's modernization process of Conservative Party at least at the initial phase (Lynch, 2015: 188). At first sight, it can be noted that this process "involves reappraisal of party tradition" by changing in personnel, organization, ideology and policy in order to respond changes within state, society and economy (McAnulla, 2010; Bale, 2011; Lynch, 2015; Kenny & Smith, 1997; Dommmett, 2015). First of all, Cameron has made a move to change Thatcherite direction of the party. He defines himself as "an admirer [of Margaret Thatcher] not a devote" (Hayton, 2013: 8). Whilst talking about his intention with the new approach, he notes that "I am not rejecting the Thatcherite concept of society [...] but seeking to rehabilitate it" (Rawnsey, 2005). Therefore, it would not be wrong to claim that "Cameron's arrival [to the party as a leader] effectively marked the end of the ideological dominance of Thatcherism within the Conservative Party" as Richard Hayton argues in his work. (2013: 6).

As I mentioned earlier, Cameron has aimed to reshape conservatism of the Conservative Party (Hayton, 2012) and "detoxified the Conservative brand by association with language and issues not traditionally linked to the party" (Hayton, 2013: 9). Similarly, Hayton touched on this by claiming that "a notable feature of his modernization strategy [is to] aim at positioning the Conservatives to compete effectively on the political centre ground" (2010: 31) Consequently, Conservative Party under the leadership of David Cameron has consciously started to downplay traditional Conservative values and taken a unusual stand on issues such as immigration, European Integration, crime, LGBTQ rights, multiculturalism,

climate change, overseas aid and so on (Goodwin & Milazzo, 2015: 21-22; Hayton, 2010: 31). Clearly, this new political standing gives more socially liberal outlook to the Conservative Party (Hayton, 2013: 9).

Although Cameron's initial plan while constructing this modernization strategy was to achieve reaching a wider range of electorate, he actually has put Conservative Party's own traditional votes at risk unconsciously (Dorey, 2007: 164; Hayton, 2010: 132). The approach of Conservative Party under the leadership of David Cameron towards the issues mentioned above, exemplarily diversifying the range of candidates to be standing in elections (Hayton, 2010: 9), legalizing same-sex marriage or maintaining soft-Eurosceptic attitudes, was found too "close to centre" by traditional Conservative voters (Heppell, 2013; Crines & Heppell, 2016: 244). Accordingly, it would not be wrong to claim that a serious discontented and resentful group was formed within traditional Conservative electorate as a result of Cameron's modernization process. Correspondingly, this formation seeking for an alternative to demonstrate their discontent and protest with Cameron's Conservative Party has become obvious and rich source for UKIP. In short, Bale consolidates this claim by stating that "[Process] alienated those voters who had previously welcomed what Cameron now seemed so keen to reject, thereby rendering them highly receptive to UKIP's message that it was now very much the party for them" (2018: 3). Similarly, on defections of traditional Conservative voters to UKIP, Gruber and Bale argue that "many of those tempted by UKIP are at least in part influenced by a feeling that David Cameron is an out-of-touch liberal, too-far removed from their idea of what a Conservative leader should be" (2014: 250). To conclude, it can be easily point out that modernization period led by David Cameron has created political space for UKIP to fulfill and attract discontented traditional Conservative voters (Lynch, 2015: 187).

Modernization process of Conservative Party has not only caused discomfort among its traditional voters, it has also induced "a division within the party as modernizers who saw the need for change and traditionalists support just the opposite" (Hayton, 2013: 7). Predominantly in concern with Cameron's management of EU relations and his 'too-liberal' policy moves like same-sex

marriage, an opposition group has begun to emerge among Conservative benchers (Bale, 2018: 10). It can be easily observed that there were serious dissidence and disconnection between the direction of Cameron-led government and preferences of many Conservative MPs especially on EU-related issues (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 305; Cowley & Stuart, 2012: 405). In fact, David Cameron has encounter a tough opposition from his own party between 2010-2015 containing interesting facts like “103 different Conservative MPs rebelled on EU issues and 49 votes on EU issues saw a rebellion” (Lynch, 2015: 193). Many examples of this ‘riots’ can be given. For instance, as following step of David Nuttall-led worldwide petition over 100.000 people, 81 of Cameron’s own MPs have defied their leader in the issue of EU membership of the United Kingdom and voted in favor of in-out referendum in October 2011 (Bale, 2018: 9). Similarly, MP John Baron has written a letter to Cameron on behalf of 100 Conservative MPs to call referendum (Baron, 2012). Lastly, in June 2012, 53 Conservative MPs have voted with Labour Party members with regards to cut in EU budget (Dale, 2016: 378; Bale, 2016: 9; Lynch, 2015: 193). All of these examples clearly prove that changes in Conservative Party came with David Cameron’s modernization strategy have not only provoked displeasure among Tory electorates but also within the party itself. Along with centre-ground and liberal policy choices of Cameron, particularly his management of EU relations has caused serious divergence among Conservative Party members. Without no doubt, those troubles in Conservative Party have given birth to many valuable opportunities for UKIP to channel dissatisfied Tory voters and members to their own party.

5.1.3.b. Post-New Labour Era

Whilst talking about disenchanting and discontented voters in British society and analyzing those voters’ effect on UKIP’s surge, it is not possible to ignore traditional Labour Party grassroots which have been resentful since New Labour movement of Tony Blair. Goodwin and Milazzo put forward that “in the 1990s, Tony Blair and New Labour have followed a third way between traditional top-down socialism and unregulated neo-liberalism, and rescinded their commitment to the public ownership of key industries. [...] His move to the centre

ground contributed to a loss of support for Labour among its core electorate” (2017: 16). As a part of a Third way move, Labour government has build close relationship with the European Union and welcomed immigrants to British labor market from the members states. According to Dennison and Goodwin, “Labour’s embrace of liberal consensus on immigration and Britain’s EU membership had alienated its traditional working-class voters” 2015: 171). Since immigrants in labor market cause unemployment danger for low-skilled, low-educated blue collar British working class, they have become really resentful with this decision of Blair government. Therewithal, in 2011, Labour leader Miliband has accepted this estrangement between the party and its core electorate by stating that “Labour decision to allow unlimited numbers of EU migrant workers to settle in Britain had been a mistake and that large-scale migration could undermine wages for low-skilled workers” (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015: 172). In the end, traditional working class which felt marginalized by globalization, anxious about their economic and social well-being have started to believe that Labour Party is not representing them anymore. According to them, original Labour Party “had been replaced by a new generation Labour elites, middle-class and professional politicians who talked about economics over national belonging, appealed to the centre ground over class solidarity, and claimed to represent the workers while appearing to dismiss their concerns” (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015: 5). Correspondingly, these changes in perception of Labour grassroots on their own party and “those disgruntled manual workers were quickly becoming an important sources of votes for UKIP” (2015: 16).

5.1.3.c. Inclusion of Liberal Democrats into Coalition Government

The Liberal Democrats has remained as the third party for many years and created an alternative to two major parties in the British political system. Therefore, electorate which are not happy or satisfied with the management of these two major parties’ government tend to vote for Liberal Democrats so as to show their protest (Usherwood, 2016: 254). However, with the accession of Liberal Democrats to the coalition government together with Conservative Party has reduced its popularity among its voters. Crines and Heppell claims that “credibility and trustworthiness

of Liberal Democrat Party has been seriously undermined by their stance on increasing tuition fees and VAT” for their voters (2016: 243). In fact, Goodwin and Milazzo points out in their work that “the Liberal Democrat chief had become the most unpopular third-party leader since David Owen” (2015: 27). Obviously, all of these developments have created chances to shine out for Nigel Farage and his party. In conclusion, “participation of Liberal Democrat Party’s in the coalition left the way open for UKIP to pick up those who feel unserved by the system” (Usherwood, 2016: 254). It can be argued that now UKIP is better positioned to attract and get protest votes of British electorate in the absence of Liberal Democrats in the area of non-mainstream (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 295; Tournier-Sol, 2014: 140-151).

5.1.4. Change In Traditional Structure of British Politics: A Coalition Government

Indeed, it can be argued that two essential features of coalition government have paved the way for UKIP to be more appealing in the eyes of electorate. First one of this features Eurosceptic voters’ perception of weak management of coalition government especially in EU-related issues. Other one is the fact that formation of coalition government underlines the negative aspects of the Conservative Party’s modernization process in the eyes of traditional Tory voters and raises doubts about Cameron's leadership of Conservative Party.

About the first, it can be pointed out that since the coalition contains Liberal Democrats which favors the European Union, EU policies of government did not make happy and satisfied Eurosceptic voters in rise within society (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 305). Along with his modernization process’ soft-Eurosceptic attributes, presence of coalition government with Liberal Democrats has “restricted Cameron’s room for maneuver” particularly on EU issues (Lynch, 2015: 192). Therefore, it would not be wrong to put forward an idea that the coalition government has seemed as weak power in relations with the EU in the eyes of Eurosceptic voters. For instance, “the intervention of ECHR delaying the deportation of the radical Muslim cleric, Abu Qatada, has created an image of an

impotent coalition government” (Crines & Heppell, 2016: 243). In addition to this, increasing media portrayals about rising immigration from specifically from Bulgaria and Romania has pictured coalition government as weak power to prevent given EU rules” (Ford & Goodwin, 2014: 92). Without doubt, this perception of incompetent coalition government especially against the EU among British electorate also fed by duality of Conservative-Liberal Democrats partnership has created favorable conditions for UKIP (Lynch et al., 2011: 754). In this way, UKIP has found tremendous opportunity to appeal Eurosceptic voters by using this weakness coalition perception and to gain issue ownership EU-related issues (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 291, Tournier-Sol, 2015).

The second feature of formation of coalition government which creates space for UKIP is related to Cameron’s modernization strategy and his leadership. Chris Gifford notes that “a failure of the Conservative Party to win a clear victory in 2010 General Elections weakened the Cameron’s leadership, leaving many Conservatives disillusioned and critical of the leadership’s attempt to moderate the party’s Thatcherite trajectory” (2014: 520). In the eyes of traditional Tory voters, as compatible with modernization process, “Conservative Party has repositioned themselves closer to the centre ground in their alliance with Liberal Democrats” (Tournier-Sol, 2015: 140). In parallel with this, as both Tournier-Sol states in her work that the Conservative Party in coalition has created political space to the party’s right and enhanced UKIP’s chances to get disaffected mainly Conservative electorate’s votes on the right of the political spectrum. (Hayton, 2013: 16).

Eventually, it would not be wrong to say that coalition government came after 70 years has both weakened the ‘perception of strong government’ especially against the European Union among Eurosceptic British society, and also David Cameron’s leadership in the eyes of traditional Tory voters. All of these developments have turned out to be enabling conditions for UKIP to take advantage of in the end.

In the end of the section, it can be argued that those crucial enabling conditions elaborated above have created very suitable political environment for a

right-wing populist party in Britain, particularly between 2010 and 2015. Obviously, the reappearance of traditional Euroscepticism of British society, the rising immigration and growing anxiety over it among people, the transformation process of the mainstream parties and the coalition government experience have opened a way for UKIP to rise. Nonetheless, none of these enabling conditions are merely enough to make this kind of rise happen. As a populist party, UKIP's responses to those enabling conditions and effective interaction with them are equally crucial to be risen. Therefore, in the next section of the chapter, UKIP's populist political agendas as response to the enabling conditions will be discussed.

5.2. UKIP's Populist Political Agendas as Response to Enabling Conditions

As it is already mentioned, it is very important to analyze UKIP's reaction with the enabling conditions to understand the real reasons of the rise. In this respect, between 2010 and 2015, UKIP has applied political agendas featured with fundamental attributes of populist ideology; and constructed populist rhetoric and strategies in accordance with the ideology in question. Furthermore, the party has strategically focused some important fields such as local election campaigns or keeping distance with extremism. In this section of the chapter, all these responses of UKIP to enabling conditions so as to rise will be discussed one-by-one.

5.2.1. Anti-Political Establishment & Anti-Elite Sentiments Agenda of UKIP

Abedi and Lundberg argue that “[A]n Anti-Political Establishment (APE) party challenges status quo; regards itself outside, and contenting against the political establishment; and maintains that there is a fundamental divide between the people and the establishment” (2009: 74). Indeed, UKIP can be accepted as a very solid example of APE party via its discourse and policy choices which challenge status-quo by standing against EU membership of the UK; accuse mainstream parties of being the same and disconnected from the people; and describe itself as a group of politicians who are aware of people's problems and prioritizing them before their own careers.

It would not be wrong to state that UKIP and its leader Nigel Farage have underlined untrustworthiness of mainstream parties and their politicians during nearly all election campaigns between 2010-2015. Especially during 2010 General Elections campaign, the party has benefited the negative image of political-elite caused by Expenses Scandal very effectively and called voters to “sod the lot” (Kelsey, 2015: 295). In 2011, Farage has emphasized distrust of electorate towards ruling elites by stating that “their broken promises and failure to deal with real issues has led to an almost total breakdown in faith and trust in politics in this country” (Farage, 2011) (28/238). Moreover, UKIP has repeatedly accused ruling elites and mainstream parties of being disconnected from the people and their needs, concerns and preferences. According to the party, “a gulf has opened between the ruling elite and the public (UKIP, 2011). Dependently, UKIP has tried to draw attention to alleged incapability and unresponsiveness of mainstream parties and ruling elites to respond serious public concerns over issues such as immigration by forming specific policies (Lynch et al., 2011: 755). In parallel with these, Farage has alleged that “[ruling elites] all go to same schools, the same Oxbridge Colleges, and none of them have ever had a job in real world” (Farage, 2013). Therefore, he claims that they cannot understand the ‘real life’ problems of the people, they can only care their careers (Tournier-Sol, 2014: 150). Shortly, Farage and his party have categorized all mainstream parties in Britain as the same in terms of their professed untrustworthiness, unresponsiveness and disconnection from the people; and labelled them as “the LibLabCon-sensus” (UKIP, 2010). According to Nigel Farage, “three mainstream parties frankly look the same, sound the same and do not offer any real policy differences” (The Guardian, 2013). At this point, Farage has pointed UKIP as an true alternative for electorate discounted with mainstream parties by issuing that “on the contrary, UKIP is made up of ordinary people who can speak people’s language and understand their concerns” (Tournier-Sol, 2014: 150).

Robert Harmsen notes in his study that “Euroscepticism may essentially be understood as an anti-political establishment position” (2010: 335). From this point of view, it can be claimed that UKIP’s opposition to the European Union has also

APE dimension. Such that, UKIP has always emphasized unelected bureaucratic structure of the Union and opposed technocratic settlement of the Commission particularly. In 2010 UKIP Manifesto, EU has been called as “undemocratic and autocratic” and criticized by implying its “unelected, bureaucrats, commissioners, multiple presidents and judges” by UKIP. Although the democratic deficit criticism of UKIP towards the EU will be discussed under the next subtitle, it can be argued at this point that UKIP’s Euroscepticism consists also anti-political establishment sentiments.

After all, it is possible to claim that UKIP has tried to take advantage of some enabling conditions discussed in previous section of this chapter. For instance, UKIP has taken pointed steps to respond the issues allegedly partially neglected by mainstream parties such as immigration by implying unresponsiveness and inadequacy of ruling elites in the scope of its APE – Anti-Elite Agenda. Moreover, the party has directed part of its Euroscepticism towards ruling-elites of the European Union to attract Eurosceptic electorate. Additionally and maybe most importantly, UKIP has tried to reach discontent and resentful electorate of Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrat Parties by employing an effective APE rhetoric and strategies which highlight untrustworthiness and disconnectedness of those parties in the eyes of public.

5.2.2. National Sovereignty & Common Sense Agenda of UKIP

It can be observed that as a right-wing populist party, UKIP underscores the importance of notions such as national sovereignty, popular sovereignty and accordingly common sense or general will of the people.

Karine Tournier-Sol clearly points out that “UKIP’s narrative stresses the defense of national sovereignty” (2014: 142). It would not be wrong to indicate that UKIP touches the issue of national sovereignty through its opposition towards the European Union. In the understanding of the party, “British national sovereignty has been destroyed by the Maastricht Treaty” (Tournier-Sol, 2014: 142), since it has fasten Europeanization process which “has depoliticized national politics” by limiting the capacity of national governments and parliaments to make

decisions and laws without consent of EU (Gifford, 2014: 515). Therefore, UKIP spread the idea that “the EU represents a dangerous expression of global governance and is to be countered by a defense of national sovereignty[.]” (Gifford, 2014: 522). The party also sees EU membership as responsible of “surrender of the British people’s self-determination to an alien bureaucracy” (Farage, 2011). Thereby, UKIP asserts that “the only party determined to bring power and control back (from Brussels) to Westminster and British people” is UKIP (UKIP, 2010).

Along with national sovereignty, UKIP values popular democracy since it represents general will of the people. Hence, the party stands very skeptical against the unelected EU bodies. Consequently, UKIP frequently emphasizes on the lack of popular legitimacy of the EU (Tournier-Sol, 2014: 142). On this issue, Farage says in 2011 that “an undemocratic EU was never democratically approved therefore has no legitimacy whatsoever to govern British people. He similarly question legitimacy of the European Council President Herman Van Rompuy by asking him that “Who voted for you? I know democracy is not popular with you lot [...] Is this European democracy?” (Farage, 2010). He also criticized the EU democracy through founding fathers by stating that “the will of the people and peoples of Europe were irrelevant to Robert Shuman, Jean Monnet and P.H. Spaak”.

UKIP promotes popular sovereignty not just in relation with the EU but also in domestic affairs as well. Accordingly, the party prioritizes referendums and direct elections to a great extent (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 295). Exemplary, the party promises to the voters to “extend direct elections and real democracy by instituting directly elected country policy boards, education boards and health boards (UKIP, 2010). In addition to this, UKIP has covenanted to “introduce direct democracy whereby %5 of national or local electorate can demand a binding referendum on any issue” (UKIP, 2010). The party also supports allowing binding national referendums on controversial public law and order (2010), and also has been favored in a referendum on EU membership (which will be come true as it is known). Consequently, UKIP calls its policies “common sense policies” and claims that “only UKIP represents the majority view” (UKIP, 2010).

Briefly, UKIP has tried to benefit from enabling conditions by emphasizing national sovereignty, popular democracy and common sense policies. For instance, the party has questioned European Union's legitimacy in the eyes of Britons in order to take advantage of reappearance of public Euroscepticism. The party also has create a narrative which implies possible threat of losing national sovereignty because of the EU and attempted to draw Eurosceptic voters' to this tailored perception. UKIP has also underlined its priority to hear what common sense says by favoring referendums and in this way tried to reach dissatisfied voters who feel unheard by the mainstream parties.

5.2.3. Nativism & National Identity Agenda of UKIP

One of the most important attributes of populist parties is nativism as it was presented in detail during Theoretical and Conceptual Framework Chapter. UKIP as a right-wing populist party, similarly gives huge importance to national identity and tries to draw attention to possible threats towards Britishness of the society originated mainly from European Integration and migration. In this regard, UKIP predominantly attempts to benefit from these two enables which are reappearance of Euroscepticism within British society and rising migration in the country.

At this point, it would be reasonable to determine the scope of UKIP's nativism whether it reaches to even nationalism. In the party manifesto published in 2010 it is written that "UKIP believes in civic nationalism, which is open and inclusive to anyone who wishes to identify with Britain, regardless of ethnic or religious background". Parallel with this, "UKIP opposes multiculturalism and political correctness, and promotes uniculturalism –aiming to create a single British culture embracing all races and religions" and promises "to end active promotion of the doctrine of multiculturalism by local and national governments" (UKIP, 2010). Thereby, UKIP sees European Union and European integration came with it as potential threats to their target of uniculturalism within the island.

UKIP underlines the significance of British values and national identity in the line with its nativist understanding. Therefore, the European Union and its multiculturalist policies such as 'ever closer union' are seen as interventions to

undermine British national identity and traditional values. In this respect, the party claims to “recognize numerous threats to British identity and culture” and give oath to “restore British values” (UKIP, 2010). Similarly, Nigel Farage explains positive British characteristics as qualities of the British society and wants to “rediscover and embrace those characteristics that have become suppressed by EU legislation” (Kelsey, 2016: 977). In addition to these, Nigel Farage plays his party’s populist nativism card to use the opportunity of implying rising immigration caused by EU membership and says that “in many parts of England, you don’t here English anymore” (Goodwin & Milazzo, 2015: 10).

As an alternative power instead of being part of the European Union, UKIP puts Commonwealth memories forward to remind strength of Great Britain in global politics and commonalities of British values and traditions universally. In this respect, UKIP recognizes Britain as a global player with a global destiny and not a regional state [or a province] within a United States of Europe” (UKIP, 2010). The party highlights the similarities among Commonwealth countries such as sharing the same language, legal and democratic systems and offers this tradition as an alternative for the EU membership (UKIP, 2010). Farage also indicates frequently that UKIP is the party of the Commonwealth and adds that “not hemmed in by the European Union but open to the Commonwealth; not headed by my old pal van Rompuy but by the Queen” (Farage, 2013).

To conclude, UKIP has applied its nativist agenda by touching upon EU issue and migration in order to benefit from linked uneasiness of the British society with those issues. In this respect, the party has emphasized alleged threats to British values and national identity stem from European integration and tried to instill Commonwealth idea to the electorate as an alternative for the EU. It would be not wrong to argue that Nigel Farage and his party underlines the differences between the United Kingdom and the European Union by using nativist agenda to reach Eurosceptic voters and the electorate who are not happy with current management of migration issue specifically: “Our geography puts us apart. Our history puts us apart. Our institutions produced by that history puts us apart. We think differently. We behave differently” (Farage, 2013).

5.2.4. *The Fusion Strategy: Hard-Eurosceptic Policies & Immigration Agenda of UKIP*

As it is mentioned in Chapter 3, UKIP was formed as a single-issue party and its *raison d'être* was the withdrawal of United Kingdom from the European Union (Tournier-Sol, 2015: 142). The party is still hard-Eurosceptic political party; and claims that the EU is interfering the United Kingdom in nearly every fields and therefore “the only way to regain control is to leave the EU” (UKIP, 2014). Therewithal, as will be presented in the next section, UKIP has played a kind of a modifier role in the process of Brexit.

Beyond being a hard-Eurosceptic party, in order to express discontentedness with the EU membership, UKIP has “used Europe as an arena for the pursuit of populist politics” (Harmsen, 2010: 334). UKIP has strategically formalized an anti-EU populist rhetoric which questions legitimacy of the EU bodies, its functioning and benefits for the British people. Furthermore, due to this populist rhetoric, UKIP has taken attention to the possible threats and undermining effects originated from the membership to the British identity, sovereignty, and global actorness of the United Kingdom. In addition to the populist rhetoric, UKIP has reflected its hard-Euroscepticism to populist strategies through policy promises and choices in this line. Through those policies, UKIP has tried to draw attention to that EU membership causes limitations of British national sovereignty by generating laws from Brussels for the United Kingdom; creates additional economic cost for the country; and threatens national identity by insisting on further and continuous European integration. According to the Nigel Farage’s claim, European Union has used the Euro-crisis to try and take yet more power for themselves (Crines & Heppell, 2016: 231).

UKIP has been mostly annoyed with European Union’s interference to United Kingdom’s politics, economy, legal structure; and accordingly effects of its bureaucracy on daily lives of British people. In its 2010 manifesto, UKIP has complained about it by stating that “EU controls and interferes with our day-to-day lives, despite never having obtained permission to do so from the British people”

(UKIP, 2010). The party frequently implied that the membership constraints the potential of the United Kingdom in every sense. The party claims “many of global advantages are threatened by the conflicting demands of being a member of the EU, where the UK now has only %9 of deciding votes” (UKIP, 2010). Moreover on EU interference in UK sovereignty, UKIP has tried to make public aware about the claim that British legal system is predominantly regulated by the EU. The party argues that “majority of our national law is imported by Brussels (for example %72 of business regulation); more than 120.000 EU directives and regulations in force in the UK” (UKIP, 2010). In the issue of interference in British legal system, UKIP has claimed that those regulations coming from Brussels has impact on shaping local issues from job losses in manufacturing to the building of wind farms (Lynch et al., 2012: 755). Other than these, UKIP has directly question the well-functioning of the EU especially after the breakout of the Euro-crisis; and implied that the Union is not compatible anymore to intervene to any nation’s own issues by producing laws or forming economic packages. About this, Nigel Farage has said once that “I think the British public are beginning to see that EU is not working” (Farage, 2012). All of these manifestations of UKIP with regards to EU’s ‘interventionist’ nature has contribute to revival of traditional Euroscepticism of British people onwards 2010.

As a next step, UKIP has focused to produce policies and political promises in order to catch attention of voters whose dissatisfaction and discontent with European Union is accelerating. In this respect, the party has pledged to leave the EU; and portrayed the positive consequences of leaving the Union for the British public in the party manifestos between 2010 and 2015 repeatedly. According to this, the party’s uttermost emphasis has been on the notion of ‘freedom’. In this respect, UKIP has advertised that by leaving the EU, the United Kingdom can finally manage to gain three fundamental freedoms: Freedom of action, freedom of resource, freedom of people (UKIP, 2010). Among these three, UKIP firstly declares Britain will gain freedom of action by leaving the EU; and states that UK will “no longer be country have to grovel to EU permission to spend our money to save our Post offices, or to negotiate our trade deals and determine our destiny”

(UKIP, 2010). Other than this, UKIP promotes the idea that UK will be in beneficially better economic conditions if the leaving happens. According to the party, “the costs of the EU to the UK is estimated at up to 10 billion pound a year”, and the country “will save extra 6,4 billion pound a year in net cash” (UKIP, 2010). Hence, Farage and his party thinks that UK “simply cannot afford to remain in the EU” (UKIP, 2010). Lastly, UKIP has promised for the freedom of British people from the EU by stating that “British people will be free from the EU straight-jacket” by being released from excessive EU laws (UKIP, 2010).

Shortly, UKIP has successfully united its hard-Euroscepticism with its populist stance by emphasizing on negative effects of the EU membership on national sovereignty of United Kingdom. During all campaigns between 2010 and 2015, the party has pointed the EU as the source of limitations of British sovereignty. Therefore, UKIP has offered ‘freedom’ instead of EU membership and promised to gain power back in the name of Britions as Farage declaired: “We get our money back. We get our borders back. We get our parliament back. We get our own seat in on the bodies that actually run the world” (Farage, 2013).

On the other hand, as a populist hard-Eurosceptic party, UKIP has wisely fused relatively low salient Euroscepticism¹⁵ with high salient issue of immigration in the beginning of the 2010s (Tournier-Sol, 2014; Dennison & Goodwin, 2015). Due to this combination, the party has accomplished to raised the saliency of British Euroscepticism between 2010 and 2015; and also to kept the immigration issue warm In British politics by describing that “the biggest single issue facing this country” (Farage, 2013). According to the UKIP perspective, the main cause of immigration into the UK is the European Union. The party claims that “as a member of EU, Britain has lost control of her borders” (UKIP, 2010). Thus, “Farage has centered his party’s manifesto and many policy announcement on immigration, which he argued could not be controlled so long as Britain remained in the EU” (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015).

¹⁵ In 2010, European related issues had relatively lower importance in British public. This started to change with the effect of UKIP since then and the reappearance of the traditional Euroscepticism started to awake again.

As a right-wing populist political party, because of its nativists and anti-immigrant nature, UKIP can be accepted as the most hostile party in the UK towards immigration (Dennison & Goodwing, 2015: 177). In this respect, UKIP candidates has favored tougher immigration controls and indicated their those expectations repeatedly as an opposition (Lynch & Whitaker; 2013: 294). The party has been really worried about the influx; and tried to draw attention to Farage's estimation in order to show to the extent that it is going to get worse. According to Farage, "Britain would attract far more than 13.000 migrants predicted by the Home Office and could even attract many times more than 50.000 prediction of Migration Watch".

In the end, UKIP has associated 'the danger of the rising immigration' to various fields such as social services, security, British culture and economy. Nigel Farage also has spoken often about the perceived economic and cultural threats of immigrants; and referred them as 'criminal gangs'. Firstly, UKIP has consistently mentioned that those immigrants coming to the UK cause a giant burden on British social services; and hinder British natives from benefiting the social services. In 2014 EU Manifesto, the party has indicated that "a growing population is putting a massive strain on the National Health Service (NHS) and creating serious pressure on schools"; and as a solution for this, UKIP has called for "stopping the NHS becoming 'the International Health Service'" (UKIP, 2014). Secondly, UKIP has approached those immigrants as explicit source of public insecurity. In 2013, Farage has alleged that "%92 of ATM crime is committed by Romanians" (Farage, 2013) and added that "I don't want to live next door to Romanians". Thirdly, UKIP has attempted to persuade British public that growing immigrants are posing threats to British national identity and culture. On this, UKIP leader Nigel Farage has complained about through his humor by saying that "English language is not very common in British land anymore"; and said that "I feel anxious when I do not hear the English language in public transportation". Lastly, UKIP has matched the rising immigration issue with the field of economy. According to the party, migrant workers from Bulgaria and Romania offer cheaper labor force and thus occupy available vacancies; accordingly remain British youth unemployed. In the 2014

Euromanifesto of the party, it is stated that “mass immigration has coincided with soaring youth unemployment and stagnant wages that have not kept pace with the cost of living (UKIP, 2014).

As responses to those problematic areas the influx of migration generates, UKIP has offered several tough and anti-immigrant policies. First and foremost, the party has called for an immediate five-year freeze on immigration for permanent settlement (UKIP, 2010). In terms of admission procedure, UKIP has pointed the point-based systems like Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Furthermore, UKIP has opposed to the right of immigrants to benefit from social services. For instance, in April 2015, Nigel Farage has declared during an interview that “HIV patients from outside of the UK should be excluded from accessing NHS treatment. What we need to do is to put the NHS there for British people and families, who in many cases have paid into the system for years” (BBC News, 2015). Additionally, UKIP has promised that there would not be an amnesty for illegal immigrants during UKIP’s era since such amnesties merely encourage further illegal immigrants” (UKIP, 2014).

As following step of its strategy, UKIP has successfully blamed the government and particularly the Conservative Party for being incompatible to handle with the issue of rising immigration as it should be. Even, UKIP has criticized Conservative Party for ignoring the importance of the issue for British public; and reminded voters the failure of Conservative Party to reduce numbers of migration frequently. In 2011, Farage has declared on that “Conservative Party could not down immigration net numbers. You’ve been let down” (Farage, 2011). Herewith, UKIP has offered itself as an genuine and effective alternative as a solution of immigration issue by highlighting that UKIP is the only political party in the United Kingdom which shares and understands all concerns of British public about rising immigration. In this respect, Nigel Farage has said that “The establishment has been closing down the immigration debate for 20 years. UKIP has opened it up [...] UKIP talks about it honestly and directly” (Farage, 2013).

Consequently, UKIP has managed to focus immigration issue very effectively and mobilized British people's concerns over it largely. Meantime, Nigel Farage and his team has intentionally trivialized the positions of Conservative Party and the government on the immigration issue; thusly created a very suitable place to be arbiter of the issue instead of Conservative Party. Such that even Labour Party leader Milliband has accused Conservative Party for leaving the issue to the UKIP. As a result, as Dennison and Goodwin argue, "throughout the 2010-2015 Parliament, the Conservative lost their historic ownership of immigration, which enabled UKIP to establish a stronger hold over this issue than previously and emerge as a far stronger vehicle for anti-immigrant sentiments". They also very rightfully add that "this provided an opening for UKIP to establish something that the party have never had before: ownership of a major issue within British politics" (2015: 179).

Briefly, by linking the debates on EU with rising immigration, UKIP has been able to make it difficult for Conservative Party to both lower their salience and claim policy success (Lynch, 2015: 196). In parallel with this, for the first time, these unsolved public anxieties about rising immigration has paved the way for UKIP as a right-wing populist party to own the issue and to appeal dissatisfied voters about it. Therefore, UKIP has very successfully altered the generality that Conservative Party is the best or most competent party on immigration; instead brightened itself very effectively as a better alternative. To conclude, UKIP has targeted to reach out anxious electorate about the rising immigration by constituting a broad narrative referring threats towards national identity and abandonment of the public in particularly between 2010 and 2015. By this means, Farage and his party has managed to transform themselves an effective and appealing political party whose main driven for more votes is now using rising immigration issue to reach unhappy electorate with the issue.

5.2.5. UKIP Agenda for Dissatisfied Voters of Mainstream Parties

As it is discussed under the "Enabling Conditions" section of this chapter, when we check the very beginning of the 2010s, it is very likely to observe

considerable distance between two major parties of British politics and their core electorates. As it is mentioned earlier, Conservative Party has damaged its relationship with traditional Tory voters due to David Cameron's modernization process mainly. When it comes to Labour Party, disaffection has been started with New Labour movement of Tony Blair and consolidated with immigration policies of the party during that era. Clearly, these frictions between the grassroots and their parties have created tremendous opportunities for UKIP to have remarkable political gain by reaching those electorates. In this line, UKIP and its leader Nigel Farage have taken effective steps by forming the party discourse to touch these disaffected relations. Consequently, as Webb and Bale stress out, "UKIP seeks to get votes from those whose party is softening its stance" or "those feel abandoned by their own parties" (2014: 962-967).

In this regard, UKIP has endeavored to reach resentful Conservative voters by exploiting dissatisfaction towards the modernization process. To do that, the party has tried to take attention to the idea that David Cameron is more left and more liberal than the Conservative Party when considering his moves about same-sex marriage for instance, and UKIP can be a more suitable political party and closer political stance for 'traditional Tories' who do not feel valued or respected by their own leader (Webb & Bale, 2014: 967). Nigel Farage has also used very sharp language to turn unhappy Conservative voters' heads towards the gap between their political stance and the Tory leader's. He once declared that "David Cameron has clearly decided to abandon Conservatism" (Farage, 2006). He also has blinked Thatcher era of the party very often in order to show new direction of the Conservative Party after the modernization process and to familiarize his party's ideological standing with hers. He has stated that "there would be no need for UKIP if Margaret Thatcher had stayed in Number 10"; and added "I cannot believe that a young Thatcher leaving Oxford today would join the Conservative Party led by Cameron. I think she'd come and get involved in UKIP and no doubt that topple me within 12 months or so". In the end, by commenting on the Conservative Party's modernization process and softened policies on some important issues such as immigration and the EU as a result of this process, UKIP "has targeted the political

space vacated by Conservative move to the centre, purposing to be an authentic Conservative voice on Europe & immigration, adopting policies shunned by the Tories (e.g. building grammar schools) and appeal to disaffected Conservatives to ‘lend us your vote’” (13/744).

UKIP and Nigel Farage have attempted to attract discontented Labour electorate particularly by drawing attention to New Labour’s immigration policies which are accepted as genuine reason behind the labor market competition between British working class and immigrants in the island. In this perceptive, Nigel Farage strategically and exaggeratedly criticized Labour Party for evaluating their own working-class as lazy and pointed out UKIP as their true representative force by saying that “there are huge numbers of good, ordinary, decent people in this country that want to work, that want to obey the law. They’ve been denied from doing it. And I would say that now, UKIP is the champion for those people, not the Labour” (Farage, 2011). Nigel Farage has tried to combine economic struggles with migration influx to the United Kingdom from the European Union (Ford & Goodwin, 2014: 91) and accused Labour Party for that by stating that “working class people in this country has been betrayed by Labour, by pursuing open-door immigration policy, depriving British workers of jobs” (Farage, 2011). He also adds that “how can it be right that for so many people the minimum wage has actually become the maximum wage because of the massive oversupply of labor coming into this country”. Moreover, as Tournier-Sol argues, “UKIP offers an anti-immigration policy giving priority to council housing applicant with parent born locally in a clear appeal to white working class voters. Labour can no longer dismiss UKIP as only being threat to Tories” (2014: 151).

In conclusion, UKIP has wisely constructed an effective discourse underpinned by populist sentiments in order to get disaffected Conservative and Labour Party electorate’s attraction. In this regard, UKIP has tried to benefit from Conservative Party’s new direction on issues such as immigration, Europe, same-sex marriage after modernization process; and positioned itself righter than Cameron’s Conservative Party to take discontented and resentful Tory voters to UKIP’s side (Lynch, 2015: 196; Tournier-Sol, 2014: 147). Nigel Farage and his

party has also worked hard for unhappy working-class which generally identified with Labour Party by welcoming those electorate to UKIP regardless right-left spectrum. Farage has stated that “this party is not about left and right [...] it is about right and wrong” (Farage, 2014). In this way, Farage has tried to evolve UKIP’s message to reach those alienated working-class voters because of the Labour Party’s professionalization process (Crines & Heppell, 2016: 238).

5.2.6. UKIP Agenda for Broader Political Message & Organizational Development

As it was portrayed in the Literature Review Chapter, UKIP was found in 1993 as a single-issue party. The party has maintained to pursue solely anti-EU policies in British politics for a long time. At this point, it can be pointed out that UKIP has faced with “dilemma of single-issue parties” which is deciding on further direction and extension of the party in the political context (Usherhood, 2016) and decided to broaden its political message despite the risk of losing core electorate. Also, it was obvious that pursuing single-issue policies has not brought the party any concrete success except for relative accomplishments in European Parliament elections. – argues that “until 2010, the party was largely free to critique other parties’ policies, without having to set out alternatives” (Usherwood, 2016: 9). Eventually, “Farage has long understood that UKIP has the potential to be a touchstone for voters discontents, not only on European integration, but also more widely” (Usherwood, 2016: 9). Therefore, especially with second term of Farage, UKIP had broaden its policy areas and started to “campaign against government plans to develop wind turbines, legalize same-sex marriage, a ban smoking in pubs and in favor of a significant increase in spending defense” (Flamini, 2013: 36). By constituting those policies, party has tried to position itself to the right of the Conservative Party and to appeal resentful Tories who are not happy with modernizer David Cameron.

In addition to the initiatives with regards to broadening political message, UKIP has also made valuable efforts so as to achieve organizational development and logically formalized a strategy to concentrate on local elections. It can be easily

observed that UKIP had to handle with several intra-party crises and fights since its foundation (Ford & Goodwin, 2014). It would not be wrong to claim that these internal disputes of the party has weaken its image in the eyes of British electorate and caused a immature look of UKIP. Therefore, Nigel Farage has aimed to develop organizational structure of UKIP so as to strengthen party's capabilities and also to fix perception of electorate. In 2013, Farage commented on that by saying that "there is a difference between the old UKIP and the new UKIP. UKIP has grown up. We are going to be a more disciplined party from now on" (The Daily Telegraph, 2013). Similarly, UKIP has actively focused on local elections since especially 2010. As Lynch and Whitaker state in their works, "UKIP recognized the importance of building grassroots support and campaigning on local issues" in order to be effective in first-past-the-post system. Therefore, the party has increased funding and started to have greater management on local elections (2013: 297). In this respect, UKIP has tried to follow Liberal Democrat Party's strategy which is building strong local associations to create grassroots support; and also made credible efforts on "professionalization of by-election campaigns" (Usherwood, 2016: 10).

In short, UKIP has realized that it was vital to offer wider policy range and carry out organizational development so as to be more appealing among British electorate particularly 2010 onwards. Therefore, the party firstly has broaden its political message, "while withdrawal from the EU [remains] crucial to UKIP's message, the party [now] has a full range of policies" (UKIP, 2010). Moreover, Farage has attentively focused on finishing intra-party disputes to strengthen party organization. As a last step, the party has started to concentrated on constituting its own grassroots support by racing for more seats at local elections and campaigning more effective for by-elections.

5.2.7. UKIP Agenda for Remain Distant from Extremist Politics

Kitsdrelt (1995) and Lange (2007) argue their works that political parties extremist tendencies in Britain "remembered too closely aligned to the fascist tradition, with their leadership, organization and politics too heavily influenced by

Nazism” (Goodwin, 2007) and failed to develop winning-formulas that would appeal to centre-right voters too” (Gruber & Bale, 2014: 240.) Actually, there has been a long-term discussion in British politics regarding whether UKIP’s political standing is extremist or racist. Such that Prime Minister David Cameron has once called Ukipers “full of fruitcakes, loonies and closet racists” (Abedi & Lundberg, 2008: 76). Similarly, UKIP has encounter an imputation saying “UKIP is BNP in blazers” (Ford & Goodwin, 2014). In this respect, UKIP has needed to make clear its political position and assertively separated itself from extremism. It is written in their 2010 manifesto that “UKIP rejects the blood and soil ethic nationalism of extremist parties” (UKIP, 2010). Farage also has made their distinction from extremist parties clear by stating that “We oppose racism. We oppose extremism. We oppose sectarianism of the left and right” (Farage, 2013).

In addition to those statements, UKIP has taken obvious steps so as to distinguish their political understanding from extremism, particularly from BNP. For instance, the party has banned BNP and English Defense League members from joining to UKIP (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 294; Tournier-Sol, 2014: 146). At this point, it can be argued that UKIP strategically has tried to become a ‘polite alternative’ to the BNP and, as Lynch and Whitaker states, mobilized “alienated, anti-immigration voters who will not vote for the far-right” (2013: 295; Ford et al., 2012; Tournier-Sol, 2014: 151; Usherwood, 2016: 209). Accordingly, UKIP has developed “neo-liberal and libertarian positions which makes itself distant from BNP and remained more radical than Conservative Party” (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 308). At the same time, UKIP has accomplished to access to “the supporters of the main parties who identify with the policies of the BNP but who don’t wish to do so directly” (John & Magetts, 2009: 508; Usherwood, 2016: 228) through its ‘bridge’ position.

Under the leadership of Nigel Farage, UKIP has made further moves to keep distance with extremism beyond limiting relations with BNP. For example, after Farage’s return to the party leadership, burqa ban proposal and overall xenophobic attitudes of the party during Lord Pearson era were removed from 2011 policy statements of UKIP (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 295). Moreover, some MPs

has been expelled from the party due to their discriminative attitudes or statements. Most famously, God Fey Bloom was discarded from the party because of his contemptible remarks for women in UKIP staff (Usherwood, 2016: 6).

Eventually, UKIP has strategically separated itself from extremism by drawing certain line between BNP through policy statements and Farage's speeches; and stressed repeatedly party's radical populist nature so as to correct possible wrong assumptions about the party. In this way, UKIP has tried to achieve to reach the voters who are uncomfortable with rising immigration and perceived threats to Britishness; but not willing to vote for extremist right like BNP. Simultaneously by doing this, UKIP has turned out to be a right-wing populist political party which has more positive image compared to those located in far right spectrum; and benefited from the media's good impression about the party (Tournier-Sol, 2014: 151).

5.2.8. Charismatic Leadership and Populist Discourse of UKIP

In terms of a populist party's success, charismatic leadership as a mode of political strategy and populist discourse as a mode of political style play facilitator role to feed populist ideology of the party as Cas Mudde argues in this work. Indeed, I already talked about populist discourse of UKIP on some specific policies in line with the strategy of benefiting from enabling conditions. However, Nigel Farage's effect on party's rise with his leadership style and rhetoric cannot be underestimated and should be discussed specifically.

It can be clearly argued that individual political actors have the capacity to mobilize masses and to affect electorate's choices. It would be fair to say that UKIP leader Nigel Farage is one of those influential politicians in Europe. Many scholars also share this idea by describing him as 'charismatic leader' (Ford & Godwin, 2014), 'inspirational figurehead' (Crines & Heppell, 2016: 233) and even 'an irresistible force' and 'impossible to ignore' (Kelsey, 2015: 977).

In the end of this section, it can be clearly seen that UKIP has responded to the enabling conditions very effectively through its policy choices, discourse and

strategies containing fundamental populist attributes such as APE, popular sovereignty, general will of the people, nativism, identity and anti-immigrant sentiments. In addition to these, UKIP has logically put distance between its own populist position and BNP's extremist approach so as to provide cleaner appearance in the eyes of Britons. Moreover, the party has realized the significance of the grassroots support; and concentrated very successfully on local elections and by-elections campaigns between 2010 and 2015. Plus, thanks to Nigel Farage's charismatic leadership and straight-forward populist rhetoric, the party has achieved to appeal the voters from different political backgrounds.

5.3. The Overall Impact of the Rise of UKIP on British Politics

In this section of the chapter, overall impact of the rise of UKIP on British politics will be analyzed as a result of interaction between enabling conditions and UKIP's responses to them discussed previous section. According to this, three main domain will be focused on respectively: growing electoral strength of UKIP, the party's enhanced public agenda-setting ability and UKIP's changing capacity to shape policies of mainstream parties and even the country.

Due to the interaction of enabling conditions allowing UKIP to rise and the party's reactions to them has ended up with serious growing electoral strength for UKIP between 2010 and 2015. Such that UKIP has boosted their results in each and every elections compared to the previous ones from 2010 to 2015. For instance, UKIP has managed to gather only %3.1 of the total share by getting 919,546 votes in 2010 general election.¹⁶ Although it is not a very persuasive determinant to analyze 'success of a niche party' in the scope of the the-first-past-the-post system of the United Kingdom, it can be mentioned that UKIP has not achieved to take a seat in 2010 elections. In the following five years, the party has succeeded in displaying a totally different image during the 2015 elections, as the previously mentioned enabling conditions matured and the UKIP produced effective populist policies for them. Eventually, the party has gotten incredibly 3,881,099 votes and

¹⁶ For further information please see: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/election2010/results/>

gained %12,6 of the total share.¹⁷ Those results has positioned the party at third position and enabled them to send one MP to Westminster. This dramatic rise, almost four times of previous result, has obviously proved that the combination of existing enabling conditions in British politics and UKIP's populist responses to them is working very well in between 2010 and 2015.

Similar uptrend also has been valid for European Parliament elections as well. As already implied, UKIP has been showing relatively better performances in EP elections, however in 2014, the party has achieved to be the first party by gaining %27,49 of total share.¹⁸ Due to 4,376,635, UKIP has also managed to sent 24 MEPs to Strasbourg and increased its number of representatives through adding 11 MEPs. This important success of UKIP can be seen as a result of the party's very effective 'fusion strategy' concerning with both traditional Euroscepticism and anxiety over rising immigration of British public simultaneously.

UKIP has also experienced a very sharp momentum in local elections 2010 onwards. Whilst the party has only managed to gain one first position and one second position in 2010 by getting %7,9 of total vote, those numbers has increased to 147 first positions and 119 second positions in 2013. In that elections, the party has accomplished to take %24,3 which is equal to 1,141,487 votes. These incredible rise clearly proves that UKIP's new and accelerated populist focus on local elections, supported by Nigel Farage's 'common sense tour' and UKIP's broadcasts emphasizing on UKIP's adequate capacity to respond real needs and demands of 'ordinary hard-working people', has worked very well (Ford & Goodwin, 2014: 253).

UKIP has showed good performance on by-elections between 2010 and 2013 as well. The party which never had even a third-seat before 2010, has gained five third positions, and two second positions since then. Additionally, UKIP has

¹⁷ For further information please see: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/ng-interactive/2015/may/07/live-uk-election-results-in-full>

¹⁸ For further information please see: <https://www.bbc.com/news/events/vote2014/eu-uk-results>

enhanced its constituency vote from 11 percent to 28 by breaking its own record (Ford & Goodwin, 2014: 248).

In the light of those results, it can be clearly argued that the populist political stance that UKIP has strengthened since 2010 has been able to receive public support for all of the different electoral types. In this way, it can be claimed that populism as an alternative and niche ideology has entered to mainstream politics frankly. As a result of UKIP's rise, populism has turned out to be a considerable variable in British politics; it was proved that political discourse and strategies based on populist ideology now can find target group to get more vote from British electorate.

In addition to populism's verified presence in British politics through growing electoral strength of UKIP, this rise resulted from the combination of enabling conditions and populist responses of the party to those conditions has altered the dominance of mainstream parties on determining, changing and setting public agenda. Particularly between 2010 and 2015, UKIP has played very crucial role to bring political subjects which British public have concern with such as immigration to political context. Moreover, the party even could manage to manipulate those issues in order to appeal more voters, albeit the mainstream parties efforts to downplay the saliency of issues. For instance, during 2015 general election campaign, the Conservative Party has tried to avoid the immigration issue because "the Conservative Party went into the campaign having failed to meet their pledge to curb net migration to the tens of thousands" (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015: 183). Basically, Conservative side has been afraid of UKIP's appealing and domination over the immigration issue, thusly attempted to reduce saliency of the issue by not mentioning about throughout the campaign. Nevertheless, UKIP has achieved to keep the issue of rising immigration alive in the considerations of voters; and gained serious amount of votes due to this ability. Similarly, between 2010 and 2015, UKIP has contributed to accelerate reappearance of Euroscepticism in British society; and played a very vital role in the process of Brexit. In the end, as an impact on British politics, it can be argued that an alternative political standing to mainstream ones like populism has enhanced its

ability to set, change and manipulate public-agenda in British politics through UKIP.

Another and probably the most important impact of the rise of populism on British politics in the context of UKIP is that populism's pressure on mainstream political parties, specifically on ruling ones, has made them to change their primary policies on the issues UKIP has insistently emphasized on. Particularly Conservative Party, as the largest party in the parliament and the closer one to UKIP in terms of its position at political spectrum, has explicitly altered its direction on the European issues specifically.

Actually, the rise of UKIP has put pressure on the Conservative Party in two ways: The first one was that David Cameron and his team has started to realize possible Conservative defections to UKIP in general elections. On the other hand, UKIP's rise has awakened resentful backbenchers because of the position of the party in the EU issue and Cameron's leadership. Particularly due to the letter, "Conservative Party has become more Eurosceptic overtime and includes a small, but growing group of MPs, who publically endorse withdrawal form the EU and a larger number advocating renegotiation of British membership" (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 287). As Lynch and Whitaker also add that "a desire to avoid division within his party and confrontation in the EU has underpinned Cameron's Euroscepticism" (2013: 300).

Thereby, David Cameron has responded to the Eurosceptic pressure within the party and threat of defections, which are the impacts of the rise of UKIP, by "shifting in a more Eurosceptic direction and intensifying its own populist rhetoric (Giffrod, 2014: 524). In this respect, Cameron has signed several anti-EU documents one by one particularly after 2011. For instance, in July 2011, the coalition government led by David Cameron has adopted EU Act (EU Bill) which contains 'repatriation of certain of certain powers' and 'referendum lock' (Wellings & Vines, 2016; Bale, 2018; Lynch, 2015). According to these arrangements, David Cameron has promised to negotiate to get some vital powers back from Brussels to protect national sovereignty of British people; and also given

the word that governments would need to organized a referendum with regards to any further transfer of power to the Union. As a consequent of the EU Act, as Wellings and Vines point out, populist Euroscepticism has started to be felt in British politics prominently. Other than these, as Tournier-Sol points out, Cameron has also intensified his right-wing moves on the issues such as welfare state; made immigration measurements tougher; and “this is quite significant as it shows the growing influence of UKIP” on the policy shaping of Conservative Party, accordingly the government (2014: 148). Consequently, it can be argued that all of these changes in policy choices and concessions from his modernization movement have been caused by UKIP’s rise since 2010.

Lastly, it can be pointed out that the rise of UKIP and its pressure on Conservative Party is the one of the most crucial driven behind the David Cameron’s promise on in-out referendum. Indeed, Cameron has indicated in 2009 that he opposes such a referendum since the EU membership is national interest (Lynch & Whitaker, 2013: 305). However, with the rise of UKIP in nearly every types of election and also opinion polls, the pressure on David Cameron and the Conservative Party has been grown seriously. As a response to this pressure, Prime Minister Cameron has made the famous Bloomberg Speech in 2013, and pledged for an in and out referendum with the European Union. Due to the referendum, Cameron and his party has hoped to reduce Farage’s and his party’s attraction on the issue of EU and immigration by “shooting the UKIP fox” via their own gun (Flamini, 2013; Tournier-Sol, 2014). In the end, UKIP’s rise has affected policy choices of the Conservative Party; and indirectly reshaped the government decisions on the European issues particularly.

Consequently, overall impact of the rise of populism in the context of UKIP between 2010 and 2015 has been observed in three major channels. Firstly, populism as an ideology has entered into mainstream politics of Britain by means of growing electoral strength. It has been proved that populist discourse and strategies based on populist ideology can find broad public support in the United Kingdom. Secondly, it was observed that an alternative political standing to mainstream ones like populism can be setter and changer in the process of public

agenda determination in British politics. And thirdly, it was seen that policy choices of the mainstream parties and the decisions of the government can be reshaped as reaction to the rising populism in Britain.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Populism is not a new phenomenon in politics. Nevertheless, it would not be extraordinary to say that this phenomenon has virtually infiltrated to nearly all edges of world politics for last two decades particularly. Without any doubt, it is more visible now more than ever. In contemporary politics, it is possible to see a US President with populist attitudes like intention of building a wall on US-Mexico border, or a ruling Polish right-wing populist political party which blinking to nativism through making huge emphasis on Catholicism and homogeneity of Polish society, or a long-term ruling religious political party from Turkey which favors referendums by putting forward ‘general will of the people’, or a right-wing populist party in France with rigid anti-immigrant and anti-Islam attitudes, or a left-wing populist party promoting a new socialist wave by taking side with ‘the people’ against imperialism of ‘the elite’ in Venezuela. Similarly, United Kingdom has also experienced with the rise of a right-wing populist political party, United Kingdom Independence Party, with its opposing posture to political elites of both British politics and the European politics, its strong opposition to the European Union and migration influx professedly caused by the freedom of movement principle, its significant emphasis on nativism, British values and traditions and its constant promise to strengthen direct democracy through referendums.

Consequently, proliferation of populism in world politics has directed scholarship’s attention towards populism intensely. Heterogeneous and contested nature of the concept have enhanced this attention even more and now it is possible

to reach out many credible studies in concern with the questions of what populism really is, what made it this common in politics of different countries, what are the convergences of populist parties, or what is divergence between them. Although all of these studies contribute tremendously to the general understanding of the rise of populism in world politics, it is actually more likely to provide satisfactory, multi-dimensional, more closer look to the rise of this phenomenon by studying it in a contextual based manner. In other words, the rise of populism can be understood better with intense focus on specific populist political parties or actors in a specific country; and also political system, culture and history of that country to be concentrated on. In this respect, United Kingdom Independence Party was chosen as a study field in order to look closer to the rise of populism in the United Kingdom between 2010 and 2015.

In the light of this, one main research question and one interrelated sub-question were determined for the thesis. The main research question focuses on what the fundamental reasons of the rise of populism in British politics are in the context UKIP between 2010 and 2015. In addition, the sub-question is concerned with to what is the overall impact of this rise of populism through UKIP on British politics. In this respect, in order to provide an comprehensive answer to the main research question, initially enabling conditions in British politics and society which help UKIP to get more attraction from the electorate were specified carefully and discussed in detail. Additionally, UKIP's populist political agendas as responses to those enabling conditions were portrayed one-by-one. On the other side, in order to understand overall impact of the rise of populism in British politics, evolution of UKIP's election results, changes of policy choices and policy-making styles of British mainstream parties caused by UKIP's rise; and several distinctive political events which can be interpreted as a result of populist rise were demonstrated respectively.

According to the findings, when it comes to the period of 2010 and 2015, there have been very rare, critical and important enabling conditions in British political context which genuinely created an unprecedented opportunities for a right-wing populist party to rise. So much so that dissatisfaction of British

people, which is already rising against the European Union due to the Eurozone crisis, has become very serious with the increase in immigration to the UK. Frankly, traditional Euroscepticism of Britain has been almost revived and created a political space for hard-Eurosceptic UKIP that the party could not even imagine. Another significant enabling condition, as a result of a coincidence in terms of time manner, was that the handicaps created by the UK's major two parties' transformation processes have begun to become more explicit and even more problematic, especially since 2010. Blair's New Labour and Cameron's Modernization movements have caused alienation and disaffection among those traditionally voted for these parties. When all these added to a large-scale political incident like 'Expenses Scandal', the confidence in the mainstream parties has been severely damaged in British politics. In such an political environment, UKIP has found really remarkable opportunity to appeal those voters who traditionally vote for Conservative or Labour Party but resentful to their parties. As another rare and significant enabling condition, the British political structure has encountered a surprising change. For the first time in 70 years, British politics has experienced a coalition government. This new experience has created the perception that the government is now weaker for generations that have never experienced it before. Accordingly, the coalition experience has contributed negatively to alienation of electorate from mainstream politics, political class; and made them to seek for an alternative like right-wing populism. In addition, Liberal Democrats' entrance to the coalition government has cost protest votes to the party which they obtain regularly in every elections. Naturally, the owners of those protest votes have started to turn their heads toward UKIP in order to show their protest against political class and mainstream politics. Briefly, alterations in British politics, mainstream parties, their relationships with their core electorate; also societal changes, re-evaluation of public sensibilities on the issues like national identity, traditions, perceived threats triggered by external factors like rising immigration have generated the very critical enabling conditions for the rise of populism through UKIP in the specific time period of 2010 and 2015.

However, as findings premeditate, those enabling conditions are not merely enough to enable a right-wing populist party to rise, or at least to maintain that rise in question. Therefore, the exact reason of UKIP's rise in British politics in between 2010 and 2015 should be considered as a consequence of the combination of crucial enabling conditions' presence and the party's very effective and vivid populist political reactions and responses to those conditions. In this period, UKIP has strengthened its populist political standing prominently by augmenting emphases on anti-political sentiments, indispensability of popular sovereignty and general will of the people, nativism and importance of Britishness specifically. At the same time, the party has achieved to construct a very influential and apprehensible populist discourse to appeal more electorate; also formalized really suitable, to the point and effective political strategies through populist policies in the line with party's populist standing. In this regard, UKIP has intensified its APE sentiments against to both British political class and bureaucrats in Brussels. As response to mainly rising discontent of Conservative and Labour electorate, UKIP has strategically used the expression of 'corrupted elite' of mainstream parties; and underlined their point that political elites in the Britain put their interests over the interests of 'the people'. Moreover, as response to the reappearance of Euroscepticism among British public, UKIP has intentionally taken attention to the legitimacy of the European Union by criticizing unelected technocrats and bodies of the EU institutions. Also, the party has promised to proliferate direct democracy tools such as referendums in the issues concerning the majority of the people. In this way, UKIP has showed to what extent the party prioritizes 'general will of the people' and 'popular sovereignty'; and criticized mainstream parties and the European Union with not giving importance to those principles. Other than these, as response to rising immigration to the island and rising unhappiness with the EU, UKIP has accomplishedly brightened nativist rhetoric by reminding the importance of British values and traditions, the stateliness of the Commonwealth legacy. Moreover, the party has calculatedly created a perception that the EU as an entity and influx of migration as a result of freedom of movement principle are threatening the Britishness and traditional values of the public; and that the EU

membership is eroding Britain's power in the international arena as a global power. Lastly and very importantly, as response to rising immigration, UKIP has formed a 'fusion strategy' against the combination of rising Euroscepticism of British public with rising immigration. The party has approached to these two issues as connected to each other; and accomplished to raise the displeasure of British public with the image of the European Union.

In addition to this populist maturation of party, particularly since 2010, UKIP has improved its organizational structure and broaden its political message in a large extent. Thanks to this new enhanced organizational structure, UKIP has finally accomplished to eliminate intra-party fights and the frequency of party leadership replacement. Similarly, by broadening the political message, UKIP has managed to reach more voters from different political backgrounds; and to alter the 'single-issue party' perception of Britons about the party. As another crucial move to be successful, especially since 2013, UKIP has realized to significance of grassroots support in British political system and worked very effectively for focusing on local elections and by-elections. Therewithal, the party has gained really worthwhile successes in those elections; and proved that UKIP is now accessing more people and building its own grassroots support. Lastly, Nigel Farage, as a leader of the party between 2010 and 2015, has played an enormous role to spread party's appeal to larger masses and to get more and worthwhile attention from media. Thanks to Farage's straight-forward, humorous and striking rhetoric, populist discourse of UKIP has been more influential on voters who are undecided as political standing, unhappy with the EU membership and migration issue, dissatisfied with the coalition government or alienated from the mainstream parties. In this sense, Nigel Farage has been one of the most successful and effective responses of UKIP, against enabling conditions existing in the British politics through his leadership and rhetorical style.

In the light of all these, the answer to the main research question of the thesis is as follows: the most comprehensive and satisfactory explanation to understand the fundamental reasons of the rise of populism in Britain in the context of UKIP between 2010 and 2015 is originated from the unprecedented harmony

and connection between enabling conditions and UKIP's responses to those conditions in this specific timeframe, through featured populist political agendas. As facilitators to those agendas, UKIP has successfully managed to benefit from very efficient populist discourse and pretty suitable political strategies as well. In the end, the combination containing the presence of rare, critical and important enabling conditions; and effective political reactions of UKIP to those conditions has brought the rise of populism into British politics in the context of UKIP between 2010 and 2015.

With regards to the answer of the sub-question, as the findings guide, the first arresting impact of the rise of populism in British politics is that populism as an ideology has entered into mainstream politics in Britain explicitly; and proved that an alternative political standing like populism can now be successful in British political system by gaining remarkable electoral support. Such that UKIP has experienced visible electoral success 2010 onwards. Between 2010 and 2015, UKIP's vote share has increased in every election type (general elections, EP elections, local elections, by-elections) the party raced for compared to previous elections results. In general elections for instance, UKIP has only managed to get %3,1 of total votes in 2010 general elections. However, when it comes to 2015, with the help of critical enabling conditions discussed in Chapter 5 and UKIP's successful populist political agendas as responses to those conditions, the party has achieved to gain %12,6 of the total votes; and become third party in Britain. Certainly, it was genuinely an important accomplishment for a right-wing populist party in a political system as such in Britain. Similarly, rising momentum of UKIP has continued in European Parliament elections as well. EP election is the political arena in which UKIP has always been the most successful since early years of the party. However, UKIP has made an unimaginable success real and become the first party in 2014 EP elections by taking political winds of the reappearance of Euroscepticism and rising immigration behind. Electoral uptrend of UKIP has also diffused to local elections and by-elections in 2013. Previously, UKIP has not gained respectable results in those elections, because the party has not needed to concentrate on local elections. However, with the Nigel Farage's second term,

UKIP management has realized the vitality of grassroots support to be successful in British political system; and the party has started to formalize an effective strategy addressing to both local elections and by-elections. Hereby, UKIP has won 140 country councilors in 2013 local elections; and increased its by-election vote share in local constituencies from %12.2 to %27.8. Consequently, this growing electoral strength of UKIP has verified that populism as an ideology is now a variable in British politics; political discourse and strategies based on populist ideology now can find target group to get more vote from British electorate, also get more attraction from the mass media.

As the findings suggest, another impact of the rise of populism in Britain is that it can be now observed that the power of alternative political standings like populism has enhanced in determining, setting and changing public agenda. Agenda-setting competence is not mainly exclusive to mainstream parties anymore; agenda-setting processes have been shaped and manipulated by non-mainstream parties as well in an effective way in British politics. Such that UKIP accomplishedly has contributed to rising Euroscepticism among British public; and ensured that this dissatisfaction regarding United Kingdom's relationship with the EU remains as a serious political subject in British politics. Similarly, UKIP has kept issue of migration alive both in the eyes of British public and mainstream politics. Accordingly, mainstream parties now had to consider those issues brought into forefront by UKIP; and to constitute relevant policies to respond them. Consequently, due the rise of populism in Britain, the contribution of alternative parties to mainstream ones to the identifying process of fundamental dynamics of British politics has been seriously raised between 2010 and 2015.

In connection with the changes in agenda-setting dynamics, another important impact of the rise of populism in Britain that particularly between 2010 and 2015, populism's pressure on mainstream political parties, specifically on ruling ones, has made them to change their primary policies on the issues UKIP has insistently emphasized on. In this way, particularly Conservative Party, as the first party in the parliament and the closer one to UKIP in terms of its position at political spectrum, has explicitly altered its direction on the European issue

specifically. Such that Conservative Party's more positive stance towards the EU, resulting from David Cameron's modernization process, has started to change through consecutive vetoes of the party to Union's bailout packages for some member states and sniffed promises on rearranging the relation of United Kingdom with the Union. In this respect, UK Government under the leadership of David Cameron has vetoed Fiscal Compact; and opened a way for a popular referendum in the matters concerning further transfer of power to the EU. Furthermore, during his famous Bloomberg Speech in 2013, Cameron has even pledged a membership referendum in the case of Conservative Party's majoritarian presence in the parliament as a result of 2015 general elections. As the findings bring light that particularly Conservative Party and British politics has gotten more populist and Eurosceptic as reaction to UKIP's rise; and these more populist and Eurosceptic tendencies within British mainstream politics have naturally reflected to policies adopted. Consequently, the relationship between the United Kingdom and the European Union has started to change especially since 2010; and even the country has encounter very unique experience in the history of the Union which is Brexit by means of the rise of populism in Britain.

In the light of these, the answer to the sub-question of the thesis is as follows: overall impact of the rise of populism in the context of UKIP between 2010 and 2015 has been observed in three major channels. Firstly, populism as an ideology has entered into mainstream politics of Britain by means of growing electoral strength. It has been proved that populist discourse and strategies based on populist ideology can find broad public support in the United Kingdom. Secondly, in the process of public agenda-setting, alternative political standings to mainstream ones could be very effective in British politics; albeit downplaying efforts of mainstream parties, the issues UKIP has insistently emphasized on like immigration or EU membership could remain as significant and modifying political subjects in British political context. Thirdly, in connection with agenda-setting alteration, ruling mainstream parties' and accordingly the government's policy choices have been affected and reshaped because of the pressure of the rise

of populism. Such that these changes on policy choices even has led the country to Brexit which was a very unique experience for European politics.

In this regard, it can be argued that UKIP, as a right-wing populist party in British politics, has positioned itself very correctly and effectively by indeed being in the right place at the right time. This does not mean that the success of the UKIP through its populist stance was a coincidence. Contrarily, the UKIP has successfully read the expectations and wishes of the British people very well particularly since 2010; and assessed rising tendency of Britons towards populism correctly and in a timely manner. However, it should be mentioned that especially between 2010 and 2015, very unique and conducive enabling conditions emerged for a populist party to rise such as serious resentment of major parties' supporters or the existence of a Coalition government after 70 years. Additionally, an effective and charming political figure like Nigel Farage has returned to UKIP as a leader and created a new path for the party. At this point, as an addition to being in the right place at the right time, UKIP has achieved to formulate an effective strategy to meet this changing tendencies in British politics and become an influential political actor in British political context as a right-wing populist party especially in between 2010 and 2015.

Indeed, the party's performance 2015 afterwards has proved that UKIP's breakthrough in 2010-2015 depends on the harmony and the connection between presence of important enabling conditions and the effective populist reactions of UKIP to those conditions in the period in question. After 2015, it was not possible anymore to talk about many enabling conditions which were demonstrated in this thesis with details. For instance, since 2015, it can be argued that Conservative Party has responded to rising Euroscepticism within the island and unhappiness with influx of migration through referendum promise. Indeed, due to Brexit, core Conservative supporters has returned to their party and resentment has ended relatively with David Cameron's handover. Moreover, after 2015 general elections, the existence of the coalition government has been disappeared as well. All of these show that many enabling conditions this thesis covers did not exist 2015 afterwards; and accordingly UKIP could not find any important and urgent

political issue to react though its populist agenda in British politics . In addition, after 2015 elections, the most important power of the UKIP, Nigel Farage has resigned from the leadership, and accordingly the party has started to loose serious amount of blood. Eventually, the 2017 general election results have caused a serious disappointment for the UKIP and its supporters. In short, all of these prove that the breakthrough of the UKIP in between 2010 and 2015 should be evaluated by taking both enabling conditions and the party's populist reactions to those conditions into consideration at the same time; and also verified the idea that the UKIP was in the right place at the right time; and most importantly by doing 'right' thing.

To conclude, this thesis contributes to the literature by providing a focused analysis with regards to the rising populism in Britain in a specific time period through the case study of United Kingdom Independence Party. In this manner, the reasons of the rise and overall impact of the rise in question were presented in a comprehensive way. In order to have a better understanding with regards to retroactive reasons f this rise, its continuity and future effects, there can be further studies on the British populism. For instance, a different time period can be researched on so as to reveal whether this rise is intrinsic to the years between 2010 and 2015. Moreover, the overall impact of rising populism on different political parties in the United Kingdom can be investigated on more thoroughly. Additionally, there can be more comparative analyses showing similarities and differences of rising dynamics of right-wing populist parties in different countries.

REFERENCES

- Abedi, A., & Lundberg, T. C. (2009). Doomed to Failure? UKIP and the Organisational Challenges Facing Right-Wing Populist Anti-Political Establishment Parties. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 62(1), 72-87.
doi:10.1093/pa/gsn036
- Acemoglu, Daron, Georgy Egorov and Konstantin Sonin. 2011. 'A Political Theory of Populism,' NBER Working Papers 17306, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Akkerman, T. (2015). *Radical Right-Wing populist parties in Western Europe: Into the Mainstream?* London: Routledge.
- Albertazzi, D., & McDonnel, D. (2008). *Twenty-First Century Populism The Spectre of Western European Democracy*. Palgrave.
- Aslanidis, P. (2015). Is Populism an Ideology? A Refutation and a New Perspective. *Political Studies*, 1-17. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.12224
- Bale, T. (2018). Who leads and who follows? The symbiotic relationship between UKIP and the Conservatives – and populism and Euroscepticism. *Politics*, 1-15.
doi:10.1177/0263395718754718
- Barr, Robert R. 2009. 'Populists, Outsiders and Anti-Establishment Politics', *Party Politics*, Vol. 15 (1), pp. 29–48.
- Betz, H. (1993). The New Politics of Resentment: Radical Right-Wing Populist Parties in Western Europe. *Comparative Politics*, 25(4), 413-427.
doi:10.2307/422034
- Canovan, M. (2004). Populism for Political Theorists?. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 9(3), 241-52.

- Carter, E. L. (2005). *The extreme right in Western Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Clarke, H., Whiteley, P., Borges, W., Sanders, D., & Stewart, M. (2016). Modelling the dynamics of support for a right-wing populist party: The case of UKIP. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 26(2), 135-154. doi:10.1080/17457289.2016.1146286
- Clarke, J., & Newman, J. (2017). 'People in this country have had enough of experts': Brexit and the paradoxes of populism. *Critical Policy Studies*, 11(1), 101-116. doi:10.1080/19460171.2017.1282376
- Cowley, P., & Stuart, M. (2012). The Cambusters: The Conservative European Union Referendum Rebellion of October 2011. *The Political Quarterly*, 83(2), 402-406. doi:10.1111/j.1467-923x.2012.02291.
- Crines, A., & Heppell, T. (2016). Rhetorical style and issue emphasis within the conference speeches of UKIP's Nigel Farage 2010–2014. *British Politics*, 12(2), 231-249. doi:10.1057/bp.2016.2
- Cross, Tony. 2012. Has Marine Le Pen made France's Front National respectable?.
- Cutts, D., Goodwin, M., & Milazzo, C. (2017). Defeat of the Peoples Army? The 2015 British general election and the UK Independence Party (UKIP). *Electoral Studies*, 48, 70-83. doi:10.1016/j.electstud.2017.03.002
- Dalton, R. J. (2002). *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. New York/London: Chatham House/Seven Bridges.
- Dennison, J., & Goodwin, M. (2015). Immigration, Issue Ownership and the Rise of UKIP. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 68(Suppl 1), 168-187. doi:10.1093/pa/gsv034
- de la Torre, Carlos. 2000. *Populist Seduction In Latin America : The Ecuadorian Experience* Athens: Ohio University Press.

- Dukanovic, D. (2014). Populist Parties in Selected European Countries. 1-43.
- Dunphy, R. (2004). *Contesting Capitalism? Left Parties and European Integration*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- European Commission (2006) Eurobarometer: Public Opinion in the European Union. 65. Brussels.
- European Commission (2009) Eurobarometer: Public Opinion in the European Union. 71. Brussels.
- European Commission (2012) Eurobarometer: Public Opinion in the European Union. 77. Brussels.
- Evans, G., & Mellon, J. (2016). Working Class Votes and Conservative Losses: Solving the UKIP Puzzle. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 69, 464-479.
doi:10.1093/pa/gsv005
- Farage, N. (2006) Annual Conference Speech, 11 September.
<https://www.channel4.com/news/factcheck/factcheck-nigel-farages-ukip-conference-speech>
- Farage, N. (2010a) Speech in European Parliament, 24 February.
<https://www.channel4.com/news/factcheck/factcheck-nigel-farages-ukip-conference-speech>
- Farage, N. (2010b) Annual Conference Speech, 16 September.
<https://www.channel4.com/news/factcheck/factcheck-nigel-farages-ukip-conference-speech>
- Farage, N. (2011) Annual Conference Speech, 17th September.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/av/uk-politics-14850780/ukip-leader-nigel-farage-speech-to-party-conference>

- Farage, N. (2012) Annual Conference Speech, 19 September.
<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/blog/2012/sep/21/ukip-conference-farage-speech-live-blog2>
- Farage, N. (2013) Annual Conference Speech, 20 September.
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b03brqy2>
- Farage, N. (2014) Annual Conference speech, 22 September.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/av/uk-politics-34361111/ukip-leader-nigel-farage-s-full-speech-to-conference>
- Filc, Dani. 2010. *The Political Right in Israel: Different Faces of Jewish Populism*. London: Routledge.
- Flamini, R. (2013). The UK Independence Party: Euroskeptics Rattle Cameron. *World Affairs*, 176(2), 35-41.
- Freeden, M. (1998). *Ideologies and Political Theory*.
doi:10.1093/019829414x.001.0001
- Ford, R., Goodwin, M. J., & Cutts, D. (2011). Strategic Eurosceptics and polite xenophobes: Support for the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) in the 2009 European Parliament elections. *European Journal of Political Research*, 51(2), 204-234. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2011.01994.x
- Ford, R. A., & Goodwin, M. (2014). *Revolt on the right: Explaining support for the radical right in Britain*. Routledge.
- Gidron, N., & Bonikowski, B. (2013). Varieties of Populism: Literature Review and Research Agenda. *Weatherhead Working Paper Series*, 13(0004), 1-38.
doi:10.2139/ssrn.2459387
- Gifford, C. (2006). The rise of post-imperial populism: The case of right-wing Euroscepticism in Britain. *European Journal of Political Research*, 45(5), 851-869. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2006.00638.x

- Gifford, C. (2014). The People Against Europe: The Eurosceptic Challenge to the United Kingdoms Coalition Government. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(3), 512-528. doi:10.1111/jcms.12112
- Glencross, Andrew. "British Euroscepticism as British Exceptionalism: The Forty-Year 'Neverendum' on the Relationship with Europe." pp. 1–12.
- Goodwin, M., & Milazzo, C. (2015). *UKIP inside the campagne to redraw the map of british politics*. New York: Oxford Univercity Press.
- Goodwin, M. J., & Heath, O. (2016). The 2016 Referendum, Brexit and the Left Behind: An Aggregate-level Analysis of the Result. *The Political Quarterly*, 87(3), 323-332. doi:10.1111/1467-923x.12285
- Greven, T. (2016). The rise of Right-wing populism in Europe and United States A Comparative Perspective. 1-11.
- Gruber, O., & Bale, T. (2014). And it's good night Vienna. How (not) to deal with the populist radical right: The Conservatives, UKIP and some lessons from the heartland. *British Politics*, 9(3), 237-254. doi:10.1057/bp.2014.7
- Harmsen, R. (2010). Concluding Comment: On Understanding the Relationship between Populism and Euroscepticism. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 11(3), 333-341. doi:10.1080/15705854.2010.503036
- Hauwaert, S. M., & Kessel, S. V. (2017). Beyond protest and discontent: A cross-national analysis of the effect of populist attitudes and issue positions on populist party support. *European Journal of Political Research*, 57(1), 68-92. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.12216
- Hawkins, K. A. (2010) *Venezuelas Chavismo and Populism in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayton, R. (2013). Conservative Party Statecraft and the Politics of Coalition. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 67(1), 6-24. doi:10.1093/pa/gst019

Hayton, R. (2010). Towards the Mainstream? UKIP and the 2009 Elections to the European Parliament. *Politics*,30(1), 26-35. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9256.2009.01365.x

Hillebrand, E. (2014). Right Wing Populism in Europe - How do we respond? *International Policy Analysis*, 1-14.

Ignazi, P. (2003). *Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1977). *Policy problems of advanced industrial society*. London: Sage Publications.

Jansen, R. S. (2011). Populist Mobilization: A New Theoretical Approach to Populism. *Sociological Theory*,29(2), 75-96. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9558.2011.01388.x

Kazin, Michal. 1995. *The Populist Persuasion: An American History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kazin, M. (1998). *The populist persuasion: An American history*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kelsey, D. (2015). Hero Mythology and Right-Wing Populism. *Journalism Studies*,17(8), 971-988. doi:10.1080/1461670x.2015.1023571

Kitschelt, H. (1991). *The formation of party systems in Eastern Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies.

Koch, K. (1991). Back to Sarajevo or Beyond Trianon? Some thoughts on the problem of nationalism in Eastern Europe. *Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences*, 27 (1), 29-42.

Koopmans, Ruud. 1996. 'Explaining the rise of racist and extreme right violence in Western Europe: Grievances or opportunities?', *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 30, pp. 185- 216.

Laclau, E. (2005). *ON POPULIST REASON*. VERSO.

Lynch, P., Whitaker, R., & Loomes, G. (2012). The UK Independence Party: Understanding a Niche Party's Strategy, Candidates and Supporters. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 65(4), 733-757. doi:10.1093/pa/gsr042

Lynch, P., & Whitaker, R. (2013). Rivalry on the right: The Conservatives, the UK Independence Party (UKIP) and the EU issue. *British Politics*, 8(3), 285-312. doi:10.1057/bp.2012.29

Lynch, P., & Whitaker, R. (2013). Where There is Discord, Can They Bring Harmony? Managing Intra-Party Dissent on European Integration in the Conservative Party. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 15(3), 317-339. doi:10.1111/j.1467-856x.2012.00526.x

Lynch, P. (2015). Conservative modernisation and European integration: From silence to salience and schism. *British Politics*, 10(2), 185-203. doi:10.1057/bp.2015.17

Madrid, R. L. 2008. 'The rise of ethnopopulism in Latin America'. *World Politics*, Vol. 60(3), pp. 475–508.

March, L. (2011). *Radical Left Parties in Europe*. NY: Routledge.

March, L. (2015). The European radical left beyond Syriza – a new left-wing Zeitgeist? Retrieved from: <https://epern.wordpress.com/2015/02/27/the-european-radical-left-beyond-syriza-a-new-left-wing-zeitgeist/>

March, L. & Mudde, C. (2005). What's left of the radical left? The European radical left after 1989: Decline and mutation. *Comparative European Politics*, 3(1), 23-49.

- March, L. & Rommerskirchen, C. (2012). Out of left field? Explaining the variable electoral success of European radical left parties. *Party Politics*. doi:10.1177/1354068812462929
- Markou, G. (2017). The Left-wing Populist Revolt in Europe: Syriza in Power. *Research Gate*, 148-154.
- Meny, Y., & Surel, Y. (Eds.). (2002). *Dmocracies and the Populist Challenge*. New York: Palgrave. doi:10.1057/9781403920072
- Moffitt, B., & Tormey, S. (2014). Rethinking Populism: Politics, Mediatisation and Political Style. *Political Studies*, 62(2), 381-397. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.12032
- Mudde, C. (2004). The Populist Zeitgeist. *Government & Opposition*, 39 (3), 541-563.
- Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mudde, C. (2010). The Populist Radical Right: A Pathological Normalcy. *West European Politics*, 33(6), 1167-1186. doi:10.1080/01402382.2010.508901
- Mudde, Cas and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser (eds.). 2012. *Populism in Europe and the Americas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). *Populism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Norris, P. (2005). *Radical right: Voters and parties in the electoral market*. Cambridge University Press.
- Olsen, J., Koß, M. & Hough, D. (Eds.). (2010) *Left Parties in National Governments*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Otjes, Simon and Tom Louwse. 2013. *Populists in Parliament: Comparing Left-Wing and Right-Wing Populism in the Netherlands*. Political Studies: (Early View).
- Panizza, F. (2005). *Populism and the mirror of democracy*. Verso.
- Pappas, Takis S. 2012. 'Populism Emergent: A framework for analyzing its contexts, mechanics, and outcomes'. EUI Working Papers, RSCAS 2012/01.
- Pauwels, Teun. 2011. 'Measuring Populism: A Quantitative Text Analysis of Party Literature in Belgium', *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*. Vol. 21 (1), pp. 97–119.
- Richardson, J. (2018). Brexit: The EU Policy-Making State Hits the Populist Buffers. *The Political Quarterly*, 89(1), 118-126. doi:10.1111/1467-923x.12453
- Roberts, Kenneth M. 2006. 'Populism, Political Conflict, and Grass-Roots Organization in Latin America'. *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 38 (2), pp. 127-148
- Rogers, I. (2017, November 25). The inside story of how David Cameron drove Britain to Brexit. Retrieved from <https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/politics/the-inside-story-of-how-david-cameron-drove-britain-to-brexit>
- Rooduijn, Matthijs. 2014. Vox populismus: a populist radical right attitude among the public?. *Nations and Nationalism*, 20 (1): 80–92.
- Rooduijn, M., Lange, S. L., & Brug, W. V. (2014). A populist Zeitgeist? Programmatic contagion by populist parties in Western Europe. *Party Politics*, 20(4), 563-575. doi:10.1177/1354068811436065
- Sanders, D and Scotto, T and Reifler, J (2016) *The Consequences of Authoritarian Populism in Britain*. University of Essex, 1-15.
- Stanley, L. (2013). *A European Supra-National Identity: The Solution to the European Union's Crisis of Legitimacy?* London: The Bruges Group. Retrieved from: http://www.brugesgroup.com/images/media_centre/comment/AEuropeanSupra-NationalIdentity.pdf

Steenbergen, M. R., & Siczek, T. (2017). Better the devil you know? Risk-taking, globalization and populism in Great Britain. *European Union Politics*, 18(1), 119-136. doi:10.1177/1465116516681858

Taggart, P. (1995). New populist parties in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 18(1), 34-51. doi:10.1080/01402389508425056

Taggart, P. (1998). A Touchstone of Dissent: Euroscepticism in Contemporary Western European Party Systems, *European Journal of Political Research*, 33, 363-388.

Taggart, Paul. 2000. *Populism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Tournier-Sol, K. (2015). Reworking the Eurosceptic and Conservative Traditions into a Populist Narrative: UKIPs Winning Formula? *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 53(1), 140-156. doi:10.1111/jcms.12208

UKIP. 2010 Manifesto. <https://www.ukip.org/>

UKIP. 2013a. Local Manifesto. <https://www.ukip.org/>

UKIP. 2014 Euromanifesto. <https://www.ukip.org/>

UKIP. 2014a. Local Manifesto. <https://www.ukip.org/>

Usherwood, S. (2015). The UK Independence Party: The dimensions of mainstreaming, 1-25.

Van der Brug, W., & Fennema, M. (2007). Causes of Voting for the Radical Right. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 19(4), 474-487. Retrieved March 18, 2018.

van der Brug, W., Fennema, M., van Heerden, S. & de Lange S. (2014). Not that different after all: radical right parties and voters in Western Europe. In C.

Sandelind (Ed.), *European Populism and Winning the Immigration Debate* (pp. 65-97). Stockholm: ELF/Fores

Vuorinen, Linda. "Believe in Britain: Euroscepticism in the United Kingdom Independence Party's (UKIP) Policies in 2009-2015." University of Tampere, 2015, pp. 1–102.

Webb, P., & Bale, T. (2014). Why Do Tories Defect to UKIP? Conservative Party Members and the Temptations of the Populist Radical Right. *Political Studies*, 62(4), 961-970. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.12130

Webb, P., Bale, T., & Poletti, M. (2017). 'All mouth and no trousers?' How many Conservative Party members voted for UKIP in 2015 – and why did they do so? *Politics*, 37(4), 432-444. doi:10.1177/0263395717697344

Wellings, B., & Vines, E. (2016). Populism and Sovereignty: The EU Act and the In-Out Referendum, 2010–2015. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 69(2), 309-326. doi:10.1093/pa/gsv045

Weyland, Kurt. 2001. 'Clarifying a Contested Concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics', *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 34 (1), pp. 1-22.

Willsher, Kim. 2014. French far-right Front National party makes big gains in local elections. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/mar/23/france-far-right-front-national-gains-elections> (25th of March 2014).

APPENDICES

A. TÜRKÇE ÖZET / TURKISH SUMMARY

Popülizm, siyasi bir fenomen olarak, son yıllarda özellikle siyaset bilimcilerin yoğunlukla çalıştığı bir alan haline gelmiştir. Öyle ki bu fenomen, hangi formda vuku bulursa bulsun, dünyanın farklı kıtalarından birçok siyasi sistemde kendine yer bulmuş, hatta bazılarında oldukça etkili oluşmuştur. Öyle ki bugün, halk ile siyasi elit arasındaki zıt ilişkiye odaklanan ve halkın çıkarını gözeten popülizm dalgası, Latin Amerika siyasetinde; Kuzey Amerika'da, Rusya'da, Orta Doğu'da ve keza Avrupa siyasetinde de rahatlıkla gözlemlenebilmektedir.

Varlığını gün geçtikçe arttıran bir siyasi fenomen olarak popülizmi İngiltere'de de gözlemlemek mümkündür. Avrupa siyasi sistemlerinde popülizmin çoğunlukla üye ülkelerin Avrupa Birliği (AB) ile olan ilişkilerinden beslendiği düşünüldüğünde, bu fenomenin ada politikasında vuku bulması çok da büyük bir sürpriz değildir. Zira İngiltere AB'ye üye olduğu 1973 yılından beri bu yapıyla diğer üye ülkelerden farklı bir ilişki kurmuş, AB kuşkuculuğu ve entegrasyon karşıtlığı Ada politikasında dönem dönem aktif rol oynamıştır. Ancak, popülist ideoloji ile İngiltere'nin AB ile olan bu özel ilişkisini bir potada eriterek, bu fenomeni İngiltere siyasi sisteminde dikkat çekici kılan parti Birleşik Krallık Bağımsızlık Partisi (UKIP) olmuştur. Özellikle 2010-2015 yılları arasında parti, popülist ideolojinin temel özelliklerini göstererek bu süreçte gerçekleşen

seimlerde oy sayısını arttırmış; kantitatif başarısına ek olarak, İngiltere ana akım siyasetine dolaylı olarak etki etmiştir.

Bu tez, popülizmin 2010-2015 yılları arasında İngiltere siyasetinde UKIP aracılığı ile elde ettiği yükselişin temel nedenlerini araştırmayı ve bu yükselişin bahsi geçen zaman periyodunda İngiliz siyasetine yaptığı etkileri tespit etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu doğrultuda, tezin temel araştırma sorusu şu şekilde belirlenmiştir: “2010-2015 yılları arasında popülizmin UKIP vasıtasıyla İngiltere siyasetinde yükselişe geçmesinin temel sebepleri nelerdir?”. Bu ana araştırma sorusuna ek olarak tezde bir de yardımcı araştırma sorusuna cevap verilmek istenmektedir. Bahsi geçen soru ise şu şekilde belirlenmiştir: “Popülizmin 2010-2015 yılları arasında UKIP aracılığıyla İngiltere’de yükseliş göstermesinin İngiliz ana akım siyasetine etkileri neler olmuştur?”. Bu sorulara tatminkar cevaplar sağlamak amacıyla tez, söz konusu partinin tarihini kısa bir özet halinde sunmuş ve popülizm kavramını anlaşılır bir çerçeveye oturtmuştur.

UKIP, 1993 yılında İngiltere’nin AB üyeliğinin geri çekilmesini sağlamak amacıyla, AB-karşıtı bir siyasi parti olarak kurulmuştur. Temel siyasi prensibini yalnızca İngiltere’nin AB üyeliğinden ayrılması üzerine kurduğu için UKIP, uzun seneler İngiliz siyasetinde kayda değer bir başarı yakalayamamıştır. Parti içi fikir ayrılıklarının ve sık lider değişikliklerinin de etkisiyle, parti 2000’lerin ortalarına kadar İngiliz siyasi sisteminde belirgin bir varlık gösterememiştir. Buna rağmen UKIP, özellikle 2004’ten itibaren, İngiltere’de halkın AB ile ilgili konulara daha çok ilgi gösterdiği dönemlerde ve özellikle beş yılda bir gerçekleştirilen AB Parlamentosu seçimlerinde zaman zaman kısa süreli görünürlükler ve başarılar kazanmayı başarmıştır (Usherwood, 2008). Ancak UKIP’in İngiltere siyasetindeki en büyük yükselişi 2010 tarihinden itibaren olmuştur. Partinin önemli siyasi figürlerinden Nigel Farage’in 2010 yılında ikinci kez parti başkanı seçilmesinden sonra, partinin siyasi duruşunda ve kurumsal yapısında değişikliklere gidilmiştir. Bu dönemle birlikte partinin AB karşıtlığına dayandırılan siyasi duruşu popülist ideoloji ile birleştirilmiş ve parti bu sayede büyük bir ivme kazanmaya başlamıştır (Ford & Goodwin, 2014).

Tezde popülizm kavramının çerçevesi belirlenirken, kavramın iki belirgin özelliği üzerinde durulmuştur. Bunlardan ilki, popülizmin tartışmalı bir kavram oluşudur (Laclau, 2005). Öyle ki, akademi dünyası popülizmin dünya siyasetlerindeki yaygınlığı üzerinde hemfikir olsalar da, fenomenin vuku bulma şekillerini (formlarını) ve tanımını farklı şekillerde değerlendirmişlerdir. Bu kapsamda ortaya üç farklı görüş ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunlardan ilki, popülizmi bir ideoloji olarak açıklamaktadır (Mudde, 2004; Ignazi, 2003; Norris, 2005). Bu görüşe göre popülizm, siyasi kurumlara ve sisteme karşı olma, doğrudan demokrasiyi savunma, halkın çoğunluğunun isteğine önem verme, ulusal kimlik ve kültürü ön plana çıkarma ve koruma ya da ülke yerlilerinin çıkarlarını gözetme gibi fikirlerden oluşan bir sistem olarak görülmektedir. İkinci görüş ise popülizmi bir siyaset yapma biçimi olarak açıklamaktadır (Laclau, 2005; Panizza, 2005; Meny & Surel, 2002; Kazin, 1995). Bu görüşe göre popülizm, siyasi aktörlerin kullandıkları; ve siyasi sistem karşıtlığı, doğrudan demokrasi, yerel halkın önceliği gibi unsurları içeren siyasi söylemleri aracılığıyla vuku bulmaktadır. Son grup ise popülizmi bir çeşit siyasi strateji olarak açıklamaktadır (Jensen, 2011; Robert, 2006; Wayland, 2001; Madrid, 2008; Acemoglu et al., 2011). Bu görüşe göre popülizm siyasi partinin seçtiği politikalar, siyasi yapılanma ya da liderlik biçimi gibi yollar aracılığıyla partinin daha çok oy almak için seçmiş olduğu stratejilerden oluşmaktadır.

Tezde popülizm temel olarak siyasi bir ideoloji olarak değerlendirilmekle birlikte, popülizmin söylem yoluyla bir çeşit siyaset yapma biçimi oluşu veya siyasi stratejilerden oluştuğu fikirleri de göz ardı edilmemiştir. Bu noktada, UKIP'in 2010-2015 yılları arasındaki yükselişini okurken ele alınan popülizm, ilk olarak partinin benimsediği siyasi ideoloji kapsamında değerlendirilmiştir. Ancak bu süre içinde partinin ve partililerin popülist söylemleri ve popülist politika seçimleri de incelenmiş ve değerlendirilmeye alınmıştır.

Popülizmin değinilen bir diğer belirgin özelliği ise konseptin heterojen bir nitelik taşımasıdır. Kısaca, popülizm siyasi bir fenomen olarak herhangi bir kıta siyasi sistemine, ülkeye ya da topluma ve sağ-sol fraksiyonlarına özgü değildir. Dünyada popülizm neredeyse her kıtada, hem sağ hem de sol partiler tarafından

dönem dönem ya da mütemadi bir şekilde benimsenmiştir. Tezde inceleme altına alınan UKIP sağ fraksiyona bağlı bir parti olduğu için, tezde ağırlıklı olarak sağ görüşlü popülist siyasi parti özelliklerinden söz edilmiştir.

Tezde bahsi geçen tarihler arasında UKIP'in başarısını incelediğinden, literatürde popülist siyasi partilere desteğin artmasına sebep olarak gösterilen teoriler ve görüşleri de sunulmuştur. Bu kapsamda popülizmin ülke siyasi sistemlerinde ilgi görmesini açıklayan iki temel görüş ön plana çıkmıştır. Bunlardan ilki, bu partilerin ve siyasi bir fenomen olarak popülizmin yükselişe geçebilmesi, daha çok oy alabilmesi için incelenen ülkenin toplum yapısını ya da siyasi sistemini etkileyen bazı olağandışı öğelerin olması gerektiği fikrini savunur. Bu görüşe göre, uzun vadede oluşan toplumsal değişiklikler ya da herhangi bir ekonomik, siyasi ya da toplumsal krize bağlı olarak ani bir şekilde değişen konjonktür bu partilere ya da fenomene olan yönelimi arttırmaktadır. Diğer görüş ise, bu partilerin yükselişinde, partilerin siyasi yapılanmalarının, politika seçimlerinin, siyasi söylemlerinin ve liderlerinin spesifik özelliklerinin rol oynadığını iddia eder. Bu tezde, bu iki görüş bir araya getirilerek, İngiltere siyasetindeki değişikliklere partinin verdiği popülist siyasi reaksiyonlar incelenmiş ve sonuca bu şekilde ulaşılmıştır.

Bunun ışığında, popülizmin 2010-2015 yılları arasında UKIP aracılığı ile yükselişe geçmesinin temel nedenlerini anlamak için, bu dönemde bu yükselişe sebebiyet verebileceği varsayılan toplumsal ve siyasal değişiklikler belirlenmiştir. Bunun sonucunda, UKIP'in 2010-2015 yılları arasındaki yükselişine neden olabilecek dört temel yardımcı koşul ön plana çıkmıştır. Bunlardan ilki İngiltere'de hem seçmen hem siyasi partiler seviyesinde yükselen AB-karşıtlığı; ikincisi, İngiltere'ye yönelik göçün artması, bu göçün kaynağının özellikle Bulgaristan ve Romanya gibi AB üye ülkelerinden olması; üçüncüsü, ana akım partilerle geleneksel seçmenlerinin arasındaki görüş ayrılıklarının ciddi oranda artması; son olarak da dördüncüsü İngiltere siyasi sistemin yetmiş yıl sonra ilk kez bir koalisyon hükümeti tecrübesi yaşamasıdır.

İngiltere’de popülizmin UKIP aracılığı ile 2010-2015 yılları arasında yükselişe geçmesine yardımcı olan koşullardan ilki artan AB karşıtlığıdır. İngiltere, AB’ye üye olduğu 1973 tarihinde beri Birlik ile diğer üye ülkelerden farklı bir iletişim biçimi geliştirmiştir. Öyle ki, AB-karşıtlığı o yıllardan beri zaman zaman İngiltere ana akım siyasetinde önemli bir etmen olarak ön plana çıkmıştır. Özellikle Thatcher döneminde oldukça etkili olan AB-karşıtlığı, sadece İngiliz ana akım siyasi partilerinin değil, aynı zamanda İngiliz toplumunun ve seçmenin de geleneksel olarak göz önünde bulundurduğu bir faktör olarak gözlemlenmiştir. Toplumsal seviyede dönem dönem farklı yoğunluklar gösteren AB karşıtlığı, 2010 yılından itibaren İngiltere’de tekrar önemli bir rol oynamaya başlamıştır. Bu dönemde halk arasında Birlik’in hukuki düzenlemelerinin İngiltere Hukuk Sistemi’ne müdahalelerinin sıklığından duyulan rahatsızlık, meclisin karar verme yetkisinde olan bir çok konunun Brüksel tarafından yönlendirildiği algısı gibi konular, İngiltere seçmeninin AB-karşıtlığının artmasına sebep olmuştur. Buna ek olarak, AB’nin Avro Bölgesi’nde gerçekleşen ekonomik kriz, ve bununla birlikte bir türlü çözülemeyen Suriyeli Göçmen Krizleri, İngiliz toplumunun gözünde Avrupa Birliği’nin işlerliğini sorgulanacak bir konuma getirmiştir. Nihayetinde İngiliz seçmeni arasında yükselen bu AB-karşıtlığı, kuruluşundan beri bu minvalde politikalar üreten UKIP için önemli bir fırsat doğurmuştur.

Buna ek olarak, özellikle 2010 yılından itibaren İngiltere’ye yönelik göçte ciddi bir artış olduğu gözlenmiştir. Artan bu göçe yönelik çalışmalar, göçün kaynağı olarak Doğu Avrupa ülkelerini, özellikle de Bulgaristan ve Romanya’yi işaret etmiştir. AB’nin serbest dolaşım prensibinin bir sonucu olarak değerlendirilen bu durum, İngiliz toplumu için ciddi bir rahatsızlık oluşturmuştur. Göç sayısının düşürülmesini açıkça talep eden İngiliz halkı, Muhafazakar Parti’nin bu hususta verdiği sözlere rağmen başarılı olamaması sonucunda, bu konuda daha radikal bir tutum sergileyen UKIP’e şans tanımaya başlamıştır. Sağ yönelimli popülist bir siyasi parti olarak UKIP, artan göç ve bunun toplumda yarattığı huzursuzluktan etkin bir şekilde yararlanabilecek bir konuma gelmiştir.

UKIP’in popülizm aracılığıyla, 2010-2015 yılları arasında İngiliz siyasetinde yükselmesine yardımcı olan bir diğer önemli koşul, İngiliz ana akım

partileri ile seçmenlerinin arasındaki artan fikir artışlarıdır. Bu süreçte, hem Muhafazakar Parti hem de İşçi Partisi seçmeninden ciddi orandan tepki görmüş ve destek kaybına uğramıştır. Muhafazakar Parti için bu uzaklaşmanın ana sebebi, 2006 yılında lider seçilen David Cameron'ın partide başlattığı “modernleşme süreci” olmuştur. Parti başkanı seçildikten sonra Cameron, Muhafazakar Parti'nin değerlerinin revize edilmesi gerektiği fikrini savunmuş, aynı şekilde partide hüküm süren Thatcher prensiplerinin yeniden yorumlanması gerektiği fikrini öne sürmüştür. Bu süreçle her kesimden daha çok seçmene ulaşmayı hedefleyen Cameron, İngiltere'de eşinsel evlilikleri yasallaştırmış, üzerine düşünülmüş bir iklim değişikliği politikası geliştirmiş, AB ile daha ılımlı bir iletişim kurmayı hedeflemiştir. Ancak bu girişimler, parti içinden birçok önemli figürün ve partinin kemik seçmeninin eleştirilerine maruz kalmıştır. Muhafazakar değerlerin önemini azaltmakla eleştirilen David Cameron ve partisinin arası kendi seçmeniyle açılmaya başlamıştır. Benzer şekilde, İşçi Partisi Tony Blair ile başlattığı “Üçüncü Yol” hareketi sebebiyle kendi geleneksel seçmeninden tepki görmüştür. 2010'dan beri seçimlerde başarı yakalayamayan partinin, Tony Blair döneminde Avrupalı göçmenlere İngiltere kapılarının açılmasının ve piyasada İngiliz işçiler ile rekabeti arttıran Avrupalı işçilerin sayısının gün geçtikçe artmasının sorumlusu olarak görülmüştür. Aynı şekilde, seçimlerde ana akım siyasi partileri eleştirenlerin protesto oylarını alan Liberal Demokrat Parti'nin 2010 yılında Muhafazakar Parti'yle koalisyon hükümetine dahil olması, bu partiye yönelik desteği de düşürmüştür. Tüm bu gelişmeler, UKIP için çok değerli fırsatlar doğurmuş, UKIP kendi partilerine küskün olan bu seçmenleri etkilemek için oldukça önemli bir siyasi alan bulmuştur.

Bahsi geçen yardımcı koşulların sonucusu İngiltere siyasi hayatında 70 yıl sonra ilk kez tecrübe edilen koalisyon hükümetidir. Ülkenin bu hükümet biçimiyle yönetildiği 2010-2015 periyodunda, ana akım siyasi partilerin yetkinliklerine olan güven azalmış, halk nezdinde İngiliz hükümetinin özellikle AB karşısındaki gücü sık sık sorgulanmıştır. Herhangi bir partinin tek başına hükümeti kuramamış olması, böylesi bir sisteme alışkın olmayan İngiliz seçmenini alternatifleri değerlendirmeye yöneltmiş, bu süreçte UKIP popülist elementlerden oluşan siyasi

ajandasını İngiliz seçmenine alternatif bir siyasi duruş olarak sunma şansı elde etmiştir.

Tezin bir diğer bölümünde, UKIP'in bahsi geçen yardımcı koşullara yönelik uyguladığı popülist tabanlı politikalar detaylıca incelenmiştir. Buna göre UKIP, hem İngiltere'deki ana akım partilere hem de AB kurumlarına yönelik kurulu siyasi düzenin eksikliklerini gösteren etkili politikalar üretmiştir. Bu süreçte UKIP, İngiltere'deki üç büyük siyasi partiyi (Muhafazakar Parti, İşçi Partisi, Liberal Demokratlar) birbirinden farklı olmamakla ve İngiliz halkının istek ve beklentilerinden habersiz olmakla suçlamıştır.

Bunlara ek olarak UKIP, popülist bir siyasi parti olarak doğrudan seçimlere verdiği önemi sürekli olarak tekrarlamış, İngiltere'deki seçim sistemini bu minvalde revize etmeyi taahhüt etmiştir. Ayrıca, doğrudan seçimle göreve gelmeyen teknokratlardan oluşan Komisyon gibi AB kurumlarını demokratik olmamakla suçlamıştır.

Bir diğer popülist parti özelliği olarak, UKIP siyasi ajandasına İngiliz kültürünün ve değerlerinin ön plana çıkarılması temasını da eklemiştir. Ek olarak, İngiltere'nin global seviyede kendi kararlarını kendi verebilecek kuvvette bir ülke olduğu fikrini savunmuş; bu noktada ülkeye dolaylı olarak kısıtlamalar getiren AB'yi ciddi bir şekilde eleştirmiştir. Aynı şekilde, AB üyeliği yerine İngiliz İmparatorluğu dönemimdeki ülkeler arası birlikteliği savunmuş, bu dönemin değerlerini, İngiliz kültürünün başlıca özelliklerini politikalarında sık sık kullanmıştır.

UKIP'in yükseliş sürecinde attığı en başarılı adımlardan biri, artan göç oranı ile AB şüpheciliği kavramını çok başarılı bir şekilde harmanlaması olmuştur. Ürettiği politikalar ve yürüttüğü siyasi kampanyalarda UKIP, artan göçün kaynağı olarak AB'nin serbest dolaşım ilkesini işaret etmiş, İngiltere'nin AB'den ayrılmasının göçün azaltılmasındaki en etkili yol olarak göstermiştir.

Bu siyasi manevraların haricinde UKIP, 2010-2015 yılları arasında oldukça hayati gelişmeler göstermiştir. Bu süreçte aşırı sağ partiler ve fikirlerle arasına

belirgin bir mesafe koyan parti, sadece AB karşıtlığı üzerine kurduğu siyasi mücadelesini ve mesajını genişletmiş; kurumsal olarak çok daha profesyonel bir yönetim anlayışı benimsemeye başlamıştır. Bunlara ek olarak, bu tarihler öncesi sadece Avrupa Parlamentosu seçimlerine odaklanırken, 2010 tarihinden itibaren parti yerel ve ara seçimlere de oldukça iyi bir şekilde hazırlanmaya başlamıştır. Partinin en önemli figürlerinden olan lider Nigel Farage'ın dikkat çeken ve beğeni toplayan retoriği ile takdir edilen popülist liderlik vasıfları da UKIP'in bu dönemdeki yükselişine katkı sağlamıştır.

Nihayetinde UKIP'in 2010-2015 yılları arasında popülist bir parti olarak İngiltere siyasetinde yükselişine mevcut yardımcı koşullar ve bu koşullara partinin verdiği popülist siyasi reaksiyonların bir arada etkili bir şekilde var olmasının olanak sağladığı görülmüştür.

Buna ek olarak tezde, 2010-2015 yılları arasında UKIP aracılığı ile yükselen popülizmin İngiltere siyasetine olan etkileri de ortaya konmuştur. Buna göre, UKIP bahsi geçen yıllar arasında İngiltere ana akım siyasetine dolaylı olarak etkide bulunmuştur. Öyle ki bu süreçte İngiltere siyasetinin en köklü ve büyük iki siyasi partisinin karar alma mekanizmaları, iç dinamikleri ve siyasi adımları UKIP'in yükselişinden etkilenmiştir. Benzer bir şekilde UKIP, bu dönemde seçmenin önem verdiği politik durum ve olayları belirleme görevi üstlenmiş ve İngiliz toplumunun siyasi gündeminin şekillenmesinde büyük rol oynamıştır.

B. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Social Sciences
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics
- Enformatik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Informatics
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

- Soyadı / Surname : YILMAZER
- Adı / Name : MUSTAFA MELİH
- Bölümü / Department : EUROPEAN STUDIES

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): THE RISE OF
POPULISM IN BRITAIN: THE BREAKTHROUGH OF THE UNITED KINGDOM
INDEPENDENCE PARTY IN BETWEEN 2010-2015

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE : Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two year.**
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **six months.**

Yazarın İmzası / Signature:

Tarih / Date: 15.08.2018