Populism against Globalisation
A New European Revolt

Dr. René Cuperus

Wiardi Beckman Stichting
Think tank of the Dutch Labour Party PvdA,
Amsterdam, the Netherlands
rcuperus@pvda.nl

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Introduction

It is my great pleasure and honor to have been invited by the Finnish Kalevi Sorsa Foundation for this important seminar in the town of Tampere.

To my shame, I must admit that first I did not know who Kalevi Sorsa was. I believe, to be frank, that I never heart that name before.

This embarrassing fact is pointing at a more general European problem. European Integration is far too much a boring, technocratic story about Brussels institutions and far too little a story of a transnational exchange of knowledge, contacts and sharing experiences. To grow together to a certain extent towards one big European Union presupposes a desire for mutual understanding and learning.

This to me is one of the dissatisfying dimensions of the European Project till now. Especially the mutual contact and interest between smaller countries in Europe is quite underdeveloped. Let's be clear: Stories of the small countries are not reported in the newspapers of other small countries. Our joint reference points are the big names in the big countries: Sarkozy in France, Blair and Brown in the UK, Merkel in Germany. We have no Dutch correspondents (on a daily basis) in Finland or Sweden or even Denmark. Too costly. Those countries which resemble each other most, are not sharing common experiences. That's both strange and wrong. It may be a bit different for the Scandinavian family of countries (as it is between Holland and Dutch speaking Flanders in Belgium), but as a general picture it is true that we all know far too little about each other.

Proof? Let us share some feelings of shame: I did not know who was Kalevi Sorsa (the good news is that I could find him even in the Dutch Wikipedia), but do you know who was the Kalevi Sorsa of the Netherlands? The former leader of my own party, the Dutch Labour party, also

famous Prime Minister in the 1970s and active in the Socialist International, side by side with the generation of Olaf Palme and Willy Brandt? No: This was Joop den Uyl.

Other example: do you know who today is the Prime minister of the Netherlands, or who today is the partyleader of the Dutch Labour party? You see: there is a fundamental lack of knowledge about the smaller states.

This problem of lacking knowledge of various national contexts is important. It makes us less robust against the popular myth that the whole world is converging towards one big cosmopolitan global village. It makes us defenseless against the new fashion of the international policy making community of technocrats: bench marking OECD statistics, making medal tables of national performances and policy comparisons etc.. As if national cultures, identities, institutions, traditions do not matter any more., do not exist even.

We encounter this, for example, in the debate, which must be very familiar to you: the debate about the Finnish model. The Finnish Nokia innovation model was, and probably still is, the love baby of the international policy making community (except for the Swedes - funny if you talk to Swedes about the Finnish model you get grumpy, grim and jealous comments).

In the Netherlands we now even have a discussion about the Finnish educational system, about the Finnish model of teaching (not based on any knowledge about the actual situation, just on statistics): in Finland, it seems to be the case, that compared to the Netherlands, teachers are paid less, but perform better, because of their status in society. So let's copy this practice tomorrow to the Netherlands. These blunt comparisons of very subtle cultural and historic arrangements is one of the root annoyances underneath the populist discontent and unrest in society, about which I will speak now after this brief introduction.

You invited someone from the Netherlands. As a result you get someone with a relatively open mind towards the concept and practice of populism. Why so? Because the Netherlands as a country seems to be a laboratory for populism. We had, in the past, small extreme-right or far right varieties of xenophobic populism. Then we had in 2002 a citizen's revolt of the Pim Fortuyn movement, which was something new: I sometimes define it as postmodern populism, because of its bricolage or mix of right wing and left wing ideas.

On top of that: Since the last elections we face a serious problem of the fragmentation of the political center: there is a left-wing populist movement (anti-Europe, anti-liberal, protectionist), the Socialist Party, former Maoist, which is eating away at the heart of the moderate social-democratic party (sometimes even leading in the polls). There is at the other end of the spectrum a conservative-liberal party which is under attack by a islamophobic populist leader (Wilders, sometimes called the new Pim Fortuyn, but not as charismatic nor gay, but under strong permanent police protection because of threats from radical Muslims). This conservative-liberal party is also under attack by its own former Minister for Immigration and Integration, a woman who started her own movement "Proud to be Dutch', first inside the conservative-liberal party, but now independent since she was thrown out soon after.

Of course, I don't want to talk this afternoon about Dutch politics, but I will speak more generally about the phenomenon of populism.

It may be clear already from the outset:

This afternoon I will present you, or confront you, with a broader idea of populism, with the **inconvenient truth of populism** (with a smile to Al Gore).

In two sentences:

1. The inconvenient truth about populism is, that in countries such as the Netherlands, Belgium or Germany populism is no longer a marginal phenomenon any more, no longer restricted any more to the extreme fringes of the political system, but a political phenomenon which is increasingly threatening the political center, both from the right and the left.

2. The second inconvenient truth about populism is that, whereas populism is all about the construction of ''Us'' versus ''them', us the people, against them, the elites or the foreigners, that in my analysis the inconvenient fact is that it is the elites which are the prime movers: the academic, professional, international elites are constructing a threatening 'we' against them, the ordinary people. The elites unintentionally produce populism, cause the pan-European Populist revolt of citizens.

I will for the rest of my speech elaborate further on these bold, inconvenient statements.

As a matter of fact, Populism is a complex concept for political researchers and in academic debate; it is also a very complex phenomenon in wild reality, with different varieties and connotations in various countries. I am not an expert at all on the Finnish political party system, so I do not know what are the exact connotations of populism in Finland.

[I like to learn about that in the later discussion with you.]

Generally speaking, in postwar Europe populism has been considered a dangerous political species; referring to the black past of European history. Populism in Europe , unlike the American or Latin American tradition of populism, is more or less associated with fascism and Nazism, the pathologies of the ''voice of the masses''. The worship of authoritarian leadership, anti-democratic and anti-constitutional and anti-pluralistic strands of populism. The nasty face of populism, which remains a very alarming warning.

But populism, and that's the other side of the coin, can also be analysed in itself, as an alarming warning against perceived or real failures of representative democracy, against the unfair outcomes of elite policy making, against the bias of the academic professionals in the world of politics, against new inequalities. Populism might act as an alarm signal, pointing at a crisis of representation, a communication breakdown between elites and ordinary people. In this sense of the word, populism should not be demonized nor underestimated, but taken very seriously.

And that sums up my position towards populism. With a last farewell to Tony Blair, my position on populism is a Blairite one:

We must be tough on populism and tough on the causes of populism (as Blair was tough on crime and the causes of crime):

So what's behind all this?

Populism against globalisation

A tormented wave of anti-establishment populism is haunting Europe. Populist parties manage to enter political centre stage. This is partly the result of the breakthrough of former extreme-right or far right parties to the 'regular right' part of the political spectrum and of the drift to the right in the European political discourse concerning issues of immigration, Islam and the concept of the multicultural society. In Europe, new populism not only comes from the right, but increasingly from the anti-liberal protectionist left wing as well. In this essay will be argued that in Europe the populist wave points at a deeper rooted crisis of the political and societal system at large.[1]

Western Europe is in the grip of a political identity crisis. The disrupting effects of globalisation, the permanent retrenchment of the welfare states and the development of a ''media audience democracy''[2] are accompanied by fundamental changes in the political party system: the triumph of the floating voter, i.e. the unprecedented rise of electoral volatility, and the spectacular jump in the political arena of neo-populist movements.

The traditional mass parties that have ruled the region at least since the end of the Second World War have lost members, voters, élan, and a monopoly on ideas. Because they are the pillars of both the party-oriented parliamentary system and the welfare state, their slow but steady decline affects European societies as a whole. Due to changes in labour, family and cultural life styles, the Christian Democratic (conservative) and Social Democratic pillars of civil society are eroding away, leaving behind "people's parties" with shrinking numbers of people. This erosion of political representation eats away at the foundations of the European welfare states and European party democracies.

The second ingredient of the European crisis is what might be called the paradox of the Holocaust trauma. Europeans seem unable to cope with the question of ethnic diversity. Intellectual discourse was long characterized by a species of political correctness which praised multiculturalism and 'The Foreigner' as enriching society while turning a blind eye to the *de facto* segregation and marginalisation of many new immigrants and the stress they placed on the welfare system in many nations. Also the potential culture conflict between Europe's liberal-permissive societies and the orthodox Islam was denied. The established democratic parties reacted to the rise of extreme right, racist parties with a *cordon sanitaire*, but made the mistake putting a 'cordon sanitaire' also around the topic of these parties, i.e. the shadow sides of mass migration and a the transformation into a multi-ethnic society: problems of integration and segregation, high unemployment and crime rates; 'multicultural discontent'', especially within the constituencies of the people's parties. These problems did much to provoke a populist-xenophobic reaction. In this respect, Europe is facing two dilemmas: 1. how to maintain its 'communitarian' welfare states under conditions of permanent immigration?; 2. to what extent will the integration patterns in Europe be determined by multiculturalism or assimilationism?

A third ingredient of the crisis is widespread unease over the process of European integration. What should be a proud achievement of cosmopolitan cooperation between nations has become, instead, a cause of increasing insecurity and national alienation. This discontent with the European Union propelled considerably by the uncertain, unintended effects of the so-called European enlargement: the arrival of a series of many new East-Central European member states to the EU.

The fourth component is the fact that much of this discontent was channelled through the

rise of right wing or radical right populist movements and in Europe, totally unlike the American tradition, populism is more or less associated with fascism and Nazism, the pathologies of the ''voice of the masses''. This in itself added up to a sense of crisis.

The representation problem of the traditional political party system; the widespread discontent with ill managed mass migration and the subsequent rapid, radical and unprecedented 'multiculturalisation' of European societies; the growing unease with the European integration process (not a shield against globalisation, but instead the transmitter and 'visible face' of globalisation); they all fuel the political and electoral potential of (right wing) populist movements.

Populism can be defined as a particular style of politics, referring to 'the people' as a homogeneous entity against 'a corrupt elite' and in this sense the neo-populist citizens's revolt in Europe can be understood. This revolt is rooted into the perception that the people are 'betrayed' by the ruling elites. They feel not represented in, but victimised by, the great transformation of (post)modern society, in particular the processes of postindustrialisation, multiculturalisation and Europeanisation. 'Populism can be read as a fever warning which signals that problems are not being dealt with effectively, or points to the malfunctioning of the linkages between citizens and governing elites'.[3]

The new right-wing populism that emerged in the last decade of the last century can be called populist because they claim to represent 'the people' and to be mobilising them against a domineering Establishment. And they can be classified as right-wing populist because they claim to be defending and shielding national, cultural or ethnic identity against 'outsiders' or external influences.

In this sense there are connections to xenophobic, racist or far-right parties and political ideas. Some of the parties have their origin in extreme-right quarters or did house neo-nazi or fascist party activists (the Haider Party in Austria, the ''Vlaams Belang'' party in Flanders). Most of these parties however tried to transform themselves (sometimes just to cover up) into democratic 'normality'; other parties cannot be associated at all with this 'black European history', especially the Pim Fortuyn party in the Netherlands, which has been called 'postmodern populist', because of his *bricolage* of right-wing and left-wing ideas. One could call this kind of new populism as was espoused by Berlusconi, Blocher (Switzerland),Hagen (Norway) and the late Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands a "third way of the right", a middle road between the democratic and the undemocratic right, between traditional conservatism on the one hand and the antidemocratic extreme right of the past on the other.[4]

It is common usage in Europe to identify populism with the new radical right parties.

But one of the actual problems is that the new anti-globalisation populism is not restricted any more to the relatively small ''home constituencies'' of the far right parties. The populist discontent with established politics and with the perceived disrupting process of internationalisation (global neo-liberalism, mass migration, the destruction of national borders) is extending to great parts of the middle class electorate.[5]

Therefore, it might be more clarifying to link the trend of neo-populism with a broad, cross class appeal to protest voters, to the so-called *Modernisierungsverlierer* (losers of the accelerated process of modernisation) . It's this mix of anti-immigration and anti-globalisation discontent and protest, especially against the 'perceived degeneration of representative democracy by privileges of particular groups' , which characterises the new successful European populist revolt.[6]

This essay focuses on the widening gap between the political and policy elites and large groups – if not the majority – of the population of the continental European welfare states. There is a massive level of unease in many Western countries, trust in institutions and politics is at a record low, there is a crisis of confidence and a crisis of political representation.[7] The disturbing thing is that this great distrust and great unease can be encountered not only in countries which have become manic depressive as a result of reform postponement (the German and French disease), but also in countries which have actually carried through reform programmes, such as Denmark, Austria or the Netherlands. The ever-growing pan-European presence of right-wing and left-wing populist movements, which often appear following a reform of the welfare state, remains an alarming and grimy reminder of the general unease in the population and the crisis of confidence which besets the established political scene.[8] In the process of reform and adaptation to the New Global World Order, there has been a fundamental breakdown of communication between elites and the general population.

The pressures of adaptation to the new globalised world are particularly directed towards those who do not fit in to the new international knowledge based economy, the unskilled and the low-skilled. The over all discourse of adaptation and competitive adjustment has a strong bias against the lower middle class and non-academic professionals. This bias is the root cause for populist resentment and revolt.

Policy and political elites are selling and producing insecurity and uncertainty, instead of showing security and stable leadership in a world of flux. With the exception of some Scandinavian countries, European policy elites do not show welfare state pride stability in times of change and reform. This ambivalence about the very foundations of the European welfare state models is in itself producing populist unrest.

Unease and Distrust in contemporary European society must be located at more levels than that merely of the welfare state reform. We are experiencing a shift right across the board: the magic of the post-war period seems to be all used up: the post-war ideal of European unification, the post-war welfare state model and the post-Holocaust tolerance for the Foreigner; they all seem to be eroding and under pressure. The over all-process of internationalisation (globalisation, immigration, European integration) is producing a gap of trust and representation between elites and population around questions of cultural and national identity. This essay will take a closer look at precisely this complex of problems, the New Populist Condition of Contemporary Politics, especially in relation to the question of immigration, integration and the idea of a multicultural society.

A pan-European Populist Revolt

As stated before, a wave of anti-establishment populism is conquering Europe. Populist parties of left and right are more and more successful in local and national elections. Populism is also conceived to be the main trigger of the No-vote in the French and Dutch referenda on the European Constitution. Moreover, a populist discourse and agenda is taking over mainstream politics in many European countries, not the least in post-communist East-Central Europe. But also in Western Europe establishment parties, especially on the right, are copying populist themes and messages, a cocktail mix of cultural conservatism, nationalism, euroscepticism and latent or manifest xenophobia.[9]

Again, the core characteristic of this so-called new populism is that groups and movements

identify the structural conflict in modern society and politics not any longer as one between left and right, but between 'the people' and 'the elite', both perceived as homogenous people.[10] But it's more complex than that. We can differentiate between at least three faces of populism. In the older sense, populism has been exclusively associated with right wing populist movements, populism being a euphemistic word for radical right racism or aggressive xenophobia.

A second type of populism can be labelled ''media populism'' or populism as a new style
of communication politics. In the new information society and ''mass media democracy'' , under condition of diminished ideological party differences, populism is becoming more and more the dominant style of politics. Through election campaigns and permanent communication strategies (spin doctors) political leaders are trying to connect ''catch-all'' to mass audience and electorate for vote maximalisation and popular approval. In a way, modern democracies are doomed to be populistic in this sense.[11]

In the third sense - and this essay concentrates on this dimension (sometimes overlapping with the first dimension) – the new populist revolt must be characterised as a revolt against the New World as conceived and promoted by the mainstream political, cultural and economic elites, the New Global World, driven by the international forces of economic liberalism and cultural liberalism.

The biggest risk for contemporary social democracy is the breakdown of the social-democratic parties, the split of these parties in two constituencies under the attack by populism.

What is at stake is the fragmentation of the social democratic electorate into two camps: a cleavage between social liberal academic professionals and traditional trade union-social democrats; the cleavage between higher educated and lower educated, between cosmopolitan and nationalistic or libertarian and authoritarian orientations. This split is representing the fragmentation within our middle class society at large. As a result of the strong forces of globalization, mass migration, individualization and the postindustrial knowledge based economy.

The problems of the center parties are a *pars pro toto*, a mirror for what's happening in society at large. The pressures of division and fragmentation on the social democratic parties are the pressures within society. A possible cleavage or split in our party may be a foreshadowing of the split in society at large. What is fundamentally under attack is the social cohesion, the social fabric, the solidarity of our societies. What could be under attack is the European social model, and European social democracy as one of its foundations and pillars. Social democracy defined as the coalition, the connector between privileged and underprivileged, between lower and higher middle class. So the big challenge for contemporary social democracy is how to prevent the exodus of *die letzte Arbeiter aus die Arbeiterparteien*, under the strong threat from populism, left-wing and right wing.

Again, the biggest challenge for European Social Democracy is populism, populism from the right or even extreme right, and populism from the left. My position on populism is a Blairite one: *We must be tough on populism and tough on the causes of populism*. Populism is a concept with a Janus-head. Populism is a dangerous political species; referring even to the black past of European history. Populism in Europe , unlike the American tradition of populism, is more or less associated with fascism and Nazism, the pathologies of the ''voice of the masses''.

But populism, and that's the other side of the coin, can also be, a legitimate warning against technocratic policy making, against the bias of the academic middle class in the world of politics, against new inequalities, and the failures of representative democracy. In this sense of the word, populism never should be demonized and underestimated, but may even be considered as our bad conscience.

Populism might act as an alarm signal. Pointing at a crisis of representation, a communication breakdown between elites and ordinary people. A popular revolt of distrust and discontent. Indeed, Populism is the nightmare for moderate politics, for center-left reform politics, for the political coalition between the low-skilled and high skilled, the low educated and high educated.

Populism is a deep, fundamental reaction to social developments, to a possible new phase of the modernization process: the coming of a globalised, postindustrial multicultural world society.

Populism, in its core, is a revolt against this imagined future, the future world of the political, economic , cultural elites. This future scenario of the elite is, what, in my analysis, producing the populist revolt. Let's put it this way: The notion that the future will be a post-national European future, a multicultural future, a globalised future, a future of permanent learning in a meritocratic knowledge economy, based on market flexibility and dynamics; that notion of the future is revolted against by populism. The more so, because the elite is communicating that this future is the only future: TINA:, There is No alternative. This is the only possible future for countries such as Germany, Denmark, or even for Europe at large to survive in the new global world.

In the process of reform and adaptation to the new global world order, there has been a fundamental breakdown of trust between the elites and the general population, creating a harsh cleavage between winners and losers of the new modernization, a cleavage between future-optimists and future pessimists.

A new dividing line is emerging between two groups: those who embrace the future and those who fear the future, people who believe that the new world holds nothing good in store for them and who feel betrayed by the 'political elite'. This concerns both a cultural-political cleavage as well as a social-economic class divide. On the right this new dividing line creates a breeding ground for anti-immigrant right-populist parties; on the left it provides a basis for more traditional or left-populist parties. Especially, the social democratic people's parties are faced with an existential issue as the dividing line between these groups runs right through their electorate.

The process of economic and cultural modernization results in a new social polarization between winners and losers. Major economic changes associated with globalization and new technologies do not have the same effect on everybody but result in a redistribution of opportunities for participation and success. The level of education in particular, pre-determines individuals' life-chances, their confidence in politics and public institutions and their expectations of the future.

The ''New Populist European Revolt'' in this last sense recently has been empirically demonstrated by a research team of the University of Zurich and the University of Munich, under the academic leadership of prof. HansPeter Kriesi.[12] In a Six European Countries Comparison, they analyse that ''the current process of globalisation or denationalisation leads to the formation of a new structural conflict in Western European countries, opposing those who benefit from this process against those who tend to lose in the course of events'. They observe a structural opposition between so-called globalisation ''winners'' and ''losers'', leading to a new cleavage

transforming the basic national political space. ''We consider those parties that most successfully appeal to the interests and fears of the 'losers' of globalization to be the driving force of the current transformation of the Western European party systems''.

Kriesi et al. assume ''that the processes of increasing economic (sectoral and international) competition, of increasing cultural competition (which is, among other things, linked to massive immigration of ethnic groups who are rather distinct from the European populations) and of increasing political competition (between nation-states and supra- or international political actors) create new groups of ''winners'' and ''losers''. The likely winners include entrepreneurs and qualified entrepreneurs in sectors open tot international competition as well as all kinds of cosmopolitan citizens. The expected losers, by contrast, include entrepreneurs and qualified employees in traditionally protected sectors, and unqualified employees and citizens who strongly identify themselves with their national community''.

Kriesi et al. formulate an interesting paradox of national boundaries: ''the lowering and unbundling of national boundaries renders them politically more salient. As they are weakened and reassessed, their political importance increases''. They therefore expect globalisation losers to support protectionist measures, stressing the importance of national boundaries and independence. Winners who benefit from the increased competition tend at the other hand to support the opening up of the national boundaries and the process of international integration. The new antagonism between winners and losers of globalization is labelled *the conflict between integration and demarcation.*[13] Kriesi's c.s.'' main argument is that this conflict represents a new political cleavage emerging from the process of denationalization, which is influencing the political space, the supply side of politics. The traditional left/right-class conflict around social-economic politics – the regulation of the market and social protection by the welfare state – and the traditional cultural conflict around religion and the libertarian post-materialist values plus identity issues of the new social movements are now extended and complicated by the new cleavage of integration versus demarcation. The new demarcation/integration conflict will be embedded into the two-dimensional basic structure, as Kriesi puts it.

''On the social-economic dimension, the new conflict can be expected to reinforce the classical opposition between a pro-state and a pro-market position (…). The pro-state position is likely to become more defensive and more protectionist (…)'. On the cultural dimension, we expect enhanced opposition to cultural liberalism of the new social movements as a result of the ethnicization of politics: the defence of tradition is expected to increasingly take on a ethnic or nationalist character. (…) The demarcation pole of the new cultural cleavage should be characterised by an opposition to the process of European integration and by restrictive positions with regard to immigration; these are issues which correspond to the new political and cultural forms of competition linked with globalization'. (p. 924).

Kriesi c.s. suggest by hypothesis ''that in Western Europe, a). mainstream parties will generally tend to formulate a winners' programme (i.e. a programme in favour of further economic and cultural integration), but that b). mainstream parties on the left will attempt to combine the economic integration with the preservation of the social protection by the welfare state, while mainstream parties on the right will tend to reduce the role of the state in every respect. (..) Left wing mainstream parties may also face the dilemma that market integration in Europe (and more globally) poses a threat to their national social achievements. In those countries where mainstream parties tend to moderately opt for the winners' side, we face an increasing political fragmentation,

with the strengthening of peripheral actors, who tend to adopt a 'losers' programme: i.e. on the right a culturally more protectionist stance, on the left a socially and economically more protectionist stance.

According to the Convergence thesis, the convergence of the major parties has been compensated for by the emergence of new parties.[14]

The radical's left opposition to the opening up of the borders is mainly an opposition to economic liberalization. The populist right's opposition is protectionist on the cultural dimension, to preserve the national identity. ''The main characteristics of this ''national-populism'' are its xenophobia or even racism, expressed in a fervent opposition to the presence of immigrants, and its populist appeal to the widespread resentment against the mainstream parties and the dominant political elites.

''Given the heterogeneous economic interests of the ''losers' of denationalisation, the defence of their national identity and their national community constitutes the smallest common denominator for their political mobilization.. This could explain why the populist's right appeal to the losers is more convincing than that of the radical left. "929.

A world in flux

In other words than Hans Peter Kriesi and his colleagues, I arrived at the same analysis of populism as the protest vehicle of losers of the current modernisation process. Populism or protectionism or ''politics of demarcation'' mat be analysed as reactions of fear and discontent to

Globalisation, denationalisation or detraditionalisation, a revolt against economic and cultural liberalism, the ideology of the modern internationalised professional elites, a revolt against the universalistic, cosmopolitan global village without boundaries and distinctions. In nucleus, this is what the new populism is all about, both in its moderate version (conservative protectionism) and in its nasty version of xenophobia, racism or aggressive nationalism.

Indeed, these are perilous times we live in. History teaches us that acceleration in a modernisation process is often accompanied by counter movements, not infrequently of a very dangerous nature. The process of modernisation is a story of trends and countertrends, movements and counter movements. To give a big example, the Industrial Revolution and the evolution of the modern liberal society both ultimately produced democracy and prosperity, but also totalitarian pathologies such as Communism and National Socialism.

It looks as if we're now once again in a period of hypermodernisation. All the signals are set for change, for transition and transformation. Let's list the rather worn-out clichés: globalisation; European unification; the technological ICT revolution; the development of a post-industrial knowledge economy; immigration and the rise of multi-ethnic societies; individualisation and social fragmentation; environmental degradation; a commercial entertainment revolt in the media; geopolitical power shifts at the global level; international terrorism linked to political Islam.

This points to a world in flux; society, the economy and politics have entered an accelerated phase; traditional institutions and attitudes are under great pressure. Such a process of change produces both optimism and pessimism; fear and unease alongside a sense of adventure and spirit of enterprise. Those ready to welcome the future stand alongside those who fear it. A fairly harsh division is appearing between winners and losers, a demarcation line between countries and within countries. China and India versus Japan, the Arab world and Africa. Ireland, Poland,

Finland and the United Kingdom against France, Germany, Italy. And within countries: young academic double-earners in the 'exposed' private sector against older, less well-educated industrial *Facharbeiter* and immigrants who are discriminated against on the labour market. New inequalities and polarisations are being produced. The transformation is particularly strong in questions of identity, issues of national, cultural and ethnic identity.

There are some who like to dismiss the German electorate, or the Dutch and French no-voters in the constitution referendums, as xenophobic nationalists, as frightened enemies of the open society, as people who turn their back on the future, as deniers of globalisation and immigration. But these critics are wide of the mark. There is a great danger involved when a cosmopolitan post-national elite carelessly argues away the nation state and national identity, just at the moment that the nation state is for many a last straw of identification to cling to, a beacon of trust in a world in flux.

A casual cosmopolitan reaction also painfully denies the strong polarising forces to which society is currently subjected and which can have very different results for different groups. It denies the extremely weak socio-cultural and political climate in Europe, which is reflected by the pan-European rise of the populist right (and to a less strong extent: left-wing protectionism). The issue is thus the crisis of political representation for traditional parties and the new sociological fault line in today's European society, a fault line which we have just encountered so clearly again in voter behaviour on the European Constitution, both in the Netherlands and in France: *la France d'en haut* versus *la France d'en bas*, a division between those who greet the future, and those who fear it (see box 1).

Box 1. "Those who greet the future, and those who fear it"

'On the one side is the group of people enjoying a reasonable measure of protection, who are neither insecure nor anxious. They see the market as an opportunity for progress, they view the unification of Europe as a success, they live alongside rather than within the multicultural society, they have a strong, individualised lifestyle and are not interested in the neighbourhood as a centre for solidarity and social control. They feel perfectly safe and secure and their individual prosperity gives them the means they need to avoid contact with the degenerating public domains and services. They usually cope well with bureaucracy and feel competent in their dealings with the various branches of government. They view the established political parties as legitimate organisations for shaping the democratic process, but consider them totally irrelevant in terms of their personal lifestyles. (…)

On the other side are the people who fear the future and feel threatened by the market, European expansion, continuing immigration and the multicultural society, the collapse of the social infrastructure, the loss of the tradition of helping your neighbours and solidarity in working-class areas, the internationalisation of the economy, the inadequate safety of the public domain and the deterioration of public services. They live in the midst of the multicultural society and have experienced enormous change in the social relations that used to form part of their lives. The monoculture of working-class neighbourhoods with a high degree of social control has made way for multicultural 'deprived' neighbourhoods. This group of people has lost all confidence in the traditional political parties, because they do not see them as organisations that represent their interests, but as part of the failing state machinery. Government is perceived as the opponent or the enemy. In the eyes of this frightened, insecure part of the electorate, all their problems are

Identity Issues: Europe and the multicultural society

The previously described problem cluster of social unease and distrust regarding the reform of the welfare state, as well as the demarcation line between future optimists and future pessimists (see box 1) can to an important extent be assigned to, or broadened to, the issue of threatened identity. First of all, on the Continent the welfare state is a strong identity issue in itself. A specific characteristic is that around the concept of the welfare state a progressive view of national identity did arise after the Second World War in many European countries. This strong sentiment may be described by "welfare chauvinism", which is a 'civil religion' of communitarism associated with national solidarity of welfare state arrangements in countries like Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Finland and Germany (to some extent comparable with the symbolic value of the NHS for the British Labour Party).

We in Europe thought that with the European social model (the sum of national social welfare states), we had realised something resembling Francis Fukuyama's *End of History*: the apogee of human civilisation, the social paradise on a human scale, the final mental stage of social politics. This self-assurance is suffering a nasty hangover now that the holy welfare state is coming under serious pressure (from within and without[16]). And this isn't just a question of slimming-down but now involves its very foundations, its sustainability and thus its continued existence.

The self-image has been shaken so strongly that even the contrast with the American capitalist model is no longer proudly and unanimously supported any more. This is causing identity problems. The consequences of globalisation, modernisation, Europeanisation and immigration for the well-being of the welfare state have repercussions at the level of national identity and societal self-image. For this reason alone we cannot afford to ignore feelings of national identity in the debate on the European Social Model. Only in this way can we understand the unease which is spreading so alarmingly in Europe and acting as a political and mental block to reforms, be they necessary or not.

By broaching the subject of national identity I am venturing onto thin ice. Historical thin ice: in its dark incarnation, nationalism is an extremely dangerous political raw material with the very worst of antecedents. And I am venturing onto political thin ice: there is a taboo on this theme in progressive-academic circles. Just as for Thatcher there was "no such thing as society", so for the cosmopolitan intellectuals there is 'no such thing as a nation state or national identity'. For those who like to regard themselves as post-national cosmopolitan global citizens, national identity is a fiction: a dangerous, vulgar-populist, reactionary, collective construction. William Pfaff puts it this way:[17] "The conventional political wisdom since World War II has identified nationalism with fascism. Fascism and Nazism both were nationalist historical moments, but nationalism is not fascism or Nazism. The US at this moment is arguably the most nationalistic country on earth."[18]

Moreover, centre-left and social-democratic parties have long been embarrassed by this type of cultural theme. I'll return to this later, but can say right now that it doesn't seem wise and advisable for progressives to deny the 'lived reality' of national identities and thus to allow this issue to become the monopoly of the right. In fact it is the task of progressives to develop an open,

hospitable, non-xenophobic definition of national identity: *a greater Us*. National solidarity, the moral foundation of a social caring society, can't survive without this.

There is a tension between the experience of national feelings of 'us' and the ongoing internationalisation, for the purposes of this argument understood as a double process: the process of European unification and the creation of multi-ethnic societies, the cultural and ethnic differentiation of European society. Both can lead to a felt loss of individuality, according to an official advisory body of the Dutch government that was commissioned by the government to study this subject.[19]

So the perception of a threat to, or an undermining of, national identity is related to two other dimensions of the headlong process of internationalisation – domains at which a confrontation occurs between cosmopolitan, highly educated elites and the population at large: apart from the (perceived) undermining of the peace of mind of the welfare state by globalisation and post-industrialisation, there exists a double 'integration issue' resulting from the internationalisation:

2. the integration of the nation states in the European Union, and

3. the integration of immigrants in the nation state.

European integration: the revenge of national identity

The European adventure has recently been the victim of *imperial overstretch:* the seemingly endless expansion; Europe as the heavy-handed transmitter or accelerator of globalisation and liberalisation; Europe as the shears used to keep the member states uniformly trimmed.

This has made Europe, and this is the real crux of the matter, into more of a threat than an inspired solution. It is where we encounter what I will call the *'nationalism paradox'* of European unification. European cooperation was originally begun as a way of transcending the aggressive nationalism of the 19th century, which in the following century resulted so catastrophically in the European Civil War. But with its current changes of form (the expansion, the neo-liberal currency union, a Super State Constitution, technocratic centralisation and regulatory spill-over) the EU would seem to have reached a critical boundary. Europe generates strong national counter forces and, like a magician's apprentice, now produces the nationalism which it actually aimed to transcend.

People don't want to give up their country for an imaginary European Unity. They are not convinced, amused nor involved, as referendum exit-poll research in France and Holland has demonstrated. [20]

The Multicultural Society: a disrupting concept

"For some time I have been thinking that the Europeans, and especially the Dutch, have had their heads stuck in the sand. It now seems clear to me that the entire concept of the multicultural society has been a serious mistake. What has been achieved is not something like a liberal society, but a collection of groups who don't talk to each other. You can't call that a nation, I think", remarked Francis Fukuyama during a recent visit to the Netherlands. [21]

The term multicultural society, however inviting it may be intended to be for newcomers, for incoming immigrant groups, has done a lot of damage. It is at odds with the quite successful integration-, acculturation- and assimilation patterns in terms of employment, equality, social and political inclusion, which we can observe over generations in true immigration countries such as America and Australia. The concept has also, up to today, done much damage to support for

immigration among the autochthonous population. On the contrary: the term produced unnecessary and perilous xenophobia and resentment.[22]

The multiculturalism concept, as used by post-national politically correct cosmopolitans, suggests that the autochthonous population is no more and no less than one of the 'multi-cultures', a minority among the minorities. It cannot be ruled out that in the longer term this will be a lived reality in some cities (and assuming that by that point the processes of integration, emancipation and acculturation have succeeded, this need in no way present a problem), but applying such a normative-imperative description at the start of a mass immigration process is probably the most confrontational way of creating race relations[23] between established population and newcomers. There is no better way of unsettling and potentially disrupting a host society. In this respect I share the view of Prospect's Editor in Chief David Goodhart: it is disproportional to imagine "that Britain must radically adapt its majority way of life or reach out to meet the newcomers halfway. (…) But in the nature of things most of the adaptation will, initially, be on the side of the newcomers who have chosen to live in an already existing society with a majority way of life and at least some sense of itself. (…) It's important that newcomers acknowledge that Britain is not just a random collection of individuals, and that they are joining a nation which, although hard to describe, is something real."

And Goodhart still errs on the side of caution. It is the breakdown in communication regarding the core idea of multiculturalism between the politically correct elite of experts, minority experts, highly educated representatives and immigrant organisations on the one hand, and the average population on the other hand which has (perhaps unnecessarily) caused much damage. Prompted by legitimate feelings of guilt about Western colonialism, racism, about apartheid and the Holocaust, the counter reaction has taken the form of exclusive attention and respect for the cultural ethnicity, individual qualities and group culture of minorities/immigrants, accompanied by a total denial if not indeed demonising of the group culture and ethnicity of the autochthonous majority.

It is this multicultural illusion, constituting a clear and threatening deviation from lived reality, which drives many 'ordinary people' into the arms of extremely dubious parties, luckily initially to a very small extent towards extreme right-wing, racist parties (which in the 1980s agitated against the idea of multiculturalism), but later towards large populist right-wing movements such as those of Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands, Hagen in Norway, Kjaersgaard in Denmark. Now mainstream politicians, experts and social scientists (with an unheard-of delay of 20 years) have also arrived at this position regarding multiculturalism. But David Goodhart is still forced to conclude, *nota bene* about one of the most burning contemporary social issues, that "at present there is a large conceptual and linguistic space between racism, at one end, and liberal cosmopolitanism, at the other. Most people reside in this middle space but it is empty of words for us to describe our feelings".[24] What tragic incapacity and social alienation!

But beware: one should still not underestimate the fact that in many European countries we are faced with a creeping revolt by parts of the autochthonous population, deep into the non-racist middle classes, a stubborn peat moor fire, against the optimistic idea *and* the segregated practice of the multicultural society. This revolt is not always expressed in political voting patterns; due to the nature of the electoral system (as in the UK), due to a massive historical burden (as in Germany) or due to a lack of corresponding parties to vote for, as in the Netherlands, where no anti-multicultural party has appeared in the left of the spectrum. But make no mistake: voter research

in the Netherlands for instance (a country with a low consciousness of national identity which is both proverbial and also repeatedly indicated by comparative European studies) shows that a large (70%) majority rejects multiculturalism and believes that minorities should adjust to 'the Dutch culture' (see table). The great majority of the Dutch population is, in contrast to what the obligatory terminology has prescribed for decades, 'uniculturalist'.[25] This means that people wish and expect cultural minorities to adapt (up to a certain point) to the culture of the guest country.

Multiculturalism versus Uniculturalism in the Netherlands

Opinions about the integration of ethnic minorities (1994 and 2002)

label	category	response in 1994 (%)	response in 2002(%)
*Migrants and ethnic minorities are allowed to stay in the Netherlands with maintenance of all customs of their own culture**			
	1	5,0	1,6
	2	6,3	4,5
	3	7,8	8,2
	4	19,2	14,3
	5	16,8	18,9
	6	16,9	26,9
	7	28,0	25,6
Migrants and ethnic minorities must adapt completely to Dutch culture		*100,0*	*100,0*

Source: NKO 1994 and 2002
* Labels in Dutch: 'allochtonen en etnische minderheden moeten in Nederland kunnen blijven met behoud van alle gewoonten van de eigen cultuur'en 'allochtonen en etnische minderheden moeten zich volledig aanpassen aan de Nederlandse cultuur' (p. 235).

Table in: M. Adriaansen, W. van der Brug & J. van Spanje, 'De kiezer op drift?', in: Kees Brants & Philip van Praag (red.), *Politiek en media in verwarring. De verkiezingscampagnes in het lange jaar 2002*, p. 234/235.
 'This table shows that already in 1994 there was little support for multiculturalism under the Dutch population. In those days more than 60% already had the opinion that minorities should adapt to 'the Dutch culture'(positions 5,6 and 7). (…) In 2002 the overall climate further moved into the direction of

uniculturalism (70 percent and only 14 percent supporting multiculturalism). So based on the majority opinion of the Dutch electorate in 1994 already a lot of support existed in 1994 in favour of a uniculturalistic policy towards immigrants' (translation RC).

A snapshot of the Dutch case

In the Netherlands during the last year we experienced a dramatic shift**.** First we had a strong climate of political correctness. For a long time, shame about the colonial past and the memory of the Holocaust guaranteed a high level of tolerance and respect in dealings with ethnic minorities.

This situation was rudely destroyed in the eighties by the rise of extreme right, racist parties propagating xenophobia and hatred of foreigners. A shock for the post-war consensus of 'never again'. The established democratic parties reacted to this with a 'cordon sanitaire'. Migrants were, above all, perceived as victims of racism and discrimination.

What we also did, and this turned out to be a very serious mistake afterwards, was putting a 'cordon sanitaire' not only around these nasty racist parties, but also around the topics of these parties: the overstretch of immigration, problems of integration and segregation, high unemployment and crime rates, 'multicultural discontent'', especially within the constituencies of the social-democratic people's parties.

So, political correctness turned a blind eye to the shadow sides of immigration and the multi-ethnic society and to the people who experienced this transformation day-by-day in their neighbourhoods.

The final blow came from the Pim Fortuyn Movement, a populist revolt of citizens, directed against the political correct taboos of the political elites, especially the social-democrats, and against the dangers of (non reformed)Islam for a progressive-libertarian society as the Dutch.

The climate changed drastically. You should speak **of** a pre-Fortuyn era and a post-Fortuyn era in the Netherlands, concerning these issues. In terms of Kriesi c.s.: ''the emergence of a populist party on the right gives rise to a move of the centre of gravity of the party system in the direction of cultural demarcation/protectionism'. [26] All mainstream political parties more or less adopted the Pim Fortuyn program, in terms of stricter immigration and tougher integration measures, including the Dutch Left. The New Post-Fortuyn Consensus could be characterised as: 1. limit (unskilled) immigration; 2. foster integration by all means (''inburgering''; Dutch citizenship programs); 3. fight discrimination and racism.

Nevertheless, things got out of balance. There has been a risky overreaction and polarisation by the conservative centre-right government of Balkenende, especially by the right-wing populist Minister for Immigration and Integration, Rita Verdonk of the liberal-conservative VVD party. Instead of being perceived as victims of racism, migrants are now perceived as a burden, a social problem or a danger. A burden to the welfare state, a social problem because of segregation and the violation of women's rights; and a danger because of crime and terrorism. The government was one-sidedly communicating repression, distrust and law and order. This caused a terrible climate of 'we against them' which is completely counterproductive for what is so urgently needed.

It's my strong conviction that progressives in the long run have the task too construct **a** Greater Us, a greater we. A binding story of solidarity and belonging; a bridge between cultures and ethnic groups. Not because of outdated and naive political correctness, but as the only way to maintain

the European tradition of solidarity (which is under strong pressure nowadays: we could end up in a full Americanisation of Europe). And we also urgently need a greater We for reasons of state security and citizens security. In order to combat terrorism, and eliminate the home-grown breeding ground for terrorism, we should improve at nearly all costs the relations of the Dutch mainstream society with the migrant communities. We need to put a giant plan into work to improve employment, education, housing, social and political participation. The new historic mission of social democracy is to start the emancipation process all over again. There is no other way.

But the price to pay for these noble ideals and ambitions is to say goodbye to the concept of the multicultural society. That's a hard choice to make, but I think that the concept of multiculturalism has caused a lot of harm and confusion, both for migrants and for the native Dutchmen. We can only win the heart and minds of all people in society for such a ''investment in emancipation'' plan, if there is a fundamental trade-off between migrants and native inhabitants in terms of a full and loyal orientation at the host country by migrants at the one hand, and acceptance of a multi-ethnic and multi-religious future for Holland by native Dutchmen at the other hand. But the concept of multiculturalism stands in the way here.

So, in the post-Fortuyn Netherlands there has been a radical change of tack from subsidised multiculturalism to mandatory integration and 'citizenship' measures (language and elementary cultural education), also as far as possible with retrospective effect for 'oldcomers' – immigrants of the first generation who have been living here for a long time.[27]

The signals are set more for integration, for more obligatory co-existence between autochthonous and immigrant residents. The patterns of segregation in education (the Netherlands has traditionally applied confessional education and thus has Islamic schools), housing and social contacts are increasingly causing concern in areas where they continue to result in above-average unemployment, school truancy and crime. These statistics are generating more and more tension between solidarity and diversity and in theory form a threat to the sustainability of the European welfare state model, with its delicate balance between horizontal and vertical solidarity.[28]

Even Islamic fundamentalist terrorism can have the perverse positive side-effect that, simply for reasons of state security and citizen safety, there are increased calls for mutual approach and cooperation between immigrant communities and the autochthonous population.[29]

In short, there is a great and increasing urgency for an anti-segregation offensive, against living back to back, against separated parallel societies, leaving in tact the 'multicultural society' in the private sphere (as long as it is compatible with the laws of constitutional liberal democracy), but urgently looking for ways to marry ethnic and cultural diversity with a common national identity. "The biggest question in all in modern Europe is how majorities can express their local and national identities without alienating minorities? How can outsiders be made to feel at home without making insiders feel that they have become strangers in their own home?" [30]

There is a growing need for a uniting, bridging national identity, a bigger Us. This is required for 'majority reassurance' (Goodhart) and for the social acceptance and socio-economic success of immigrants. How could European countries pretend to differ from the experience of historical immigration like the US, where the umbrella of American (political-cultural) identity is a prerequisite for successful 'multicultural' integration and where patriotism produces a sense of belonging across ethnic and cultural heritage?

The concept of national identity as a replacement for multiculturalism can, viewed thus, be both

a problem and a solution. It is a dangerous term in the closed, xenophobic, ethnocentric variant; but in the open, tolerant variant it can promote supra-ethnic community formation and solidarity, can promote bridging and social, colour-blind cohesion.

The migration of highly skilled labour à la cosmopolitan London is essential for a creative economy such as in the Netherlands, but broad public support for this can only arise (again) if we become really clear again about what integration is and what it is not, about the boundaries, rights and obligations of 'fellow citizenship' and if the process falls into line with what the great majority of Dutch people see as fair, civilised and reasonable. The final goal could well be "assimilation with retention of one's own cultural identity" (Cuperus): 'hyphenated immigrants', so to speak, comparable to the US-experience.[31] This is, by the way, relatively much easier in the United Kingdom, with its umbrella identity of Britishness, related to both the Commonwealth and the English-speaking world, than in countries such as the Netherlands, Denmark or Germany![32]

The Netherlands is obliged by its history (Holocaust, apartheid) to be an open, cosmopolitan, non-racial society – but then preferably one not based on closed ethnic-traditional communities, but rather on individual citizenship, irrespective of ethnicity and religion. There is a non-racial understanding of national identity in the Netherlands – the Afro-Dutch from the former colonies (Surinamese, Antilleans) are mostly well-integrated. Things are more difficult with the population of 1.0. Million Muslims in the Netherlands, mainly Moroccans and Turks who – due in part to marriage-based immigration and family formation – repeatedly have problems with integration. These groups often originate from traditional rural areas with a large cultural and religious gap between them and the progressive-libertarian culture of the Netherlands (research shows that xenophobic sentiments in the Netherlands are held by highly educated women and homosexuals in larger towns and cities who are afraid of the discriminating intolerance of the Muslim immigrants).

Multiculturalism even may be considered the ideology of segregation. This points at the core problem that multicultural segregation through collective group formation along ethnic, cultural or religious lines is strongly at odds with the model of a Western, emancipated, individualised society, where individuals are not for ever 'overlapping' with their ethnic and cultural traditional communities. One of the main battlegrounds between western culture and non-western culture, the clash between individualism and traditional collectivism, is ill-addressed by the concept of multiculturalism, to put it mildly. Is multiculturalism in its final consequences not the ideology of apartheid?

Moreover, if multicultural segregation, despite all theory, results practically in ghettos of the deprived, for European social democracy these must surely be an intolerable cultural and socio-economic scandal, to be prevented by all means.

Concluding observations

This essay examined unease and popular distrust, an instable undercurrent in European society, with particular reference to the issue of threatened national identity. In dealing with the theme of national identity I ventured into tricky terrain, certainly for centre-left progressives who mostly prefer to sing a post-national cosmopolitan and laconic multiculturalist melody. National identity is understood in a broad sense, because it seems typically European that it is precisely the social model of the post-war welfare state and the social market economy which form a substantial part of the positive self-image of various European populations. The unease is to be found in the

perception of threat and undermining of national characteristics through processes of internationalisation: on the one hand the globalisation of production of goods and services as well as capital markets and the apparently boundless European unification, and on the other hand a seemingly uncontrollable immigration and the development of multi-ethnic societies with problems of integration, segregation and multicultural 'confusion'. Research is showing that immigration, except for Britain till 2005, has become the most salient and much polarising issue since the 1970s. In some eurosceptic countries (Switzerland, Britain and new: the Netherlands), the question of European Unification is also part of the new political-cultural conflict. According to Kriesi c.s., this cultural dimension has become the primary basis on which new parties or transformed established parties seek to mobilize their electorate.[33]

Contrary to the gospel of the ultra-modern pundits who advocate the self-abolition of the nation state in favour of new regional power centres, instable and dislocating undercurrents in European society require not only prudence in modernisation and innovation but also the rehabilitation of and return to the nation state as a forum for restoration of trust, as an anchor in uncertain times, as a renewed test case for socio-economic performance, as a source of social cohesion between the less and the better educated, between immigrants and the autochthonous population. A restoration of trust between politicians and citizens will have to take place at the national level, as will the creation of a harmonious multi-ethnic society. Europe must facilitate this process, and not obstruct it. In other words, the future of the EU, the European Social Model and a harmonious multi-ethnic society lies with the nation state. The motto for the coming period of transition is therefore: *How the nation states must rescue the European Union and the multicultural society!* (freely rendered from Alan Milward). [34]

[Another version of this essay has been published in: Policy Network, *Rethinking Immigration and Integration: a New Centre-Left Agenda*, London, UK, 2007]

---

[1] CF. my contribution published in Dissent, ''The Fate of European Populism'', *Dissent*, Spring 2004, p. 17-20.

2 Cf. R. Manin, *The Principles of Representative Government*: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

3 Yves Mény and Yves Surel, 'The Constitutive Ambiguity of Populism', in: Y. Mény and Y. Surel (eds.), *Democracies and the Populist Challenge*. Palgrave, 2002, p. 15

4 Cf. Michael Ehrke, *Rechtspopulismus in Europa*: Die Meuterei der Besitzstandswahrer, Analyse International Policy Analysis Unit, p. 3.; also Meindert Fennema, *Populist Parties of the Right* (IMES Paper, 23 July 2001).

[5] See the anti-reform results of the recent Austrian national elections, see the French and Dutch No-vote at the European Constitution; see the electoral penetration of the ''Vlaams Belang'' party in Flanders or Le Pen in France. Recent polls in *Le Monde* suggest that up to 25% of French electorate agree with the basic ideas of Le Pen.

6 Tjitske Akkerman, 'Populism and Democracy: Challenge or Pathology?, in: *Acta Politica*, 2003, 38 (147-159)

[7] M. Elchardus & Wendy Smits, *Anatomie en oorzaken van het wantrouwen*, VUBpress, 2002. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (SCP), *De sociale staat van Nederland 2005. 21minuten.nl*, Report of McKinsey and Company, 2005.

[8] On the causes and backgrounds of the Populist Revolt, see: René Cuperus, 'Roots of European Populism: The Case of Pim Fortuyn's Populist Revolt in the Netherlands', in: Xavier Casals (ed.), *Political Survival on the Extreme Right. European Movements between the inherited past and the need* to adapt to the future', Institut de Ciènces Polítiques I Socials (ICPS), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, p. 147 – 168, Barcelona, 2005; René Cuperus, 'The Fate of European Populism', in: *Dissent* (Spring 2004), p. 17-20; René Cuperus, 'The populist deficiency of European social democracy: the Dutch experience'. In: Matt Browne & Patrick Diamond (eds.), *Rethinking social democracy*, London, Policy Network, 2003, p.29-41.

[9] The conservative-liberal VVD in the Netherlands is split between a traditional liberal wing and a new right wing populist wing under leadership of Immigration Minister Rita Verdonk; also inside the German Christian Democrats right wing populist voices can be heart, especially at Bundesland-level.

[10] Cf. Ivan Krastev, 'The new Europe: respectable populism and clockwork liberalism', www.openDemocracy.net; and 'The Challenge of the New Populism', Centre for Liberal Strategies conference Sofia, may 2006.

[11] Cf. Hans-Jürgen Puhle, ''Zwischen Protest und Politikstil: Populismus, Neo-Populismus und Demokratie'', in: N. Werz (Hrsg.), *Populismus. Populisten in Ubersee und Europa*, Opladen, 2003, p.15-43.

[12] HansPeter Kriesi (and others), "Globalization and the transformation of the national political space: Six European countries compared'', in: *European Journal of Political Research*, 45/2006, p. 921-956. The term ''The new populist European Revolt' is not theirs, but mine.

[13] Ibidem, p. 922.

[14] A. Abedi, "Challenges to established parties: The effects of party system features on the electoral fortunes of anti-political-establishment parties", in: *European Journal of Political Research*, 41 (4), 551-583.

[15] Kees van Kersbergen and André Krouwel, 'De buitenlanderskwestie in de politiek in Europa', in: Huib Pellikaan & Margo Trappenburg (red*.), Politiek in de multiculturele samenleving*, p. 195-196. Beleid en Maatschappij Jaarboek/Boom, 2003.

16 G. Esping-Andersen, D. Gallie, A, Hemerijck, J. Myles, *Why We Need a New Welfare State*, Oxford University Press, 2002.

17 William Pfaff, ''What's Left of the Union? In': *New York Review of Books*, september 2005. William Pfaff: "Nationalism is an expression of the intense need for affirmation of national or communal identity as the anchor of individual identity. It is one of the fundamental forces at work in political societies, giving them meaning. It is also one of the 'strong' forces in the physics of international relations, if not the strongest. It overrides short-term deviation or distraction. Although it may accompany high-minded internationalism, it does not readily yield to it; the repressed returns. For this reason nationalism has to be accommodated, not stubbornly resisted."

[18] Here I follow the line of thought and argumentation of the Dutch Council for Social Development (RMO) in its report 'National Identity' as an unimpeachable, neutral source in this delicate minefield. The Council explores the field of tension between feelings of national identity and processes of ongoing internationalisation as they manifest themselves in European unification and the multi-ethnic development of our society. Cf. S.W. Couwenberg (red.), *Nationale identiteit. Van Nederlands probleem tot Nederlandse uitdaging.* Civis Mundi jaarboek 2001, p. 9.

19 RMO-advies. *Nationale identiteit in Nederland. Internationalisering en nationale identiteit*, advies 9, september 1999. Cf. Koen Koch & Paul Scheffer (red.), *Het nut van Nederland. Opstellen over soevereiniteit en identiteit*, 1996.

[20] Cf. 'De publieke opinie over Europa', in: *Europese tijden. Europese Verkenning 3*, bijlage bij de Staat van de Europese Unie 2006, Centraal Planbureau & Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

21 Interview in *de Volkskrant*, 17 September 2005.

[22] See also: R. Cuperus, K. Dufek & J. Kandel (Eds.), *The Challenge of Diversity. European Social Democracy Facing Migration, Integration and Multiculturalism,* Forum Scholars for European Social Democracy/StudienVerlag, Innsbruck, 2003.

[23] Race relations is for Continental Europeans a problematic word, containing even Nazi-associations. On the Continent the whole concept and terminology of race is not used any more, hidden under layers of history.

[24] David Goodhart, 'Britain's Glue', in: A. Giddens and P. Diamond (eds.), *The New Egalitarism*, p. 170.

[25] Kees Brants & Philip van Praag (red.), *Politiek en media in verwarring. De verkiezingscampagnes in het lange jaar 2002*, Het Spinhuis, 2005, p. 235

[26] Kriesi, op. cit, p. 945.

[27] Cf. René Cuperus, ''From Polder Model to Postmodern Populism. Five Explanations for the ''Fortuyn Revolt'' in the Netherlands'', in: R. Cuperus, K. Duffek, J. Kandel (eds*.), The Challenge of Diversity. European Social Democracy Facing Migration, Integration and Multiculturalism*, Forum Scholars for European Social Democracy/StudienVerlag, 2003, p. 276-301. See also: Rinke van den Brink, *In de greep van de angst. De Europese sociaal-democratie en het rechtspopulisme*, Houtekiet, 2005.

[28] David Goodhart on the trade-off of solidarity and diversity; see also Warren House Speech Wouter Bos at website Policy Network

[29] Cf. Tariq Modood, 'Remaking multiculturalism', www.Opendemocracy, 29-9-2005.

[30] David Goodhart, p. 170.

[31] Francis Fukuyama, 'Nexus Lecture: The Future of Democracy, Culture and Immigration" :'Een liberale democratie is niet cultureel neutraal', *NRC Handelsblad*, 1 oktober 2005.

[32] Cf. Stephen Howe, ''Britishness and Multiculturalism'', in: *The Challenge of Diversity* (note 30).

[33] Kriesi, op. cit., 950.

[34] Alan Millward, *The European rescue of the nation-state*, 1992.