



**THE IMPACT OF REFUGEE CRISIS ON
POPULISM IN EUROPE: A SUPRANATIONAL
ANALYSIS**

OSMAN TUFAN

Master's Thesis

Graduate School

Izmir University of Economics

İzmir

2021

**THE IMPACT OF REFUGEE CRISIS ON POPULISM IN
EUROPE: A SUPRANATIONAL ANALYSIS**

OSMAN TUFAN

A Thesis Submitted to
The Graduate School of İzmir University of Economics
Master Program in Political Science and International Relations

İzmir

2021

ABSTRACT

THE IMPACT OF REFUGEE CRISIS ON POPULISM IN EUROPE: A SUPRANATIONAL ANALYSIS

Tufan, Osman

Master Program in Political Science and International Relations

Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Serhun AL

January, 2021

Populism has recently been an enormously debated issue in the political science literature. However, populism is not a newly emerged concept in the literature because populism firstly appeared in the United States and Russia in the late 19th century. Then, it expanded to Latin America as a result of the economic crises in the mid-20th century. In Europe, on the other hand, populism firstly ascended in the late 20th and 21st centuries with the effects of taxation, globalization, 2008 financial crisis, Eurozone problem, and European enlargement and so on. The refugee crisis in 2015 also triggered populist parties to broaden their places in the political arena because people, who were alienated from the current system and elites and perceived the refugees, migrants and asylum seekers as cultural and economic threats, started to look for the political alternatives. Therefore, populist parties, which mainly have the

features of creating antagonistic relations as “*people vs. elites*” and “*people vs. strangers*”, prioritizing people’s demands and sovereignty, criticizing the elites and establishment, having exclusionist attitudes toward refugees and supporting the socio-cultural integrity and purity, stood out in Europe. Nevertheless, the current literature focuses on populism studies at a national level.

In this regard, this thesis indicates populism is not confined to national level by conducting a supranational analysis through the discourses of the political groups of the European Parliament. As a result, this study illustrates how the right-wing and left-wing political group differentiates from one another in their populist discourses despite having similar populist features.

Keywords: Populism, Refugee Crisis, Migration, Asylum Seekers, European Parliament

ÖZET

MÜLTECİ KRİZİNİN AVRUPA'DA POPÜLİZME ETKİSİ: ULUSLARÜSTÜ BİR İNCELEME

Tufan, Osman

Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Serhun AL

Ocak, 2021

Popülizm, siyaset bilimi literatüründe son zamanlarda oldukça tartışılan bir konu olsa da tarihte ilk olarak 19.yüzyılın sonlarında Amerika Birleşik Devletleri ve Rusya'da ortaya çıkması nedeniyle yeni bir kavram değildir. 20.yüzyılın ortalarında popülizm, ekonomik krizlerin etkisiyle Latin Amerika'ya yayılmıştır. Avrupa'da ise vergilendirmenin, küreselleşmenin, 2008 finansal krizinin, Euro bölgesi borç sorunun ve Avrupa Birliğinin genişlemesinin etkileri ile ilk olarak 20.yüzyılın sonlarında ve 21.yüzyılda yükselişe geçmiştir. 2015 yılında Suriye ve diğer Orta Doğu ülkelerinde yaşanan karışıklıklar nedeni ile ortaya çıkan mülteci krizi de popülizmin siyasi arenada yerini genişletmesine neden olmuştur. Bu durumun nedeni ise mevcut sistem ve seçkinlerden uzaklaşan; mültecileri, göçmenleri ve sığınmacıları kültürel ve ekonomik tehdit olarak algılayan insanların, alternatif partilere yönelmesidir.

Böylece insanları seçkinlerin ve yabancıların karşısına yerleştirerek zıt bir ilişki kurma, insanların taleplerini ve egemenliğine öncelik verme, seçkinleri ve kurulu eleştirme, mültecilere karşı dışlayıcı tutumlar sergileme ve sosyo-kültürel bütünlük ile saflığın korunması destekleme gibi özellikler sergilen popülist partiler Avrupa’da ön plana çıkmıştır. Ancak, mevcut literatür ulusal düzeydeki popülizm çalışmalarına odaklanmaktadır. Bu bağlamda söz konusu tez, Avrupa Parlamentosu’ndaki siyasi grupların söylemleri aracılığı ile uluslararası bir inceleme gerçekleştirerek popülizmin ulusal düzeyle sınırlı kalmadığını göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak ilgili tez, benzer popülist özellikler gösterecek de sağ ve sol kanat siyasi grupların popülist söylemlerinde birbirinden nasıl farklılaştığına ışık tutmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Popülizm, Mülteci Krizi, Göç, Sığınmacılar, Avrupa Parlamentosu

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Serhun AL, for his guidance and insight through the research. I am also grateful for my dearest family who always believes in me and stands behind me. Finally, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to my friend, Berfu SOLAK, who shares her precious experiences in this path with me and encourages me.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	8
2.1. <i>Populism: Its Definitions and Characteristics</i>	8
2.2. <i>Populism and Media</i>	16
2.3. <i>Populism and Democracy</i>	17
CHAPTER 3: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	20
3.1. <i>Populism in 19th Century</i>	21
3.2. <i>Populism in the Mid-20th Century</i>	21
3.3. <i>Populism in the Late 20th and 21st Centuries</i>	22
3.4. <i>Populism and Refugee Crisis in 2015</i>	27
3.5. <i>Populist Traces within the Europe</i>	31
CHAPTER 4: THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND POPULISM	39
4.1. <i>A Brief Information on the European Parliament</i>	39
4.2. <i>The Group of the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats) – (EPP)</i> . 41	
4.2.1. <i>General Overview of the EPP Discourses</i>	42
4.2.2. <i>Analysis of the EPP Discourses Before 2015</i>	46
4.2.3. <i>Analysis of the EPP Discourses After 2015</i>	51
4.3. <i>Groups of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (S&D)</i>	57
4.3.1. <i>General Overview of the S&D Discourses</i>	58

4.3.2. <i>Analysis of the S&D Discourses Before 2015</i>	61
4.3.3. <i>Analysis of the S&D Discourses After 2015</i>	66
4.4. <i>Renew Europe – Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE)</i>	73
4.4.1. <i>General Overview of Renew Europe Group Discourses</i>	74
4.4.2. <i>Analysis of Renew Europe Group Discourses After 2015</i>	75
4.5. <i>Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance (Greens/EFA)</i>	81
4.5.1. <i>General Overview of Green/EFA Discourses</i>	82
4.5.2. <i>Analysis of Greens/EFA Discourses Before 2015</i>	83
4.5.3. <i>Analysis of Greens/EFA Discourses After 2015</i>	89
4.6. <i>Identity and Democracy Group (ID)</i>	94
4.6.1. <i>General Overview of the ID Group Discourses</i>	94
4.6.2. <i>Analysis of the ID Group Discourses After 2015</i>	99
4.7. <i>European Conservatives and Reformists Group (ECR)</i>	106
4.7.1. <i>General Overview of the ECR Group Discourses</i>	106
4.7.2. <i>Analysis of the ECR Group Discourses Before 2015</i>	110
4.7.3. <i>Analysis of the ECR Group Discourses After 2015</i>	114
4.8. <i>Confederal Group of the European Left – Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL)</i> .	120
4.8.1. <i>General Overview of GUE/NGL Discourses</i>	120
4.8.2. <i>Analysis of GUE/NGL Discourses Before 2015</i>	123
4.8.3. <i>Analysis of GUE/NGL Discourses After 2015</i>	128
4.9. <i>Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group (EFDD)</i>	134
4.9.1. <i>General Overview of the EFDD Group Discourses</i>	134
4.9.2. <i>Analysis of the EFDD Group Discourses Before 2015</i>	135
4.9.3. <i>Analysis of the EFDD Group Discourses After 2015</i>	138
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION	141
REFERENCES.....	156

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Shares of Votes and Seats of the Populist Parties at the Latest National Elections across the EU Member States	37
Figure 2. The European Parliament Election Results in 2014 & 2019	41
Figure 3. Criticism of Establishment as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups Before 2015	145
Figure 4. Rejection of Others as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups Before 2015.....	146
Figure 5. People-Centrism as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups Before 2015.....	148
Figure 6. Criticism of Establishment as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups After 2015.....	150
Figure 7. People-Centrism as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups After 2015.....	152
Figure 8. Rejection of Others as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups After 2015.....	153

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- AfD: Alternative für Deutschland - Alternative for Germany
- ALDE: Group of Alliance and Liberals and Democrats for Europe
- AN: Alleanza Nazionale - National Alliance
- BNP: The British National Party
- EASO: European Asylum Support Office
- ECHR: European Court of Human Rights
- ECR: European Conservatives and Reformists Group
- EFDD: Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group
- ENF: Europe of Nations and Freedom
- EPP: Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats)
- EU: European Union
- EUROSUR: The European Border Surveillance System
- FI: Forza Italia - Forward Italy
- FN: Front National
- FPÖ: Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs - Freedom Party
- Frontex: Frontières Extérieures - The European Border and Coast Guard Agency
- Greens/EFA: Groups of the Greens/European Free Alliance
- GUE/NGL: Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left
- ID: Identity and Democracy
- LN: Lega Nord - Northern League
- LPF: Lijst Pim Fortuyn - Pim Fortuyn List
- MEPs: Members of European Parliament
- NI: Non-attached Members
- PDL: Il Popolo della Libertà - The People of Freedom
- PDS: the Socialist Unity Party of Democratic Socialism
- PVV: Partij voor de Vrijheid - Party for Freedom
- S&D: Groups of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament
- UDC: Unione dei Democratici Cristiani e di Centro - Union of Christian and Centre Democrats
- UKIP: The UK Independence Party

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Populism is a political concept which has been widely examined by many scholars for years. Canovan (2004) states that populism is derived from the word of “*public*” in general in Latin and from the word of “*populus*” meaning “*crowded*” depending on its usage. “*Populus*” refers to people as sovereign, people as nations and “*ordinary people*” as adversary of the governing elites.

However, definitions of populism in the political science literature broadly vary from ideology to thin-centered ideology, discourse to rhetoric, and political strategy to political style or communication style. In spite of these different definitions, populism is generally accepted as a concept which ordinary people’s views and opinions should take priority over the elites’, and which the establishment is criticized due to its mistaken actions and judgments as well as its negligence of people. Besides, since a group of populists emphasizes the homogeneity and purity of people, they can take hostile attitudes to the strangers who can threaten this united structure of the people. Populists stress that these strangers, who do not belong to the society, like refugees and asylum seekers, can be majority in a country where local people have been dwelling for years. Therefore, populists underline that the cultures, values, religion and lifestyles of these strangers may take over the ones of the local people, and they can take advantage of jobs and social benefits which the local people need to benefit. In other words, populists form antagonistic connections between people and elites, and between people and strangers.

In addition, populists argue the demands of people are not sufficiently represented in the current political system; therefore, they advocate direct democracy or referendum in order to reflect people’s opinions more frequently in the politics. Furthermore, according to populists, corrupt elites and established institutions like politicians and political parties do not represent people genuinely and aware of people’s true wills and demands. For this reason, populists underscore the importance of people’s will and popular sovereignty.

As a result of its chameleonic disposition, populism can take place in right and left political ideologies. This different position of populism only influences their target audiences on which they focus without altering their precedence to people, criticism of elites and establishment. For example, right-wing populists criticize elites, who

are open-minded, liberal, and have approving views minority rights, diversity, racial equality and multiculturalism, for ignoring people's demands on stricter immigration strategies (Norris, and Inglehart, 2019). However, left-wing populists criticize elites, who are hugely prosperous, for neglecting the needs of working people.

Besides, populism is not a concept which has recently come into light. The traces of populism were firstly observed in the 19th century in Russia with a movement called Russian Narodism, and in the United States of America with the People's Party, both of which had rural substances. Subsequently, populism spread into the Latin American countries in mid-20th century with the notable figures such as Vargas in Brazil and Peron in Argentina and with a special focus on economic problems and economic dependence.

Moreover, in the later 20th century, populism set out a transatlantic journey and stepped in European soils. Tax collection, economic and cultural globalization, open international trade in Europe sparked the emergence of populist parties in the late 20th century. Afterwards, economic and budget crises in 21st century as well as European integration and rising political and democratic distrust led to the second upsurge of populism across Europe.

On the other hand, refugee crisis is one of the greatest humanitarian problems of the 21st century. The civil war in Syria, political unrests in other Middle Eastern countries and African countries in 2015 led most of their citizens to abandon their homes and to seek refuge in neighboring and remote regions in order to save and sustain their lives. Europe is one of these regions which witnessed an unprecedented influx of refugees; therefore, many European countries, the ones in the southern part in particular, were blindsided by this situation. Consequently, some of these European countries initiated to take preventive measures against the refugees due to the fact that the refugees could disrupt the social, cultural and economic structures of the European society. In this context, radical right and populist parties took a chance to broaden their base in Europe because these populist parties had generally discriminative behavior against the migrants due to being Muslim, tried to restrict their arrival to Europe, and supported the national sovereignty of their own country to make decisions on status of migrants and refugees.

In this regard, the existing academic literature mainly focuses on populism, its

definitions and variations, its impact on democracies and its relation with social, cultural and economic problems and so on through the political parties or leaders within a specific country. Nonetheless, there is a gap in the literature in terms of analysis of populism in combination with the refugee crisis in a level different from the national level. Thus, this thesis contributes to the existing literature by analyzing the impact of the refugee crisis on populism at a supranational level with the following research question:

- How did the refugee crisis affect populism in Europe?

In this sense, the thesis examines how the refugee crisis caused the political groups in the European Parliament to have populist discourses because the existing literature exposes that numerous populist parties across Europe such as Freedom Party in Austria, Front National in France, Alternative for Germany and Party for Freedom in the Netherlands had repercussions in Europe, defended the unity and purity of European culture and society, embraced hostile and anti-immigrant stances, and complained about the policies of the current elites and establishment in relation to migration, refugee crisis and asylum. However, the political groups within the European Parliament have not yet been analyzed in terms of the relation between refugee crisis and populism. For this reason, it is possible to observe populist traces among the political groups within the European Parliament because the political groups, which are formed on the basis of political affinity, include the members of the national parties from the each member state.

In this context, this research sheds a light on how the right-wing and left-wing political groups embraced populist reaction against the refugee crisis and on how the functionality or credibility of the European Union were addressed by the political groups within the European Parliament. Besides, the thesis enables to compare the political groups' trajectory of populist discourses before and after 2015 by taking into account the starting date of the refugee crisis as 2015. It demonstrates what the political groups focused on before and after 2015 in terms of refugee crisis.

The thesis analyzes its research question by benefiting from discourse analysis which is one of the mostly resorted qualitative research methods in the political science and international analysis as well as in the other disciplines of the social sciences such as media, sociology, linguistic and cultural studies. The core components of discourse

analysis are mainly texts such as newspaper excerpts, reports, social media posts, brochures and related documents, which contain numerous details and information to be disclosed (Halperin, and Heath, 2012).

Fairclough (2003) stresses that discourse analysis includes the examination of language which is an indivisible party of social life; therefore, language should be at the center of a social research. Furthermore, according to Fairclough (2003), discourse analysis possesses a textual essence, and this analysis needs to focus on both the theoretical association with discourse and on alterations in the speaking or writing process of people.

Discourse analysis is used to comprehend how the meaning is constructed and duplicated in a wider context through examining the parts of discourse like opinions and concepts, evaluating their association with the context in terms of the message, medium, receiver and its relation to other parts, and assessing the creation of the context that is molded by the power and authority relationship (Halperin, and Heath, 2012).

Baş, and Akturan (2008) as cited in Ekşi and Çelik mention that the main aim of discourse analysis is either explanation or interpretation. Discourse analysis is used to widen an existing information, thought and sentiment, and to assess the existence and message of discourses identifying faith, attitude and actions rather than giving a final answer to a certain question.

Discourse analysis is also an important methodology for construing social phenomena and social communication structure, and language is an exclusive component of this analysis. Textual analysis is a crucial element of discourse analysis because language manifests itself in a textual form in social communication styles. Therefore, text refers to any written product ranging from newspaper articles to shopping lists, from and social media posts to reports (Özdemir, 2010).

Furthermore, Norris and Inglehart (2019) state that the analysis of populist discourse can be implemented through social media posts, statements of political parties and leaders in the press, visual and textual contents in media and speeches. Along with the political parties and political party leaders, populist discourse can be observed in other performers such as political organizations, media channels, social movements, and different leaders and politicians. The analysis of populist discourses can be

carried out by addressing negative sentimental signals like fear, threat and animosity, appeal to people, and critique of elites and establishment.

In terms of applying discourse analysis in a study, it is attempted to scrutinize the connection between the discourse and a specific context owing to the fact that the discourse analysis aims at discovering the linkage between the discourse and reality within a distinct context. Furthermore, it is also believed that the discourses should be examined in their specific social and historical contexts so that the reality or meaning they constitute can be vividly figured out. In order for this scrutinization to be conducted, a particular type of text is used and how the language, expressions, figures of speeches etc. of this text produces reality is analyzed. Besides, another step of the analysis is to execute a backward inference so as to observe how the discourse-driven production builds a framework via the factual instances (Halperin, and Heath, 2012).

Accordingly, in order to study the populism at supranational level, in particular within the European Parliament, following the refugee crisis by benefiting from discourse analysis, a great number of discourses have been selected from the websites of the five political groups within the European Parliament which are Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats), Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats, Renew Europe Group, formerly known as Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance, European Conservatives and Reformist Group and Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left. Furthermore, the rest of the discourses have been taken from the social media accounts of Identity and Democracy Group, and Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group which has not currently located among the political groups for the 2019 – 2023 political term, as it has not been possible to reach their websites or they have had restricted content for the analysis.

The selection of discourses from these political groups of the European Parliament is composed of the passages of the news and contents published in their own websites, statements of the Members of the European Parliament affiliated with these political groups, excerpts of the position papers, policy papers and reports prepared by the political groups and the social media posts released in their accounts.

The discourses have been collected based on some specific keywords such as refugees, refugee crisis, immigration/migration, asylum and border protection before and after 2015 so as to evaluate comparatively the influence of the refugee crisis on populism at a supranational level. However, it was unable to reach the discourses of the certain political groups before 2015 due to the fact that their websites did not allow access for that period. Besides, as the language of some texts was not English but French, Italian, German or Romanian, they were translated into English through online translation tools like Google Translate for understanding the context and meaning clearly and plainly.

The discourse analysis helps understand and interpret how these political groups use the words and language to articulate their position on the refugee crisis. In addition, the selection of these political groups is important in terms of observing populism which differs according to their political and ideological stances in the European Parliament.

In this context, the thesis is composed of five chapters as introduction, conceptual framework, historical background, European Parliament and populism, and conclusion and discussion. The introduction chapter provides an insight about the thesis subject, the research question and the importance of the thesis by touching upon the brief presentation of conceptual and historical contexts of populism, explaining research question and its analysis process, and depicting the selection of discourses.

The chapter of conceptual framework focuses on the arguments in the literature with regard to the definitions and characteristics of populism, the relation between populism and media, populism and democracy by elaborating how scholars approach and define populism and examine its connections with other concepts.

The chapter of historical background addresses the evolution of populism throughout the history by starting from Russia and the United States of America in 19th century, continuing with Latin America in mid-20th century and Europe in late 20th century, addressing the effect of the economic crisis on populism in Europe in 21st century, and ending with connection between populism and the refugee crisis and populist traces within the Europe.

The chapter of the European Parliament and populism focuses on the brief

information about the European Parliament, its main functions, the European election results of 2014 and 2019, and the examination of each political group by evaluating first generally their discourses irrespective of refugee crisis and then their discourses related to the subject before and after 2015.

The conclusion chapter first readdresses the various interpretations of populism in literature, its general qualities and then provides the evaluation, differentiation between the right-wing and left-wing political groups and comparison between the both periods, touches upon how the European Parliament should take a step, and finally offers recommendation how to elaborate populism studies.



CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Populism: Its Definitions and Characteristics

Populism is a growing issue all over the globe. Not only it has already been in the Latin American countries but also it has recently started to show up in the United States of America and many countries across Europe such as Germany, Netherlands, France, Greece and Spain and etc.

Although the reflections of populism can be observed all around the world, its definition in the existing literature is exceptionally debated issue. There is not any shared agreement on whether populism is a movement, ideology, style, strategy, discourse or rhetoric. According to Akkerman, Mudde, and Zaslove (2014), this ambiguity in the definition of populism results from the fact that it is depended upon the context identifying the ideological stance of the populist leaders and parties and affecting their focal points such as immigration, globalization, Islam and imperialism. Moreover, at the onset of 1990s, populism was also generally regarded as a reckless economic policy due to the financial deficit.

For instance, on the concept of populism, Mudde (2004) argues that two leading renderings exist for populism. While one of them possesses an internal feature and addresses the sentimental rhetoric and features of people, which is empirically difficult to study, the second rendering is about the mutual relationship between the electorate and politics, which refers to be casted by voters through satisfying them.

Moreover, Mudde (2004 p. 543) gives description of populism as an ideology that focuses on the common demand and requests of the people, which is as follows:

“As a an ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogenous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite’, and which argues that politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people.”

According to the description of populism made by Mudde (2004), it is understood that populism is based on the interaction between “*the pure people*” and “*the corrupt elite*”. Within the framework of the description of populism, “*the pure people*” is the good group whereas the “*corrupt elite*” is the evil group, which demonstrates the

pure people are superior to the corrupt elite in moralistic terms (Stoker, and Hay, 2017). Additionally, Rooduijn (2014) regards “*the pure people*” as the people-centrist aspect of populism, referring that there is not an estrangement among people, and that popular sovereignty should be the priority of the politics.

Populism includes a strong commitment to the popular sovereignty and its complete implementation. The will of the people is at the center of the politics and the legitimacy stems from people. A moralistic characteristic is included in the ordinary and simple people making the majority of the country. The will of these majority people should be opposed to the will of the immoral minority who possesses too much power. As it is thought that the majority of people are benefited by the immoral minority, populism has an anti-elitist approach (Abromeit et al. 2015).

Besides, Abts, and Rummens (2007) specify that people are unified, undivided and discernible group that shares a common identity and will. Albertazzi and McDonnell (2008) also contribute that if there were any split among the people, the political and cultural elites would be the main culprits behind it and this split could be surmounted. Brubaker (2017) also adds that people advocated by populism are the ones who have strong family bonds, strive for better economic circumstances, possess common sense, and use simple language as well as being decent.

Even if people are characterized as pure or decent, Brubaker (2017) illustrates that the definition of the concept of the people is also vague as it contains three different interpretations. First, it can refer to the ordinary people and public; hence, to act on behalf of these people against the ones on the top would manifest a redistribution politics. Second, it can be rendered as the sovereign people; therefore, to act on behalf of the sovereign people against the political elites would signify a re-democratization politics. Last, it could mean culturally unified people or nation; thus, to act on behalf of the nation against the menacing foreigners might indicate a culture or ethnicity-oriented politics.

On the other hand, the corrupt elite can also be divided into three groups such as the political elites like the political parties and politicians, the economic elites like the capitalists, bankers and business people and the cultural elites like the academicians, authors, actors and celebrities (Rooduijn, 2014). Besides, the elites are composed of the ones who have well education, institutional powers, and prosperity, and belong to

a different world from the people (Brubaker, 2017). Moreover, the corrupt elites are believed to dispossess people's dominion and they are not the representative of people anymore. For this reason, populists are in an attempt to expose the failures of the existing governing parties and established opposition parties, and their focal point is the issues neglected by the established governing or opposition parties (Louwerse, and Otjes, 2019).

Besides, there is another feature of populism, which depicts that populism is about the righteous and homogenous people against a group of elites and hazardous "others" lacking of the sovereign identity, voice, right and values (Albertazzi, and Mueller, 2013). According to this feature, strangers such as the members of LGBT or the ones who are not the ordinary people from the society such as immigrants or refugees are regarded as others to which the populists are opposed. Mastropaolo (2008), Bobba, and McDonnell (2016) also add that the European populists consider Muslims, political rivals, drug addicts, long-standing unemployed ones, welfare beneficiaries, individuals of the Roma community as the enemies of the people.

It signifies that populists do not recognize the ones from the different social, historical, ethnical, religious and racial backgrounds, and pursue discrimination towards them. Additionally, Abts, and Rummens (2007) state that the ones, who do not suit in the society such as immigrants, strangers, minorities and economic beneficiaries, jeopardize the purity, unity and homogeneity of people. Brubaker (2017) stresses that the others or the ones in the bottom line are labeled as aberrant and deadbeats. Hence, this feature reveals that populism's people-centrist approach has both vertical and horizontal antagonism against the elites and the others.

Furthermore, Schmidt (2018) identifies that there are three components of populism as a political communication style, which are appeal to people, critique of the establishment and rejection of the others. Accordingly, appeal to people signifies that populists use people as a starting point for their actions and behaviors; the critique of the establishment refers that an alienation occurs between people and elites located in the high positions and the established political organizations and mechanisms such as parliaments, courthouses and elections while the rejection of the others means that some groups within the society do not possess the benign qualities as pure and homogenous people do; therefore, they are thought as the perils against the unity of society.

Abts, and Rummens (2007) also define populism as a thin-centered ideology regarding the place of power within the community. It is also contributed that there is another antagonism between people and the prevalent values and opinions of the society as well as the political establishment. Politicians and elites are blamed for giving precedence to their own ideas and interests rather than the ones of people. It means that populists do not accept the values and opinions of elites because they are "*mainstream*" culture in a kind of way. Furthermore, Aslanidis (2016) underlines that populism is a thin-centered ideology, referring that it does not have comprehensive policy suggestions and coherence, and that it adheres itself into complete ideologies such as socialism and liberalism. As a consequence of this adherence of populism into the ideologies, it is aimed to give back the authority of rule and democracy to the people (Albertazzi, and McDonnell, 2008).

However, Norris (2020) argues that populism is not an ideology owing to the fact that it does not equip an understanding of good society and does not propose consistent ideas as the liberalism, socialism or communism do. For this reason, populism can be observed in various political parties and leaders because of its chameleonic nature. It is also addressed that there can be subcategories of an original ideology if its main aspects are disputed. From this point of view, as populism is a debated issue, it has subcategories such as the exclusionary populism, inclusionary populism, neoliberal populism, national populism, and agrarian populism (Aslanidis, 2016). Moffitt, and Tormey (2014) also highlight that populism is not an ideology as it lacks of a broader international networks such as "*Populist International*", it does not involve any important thinker or theoretician, and it does not have a vivid shared history.

Aslanidis (2016) reveals that there are some arguments stressing that populism is a political strategy through which a leader tries to be in the government after their supporters vote for them in a direct way without any institutional requirement, or which emphasizes on conjuring up the hidden public problems and resorting to these emotions. Moreover, Abts, and Rummens (2007) also reveal that there are interpretations of populism in order to incorporate newly formed social groups into the democratic process.

However, according to Aslanidis (2016), accepting populism as a political strategy is not conceptually sufficient because it then means simply an agitation and creating an

exaggerated hope and affirmation towards people. In relation to the conceptualization of populism as a strategy, it is reiterated that it may be misleading since some “*unpopulist*” social movements or types of political actions may seem populist and this conceptualization excludes “*people*” which is the core component of populism (Moffitt, and Tormey, 2014). Consequently, Aslanidis (2016) considers populism as a discourse calling upon the people’s sovereignty that is ignored by the corrupted elites. Thanks to the discourse of populism, people can become aware of the existence of troublesome issues as the corrupt elites manipulate the reality and take over the people’s sovereignty.

Furthermore, Norris (2020) construes populism as a rhetoric that concentrates on the phenomena that the right to rule derives from people and that the establishment is the adversary of people as they are hindering the will of people and are disloyal to people’s trust, are selfish and unreachable. From this point of view, even though populism’s claim on the people-driven right to rule seems democratic, it turns out to be undemocratic when populist leaders call for a direct authority for people and try to disassemble the checks and balances on the executive including their aggression toward the elites like the legislators, political rivals, judges, academicians and experts and the established institutions and systems such as mainstream media and judicial system (Norris, 2020).

In addition to the above-mentioned argument, Otjes, and Louwse (2015) contribute that populists consider that the established political system is unsuccessful to represent people, and that people are left incapable of choosing their own representatives due to the corrupt political elites. For this reason, populism is regarded as a path to restore this structure and let people have the power to select their own representatives. Moreover, the corrupt political elites are thought to be in cooperation with the “*others*” who are not part of people and to protect their benefits and interests.

Moffitt, and Tormey (2014) also designate populism as a political style which has been used by the populist leaders since 1990s by invoking to people-centric politics, threat and crisis issues and improper behaviors that have been neglected by the mainstream politics. This definition of populism as a political style concentrates on how the populist leaders mobilize their supporters in the context of the performative facet of the populist leaders and on how the relationship between the two groups is

influenced. Filc (2015) also states that populism as a political style has more moralistic orientations rather than strict programmatic and organizational structures.

According to Moffitt, and Tormey (2014), it is not appropriate to label populism as an ideology, discourse or organization as they bring the topic into a peculiar position where some issues that is thought as populist show up as “*unpopulist*”. This happens because of populism’s existence on the both political wings as an ideology, of different discourse usages and of vague networks and stiff party discipline in terms of organization.

Furthermore, populism has a fickle nature implying that it can be associated with both the right and left political spectrum, and that they show some differences in terms of their focal points (Louwerse, and Otjes, 2019; Otjes, and Louwerse, 2015). Besides, as populism does not have an optimal kind in contrast to the authoritarianism and democracy, it is commonplace both in the left and right political wing (Jonsson, 2020). It is argued the reason why populism is located in both the left and right wing results from the fact that it is accepted as a thin-centered ideology (Akkerman, Zaslove, and Spruyt, 2017). On the other hand, populism is also considered consistent with the different kinds of regimes and the various social backgrounds as well as being coherent with diverse ideologies and economic structure (Albertazzi, and McDonnell, 2008).

For instance, leftist populist political parties address social and economic problems and put forward that the corrupt political elites give priority to the benefits of business elites instead of the benefits of ordinary working people whereas the rightist populist political parties emphasize that a state should be merely located by people of its nations as the others, who are not parts of the nation, are threatening for the existence of state.

In addition, Abts and Rummens (2007) express that while populism in the right spectrum sees the society from an ethno-nationalist point of view, populism in the left spectrum regards people as working class abused by the bourgeois class. According to the populist right, the elites are accepting the immigrants and refugees while turning a blind eye to their own people, and they are supporting the multiculturalism and accusing the normal people of being racist and xenophobic (Brubaker, 2017).

Therefore, populism's component of "*rejection of the other*" is mostly linked with the parties from the right political spectrum, radical right in particular, compared to the parties in the left or center political spectrum. Nevertheless, it is argued that populist parties not only in the right spectrum but also in the left spectrum resort to the components of "*appeal to people*" and "*critique of the establishment*" of populism. (Schmidt, 2018).

It is also discussed that another common point for both the populist right and the populist left is the hatred against elites. However, one differing point on this issue is that while the liberal ones are accepted as elites by the populist right, the wealthy ones are regarded as elites by the populist left (Blair, 2017). Besides, whereas the populist left considers the businesspeople and business institutions as the hazardous elites, the populist right thinks judges and police forces as the hazardous elites (Akkerman, Zaslove, and Spruyt, 2017). Another shared point between the populist left and right is mentioned to be the fact that they both regard the elites as external parts of the society culturally, economically and politically in addition to be located on the top (Brubaker, 2017).

Norris (2020) illustrates that the populist right parties support the free market economy that the state intervention is very limited and have traditional attitudes toward immigration, nativism, nationalism, LGBT rights and gender equality whereas some of the populist parties located in center left spectrum favor for welfare state and economy but display anti-immigrant and nativist position, and a few of the populist parties bear the progressive features, indicate socialist stance and support liberal values.

On the other hand, it is very possible that the established parties can embrace populist style in their politics in order to challenge the success of the newly formed populist parties (Rooduijn, 2014; Louwse, and Otjes, 2019). For example, the Conservative Party of Britain during the tenure of Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s grasped a populist approach by calling upon the common people of the middle England and attacking the misdeeds of the British elites. In addition, the New Labor during the leadership of Tony Blair also possessed a populist style by claiming they behaved on behalf of the whole nation including every segment of the society (Fella, 2008).

Spruyt, Keppens, and Droogenbroeck (2016) demonstrate that there is a hope-oriented aspect of populism meaning that the hope, which is demolished by the current parties and elites, is tried to be revived by populist actors for common people. According to these common people, populism is a means to sustain their self-esteem and to surmount the obstacles such as ambiguity and apprehension that these people are unable to control. Therefore, this hope-oriented approach differentiates populism from political dissatisfaction and grievances. Besides, the hope-oriented aspect of populism can be witnessed in the rhetoric of populist leaders because they generally employ exaggerations in relation to people's expectations, hopes and fears, and repeat what they say in order to get feedback from the people while addressing to the public (Norris, 2020). It is believed that hope-oriented approach of populism stems from its people-centrism and as a result, the politicians, political leaders and institutions will not be out of touch for the people any longer and they will have a closer relationship (Akkerman, Zaslove and Spruyt, 2017).

Aytaç, and Öniş (2014) contend that populism is a collective movement that a stranger or maverick spearheads in order to attain power by utilizing anti-establishment demands and plebiscitarian connections. In other words, the goal of populism is to change the established system dominated by the elites and to resort to referendums for people and ultimately to take over the power.

Moreover, it is believed that there is a connection between populism and a charismatic leadership since populist political parties are governed by a charismatic leader. In this scope, the charismatic leaders in a populist attitude are regarded as heroes with exceptional features, are imposing speakers who are skillful in evoking the sentiments of people by the addressing the general will of people (McDonnell, 2016).

Müller (2017) also ascertains that populist leaders have a capability to ascertain the common good for people; hence, people tend to choose them. Moreover, it also refers that the populist leaders can accurately ascertain what we accurately consider and they can be quick to consider the accurate thing before we can. Müller (2017) also demonstrates that the populist leaders dominate the political parties meaning that there are subordinates of the populist leader within the political party. The charismatic populist leaders are thought to use a direct language, come up with uncomplicated solutions, resort to the people's sound judgments and condemn the

politicians' sophisticated policy approach (Abts, and Rummens, 2007).

Furthermore, Albertazzi and McDonnell (2008) set forth that the charismatic populist leaders come into the fore among ordinary people, and these leaders maintain being one of the ordinary people by using a simple language and having a plain appearance. As a consequence of being one of the normal people, the charismatic populist leaders are perfectly suitable to become the hero of people as well as touching upon the oppressed feelings of the people.

Lastly, it is also argued that there is a great commitment and faithfulness of the supporters towards the charismatic populist leaders. For this reason, it is strongly believed that the development and salvation will show up thanks to the charismatic populist leaders bearing the outstanding capabilities (Pasquino, 2008). In addition, due to the existence of high faithfulness of the supporters towards the charismatic populist leaders, anyone who challenges the populist leaders, whether or not within a populist party, can be labeled as enemies and scapegoats and put into the category of "others" (Albertazzi, and McDonnell, 2008).

2.2. Populism and Media

The high usage of political differentiation of "us" and "them" by professionals such as political parties, political consultants and lobbyists, and the huge coverage of political elements in the media led to the expansion of populist discourses and behaviors. This coverage in the media supporting to populist antagonism against the elites and publishing sensational news causes the emergence of populist attitudes among the public (Stoker, and Hay, 2017).

Populist parties and leaders also set a strong media in motion and as a result of this strong media factor; they can improve their positions in the politics and affect their followers through the furious rhetoric they use in the media (Blair, 2017). It is asserted that media has catalyzed the acceptance of populist discourse among the public and contributed to the success of populist surge because the media has a tendency to cover the non-routine and unusual issues that have been employed by the populist leaders, and has helped resonate populist style among people (Mazzoleni, 2008).

Mazzoleni (2008) also notes that the populist leaders have a media intellect which

brings them in a reputation before the public, and from which they benefit in order to reach their targets in domestic politics. In addition, it is also put forward that the populist leaders possess an extravagant appearance and follow quarrelsome topics which take attention of the media channels. For instance, the personal allure of Jörg Haider, the press critique of Le Pen and fancy frankness of Pim Fortuyn as well as their address on delicate and contentious issues caught the attention of the media in their respective countries.

On the other hand, Mazzoleni (2008) also specifies that the mainstream media are associated with governing political class and elites, and they give coverage to the topics of the established politics and seek to preserve the established system by minimizing populist message. Nevertheless, people show distrust and anti-established feeling towards these mainstream media for being with the elites. For that reason, this attitude of the mainstream media is triggering the populist rise. Brubaker (2017) also contributes that the populists do not have a confidence in the established mainstream media; thus, they prefer to reach their followers through social media such as Twitter and blogs as Trump, Monti and Wilders did.

2.3. Populism and Democracy

Pasquino (2008) asserts that populism and democracy bear a close relation as the both are thoroughly based upon people, and the concept of people is highly crucial for both of them. On the other hand, Pasquino (2008) also claims that populism and democracy contain a strained connection. This strained connection between populism and democracy originates from the fact that the description of people is being vague because there are different interpretations of people referring to citizens with the rights and duties, nation with the common history, tradition, and ancestry or the class-based people that are the underdogs of the society.

In terms of the relationship between populism and democracy, Abromeit et al. (2015) clarify that populism is against the liberal representative politics and Abts, and Rummens (2007) illustrate that there are some scholars regarding populism as a political style as a redeeming instrument towards representative democracy. Populism is accepted as a way to rectify the defects and unfulfilled commitments of the representative democracy. Through populism, the views of common people are tried to be demonstrated and announced rather than to be represented without

needing the constitutional rights.

Furthermore, Mastropaolo (2008) states that populist parties do not seek to form a brand new system; however, they plan to refurbish the established system which has been deteriorated as a result of the faults of business organizations, finance institutions and trade unions as well as the public officials and political circle.

Therefore, populists want to put the direct democracy in effect rather than the liberal representative politics because it is considered by the populists that long discussions in the parliament and hidden elections are obstructions for the general will of people. Thus, this argument indicates that the referendums can be applied and utilized by the populists as a mechanism to carry out the direct democracy for the will of people.

Besides, Ruth (2018) specifies that liberal democracy is relied on the preservation of the minority groups under the constitution and on the political pluralism; however, populism is inimical to these concepts of liberal democracy due to its opposing and moralistic characteristics. This situation also arises out of populist argument on the fact that the society is comprised of pure and homogenous people; consequently, populism challenges the mechanisms of pluralism such as compromise and mediating institutional organs (Akkerman, Mudde, and Zaslove, 2014). To illustrate, the rightist populist parties, be them in the opposition or government, across the countries within the European Union carry illiberal characteristics due to the fact that they try to curb the rule of law, political rights and civil freedoms, which shake the foundations of the liberal and pluralist European Union (Öniş, and Kutlay, 2020).

In contrast to the pluralist values such as minority rights and civil freedoms, Mastropaolo (2008) contributes to the fact that populism introduces an encompassing and organic view of people addressing on the absoluteness and sanctity of majority rule principle. Nonetheless, the differing point is that it is not contaminated by the established politics' pluralism, intrigues, sophistry and corruption.

To gain seats in parliaments for populist parties is depended on the type of democracies where countries possess. In this regard, Louwerse, and Otjes (2019) have put forward that the likelihood of populist parties to take place in parliaments of countries where consensus democracy exists is higher than the ones of countries where majoritarian democracy has a presence. It is because consensus democracies provide open electoral systems and strong parliaments whereas the single party

governments and closed electoral system prevail in majoritarian democracies. Furthermore, all political parties without exception have the same mechanism to set an agenda, formulate considerable proposals and benefit from examination apparatuses in consensus democracies in contrast to majoritarian democracies where governing parties steer the agenda. In consequence, whether or not populist parties are in government, it is more likely that they can influence the policy agenda and endeavor to pronounce the will of people in the parliaments of consensus democracies.



CHAPTER 3: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Moffitt, and Tormey (2014) put forward that the perceptions of threat, breakdown and crisis have a stimulating influence of the emergence of populism. Crises are associated with the disruption between people and their representatives as well as the threat in terms of military, economic and social, and injustices. Additionally, populism appeared as a reaction against a crisis breaking down people and corrupting the elites (Abromeit et al., 2015). Therefore, populism tries to overcome this situation and give power back to people. From this perspective, populism is an attempt to take action in a more swift and resolute manner and to use clear and straightforward discourse. Albertazzi, and McDonnell (2008) also mention that the populist leaders or parties call upon the perception of crisis and propose liberation ways in order to awaken the quiet and suppressed people so that they can take action without losing much time.

In this respect, populism has had three different kinds such as agrarian, Latin American and new-right populism in Europe throughout history, all of which emerged as a reaction to the certain sorts of crisis or problems. On the one hand, Russian Narodism fighting for the peasantry in Russia, and American People's Party advocating rural economic benefits and opposing capitalism were associated with agrarian populism in late 19th century. On the other hand, the Latin American populism was linked with patriotic, charismatic and authoritarian political leaders like Vargas in Brazil and Peron in Argentina who claimed to be at people's service in 1940s and 1950s. Moreover, the new-right populism was known for its focus on patriotism, crime, migration and tax collection as well as critique of the established politics which was egotistic and ignorant of people's genuine demands (Jagers, and Welgrave, 2007).

Besides, Filc (2015) expresses that the first examples of populism in modern terms appeared both in the United States of America and in the Russian Empire in the late 19th century when the American People's Party and Russian Narodism grounded their actions on the view that there were two groups in the society as the good people and their enemies.

Afterwards, the populist traits were seen in the South American continent in the mid-20th century and had taken a vital role for over thirty years.

3.1. Populism in 19th Century

In 19th century, populism was associated with a couple of historical events or developments such as Russian Narodism and the People's Party of the United States. In 1890-70s, appeal to people was the moralistic center of the Narodism movement so that the Russian peasants would achieve a political and social transformation across Russia. On the other hand, in late 1800s, populism was also linked with the People's Party of the US, whose establishment was triggered by the agrarian movement and which had the epithet of "*populists*", and populist traces in the United States of America were observed in the People's Party containing a kind of mass movement with bottom-to-top characteristics and carrying the word of populism in its party name (Moffitt, 2016; Taggart, 2000).

Taggart (2000) also mentions that with a populist essence, the Russian Narodism aimed to revolutionize Russia through people who were dwelling in the villages and were considered to possess historical knowledge of Russia and prospect for the future. On other hand, populism in Russian context had encountered different interpretations. As the word of "*narod*" signifies almost the same meaning as German word of "*volk*", it was first interpreted as a social movement depending on people and democratic values in late 19th century. Afterwards, Narodism started to be utilized as an ideology following the movement of "*going to people*." Moreover, the contents of the Russian populism exposed to some differences. While one of its usages was built upon the belief that people were greater than the sophisticated elites, the other was centered on the thought that socialism could be domestically achieved by circumventing the capitalism.

3.2. Populism in mid-20th Century

When stretched into the mid-20th century, populism was a significant component of politics being revolved around the particular political leaders in Latin American countries.

Furthermore, populism in Latin America stemmed from the continent's economic overdependence and from the economic challenges.

Thus, the targets of the Latin American populism were to enhance social justice, to ensure national economic liberty and to shatter semi-feudal architecture.

Nevertheless, Latin American populism was unable to reconstruct politics in the continent since it was apt to money, reward, centralization and leadership (Taggart, 2000).

Yetkin (2010) also puts forwards that Getulio Vargas who came into power in Brazil was the precursor of populism in 20th century in Latin America. However, Juan Domingo Peron doubtlessly stands out when speaking of the Latin American populism. Populism of Peron rests on the working class of Argentina under his reign. Peron being participated in the military takeover in 1943 in Argentina which was going through an economic depression became the Minister of Labor and Social Security in the government subsequently established. During his tenure, he gained the support of unions and poor ones owing to his policies such as rent limitations and acknowledgment of unions. Peron also distributed welfare to the benefits of urbanized workers under the depression circumstances. He founded unions in every industrial sector, generalized the social security networks, made education free of charge entirely, established settlement projects for those with low incomes and legalized vacation with pay.

Even though the military authoritarian regimes in the 1970s and the democratization steps in 1980s abated the populist influence in Latin America, populism not only revived in Latin America but also came out in the Europe for the first time in late 20th century (Filc, 2015).

However, Akkerman, Mudde, and Zaslove (2014) state that while populism in Europe is associated with the exclusionist, identity-oriented characteristics and with the political right, populism in the Latin American countries is related with the inclusionary, economic features and with the political left.

3.3. Populism in late-20th and 21st Centuries

The rise of populism in the Western Europe in late 20th and 21st centuries is a reaction against the failures of the traditional parties to react to a set of phenomena like taxation, economic and cultural globalization, the direction and speed of European integration, migration, fall of ideologies and class politics and uncovering of elites' corruption (Albertazzi, and McDonnell, 2008).

Moreover, as the European Union and its members states are not immune to the

crises, they went through various crises such as immigration issue, Eurozone problem, effect of 9/11 terrorist attacks and the constitutional deadlocks. All of these crises have deeply affected the EU and the member states in the context of the identity, economy and security by arising angst, fear, questions toward multiculturalism, distrust, suspicion and economic insecurity among the people in the Europe (Öniş, and Kutlay, 2020).

Taggart (2000) elaborates that following the mid-20th century, a brand-new type of populism called the new populism and supported by the far right political parties came into prominence especially in Western European countries. Being inspired by the “new politics” of the political left actors, the new populism simultaneously embraced by a great number of political parties in various countries generally criticizing the political parties in government or opposition, party programs and party structures.

Subsequent to the Second World War, the values and ideals of social democracy, Keynesianism, welfare state and mixed economy were enormously adopted by many political parties ranging from social democrats and Christian democrats to liberal and conservative parties. Nonetheless, the adoption of these values began to be questioned by green parties and parties of the new left, which were against nuclear power and war and were feminists, environmentalists and supporter of students’ rights, in the 1970s and 1980s. In addition to questioning the post-war ideals in politics, these parties of the new politics attacked on the political style of the existing parties, their overly bureaucratic and stiff structures and personalized leadership.

The developments on the political left called “the new politics” also stimulated a reaction in the political right and brought about an increasing support and accomplishment for the far right political parties throughout 1980s and 1990s in Western Europe. This reaction was called neo-fascism concurring with a new form of populism. Whereas the new populism was opposed to the ideals in the Europe after the Second World War, and to the immense bureaucracy in the welfare state and immoral nature of the establishment just as the new politics was, the new populism differed from the new politics with regards to reshape politics by focusing on nationalism, taxation and immigration (Taggart, 2000).

Furthermore, Guibernau (2010) states the new radical right parties in Europe possess

some populist and nationalist features due to their opposing views on migrants, elites and democracy. What have triggered the electorate to support the new radical right parties across Europe are globalization wave and immense migration numbers. Owing to the globalization and migrants, European electorate began to feel that they would lose their jobs and social benefits to the migrants, and that the migrants would jeopardize their national lifestyles, social values, identities and cultures. In other words, globalization and migration tides evoked sentiments of fear, uncertainty and anxiety among the European electorate. Therefore, this group of electorates have begun to look for alternatives for the existing political parties and tended to voting for the new radical right parties which have touched upon these feelings by creating a division of “*us*” and “*them*”.

In the late 1990s, the globalization of goods, trade, finance, investment and labor, increasing economic disparity, less secure jobs for unqualified employees, disappearance of manufacturing sectors positively affected the support for and emergence of populism in the Western countries. While numerous people living in developing Asian countries took advantage of the globalized economy and trade, unskilled people in the developed countries could not benefit from this globalization development and were labeled as the losers of globalization due to declining wages, lessening employment opportunities and crumbling public services. Furthermore, the ineffectiveness of the national authorities to manage the functions of multinational companies and globalized markets exacerbated the situations of the losers of globalization. Consequently, this segment of population feeling unsafe economically and resentment against the establishment initiated to support populist parties promising to safeguard them against the globalized competitiveness, to enhance their reach to public services and to prioritize them in the labor market instead of the foreign workers (Norris, and Inglehart, 2019).

In addition to the factors of globalization and open international trade, Norris and Inglehart (2019) specify that 2008 financial crisis and Eurozone debt crisis in 2009 influenced the spread of populist parties and populist support among the public. The financial crisis in 2008 led to many people in the US to lose their jobs and homes as well as causing a deep economic shrinkage, a number of bankruptcies and loss of consumer trust. On the other hand, 2008 financial crisis had a spillover effect triggering the Eurozone debt crisis in 2009. Due to the Eurozone debt crisis, some

member states in the Euro area had to have decreasing GDP growth. Moreover, being taking place in Eurozone area requires the member states to abide by the conditions set in the deal in terms of interest rates, inflation and budget deficit. In this regard, the Southern members, Greece and Spain in particular, could not undertake these responsibilities, and witnessed the worst economic recession. As a result, these conditions resulted in a decline in people's trust in governing and mainstream political parties and in an increase in people's tendency to support extreme and populist parties such as the accomplishment of Golden Dawn and ANEL in Greece and Podemos in Spain.

Besides, it is also thought that European integration has estranged some of European voters from the established system and political parties because of the negative effects of the European integration such as decreasing national sovereignty, growing competitiveness and rising labor mobility and cultural variety. Consequently, these electorates commenced to support the new radical right parties addressing rhetoric of anti-establishment and democracy reform as well as their discourses on anti-immigration (Guibernau, 2010).

On the other hand, some of the populist radical right parties in Europe have been Eurosceptic for twenty five years. They have had suspicions on democratic integrity of the European Union because these parties believe that the power of the European Union should reline on the elected European Parliament instead of unelected Council of Ministers. Furthermore, they criticize the supranational structure of the European Union and complain about the Maastricht Treaty resulting in damage on national sovereignty and breach of constitutional standards. The populist radical right parties also blame for Brussels controlled by the corrupt technocratic and political elites (Liang, 2016).

In addition to the crisis argument, Ramiro, and Gomez (2017) set forth that Euroscepticism, political distrust, feeble social bonds, high illiteracy level, unhappiness with the democracy, ideological radicalism are the other drivers behind populism all around the Europe, and that dissatisfaction with the established parties due to their lessened representative roles triggered the voters to elect populist parties as a protest. Besides, political complaints in terms of legitimacy problems are other drivers behind the rise of populism as well as economic, social and cultural crisis. Consequently, all of them need to be considered together while explaining

populism's success across the Europe (Ibsen, 2019).

Therefore, it is possible to put the drivers of populism into categories such as supply side, demand side and contextual elements, which are political parties and leaders, individual-oriented factors like anti-immigration stances, and unemployment, elites reactionary attitudes, electoral systems and rules, respectively. The modernization-level factors are other demand side reasons and propel the occurrence of populism because the quick and radical social transformations result in the fact that the people do not feel secure (Bernauer, 2017).

Geurkink et al. (2020) have also demonstrated it is highly probable that populist parties are endorsed by the followers whose trusts towards the political elites and institutions have decreased and who consider political elites are not aware of their wills and requests with regard to the external political efficacy referring to the thoughts that political leaders do not pay attention the people's views.

Moreover, Pasquino (2008) also contends that people who are socially and politically detached without having any affiliation with an institution in terms of profession, culture or religion, and look for an immediate sentimental connection are more likely to support a populist party and a leader.

Ibsen (2019) pointed out that as the Western welfare countries were deprived of their control over the economy due to the increasing globalization, they were unable to politically regulate the market and tackle the crisis effectively, and then this condition caused distrust among people towards the established political institutions and mechanisms, and led them to search for alternatives like populists. For this reason, Akkerman, Zaslove, and Spruyt (2017) contend that there are some populist parties which are chauvinist and exclusionist in terms of welfare policies and welfare redistribution.

In terms of the Northern and Southern Europe axis, whereas the populist parties addressed the problems regarding to immigration and culture in the Northern Europe due to the countries' ineffective attempt to control the economy and structural pressures resulting from globalization, the populist parties addressed equal distribution issues in the Southern Europe by attacking creditor countries and institutions as this part of Europe was hit by Eurozone and austerity policies. As a result, the final outcome following these economic problems appears to be politics

having nativist and cultural reflections (Ibsen, 2019).

Blair (2017) also puts forward that the upsurge of populism is mostly based on the cultural factors and slightly on the economic factors. As a consequence, right-wing populist parties seek to change the old politics with the new alternative one by encompassing both the left-wing voters disappointed by globalization and the right-wing voters disliking the liberalism. Furthermore, both of the groups consider that their own culture is under threat of the immigration, existing political leaders disenchant them, and the ones who will ignore what the established political parties and leaders consider about them will help them. Akkerman, Zaslove, and Spruyt (2017) also put forward that although sufficient research is not available in the literature, it is plausible to think that the supporters of the radical left wing populist parties may be opposed to the immigration due to being the underdogs of globalization.

In addition to the afore-mentioned drivers behind the rise of populism across the Western Europe, Albertazzi, and McDonnell (2008) also mention that uncovering of elite corruption, weakening of class politics and ideologies, declining electoral attendance and lessening memberships to political parties are other factors sparking the surge of populism in the Western Europe. Mastropaolo (2008) also stresses that increasing crime levels all around the world and disrupted Western democracies as well as the immigration factor purportedly menacing the cultural unity are the other elements leading to the advance of populism.

3.4. Populism and Refugee Crisis in 2015

One of the most recent crises that almost whole Europe experienced is the refugee crisis in 2015, resulting from the ongoing civil war in Syria and other Middle Eastern and African countries. Majority of these people influenced by these wars set out a path to reach Europe in order to save and sustain their lives. Nonetheless, this influx of refugees led to a suspicion and fear among Europeans owing to the recent rise of populism and the different cultural and religious backgrounds of both parts.

Brubaker (2017) reveals that the refugee crisis in the Europe in 2015 resulted in reaching the numbers of asylum applications to 1.3 million. In addition to the numbers of asylum applications, according to the Frontex which is the external frontier force of the European Union, the numbers of the refugees entering the

European frontiers jumped to almost 1.800.000 million people in 2015 (Dagi, 2018). Furthermore, when the refugee issue was mediatized and dramatized across the Europe, this situation caused the European people to feel threatened and frightened and then to the rise of the populist voice in the Europe.

Börzel, and Risse (2018) note that as a reaction to the mass flow of the refugees, the national communities in the European Union tried to draft a plan to overcome the difficulties to be posed by the crisis through sharing the responsibility and controlling the imminent refugee influx. At the onset of this plan, the member states sketched a legal outline by focusing on the shared asylum and immigration policy which involved in the financial aids for the member states and the third countries where the refugees first entered, acceptance of the list of safe countries, relocation of the immigrants between the member states, and formation of the extra hot spots in Greece and Italy.

However, this collaborated action was broken down and populist parties, which had suspicions about the European Union, approached the refugee and immigration issues from the perspective of Schengen crisis that should have been the border guardian of the Europe. As the Schengen crisis showed the European Union's ineffectiveness on coping with the refugee crisis, it profoundly affected the identity politics of the European Union. As a consequence, the member states' economic and cultural capacities for the acceptance of the refugees started to be discussed, the fact that the external frontiers of the European Union needs to be reinforced was advocated (Börzel, and Risse, 2018).

Brubaker (2017) argues that the refugee crisis in 2015 extremely also devastated the Dublin system managing the asylum applications as well as the Schengen System. The Dublin system was laid out in 1997 for the identification of the member countries to obtain the asylum seekers. Depending upon the principles of the Dublin system, the asylum seekers can make application for the country they enter at the first place and face banishment if they infringe the frontiers. Nonetheless, the travel of the asylum seekers to a different country from their first entry county disrupted the Dublin system and worsened the frontier controls of the Europe. Besides, the Lisbon Treaty of 2009, which was put into force to determine a single and common asylum policy applicable for the whole European Union by giving powers to the EU institutions, was also negatively affected by the refugee crisis. (Dagi, 2018).

Therefore, this situation caused the member states to pursue the politics based on prioritization of their national preferences and sovereignty, and populists to raise their voices such as taking their own precautions against the uneven share of the refugees like construction of a border barriers in the border between Serbia and Hungary, interim freeze of Schengen visa policy of Austria and reintroduction of border controls for protection their domestic frontiers. This application led to the questioning of Schengen visa system guaranteeing the free travel of the people (Dagi, 2018).

Furthermore, it is argued that the refugee crisis, which hit the whole Europe in a hard way, exerted a great influence on populism in the continent because the credibility of the European Union, its institutions, the established political system, and the mainstream politicians started to be shaken in the eyes of the people. The fact that the Muslim origin of the refugees entering the Europe was not compatible with the European cultures and values, and that the European institutions should have taken action to safeguard their own cultures against the Muslim menace led to the birth of nationalist populism wave in the continent (Dagi, 2018).

On this issue, Jonsson (2020) contends that a great number of immigrants within the Europe can galvanize the Europe's behavior in the past in terms of its exclusion, displacement, deportation and eradication of strangers. This situation was signaled in the remarks of some European leaders such as Angela Merkel and then European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker, who stated that refugee crisis was a "*historic test for Europe*" and dragged Europe on the verge of "*an existential crisis*", respectively.

Furthermore, as populism has been described as a thin-centered ideology favoring the people's sovereignty as a pure unit (Abts, and Rummens, 2007), the refugees can be seen as a hindrance for the purity of the people's sovereignty. Besides, devotion to the one's culture and lifestyle and their preservation lie at the core of populism. From this point of view, once populism combines with an exclusionary ideology after encountering a threat for culture and lifestyle such as refugees, the sense of devotion and preservation can transform into elimination of this threat (Albertazzi, and McDonnell, 2008).

In this scope, Betz (2001) sets forth that there is a type of populism called as

exclusionary populism. This type of populism stresses that the true democracy is the one that gives precedence to the long-lasting citizens of a country by taking into consideration of the national preference and the cultural homogeneity of a society. The exclusionary populism's main purpose is thought to prevent a nation's culture and lifestyle from being invaded and adulterated by foreigners instead of supporting ethnic and cultural excellence.

File (2015) also contends that the exclusionary populism focuses on the shared history and of the people that the immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers were not part of, on the welfare chauvinism to give primacy to the national people in economic resources rather than the immigrants, and on the restricted citizenship opportunities for the immigrants.

In addition, Rydgren (2008) states that populist radical right parties, which have increased their numbers across the Western Europe since the last twenty years, illustrate a strict anti-immigration and anti-multiculturalism position by embodying ethno-nationalist and xenophobic behaviors as well as their antagonism against the establishment. Betz (2001) also argues that the populist radical right parties pursue cultural nativism as it can be seen in their exclusionary discourses by associating the ethnic people's rights with a culture. Resting on the exclusionary populism, it is likely that the refugees and immigrants are not accepted as the members of a culturally homogeneous community. For this reason, the populist radical right parties may claim to protect the European civilization and culture from the various threats such as Muslims and American cultural hegemony.

Boomgaarden, and Vliegthart (2007) specify that the immigrants and refugees are not tolerated by the populist parties in terms of negative economic conditions as well as the cultural threats because the local public can consider that the immigrants may take over the professions which would normally be occupied by the locals and this would lead to the decline in their incomes.

Rydgren (2008) also demonstrates that the more the immigration issue was politicized, the more xenophobic attitudes appeared and the more populist right parties emerged, and that a plenty of people across the many Western European nations have possessed anti-immigration stances since the onset of 1990s, which was based on various surveys. Boomgaarden, and Vliegthart (2007) state that the

coverage of the immigration issues in the mass media such as newspapers and television channels increases the likelihood to support the anti-immigration populist parties. The reason is that the immigration issue is politicized as long as it is addressed in the media instruments and the people begin to think that the immigration is a problematic area which is needed to be solved.

Boomgaarden, and Vliegthart (2007) reveal that the populist right parties opposing to the immigration and policies relevant to this issue have a feeling of resentment against the immigrants. Besides, this resentment against the immigrants can be also manifested to the refugees in Europe and it can be used by the populist parties so as to mobilize their electorate and increase their voice in a disguise to safeguard common people.

Furthermore, the populists believe that since the refugees and immigrants are thought not to fit into the European culture and lifestyle, they are the main wrongdoers behind the some crimes in the Europe. On this issue, Brubaker (2017) gives example that the right-wing populists asserted the asylum-seekers committed terrorist attacks in several German cities and the sexual assaults in Hamburg and Köln on New Year's Eve 2015. For this reason, the right-wing populists started to question the acceptance of the refugees to the Europe and asylum seekers as they posed a danger the normal public life.

3.5. Populist Traces within the Europe

Based on the afore-mentioned drivers behind populism, the populist parties across the Europe can be exemplified as Lijst Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands, Front National in France, Freedom Party in Austria, Lega Nord in Italy, Danish People's Party in Denmark, Sweden Democrats in Sweden, Jobbiks in Hungary, Five Star Movement in Italy (Rooduijn, 2014; Norris, 2020). Another populist party emerged in Europe is the leftist Podemos in Spain subsequent to the Great Recession of 2008 (Ramiro, and Gomez, 2017). Boris Johnson, Nigel Farage, Viktor Orban, Milos Zeman, Marine Le Pen and Geert Wilders are also some of the populist leaders in Europe (Norris, 2020).

To elaborate, for instance, the Netherlands is known as a European country where the populist parties have already had a solid existence and achieved almost more than one fifth of the votes since 2002. Besides, the Netherlands is also home to the

populist parties from both the political right and left, which are Socialist Party and Party for Freedom, respectively (Akkerman, Mudde, and Zaslove, 2014).

In relevant to populism in the Netherlands, Akkerman, Zaslove, and Spruyt (2017) assert that the leader of Party for Freedom (PVV), Geert Wilders is one of the most prominent populist figures in the Western Europe and that his party includes culture, nativism and populism on ideological terms as well as high levels of opposition to the immigration. It is also analyzed that the populist left, Socialist Party, in the Netherlands for income parity and low level of trust towards the businesspeople and business institutions. Boomgaarden, and Vliegenthart (2007) point out that the Lijst Pim Fortuyn (LPF) in the Netherlands were one of the leading populist parties which strengthened its electorate base by challenging the problems of immigration, refugees and asylum-seekers and trying to safeguard Dutch traditions, values and culture.

Another European country that contains a populist party is Austria with the existence of the Freedom Party (FPÖ), which is a populist right with its leader Jörg Haider. In the Austrian context, populism is seen as a political mobilization appealing to people-centrism versus the threat of malicious elites and strangers. Moreover, as specific to Austria, there is a connection between populism and its full of cultural events attracting many tourists; therefore, the media intervenes in and give high coverage of these events through which the populists stretch to the public. Besides, populism in Austria has gone through a big transformation from the anti-establishment challenges of the middle-class into the culture and ethnicity-oriented radical style (Heinisch, 2008).

Heinisch (2008) explains that the culture-oriented populism in Austria results from the fact that the national identity of Austrian is vague because Austria had witnessed a number of setbacks and fragmentations throughout its history until it took its modern form. The Austrian history turned out to be short and embarrassing, and Austrian elites attempted to form a new identity differing from the one of Germany. For this reason, the Austrian populists took the opportunity of this situation, labeled this process as an ideological mishap and used the lurking apprehension and threat of foreignness relating to the construction of a national identity in order to take stage in the Austrian politics.

Furthermore, Italy is accepted as the wonderland of populism since the populist

parties in this country gained great achievements against the mainstream parties. For instance, the government of Berlusconi comprised of Lega Nord (LN), Alleanza Nazionale (AN), Forza Italia (FI) and the Unione dei Democratici Cristiani e di Centro (UDC) had the populist features in its governance and policies during its five-year tenure. The reason is that the Berlusconi government proclaimed that they acted on behalf of people by considering what they were in need, were opposed to the doctrines of liberal democracy hindering the fulfillment of the public good and blamed the politicians, cultural and economic elites for splitting the people into different classes (Tarchi, 2008).

Bobba, and McDonnell (2016) mention that the Forza Italia and PDL are the populist parties which are not located in the radical right spectrum and which are the most preeminent populist right parties of the current century. On the other hand, the Lega Nord is known as one of the populist radical right parties for referring to the homogenous unity of people, opposing to immigration and manifesting authoritarian and nativist characteristics.

Besides, even though Switzerland is known as the country where the prosperity has prevailed, foreign threats have not existed and the guest workers have not been needed in great amounts, it has gone through the emergence of populism. The factors such as the fast globalization process, deteriorating welfare of the country, the self-government of the communities within the country, highly availability of the direct democracy mechanisms such as referendum have triggered the rise of populism in Switzerland. In addition, the rising number of immigrants from Italy, Turkey and Kosovo and their perils against the existing culture and religion, and the presence of a populist leader like Christoph Blocher, who was very skillful at touching upon the feelings of people through its plain rhetoric and had a wealth for reaching his goals, accelerated the development of populism in Switzerland (Albertazzi, 2008).

On the other hand, Germany has not become a very suitable country for the evolution of a populist right party in contrast to the rest of the Western Europe. This situation stems from the structural and cultural factors particular to Germany. For example, the five percent electoral threshold in Germany happened to be an obstacle for the new right-wing populist parties while entering in the parliament and taking place in the political arena. Federalist organization of the country prevented the populist parties to resonate their claims across the whole country by restricting them at the

local level, and the intra-party clashes impeded them to grow strong. Additionally, the dark history of the country associated with the Nazi government blocked that a populist right party could compete with the mainstream parties due to the anxiety of extreme right (Decker, 2008). Decker, and Hartleb (2007) also put forward that the inability of the separate populist right parties to gather under a single party and their lack of a charismatic leader resulted in the weakness of the populist right parties in Germany by dividing their vote shares.

Moreover, Decker (2008) sets forth that the populist right parties within Germany could not take chance of using the issues in the political right spectrum such as the immigration and the European Union's law and order critiques as these issues have already been dealt with the mainstream parties. In addition, since various mainstream parties and media institutions embraced a populist approach in their policies to some extent, the new populist right parties could not show up as a powerful political force in Germany (Decker, and Hartleb, 2007).

Nevertheless, Decker (2008) states it is more probable the populist left parties in Germany such as the Socialist Unity Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS) and the Left Party to exert an influence on the established politics because they have a charismatic populist leaders who are capable of guiding the people, possess the property to challenge and lack of any possibility to be labeled with extremity.

On the other hand, Decker (2016) notes that the unluckiness of the right-wing populist parties in Germany disappeared with the emergence of Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) Party in subsequent to the Euro crisis in 2013, and that the refugee crisis in 2015 enabled the party to gain its most successful results in the state election in 2016. Moreover, the word of "Alternative" in the party name indicates that the party has a populist characteristic of anti-establishment in addition to appealing to people. Besides, the disquiet and fear stemming from the huge amounts of the refugee entrances to the country about the probable economic loss, cultural estrangement and deterioration of public order provided a fertile ground for increasing the party's electoral votes.

Sweden is also one of the European countries having a populist experience now and then. For instance, nuclear power and the environment issues of the 1970s pushed the formation of a populist wave in Sweden with the Centre Party. Subsequently, the

issue of immigration started to take stage in the political atmosphere of Sweden in almost mid-1980s. However, the emergence of a nationwide populist right party occurred at the beginning of 1990s with the New Democracy as a consequence of the high numbers of immigrations and asylum applications. Besides, the stationary manner of the mainstream political parties in Sweden, which was to maintain welcoming the new immigrants, was also a factor behind the rise of populism (Rydgren, 2008).

The Sweden Democrats is another populist right party within Sweden as it also manifests the exaltation of the national culture, hostility towards immigration, refugees and establishment, and is proponent of an ethnicity-driven partition. Furthermore, the Sweden Democrats deems globalization, cultural domination and supranational institutions as menaces against the purity of the Swedish culture and regards the immigration issue as the most problematic topic in the country. Therefore, the Sweden Democrats supports a more provisional immigration policy through rejecting the entrance of non-European immigrants, stipulating a dwelling limit and cultural familiarity for the acquisition of a citizenship as the immigrants are believed to be major perpetrators of a crime, dangerous for the national values and reason behind the unemployment and welfare-related economic problems (Rydgren, 2008).

Rydgren (2008) also mentions that the Front National (FN) of France is one of the prominent populist parties all around the Western Europe with its focus on creating a homogenous nation based on ethnic unity, and restoring conventional values, denouncing immigration and the established political system, and condemning the politicians and elites for giving primacy to their own interest and internationalism rather than the French people and nation.

Moreover, according to the Front National, the individual rights are less significant than the rights of the nation because it is thought that a person is raised in a nation through which he or she acquires the priceless culture, language and values by birth. It is also considered that the ones who do not belong to the nation and possess the cultural values of that nation such as the international companies and immigrants are perils against the French nation since they do not display the appreciation and responsibility as much as the ethnic French people do. Besides, the Front National believes that the protection of the national identity and unity is possible via the

partition of the different people and elimination of the foreign matters. In this scope, ethnic French people need to be always prioritized in comparison with the immigrants and non-ethnic French people (Rydgren, 2008).

As for the Britain, Fella (2008) argues that there is not much solid populist surge which has deeply influenced the political environment of the country due to the country's electoral structure called first-past-the-post electoral system impeding the new political parties to take seats in the parliaments. However, it is not impossible for a populist rise in the Britain because of the existence of the populist right parties such as the UK Independence Party (UKIP) and the British National Party (BNP) which had an accomplishment in the European Parliament elections and local elections, respectively. Additionally, it is also considered that unavailability of a written constitution and lack of constitutional checks on the parliament could form an appropriate atmosphere for the birth of populism on theoretical terms.

Furthermore, the decreased levels of political trust, pessimistic thoughts about the effectiveness of the system, availability of media instruments embracing a populist agenda such as the Sun and the Daily Mail indicate a potential for the emergence of strong populist wave in the Britain. As well as these political factors, the cultural factors like suspicion towards immigration and high number of the minorities who are the holders of British citizenship, and the antipathy toward the country's membership in the European Union stimulated this populist potential (Fella, 2008).

For instance, the Britain's choice in the last referendum on 2016 about the Britain's exit from the European Union and the UKIP's view below on the Brexit located in its policies are clear examples of an intensified populism in Britain.

“UKIP stands for a complete and total withdrawal from the European Union. Irrespective of whatever new ‘withdrawal agreement’ or treaty the government agrees with the EU, UKIP will continue to fight for the UK’s total independence from the EU, and to fully restore the UK’s former status as an independent, self-governing, sovereign state. In short, UKIP stands for: no more money to be paid to the EU, no more EU laws imposed upon us, no more jurisdiction over us by the European Court and no more open-border EU immigration.” (UKIP, 2019)

According to Figure 1, 46 political parties accepted as populists across the member states of the European Union participated in the latest national elections and 44 of

those political parties accomplished to gain seats in their parliaments while 2 of them failed to take place. In addition, 31 of these populist political parties are located in the right political spectrum and 12 of them place in the left political spectrum while there are 2 center political parties without a clear orientation and 1 political alliance including the parties from both right and left.

Political Party	Election Year	Country	Share of Vote	Gained Seats/Total Seats	Political Spectrum	Status
Freedom Party of Austria	2019	Austria	16,20%	31/183	Right	Opposition
Flemish Interest	2019	Belgium	11,95%	18/150	Right	Opposition
Coalition United Patriots (National Front for the Salvation of Bulgaria - National Bulgarian Movement - Attack)	2017	Bulgaria	9,31%	27/240	Right	Coalition
Will	2017	Bulgaria	4,26%	12/240	Right	Government Support
Bridge of Independent List	2020	Croatia	7,40%	8/151	Center-Right	Opposition
Freedom and Direct Democracy	2017	Czechia	10,64%	22/200	Right	Opposition
Action of Dissatisfied Citizens	2017	Czechia	29,64%	78/200	Center-Right	Coalition
Danish People's Party	2019	Denmark	8,70%	16/179	Right	Opposition
Estonian Conservative People's Party	2019	Estonia	17,80%	19/101	Right	Coalition
Finns Party	2018	Finland	17,50%	39/200	Right	Opposition
National Front/Rally	2017	France	13,20% (1st Round) - 8,75% (2nd Round)	8/577	Right	Opposition
France Arise	2017	France	1,17% (1st Round) - 0,10% (2nd Round)	1/577	Right	Opposition
France Unbowed	2017	France	11,03% (1st Round) - 4,86% (2nd Round)	17/577	Left	Opposition
Alternative for Germany	2017	Germany	12,60%	94/622	Right	Opposition
The Left	2017	Germany	9,20%	69/622	Left	Opposition
Greek Solution	2019	Greece	3,70%	10/300	Right	Opposition
Syriza	2019	Greece	31,53%	86/300	Left	Opposition
European Realistic Disobedience Front	2019	Greece	3,44%	9/300	Left	Opposition
Jobbik (The Movement for a Better Hungary)	2018	Hungary	19,06%	26/199	Right	Opposition
Fidezs(Hungarian Civic Alliance)/Christian Democratic People's Party	2018	Hungary	49,27%	133/199	Right	Coalition
Sinn Féin	2020	Ireland	24,53%	37/160	Left	Opposition
Northern League	2018	Italy	17,35%	73/630	Right	Opposition
Brothers of Italy	2018	Italy	4,35%	19/630	Right	Opposition
Forza Italia	2018	Italy	14,00%	59/630	Center-Right	Opposition
Five Star Movement	2018	Italy	32,68%	133/630	Center-Left	Coalition
Who owns the state?	2018	Latvia	14,25%	16/100	Center-Right	Coalition
Labour Party	2020	Lithuania	9,80%	10/141	Center-Left	Opposition
Lithuanian Centre Party	2020	Lithuania	2,40%	-	Center	-
Alternative Democratic Reform Party	2018	Luxembourg	8,28%	4/60	Right	Opposition
Polish Coalition (Polish People's Party, Kukiz15 and smaller parties)	2019	Poland	8,60%	30/460	Right/Left	Opposition
Law and Justice	2019	Poland	43,60%	235/460	Right	Ruling
Enough!	2019	Portugal	1,30%	1/230	Right	Opposition
Direction - Social Democracy	2020	Slovakia	18,30%	38/150	Center-Left	Opposition
Ordinary People	2020	Slovakia	25,00%	53/150	Center-Right	Ruling
Slovenian Democratic Party	2018	Slovenia	24,92%	25/90	Right	Opposition
Slovenian National Party	2018	Slovenia	4,17%	4/90	Right	Opposition
List of Marjan Sarec	2018	Slovenia	12,60%	13/90	Center	Ruling
The Left	2018	Slovenia	9,33%	9/90	Left	Government Support
Voice	2019	Spain	10,26%	24/350	Right	Opposition
Podemos, United Left, Equo, In Common We Can, et al (Together We Can - Unidas Podemos)	2019	Spain	11,95%	35/350	Left	Coalition
Sweden Democrats	2018	Sweden	17,53%	62/349	Right	Opposition
Party for Freedom	2017	The Netherlands	13,10%	20/150	Right	Opposition
Forum for Democracy	2017	The Netherlands	1,80%	2/150	Right	Opposition
Socialist Party	2017	The Netherlands	9,10%	14/150	Left	Opposition
United Kingdom Independence Party	2017	The United Kingdom	1,80%	-	Right	-
Sinn Féin	2017	The United Kingdom	0,70%	7/650	Left	Opposition

Figure 1. Shares of Votes and Seats of the Populist Parties at the Latest National Elections across the EU Member States (Source: Rooduijn et al., 2019; Schulmeister et al., 2019; The Irish Times, 2021; Jones, 2020; Rodriguez, and Luelmo, 2020; Politico, 2021; Vladisavljevic, 2020)

In terms of their status in the parliament, 32 out of 46 populist parties in Europe are opposition parties whereas 2 of them have the role of government support, 3 of them are ruling parties and 7 of them take place in the coalition parties. On the one

hand, it is clear that the right-wing populist parties dominate the political arena in Europe because there are 2 ruling populist parties in coalition, 5 populist parties in coalition, 1 populist party as government supporter and 23 populist parties as opposition parties in the right political spectrum. On the other hand, the dominance of the left-wing and center populist parties is less than the right-wing populist parties since there are 2 parties in coalition, 1 party as government supporter and 9 opposition parties while 1 center populist party is in the ruling position.

To summarize, populism has been wreaking havoc on many parts of the world throughout the history by starting in Russia and the US, and extending to Latin America and Europe. Through its anti-establishment, appeal to people, rejection of strangers and charismatic leadership characteristics, populism has left its traces on the Europe, as well. The declining trust to the mainstream political parties, political institutions, leaders, ignorance of the sovereignty of people by the elites, decreasing electoral turnouts, search for alternative political choices, problems resulting from the taxation, globalization and modernization, economic crisis and alleged ineffectiveness of democracy have affected the birth of populism. In addition, the refugee crisis, which the Europe has recently and still experienced, its media coverage and politicization, the incapability and incompetence of the existing political institutions, the threat of diverging cultural, social and religious background against the European culture and way of life, and the possible crimes to be committed by the refugees have helped the voice of the populism to be heard much louder.

In this context, this study approaches populism as a discourse and takes places in the literature by analyzing the discourses of the political groups in the European Parliament before and after 2015 in terms of the relation between refugee crisis and populism. As the current literature examines populism from conceptual or theoretical perspectives or looks at the influences of some economic or cultural crises on populism at a national level, this thesis contributes to the literature through conducting a supranational analysis and elucidating how the right-wing and left-wing political groups differ from one another in their populist discourses despite showing similar similarities.

CHAPTER 4: THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND POPULISM

4.1. A Brief Information on the European Parliament

The European Parliament whose members are directly elected by the electorates from the whole member states per five years is the legislative body of the European Union as well as possessing a budgetary function. The European Parliament, which was previously only responsible for inspection, has now the duty to represent European people's interest as being the single EU institution elected by the people.

As well as having the roles of decision-making and law-making, the European Parliament along with its stakeholders in the Council aims at steering the European project and fostering human rights and democracy across the Europe and all around the globe.

In the scope of its law-making function, the European Parliament may ratify, change or refuse a law draft prepared by the European Commission. Besides, the European Parliament and the Council may have the same roles in the ordinary legislative issues such as migration, environment, economic governance, transportation and consumer protection, and most of these legislative issues are accepted by the European Parliament and the Council together. On the other hand, the European Parliament may have an advisory function on specific legislation processes. In these processes, the Council does not have to consider the decision of the European Parliament under legal circumstances; however, the case-law of the Court of Justice stipulates taking consultation from the Parliament for Council before it reaches a decision. Additionally, the European Parliament has the role of consent both as non-legislative and legislative process. While the consent role in legislative process gives the Parliament to accept a law against discrimination and to have a veto right in the subsidiary general legal basis is used, the consent role in the non-legislative process enables the Parliament to have function in accession or exit of a country, and in violation of fundamental right, and to adopt the deals arranged by the European Union (The European Parliament, 2020)

As for its budgetary function, the European Parliament has common functions with the Council of the European Union to design the annual budget while carrying its right to say the last word on the budget. Following the adoption of the annual budget, the European Parliament sustains its budgetary powers to ensure that the EU

institutions and the Commission implement the allocated budget and funds appropriately. Thus, it indicates that the European Parliament, the only elected representative of the people, fulfills its democratic supervision.

In addition, the European Parliament possesses supervisory functions over other EU institutions ranging from the European Council, the Council of the European Union, and European Commission to the Court of Justice, European Central Bank, European Court of Auditors and European Ombudsman. For instance, the European Parliament shapes its stance on the issues to be followed in the European Council while the Members of the European Parliament can prepare oral and written question to the Council of the EU and request for a creation of a new policy. Besides, the European Parliament can legally accept or disband the European Commission whereas the other institutions can resort to the European Parliament for its opinions and consultation. Furthermore, European citizens, inhabitants and legal entities have the opportunity to convey their petition to the European Parliament about any EU law; thus, the European Parliament is responsible for controlling and responding these petitions (The European Parliament, 2020).

On the other hand, based on the elections held on July 2nd, 2019, seven political groups and 751 members of the European Parliament as well as the non-attached members take place currently within the European Parliament. Besides, the members of the European Parliament come together under a political group according to their political connection instead of their country. The European Parliament is presided for the tenure of 2,5 years by one of the MEPs selected by the other MEPs according to the majority of votes (The European Parliament, 2020).

The current President of the European Parliament is David Maria Sassoli from the Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats. His predecessors were Antonio Tajani from Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats) for 2017-2019 political term and Martin Schulz from Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats for 2014-2016 political term, respectively (The European Parliament, 2020).

The political groups, and the numbers and percentages of the seats they have gained for 2014-2019 and 2019-2024 political terms are manifested in the table below.

The Political Groups in the European Parliament	Election Result in 2014		Election Result in 2019		Change in Results
	Share of Votes	Number of Seats	Share of Votes	Number of Seats	
EPP - Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats)	29,43%	221	24,23%	182	↓
S&D - Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament	25,43%	191	20,51%	154	↓
ECR- European Conservatives and Reformists Group	9,32%	70	8,26%	62	↓
ALDE - Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe / Renew Europe as of 2019 elections	8,92%	67	14,38%	108	↑
GUE/NGL - Confederal Group of the European United Left - Nordic Green Left	6,92%	52	5,46%	41	↓
Greens/EFA - Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance	6,66%	50	9,85%	74	↑
EFDD - Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group	6,39%	48	N/A	N/A	↓
ID - Identity and Democracy	N/A	N/A	9,72%	73	↑
NI - Non-attached Members	6,92%	52	7,59%	57	↑
Total	100%	751	100%	751	

Figure 2. The European Parliament Election Results in 2014 & 2019 (Source: The European Parliament, 2020)

When the results of both elections are analyzed, it is observed that most of the political groups in the European Parliament decreased their numbers of seats and shares of votes in comparison to the previous election, and that a political group, which is Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group (EFDD), was not be able to take a seat within the parliament.

On the other hand, only two political groups, Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE) that renamed itself as Renew Europe Group, and Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance were able to accomplish to increase their numbers of seats and shares of votes in the last election. Furthermore, a new political group called Identity and Democracy (ID) which participated in the European election for the first time in 2019, was able to have a success by ranking as the fifth largest political group in the parliament and following Groups of the Greens/European Free Alliance (Greens/EFA) with a difference of 0,13 % share of votes.

Within the framework of these election results, the analysis of the afore-mentioned political groups' discourses with a view to evaluate the association between the refugee crisis and populism will be carried out by taking into consideration of the places of the political groups in the parliament.

4.2. The Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats) - (EPP)

The Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats) – (EPP) is the largest political group in the European Parliament with 182 numbers of seats and

24.23 % voting share (The European Parliament, 2020).

The Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats) – (EPP) whose president is Manfred Weber defines themselves as the oldest political group within the European Parliament by dating back to the masterminds of the Europe such as Robert Schuman, Konrad Adenauer and Alcide de Gasperi. Moreover, by positioning themselves in the center-right political spectrum, the EPP group is dedicated to form a more powerful Europe that is depended upon its people because it is considered their people are the backbones of their economy, which is the greatest one all around the world. In addition, they explain their target as to design a Europe which has higher competitiveness and democracy levels, and which people can establish a life based on their wishes (The EPP Group, 2020).

With regard to the name of the Group and the information released in the Group's website, it is clearly seen that the point of departure for their targets and commitments is concentrated upon the “*people*”. Additionally, it is apparent that people are at the center of their economy policies by expressing that people are the backbones of the economy. As a result, it is evident that the EPP Group possesses a characteristic of populism which is appeal to the people.

Moreover, since the EPP Group has used some comparative adjectives such as “*more powerful Europe*” and “*a Europe with higher competitiveness and democracy level*” while mentioning their targets for the Europe, it can be understood that they are not contented with the existing European structure and that they want to refurbish this system. Therefore, these expressions result the fact that the EPP Group has another characteristic of populism which is critique of establishment or anti-establishment.

4.2.1. General Overview of the EPP Discourses

In this section of the study, a couple of discourses independently of the context of the refugee crisis have been analyzed in order to take a glance at whether or not The Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats) – (EPP) possesses a populist discourse in their webpage contents and newsletters.

In the following discourses, a couple of populist characteristic can be observed in the EPP Group. For instance, the EPP Group pursues a people-centrist path in European-oriented policies by resorting to a figure of speech by saying “*at the heart of the*

European project” in order to increase the effectiveness of the statement. In addition, the EPP Group expresses that they will stand by the European citizens and will help them convey what they need by using a candid tone, neutral and denotative words. It is also apparent that the EPP Group bolsters the direct democracy so that they can enable the EU citizens to involve in the discussions.

“To put people at the heart of the European project, strengthening European democracy and the accountability of its institutions; defending the European way of life, advocating a united Europe based on the values of human dignity, freedom, solidarity, the respect of human rights and the rule of law.” (EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

“The 1st of April 2012 is an important day for European direct democracy. We can even call it a European Citizens' day because it is meant to engage our citizens in truly European debates. The EPP Group will be the people's partner in helping them voice their European concerns. I (Joseph DAUL - former MEP) see this initiative as a good opportunity for us, European lawmakers, to get closer to Europeans generally, to understand their needs and how to improve their daily lives. This is also a chance for citizens to provide an extra check on the legislative process.” (Vlase, 2012)

Moreover, it can also be inferred from people have recently lost their trust in the Europe and their apprehension is not sufficiently listened because of the EPP Group’s word choices such as the verb *“restore”* and the comparative adjective *“more”* while stating their committee works.

“This committee is also working to restore public confidence in Europe by paying more attention to the concerns of citizens. With that in mind, the European Parliament electoral procedure sits high on its agenda.” (EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

In this regard, since populism attaches great importance to the popular sovereignty and people’s will, and populists claim that the establishment is unfaithful to people’s confidence and does not take into consideration people’s needs, the EPP Group has a populist feature in terms of its people-centrism and criticism of the establishment. Furthermore, another populist feature of the Group is to help people conveying their needs and to support direct democracy because it is aspired to indicate the needs and

opinions of the people instead of representing them via populism which prefers direct democracy to representative democracy.

On the other hand, the cultural and social aspects such as lifestyle, history and values are highly significant for the EPP Group because they accept Christian-Judeo values as their very basis and aim at protecting their lifestyle. Therefore, it is very probable that the Group is opposed to any social or cultural disruption among people. Accordingly, the EPP Group is associated with populism due to the fact that homogeneity and unity of society is crucial for populism.

“A united Europe in which every individual is able to realise their full potential. A fairer, more competitive and democratic Europe where people travel, work, do business, invest, learn from each other, buy, sell, collaborate and team up. A self-assured Europe that recognises its unique history and heritage and defends its way of life. A strong Europe that is ready to punch above its weight globally.”
(EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

“We value human dignity, freedom and responsibility, equality and justice, solidarity and subsidiarity. We acknowledge Christian-Judeo values as our foundation and are committed to defending freedom of religion all over the world.” (EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

In addition, there are a number of statements regarding the migration, refugees and asylum among the general content of the EPP Group’s website as it can be seen below. In one of these statements, the EPP Group takes a negative tone while talking about migration as well as unemployment and global competition by describing them as “*challenges*”. Furthermore, the Group increases this negativity by using the verb “*compound*” when they mention about the decreasing level of trust between Europeans towards the politics. For solution, they offer a change in the European Union.

“The European Union is facing big challenges: unemployment, migration and tough global competition compounded by European’s loss of trust in politics’ ability to deliver solutions. The EPP Group wants to equip the EU with a successful reform agenda for Europe’s future that ensures the EU can meet the challenges ahead. Increase in growth and jobs must be supported by efforts to regain the trust of its citizens. Europe is a continent of values and human dignity.

We must defend our social model in the face of global competition while meeting the demographic challenge.” (EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

Besides, the EPP Group clearly explains that there is a lack of an adequate shared mechanism across the Europe for the refugees and migrants. Therefore, the EPP Group assumes the establishment of an adequate shared migration and asylum mechanism as an obligation by the European Union and uses the modal verbs such as “*must, should and need to*”.

It is also obvious from the statements of the Group that the current system for migration and asylum does not work sufficiently and that it has some shortcomings in terms of bindingness, justness, and responsibility during the allocation of the asylum seekers because the member states of the European Union does not abide by the principle or they apply arbitrary treatments.

While expressing the need of establishing a common migration and asylum mechanism, the EPP Group stresses a mechanism enabling the member states to give precedence the citizens of the EU, and a necessity of differentiation between refugees and economic migrants. Furthermore, the Group advocates the fact that the Member States should repatriate the economic migrants who do not have a legal basis for their stay. On the other hand, the usage of “*economic migrants*” leads to a negative connotation because it can be understood that these types of migrants take advantage of the current economic opportunities and chances more than the EU citizens.

“Migration and asylum rules also fall under the remit of this committee. The EPP Group is demanding fairer distribution and sharing of responsibility for asylum seekers between the EU Member States by calling on the European Commission to complement the existing system with a binding mechanism.” (EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

“Europe must offer protection to political refugees and those fleeing civil wars. To meet our humanitarian responsibility, the EU should set up an effective common asylum system while its Member States fully implement existing rules. Europe needs to develop a common policy on asylum and immigration where Member States can prioritise EU citizens’ access to their labour markets, while increasing its targeted development and humanitarian aid. The EU cannot tolerate social fraud and social dumping. While we respect legal migration into

the job market, we must tackle abuses and distinguish between refugees and economic migrants. Member States must return illegally-residing economic migrants to their countries of origin, in respect of international and EU law.”
(EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

Within this framework, as it is indicated in the literature review of populism, the EPP Group has also populist features in relation to their statements on migration, refugees and asylum seekers. For example, since Louwerson, and Otjes (2019) mentions that the populists try to reveal the shortcomings of the existing system or the elites, the EPP Group embraces a populist style while mentioning about the necessity of establishment of a common migration and asylum mechanism for the EU and the arbitrary treatments of the member states. Moreover, because the populism is about the homogenous people against elites and hazardous “others”, the EPP Group also reveals another populist character when talking about the repatriation of the migrants who pose danger economically. Last but not least, the EPP Group can be accepted as a populist right party because it supports that the member states should take priority over the economic migrants and send them back to their own country.

4.2.2. Analysis of the EPP Discourses Before 2015

In this section, the discourses of the EPP Group with regard to phenomenon such as refugee crisis, asylum seekers and immigration taken from the EPP Group’s news ranging from 2013 to the end of the 2015 will be studied.

Within this framework, it is seen that the illegal immigration is accepted as a security issue across Europe and that the reinforcement of the European security is associated with the demands of the European people. Even though the EPP Group states necessary institutions such as Frontex (Frontières Extérieures - the European Border and Coast Guard Agency) and EUROSUR (The European Border Surveillance System) exist to fortify the European security, the Group affirms that they need to be enhanced due to their some weak points such as budget and personnel, and that the European Union lacks of a prevailing program towards the asylum, immigration and preservation of the external borders. While expressing these statements, the Group has direct and imperative language use as well as informative, somber and critical tones since they give information to the citizens, use obligatory verbs “*to urge and need*” and pinpoint the shortcomings of the EU.

“European citizens ask us what we do to strengthen security in Europe. Today we can answer them: Frontex and EUROSUR! But we must go further! We must act with firmness against illegal immigration networks that exploit human misery, as the Lampedusa tragedy sadly reminds us. We must also strengthen Frontex, increasing its budget and its team of European border guards.” (Jeanne, and Frapiccini, 2013)

“We urge the Commission and the Council to finally give substance to a common European policy on the protection of our external borders and on immigration. For this we need a common approach on asylum and a focus on Lampedusa and the Mediterranean, areas in a situation of permanent emergency. Furthermore we ask for values such as sharing responsibility at European level, European solidarity and common trust among Member States to be recognized, as well as for more resources and equipment.” (Jeanne, and Frapiccini, 2013)

In 2015, another association between people and migration was created by the EPP Group and it is denoted that people will question the migration situation and they will hold the officials responsible for it because it is restated that there needs to be a strategy for it. On the other hand, the EPP Group sustains its defense for the repatriation of the ones who do not have necessary qualifications and they predicate it on the condition of getting support of the European people for the policy. Accordingly, there is a sorrowful tone while naming the deaths in the Mediterranean as tragedies, and a persuasive viewpoint while stating that repatriation is the indicated as only method to get people’s support for the asylum policy.

“What do European citizens think when they see the images on TV, when they see the tragedies that are going on in the Mediterranean? The answer is clear: we need to have a European response. The EPP Group welcomes the solidarity mechanism that has been proposed, but which still needs to be put together. On the other hand, we also need to make sure that those who do not fulfil the criteria to be granted asylum should be returned. It is the only way to ensure that European citizens support our asylum policy in the long run.” (Jeanne, 2015)

In addition to the fact that the absence of a common and effective stance towards the management of migration is reiterated in other discourses of the EPP Group, it is also apparent that the Group is complaining about the lacking of solid action and about

presence of the mere words and social media posts by accusing the European elites and established bodies indirectly. Accordingly, these statements possess an unfavorable point of view and not only a critical but also complaining tone.

“The boat tragedy in the Mediterranean over the weekend has shown us yet again just how crucial it is for Europe to take a concrete stand on migration and move on from tweeted condolences and empty statements to real action. The time for action is now. It is already too late for the thousands of people who died crossing the Mediterranean. Member States cannot bicker while bodies continue to wash up on our beaches.” (Metsola, 2015)

The Dublin system’s drawback, which is a mandatory binding apparatus, is also revealed as well as the afore-mentioned shortcomings of Frontex and EUROSUR in the EPP Group’s statement. Moreover, the Group assumes the refugees as challenges and burden all around the Europe, which need to be distributed equally among all member states. Consequently, the EPP Group embraces an unfavorable point of view and a daunting and critical tone.

“No more words, but concrete responses are needed to respond to the immigration problems we are facing today. The EPP Group in the European Parliament wants the existing Dublin System to be complemented through a binding solidarity mechanism for asylum seekers in Europe. Refugees are not something that only a few Member States have to take care of. They are a challenge for Europe as a whole. This is why the burden should be shared. This is the signal we are sending from Milan, and which we will push for in Brussels and in the capitals.” (Jeanne, 2015)

Furthermore, although the EPP Group maintains an approving tone while mentioning about the achievement revealed by the EU toward the migration challenge, it is once again stressed by having a persuasive discourse that further actions need to be taken such as assisting the member states through EASO (European Asylum Support Office), giving further monetary help, realizing new mechanisms like “*Smart Borders*”, strengthening the external borders and conducting a common stance towards the migration and asylum. On the other hand, the Group considers arrivals of refugees as a jeopardy for the survival of the Schengen and the EU itself and backs the intensifying the external border security while they have a moderate tone by

accepting to save human lives.

“Important progress has been made by the European Union in managing this challenge, especially through FRONTEX and EASO. In many cases, the latter have managed to reduce, but not stop entirely, the waves of migrants that arrive in Europe without travel papers. However, FRONTEX should be financially strengthened as well as empowered by additional human resources, so it can more efficiently survey vulnerable European borders. Additional help from the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) is needed to support those Member-State asylum systems under pressure. It is essential also to apply the ‘Smart Borders’ programme, inter alia, for the most effective management of the Schengen area, as this will enhance the control of European borders. Moreover, extra financial aid must be provided for handling this problem, especially to those Member States that urgently need it. I (Elissavet VOZEMBERG-VRIONIDI – MEP) belong to those who believe that a common European strategy, like the one already drawn up by the European Commission and supported by the EPP Group, must be implemented and that all Member States should contribute within their capacity, so as to improve reception conditions for migrants in quality and quantity through the European Union's budget. The EU needs to step up security at its external borders by making use of new technologies and by strengthening cooperation with third countries, so that the rise in human trafficking, smuggling and deaths in the Mediterranean can be drastically reduced, if not eliminated. We need an open Europe with controlled borders and not an inaccessible one.”

(Vozemberg-Vrionidi, 2015)

Besides, the EPP Group also maintains another daunting tone when they give increasing numbers of the refugee casualties, relocation and arrivals, and they explain this crisis will prolong. They also benefit from a metaphor such as *“political dithering”* in order to convince that there is not any time left to lose and a prompt action needs to be taken by the EU and member states.

“With a crisis of this magnitude I (Roberta METSOLA – MEP) appeal to Member States to adopt the legislative proposals put forward by the Commission today without delay. In 2015 alone, 2643 people lost their lives looking for Europe. These figures are staggering and there is no time for political dithering. EU Prime Ministers must act now. Nothing is more urgent or more important. I

(Roberta METSOLA – MEP) am happy to see the Commission increasing the emergency relocation of refugees from 40 000 to 160 000, and adding aid to Hungary in addition to that to Greece and Italy. I (Roberta METSOLA – MEP) think the scale of crisis is such that we have no other option but to react swiftly, with a sense of urgency. We need to move beyond immediate measures and quickly implement a binding, permanent fair system of distribution for all Member States.” (Stellini, and Georgitsopoulos, 2015)

“It is also a signal of solidarity towards the most concerned countries Italy, Greece and Hungary. We need speedy responses to the continuing heavy influx of refugees to Europe. EU Member States must act. They must stop focusing on themselves. The challenge is so enormous that it can only be solved together.” (Jeanne, 2015)

Additionally, much as the European Union carries out some applications toward the migration or asylum, the EPP Group generally takes an opposing stance, regards the EU applications as insufficient and claims the lack of political will. Therefore, they come up with extra solutions and recommendations.

“But yesterday's decisions are not enough. They will neither put an end to the chaotic situation of refugee flows in Europe nor establish organised procedures. More money, action and decisions - but most of all political will - will be needed. The most important decision of the week is the decision on the distribution of 120,000 refugees among EU Member States. Member States showed courage on this decision. But most of these decisions will be overtaken by reality in a short period of time. Additional measures are urgently necessary. The EPP Group is ready to act.” (Jeanne, 2015)

"The decisions of the European Summit are clearly not sufficient to tackle the challenges of the refugee crisis. Too many EU Member States still believe that they will be able to bumble through the crisis with a closed-eyes strategy. But this is an illusion. We fully support Commission President Juncker's ambitious programme. What is needed is more money, a comprehensive agreement with Turkey, EU external borders must be secured, hotspots must be put in place, and returns must be widely increased. The results of the summit are in any case a small intermediate step. The state and government leaders must re-work this

quickly and with much more commitment." (Jeanne, 2015)

On this basis, it is obvious that the EPP Group contains some populist traits resulting from the refugees, asylum seekers and migrants in terms of showing people-oriented attitudes, criticizing the establishment and invoking a threat and crisis atmosphere because they feel liable at people while building up the European security and getting their support for the policies, they find shortcomings and failures of the establishment and advise for the formation of new approaches to the issue and they stress the magnitude and scale of the situation through its numbers and duration.

4.2.3. Analysis of the EPP Discourses After 2015

Following the analysis of the discourses of the EPP Group with regard to phenomenon such as refugee crisis, asylum seekers and immigration before 2015, the Group's discourses after 2015 until today which is given below will be now examined in this part.

In one of these discourses, it is stressed that a comprehensive approach based on the people's demands should be taken by leaving aside giving the ideological and partisan instructions. This situation has been expressed in a figurative language and thought-provoking tone for persuasion relating to the actions needed because of word choice such as *"to preach"* and *"entrenched ideological towers"* that is something like not easy to reach or surpass. In the following statements, it is also emphasized that the external borders need to be strengthened and unresolved issues need to be surmounted in order not to disappoint, not to jeopardize the European citizens and not to risk the European lifestyle. As a consequence, the EPP Group links the solution of the refugee crisis or asylum problem with sustainable trust of the European people and viable European way of life. On the other hand, the Group admits they act in accordance with the peoples' demands and interests so as to preserve their security regarding to enforcement of a law on reform of the European Border and Coast Guard.

"So it has not been easy. We are perhaps too used to preaching from our entrenched ideological towers, but if we stand any chance of getting something meaningful through we know that we all have to move away from scoring partisan points and come up with the holistic response our citizens demand. There is no quick fix for migration. We need to look at every single aspect and come up with

an all-encompassing plan.” (Metsola, 2016)

“Numerous, unsolved problems Europe-wide cause discontent among the public and fuel extremism. We call on the EU and its Member States to provide more help to those in need, show more understanding towards minorities and ensure that institutions work fairly. With regard to the security and migration crisis, we ask for reasonable solidarity and responsibility, more cooperation and effective protection of our external borders.” (Stellini, and Agárdi, 2016)

“The security of EU citizens should be our highest priority and these controls are part of the measures needed to manage threats to Member States’ security. Controls at the external borders will allow us to identify such persons and minimise risks to the internal security of the Schengen area. This is one positive step towards restoring a fully-functioning Schengen system.” (Stellini, and Byczewska, 2016)

“We wish to secure our European way of life. Europeans are afraid of losing control and a say in their daily lives because they are facing unprecedented challenges. Some of these challenges have technological or economical roots: digitalisation, a globalised economy, climate change. Others are created by external powers: wars in the Middle East, uncontrolled migration and terrorism, an aggressive Russia threatening freedom and peace, as well as a more inward-looking United States of America. Others are commonly faced within the Union: structural unemployment, an ageing population, the rise of political nationalism and a lack of cohesion.” (EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2017)

“In less than six months, we managed to draft, negotiate and approve a new law which will provide a response to the topmost concern of people in every Member State. This makes them more secure. Europeans will feel safer at home, as the continent’s borders will be better managed, and there will be new tools to combat cross-border crime. This is a proud moment for Europe. People asked and we delivered in record time. We will now ensure that the revamp of the European Border and Coast Guard is done as swiftly as possible.” (Bonett, and Raissi, 2019)

It is also demonstrated in a frightening tone that there was a more influx of migrants in 2016 in comparison to 2015. As a result, the Group proposed what should be done

to overcome this situation one by one through having an instructive tone and denotative words. The EPP Group emphasizes that the European Union should not let in all migrants and that adverse opinion should be pacified; otherwise, a momentous breakdown will occur. In addition, it is stated that the European labor force need to be prioritized rather than the huge numbers of refugees arriving to Europe. Besides, the Group expresses in a decisive tone that there should not be any concession regarding to the Europeans' working rights and opportunities pursuant to quota application for asylum seekers. Accordingly, the EPP Group grasps a discriminative attitude towards migrants by proposing not to accept all migrants and not to compromise the Europeans' rights, and to prioritize their own people in the labor market.

“In January 2016, the number of people crossing the Mediterranean was 13 times more than in January 2015. 368 migrants lost their lives in January 2016 alone. To retain Schengen and free movement we must manage Europe's external borders effectively. The EU cannot accept every migrant, and any opposing positions that now exist within the EU on how to deal with the refugee crisis will need to be reconciled. Failing to do so would be an historic failure.” (Arbelo, and Stellini, 2016)

“We are confronted with the massive challenge of migration and refugees coming to Europe. If we want to remain on the path towards sustainable growth we need to start generating quality jobs by reforming our economies and investing in the human capital of our citizens. We also need to urgently update employment legislation with tools to fight undeclared work.” (De Lange, and Riberio, 2016)

“It is high time to put an end to differences in approach to applicants for international protection in the Member States. The current situation, where some Member States fail to comply with reception standards of applicants, is one of the main reasons for migrants repeatedly applying for asylum in other Member States. However, the EPP Group made it clear that EU citizens' working opportunities and social benefits will not be compromised by any quotas for asylum seekers accessing the labour market.” (Stellini, 2017)

Furthermore, the EPP Group continuously mentions about the necessity of establishing a common stance for tackling the migrants and asylum seekers since

they consider that separate strategies followed by some of the member states lead to the unfairness and disruption of solidarity among the member states. Hence, the EPP Group calls upon taking action instead of talking and possesses an unfavorable point of view and instructive tone while expressing the situation.

"The unrestrained migration flow has caused tensions in many Member States. We have to come back to law and order in asylum policy. The different procedures for dealing with asylum applications across Member States have further worsened the problem of irregular secondary movements. Europe needs more cooperation within a fairer common asylum system. This is another lesson learned from the migration crisis. There is no better alternative to managing migration in the long term. The fact that we in Europe use different standards for asylum recognition is unacceptable. More solidarity and fair burden-sharing of the distribution of asylum seekers are very important." (Georgitsopoulos, 2016)

"We have all seen the images from Aleppo and the Greek borders with FYROM. Europe must demonstrate its ability to act and agree on fair burden-sharing. If we want a Europe of freedom and open borders then we have to fight for a European solution to the migration crisis. If in the next few months we do not succeed to cope with the refugee crisis, we will destroy some things we have built up over the last few decades. There has been enough talk. Europe must now deliver." (Georgitsopoulos, 2016)

"The European Parliament is independent and obliged to the citizens of Europe only...It is essential that Europe is making significant progress in the development of the Common European Asylum System. The experience of recent months has shown that we need a functioning and sustainable system." (Georgitsopoulos, 2016)

On the other hand, the EPP Group's other discourses signify that lack of any effective asylum and migration system results in emergence of security uneasiness among the people; thus, they once again point out the essentiality of devising a common, operating and viable asylum and migration system, and of reinforcing the external borders. While explaining it, the Group benefits from an instructive and persuasive tone so as to mobilize for action as well as a critical tone due to the usage of metaphor *"like to bury the head in the sand."*

“We cannot bury our heads in the sand. Security fears exist among our citizens and Member States must fulfil their obligations at the external borders if these fears are to be in any way allayed. The abolition of internal border controls in Schengen has to go hand-in-hand with strengthening external borders.” (Stellini, 2016)

In addition to the expression of referring to the establishment of a common European approach towards the migrant problem and to the reinforcement of the external borders etc., the EPP Group overtly explains their advocacy for changing the EASO with a new European Agency for Asylum and therefore, it can be inferred that they consider the former agency was not powerful enough to cope with the migration crisis.

“Today, Members of the European Parliament in the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs will vote on the creation of a new European Agency for Asylum, replacing the current European Asylum Support Office (EASO). This new Agency will allow the Union to increase its support for Member States to address the refugee crisis. The EPP Group fully supports this proposal.” (Stellini, and Da Silva, 2016)

“It is time to act. We have to implement the new Coast Guard Agency; we need to agree on how to finance the fund for Turkey; we should clarify the common principles of our migration policy; and we have to make clear that all those who arrive in Europe must meet the same obligations as Europeans.” (Stellini, 2016)

“The migration crisis is still acute and we need a strong Agency. This is why we put it on a fast track to the vote. This new Agency will reinforce European Solidarity.” (Stellini, and Da Silva, 2016)

Once again, the great numbers of refugees or migrants coming to Europe are underlined in the EPP Group statements and it is stated that there should be a strategy making a distinction of the migrants such as refugees and economic migrants, and that the European Union needs to prioritize sending the migrants ineligible to stay back to their origin country. Through having an unfavorable attitude and aggrieved tone, the Group bases this statement upon the fact that the EU cannot deal with this huge quantity of migrants in economic terms.

“While the EU should fully respect international norms guaranteeing the rights of refugees, it cannot maintain an open door policy to anyone and everyone wishing to reside in the EU. It must distinguish between different types of migrants. The return of those who cannot stay must become a priority for the Union, which is currently facing overstretched resources in processing migrants, especially in the frontline states” (Mussolini, 2016)

“Migration is one of the most important topics for the EU. We have had an exceptional situation in Europe for many months. We’ve managed to significantly reduce the death toll in the Aegean Sea to stop the migration flow. We can’t afford huge migration flows in Europe and we have to stop illegal migration.” (Georgitsopoulos, 2016)

Furthermore, the EPP Group plainly states that the existing asylum system of the EU collapsed, the European Union was shattered and the concepts of solidarity, humanitarian approach and security for which the EU is famous were questioned. Besides, the word choices of the Group such as *“to crumble”*, *“harsh conditions”*, *“to be overwhelmed”*, and *“to be seriously challenged”* demonstrate the Group’s grave and critical tone. In addition, the Group criticizes a report accepted by one of the committees of the European Parliament which limits the financial amount required to operate the repatriation and migration tides and claims that this report turns the EU’s asylum and migration strategy into a feeble one.

“In 2015 and 2016, some 2.5 million people reached the EU, escaping the sufferings of life in their home countries. A vast majority of them were running away from wars and conflicts, persecution and humanitarian disasters. Faced with such an unprecedented influx of people, the EU’s asylum system, which was never designed to deal with such mass arrivals, crumbled. It left people stranded, often in very harsh conditions, and countries at the EU’s periphery were overwhelmed by hundreds of refugees arriving each day. In fact, a vast majority of all asylum seekers ended up hosted by only 6 Member States (Germany, Italy, France, Greece, Austria and the UK). The foundations of the European project were shaken. Our solidarity, security and humanitarian nature, on which the EU has built its reputation, were all seriously challenged. A proper response – taking into account the best interests of both EU citizens and the people seeking the refuge – was needed.” (EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2017)

“The European Parliament’s Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs Committee adopted a position today on the migration management funding from 2021. By restricting money available for much-needed cooperation to handle returns to and migration flows in third countries, the Report, as voted, makes the Union’s policy on migration and asylum less effective.” (Raissi, 2019)

In this framework, the EPP Group maintains its populist characteristics in relation to the refugee crisis, migration and asylum seekers issues after 2015. For instance, it is distinctly visible that the Group generally criticizes the establishment and exposes the shortcomings such as creation of a common and useful migration and asylum system, fortification of the external borders, slowness of taking action and the necessity of reforming the existing mechanisms with new qualities. The people-centrism aspect of the Group is also apparent in their discourse since they accept the people, their concerns, interests and security as their reference point and they feel obliged to the people. Besides, the EPP Group carries the traces of a populist right party because they are opposed to the acceptance of all kinds of migrants without drawing any difference and they believe that economic migrants can pose a threat to the European labor force and can be an economic burden.

4.3. Groups of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament

The Groups of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (the S&D Group) which is chaired by Iratxe García Pérez is the second largest political group in the Parliament with the 154 number of seats and the 20.51 % share of votes.

The S&D Group locates themselves on the center-left political group in the Parliament and it is stated that equality, diversity, solidarity, freedom and freedoms are the fundamental principles they advocate for an all-encompassing European society.

The S&D Group also states that they are devoted to safeguard occupations, economic progress, sustainable development, human rights, consumer rights, social justice and financial market reform so as to construct more powerful and democratic Europe and a better future for society.

Besides, the Group plans to restore the people's trusts for the Europe and refresh their hopes for the future, which shape the Group's activities in both the European Parliament and elsewhere (The S&D Group Who We Are, 2020).

Based on this content, it is visible that the Group has an informative tone and neutral exposition while explaining their actions. It is also clear from the usage of the comparative adjectives that the Group is not adequately satisfied with the current strength and democracy level of the Europe, as they want to improve these qualities. Moreover, the Group bases their action on reinstating people's trust in the Europe and giving hope for their future. Therefore, these statements signify that the S&D Group carries the traits of the establishment criticism and people-centrism aspects of populism.

4.3.1. General Overview of the S&D Group Discourses

Subsequent to providing the short information of the S&D Group, the texts about not only the general content but also the refugee crisis gathered from the S&D Group's website, are to be examined in order to gain first impression whether or not the S&D Group includes any populist elements in their discourses.

It is noticed that the S&D Group has a people-centrist approach in their discourses because they attach importance to the people's needs, concerns and views and they regard the people as the starting point for their actions. Besides, the Group urges the Europe and related officials to listen to people before taking any action in an instructive tone, and criticizes the European Commission for not paying attention to people but to market. The Group also stresses that the existence of the Europe is relied upon the people; therefore, to work for them and to enhance their lives are the main targets of the Europe.

In addition to the direct usage of "*people*", the Group also benefits from equivalent words such as "*citizens*" and "*Europeans*" because it is probable the Group wants to emphasize their connection with the Europe. The Group also usually benefits from direct and denotative words as well as having an instructive and critical tone in their discourses regarding to people.

"Europe must regain its social soul and put people and the fight against inequalities at the heart of its political action." (Group of the Progressive Alliance

of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“We should not give up on our efforts to meet citizens’ needs and improve life for so many people that deserve better.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“The S&D Group’s MEPs work hard to support many campaigns and initiatives, highlighting important causes and bringing people together to find better solutions for the key problems we face in Europe.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“Europe is the present and the future for citizens, a reality that is worth fighting for and shaping people’s lives for the better.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“From growing inequalities to uncontrolled globalisation, to the worrying climate crisis, we need a concrete strategy that answers the real needs of all Europeans.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“So here’s the deal. You suggest, and we deliver. We’re launching a call for an EU-wide consultation of people’s priorities on which the work and new mandate of the Socialists and Democrats’ Group in the European parliament should be based.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“Yet, the Commission paper is not fully balanced. The Commission puts too much emphasis on markets and not enough on people. The EU can and must protect European workers against unfair competition and social dumping. Globalisation is not just about challenges and opportunities, as the Commission claims, but creates real problems for real people.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2017)

Besides, the S&D Group resorts to the criticism of the existing European institutions and bodies. For instance, in the following excerpt, the Group states that disintegration of the European Parliament and the European Council has further worsened and that these bodies are unable to create a majority which is forward-looking and favors for Europe, and to challenge the threats the Europe witnesses.

Therefore, they offer themselves as the solution for these threats.

“The Parliament and the European Council are now more fragmented than ever. We are the only political family that can form a progressive and pro-European majority to stand up to far right, nationalist and populist forces. From the inside, these forces are trying to destroy the only project in our history that has brought peace, prosperity and well-being to millions of Europeans for more than 60 years.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

As for the refugee crisis discourses regardless of the news in the Group’s website before and after 2015, there are a couple of populist characteristics of the Group. For example, it can be seen that the group is not sufficiently contented with the existing migration system. Therefore, they propose to revising the system which will include a just relocation system and a better management at the search and rescue in the Mediterranean. Furthermore, the Group criticizes that the European Union is incapable of devising a sustainable strategy for the migration. On the other hand, the word of solidarity is frequently repeated in the Group’s statements by showing it as a necessity and this shows that the European Union, its bodies and member states are lack of this solidarity for coping with the refugees or asylum seeker. On the other hand, the S&D Group maintains a humanitarian and embracing attitude toward the refugees and migrants due to their advocacy for paying attention to the human rights and creation of humanitarian visas.

“And we want more solidarity in Europe, not only within our borders but also for those who knock on our door from fleeing war, hunger and climate disasters. This is a Europe with a real common asylum and migration policy, based on responsibility and solidarity among member states, as well as respect for human dignity. Europe must remain the beacon of human rights in the world...” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“We have been fighting for a better migration policy - fighting its causes, pushing for coordinated search and rescue operations in the Mediterranean and demanding a fair relocation of refugees in Europe.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“Migration and the refugee crisis have been at the top of the agenda for some time, and the European Union has been unable to come up with a long-term plan. Our Group has continuously fought for humanitarian solutions. We advocated for an integrated approach to migration based on solidarity and responsibility-sharing, as well as respect for fundamental rights, a balanced approach towards third countries, and generally a more positive vision of what migration can offer.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“We are calling for an overhaul of European asylum rules to ensure greater harmonisation of asylum procedures, create genuine solidarity and evenly share responsibility between member states, while respecting and focusing more on the fundamental rights of those arriving in Europe by land and sea. Ultimately, this should result in a sustainable, unified, effective Common European Asylum System.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

“In addition to that, the S&D Group has been very clear on the need for a European approach on resettlement of those in need of protection and for the introduction of systematic, mandatory, large-scale resettlement programmes as well as the establishment of humanitarian visas at European level in case of a significant stream of refugees. This would help countries in the region that host millions of refugees, and would simultaneously create safe, legal routes for the most vulnerable refugees. The S&D Group position on these issues has been clear and has been supported.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2020)

Accordingly, these statements expose that the Group has populist qualities in terms of people-orientation and critique of establishment since the Group promotes for putting people at the center of the actions to be taken, gives recommendations for improving the existing systems or apparatuses and forming brand-new structures, and criticizes the established institutions for their incapableness.

4.3.2. Analysis of the S&D Group Discourses Before 2015

Following the analysis of the general website content of the S&D Group on whether or not it bears populist characteristics, the next section will focus on the examination

of the press releases published in the Group's website before 2015 in relation to any connection of discourses of refugee, asylum and migration with populist features.

Based on the S&D Group's statements on refugee or migration themes before 2015, it is clear that the Group rarely applies to people-centrism except for the passage in the below. The Group explains that the member states need to take a progressive step for a shared migration approach depending upon solidarity and European people wait for this outcome. Therefore, it can be comprehended that the necessary step should be taken for the European people. Besides, the Group indicates that it supports for an all- encompassing and sustainable approach based on its unfavorable and negative attitudes toward the resolution of the problem through the daily works and political self-interest.

“Europe is ready to take up the challenge of a common migration policy based on solidarity. European citizens are ready. Now it is up to the European national governments to demonstrate that they can be forward-looking. We cannot tolerate tackling this humanitarian crisis with the vile approach of daily routine, with petty political self-interest.”(Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2015)

However, the discourses of the S&D Group before 2015 are mostly concentrated upon the criticism of establishment and the shortcomings of the existing mechanisms and the institutions. For instance, by using an instructive tone, the Group wants the migration and asylum policy to be relied on the *“true European solidarity”*. Therefore, it can be inferred that the current one does not function as it is supposed to do. Besides, the Group calls upon the new administration to pay attention to stand by the rights of asylum seekers and to provide reliable pathways for their reach to the necessary mechanisms. Thus, the S&D Group maintains a benevolent attitude towards migrants or asylum seekers. On the other hand, the Group regards showing solidarity and creating secure structures for refugees' reach to Europe as some fundamental elements of the European values. Hence, ignoring these elements leads to incompatibility with the European values.

“The continuing tragedy in the Mediterranean sea must stop. We must ensure that European immigration and asylum policy is based on true European solidarity in terms of real actions and numbers in the areas of reception of refugees and

immigrants. We expect the new commissioner to uphold asylum seekers' rights and promote safe and lawful access to the EU's asylum systems.”(Alberti, 2014)

“We need solidarity. We need to defend our European values. We need to implement common asylum directives, clear relocation and resettlement rules. We need safe ways for refugees and legal ways for people looking for work. These are difficult times - but we need common answers and we need to defend our values.”
(Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2015)

In addition to the Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament dysfunctionality of the existing asylum policy, the Group, in another statement, explains the other shortcomings of the policy such as having an inadequate financial instrument and lacking of necessary useful mechanisms. Therefore, the Group recommends the formation of an authentic common migration policy as well as the establishment of a shared border police service to control illicit human trafficking. Moreover, the S&D Group suggests enhancing the shared resettlement strategy of the European Union and denounces the current structure of the Europe for the refugee crisis as *“broken”* and *“failure”*. Consequently, they give recommendation of leaving behind these negative conditions and implementing what has been uttered beforehand.

“Everything has to change. Europe can no longer consider southern borders just as national borders. Europe needs a genuine common European migrant's policy with a real budget - not the current insufficient one - and dedicated tools to be effective. Selfishness of some member states should be abandoned to implement the possibility to share among several states the responsibility of migrant flow. Europe needs a more effective asylum policy which could already help seekers in their country of origin. Europe also needs a common border police service capable of managing the illegal traffic of human beings.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2014)

“...We need to improve the EU’s common resettlement policy and encourage more member states to participate, while ensuring that migrants’ rights are always respected when the EU co-operates with third countries, especially

conflict zones...” (Alberti et al., 2014)

“...The thousands of deaths every year remind us just how broken Europe's system of dealing with refugees really is. We must stop this failure once and for all and start fulfilling our promises.” (Alberti, 2014)

On the other hand, the S&D Group demonstrates a critical and complaining tone while stating that there is not any actual response or process for the refugee crisis although numerous words, promises and grief were uttered. The fact that the Group first presents the European bodies' expression, second the member states' promises and then the continuation of the issue reveals its complaining manner. Besides, the Group shows the severity of the situation of refugees who die by being in an attempt to come to Europe through the usage of a metaphor like *“bleeding cemetery”*. Moreover, it is again inferred from the expression of the Group such as *“waking up”* and *“finally”* or from the metaphors of *“burying its head”* or *“shambles”* that the EU has neglected the necessity to form a new common policy toward migration for a long time and that it has just moved forward for this goal though.

“One year has passed since the Lampedusa tragedy. Since then nothing has changed. The Mediterranean Sea still represents a bleeding cemetery for hundreds of migrants that everyday take the risk to reach European soil to leave behind war and poverty. Europe missed the call. European Institutions expressed deep sorrow, deep concerns and sincere regrets. Member states stressed their willingness to react and promised their commitment to be sure that the Lampedusa tragedy could not happen again. But nothing has changed.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2014)

“Europe is waking up. After a shameful delay, the EU Commission has finally taken a step forward on the way to creating a common European policy on migration, based on a mix of urgent short-term actions and a long-term plan to tackle the roots of the problems in Africa and Libya...”(Alberti et al., 2015)

“For too long the Council has been burying its head in the sand when it comes to migration. We in Europe have the means to deal with the current refugee crisis, however we lack the political bravery to even take small steps in the right direction...” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2015)

"More widely we must now work towards a truly common European Asylum policy to prevent the shambles of the last few months becoming the norm. We cannot continue to build on the Dublin rules that were developed 25 years ago in a very different context! We need to come up with a new set of rules for a workable and fair system. We are only going to be able to do this with greater solidarity and increased cooperation across Europe." (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2015)

In addition to their anticipation of guaranteeing the rescue activities from the Council and Commission, the S&D Group depicts the current immigration strategy as “*shameful*” and addresses that there is a very restricted time to come up with an advanced policy; as a result, it can be deduced that the Group tries to speed up the efforts in a disparaging and mobilizing tone.

"We expect the Council and the Commission to explain how they intend to ensure effective rescue operations and fight against the criminal behaviour of smugglers and traffickers...We have to stop the EU's shameful Immigration Policy. We will keep a close eye on the new Juncker Commission and its commitment to develop adequate legal migration channels. Time is running out to improve our approach to migration." (Alberti, 2014)

Furthermore, as the Group states that Frontex personnel should show respect to the rights of migrants or asylum seekers for reforming the European asylum policy as a whole, it can be understood Frontex turns a blind eye to this issue. Additionally, another existing mechanism criticized by the S&D Group is Dublin Regulation as being obsolete and impotent; hence, the Group favors for its amendment, as it does not fit for the up-to-date challenges.

"Thirdly, we need a new approach in the European asylum policy, from the top to the end. This means, for example, ensuring that Frontex's patrols respect migrants' rights at the EU's borders, and notably their right of seeking asylum..." (Alberti, 2015)

"...The Dublin regulation is anachronistic and ineffective. It must be revised. We acknowledge that European society needs to address its existing skills gap." (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2015)

In this context, it is apparent that the S&D Group has populist characteristics in its discourses before 2015 because of criticizing establishment in terms of the idleness of the European Union and its relevant bodies, the flaws of the existing mechanisms like Frontex, Dublin Regulation and current asylum policy and the lack of solidarity between the member states, and of having a people-centrist approach for creation of a new migration policy. Besides, although the S&D Group bears populist features, the Group is not against the liberal values and immigration. For this reason, the Group can be put into the category of populist parties in the political left spectrum as Norris (2020) specified.

4.3.3. Analysis of the S&D Group Discourses After 2015

Following the analysis of its discourses before 2015, in this part, the S&D discourses after 2015 are to be studied and are tried to make connection with the populist characteristics in the literature review.

The S&D Group expresses in a gloomy tone that 2016 is not different from 2015 as the migration flow continues and the member states pursue egoist solutions such as border protection. However, the Group complains that this is not a real solution and it will lead to the disintegration of Europe. The Group also states that unharmonious actions taken by the member states do not help alleviate the refugee issue owing to the massive magnitude of the incoming refugees. For this reason, the Group upholds crafting a common migration approach for a feasible solution by prompting the member states to realize the situation.

"2016 is starting on the same tragic tone as 2015. Europe is falling apart as a result of the narrow-minded selfishness of some national government and the illusion that restoring borders will solve the global challenge of migration." (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2016)

"Each member state taking different and contradictory approaches to tackling the refugee crisis worsens the situation and damages Europe's standing in the world. We are talking about the movement of millions of people. As a continent, acting in a coordinated way, that is something we can handle. Working as individual countries it is not. We therefore urge national ministers today to finally wake up and see that the only sustainable solution to this crisis is one reached at the

European level. The Commission has put forward proposals that would allow us to get on top of this situation - ministers must now implement them." (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2016)

On the other hand, it is also possible to observe that the S&D Group preserves its stance to modify the Dublin Regulation because the Group draws attention to its ineffectiveness by describing it as *"dead"* in a figurative language. The Group also points out a swift action by indicating a catalyzing manner and stressing the limited time since they associate the survival of Europe and Schengen with swift action. Besides, the Group emphasizes the current system for dealing with the refugee crisis is outdated. Later, they also specify that there is a need for a genuine *"European"* system rather than the existing Dublin Regulation; thus, it can be inferred that the Dublin Regulation does not comply with the European principles and values. On the other hand, the Group shows a weary attitude as the revision of the Dublin Regulation is put off constantly by the European Council. As a result, they are in favor of formulation of a new mechanism depending on the solidarity and responsibility between the member states. In addition, the Group brings forward a proposal to organize vigorous and beneficial search and rescue activities by the European Union; therefore, they consider the current activities are not powerful enough to help those in need.

The Group also reveals the need to build a solidarity and responsibility among the member states because they put an emphasis on the inadequacy of closing borders for solving the problem and on the unfairness between the member states in terms of differing numbers of accepted migrants. The term *"broken migration and asylum policy"* used by the Group also intensifies the urgency of the matter.

Furthermore, the S&D Group advocates for providing instruments to EASO (the European Asylum Support Office) to carry out the asylum policy in a coordinated way. In addition, they show their support in a persuasive manner for creation of a controlling structure to provide the sustainability of the Common European Asylum System by the member states, which they are likely to face penalties in the contrary case.

"The Dublin regulation - under which refugees must apply for asylum in the first

EU country in which they arrive - is dead. The Commission must propose a new and practical solution based on sharing responsibility between the member states. We do not have more time - we must act now to save lives, to save Schengen, to save Europe. The inhumane situation in which refugees, human beings, are living in Greece is no longer acceptable. European leaders and public opinion should realise that also within Europe, humanitarian assistance is now needed.” (Tuttlies, and Martin De La Torre, 2016)

“With this report we outline our vision for a common European immigration policy. There is a need for a European immigration policy that includes the right to asylum, and fully implements the principle of solidarity. As clearly stated in the treaties, solidarity is the basis of the European integration process. Therefore, we need an overhaul of the Dublin regulation. We are calling for permanent, robust and effective Union search and rescue operations to help prevent the tragic and needless deaths we have seen in the last few years...” (Tuttlies, and Martin De La Torre, 2016)

“The refugee crisis has shown that the current EU approach to migration is not sustainable. We need to have a complete overhaul to create a system that is fit for the 21st Century.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2016)

“With the ongoing refugee crisis, more and more tasks have been given to the EU bodies working on implementing asylum policy. The majority of this responsibility has fallen on the European Asylum Support Office (EASO). If we are serious about getting to grips with the current situation we need to also give EASO the means to fulfil its new responsibilities. We also want to see a clearer monitoring mechanism, so that if a member state fails to comply with the Agency’s rules and threatens the functioning of the Common European Asylum System – corrective measures can be quickly and effectively triggered by the European Commission.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2016)

“The European Parliament has adopted a clear and coherent plan on cooperation with third countries and on how to fix the EU’s asylum system. We need a complete departure from the current Dublin system, replacing it with a truly

European one...”(Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2018)

“In order to settle the dispute that has led to this unbearable situation, we repeat our call on Council President Donald Tusk to put the reform of the Dublin Regulation on the agenda of the Council meeting this week. Given the loaded situation, it is irresponsible that the issue be postponed one more time as President Tusk is planning to do. There is no solution to the migration challenge as long as there is no agreement on a reformed Dublin system.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2018)

“Securing Europe’s borders is only one element in fixing the EU’s broken asylum and migration policy. The current rules leave countries on Europe’s borders, such as Italy and Greece, to face the majority of asylum cases alone, and allow other countries to shirk their humanitarian responsibilities.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2019)

Furthermore, the S&D Group addresses in a derogative tone that no actual progress has been made to overhaul the migration and asylum system since the Lampedusa shipwreck; hence, the refugee problem persists and there is not a coherent allocation of these refugees between the member states. Moreover, the Group also shows the lack of political will among the European leaders as an obstacle for the solution of the refugee crisis which is denominated as *“hot potato”* to stress the delicacy of the matter. The S&D group also indicates its exasperation as there is not any step forward for the refugee crisis and nobody takes any responsibility. The Group uses the expression of *“enough is enough”* to show their anger and exasperation. They also hold the member states and the Commission liable at finding a solution to terminate this condition. The S&D Group also demonstrates the constant incapability of the EU bodies to plan a scheme for tackling the migration through the use of *“another failure.”*

“In addition, it is shameful that two and a half years after the humanitarian tragedy off the coast of Lampedusa, and many tragedies later, the EU has still no effective European mechanism to distribute asylum seekers evenly amongst the member states. The Commission has now come up with a new proposal, but the

current draft is not enough.” (Tuttlies, and Martin De La Torre, 2016)

“A real common response to the refugee crisis is possible if European leaders regain the will to act together, instead of trying to pass on the 'hot potato'...” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2016)

“Enough is enough with inaction and responsibility shifting in Europe! 721 people lost their lives in the Mediterranean trying to reach Europe in June and July alone. The death toll in the Mediterranean is going up despite the number of people heading towards EU shores going down. Currently, one in sixteen of those embarking on this dangerous journey are believed to drown on their way. EU member states and the Commission bear a joint responsibility to end this humanitarian disaster.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2018)

“Another European Council and another failure to find a sustainable way to manage migration. The Austrian government continues to push the idea that we can just close our borders and bribe neighbouring countries, and the issue will disappear. This is short-sighted and wrong.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2018)

In addition, the Group demonstrates they do not believe the relocation mechanism functions properly since they recommend the initiation of infringement process in case the member states do not abide by their relocation commitments, and they complain the procedures last a long time, which worsens the situations of the refugees.

“We need to get the relocation system working. Member states should pledge and transfer asylum seekers on a stable monthly basis, giving priority to the relocation of unaccompanied minors and other vulnerable applicants. If they do not do comply with their legal obligations towards these people then the European Commission must take action. We fully support the Commission proposal to begin infringement procedures against countries that do not comply.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2017)

“Relocation of refugees is taking far too long resulting in thousands of migrants and refugees being stuck in grave conditions hopeless and insecure about their futures. Likewise, much needed experts and support to the country are yet to arrive.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2017)

The S&D Group has also a suspicious attitude toward the new Commission President as there is not any progress in spite of the promise to modernize the Dublin system. Besides, they blame the European Council for not taking a step against the refugee crisis which they could predict it would happen. By using a figure of speech like *“come out of blue”*, the Group stresses the predictability of the refugee problem and ignorance of the establishment. The Group also complains the European Union could not show any authority and revealed numerous failures.

“The EU and its member states should take responsibility and start reforming the Dublin system which we all know is not working. Von der Leyen committed to do something but we are still waiting. S&D MEPs will keep up the pressure on the Commission to come forward with new laws for humanitarian visas to make sure that there are safe and legal channels to enter the EU for those that really need it. Illegal push-backs and violence at our external borders needs to stop immediately.” (Czerny-Grimm, and Macphee, 2020)

“Bordering member states such as Greece and Bulgaria have been left alone for years. This crisis does not come out of the blue, it was foreseeable, but the EU Council has been blocking long-term solutions for too long. Now we must act urgently and make up for the delinquency and lack of leadership of the EU in the region.” (Martin De La Torre, and Macphee, 2020)

Besides, the Group maintains its humanitarian approach toward the migrants and refugees as they promote the construction of secure and lawful paths so that they can come to Europe without any loss or damage.

“We urgently need to establish safe and legal channels for asylum seekers and potential migrants, which would be the best way to break the business of human traffickers and organised crime.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2017)

On the other hand, the Group even criticizes the newly-formed mechanism as it does not contain a binding relocation approach and solidarity aspect. As the Group uses the words of “*permanent, fair and European*”, it is clear they do not believe this mechanism will endure for a long time as it lacks of fairness and European values. Besides, another reason is that the Group thinks a binding relocation mechanism is an effective method for solution of the migration problem.

“That is why the EU needs a sustainable and coordinated approach to search and rescue based on international law to replace the existing ad-hoc solutions. Furthermore, the New EU Pact on Migration needs to include a mandatory relocation mechanism based on solidarity with member states at the external borders and vulnerable people at every step of the process. We need to see the Commission and the Council deliver a permanent, fair and European solution to migration challenges so that we can work together to answer the calls for help where people need it.” (Macphee, 2020)

“For the new Pact on Migration and Asylum to be a real game changer, there needs to be a permanent mandatory relocation mechanism in place. This is the only way to improve the situation on the ground and improve mutual trust among member states.” (Macphee, 2020)

In addition to the flaws or shortcomings of the EU institutions and mechanisms, the S&D Group also emphasizes that a genuine response to the refugee crisis are also necessary in term of proving that the anticipations of the European citizen are realized. The Group also stresses that the solution of the refugee crisis will provide advantage for the European citizens; thus, they push devising a European solution for benefits of the people. Therefore, it reveals that the Group gives importance to the people’s views for the political actions to be taken in the refugee issue.

“Citizens are also expecting us to provide a real European approach to the migration crisis. We must look at Africa not only as a continent of problems but also as continent of opportunities to be developed and supported through a real partnership. A new approach that cares about people, specially unaccompanied children, instead of viewing them just as cold statistics. Legal channels must be set up in order to tackle illegal migration and human trafficking. My group will never support a Dublin reform which does not remove the first country of arrival

principle.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2017)

“In the letter we express our shared conviction that migration is a Europe-wide challenge that can only be solved sustainably through a Europe-wide agreement, based on solidarity and responsibility. Only at EU level can effective and fair solutions be found to the benefit of all member states and EU citizens. We have very reasonable options for such an agreement on the table, especially concerning a reform of the Dublin system. Now we need the member states to deliver on that.” (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2018)

In this scope, the S&D Group sustains its populist characteristics after 2015 as they have before 2015 regarding to the concepts of refugee crisis, asylum seekers and migration. To illustrate, the Group shows some features of criticism of the establishment ranging from the dysfunctions or shabbiness of the existing policies and mechanisms, and the necessity of forging or adding new methods for coping with the issue, to the idleness of the management and the absence of political will and to the failures of the established EU institutions. By possessing a people-centrist aspect of populism, the Group also links the need to respond to the refugee crisis with the EU citizens’ expectations; hence, the Group wants the established EU bodies to show that they listen to people and act accordingly.

4.4. Renew Europe - Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE)

Renew Europe describing itself as the largest centrist political party and being presided by Dacian Ciolos is the third largest political party with 108 seats and 14.38 % shares of votes within the European Parliament for the political term of 2019 – 2024. However, the Group was previously known as the Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), which had 67 seats and 8.92 % shares of votes in the Parliament with for the political terms of 2014 – 2019. The ALDE Group made a decision to change their name as “*Renew Europe*” following their election campaign in 2019. Given the comparison of their seats and votes shares between the two political terms, it is obvious that the Renew Europe Group had an accomplishment by increasing their rank, political seats and shares of votes.

4.4.1. General Overview of the Renew Europe Group Discourses

In this section of the study, a number of texts collected from their website regardless of the concept of the refugee crisis will be analyzed so as to evaluate whether or not the Renew Europe Group possesses any populist element in their discourse in general.

The Group specifies that they will work to improve Europe, as it is a duty assigned by the Europeans. The Group also mentions that they will stand by those negatively affected by the illiberal and nationalistic inclinations. Besides, the Renew Europe Group wants to create more affluent Europe for the sake of the Europeans. While expressing these statements, the Group has a sincere and public-spirit tone and a sense of mission through the use of expressions such as “*stand up for the people who suffer*” and “*to the benefit of all Europeans.*” On the other hand, the Group usually benefits from the words of “*Europeans*” or “*citizens*” as well as people because they probably want to create a linkage between them and Europe. Besides, the Renew Europe Group puts forward that Europe has lost its connection with its citizens; thus, they uphold that these situations should be restored. Moreover, they mention that a democracy which people are engaged in all the time, not per election, needs to be provided; thus, it can be inferred that the current understanding of democracy within Europe do not fully encompass people.

“By ending the dominance of the Conservatives and the Socialists, Europeans have given us a strong mandate to change Europe for the better.” (Renew Europe, 2020)

“At a time when the rule of law and democracy are under threat in parts of Europe, our Group will stand up for the people who suffer from the illiberal and nationalistic tendencies that we see returning in too many countries.” (Renew Europe, 2020)

“We thrive for a more prosperous Europe to the benefit of all Europeans.” (Renew Europe, 2020)

“And last but not least, to achieve all this, we must reconnect Europe with its citizens. We want a European democracy which is not just an election every five years, but a democracy in which citizens feel a sense of belonging. This will be the

task of the Conference on the Future of Europe. This will be the vehicle to remove the obstacles that prevent the Union from working as it should.” (Jeroen, 2019)

In addition, the Renew Europe Group also builds an antagonistic relationship between the people and the elites because the Group expresses that Europe has existed for people but not for elites through use of words like “*Brussels*”, “*elite*” and “*bubble*.” For this reason, they state there is a need to assume responsibility to engage people in the European mechanism.

“The European elections showed citizens believe in Europe, but they want a better, different, renewed Europe. We must change the way citizens are involved in the European process. Europe was not created for “Brussels”, for an elite or a “bubble”, but to serve all citizens.” (Yannick, 2020)

Furthermore, the Renew Europe Group is not content with the current condition of Europe because they would like to change it in order to bring freedom and fairness. Therefore, it can be inferred that the existing officials or the established institutions do not function properly as the Group aims to restore Europe.

“Our new Group is stronger than ever and has the unique chance to shape Europe. There is a lot of work ahead of us. Our mission is to renew Europe. We are inspired to build a free and fair Europe.” (Jeroen, 2019)

Accordingly, the Renew Europe Group generally carries the basic traits of populism such as people-centrism, antagonism between people and elites, and the criticism of the establishment because they build their task upon the people’s will, want to work for their good, they believe the presence of Europe is for people not for elites, and they would like to renew Europe to turn it into better, fair and free structure.

4.4.2. Analysis of the Renew Europe Group Discourses After 2015

This section of the study will focus on the examination of the texts such as news and reports gathered from the websites of both the Renew Europe Group and ALDE Group in relation to refugee crisis, asylum seekers and migration after 2015. Nevertheless, the scope of the study is only limited to the discourses until 2018 because both Groups’ website do not let any access to news before 2018. For this reason, the analysis of the Renew Europe Group discourses before 2015 could not be carried out.

First of all, the Group considers the current European Asylum System does not work because they are in favor of the development of a contemporary and functional asylum system by using an approving tone towards the works done by the committee. The Group also wants to mobilize the European Council to take action without losing time by resorting an instructive tone and figurative language like “*dragging their feet.*” Thus, it is possible to infer that the Group has some opposing views on the established mechanisms and institutions for not working appropriately.

The Group also maintains its criticism toward the European Council and further overtly blames the Council for not taking necessary steps to prevent the deaths in the Mediterranean and to modernize the Dublin system, and for transferring its responsibility to other countries to preserve the external borders. It is also clear that taking responsibility and acting accordingly has utmost importance for the Group since the word stands out in the Group’s discourse three times in a row. Besides, the Group believes the current asylum system is not suitable to European standards and is shattered through the use of words such as “*anti-European*” and “*broken.*”

Furthermore, the Group draws attention to the requirement to plan a new and sustainable European response towards the migration problem; otherwise, they claim Europe will face a disorder. Accordingly, the Group resorts to a gloomy tone by pointing out a possible disorder.

“I (Cecilia Wikström – former MEP) welcome that the committee today has adopted the last of the eight files of the asylum package. It shows that creating a truly new, functioning European Asylum system is possible. Now it is time for the Council to stop dragging their feet and give a clear mandate to Justice and Home Affairs ministers to proceed with the legislative work as required under the treaty, in order to find a position with a broad majority that can then be negotiated with the European Parliament as co- legislator. Dragging out talks in the European Council on the much needed new Common European Asylum System, leaves almost no time for negotiations between the co-legislators before the next European Parliament elections.” (Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, 2018)

“I (Guy Verhofstadt - MEP) don’t point my finger to any individual country, not to Italy, not to Malta, and certainly not to Spain. It is too easy to blame Mr.

Muscat or Mr. Salvini, even though I (Guy Verhofstadt - MEP) really despise his ideas. It is too easy to give moral lessons from the North to the South, while the Northern countries are hiding themselves behind an anti-European and broken asylum system. I (Guy Verhofstadt - MEP) am pointing the finger to all of them, all member states, the so-called European Council. The tragedy in the Mediterranean is their fault, their collective responsibility. It is their responsibility that two years after the Commission proposed to reform 'Dublin', they still do not have a position. Member states still refuse to give to Europe full responsibility to protect our external borders. Worse, we outsourced this task to Erdogan and now even to criminal gangs terrorizing Libya.” (Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, 2018)

“The last few days the argument between Italy and Malta illustrate the need for European solutions in the field of migration and the chaos that awaits if we fail. It is no longer acceptable to kick problems down the road; leaders now need to show leadership.” (Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, 2018)

In addition, the Group invokes to a crisis and threat issues since they fires off the crises that the European Union is unable to surmount such as loss of reputation and authority in international arena, financial crisis, Brexit and five-year long migration crisis. Since the European Union has failed to overcome these crises and problems, the Group wants to change the structure of Europe. The Group also explains that these various crises and incapability of the EU bodies resulted in discontent among the European people.

The Group also stresses that the European Union should have predicted the existing refugee crisis; however, they could not foresee it and have not taken action for it for four years. By taking an unfavorable attitude, the Group presumes this situation as undesirable and emphasizes a shared and extensive response based on solidarity and responsibility should be rapidly made in an instructive tone.

“Our problems are abundant: Brexit is a failure of the European Union. Five years after the start of the migration crisis, we still don't have a reform of Dublin system. Ten years after the outbreak of the financial crisis, we still don't have a Banking Union. We are mocked by Putin, blackmailed by Erdogan, bullied by Trump, and ignored by the Chinese government. That is why we want a reform of

Europe.” (Yannick, 2020)

“The current migration crisis was to be expected, unfortunately. Since the last crisis, our Union has failed to act. When I was Council member in 2016 as Prime Minister, discussions on Asylum & Migration policy were exactly the same as they are today. For Renew Europe, it is not acceptable that no progress has been made since then. We should reach conclusions. Solutions are based on unity and solidarity. Let's put them into action with a common and comprehensive EU approach.” (Vernet, 2020)

“Renew Europe has for long been pushing for a swift and full reform of the CEAS (“Common European Asylum System”) in line with the principles of solidarity and responsibility. We cannot waste more time.” (Rhawi, 2020)

“The inability of the EU institutions to cope with the deep and multiple crises currently faced by the Union, the so-called ‘polycrisis’ including its financial, economic, social and migratory consequences and the rise of populist parties and nationalist movements have all led to increased dissatisfaction among a growing section of the population regarding the functioning of the current European Union.” (Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Delivering for Europe, 2019, p.2)

Besides, the Group expresses in a criticizing tone that flawed policies such as the policy of deterrence have been pursued and they have led to disasters like fire in Moria refugee camp. For this reason, the Group is against the maintenance of these policies and is in favor of revising the migration and asylum policies based on responsibility and solidarity.

“Moria makes painfully clear that the EU is failing asylum seekers. We cannot leave people without shelter and care, it is contrary to all European values and laws. However, it is no accident, it is the direct consequence of our policy of deterrence. As the Commission presents the new Pact for Asylum and Migration next week, one thing is clear for me: it cannot be continuation of this policy, it cannot be the blue print for more “Moria's” at Europe's borders. Let Moria be a wake up call to change course.” (Rhawi, 2020)

“Our current migration policy is not fit for purpose. The recent fires in Moria are

another cynic reminder of this. As long as migrants find their way to the EU via irregular routes, we need a proper response. We need to take shared responsibility and create a future-proof migration policy. We owe it to the migrants and our citizens to regain control on migration.” (Rhawi, 2020)

On the other hand, the Group clearly takes a doubtful attitude towards the migration crisis by describing it as “*so-called*” and considers the situation was resulted from the political inaction or inability due to calling it as “*political crisis*”. Moreover, the Group criticizes the Council for ignoring the problem and for not taking action in a complaining tone and a figurative language like “*not in my backyard.*” Consequently, the Group proposes what should be done to the solution of the problem. While doing this, the Group benefits from short sentences consecutively to accentuate the situation in a questioning and faultfinding tones. Based on that, the Group deems the formation of a genuine European Border and Coast Guard, modernization of the failed Dublin Regulation, creation of European reception centers and establishment of a lawful structure for economic migration as necessary for the solution.

Furthermore, it is apparent that the Group considers the current migration and asylum system has many shortcomings because they want the establishment of a comprehensive system containing protection of external borders, creation of a harmonized labor migration approach, feasible return and readmission strategies and an applicable integration mechanism.

“And then there is the migration crisis, the so-called migration crisis. I use the words ‘so called’ because I (Guy Verhofstadt – MEP) think it’s not a migration crisis that we are seeing today. But a political crisis.” (Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, 2018)

“Do you see what the problem is? The problem is that the only consensus the Council and you and your friends can agree on today is “not in my backyard”. While the real solution to the problem is on the European level; together. And it’s your role to make this happen.

- 1. By creating a real European Border and Coast Guard. We still don’t have it!*
- 2. Completely overhaul of the broken Dublin system. As the European*

Parliament has done. What is the Council waiting for?

3. *Establishing ‘European reception centres’, where people can ask for asylum. Inside or outside Europe. What’s important in the end is to keep people out of the hands of the smugglers!*
4. *And finally, setting up a legal system for economic migration.” (Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, 2018)*

“The Renew Europe vision for the European Pact on Migration and Asylum is based on six interlinked pillars and looks at all aspects of migration: European migration policy in an international perspective, an asylum policy that works, a sustainable return and readmission policy, a well-managed external border - at land and sea, a coordinated European labour migration policy, and a sustainable approach to integration.” (Blasko, 2020)

In their report, the Group also indicates they want to see a renewed policy for the migration and asylum which includes the qualities of viability, transparency and humanitarian approach and takes into consideration of migrants and European people; therefore, it is possible to conclude that the existing one is lack of these qualities. Besides, the Group favors that the migration policy to be established should include the establishment of secure and lawful passages for the migration.

“The Renew Europe Vision for a European pact on Migration and Asylum is not about ‘more’ or ‘less’ migration, but about proposals that are transparent, humane, sustainable and showing that we are in control. Migration policy is about people, the ones at home in Europe, the ones striving for a better life, the ones in need of protection.” (Renew Europe, 2020, p.8)

“...Besides working towards a migration policy based on intensified efforts to provide adequate shelter close to people’s homes as well as safe and legal pathways to the EU, our asylum policy is in need of reform.” (Renew Europe, 2020, p.15)

Additionally, the Group explains that the current migration and asylum approach in Europe is quite unsuccessful and does not address the condition of the contemporary world. Accordingly, the Group puts emphasis on the fact that it is essential to prepare a viable migration and asylum approach in order to satisfy the anticipations of the

European people, to hinder the recurrence of the refugee crisis in 2015 and to indicate people that the situation are managed by the officials.

“Europe’s migration and asylum system is failing us: time for an ambitious way forward.” (Blasko, 2020)

“Europe’s policy on migration and asylum is not fit for purpose in a changing world. European citizens rightly expect us to prevent a repeat of the 2015 migration and refugee crisis by putting in place sustainable migration and asylum policies. This is why Renew Europe presents a new vision on migration and asylum to put Europe back into the driver’s seat.” (Blasko, 2020)

“This paper is not about 'more' or 'less' migration, but about a clear framework for policies that deliver. We do not single out one proposal, but present a comprehensive approach to migration in order to show European citizens that we are in control. A future-proof migration and asylum policy is and will be one of the main priorities for Renew Europe.” (Blasko, 2020)

In this regard, the Renew Europe Group or ALDE Group possesses populist aspects, criticism of establishment and people-centrism in particular, in their discourses after 2015. The criticism of the establishment is resulting from the fact that the Group is not satisfied with the inactivity of the EU and institutions and with the current mechanisms and policies; hence, and they come up with proposals to find a solution to the migration or refugee crisis problem. As for the people-centrism, to respond the migration in a proper way and to change the direction of the current policies is necessary for not disappointing the European people and for indicating their expectations are listened according to the Group.

4.5. Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance (Greens/EFA)

The Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance (Greens/EFA) is the fourth largest political groups followed by the Identity and Democracy Group with a slight difference in the European Parliament.

Greens/EFA Group, which is co-presided by Ska Keller and Philippe Lamberts, aims to create a society upholding the liberal values such as human rights and environmental fairness, to enable people’s direct involvement of the decision-making processes, to develop a democracy not including a high centralization, to improve the

European Council and Commission in a more transparent direction and to restructure the European Union where subsidiarity is followed and solidarity is a shared understanding between free people.

4.5.1. General Overview of Greens/EFA Discourses

This part of the study concentrates on the short overview of the Greens/EFA Group discourses gathered from their website to assess their relation to the populist features.

In this regard, it is firstly possible to observe the appeal to people feature in the Group's discourse while expressing the necessity to listen people's thoughts and to be transparent during the decision-making process. As the Group aspires to reform the EU and its institutions in a more democratic and transparent way, Greens/EFA considers the current democracy and transparency status of these bodies are not sufficient. Therefore, it can be inferred the Group is not satisfied with the competency of the establishment.

“Democratic decisions can't be taken in the dark. Citizens' voices need to be heard. Transparency is needed to ensure equality and to prevent private interests from taking over the political process. The Greens/EFA are leading the way in the fight for more transparency and democracy in the EU and its institutions.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

In addition, the Group of Greens/EFA favors for participatory democracy; thus, it is highly likely that they want people to be more engaged in steering the political decision- making, policy preparation and political action without requiring any mediator as it is in the representative democracy. As a result, the Group tries to ease the democratic processes within the European Union through an increased citizen participation.

“We work tirelessly to promote truly participatory democracy in the EU.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

Besides, Greens/EFA criticizes then Commission President for ignoring to alleviate the people's concerns. Therefore, it is concluded that the Group bolsters that people's concerns and opinions should be at the forefront. In addition, the Group forms an antagonistic relationship between people and elites because they state people went through difficult time whereas elites, big corporations and the rich in this context

took advantage of these crises. For this reason, they criticize the EU for being unable to improve people's lives. On the other hand, the innocence and purity of people are stressed in this discourse because the Group does not hold them responsible for emergence of the crisis.

It is also reiterated that Greens/EFA puts importance on listening to people and making them involved in the political decision-making at the EU level. Moreover, as the Group mentions in a figurative language that it wants to “*build a bridge*”, it means they try to remove the quality of being out of touch specific to the elites and established politicians for people.

“It will take a lot for Juncker to convince the people of Europe that he is genuinely ready to tackle their problems. For far too long, the people of Europe have suffered the consequences of crises that were not of their making, while big corporations and the rich have prospered. From toxic air quality to financial insecurity, the European Union has failed to prove how it can add value to their lives.”(Weir, 2017)

“We want to build the bridge between citizens and politicians. We want you to know that we are listening, that we are hearing your calls. We want to give you more insight into our work and our efforts to transform your calls into actions at European level.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2020)

Accordingly, the populist features such as people-centrism, antagonism between people and elites and criticism of the establishment shine out in the discourses of Greens/EFA because they touch upon the necessity to listen to people and to improve the democratic processes and transparency, and they criticize the elites for neglecting people and being out of reach from people. Besides, when the Group states the big corporations and rich took advantage of the crises and European people experience difficult situations, they indicate a trait of populist left political parties since these parties think businesspeople and business institutions are the elites giving damage to the ordinary people.

4.5.2. Analysis of Greens/EFA Discourses Before 2015

The texts, which contain contents on refugee crisis, migration and asylum seekers before 2015, gathered from the website of the Greens/EFA are to be studied in this

part in order to observe whether populist characteristics can be involved.

To begin with, the Group of Greens/EFA shows a fault-finding tone while criticizing the member states due to the absence of solidarity among them. The Group tries to push the officials to take action for the acceptance of the refugees and indicates a humane approach towards them. Furthermore, Greens/EFA compares the numbers of potential Syrian refugees and the adopted approaches, considers these are not effective enough and complains the member states do not realize what they should do. To prevent the repetition of refugee tragedies, the Greens/EFA highlights a mandatory mechanism should be set up; however, the member states put an obstacle to this end which is criticized by the Group.

Moreover, the Group, in a derogatory tone, accuses the member states for the existence of the refugee crisis because of their rejection to take a common approach for the solution. Thus, they point out the necessity of a change in the mindset to act in a coordinated way.

“During the plenary debate with the Council and the Commission, Greens/EFA Co-President Daniel Cohn-Bendit criticised the lack of solidarity among EU states towards North African refugees and called for temporary permits to be delivered to refugees.” (Kutten, 2011)

“The scale of Syria’s humanitarian crisis is alarming, with over 2 million estimated refugees and 4.5 million internally displaced. The European response so far has been minimalist and disorganised, with EU member states abdicating responsibility.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2013)

“The Greens believe there is an urgent need for rules obliging member states to do more to assist migrant boats in distress but unfortunately, EU governments are stalling on this, blocking concrete measures under EU legislation on the surveillance of external sea borders that is currently being debated. Instead of mere surveillance and information-sharing, EU member states should have a duty act to save lives at sea, which the Greens insisted on in the resolution.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2013)

“We urgently need to find a solution to ensuring a fair distribution of asylum seekers across all EU member states and the blockage by certain EU governments

to realising this must be overcome. We also need a more fundamental shift in thinking. The current crisis is a direct result of the short-sighted and irresponsible refusal by member states to coordinate on immigration and asylum policy.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2015)

On the other hand, the Group puts forward that the egocentric attitudes of the member states for an action toward the refugee crisis are inconsistent with the EU's founding values and endanger these values. The Group also exposes that the European citizens pursue these values and have a welcoming attitude for these refugees; hence, they invite the member states to behave according to the people's actions.

“The EU was founded on the respect of human dignity and rights but the refugee crisis has once again underlined that these common values are under threat from the national egotism of member state governments. The multitude of citizens' actions in accommodating refugees across Europe underlines that the European spirit is alive and well. EU governments need to finally follow the public's lead.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2015)

In addition, the Group demonstrates a critical approach to the European Parliament as the prepared and adopted resolution for the refugee crisis is not sufficiently inclusive and the EU could not act firmly and add any useful perspective for the solution. Furthermore, Greens/EFA reveals their criticism on the European Union because the EU is incapable of embracing a consistent strategy for the migration problem and the followed applications are inappropriate for the humanitarian treatment of the migrants.

The Group of Greens/EFA demonstrates in a disparaging tone that they do not confirm the EU governments' motion of military action towards refugee crises. Besides, the Group has an accusatory attitude toward the European Union as they consider the EU has led to the emergence of human traffickers owing to the lack of concrete and safe pathways for migrants.

“The European Parliament adopted a resolution Thursday on the situation of refugees from Syria. The Greens regret that the resolution does not further address the political and military dimensions of the conflict. Most Green amendments were rejected, with the exception of an amendment denouncing cases

of excessive detention and deportation of Syrian refugees by some Member States and stressing the importance for Europe to show an example in the housing Syrian refugees on its soil. By focusing this report mainly on the critical situation of refugees, the European Parliament sends a confused political message and has missed the opportunity to contribute effectively to the resolution of the crisis.” (Pierini, 2013)

“One year on from the major tragic loss of lives of migrants off the coast of Lampedusa and the tragedies involving migrant crossings continue. The EU is no closer to developing a coherent approach and, if anything, things are moving in the wrong direction, with a new Frontex mission aimed at simply deterring migrants and with no mandate to save lives at sea.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2014)

“It is cynical of EU governments to propose a military response to what is a refugee crisis. Destroying smugglers' boats would compound the already desperate situation of refugees by leaving them in the hands of unscrupulous smugglers for even longer, with no means to continue their search for asylum. The smugglers only exist because the EU has created the demand by failing to provide alternatives for migrants.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2015)

The Greens/EFA also has an unfavorable attitude toward the current policy processes conducted by the EU bodies toward the asylum seekers. The Group highly criticizes the Council for blocking the related development. Moreover, the Group points out the necessity of establishing an asylum policy to center upon the humane treatment; nevertheless, no satisfactory one has been prepared and it is thought to be contradictory with its main motives by behaving the asylum seekers as criminals. The Group also has a complaining tone due to the inactivities of those who are accepted as elites like ministers and political organizations because they do not take a solid step in spite of enormous talking between them. In addition, the Group stresses in a critical tone the reluctance of the European political elites to focus on the problem but the presence of their various remarks on the topic.

“MEPs voted on new conditions for Asylum seekers Wednesday. The Greens since the inception of the proposed legislation have been concerned by the Council's

attempts to undermine even minor improvements. Although the Greens/EFA group acknowledges the glaring need for a clear asylum policy, with its foundations based around humanitarian interests, we are severely disappointed in the final deal. The Greens have issues with the revised rules on which state is responsible for asylum seekers (Dublin III), the reception conditions on arrival as well as the recently granted access of law enforcement agencies to the EURODAC finger print archives. This places an assumption on asylum seekers that they are more likely to commit a crime than other citizens, and thus transgresses the initial purpose of the system to stop double applications.” (Kutten, 2013)

“Following yet another tragedy involving a migrant boat in the Mediterranean near Lampedusa, and despite the outpouring of rhetoric from ministers and bigger political groups, concrete proposals remain absent.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2013)

“Despite no shortage of political rhetoric, the reality is that Europe's politicians do not want to address the core of the problem.” (Pierini, 2015)

On other hand, the Group has an unfavorable attitude toward the current mechanism for dealing with the refugees and asylum seekers because the Group believes these mechanisms such as Dublin Regulation and asylum system do not function properly and are not fit for purpose by labeling them “malfunctioning”, “unworkable” and “unfair”. Besides, the Group tries to highlight to requirement of reforming these mechanisms by giving evidence of the decision of the ECHR on the issue.

Once again, the Group stresses the importance of rectifying the Dublin Regulation thoroughly by using a figurative language like “root and branch” so as to ensure an effective and proper asylum mechanism. The Group also sustains its humanitarian approach for the refugee crisis through supporting the establishment of safe passage for refugees to enter into Europe as well as addressing the necessity of putting a long- lasting mandatory distribution feature in effect.

“Today's ruling by the ECHR is yet more proof that the EU's malfunctioning asylum system needs an overhaul. The court clearly ruled that it does not consider Italy a suitable country for families with children to be sent back to under the EU's Dublin Regulation - yet another ruling which undermines the Dublin asylum system. The Greens have long considered the system as unworkable and unfair,

both to asylum seekers and certain EU member states.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2014)

“Today's council and tomorrow's EU summit must finally reorient EU asylum policy and ensure we have a functioning and fair EU system. EU leaders need to clear the way for a root and branch reform of the dysfunctional Dublin asylum system. They also finally need to give the go-ahead for a legal entry system for refugees to Europe and for a properly-resourced search and rescue programme. Finally, they need to agree on meaningful funding for the UN's refugee response and the UNHCR.” (De Sario, 2015)

“Europe needs an asylum system that is fit for the task and this means repealing the Dublin system. At its heart, this implies the creation of a permanent binding scheme for distributing asylum seekers across the EU and a legal entry scheme for refugees.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2015)

The Group of Greens/EFA also takes a critical approach and heavily criticizes the existing approach of Frontex towards the refugees by describing it as “*abhorrent*”. Therefore, it is clear the Group thinks the behavior of Frontex is not compatible with the international standards and it should be reoriented to perform duly its duties.

“MEPs have today voted to change how the FRONTEX border management agency treats refugee boats encountered by its missions at sea, bringing FRONTEX in line with international law. Instead of the current abhorrent practise, by which FRONTEX simply turns back boats regardless, MEPs supported a Green proposal to ensure FRONTEX will have to properly assess whether refugees on intercepted boats need protection in the EU.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2013)

To sum up so far, the discourses of the Greens/EFA mostly concentrate upon their dissatisfaction toward the insufficient, inconsistent and wrong functions and policies of the EU and EU-related institutions, the negligence and individualistic actions of the member states, the babbling and unwillingness of the politicians to step forward for tackling the refugee crisis. Therefore, this situation indicates the Group has a criticism of establishment as a populist characteristic. Besides, the Group possesses a humane approach toward the refugee crisis like their support on a mandatory distribution system for refugees across the member states and creation of a secure

path to Europe. They also claim that European people have a hospitable approach toward refugees; hence, they urge political leaders and member states to follow the people's actions. As a result, it shows the Group of Greens/EFA includes another populist feature, people-centrism namely.

4.5.3. Analysis of Greens/EFA Discourses After 2015

After the analysis of the Group of Greens/EFA discourses before 2015, this part of the study is to focus on the Group's discourses on refugee crisis, asylum seekers and migration after 2015 in order to assess their connection with populism.

Initially, the Group touches upon, in a fault-finding tone, the troublesome points in the existing asylum system of Europe such as shortcomings and incoherence between the member states and mentions that these flaws inflame the current problem of asylum seekers' reception in Europe. Furthermore, the Group points out that the incoherence between the member states also result in the solidarity and responsibility problem jeopardizing the EU's existence. Greens/EFA claims that the lack of solidarity and responsibility between the member states for a common approach for refugee crisis subsequently leads to exacerbation of the crisis and suffering of the refugees. While expressing it, the Group has lamenting, complaining and disparaging tones because the Group mentions the crisis gets intensified and member states remain idle shamefully. In addition, the Group expresses its displeasure about then President of the European Council for hampering the likelihood an asylum policy relying on the solidarity in order to relocate the refugees between the member states in equal terms. The Group of Greens/EFA also complains about the member states and the EU for not showing any genuine intention to change the Dublin mechanism and to act on a humanitarian basis, and criticizes that they solely utter empty expressions and refuse the acceptance of the refugees.

“A core problem with the current system is the gap between theory in law and implementation in practice and the reluctance of some Member States to properly apply agreed standards. Loopholes and the wide discretion Member States have in applying the EU asylum instruments further exacerbate the divergent quality of asylum conditions in Europe.” (Keller et al., 2016, p.8)

“It is Europe's disunity that has created a solidarity crisis and existential threat to the EU out of what is a humanitarian emergency. If there is no agreement on how

to share the responsibility for those refugees who have fled desperate situations to come to Europe, the whole system cannot function. This is in turn what is placing the strain on the Schengen system.” (Pierini, 2016)

“EU leaders are edging towards moral bankruptcy in their response to the refugee crisis. Faced with a massive humanitarian crisis at our borders and a growing one within Europe, the dithering and division among EU governments is unpicking the common values which are the foundations of the European Union. Instead of haggling on how to outsource their responsibility to receive refugees fleeing from conflict and persecution, EU leaders should end their shameful unwillingness to agree and implement a common European response to accepting and distributing these refugees. (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2016)

“With his letter to the heads of state and government, European Council President Donald Tusk is undermining the prospects of a solidarity-based refugee policy in Europe. It is unacceptable for him to give strength to the naysayers such as Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. Without a fair redistribution of refugees, European asylum policy will remain vulnerable to crisis. As President of the Council, Tusk should be doing his utmost to resolve the solidarity crisis among the Member States, not exacerbating it.” (Weir, 2017)

“I (Josep-Maria Terricabras- MEP) hope that in the Council meeting at the end of the month the Member States will take a more firm position on migration than they have done so far. Have they, for instance, the political will to effectively reform Dublin? We don’t need nice words with no real political content.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2018)

“The European Union does not have the courage or the political ambition to save lives, but it shows that the European system is based on protecting the borders and dissuading immigrants and refugees instead of going to the causes of why they come to Europe, fleeing their countries.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2018)

The Group of Greens/EFA also criticizes the present EU mechanism concerning to tackle with immigration and asylum such as Dublin Regulation and Common European Asylum System because the Group believes they do not function

appropriately and leave migrants in difficult situations. Besides, the usage of “lottery” which has an acrimonious aspect by the Group means the Common European Asylum System does not provide equal opportunity for all asylum seekers. The Group also shows its critical attitude toward another EU mechanism that is European Asylum Office since they consider it is incomplete to control, process and distribute the asylum seekers.

“A second core failure of the Dublin system is the human suffering it entails. It most often forces asylum applicants to stay in the Member State where they first arrive on EU territory. If asylum seekers move on to another Member State, they risk detention and deportation back to the Member State of first entry.” (Keller et al., 2016, p.2)

“Applying for asylum in the EU is still a lottery. Despite the Common European Asylum System, which has been in place since 2006, reception conditions and recognition rates still vary widely between Member States.” (Keller et al., 2016, p.8)

“The allocation of asylum seekers must be managed centrally. The European Asylum Support Office (EASO), which is responsible for the common European asylum system, should be developed into a fully-fledged EU 'asylum agency' and should take the final decision on allocation.” (Keller et al., 2016, p.5)

Additionally, the Group sustains its argument to reform the Dublin Regulation through adding new elements like a mandatory distribution, reception and integration scheme and a component taking into account the preferences of the asylum seekers by putting the compelling methods behind. Besides, the Greens/EFA having a complaining tone puts an emphasis on the inadequacy of the Dublin Regulation as it could not endure the pressure of the refugee crisis and fall apart.

“The Greens/EFA alternative to the Dublin system aims at averting both major shortcomings of the Dublin system. It is based on a fair and binding distribution key, well organized reception and integration procedures in Member States - and builds around the ties and preferences of asylum seekers. It is thus based on incentives to stay rather than on coercion.” (Keller et al., 2016, p.4)

“The Dublin system has been dysfunctional for years at great human and financial cost. It has effectively collapsed in the context of the current 'refugee crisis'”

(Keller et al., 2016)

On the other hand, the Group of Greens/EFA shows a critical approach to a new mechanism, the Migration Deal between the European Union and Turkey namely, because the Group considers the deal is unviable and does not encompass any necessary action to solve the refugee crisis. Besides, the Group has a disparaging tone toward the deal because it is accepted as unrealistic when there is an absence of necessary resources. Moreover, the Group criticizes the member states as they abdicate their responsibility through this deal and are in attempt to conceal the crisis from the European public. Therefore, it is likely to infer from this text that the European governments have corrupt quality as they do not tell the truth the European people and they manipulate the reality. In addition, the Group maintains its criticism toward the migration deal between Turkey and the EU and toward the MEPs approved the deal, and puts forward that the deal does not work accurately.

“This agreement falls far short of what needs to be done to find a long-lasting solution to the refugee crisis. By forcing most asylum seekers to return to Turkey and limiting the few opportunities for resettlement to Syrians who have not previously tried to enter Europe irregularly, the EU heads of state and government have shown their complete disdain for the basic principles of EU and international law. Expecting the agreement to become operational in a matter of days, when the massive human and financial resources needed to make it work simply do not exist, is also pure fantasy. (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2016)

“First, the deal does nothing to solve the refugee crisis. Instead of providing a just and humane common European solution, member states egoistically try to hide the crisis from the view of EU citizens, pretending that illegal mass returns of refugees to Syria have nothing to do with the Union.” (The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2016)

“The majority in the European Parliament have willingly surrendered democratic oversight of the EU-Turkey deal. As we approach the one-year anniversary of the deal, we find ourselves with a deal that is failing, and no one willing to take responsibility for it. There is a deeply disturbing vacuum of responsibility.” (Weir, 2017)

Furthermore, the Group believes that Frontex is not a sufficient solution for the migration and refugee problem; thus, the Greens/EFA mentions by taking a critical attitude that broadening its capacity will not help saving the refugees. Besides, usage of words like “*unprecedented*” and “*unbalanced*” signifies that the Group considers they are extravagant and unnecessary actions.

“Too many parties and member states see Frontex as the tool to solve all problems and keep adding to the agency's staff and tasks without ever looking at its results. Border guards, no matter how many, will not prevent asylum requests, at least, if they do their job lawfully. Expanding Frontex cannot be a substitute for a missing asylum and migration policy. Rather than focusing all resources on Frontex, the EU and member states must finally make progress on the fair share of responsibility and get started on rescue at sea.” (Johnson, 2019)

“On Thursday, the Parliament will hold the final vote on the mandate of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency Frontex. The agreement reached in trilogue negotiations will result in an unprecedented and unbalanced expansion of Frontex’ and its resources. Despite increasing the agency by 10,000 extra border guards, the deal will not strengthen the rescuing of migrants and refugees at sea.” (Johnson, 2019)

Greens/EFA also highlights through the usage of “*legacy*” that EU has not concretely reacted to the refugee crisis for years and blames that the EU has become responsible for the damages the refugees went through due to its inactivity. Furthermore, the Group also disapproves the new pact of the Commission regarding to the refugee and immigration problem as it does not include any effective measures and it repeats the flaws contained the previous mechanisms.

“The devastating fire at the Moria refugee camp on Lesbos last night is a terrible tragedy that could have been avoided. Overcrowded and unsafe camps are the shameful legacy of Europe's failure to act and has deadly consequences. The EU must provide assistance and shelter to all those affected by the fire who now have nowhere to sleep tonight.” (Johnson, 2020)

“The danger of the new Migration Pact is not just that it repackages the shameful status quo. Instead of moving on from the failures of the Dublin System, this proposal reinforces it's key rules, by not abolishing the first entry criteria and

increasing the amount of time a Member State will be made responsible for an asylum seeker to up to three years.” (Johnson, 2020)

To summarize so far, the Group of Greens/EFA predominately centers on the criticism of the establishment as a populist feature through its discourses after 2015 because the Group is not contented with the ongoing policies and actions of the EU toward refugee crisis, with shortcomings of the existing mechanism such as Dublin Regulation, Common European Asylum System and Frontex, with the inadequacies in the recently adapted strategies such as Migration Deal between Turkey and Migration Pact, and with the absence of common understanding between the member states. As a result, they propose alternatives to reform these approaches and to realize sustainable solutions like creating a solidarity-based attitude, giving preeminence to refugee’s preferences, concentrating on humanitarian behavior and setting up a binding and fair distribution mechanism.

4.6. Identity and Democracy Group (ID)

Identity and Democracy Group (ID), which is chaired by Marco Zanni and formerly known as the Europe of Nations and Freedom (ENF), has had the fifth place in 2019 European Parliament election with 73 seats and 9.72 shares of the votes. (European Parliament Multimedia Center, 2019). The MEPs of the ID Groups are widely from the political parties accepted as populists across Europe such as Lega, Front National, Alternative for Germany, Vlaams Belang (Flemish Interest), Freedom Party of Austria, Finns Party, Freedom and Direct Democracy, Conservative People’s Party of Estonia and Danish People’s Party. (Identity and Democracy, 2020).

4.6.1. General Overview of the ID Group Discourses

The general overview will concentrate upon the analysis of the discourses gathered from the website and social media account of the ID Group with regard to their relation with the populism. As the language of the some contents of the Groups is French or Italian, their translations are provided through Google Translate or automatic translation service of Facebook.

The Identity and Democracy Group determines their political activities in compatible with supporting the identities, liberty, sovereignty and subsidiarity of the European

peoples and nations. The Christian and Greek-Roman cultures are crucial for the ID Group because they consider the European civilization has been built upon these cultures. In addition to the political actions driven from the enhancement of the people's rights and freedoms, the Group also urges the European Union to pay attention to the people's views. It is also clear the Group draws attention the EU has not been aware of the people's views beforehand by using the expression of "*it is time.*"

Besides, the ID Group thinks that the European future should be based on the approach to listen to people; as a result, it will be prevented from being against the democracy. Moreover, the Group claims that the people will soon start to perceive the situation and notice the problematic areas in the current system by usage of a figurative language like "*awakening of the European people.*" As a result of people's realization, it is put forward that they will object to creation of the European state but want to attain a powerful and self-reliant nation-states.

Furthermore, the Group reveals themselves as the saviors of the people because it is stated people embedded their hopes in the Group for the election of 2019. In this statement, the Group shows a determined and challenging attitude for having a success in the elections and then restoring the freedom across Europe. The usage of short sentences and of capital letters indicates the determination of the Group.

"The Members of the ID Group base their political project on the upholding of freedom, sovereignty, subsidiarity and the identity of the European peoples and nations. They acknowledge the Greek-Roman and Christian heritage as the pillars of European civilisation." (Identity and Democracy, 2020)

"It is time for the European Union to listen to the peoples." (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

"The future of Europe is not in an anti-democratic European Union, but in cooperation between sovereign Nations listening to the people!" (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

"The awakening of the European peoples is under way!" (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

"The awakening of the European people has come: With the exception of the

Germans, the citizens of all the Member States are calling for regaining a strong, and independent national power rather than for the European state which destroys them!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“In this historic election, the battle for our freedom will be decisive. Let us join forces: no matter how strong our opponents could be, we will be STRONGER! We have the strength of our conviction and we are the hope that the people of Europe have in us. Long live the Europe of Nations and long live the Europe of Freedom!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

On the other hand, the Identity and Democracy Group creates an antagonistic relationship between people and elites as well as criticizing the activities and policies of the established institutions. By utilizing a harsh and complaining tone, the ID Group obviously mentions the European elites’ actions are not compatible with the people. The Group also overtly labels the establishment as “*corrupt*” and exposes their opposition to this establishment. Besides, the Group criticizes the EU because it neglects the people’s will by applying CETA as compulsory. In addition to the established institutions, the Group demonstrates antagonistic attitude towards the non-governmental organizations as they are not elected according to democratic standards and do not represent people. The ID Group blames the EU officials for taking side of the multinationals, other elites namely, instead of implementing their works to the benefit of people.

“The insane policies of the European elites continue against the peoples!”
(Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“We will fight the old corrupt establishment. There are no cracks in the alliance. Our European alliance has a common goal: Europe of the fatherlands!” (Free West Media, 2017)

“As the United States gains sovereignty with the exit of the TTIP, the European Union imposes against the will of the peoples more globalization with CETA!”
(Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“The idea that NGOs represent civil society is very dangerous: they have never been elected democratically, they are not the people, they are the people who fund them!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“EU policy makers are not working in the interests of peoples but in the interests of multinationals!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

Moreover, since the ID Group describes the European Union as *“technocratic”*, it is possible to conclude that they are not close to the ordinary people and do not understand their needs due to the sophisticated expertise they have. The ID Group further complains the technocratic EU dislikes people with utter contempt. Later, the Group maintains its criticism on this issue and clearly states that the former president of the European Commission was very alienated from the European people’s interests all the time. The Group also indicates they are opposed to bureaucracy and bureaucrats because they envision a Europe orienting itself toward people not bureaucrats.

“The blackmail of this technocratic European Union in Brussels must stop!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“You can change Europe’s destiny and say « no » to this technocratic EU that despises peoples: on May 26th, vote for a Europe of sovereign nations!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

“Juncker, always so disconnected from the real concerns of the European peoples!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“We want a Europe of the people and not a Europe of the bureaucrats. Our vision of Europe is totally opposed to theirs and that is why the coming election is fundamental.” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

The Group also mentions that supra-state formation of the EU is not fit for democracy and people’s will. Additionally, the Group criticizes the EU as it has a deteriorated freedom and democracy structure toward people and nations; therefore, they favor the nation-state as the most suitable structure for freedom and democracy. Moreover, the Identity and Democracy Group, in a strict tone and short expressions, calls upon the officials to be respectful to democracy and to devise policies meeting the needs of people. On the other hand, it is likely to observe that the ID Group is not happy with the qualities of the EU because they aim to create more transparent and accountable EU process and to bring direct democracy.

“Indeed, the Europeans do not want you and your anti-democratic supra-

structure!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“The Nation-state is the highest form of freedom and democracy. We want the same rights for all Nations. The European Union suffers from a lack of democracy and limits the freedom of states and citizens. We want another form of cooperation between states: cooperation that respects the identities of peoples and must be based on respect for the freedom of Nations!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2018)

“People are also tired of your policies! Respect democracy!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

“Inspired by the idea of a Europe of cooperation, the new alliance and its Members are conscious of the need to deeply reform the existing EU in a way to strengthen the principles of subsidiarity and democracy, to introduce direct democracy, as well as to implement more transparency and accountability in the decision-making process.” (Identity and Democracy, 2020)

In general, the Identity and Democracy Group carries the basic traits of the populism in its discourses regardless of the refugee crisis. For instance, one of the populist traits observable in the Group’s discourses is people-centrism because they intend to foster the identities, freedom and sovereignty of people and they pay attention to listen to people and to conduct their wills, and urge the officials to do so. The hope-oriented aspect of populism is also apparent in the ID Group’s discourse since the Group aims at restoring the freedom and becoming powerful based on the people’s hope in the Group. Another populist characteristic of the ID Groups is the antagonism they establish between people and elites as the Group blames the elites like the EU for not listening to peoples, for ignoring people’s will and hating them. The Group also describes the elites as technocratic and it leads to the inference that the elites are out of touch from ordinary people. Lastly, the Group indicates the feature of criticism of the establishment because they clearly object the supra-nationalist structure of the EU which is assumed to undermine freedom and democracy of nation-states and people. The Group also favors for direct democracy in order to engage people in the process and for more transparency and accountability within the EU.

4.6.2. Analysis of the ID Group Discourses After 2015

Subsequent to the general overview of the ID Group, this section is centered upon the analysis of the ID Group discourses after 2015 in relation to the concepts of refugee crisis, immigration and asylum seekers. Since the Group participated in the European Parliament in 2019 for the first time, it has been impossible to reach the discourses before 2015. In addition, the social media account of the Group has been mostly benefited for the analysis because the Group's website does not contain enough material to evaluate.

To begin, the protection of the borders are one of the highlighted topics in the ID Group's discourses. The Group firstly makes an analogy between countries having borders and houses with walls; therefore, the Group points out the internal security of the countries are provided through borders; otherwise, it is likely to think where we sustain our lives can be demolished. On the other hand, the Group reveals its support for Brexit and for their advantage of control their own borders. As a consequence, it is possible to conclude the nation-states within the European Union are unable to manage their own border and are supposed to follow what the Union states.

Besides, the Group remarks the necessity of border checks for immigration and shows their annoyance toward the current approach in a complaining tone. The ID Group also associates the border checks with the will of the people and asserts that people are against the migration.

“There is no such a thing as a house without the walls and there is no country without the borders.” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2015)

“Thanks to the Brexit, the British will be able to control their borders again!”
(Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“We have had enough of a Europe ruled by the banks and have had enough of policies that favour immigration without any border control.” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“No Mrs. Mogherini, Europe does not need immigration, it needs borders!”
(Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

In addition, the Group criticizes the policy of the European Union toward migration and the use of words like *“to impose”* and *“mad”* indicates the Group has

unfavorable and derogatory attitude for the migration policy of the European Union. On the other hand, the Group also considers that the European Union applies its migration policy on the people by force and intimidates them by penalizing in case of their incomppliance. As a result, it is evident from the Group's word choice like "*to impose*", "*to submit*" and "*diktat*" that the Group invokes to the people's fear and anger and criticizes the EU by acting against the people's will in a harsh and provocative tones.

"The EU does not have to impose its mad migratory policy on the whole world : the United States is free to choose who they want to host in their country!" (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

"The EU again imposes a migratory wave on the European peoples and threatens to punish if they do not submit to their diktat!" (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

Furthermore, the Group strongly criticizes the relocation system of the European Union and describes it as "*forced migration.*" The ID Groups also uses an alarming tone and forms a crisis or fear atmosphere while expressing the number of migrants as "*millions*" and linking the enforcement of the quota system with the breakdown of the Europe. For this reason, the ID Group rejects the imposed quota system for migrants and the acceptance of the migrants into their countries in order to prevent the disappearance of the Europe they love by creating a sentimental relationship.

The ID Group also preserves its language of crisis and fear in its subsequent discourses because they consider lack of border control will lead to "*horror nights*" and depict the influx of migrants as "*tsunami.*"

"First on the agenda this week was the forced migration, they call it relocation. So there are tens of thousands, potentially millions of migrants that are going to be forced onto the states. Hungary, Poland and other smaller Eastern European states are just refusing to have these imposed quotas. They consider it an assault on their culture and identity and I (Janice Atkinson – MEP) call it: "the strange death of Europe". If we don't resist this, then millions more will come. There are possible 10 million people poised to break into our countries, which is Europe, the Europe that we know and love and that has to stop." (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“There will be many more horror nights if we don't close the borders!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“It is not a migratory "wave": it is a tsunami!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

Moreover, it is observed that the ID Group correlates the migrants with the culprits and terrorists because the Group thinks huge number of migrants and radical Islamism put many people's life in danger Europe. While making these correlations, the Group benefits from a lamenting tone since they point out the numerous casualties in Europe. Thus, the Group once again reveals its opposition to the migration. In addition to the possible danger of the migration on people's lives, the ID Group also claims that the migration influx jeopardizes the identity of people and nations. The ID Group also directly creates a close link between immigration and terrorism, and they possibly assume immigration results in terrorist activities. For this reason, ignoring the real reason and postponing its solution is accepted as equal to deceiving according to the Group.

“Marseille: one of the terrorists was an Algerian underground known to the police, what was he doing in France? The (too long) list of victims of radical Islamism continues to grow! Stop Mass Immigration!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“Today in Strasbourg is our colloquium on European youth! After Nicolas Bay's opening speech, the first round table on mass immigration and the threat it poses to our identity was held, with Aline Bertrand, RN PACA regional advisor, Jordan Bardella and Bart Claes of Vlaams Belang.” Identity and Democracy Party, 2018)

“Fighting terrorism without stopping immigration is an IMPOSTURE. This challenge of civilisation must today totally occupy our work because I (Jérôme Rivière – MEP) tell you, tomorrow it will be TOO LATE!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2020)

On the other hand, the ID Group criticizes the European Union for overlooking and for not taking any action toward the migration problem that the member countries encounter in a complaining tone. Therefore, the Group clearly indicates its support to the member states such as taking individual precautions against the migration.

Additionally, association of the migration with “*submersion*” connotes a negative and formidable situation the EU member states face.

“Italy submerged by a wave of 10,000 African migrants in 48 hours, but the EU refuses to open its eyes and act!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“Congratulations to the Hungarians who resist against Brussels to protect their country from this migratory submersion!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

In addition, the Group condemns the European Union for not having ability to propose an exit route of refugee crisis for people. Labeling the refugee crisis as “*invasion*” indicates the Group probably considers they have lost the country and culture which they have. Similarly, it is also expressed that the migrants or refugees will outnumber the local people in the Europe and it will result in the disappearance of national and cultural identities of local people. Likewise, the Group clearly states in an inflammatory tone their cultural identity will vanish due to forced migration application by the EU. Nevertheless, it is understandable that the Group’s response back through the people will be much more powerful.

Accordingly, the Group deems the refugees and migrants as a threat for their original cultures and identities; therefore, they pursue an approach to refuse the reception of migrants.

“The problem of migration flows is one of the most difficult problems in Europe and proves that the EU is not in a position to solve an important problem for citizens. We are living a real invasion!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

“Gerolf Annemans opened the event with his remarkable speech. He warned us for the systematic extinction of our cultural identity which is caused by the Europe machine. They are trying to impose migrants on us in Flanders! Faced with Macron and Merkel, we impose the voice of the people!”(Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

“Tom Van Grieken, president of Vlaams Belang (Member Party of ID Party), followed with his speech by asking if we do not defend our European identity, who will? The next generation will not be able to do so because it will be a minority in its own country and on its own continent.” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

The Group also objects the situation which the European officials have an authority

over deciding the numbers of migrants to be accepted by the individual states. Besides, they are opposed to their mandate to steer the nations' policies and acceptance procedures for the migration issue. By taking an unfavorable attitude, the ID Group also starts a petition campaign against this phenomenon.

“Europe's heritage is a Christian cultural space in which nations must cooperate freely with each other. European bureaucrats must not tell us how many immigrants we must welcome!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

“Countries of the Visegrád Group have been attacked at the EU Court of Justice for “non-respect of their legal obligation “on the resettlement of migrants! If you agree with us that it is not the Brussels technocrats who should decide on our immigration policies and impose the reception of migrants on us: sign our petition!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

On the other hand, the ID Group shows a disparaging tone when criticizing the pursued policies as “nonsense” and “inconsiderate”, and blames the policy-makers for the refugee crisis. Therefore, it is probable to infer if reasonable policies were followed, the situation could have been hindered. Besides, the Group sustains its criticism toward the current policies like common migration policy because they claim people do not want this and there needs to be a distinction between migrants and refugees.

“Those who keep supporting migration through nonsense directives, court decisions, inconsiderate policies giving unfair advantages to migrant are responsible for the plight of refugees.” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2019)

“Calling all migrants “refugees” is a DIRECT LIE! I (Jaak Madison – MEP) come from Estonia and I (Jaak Madison – MEP) represent my people, 65% of whom do not support a common migration policy. So forget it!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2020)

Besides, the Identity and Democracy Group resorts to the people-centrism and antagonism between people and elites regarding to the refugee crisis because they explain that majority of the people think it will adversely affect their countries; nonetheless, the EU turns a blind eye to this view of people. It is also evident that the Group appeals to the people's needs with regard to a genuine border protection

instead of the quota application and wants a referendum to be held for it. By asking for a referendum, the Group wants the will of people to be pursued.

“Almost 79% of respondents in European countries believe that immigration has a negative impact on their country! When is the EU going to listen to the people?!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

“The peoples of Europe do not need refugee quotas but real borders! The MENL calls for a referendum on this issue!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2017)

Besides, the Group again benefits from another approach of people-orientation and regards the rejection of migrants as necessary for protecting their citizen. For this reason, they try to demonstrate they listen to people and behave according to their wills in contrast to the other political groups. Additionally, the Group apparently accepts themselves as a populist political group and thrusts themselves forward as a solution to overcome migration influx, and multiculturalism so that they can realize the hopes of people and nations.

“A new movement is emerging in Europe: people are calling for a new model of citizen protection. We want to become an alternative to the parties in the system to stop immigration into our continent ! We must send a clear and pragmatic message to the citizens of Europe. We must fight to have an important role to play in the future European institutions !” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2018)

“The old times of multiculturalism and mass immigration is over. Populists are not the problem : we are the solution. We are the hope of our Nations, the hope of our continent!” (Identity and Democracy Party, 2018)

It is also possible to see the antagonism between people and elites in relation to the migration in the petition discourse of the ID Group because the EU officials are described as undemocratic and out of touch. Besides, the Group asserts in a skeptical attitude this pact is nontransparent as it has been prepared without disclosing anything to people or getting their opinions about it. The ID Group presuming the enforcement of the pact as a death for Europe is in an attempt to mobilize to take a counter action by having a provocative tone.

“With this Migration Pact, the undemocratic, technocratic elites in Brussels will implement the principles announced in the undemocratic Marrakech Pact/UN’s

Global Compact on Migration (December 2018) which erroneously proclaims that each person has a « right to migration. » (Save Europe Stop Migration Pact, 2020)

“The Migration Pact was conceived behind closed doors in the back rooms of the EU quarters in Brussels. Buried under hundreds of pages of inaccessible Brussels Newspeak and kept out of the public eye, the Migration Pact will be responsible for the demographic transformation of our entire continent. The Migration Pact will change forever both the direction of Europe and the lives of all citizens of the European nations. Should the Pact be adopted, it will be the end of Europe. To stop the Migration Pact, the mobilisation of us all is required in order to confront the technocrats in Brussels.” (Save Europe Stop Migration Pact, 2020)

On the other hand, the Group harshly criticizes the negative impact of the pact like compelling people to obey the European Commission rules. Furthermore, the Group claims this pact leaves European people and nations vulnerable to intrusion by using figurative language wholly to emphasize the severity of the situation.

“The Pact prevents member states from pursuing more restrictive immigration policies and aims to submit the peoples of the European nations and their governments to the despotism of the European Commission. We have handed over the keys of our house to the EU, who is now opening the gates without our consent, issuing an open invitation to the world to come and live in Europe. We must reclaim our keys or end up swamped, submerged and ultimately homeless” (Save Europe Stop Migration Pact, 2020)

The Identity and Democracy Group applies to a language instilling fear since they list the disruptive impacts of the pact such as economic, social and cultural deteriorations overall Europe which indicates once more their rejection of the migrants.

“Potentially at least 68 million migrants from outside of Europe could establish themselves in EU member states over the next years, a majority coming from developing countries. Their arrival will cause: the collapse of our welfare systems; the end of Europe’s distinct cultures and civilisations with their own values and way of life; the rise of parallel societies and “no go” areas throughout Europe; mass unemployment and the worsening of the housing crisis; the rise in delinquency and communitarianism related conflicts; and the further advance of

radical Islam in Europe and the spread of terrorism across the Continent, including attacks on civilians in Europe.” (Save Europe Stop Migration Pact, 2020)

In line with these discourses after 2015 regarding to the refugee crisis and migration, the Identity and Democracy Group possesses the fundamental elements of populism such as appeal to people, anti-establishment rhetoric and rejection of the others who do not belong to the society. In short, the Group favors managing the border for the security of people, highlights people’s will and opinions for political actions, criticizes the establishment and its incapability to respond the refugee crisis, forms an antagonistic relationship between people and elites who are depicted as out of touch and sophisticated, and emphasizes the dangers and threats to be posed by the immigrants against the European people and culture like cultural destruction, job loss and criminal activities.

4.7. European Conservatives and Reformists Group (ECR)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (ECR) is the sixth largest political group in the European Parliament by possessing 62 seats and 8.26 % of the total votes. The Group which is co-chaired by Ryszard Legutko and Raffaele Fitto places themselves in the center-right political spectrum. The ECR Group aims to renovate the European Union by taking into account the understanding of euro-realism, the development of economy, economic growth and competitiveness, and the respectful approach to national sovereignty (ECR Group About, 2020)

4.7.1. General Overview of the ECR Group Discourses

This section moves on to analyze the general discourses of the ECR Group gathered from its website content in terms of their relation to populist characteristics. Firstly, it is clearly understandable that the ECR Group is not satisfied with the current situation of the European Union; therefore, they would like to reshape the EU based on the understanding of euro-realism which is related to the coordinated actions of the member states to be better off in the common interest areas. The Group also criticizes the complex and time-consuming bureaucracy within the Union by using the expression of “red tape” in a figurative language, and favors an EU which the governments of the member states steer rather than the officials in Brussels.

“Euro-realism is the driving force of the ECR Group, which distinguishes our agenda from the other political groups in the European Parliament. The European Union needs a new direction. Some argue that the solution is more Europe, others that the solution is no Europe. We offer a bold alternative vision of a reformed EU as a community of nations cooperating in areas where they have some common interests that can best be advanced by working together.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2020)

“We believe in cutting red tape, in an EU run by national governments not Brussels bureaucrats, in doing less but better, in an immigration system that works, in spending taxpayer money wisely, but most of all, we believe in fostering an EU that is safe, secure, competitive and prosperous for all.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2020)

In addition, the ECR Group complains that the European Union is not connected with ordinary European people and it focuses on its own interests to have achievements. Accordingly, the Group puts the EU into the category of elites and manifests an antagonistic relationship between the EU and European people. Therefore, the ECR Group asserts that the absolute solution of the current problems is basically depended on the fact that the EU hears what European people say. Moreover, the Group puts an emphasis on the improving the transparency and accountability across the EU bodies so that European people can go on trusting and believing in the EU.

“The European Union has overreached. It has become too centralised, too ambitious, and too out of touch with ordinary citizens.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2020)

“Only an EU that truly listens to its people can offer real solutions to the problems we face today.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2020)

“Increasing democratic accountability and transparency are objectives at the heart of the ECR Group’s agenda for guaranteeing reform of the European Union. Without increased transparency and accountability of the EU’s institutions, agencies, budget and policies, then public faith and trust in the EU will continue to be eroded.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2020)

The ECR Group complains that the EU is not agile to act based on the concerns of

the European people and that the EU, on the contrary, puts forward these concerns are baseless. On the other hand, the Group also indicates that European people consider the EU has deviated from its path and it does not provide necessary elements for people. As a result, it is possible to infer that an alienation has occurred between the EU and citizens, and the EU does not take action according to the people's concerns and views.

“Time is running out for the European Union to deliver on the issues its citizens really care about, European Conservatives and Reformists group Co-chairman Syed Kamall warned today. Responding to European Commission President Jean Claude Juncker’s State of the Union speech, he said the EU’s priority must be to win back voters’ confidence ahead of next year’s elections.”(European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2018)

“We hear many in this chamber tell voters that their concerns are unfounded, or that the way they have voted is nationalist or populist. But in attempting to shut out parties which do not share their vision, they also shut out many voters and push them further away. People of many member states feel that the EU has lost its way, that it has failed to deliver on jobs, on security and on the things they care about.”(European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2018)

Besides, the ECR Group addresses the concepts of the refugee crisis, migration and asylum seekers in their general website content independent of the news released on these issues. For example, the Group embraces a critical approach for the existing migration and asylum strategies of the EU because the Group claims they include some weaknesses and they are not useful enough to endure the contemporary problems. Thus, the Group stresses these mechanisms should go through some transformations.

“Since the formation of the ECR Group, we have pointed out the flaws in the EU’s migration system and been the voice of reform and change for the Common European Asylum System. As one of the ECR Group’s founding principles, this is a key priority. The EU system currently in place is not effective in dealing with the modern challenges of globalisation, regional conflicts and poverty, and mass migration.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2020)

Additionally, the ECR Group supports that a new migration strategy to be established

should be molded by taking into account the opinions of both the European people and the member states. In this regard, it is quite understandable that the current migration and asylum mechanism do not have the complete support of the European people and member states, which prevents the migration mechanism to be viable.

“First and foremost we need a migration system which respects the voice and wishes of its Member States and its citizens. For any EU migration system to be sustainable, then it needs to have the full backing of all of its Member States and the people of Europe. The EU cannot continue to impose an immigration system which is backed by only a few of its Member States. A system of cooperation rather than compulsion must prevail.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2020)

On the other hand, the Group takes side of making a differentiation among the asylum seekers as true and defenseless ones and failed ones and favors the repatriation of the failed asylum seekers so that the EU’s migration system can be viable. Therefore, it is likely to conclude that the Group has partially rejectionist attitude towards the whole of asylum seekers in Europe.

“The ECR Group understands that in order for immigration in the EU to be sustainable, and for the genuine and most vulnerable asylum seekers to be able to be helped first by the EU, it is essential that Member States are able to return failed asylum seekers to their country of origin.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2020)

In general, the ECR Group indicates some populist traits such as people-centrism, criticism of the establishment, antagonism between elites and people, and rejection of others when they state their wish to change the European Union in a way directed by the thoughts of people and the member states, their dissatisfaction of insufficient openness and accountability, and of tedious bureaucratic procedures in the EU, their criticism of the distance between people and the EU and of the ignorance of the EU toward people’s voices, and their proposition to distinction between asylum seekers to increase the repatriation quantities.

4.7.2. Analysis of the ECR Group Discourses Before 2015

This section of the study concentrates upon the analysis of the ECR Group discourses gathered from the news in their website with reference to refugee crisis, immigration and asylum before 2015 in order to observe whether they have any connection with the populist traits.

First of all, the ECR Group urges the Commission to fortify the deals between the third countries to accommodate the refugees instead of welcoming them within the European territories. Thus, it is probable to deduce that the Group has an unfavorable attitude toward the refugees and has a characteristic of rejection of others.

“Ms. Muscardini and Mr. Callanan ask the Commission to encourage Member States to improve cooperation between their coast guard and rescue services to prevent tragedies that have caused more than 6000 deaths in the Sicilian Channel in less than 10 years, and to strengthen agreements with those countries of Maghreb that agree to host refugees from Eritrea, Somalia and Syria.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2013)

In addition, the Group highlights the inequalities between the member states in terms of the reception of refugees, criticizes the understanding of common solidarity toward refugee management as a coerced method by taking a skeptical tone, and rather favors an understanding centered upon the mutual trust between the member states. The ECR Group complains in a critical approach that the systems of quota and relocation for migration are coerced methods and are contradictory to democratic understanding and sustainability. The Group, on the other hand, retains its criticism toward the methods followed by the EU and member states toward the refugee crisis such as quota application and compelled solidarity. Besides, the Group stresses the results of the repeated missteps by using short sentences and forming a contrast structure.

“Speaking in a debate in the European Parliament on last week’s EU summit, European Conservatives and Reformists Group leader Syed Kamall said that EU leaders have taken an important step forward, but serious questions must be answered both to stabilise the region, process applications, discourage people from making the journey, and target people traffickers. He also said that EU countries with little immigration should take more people fleeing persecution, but

that arrangement should be based on ‘mutual trust’, rather than compulsion through so-called ‘shared solidarity’ (i.e. quotas).” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

“But I (Timothy Kirkhope – MEP) do not believe that this assistance should undermine key principles of humanitarian law and asylum and that an individual should be able to seek sanctuary in the first safe country reached. True solidarity is offering assistance because it is the right thing to do, not through compulsion. I (Timothy Kirkhope – MEP) do not believe that quota and force relocation is sustainable or democratic, nor is it fair to the individuals in question.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

“While some countries should probably do more to help, proposing a quota system was a mistake. Instead of cooperation the Commission proposed coercion. Instead of solidarity we now have polarity. Instead of countries working with each other we have countries arguing with each other.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

In addition, the Group underscores the need to find a long-lasting response to the refugee crisis rather than temporary ones by using a metaphor like *“sticking plaster”* and indicates their exasperation by using an imperative phrase.

“Not another sticking plaster solution until a future summit.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

Besides, the ECR Group accuses the European Council of abdicating its responsibility and dispossessing a political will toward the solution of the crisis because of usage of *“less finger-pointing”* signifying the previous meetings were full of these.

“So when the council meets next week I (Timothy Kirkhope – MEP) hope we’ll see less finger-pointing and more of a willingness to act together in the long term interests of all European countries and especially those who are truly eligible for refugee status.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

Furthermore, the ECR Group maintains its objection to acceptance of all refugees and underlines the need of a distinction between these refugees such as economic migrants and vulnerable asylum seekers. Otherwise, the Group asserts by having a

people-centrist approach that the combination of systems for asylum seekers and migrants will lead to decrease the people's confidence. The ECR Group also states that acceptance of all refugees without any differentiation will menace the performance and competence of the EU's asylum strategy. The Group also tries to move the refugee or migration problem away from the Europe because they advocate for policies focusing on increased funding and solution of the problem in the originated place. Thus, the Group sustains its partial rejectionist attitude toward the migration and refugees.

“In reality, we won't solve this problem until we stabilise the region and this will take time. Our Member States must use all the tools available to them: diplomacy, targeted aid, open trade. But we also need to distinguish between economic migration and helping genuine asylum seekers. The asylum system must not be conflated with the migration system otherwise we undermine public trust in both. Asylum must be about people running for their lives, not for people who understandably want a better economic life.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

“Whilst legal migration forms part of the European Commission's wider migration strategy, I (Timothy Kirkhope – MEP) do not believe that we can solve the problems we have seen in the Mediterranean and address the huge numbers of refugees through further forms of legal migration. There needs to be a clear differentiation between economic migrants and those seeking genuine asylum in order for Europe's asylum approach to work effectively and efficiently.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

“It is a mistake to have a strategy which addresses all kinds of migration in one document. Economic migration and asylum are two very different issues with their very own challenges, and this joint strategy blurs the lines which should be clear. We do agree on the role of FRONTEX, EASO, Returns, EURODAC, and the need for increased funding and tackling the issue at the source, and I (Timothy Kirkhope – MEP) look forward to working with the Commission on this important issue.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

The ECR Group also directly states they have an unfavorable approach to the acceptance of the refugees and this signifies their insistence on differentiation among

the refugees and their negativity to the others who do not belong to a homogeneous society.

They also correlate the necessity of making a distinction with their liability for the electorate in order to show that the politicians do not let them down and they thoroughly pursue what should be done.

“On the crisis in the Mediterranean, there is no easy answer. We cannot let no-one in yet we cannot let everyone in. Until we have a strategy, we will simply be providing lifeboats, plucking unfortunate desperate people from the sea.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

“Many people on the edges of this chamber deliberately seek to confuse economic migrants with refugees – either to let them all in, or to keep them all out. We need to be clear about the distinction. People running for their lives seek sanctuary as refugees. But for those not fleeing persecution or famine it’s human nature to want a better life, but we must be clear that correct rules must be followed. And we must be honest with our voters.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

The ECR Group also sets forth the fortification of the external borders, assistance for the Balkans and member states which densely have refugees, and financial aid for the asylum processing and returns as necessary responses for the refugee crisis. Therefore, it is likely to conclude that the Group does not regard the existing responses as sufficient and gives alternative solutions. On the other hand, the Group mentions about the possibility of not overcoming huge numbers of refugees by taking daunting tone.

“Closer to home, EU frontline states & the Balkans need to be helped. Borders need to be strengthened. Money and resources need to go into processing and returns.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

“The EU needs to put in place the facilities and resources to process and return failed asylum seekers quickly, to focus on improving external border controls, and to help those communities with integration which are placed under pressure both in transit countries and in destination countries. We need to get the basics right in Europe, otherwise we will simply not be able to cope with the numbers of people that are coming.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015)

Upon the analysis of the discourses of the ECR Group with reference to refugee crisis before 2015, it is probable to observe the criticism of the establishment and rejection of others as populist characteristics because the Group is generally opposed to reception of all types of refugees and stresses the necessity to go for a differentiation and giving asylum to those who need it most. The Group considers that unless this differentiation is not applied, the EU's asylum strategy will be under risk and European citizens will lose their trust on the EU. Moreover, the ECR Group criticizes the EU, the EU bodies and followed approaches for the refugees since they think these are inadequate and the EU either provides temporary solutions or lacks of necessary political will and responsibility. As a result, the Group offers extra solutions to address the refugee crisis such as enhancing border protection, assisting the EU states and Balkans for handling the refugee crisis and providing more funding to them.

4.7.3. Analysis of the ECR Group Discourses After 2015

This part focuses upon the analysis of the discourses collected from the ECR Group's website news concerning the refugee crisis, immigration and asylum after 2015 in order to study whether or not the ECR Group carries any populist traits.

Initially, the Group emphasizes the need to improve the asylum system so as to manage the asylums and refugee crisis. Accordingly, the Group criticizes the EU leaders on this issue by using a figurative language and disparaging tone because the usage of *"EU leaders are waking up to the fact"* signifies that the EU leaders were not previously aware of the need to manage crisis whereas the usage of *"reinventing the wheel"* manifests improving the system is not about creating a new system entirely.

"EU leaders are waking up to the fact that if we are going to gain control of the crisis there has to be a focus on making the system we already have work better. Now is not the time to start reinventing the wheel, but for EU leaders to put their heads down and deliver results." (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

On the other hand, the ECR Group criticizes in a complaining tone that the European leaders could not realize their duty for refugee crisis, and states in a daunting tone that this situation results in the disruption of the Schengen system. For this reason,

the Group associates the feasibility of the Schengen system with the preserving the external borders.

“The migration crisis was a case in point that has shown European irresponsibility at its worst.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

“Schengen is breaking down because of the irresponsibility of a few leaders. Open borders within the Schengen area are only sustainable as long as its external borders are secured.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

The ECR Group also shows a critical approach to the relocation policy that is forcefully applied by the European Commission because the Group considers it is not functional and is against the will of the national states. In addition, the Group having a derogatory tone maintains its criticism toward the European Council and the European Commission for enforcing a disfavored and feeble migration regulation to the member states against their support even though these EU bodies were aware that the member states did not uphold this regulation. Thus, the ECR Group calls upon the Council and Parliament to look up for alternative ways to take into account consensus among the member states.

“When the pressure on Germany became too severe, we saw attempts by the European Commission to impose a compulsory relocation scheme on countries that did not want it. Yet most migrants and refugees want to remain in Germany and, of the 160,000 people who were supposed to be relocated, only a couple of hundred have actually moved to date. The policy doesn’t work.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

“The Council and the Commission knew from the start that a number of Member States were opposed to this initiative. Even amongst those Member States which backed the relocation scheme, its successes have been limited, and failed to deal effectively with the scale of the crisis the EU faces. Therefore, rather than imposing unpopular and ineffective immigration legislation on reluctant Member States, the Commission and the Parliament should look to find solutions to the migrant crisis which build on consensus and not create division.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2017)

Besides, the Group indicates its displeasure for the Dublin system; however, they are opposed to the thorough amendment of the system. Therefore, the ECR Group thinks the enhancement of the current system is a much better approach for the crisis, and accepts the disobedience of the member states to the rules is the point weakening the system. Furthermore, the Group criticizes the European Parliament for its comprehensive strategy for the solution of migration solution and has a disapproving tone due to the usage of “*lowest common denominator*” signifying the poor quality of the proposals. Additionally, the ECR Group reiterates its objection the radically overhaul of the Dublin Regulation and its transformation into a perpetual and unconditional relocation system. Thus, the Group once again reveals its rejectionist traits towards the immigrants as they want to put an end the rush of the immigrants into Europe.

“To completely reinvent the Dublin regulation in the midst of a crisis is the wrong approach. We need to stick to a method that has been tried and tested, but which countries are failing to enforce effectively.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

“The justice and home affairs committee of the European Parliament has today adopted a ‘lowest common denominator’ set of proposals on a ‘holistic’ approach to resolving the migration crisis, according to European Conservatives and Reformists shadow rapporteur, Helga Stevens MEP. The Flemish MEP said that she could not support the report, which includes a call for drastically reforming the Dublin rules by turning it into a permanent relocation mechanism without any conditions, such as stemming the influx of migrants.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

The ECR Group also maintains its argument on distinguishing the people coming to Europe as economic migrants and refugees and demonstrates a critical approach to the European Parliament since they are unable to make this differentiation, to devise a strategy to accelerate the repatriations, and to demand the implementation of current rules regarding the immigration by the member states. The Group also proposes strengthening the external borders as a precaution against the economic migrants. As a consequence, the ECR Group sustains its slight rejectionist attitude toward the refugees and criticism of the establishment.

As another rejectionist attitude toward the refugees, the Group favors coming to agreements with the third countries for hosting asylum seekers similar to the deal signed with Turkey. Therefore, the Group has clearly a restricted understanding of refugees' acceptance and supports their returns to third countries, where they can be safe, as much as possible.

“These proposals adopted by the parliament today fail to get to the core of the problem. They fail to make a clear distinction between refugees and economic migrants, nor do they set out any plan for speeding up processing and returns. They make no effort to push for the EU’s rules and the Dublin regulation to be applied by all Member States, and there is no clear focus on supporting the proper integration and activation of refugees that are given shelter in our territory.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

“It is essential that we give our border agency the tools it needs to protect our external border from economic migrants, and to ensure that genuine refugees are not put at the mercy of people traffickers” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

“The next step is basically to conclude deals with countries around the Mediterranean, as we did with Turkey, and have ambitious and effective readmission and return agreements with third countries such as Pakistan, Algeria and Morocco. Accelerated procedures will determine which asylum seekers already got a safe haven in countries like Turkey. Only genuine refugees, who didn’t find solace in any of the countries they passed through, may apply for asylum in the EU. People who were safe in a third-country, need to be returned from the border, with the assistance of the border and coast guard agency, under its expanded mandate.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

Besides, the ECR Group mentions in a critical tone that the Europe has eventually realized the importance of managing the arrivals of the immigrants rather than the formation of lawful migration pathways. Thus, it can be understood that the ECR Group prioritizes the control of the migrant influx as a solution of the crisis.

“Protecting our external borders is really key within the broader asylum strategy,” Stevens says. ‘Europe is finally starting to understand we must first take control of the numbers of migrants coming in, before we start creating more legal migration

channels.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

In addition, the ECR Group links the management of the refugees with the prerequisite to revive the trust of people; thus, the identification of people coming to Europe in terms of the danger they may pose is essential for the ECR Group. In this regard, it is apparent that the ECR Group perceives some of the refugees and immigrants as dangers for European people and society. Furthermore, the Group puts an emphasis on the people’s support for a policy on migration and asylum to be realized by the EU so that this policy of the EU can become efficient and functional.

The ECR Group also criticizes the European Parliament as they do not pursue the settled rules and principles for the asylum and they follow an unsuccessful path, and states that this situation can lead to the people’s dissatisfaction toward the EU political elites. Besides, the Group creates an antagonistic relationship between the European people and European politicians by stating that the Commission does not pay attention what people wish to happen such as on the migration strategy, and has a critical and disparaging tone for this strategy by calling it the most dissenting and unpopular one.

“We need to restore public confidence that we are able to monitor who comes into the EU, and to find people who could represent a threat. Checking people against our existing criminal records databases, and making exchanging that information much easier, will go a long way towards showing that we can find those people who mean us harm, amongst the vast majority who do not.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016)

“The EU would be more successful if voters in individual EU countries actually backed the policies that the EU adopted in the first place, rather than forcing them through without consensus amongst all members states. Today’s reports from the European Commission proves that relocation isn’t working, the numbers speak for themselves.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2017)

“The ECR welcomes much in the Council’s current strategy in tackling the migrant crisis. But the Parliament has a position...that throws out the rule book and long established asylum laws to pursue a relocation system which has not exactly been a success. This approach gives asylum seekers false hope and EU citizens false solutions. These proposals won’t increase solidarity but may

increase voters' frustrations with politicians.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2017)

“Instead, the Commission stands accused of pursuing a federalist agenda regardless of what citizens want; championing the most divisive and unsupported migration policies of the past 20 years; proposing an increase in spending for the new seven year budget, despite the departure of the UK, one of its biggest net contributors; and the EU’s own ombudsman this week found the Commission guilty of four instances of maladministration in the secretive appointment of Martin Selmayr – Juncker’s former Chief of Staff – as Secretary General.” (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2018)

To sum up, the discourses of the ECR Group regarding to refugee crisis, migration and asylum after 2015 heavily concentrates on the criticism of the establishment as a populist feature because the Group is not satisfied with the ongoing coerced policy steps of the European Commission and European Council, with their action against the consent and support of the member states, with the indifference and lack of responsibility among the EU leaders, and with the insufficient approaches to protect borders and attempts to change the Dublin regulation drastically. Second, the Group shows a people-centrist attitude in their discourses as they connect the management of refugee arrivals to Europe with restoration of public confidence. They also prioritize getting people’s approval or endorsement for a migration policy before realizing it. On the other hand, the Group highlights the importance of listening to people when they criticize the Commission for not doing it. Last, the ECR Group has a partial rejectionist attitude towards the acceptance of the non-national people coming to Europe as they attach great importance to differentiation of these people as economic migrants and refugees; they push for border protection against economic migrants; they bolster signing deals with the third countries to host refugees safely; they show their determination to speed up the processing and returns of the failed asylum seekers; and they consider some of the migrants endanger the European social life and people.

4.8. The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL) whose presidents are Manon Aubry and Martin Schirdewan is the seventh largest political group within the European Parliament for 2019 – 2024 political terms by gaining 41 seats and 5.46 % of the total votes.

The Group of GUE/NGL is based on the understanding of confederalism through which they adhere and protect the diversity within the Group itself. Besides, the GUE/NGL favors a European integration which has international solidarity at its core as well as equity, sustainability and peace. (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2021)

The Group also strives for enhancing economy in a sustainable way, providing more and better job opportunities, enabling educational chances and cultural diversity, ensuring a powerful peace strategy, improving social security and solidarity, and preserving the nature and natural resources. (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2021) Accordingly, the Group pursues a pathway in the left political spectrum just as it is clear from the Group's name.

4.8.1. General Overview of GUE/NGL Discourses

This part of the analysis focuses on the overall evaluation of the GUE/NGL regardless of the concepts of refugee crisis, migration and asylum, which have been collected from the Group's website, in order to observe whether or not the Group carries the populist traits.

First, the GUE/NGL Group creates an antagonistic relationship between the European people and European Union, and criticizes the EU for currently being under the influence of the elites as the expression of "*cannot remain a project of elites*" indicates. Thus, the GUE/NGL advocates a European Union, which is steered by people and has people-centrism at its core. The GUE/NGL Group also claims that they are devoted to work on behalf of the European working people and preserve their benefits.

"The European Union must become a project of its people and cannot remain a project of the elites." (The Confederal Group of the European United Left –

Nordic Green Left, 2021)

“Thank you. It is an honour to represent the candidacy of a group that is small in number, but one that is firmly committed to the defence of the interests of the people of Europe – in particular – working people.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2019)

In addition, the Group sustains its criticism toward the European Union due to its policies from which the “*big businesses*” benefit mostly and which give damage to the workers. Besides, the Group asserts that the economic policies should be to the benefit of the people. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the GUE/NGL presumes the workers as the pure people and big business are the corrupt elites and that the Group takes an unfavorable attitude toward the big corporations and supports a people-centrist approach for the economic policies. Furthermore, the Group also criticizes the European Parliament as they take side of the elites such as corporations and lobby groups instead of the people. Therefore, the GUE/NGL considers the European Parliament should give up this situation and should take side of the people and workers.

“Austerity, privatisation and deregulatory policies in favour of big businesses are devastating for workers. Our challenge to prevailing EU economic doctrine and growing inequality involves coordination across several policy areas from demanding better employment and social rights to highlighting the devastating impact of tax dodging. The economy must serve the people and we have to ensure fair distribution of wealth throughout societies, countries and regions.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2021)

“For us, it is therefore imperative that we talk about which side the President of this Parliament will be on over the next few years. Will they continue to be on the side of corporate lobbies and multinationals? Will they be on the side of the Europe of division and walls that continues to feed the monster that is neo-fascism? Or will they, finally, be on the side of people, of workers, and of human rights?” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2019)

Moreover, the Group continues to criticize the EU bodies like the European Commission and the EU politicians as they are not connected with the real concerns

of the European people. For instance, GUE/NGL complains that the reality perception of the Commission differs from the one of the working people; therefore, it is likely to infer that there is alienation between the European bodies and people, and Commission does not offer solutions for the actual needs of the European working people. In addition, the Group of GUE/NGL uses an idiomatic expression like “*ivory towers*” and criticizes that the European politicians are out of touch with the ordinary people, they are not preoccupied with the real daily problems of the European people, and they pursue their egoistic purposes and try to have more power.

“Your speech paints a particular canvas of reality but the European workers who see their jobs threatened, the small farmers being priced out of the market, the unemployed for whom nothing is being done see a different reality.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2017)

“Instead of dealing with the real problems, you and the rest of the EU elite in your ivory towers are trying to grab ever more power for yourselves with proposals for an EU Finance Minister and a de facto undemocratic carte blanche to the Commission to sign off on free trade agreements. These are both examples of a worrying lack of respect for democracy!” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2017)

In brief, the Group of GUE/NGL indicates the characteristics of a left populist party in their general discourses regardless of the refugee crisis because the Group of GUE/NGL accepts the multinational corporation, big businesses and lobbyists as the elites who take advantage of the economic outcomes and give harm to the European people. Furthermore, the Group directs its criticism toward the European Union as they work in the interest of these afore-mentioned elites instead of the people, and complains about the EU politicians as they are not aware of the real concerns of the people and they live in a different reality to attain more power. For this reason, the Group which has people- centism and criticism of the establishment as populist features supports the idea which the European Union should adopt a new direction taking into account of real concerns of the people and exerting itself to the benefits of the people.

4.8.2. Analysis of GUE/NGL Before 2015

This section of the study touches upon the analysis of the GUE/NGL's discourses regarding to refugee crisis, migration and asylum before 2015 and the evaluation of their relation with the populist traits.

First of all, the Group complains the lack of sufficient solidarity between the member states; thus, the Group puts an emphasis the significance of demonstrating more solidarity. In addition, the Group disfavours the militarized approach toward refugee crisis in a sentimental tone. Moreover, the Group criticizes that the member states are not committed to show solidarity toward the refugee crisis even though they addressed it in the meetings, and that the member states took a contradictory attitude by conducting restrictive measures.

“It is high time that all member states show more solidarity to each other and to neighbourhood countries, in particular the southern ones. I deeply regret the adoption of an EPP (centre-right) amendment that supports setting up reinforced police cooperation between the EU and third countries as well as the possibility of setting up a new Frontex operational office in the Mediterranean region.”
(Macintosh, and Lundy, 2013)

“During EU summits they talk about solidarity, yet the response of the member states is in fact the opposite: more walls, more of the Dublin Regulation, more repression.” (Bach, and Sullings, 2015)

Subsequently, GUE/NGL, by taking a harsh tone, deeply criticizes the migration strategy followed by the European Parliament. In contrast to this disliked migration policies, the Group urges the Parliament to pursue more humane approach, to enhance the savings, to develop the accommodation facilities and to provide a lawful passage to the EU.

By pointing out the dramatic condition in the Mediterranean with a daunting tone, the Group reiterates the transformation of the migration policies and criticizes both this policy and the EU politicians for lacking of democratic understanding and of refraining from taking concrete steps, respectively. The Group of GUE/NGL also stresses the need of the EU's migration policy to respect human rights; otherwise, the Group mentions in a critical tone the EU will derail away from its own founding

principles.

“From the European parliament we are asking this despising migration policy to be changed. As primary measures, we are asking for the improvement of rescuing at sea, the replacement of retention centres by support centres and welcoming points all along the borders of the Mediterranean and the creation of a European legal framework that could facilitate access and stay in the EU”. (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2013)

“These men and women are just taking more risks, sometimes at the peril of their lives. We cannot let the Mediterranean be the cemetery of thousands of migrants. It is high time that the migration policy of the EU take another turn, more in line with the democratic values and principles that EU leaders pretend to defend, and more in line with their international obligations and to their statements.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2013)

“EU leaders must do more to protect the rights and lives of migrants, refugees, and asylum-seekers arriving at Europe's borders. If human rights are not at the heart of migration and asylum policies then the EU is simply not adhering to its own values.” (Macintosh, and Kavanagh, 2014)

The Group also shows its critical thought that another system the EU has for the refugees and asylum seekers is not fit for purpose and functional due to the constraint of the enormous presence of the refugees in the frontline states.

In addition, GUE/NGL complains about the idleness of the EU leaders to take a solid action on refugee crisis despite the prolonging of the situation. They also criticize the leaders for pursuing completely contradictory approach which is comprised of restraining precautions. Besides, the Group denounces the absence of a concrete solution regarding to the refugee crisis by the EU politicians but the process has so far been about only talking and stalling. Thus, the Group underlines the importance of taking real actions for the sustainability of the European Union.

“Greek authorities have said that in line with Dublin rules on asylum the refugees can only make a request in Greece, the country of reception. They were told that no travel documents would be issued to them and that housing for everyone cannot be ensured. The situation shows that the current Common European Asylum system (CEAS) is simply not working. The high numbers of Syrian refugees in

Greece illustrate the pressure on member states at the EU's external borders. Asylum seekers are stuck in countries that cannot provide them with anything.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2014)

“One could have hoped that EU leaders, who had described the 3rd October tragedy off Lampedusa as a “wake-up call”, would have turned these words into the much needed radical shift of policies. 20 months on and after many more deaths at EU borders, the GUE/NGL strongly condemns the repressive measures against migrants decided by member states last night while they did not commit to anything meaningful on relocation and resettlement.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2015)

“It's time for us to go from words to deeds. So far we've only see delays and postponements. In decision-making we need a viable EU approach that is humanitarian in essence. If we do not do that, it will threaten the whole process of European unification with breakdown.” (Kavanagh, and Sullings, 2015)

On the other hand, the Group indirectly blames the EU political leaders for the losses of lives in the Mediterranean owing to their policy aiming to protect the EU against refugees. In grave and skeptical tones through the usage of words like “war”, “poverty” and “hunger” indicating the plight, the Group draws attention to shaping the new policy in a more humanitarian and benevolent direction. Once again, the Group underlines that the EU should not be leading refugees to die and should rescue them on the contrary. According to the Group, the fact that the EU does not have this vision signifies it is deceptive. In addition to blaming the EU for the casualties of the refugees, the Group further accuses the EU and its institutions for stimulating the activities of the human traffickers. Therefore, the Group underlines the need of reversing the current course of action and adopting a different approach by using an idiomatic expression like “a change of tack”.

“How many people must die before EU leaders put an end to the fortress Europe policy? Already this year about 3000 people have died off the coasts of the EU. Children, women and men fleeing war, poverty and hunger need safe and legal channels to the EU. This should be the role of a modern asylum and migration policy.” (Lundy, and Kavanagh, 2014)

“The EU should not be causing mass drownings. We cannot leave people on

hunger strike in Athens and we need to save people from shipwrecks. This house is hypocritical if it does not recognise this.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2014)

“EU asylum policies and FRONTEX encourage profit-hungry human smuggling and bear ultimate responsibility for the current situation. And the more member states believe that they do not have to change their repressive border protection policies, the worse methods of smuggling are going to get. What we need is a change of tack for asylum! We urgently need legal channels and safe access to Europe!” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2015)

Furthermore, the Group maintains its criticism for the EU’s existing refugee strategy by referring it as a complete failure and demonstrates its disapproval for strengthening Frontex in a complaining tone.

The Group also reveals the failures of the EU for dealing with the refugee crisis by criticizing its policies and mechanism one by one such as Frontex, the Operation Triton, Mare Nostrum, border patrols and collaboration with the third parties. As a result of the failures exposed in a sequence, the Group emphasizes the misguided approaches and tries to mobilize the EU to follow a better path.

“European migration and refugee policy is a catastrophe and the situation is at its worst since the end of World War II. We are talking about more resources for FRONTEX rather than providing safe routes. The deaths in the Mediterranean are being used to justify more resources for FRONTEX and this is not acceptable.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2015)

“Frontex is the totally wrong partner to save the lives of refugees as it focuses on bolstering Europe’s borders and on fighting migration. The Operation Triton programme is going the wrong way. An appropriate replacement for the Italian ‘Mare Nostrum’ programme which expired in 2014 is urgently needed. What we want to see is a robust common European search-and-rescue operation in the central Mediterranean. More border patrols will not help prevent more tragedies. Simply calling for more cooperation with third countries is a false solution to the crisis.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2015)

Besides, the Group of GUE/NGL takes a harsh and rigid tone as a result of the usage of “*dirty work*” and “*blood on the hands of others*”, and criticizes the EU for forgoing and shifting its responsibilities to third parties. Consequently, the EU tries to conceal its incapacities in dealing with the refugee crisis according to the Group. GUE/NGL complains about the inadequate relocation proposal of the Commission by having a disparaging tone and using a figurative language like “*drop in the ocean*”. Furthermore, the Group addresses its disparaging criticism to the Council due to the underestimated proposal and indifference to the situation.

“They want other countries outside the EU to do their dirty work for them, they want the blood on the hands of others. They are trying to hide poverty and despair, they don't want us to see how human rights don't exist for these people so they send them to other countries, where they are not respected. This is another step towards total lack of respect of human rights and it goes directly against rights granted by European legislation.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2015)

“The Commission's proposal to relocate 40,000 people, who are in need of international protection, is a drop in the ocean when we consider what's needed. Greece has taken 260,000 people in the past year. The numbers being put forward by the Council sound like insults; the Council is not paying attention. Greek islands are literally sinking under the weight of the people who have arrived there.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2015)

In addition to the Group's critique on the EU, its policies and institutions for their inadequacy in dealing with the refugee crisis, the Group touches on the appeal to the people on the issue and calls upon the officials to pay attention what people want and say. In this sense, GUE/NGL invites the European Union to act in line with the people's opinions which include a welcoming and helpful attitude toward the acceptance of the refugees.

“The people have spoken and shown what type of Europe they want to live in and that is an open society that helps refugees and welcomes them. We should no longer try and adapt to the rhetoric and policies of the extreme right, this is not what people want. Fortress Europe must end!” (Kavanagh, 2015)

To sum up, the discourses of the Group of GUE/NGL are mostly centered upon the critique of the establishment as a populist feature since the Group does not find current works, policies, mechanisms and approaches conducted by the EU on the refugee crisis as satisfactory, and considers they need to change and contain some humanitarian aspects. Furthermore, GUE/NGL criticizes the member states and the EU politicians because the member states do not show solidarity as they have promised and the EU politicians cannot go beyond talking and postponing the solution. Therefore, the Group thinks that the EU politicians' idleness results in the human catastrophes in the Mediterranean. Lastly, although it is not prevailing as the critique of the establishment, GUE/NGL has a people-centrist feature as another populist feature because the Group underscores that European people have an inclusive and tolerant attitude toward the acceptance of the refugees. For this reason, the Group stresses the officials need to pay attention what people demand regarding to the refugees.

4.8.3. Analysis of GUE/NGL After 2015

This part of the study goes on analyzing the GUE/NGL's discourses related to the refugee crisis after 2015 so as to evaluate if they carry any linkage with populist characteristics.

To begin with, the Group of GUE/NGL embraces a critical attitude toward the EU political elites since the Group believes these politicians were not able to realize properly their duty on controlling the refugee crisis. GUE/NGL also exposes a failure of the EU to relocate the refugees and complains that the EU could not fulfill its promises on this subject.

“The President of the Commission, the Commissioner for Immigration and President Tusk should be resigning because they have completely failed to manage the refugee crisis. The European Union has agreed to relocate 165,000 people but they have barely managed to relocate a few hundred.” (Sullings, and Kavanagh, 2016)

Moreover, the usage of connotative expression like *“living inside a bubble”* indicates GUE/NGL disapproves that the Commission does not take into consideration the opinions in the outside world and it does indirectly take side of those unwilling to accept the refugees. Additionally, the Group reveals a misdeed

and fault of the EU, which its blackmail to the third countries in case of their rejection to open their gates for these refugees, and severely complains about this situation.

On the other hand, GUE/NGL takes furious and questioning tones, and complains the contradictory behaviors of the EU which does not help and provide shelter for refugees but functions to impede their entrance and mentions human rights at the same time.

“The Commission is clearly living inside a bubble from which it produces evermore cynical policies that play into the hands of anti-refugee forces across Europe.” (Sullings, and Kavanagh, 2016)

“Missing from the report is a strong and unambiguous rejection of the misappropriation of EU development funds for blackmailing of third countries for the purpose of outsourcing EU borders and limiting migration flows.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2017)

“It's time to stop talking hypocritically. It's not appropriate to have policies of building walls and at the same time talk about human rights. How can you say we are creating more security for refugee children while making it impossible for them to get permanent residence? How can you say you are working for refugee children's rights while you are returning them to third countries?” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2016)

Furthermore, the Group directs its criticism on likelihood to close the borders against the refugees and let them to lose their lives by using a metaphor like *“victims of a roulette game.”* In contrast, the Group highlights the need to change the approach and to adopt more humanitarian method by establishing secure enter of the refugees in the Europe and ensuring the common responsibility and solidarity across the member states.

“We must not allow refugees to be the victims of a roulette game where borders can be closed at any time. Instead, we must open our borders to create safe and legal pathways into Europe. We need a genuine sharing of responsibilities between all EU member states in order to address the situation in a decent and appropriate way.” (Sullings, 2016)

The Group of GUE/NGL takes a critical stance toward the member states and blames them for the flood of the refugees due to their inaction to help them in the first place which can be understood from the figurative expression like “*bury their heads in the sand*”. Moreover, the Group stresses in skeptical and daunting tones that the lack of solidarity among the member states can cause the destruction of the EU.

“Instead of being proactive and acting in due time to support refugees, EU governments buried their heads in the sand until millions of people had arrived from across the Mediterranean.” (Sullings, and Kavanagh, 2016)

“All member states should immediately receive the refugees that have been allocated to them. If Europe wants to continue to exist, we need solidarity among its members.” (Sullings, and Kavanagh, 2016)

In addition, the Group adopts an unfavorable attitude towards the deal between the EU and Turkey with regards to the rejection of the refugees owing to the fact that it is incompatible with the international procedures. Furthermore, GUE/NGL takes a harsh tone on the deal between Turkey and the EU, and stipulates this deal is against both the humanitarian values and the European principles and rules.

“The way that the EU is now trying to negotiate with Turkey to keep refugees out does not reflect your proposals. They are proposing to send refugees back in the same boats as they arrived in. That is not in line with international asylum law – thank you for making that point.” (Kavanagh, and Sullings, 2016)

“The EU-Turkey agreement, which involves thousands of people remaining in Turkey, is inhuman and cruel. This agreement undermines EU standards regarding the return of refugees in the EU to their countries of origin. It undermines our legislation on refugees, the Geneva Convention, the European Charter of Human Rights and a long list of other laws and agreements.” (Kavanagh, and Sullings, 2016)

Besides, the Group criticizes the Frontex in sentimental and daunting tones as this institution leaves refugees in difficult situations, and touches upon its corruptness as it is undemocratic and works without having any basis on the people’s will and views.

The Group also denounces the militarized approach taken by the EU toward the

refugee crisis and considers this approach aggravates the situation instead of alleviating it.

Furthermore, GUE/NGL takes a grave tone by giving the quantities of the casualties and accuses the member states and EU commission for these deaths because of their wrong actions and policies.

“It's a deportation agency, sending people back to bombs and starvation so that they don't set foot in Europe. There is no democratically elected political authority for this agency, there is no transparency and no respect for human rights.” (Sullings, and Kavanagh, 2016)

“An increased Frontex and police presence, and further militarization of the external borders, are once again the routine response to this situation. Sealing borders with barbed wire, thermal imaging, and tear gas is not a reaction to a humanitarian crisis, it is a disgrace and an act of violence against those seeking protection.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2020)

“EU governments and the European Commission are responsible for the death of at least 18,297 people during the past five years in the Mediterranean. One day, they should be tried for these crimes. Their policies of closing borders, of pushing people to risk their lives at sea, have led to 10 people being murdered on average every day. The directive that's been passed today is the direct result of these inhumane practices.” (Leung, 2019)

Besides, the Group exposes its dissatisfaction with the EU's current asylum mechanism, underscores the necessity to change it in a fairer and equitable direction. GUE/NGL also denounces the ineffectiveness and unjustness of the Dublin system because this system is not sufficient and does not provide equal conditions for each member state. Furthermore, GUE/NGL states that the refugee crisis is the result of the dysfunctional and misguided actions of the Europe.

“Europe needs a common asylum system and an equal share of the burden. As a first step, the Dublin Regulation must be abolished in favour of a policy built on mutual solidarity – unlike the unacceptable agreement between the EU and Turkey that reinforced a Fortress Europe. There should be a just system for resettlement of refugees otherwise there will be more deaths in the Mediterranean.” (The

Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2017)

“By not relocating and by exploiting the deeply-flawed Dublin Regulation, EU member states continue to shirk their duties by leaving our southern neighbours like Greece and Italy to take responsibility for the majority of new arrivals whilst barriers and fences are erected elsewhere to keep out non-EU citizens.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2017)

“Let it be clear: this is not a refugee crisis – it is the failure of our policies on asylum, relocation, family reunification for refugees and respect for the right to life.” (Sullings, 2017)

The Group also sustains its humanitarian stance toward the refugees and calls upon the EU bodies to do the same, to save refugees and to establish secure entrances of refugees to the EU. Moreover, in a left political position, GUE/NGL states the actual perils for the EU are social and economic discrepancies and advocated military interventions rather than the refugees coming to Europe.

“Instead of fuelling far-right political views and rhetoric, we urge both the European Commission and the European Council to make sure that proactive European search and rescue operations take place and provide safe and legal pathways for both asylum seekers and migrants.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2017)

“As GUE/NGL, we say that refugees and the migrants are not a threat to the EU. Wars and imperialist interventions that the EU and member states support are the real threats. The rising economic and social inequalities, and increasing racism and xenophobia are the real threats.” (The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2018)

Besides, the Group of GUE/NGL takes a people-centrist approach and urges the EU officials to act according to the wishes of the people. The usage of the pronoun “us” also signifies that the Group tries to show they are one of the people and take side of the people. On the other hand, the Group criticizes that the pile-up of the asylum seekers in a single place damages the local people as well as the asylum seekers themselves. Thus, the Group underlines the importance of putting an end this miserable situation.

“The Greek government and the EU must listen to what many of us, progressive citizens, demand: show some pan-European solidarity and ‘decongest the islands. We have no more time to lose.” (Leung, 2020)

“Both the asylum seekers and the local population have been suffering for too long from the policy of containing asylum seekers in overcrowded camps on Greek islands, in reality, turning them into prisons while ignoring the real issue. A Europe which still only wants to pay so that people in need of protection, people fleeing wars and poverty, will stay as far away as possible.” (Leung, 2020)

In short, the Group of GUE/NGL mainly shows a criticism of the establishment as a populist feature within its discourses related to the refugee crisis after 2015. For example, the Group has various complaints on the EU politicians and EU bodies such as not managing the crisis, not fulfilling their relocation commitments and following a self-centered path. Furthermore, GUE/NGL uncovers failures and flaws of the EU such as acting irresponsible for refugees and blackmailing third countries to accept these refugees, and behaving inconsistently due to the difference between what they say and realize.

The Group also indicates its dissatisfaction for the existing mechanisms and approaches implemented by the EU to tackle with the refugee crisis such as allowing border closures, the deal with Turkey to return the refugees, Frontex which does not truly represent people and ineffective Dublin system. Hence, the Group puts an emphasis on the need to change these systems. Besides, the Group blames the member states and the late EU policies for the huge influx of the refugees at the border and casualties happened at the sea. On the other hand, the Group considers the socio-economic disparities as the real hazards but not the refugees; thus, they favor the acceptance of the refugees through creating a safe passages and adding humanitarian components to the migration mechanism.

Eventually, the Group embraces a people- centrist approach but in a less dense frequency compared to its criticism of the establishment. For instances, GUE/NGL tries to show they are a member of the people and they stresses their view should be taken into account in relation to refugees. Therefore, the Group urges the officials to pay attention to people’s demands, to help the refugees and relieve the conditions in the refugee camp both for the refugees and the local people.

4.9. Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group (EFDD)

Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group (EFDD), which was co-presided by Nigel Farage and David Borrelli, was the seventh largest political group within the European Parliament for the political term of 2014 – 2019. The Group which had 48 seats and 6.39 % of votes in 2014 elections could not achieve getting into the parliament after 2019 elections.

The EFDD Group was founded on bolstering the democracy, accountability, transparency, freedom and openness among the member states as well as prioritizing the sovereignty of the member states. The Group is also opposed to complicated and slow bureaucracy of Europe and to the centralization of the European Union by gaining a superstate structure. (European Parliament, 2020)

In addition, the EFDD Group puts an emphasis on the duty of European people and member states to invigorate the European culture, history, religion and traditions, and highlights the significance of the direct democracy for controlling the political elites. (European Parliament, 2020)

4.9.1. General Overview of the EFDD Group Discourses

The discourses of the EFDD Group, which are collected from the social media account of the Group regardless of the concepts of refugee crisis, asylum and migration, are to be analyzed in this part in terms of its connection with populism. However, the scope of this section is very limited due to the scarcity of general discourses in the Group's social media account and to inaccessibility to the Group's own website.

There are two texts among the general discourses of the EFDD Group, which stand out as having populist characteristics such as people-centrism and criticism of the establishment. First, the Group stresses the people's will when they mention people's unwillingness about the Juncker's presidency and commission. The Group also highlights the people's sovereignty through its usage of "*unelected*"; therefore, it can be inferred that this Commission is not true representative of people, is not legitimate, is not able to take into account what people need and demand. Besides, the usage of "*gang*" which has a negative connotation exposes the Group's unfavorable attitude toward the Commission.

“EU are deluded. Peoples of Europe do not want to be governed by Juncker and his unelected gang in Brussels.”(Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2017)

Second, the Group demonstrates a critical approach to the existence of the European Union by calling it dysfunctional and flawed. In addition, the EFDD Group forms an antagonistic relationship between the European Union and the common EU people and exposes the failures of the establishment as a result of the EU’s feature of being out of touch for people, and of deteriorating democratic level. The usage of “*suffer*” also highlights that the EU declines in effectiveness; therefore, the EFDD Group stresses the need to come up with alternative solutions.

“The European Union is not functioning. Even the President of the Commission admitted the EU is imperfect. The EU suffers from a democratic deficit and inaccessibility to the ordinary citizens. Therefore, it is necessary to think about alternatives.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2018)

4.9.2. Analysis of the EFDD Group Discourses Before 2015

This section of the study is to be centered upon the analysis of the EFDD Group discourses which have been gathered from the Group’s social media account with respect to refugee crisis, migration and asylum before 2015 for evaluating their link with the populist features.

Initially, the EFDD Group resorts to a language of threat and crisis because they indicate the economic migrants lead to decline in salaries and disruption in social services. Furthermore, the EFDD Group reveals that the economic migrants will outnumber the local European people and spoil the homogeneity of the European people’s community. The Group also puts emphasis on the criminal activity and vital danger the migrants bring to Europe and underlines the importance to solve this uncontrolled danger. The EFDD offers to cope with the refugees in a foreign country rather than Europe, which shows the rejectionist attitude of the Group.

The Group, on the other hand, clearly associates some of the refugees with ISIS terrorists, and put forwards that they are great danger for European society and their arrival to the European soil should be refused to secure the European people and to determine the real asylum seekers.

“Mass economic immigration in Europe is a serious matter which has caused great unease because it drives down wages, puts pressure on social services and makes people feel strangers in their own land. It is not a matter of race but of space, of numbers and of skills.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2014)

“EFDD group member Mike Hookem MEP was threatened at gunpoint by migrants in French port. This situation is spiralling out of control, a strong response is needed!” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

“EU needs offshore refugee centres.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

“In addition we see as I (Nigel Farage – Co-President) warned earlier evidence that ISIS are now using this route to put their jihadists on European soil. We must be mad to take this risk with the cohesion of our societies. If we want to help genuine refugees, if we want to protect our societies, if we want to stop the criminal trafficking gangs from benefitting as they are, we must stop the boats coming as the Australians did and then we can assess who qualifies for refugee status.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

The EFDD Group also complains about the ongoing mechanisms and policies regarding to migration and asylum since the Group considers they jeopardize the European civilization. Besides, the Group asserts the existing system is not functional and has characteristic inviting immigrants to take a journey for Europe. As a consequence, the Group criticizes and blames the EU for implementing this system and leading people to imperil their lives, and urges the EU to take a new and speedy reaction. Besides, the EFDD sustains its stance on criticizing the EU strategy for asylum and accuses it as the reason of massive arrivals and stays of refugees to Europe. According to the Group, the usage of “*anyone*” indicates that the current system does not make any distinctions based on people’s qualities, criminal records or eligibility, and enables to acceptance of people at random.

“Common European Asylum System a direct threat to our civilization.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

“Rapid implementation of a common EU migration and asylum policy would be

wholly unacceptable.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

“EFDD Co-president Nigel Farage spoke about the crisis in the Mediterranean weeks ago. He said the current system is not working and look how right he has been proven. Thousands are risking their lives because the EU has a system that encourages these migrants to come over. We need a fresh response and quickly!” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

“As I (Nigel Farage – Co-president) warned you in April, the European Common Asylum Policy sets its terms so wide that to say that anyone who sets a foot on EU soil can stay, I said it would lead to a flow of biblical proportions and indeed that is what we are beginning to see and that's been compounded by Germany last week saying that basically anyone can come.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

The Group also blames the EU for the migration crisis the Europe witnesses and criticizes the EU for pursuing chaotic and ineffective policies such as Schengen and establishment of a European army by taking disparaging and harsh tones due to the usage of words like *“shambolic”* and *“vanity”*. Besides, the Group indicates they uphold protecting the external borders of the EU as a solution for the migration crisis when they complain the EU could not do it. In addition, the EFDD Group tries to expose a misstep of the EU which feigns the illegal migration as legal, and takes derogatory and provocative tones by calling it *“sheer madness.”*

“The EU’s shambolic implementation of Schengen and its pursuit of vanity projects like the creation of a European army instead of helping poorer Mediterranean members secure their borders is a reason why Europe is facing its worst migration crisis since the Second World War.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

“The EU’s way to stop illegal mass migration from Africa is to make it legal. This is sheer madness.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

In short, the EFDD Group carries the traits of populism such as rejection of others and criticism of the establishment within its discourses after 2015. The Group has feature of rejecting others because they assume the immigrants as certain threats for the European people and lifestyle resulting from the possible murder attempts, terrorism activities, economic weakening and social disruption. Consequently, the

EFDD Group does not want the majority of migrants to come into Europe and recommends dealing with them in another country. On the other hand, the Group's feature of criticizing the establishment stems from their displeasure for the EU's current approaches and systems for the migration which are unsuitable to European civilization and encourage migrant to come to Europe.

4.9.3. Analysis of the EFDD Group Discourses After 2015

This part is to be focused on the analysis of the EFDD Group discourses with respect to refugee crisis, asylum and migration after 2015 in order to assess whether or not they have populist characteristics subsequent to the analysis of the Group's discourses before 2015.

To begin, the EFDD group criticizes the EU's political leaders in a disparaging tone by calling them "bumbling" while mentioning about their inept to cope with the migration crisis and their causation to turn it into a disorderly situation. The Group also complains about the European officials utilizing the taxes of its citizens to assist the migrants financially instead of using them to the benefits of the European people.

"Louise Bours MEP slams bumbling EU chiefs after chaotic dealing of migrant crisis." (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2016)

"Eurocrats set to use cash from taxpayers to pay migrants' rent." Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2018)

On the other hand, the EFDD Group implicitly shows a migration system including border protection is essential for dealing with the situation; therefore, they criticize in a derogatory tone the current system of the European Union as being illogical. In addition, the Group directs its criticism toward the European Union and reveals its deficiencies and problematic issues such as Euro crisis and migration crisis by calling the EU as dysfunctional.

"UKIP Leader Diane James MEP outlines the madness of a borderless EU immigration system." (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2016)

"This EU isn't working. The Euro is a failure, the migrant crisis is a disaster and we've got a chance to get off this train before it hits the buffers." (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2016)

With reference to the migration or refugee crisis within the EU, Nigel Farage who is the co-leader of the EFDD Group and from the Britain is in attempt to support the Brexit in a provocative tone because he thinks the EU is unable to identify the migrants arriving to Europe and the EU is susceptible to terrorist activities due to its borderless migration policy. Consequently, Nigel Farage advocates the implementation of Brexit in order to protect the Britain and regain its sovereignty to manage its own migration policy.

“For the sake of our national security, we must leave the EU so that we have control over who can and cannot come to Britain.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2016)

“A vote to remain is a vote that makes Britain more vulnerable to terrorism. It is safer to vote to leave and take back control of our borders.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2016)

Besides, the Group takes another critical approach towards the superstructure of the European Union because it does not take into consideration the sovereignty of the member states, and complains in a skeptical tone that the member states do not have a say identifying their own strategies regarding to the migration and security. Furthermore, the Group, in an admiring tone, indicates their support for the emergence of new political parties to determine their own pathways for migration around the Europe.

“This EU legal action demonstrates that national parliaments cannot protect the security and culture of their own citizens. It is impossible to be a sovereign, self-determining state while a member of the EU’s political union. Why should these states have their immigration and security policies determined by Brussels and the madness of Mrs Merkel?” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2017)

“New political parties are growing across the whole of the EU that want to decide their own migration policy. The revolution is rolling on.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2017)

Moreover, the EFDD Group takes a lamenting tone and addresses that migrants flowing to the Europe are hazardous for the European society. The Group accuses the EU politicians and bodies for ignoring their view on this subject and leading

everyone to go through these difficult times even though the Group states they cautioned about it at the time.

“I (Nigel Farage – Co-president) warned Europe in 2015 that boats arriving from war-torn regions posed a huge threat to our civilisation. They ignored all warnings and we are now paying a huge price for their mistake.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2017)

On the other hand, the EFDD Group puts forward that the flawed migration approach pursued by the European Union results in annoyance among the European people because the voters in Italy led Five Star Movement which is an anti-establishment and Eurosceptic political party to have a great success in the elections. Therefore, the EFDD Group takes a disapproving tone for the EU’s migration strategy and considers it will cause the breakdown of the EU.

“Congratulations to our EFDD Group colleagues MoVimento 5 Stelle Europa in topping the national poll. This is a huge surge for Eurosceptic and anti-establishment parties in Italy. The EU’s misguided immigration policy is leading to great resentment and will spell its end.” (Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2018)

To summarize, the discourses of the EFDD Group after 2015 are mostly concentrated on criticizing the European Union, its bureaucrats and its policies concerning to the migration and refugees because the Group thinks the EU does not have the required skills to tackle with the migration crisis; the officials have misdeeds like using citizen’s tax for migrants; its policies are not effective due to lacking of necessary elements such as border protection; and the EU does not function properly and allow member state to decide their own policies. Therefore, the Group carries the traits of anti-establishment feature of populism. In addition, the EFDD Group has features signifying that migrants are potential dangers for Europe and its social life; thus, they have a rejectionist attitude toward the refugees. Eventually, the Group forms an antagonistic relationship between the EU elites and European people because they demonstrate the EU’s misled migration policy leads ordinary people to be disappointed and feel anger.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION

Populism has been, for a long time, a widely discussed topic in the literature of political science. Although the trajectory of the populism goes back to Narodism in Russia, Chartists in Britain, Puojadism in France, American People's Party and Argentinean Peronism, its modern version has started to spread all across Europe since the last decade (Norris, and Inglehart, 2019).

Even though populism has been heavily studied in the existing literature, there is not any consensus on what populism is. Therefore, various scholars and experts define the concept of populism in different forms such as an ideology, thin-centered ideology, political communication style, rhetoric, discourse, political style and political strategy. However, the different interpretations of populism do not obstruct it to have similar characteristics.

One of these similar characteristics across the different interpretations of populism is to prioritize demands, views and opinions of people. Accordingly, populists have a people-centrists nature and they stress the need to pay attention people's opinion before commencing any action. Another common feature is to criticize the establishment which includes diverse entities such as political officials, political parties, constitution, bureaucracy, elections, administrative officials, academics, European Union and etc. (Norris, and Inglehart, 2019). Populists criticize the establishment for not listening to people and this situation results in an antagonism between the people and the elites. Besides, as the establishment acts in a wrong direction and take misleading decisions, populists denounce them and question their credibility and reliability.

Rejection of others is also another shared trait among the varying definitions of the populism. In this sense, since the populists accept the society comprised of pure and homogenous people, they adopt a rejectionist attitudes toward strangers who potentially pose a danger and threaten the unity of this society. Having a disposition to support direct democracy and referendum, and possessing charismatic leaders who are media savvy are also other features included in the various renderings of populism.

On the other hand, populism can appear in both the right and left political spectrum due to its chameleonic nature. Even though populism is in the both political

spectrum, it does not affect their core features such as appeal to people, criticism of the establishment, and creation of an antagonism toward the elites. Nonetheless, the targets they address show differences; for instance, the rightist populists consider people in terms of nationalist perspective and assume the elites as liberals whereas the leftist populists think people consisting of the working group of the society and presume the elites as the rich ones.

As populism emerges from some crises and negative phenomenon, the traces of populism have begun to be frequently seen in the Europe due to various crises and other unfavorable factors it has recently witnessed such as refugee crisis, Eurozone crisis, constitutional problems, and economic problems. Furthermore, economic problems, decreasing level of political trust, extremism, and democratic displeasure and EU skepticism also fueled the surge of populism across Europe.

As a consequence, many scholars inclined to study the concept of populism, its features, types and reasons across Europe. However, these studies have focused on the analysis of populism within the scope of political parties and political leaders on individual European countries.

In this regard, this study has centered upon the analysis of the effect of refugee crisis on populism at a supranational level through the examination of the eight political groups within the European Parliament by taking into account the onset and aftermath of the refugee crisis.

Jagers, and Walgrave (2007) address that attributing to people and substantiating its actions on behalf of people, having hostile sentiments for elites and establishment, and bearing exclusionist attitudes toward the strangers with a focus on purity of people are assumed as the features making thick version of populism. Nevertheless, referring to people and legitimizing its actions for people is the thin version of populism as a political communication style. Based on the thin version, populism means a further proximity to the people and talking about the people referring that they are listened and noticed. For this reason, thin populism as political communication style advocates people's will and sovereignty. Besides, it is possible to witness populism in various political styles and spectrums and it has been used as a tactic to gain support.

Accordingly, this thesis indicates populism has infiltrated into the European

Parliament by surpassing national level with the influence of refugee crisis and by showing varying degrees among the political groups. Some of the political groups such as Identity and Democracy Group and Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy have thick version of populism as they have referred to people in terms of creating a distinction as “us” and “the others” including elites and refugees, of introducing their will and supporting their sovereignty, have criticized elites and establishment for ignoring peoples demand and applying refugee, migration and asylum policies in contradiction with people’s will, and have possess exclusionist attitude toward refugees and touched upon the imminent threats of refugees and migrants. On the other hand, the rest of the political groups have less thick populist style with reference to refugee crisis because they either have had less sharp discriminative behavior against the refugees or had benevolent attitudes toward them although they have criticized the establishment and appealed to people as the thicker ones have done.

In addition, this study demonstrates that refugee crisis has affected the right-wing and left-wing political groups in the European Parliament to show thematic differences even though the entire political groups have had populist features to varying extent.

Before 2015, the analysis regarding to the effect of the refugee crisis on populist trajectory within the European Parliament indicates that criticism of the establishment stands out as the most predominant populist trait among the political groups irrespective of their political positions. To elaborate, one of the mostly criticized issues by the political groups is the lack of solidarity and responsibility among the member states in relation to their response to the refugee crisis. Therefore, it is clear that the political groups believe that enhanced cooperation, solidarity and responsibility among the member states should be undeniable part of tackling with the refugee crisis.

The political groups also mainly complain about the inertness of political actors such as member states, politicians or EU institutions in response to the refugee crisis. The political groups denounce the fact that these actors are not able to show political courage and eagerness, to get into an effective action, and to come up with a solid response to the refugee crisis although there are abundance of empty words,

inadequate decisions, apprehension and upset statements. Besides, the political groups such as S&D Group and Greens/EFA overtly blame these actors for the presence of human traffickers, occurrence of human tragedies and aggravation of the refugee crisis as a result of their inaction.

Furthermore, the political groups demonstrate their dissatisfaction on the migration, refugee and asylum policies, systems and mechanisms of the European Union like Dublin Regulation and Frontex by using negative expressions such as “*broken*”, “*shameful*”, “*malfunctioning*”, “*despising*” and “*catastrophe*”. Consequently, almost all of the political groups underline the importance of changing the EU’s relevant policies to address the crisis in a more efficient direction. To illustrate, the political groups stresses the need to revise the Dublin Regulation which is not suitable and effective for the contemporary challenge.

Zulianello, and Larsen (2021) state that in Europe, the populist right parties focus on the homogeneity of people including exclusionist essence towards the others as well as their features of nationalism and nativism whereas the populist left parties address inclusion and equality, and touch upon the purity of people who are at disadvantage from a socio-economic perspective. In this regard, the differentiation between the right-wing and the left-wing political groups appears on how the changes of migration policies, strategies and systems should occur and what they should involve.

EPP	S&D	Greens/EFA	ECR	GUENGL	EFDD
How crucial it is for Europe to take a concrete stand on migration and move on from tweeted condolences and empty statements to real action.	We cannot tolerate tackling this humanitarian crisis with the vile approach of daily routine, with petty political self-interest.	The scale of Syria's humanitarian crisis is alarming.The European response so far has been minimalist and disorganised, with EU member states abdicating responsibility.	Ms. Muscardini and Mr. Callanan ask the Commission to encourage Member States to improve cooperation between their coast guard and rescue services to prevent tragedies that have caused more than 6000 deaths in the Sicilian Channel in less than 10 years...	It is high time that all member states show more solidarity to each other and to neighbourhood countries, in particular the southern ones	Common European Asylum System a direct threat to our civilization.
Complementation of the existing Dublin System through a binding solidarity mechanism for asylum seekers	We must ensure that European immigration and asylum policy is based on true European solidarity in terms of real actions	The current crisis is a direct result of the short-sighted and irresponsible refusal by member states to coordinate on immigration and asylum policy	EU countries with little immigration should take more people fleeing persecution, but that arrangement should be based on 'mutual trust', rather than compulsion through so-called 'shared solidarity'	From the European parliament we are asking this despising migration policy to be changed	Rapid implementation of a common EU migration and asylum policy would be wholly unacceptable
But yesterday's decisions are not enough. They will neither put an end to the chaotic situation of refugee flows in Europe nor establish organised procedures. More money, action and decisions - but most of all political will - will be needed. "	The thousands of deaths every year remind us just how broken Europe's system of dealing with refugees really is	Europe needs an asylum system that is fit for the task and this means repealing the Dublin system. At its heart, this implies the creation of a permanent binding scheme for distributing asylum seekers across the EU...	Instead of cooperation the Commission proposed coercion. Instead of solidarity we now have polarity. Instead of countries working with each other we have countries arguing with each other.	The situation shows that the current Common European Asylum system (CEAS) is simply not working.	EFDD Co-president Nigel Farage spoke about the crisis in the Mediterranean weeks ago. He said the current system is not working and look how right he has been proven. Thousands are risking their lives because the EU has a system that encourages these migrants to come over. We need a fresh response and quickly
	One year has passed since the Lampedusa tragedy. Since then nothing has changed. The Mediterranean Sea still represents a bleeding cemetery for hundreds of migrants....Europe missed the call. European Institutions expressed deep sorrow, deep concerns and sincere regrets	One year on from the major tragic loss of lives of migrants off the coast of Lampedusa and the tragedies involving migrant crossings continue. The EU is no closer to developing a coherent approach and, if anything, things are moving in the wrong direction...	Not another sticking plaster solution until a future summit.	EU asylum policies and FRONTEX encourage profit-hungry human smuggling and bear ultimate responsibility for the current situation.	The EU's shambolic implementation of Schengen and its pursuit of vanity projects like the creation of a European army instead of helping poorer Mediterranean members secure their borders is a reason why Europe is facing its worst migration crisis since the Second World War.
	"For too long the Council has been burying its head in the sand when it comes to migration. We in Europe have the means to deal with the current refugee crisis, however we lack the political bravery to even take small steps in the right direction	Despite the outpouring of rhetoric from ministers and bigger political groups, concrete proposals remain absent	So when the council meets next week I hope we'll see less finger-pointing and more of a willingness to act together in the long term interests of all European countries...	They want other countries outside the EU to do their dirty work for them, they want the blood on the hands of others. They are trying to hide poverty and despair, they don't want us to see how human rights don't exist for these people so they send them to other countries, where they are not respected.	The EU's way to stop illegal mass migration from Africa is to make it legal. This is sheer madness.

Figure 3. Criticism of Establishment as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups Before 2015 (Source: Metsola, 2015; Jeanne, 2015; Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2015; Alberti, 2014; Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2014; Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2015; The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2013; The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2015; The

GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2014; European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2013; European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015; Macintosh, and Lundy, 2013; The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2013; The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2014; The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2015; Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015)

The left-wing political groups, for instance, such as S&D, GUE/NGL and Greens/EFA consider that the transformation of the relevant policies should include humanitarian understanding such as creating safe and legal pathways for migrants, respecting their rights, improving the distribution and resettlement instruments, and enhancing the rescues.

EPP	ECR	EFDD
We also need to make sure that those who do not fulfil the criteria to be granted asylum should be returned. It is the only way to ensure that European citizens support our asylum policy in the long run.	We also need to distinguish between economic migration and helping genuine asylum seekers. The asylum system must not be conflated with the migration system otherwise we undermine public trust in both...	Mass economic immigration in Europe is a serious matter which has caused great unease because it drives down wages, puts pressure on social services and makes people feel strangers in their own land.
What is needed is more money, a comprehensive agreement with Turkey, EU external borders must be secured, hotspots must be put in place, and returns must be widely increased.	It is a mistake to have a strategy which addresses all kinds of migration in one document. Economic migration and asylum are two very different issues with their very own challenges, and this joint strategy blurs the lines which should be clear.	EFDD group member Mike Hookem MEP was threatened at gunpoint by migrants in French port. This situation is spiralling out of control, a strong response is needed
We need speedy responses to the continuing heavy influx of refugees to Europe. EU Member States must act. They must stop focusing on themselves. The challenge is so enormous that it can only be solved together.	On the crisis in the Mediterranean, there is no easy answer. We cannot let no- one in yet we cannot let everyone in...	In addition we see as I warned earlier evidence that ISIS are now using this route to put their jihadists on European soil. We must be mad to take this risk with the cohesion of our societies. If we want to help genuine refugees, if we want to protect our societies, if we want to stop the criminal trafficking gangs from benefitting as they are, we must stop the boats coming as the Australians did and then we can assess who qualifies for refugee status.

Figure 4. Rejection of Others as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups Before 2015 (Source: Jeanne, 2015; European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015; Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2014; Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2015;

On the other hand, the right-wing political groups such as EPP, ECR and EFDD put forward that overhaul of the EU's relevant policies need to contain some aspects such as developing and raising the repatriations of the failed asylum seekers, making a distinction between the migrants as true asylum seekers and economic migrants, and establishing refugee camps outside the EU. Moreover, these political groups also invoke the feeling of threat and insecurity when they mention about the immensity of crisis, the increasing numbers of refugees, refusal of accepting everyone, deterioration in the society like economic downturn, unemployment and criminal activities. Thus, this situation reveals another mostly observed populist trait among the political groups before 2015, which is rejection of others, because these political groups wish to protect the unity and order within the society and to lessen the risks and threats.

People-centrism is generally at the center of all of the political parties; however, people-centrism in populist context is mainly associated with reference or appeal to people, which means that ordinary people is neglected by elites and system and that their views are not paid attention and their demands are not fulfilled. Besides, people-centrism in populist context focuses on people's will and sovereignty as existing elites are incapable of representing people. In other words, people-centrism of populism is based on a dichotomy which prioritizes people and puts people against elites and "others" jeopardizing purity of people. In this respect, people-centrism is also apparent in some of the political groups before 2015 as a populist feature concerning the refugee crisis. For instance, the EPP Group feels themselves accountable to the public based on what they realize in order to ensure people's safety, and prioritize getting people's support for the change in the refugee and asylum policies while the ECR sees the making a distinction among as necessary to be candid towards the electorate. The S&D Group also mentions that people expect the revisal of EU's migration policies whereas the Greens/EFA and GUE/NGL express that people have tolerant views on accepting and helping the refugees in Europe. Accordingly, these political groups stress that the politicians and EU institutions need to be aware of what people think and meet their expectation regarding the refugee crisis.

EPP	S&D	Greens/EFA	ECR	GUE/NGL
European citizens ask us what we do to strengthen security in Europe.	European citizens are ready. Now it is up to the European national governments to demonstrate that they can be forward-looking.	The multitude of citizens' actions in accommodating refugees across Europe underlines that the European spirit is alive and well.	We need to be clear about the distinction. People running for their lives seek sanctuary as refugees. But for those not fleeing persecution or famine it's human nature to want a better life, but we must be clear that correct rules must be followed. And we must be honest with our voters.	The people have spoken and shown what type of Europe they want to live in and that is an open society that helps refugees and welcomes them.
What do European citizens think when they see the images on TV, when they see the tragedies that are going on in the Mediterranean?		EU governments need to finally follow the public's lead.		The rhetoric and policies of the extreme right is not what people want.

Figure 5. People-Centrism as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups Before 2015 (Source: Jeanne, and Frapiccini, 2013; Jeanne, 2015; Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2015; The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2015; European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2015; Kavanagh, 2015)

After 2015, on the other hand, the analysis regarding to the effect of the refugee crisis on populist trajectory within the European Parliament exposes that criticism of the establishment shines out as the most apparent populist trait among the political groups. However, what changed after 2015 is that the emphasis on the inability of European Union, EU leaders and member states to take a speedy action is more concentrated upon compared to the complaint on the absence of the solidarity and responsibility among the member states. For instance, the political groups point out that former President of the European Council delayed to propose a solution for the migration crisis and that humanitarian disasters repeat one after another owing to lack of a clear and strong instrument to solve the problem. Furthermore, the political groups such as S&D Group, Renew Europe, Greens/EFA, ECR Group, and GUE/NGL accuse the European Council, European Union and the leaders for crawling and not showing a will to get into act despite their predictions on the unfolding crisis. These political groups also claim that nothing has made headway concerning the refugee crisis over the years and the EU institutions and member states shifted their responsibility to each other or turned a blind eye to the problem.

Besides, the political groups sustain their criticism on the lack of solidarity and responsibility among the member states within the discourses following the refugee crisis. The political groups Group consider that different procedures applied by the member states aggravate the situation and threaten the unity and resilience of the

European Union; therefore, these political groups believe that an actual solidarity and responsibility among the member states is essential for managing the refugee crisis and distributing the migrants and asylum seekers effectively.

Moreover, the political groups maintain their complaints on the dysfunctionality of refugee, asylum and migration system of the European Union. These political groups stresses the current systems could not have the sufficient capacity to cope with this magnitude of the refugee crisis. Hence, the groups continue to advise that these systems need to be changed and that fresh and viable systems need to be established to address the situation efficiently. Most of the political groups also underline the necessity of reforming the Dublin Regulation as it could not work properly whereas the ECR Group asserts it would be a mistake to change it radically while the crisis is continuing.

In addition, the political groups draw attention to the border protection, estrangement between people and elites, and superstructure of the EU while criticizing the establishment in their discourses after 2015 in contrast to their discourses before 2015. For example, the rightist political groups such as ID Group, ECR Group and EFDD Group stress that the immigration policy of the European Union needs to incorporate border management and fortification. Otherwise, these political groups claim that a borderless immigration policy would jeopardize the Union and make it vulnerable to the criminal activities. The political groups such as EPP and ID also mention that the politicians proclaim the policies based on their fixed opinions as disconnected from people, and that the elites whose authority is doubted devise new migration and refugee strategies in secret methods. Besides, ID Group and EFDD Group denounce that the European Union behaves against the national will and sovereignty of the member states by forcing them to apply the migration policy; thus, these groups advocate a structure which the member states can mold their own migration policies and which they can control who can enter their countries.

Moreover, the agreement between the European Union and Turkey is also another newly contested issue among the political groups as a part of the criticism of the establishment in contrast to the discourses before 2015. While left political groups such as Greens/EFA and GUE/NGL disapprove the agreement because it is not a reasonable approach, is contradiction between the EU values and humanitarian understanding, and has negative outcomes, the right group ECR approve the deal and

support the signing of similar agreements with other third countries.

EPP	S&D	Renew Europe	Greens/EFA	ID	ECR	GU/ENGL	EFDD
The fact that we in Europe use different standards for asylum recognition is unacceptable	The Dublin regulation - under which refugees must apply for asylum in the first EU country which they arrive - is dead	I am pointing the finger to all of them, all member states, the so-called European Council. The tragedy in the Mediterranean is their fault, their collective responsibility. It is their responsibility that two years after the Commission proposed to reform 'Dublin', they still do not have a position...	EU leaders are edging towards moral bankruptcy in their response to the refugee crisis. Faced with a massive humanitarian crisis at our borders and a growing one within Europe, the dithering and division among EU governments is unpicking the common values which are the foundations of the European Union...	Europe's heritage is a Christian cultural space in which nations must cooperate freely with each other. European bureaucrats must not tell us how many immigrants we must welcome!	EU leaders are waking up to the fact that if we are going to gain control of the crisis there has to be a focus on making the system we already have work better. Now is not the time to start re-inventing the wheel, but for EU leaders to put their heads down and deliver results.	The President of the Commission, the Commissioner for Immigration and President Tusk should be resigning because they have completely failed to manage the refugee crisis.	Louise Bours MEP slams bungling EU chiefs after chaotic dealing of migrant crisis.
The experience of recent months has shown that we need a functioning and sustainable system	Enough is enough with inaction and responsibility shifting in Europe! 721 people lost their lives in the Mediterranean trying to reach Europe in June and July alone...	Our current migration policy is not fit for purpose. The recent fires in Moria are another cyclic reminder of this...	The majority in the European Parliament have willingly surrendered democratic oversight of the EU-Turkey deal. As we approach the one-year anniversary of the deal, we find ourselves with a deal that is failing, and no one willing to take responsibility for it. There is a deeply disturbing vacuum of responsibility.	Those who keep supporting migration through nonsense directives, court decisions, inconsiderate policies giving unfair advantages to migrant are responsible for the plight of refugees	The migration crisis was a case in point that has shown European irresponsibility at its worst	The EU-Turkey agreement, which involves thousands of people remaining in Turkey, is inhuman and cruel. This agreement undermines EU standards regarding the return of refugees in the EU to their countries of origin. It undermines our legislation on refugees, the Geneva Convention, the European Charter of Human Rights and a long list of other laws and agreements.	This EU isn't working. The Euro is a failure, the migrant crisis is a disaster and we've got a chance to get off this train before it hits the buffers.
Faced with such an unprecedented influx of people, the EU's asylum system, which was never designed to deal with such mass arrivals, crumbled	For the new Pact on Migration and Asylum to be a real game-changer, there needs to be a permanent mandatory relocation mechanism in place. This is the only way to improve the situation on the ground and improve mutual trust among member states.	Do you see what the problem is? The problem is that the only consensus the Council and you and your friends can agree on today is "not in my backyard". While the real solution to the problem is on the European level, together. And it's your role to make this happen...	The danger of the new Migration Pact is not just that it repackages the shameful status quo. Instead of moving on from the failures of the Dublin System, this proposal reinforces its key rules, by not abolishing the first entry criteria and increasing the amount of time a Member State will be made responsible for an asylum seeker to up to three years.	The Migration Pact was conceived behind closed doors in the back rooms of the EU quarters in Brussels. Buried under hundreds of pages of inaccessible Brussels Newspeak and kept out of the public eye, the Migration Pact will be responsible for the demographic transformation of our entire continent.	Therefore, rather than imposing unpopular and ineffective immigration legislation on reluctant Member States, the Commission and the Parliament should look to find solutions to the migrant crisis which build on consensus and not create division.	Sealing borders with barbed wire, thermal imaging, and tear gas is not a reaction to a humanitarian crisis, it is a disgrace and an act of violence against those seeking protection	This EU legal action demonstrates that national parliaments cannot protect the security and culture of their own citizens. It is impossible to be a sovereign, self-determining state while a member of the EU's political union. Why should these states have their immigration and security policies determined by Brussels and the madness of Mrs Merkel!?

Figure 6. Criticism of Establishment as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups After 2015 (Source: Georgitsopoulos, 2016; EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2017; Tuttlies, and Martin De La Torre, 2016; Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2018; Macphee, 2020; Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, 2018; Rhawi, 2020; The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament, 2016; Weir, 2017; Johnson, 2020; Identity and Democracy Party, 2019; Save Europe Stop Migration Pact, 2020;

European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016; (European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2017; Sullings, and Kavanagh, 2016; Kavanagh, and Sullings, 2016; The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, 2020; Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2016; Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2017)

As another populist characteristic, almost whole of the political groups have people-centrism in their discourses just as they had before 2015. The political groups, for example, point out that the continuation of the pending crisis and problem lead people to be disappointed; therefore, they emphasize a comprehensive solution for the migration and refugee crisis should be realized as people anticipate. Furthermore, some of these groups like EPP Group tend to prioritize the workforce among the European people rather than the immigrants and refugees. The political groups also express the people expect from the European politician hampering the emergence of a new refugee crisis. On the other hand, the rightist political groups such as ID Group and ECR Group complain that the European Union is not interested dealing with the problems of European, and assert that people favor the borders against refugee influx and do not want the migration policy.

EPP	S&D	Renew Europe	ID	ECR	GUE/NGL
We all have to move away from scoring partisan points and come up with the holistic response our citizens demand.	Citizens are also expecting us to provide a real European approach to the migration crisis...	The inability of the EU institutions to cope with the deep and multiple crises currently faced by the Union, the so-called 'polycrisis' including its financial, economic, social and migratory consequences and the rise of populist parties and nationalist movements have all led to increased dissatisfaction among a growing section of the population regarding the functioning of the current European Union	The EU again imposes a migratory wave on the European peoples and threatens to punish if they do not submit to their diktat!	We need to restore public confidence that we are able to monitor who comes into the EU, and to find people who could represent a threat...	The Greek government and the EU must listen to what many of us, progressive citizens, demand: show some pan-European solidarity and 'decongest the islands. We have no more time to lose.
Numerous, unsolved problems Europe-wide cause discontent among the public and fuel extremism	"In the letter we express our shared conviction that migration is a Europe-wide challenge that can only be solved sustainably through a Europe-wide agreement, based on solidarity and responsibility. Only at EU level can effective and fair solutions be found to the benefit of all member states and EU citizens....	We need to take shared responsibility and create a future-proof migration policy. We owe it to the migrants and our citizens to regain control on migration.	The problem of migration flows is one of the most difficult problems in Europe and proves that the EU is not in a position to solve an important problem for citizens. We are living a real invasion!	The EU would be more successful if voters in individual EU countries actually backed the policies that the EU adopted in the first place, rather than forcing them through without consensus amongst all members states...	Both the asylum seekers and the local population have been suffering for too long from the policy of containing asylum seekers in overcrowded camps on Greek islands, in reality, turning them into prisons while ignoring the real issue.
The security of EU citizens should be our highest priority...		European citizens rightly expect us to prevent a repeat of the 2015 migration and refugee crisis by putting in place sustainable migration and asylum policies	Calling all migrants "refugees" is a DIRECT LIE! I come from Estonia and I represent my people, 65% of whom do not support a common migration policy. So forget it!	Instead, the Commission stands accused of pursuing a federalist agenda regardless of what citizens want, championing the most divisive and unsupported migration policies of the past 20 years...	
We wish to secure our European way of life. Europeans are afraid of losing control and a say in their daily lives because they are facing unprecedented challenges. Some of these challenges have technological or economical roots: digitalisation, a globalised economy, climate change. Others are created by external powers: wars in the Middle East, uncontrolled migration and terrorism.		We do not single out one proposal, but present a comprehensive approach to migration in order to show European citizens that we are in control. A future-proof migration and asylum policy is and will be one of the main priorities for Renew Europe	Almost 79% of respondents in European countries believe that immigration has a negative impact on their country! When is the EU going to listen to the people?!		

Figure 7. People-Centrism as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups After 2015 (Source: Metsola, 2016; Stellini, and Agárdi, 2016; Stellini, and Byczewska, 2016; EPP Group in the European Parliament, 2017; Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2017; Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, 2018; Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Delivering for Europe, 2019, p.2; Rhawi, 2020; Blasko, 2020; Identity and Democracy Party, 2017; Identity and Democracy Party, 2019; Identity and Democracy Party, 2020; European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016; European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2017; European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2018; Leung, 2020)

EPP	ID	ECR	EFDD
The EU cannot accept every migrant, and any opposing positions that now exist within the EU on how to deal with the refugee crisis will need to be reconciled. Failing to do so would be an historic failure.	If we don't resist this, then millions more will come. There are possible 10 million people poised to break into our countries, which is Europe, the Europe that we know and love and that has to stop.	These proposals adopted by the parliament today fail to get to the core of the problem. They fail to make a clear distinction between refugees and economic migrants, nor do they set out any plan for speeding up processing and returns...	A vote to remain is a vote that makes Britain more vulnerable to terrorism. It is safer to vote to leave and take back control of our borders.
We are confronted with the massive challenge of migration and refugees coming to Europe. If we want to remain on the path towards sustainable growth we need to start generating quality jobs by reforming our economies and investing in the human capital of our citizens...	There will be many more horror nights if we don't close the borders!"	It is essential that we give our border agency the tools it needs to protect our external border from economic migrants, and to ensure that genuine refugees are not put at the mercy of people traffickers	I warned Europe in 2015 that boats arriving from war-torn regions posed a huge threat to our civilisation. They ignored all warnings and we are now paying a huge price for their mistake.
While the EU should fully respect international norms guaranteeing the rights of refugees, it cannot maintain an open door policy to anyone and everyone wishing to reside in the EU. It must distinguish between different types of migrants...	Fighting terrorism without stopping immigration is an IMPOSTURE. This challenge of civilisation must today totally occupy our work because I tell you, tomorrow it will be TOO LATE!"	The next step is basically to conclude deals with countries around the Mediterranean, as we did with Turkey, and have ambitious and effective readmission and return agreements with third countries such as Pakistan, Algeria and Morocco...	

Figure 8. Rejection of Others as a Populist Feature among the Political Groups After 2015 (Source: Arbelo, and Stellini, 2016; De Lange, and Riberio, 2016; Mussolini, 2016; Identity and Democracy Party, 2017; Identity and Democracy Party, 2020; European Conservatives and Reformists Group, 2016; Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2016; Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, 2017)

Finally, the right political groups continue to invoke sentiments of insecurity and fear and take a rejectionist attitude whereas the left political groups sustain their support to welcome refugees and establish a humanitarian attitude. For instance, the right groups such as EPP, ECR and ID mention the increasing numbers of refugees over the years and favor going to a distinction among the migrants and refusing the ineligible ones. These groups claim that huge numbers of migrant pose a threat to the existence of the European Union, spoil social and cultural essence of the Europe and lead to turmoil in the member states by linking the refugees with the terrorist activities. Nonetheless, leftist groups such as S&D Group and GUE/NGL uphold the humanitarian aid to the refugees and establishment of new pathways for refugees to enter the Europe.

In conclusion, the refugee crisis has led the political groups within the European

Parliament to possess populist discourses regardless of their political position. Besides, the refugee crisis has triggered some political groups like right-wing ones, Identity and Democracy Group and Europe of Freedom and Democracy Group in particular, to have denser populist discourses while the others had less dense populist discourses. On the other hand, the refugee crisis has differentiated the populist discourses of the political groups based on their political spectrum in terms of the themes of criticizing the establishment and of rejecting or accepting refugees, migrants and asylum seekers. The only change in the discourses after 2015 has occurred within the issues newly addressed by the political groups in their criticism of the establishment such as the EU-Turkey deal, national sovereignty, border protection and alienation between people and elites.

Whereas the political groups find the lowest common denominator when criticizing the EU for acting sluggishly as a response to the refugee crisis, highlighting a change in the EU's migration, refugee and asylum strategy and emphasizing the need to pay attention to people's demand, they differ from one another based on their right and left ideological stances when mentioning a change in the Dublin regulation, addressing the deal between EU and Turkey, supporting the distinction between refugees, acceptance or rejection of them, and creation secure pathways for them.

In addition, this thesis indicates that the European Parliament, which is the legislative and decision-making body of the European Union, needs to make an effort to bring the whole of the political groups together for functionality and sustainability of the laws, policies and systems relating to refugees, migrants and asylum seekers. Otherwise, European people's suspicion and distrust against the European Union may be fuelled. Consequently, new populist parties, which advocate for leaving the EU, underline the necessity of making national decisions on migration and refugees, and favor for preservation of social and cultural identity of their society, may take seats within the European Parliament.

In order to elaborate, the future studies can address the topic by applying different methods like holding questionnaires with the MEPs of the political groups or using a content analysis. Besides, the effect of the refugee crisis on populism at the European Union level can be examined through shifting the focus of the study from political parties to the leaders, and looking at the discourses of the Presidents of the European

Commission, European Parliament or European Council. Lastly, for diversification of the studies, the other crisis such as Euro crisis or most recently Covid-19 crisis can be analyzed in order to evaluate their influence on the political groups in terms of populism.



REFERENCES

- Abromeit, J., Norman, Y., Marotta, G., and Chesterton, B. M. (Eds.). (2015) *Transformations of Populism in Europe and the Americas: History and recent tendencies*. 1st edition. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Abts, K., and Rummens, S. (2007) *Populism versus democracy*, *Political Studies*, Vol. 55(2), pp. 405-424.
- Akkerman, A., Mudde, C., and Zaslove, A. (2014) *How populist are the people? Measuring populist attitudes in voters*, *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 47(9), pp. 1324-1353.
- Akkerman, A., Zaslove, A., and Spruyt, B. (2017) 'We the people' or 'we the peoples'? A comparison of support for the populist radical right and populist radical left in the Netherlands, *Swiss Political Science Review*, Vol. 23(4), pp. 377-403.
- Albertazzi, D. (2008) *Switzerland: Yet another populist paradise*. In *Twenty-first century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 100-118.
- Albertazzi, D., and McDonnell, D. (2008) *Introduction: The sceptre and the spectre*. In *Twenty-first century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 1-11.
- Albertazzi, D., and Mueller, S. (2013) *Populism and liberal democracy: Populists in government in Austria, Italy, Poland and Switzerland*, *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 48(3), pp. 343-371.
- Alberti, P. (2014). *European S&Ds urge Council and Commission to adopt a more holistic approach to migration: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/european-sds-urge-council-and-commission-adopt-more-holistic-approach-migration> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).
- Alberti, P. (2014). *Migration: Pressure mounts on Council and new Commission to act: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/migration-pressure-mounts-council-and-new-commission-act> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).
- Alberti, P. (2014). *S&D Euro MPs set priorities for next migration and home affairs commissioner: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/sd-euro-mps-set-priorities-next->

[migration-and-home-affairs-commissioner-0](#) (Accessed: 21 October 2020).

Alberti, P. (2015). *S&D Group calls on EU summit to discuss Mediterranean tragedy: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/sd-group-calls-eu-summit-discuss-mediterranean-tragedy> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).

Alberti, P., Hélin-Villes, S., Bernas, J., Komodromos, D. and Martin De La Torre, V. (2014). *November 2014 plenary session: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/publications/sd-groups-news-european-parliaments-plenary-session-strasbourg-24-27-november-2014> (Accessed: 29 September 2020).

Alberti, P., Hélin-Villes, S., Komodromos, D. and Martin De La Torre, V. (2015). *May 2015 plenary session: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/publications/sd-groups-news-european-parliaments-plenary-session-strasbourg-18-21-may-2015> (Accessed: 29 September 2020).

Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (2018). *Guy Verhofstadt: "We don't have a migration crisis, we have a political crisis"* [Online]. Available at: https://www.aldeparty.eu/guy_verhofstadt_we_don_t_have_a_migration_crisis_we_have_a_political_crisis (Accessed: 27 October 2020)

Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (2018). *Liberals call for an urgent solution for migration crisis* [Online]. Available at: https://www.aldeparty.eu/liberals_call_for_an_urgent_solution_for_migration_crisis (Accessed: 27 October 2020)

Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (2018). *New step forward to the EU's asylum system* [Online]. Available at: https://www.aldeparty.eu/new_step_forward_to_the_eu_s_asylum_system (Accessed: 27 October 2020)

Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (2019). *Alliance of liberals and democrats for Europe delivering for Europe 2014 – 2019* [Online]. Available at: https://m.box.com/shared_item/https%3A%2F%2Faldeadle.box.com%2Fs%2Flyzdaerwqnm7i6u852rnmq7a9drbtju (Accessed: 27 October 2020)

Arbelo, J.J. and Stellini, D. (2016). *Failing to tackle refugee crisis would be historic failure: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/failing-to-tackle-refugee-crisis-would-be-historic-failure> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/european-leaders-must-now-take-refugee-crisis-their-own-hands-future-europe-stake-says> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).

Aytaç, S. E., and Öniş, Z. (2014) *Varieties of populism in a changing global context: The divergent paths of Erdoğan and Kirchnerismo*, Comparative Politics, Vol. 47(1), pp. 41-59.

Bach, A. and Sullings, N. (2015). *Our MEPs to meet with refugees, volunteers and NGOs on Western Balkans route: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/our-meps-to-meet-with-refugees-volunteers-and-ngos-on-western-balkans-route/> (Accessed: 22 November 2020)

Bernauer, J. (2017) *A fourth wave of populism? Trajectories of populist radical right parties in Europe 2000–2017*. 11th ECPR General Conference, Oslo.

Betz, H. G. (2001) *Exclusionary Populism in Austria, Italy, and Switzerland*, International Journal, Vol. 56(3), pp. 393-420.

Blair, T. (2017). 'Tony Blair: Against Populism, the Center Must Hold.' The New York Times, 3 March [Online]. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/03/opinion/tony-blair-against-populism-the-center-must-hold.html> (Accessed: 4 April 2020).

Blasko, S. (2020). Europe's migration and asylum system is failing us: time for an ambitious way forward: Renew Europe [Online]. Available at: <https://reneweuropengroup.eu/en/news/1403-europe-s-migration-and-asylum-system-is-failing-us-time-for-an-ambitious-way-forward/> (Accessed: 24 October 2020)

Bobba, G., and McDonnell, D. (2016) *Different types of right-wing populist discourse in government and opposition: The case of Italy*, South European Society and Politics, Vol. 21(3), pp. 281-299.

Bonett, M. and Raissi, H. (2019). *EU law on border security adopted in record time: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/eu-law-on-border-security-adopted-in-record-time> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Boomgaarden, H. G., and Vliegthart, R. (2007) *Explaining the rise of anti-immigrant parties: The role of news media content*, Electoral Studies, Vol. 26(2), pp. 404-417.

Börzel, T. A., and Risse, T. (2018) *From the euro to the Schengen crises: European integration theories, politicization, and identity politics*, Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 25(1), pp. 83-108.

Brubaker, R. (2017) *Why populism?*. Theory and Society, Vol. 46(5), pp. 357-385.

Czerny-Grimm, I. and Macphee, E. (2020). *S&Ds witness deeply concerning conditions in camps on Bosnian border: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/sds-witness-deeply-concerning-conditions-camps-bosnian-border> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

De Lange, E. and Riberio, S. (2016). *EPP Group calls for responsibility and solidarity in the EU: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/epp-group-calls-for-responsibility-and-solidarity-in-the-eu> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

De Sario, G. (2015). *Refugee crisis EU governments must break the impasse: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/refugee-crisis-6260/> (Accessed: 11 November 2020)

Decker, F. (2008) *Germany: Right-wing populist failures and left-wing successes. In Twenty-First century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 119-134.

Decker, F. (2016) *The “alternative for Germany:” factors behind its emergence and profile of a new right-wing populist party*, German Politics and Society, Vol. 34(2), pp. 1-16.

Decker, F., and Hartleb, F. (2007) *Populism on difficult terrain: The right-and left-wing challenger parties in the Federal Republic of Germany*, German Politics, Vol. 16(4), pp. 434-454.

Ekşi, H., and Çelik, H. (2008). *Söylem Analizi*, Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, C, 27, 99-117.

EPP Group in the European Parliament (2017). *EPP Group Position Paper on making Europe fit for the 21st century* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/publications/epp-group-position-paper-on-making-europe-fit-for-the-21st-century> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

EPP Group in the European Parliament. (2017). *A better asylum system for Europe* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/a-better-asylum-system-for-europe> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

EPP Group in the European Parliament. (2020). *About us* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/about-us> (Accessed: 9 December 2020).

EPP Group in the European Parliament. (2020). *Civil Liberties, justice and home affairs* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/how-we-make-it-happen/working-groups/wg-legal-and-home-affairs/civil-liberties-justice-and-home-affairs> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

EPP Group in the European Parliament. (2020). *Constitutional affairs* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/how-we-make-it-happen/working-groups/wg-legal-and-home-affairs/constitutional-affairs> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

EPP Group in the European Parliament. (2020). *Legal & home affairs* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/what-we-stand-for/our-position/wg-legal-and-home-affairs> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

EPP Group in the European Parliament. (2020). *Our mission & values* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/what-we-stand-for/missions-values> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

EPP Group in the European Parliament. (2020). *Our position on* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/what-we-stand-for/our-position> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

EPP Group in the European Parliament. (2020). *Our presidency* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/about-us/presidency> (Accessed: 9 December 2020).

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2013). *Improved cooperation to prevent tragedies in the Med* [Online]. Available at: <https://ecrgroup.eu/article/improved-cooperation-to-prevent-tragedies-in-the-med> (Accessed: 17 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2015). *Kamall on the June summit: Europe needs solutions not more sticking plasters* [Online]. Available at: <https://ecrgroup.eu/article/kamall-on-the-june-summit-europe-needs-solutions-not-more-sticking-plasters> (Accessed: 13 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2015). *Kamall: Europe does not need a new Iron Curtain, it needs a new Iron will to come together* [Online]. Available at:

https://ecrgroup.eu/article/kamall_europe_does_not_need_a_new_iron_curtain_it_needs_a_new_iron_will_to (Accessed: 13 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2015). *Kamall: Stop sending out signal that anyone is welcome and instead focus on genuine refugees* [Online]. Available at:

https://ecrgroup.eu/article/kamall_stop_sending_out_signal_that_anyone_is_welcome_and_instead_focus_on (Accessed: 13 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2015). *Kamall: The EU needs to answer tough questions to resolve Med disasters* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/article/kamall_the_eu_needs_to_answer_tough_questions_to_resolve_med_disasters (Accessed: 13 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2015). *Kirkhope: Binding EU quotas will not solve migration problems* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/article/kirkhope_binding_eu_quotas_will_not_solve_migration_problems (Accessed: 13 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2015). *Kirkhope: Emergency relocation scheme not ideal if we want long-term cooperative solution* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/article/kirkhope_emergency_relocation_scheme_not_ideal_if_we_want_long_term_cooperative_solution (Accessed: 13 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2015). *Kirkhope: predictions of 3 million more migrants highlights the need to prepare a realistic response* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/article/kirkhope_predictions_of_3_million_more_migrants_highlights_the_need_to_prepare (Accessed: 13 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2015). *Migration in the Med: assistance, yes; compulsion, no* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/article/migration_in_the_med_assistance_yes_compulsion_no (Accessed: 13 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2016). *Beefed-up European Border Guard should play key role in limiting asylum flow to Europe* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/article/beefed_up_european_border_guard_should_play_key_role_in_limiting_asylum_flow (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2016). *Commission Report on*

Migratino Shows Progress [Online]. Available at:
https://ecrgroup.eu/article/commission_report_on_migratino_shows_progress

(Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2016). *ECR MEPs to lead on EU migration and asylum reforms* [Online]. Available at:
https://ecrgroup.eu/article/ecr_meps_to_lead_on_eu_migration_and_asylum_reforms

(Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2016). *EU Dublin regulation: reinvention of the wheel would be a recipe for chaos* [Online]. Available at:
https://ecrgroup.eu/article/eu_dublin_regulation_reinvention_of_the_wheel_would_be_a_recipe_for_chaos (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2016). *EU's border agency beef-up approved by MEP committee* [Online]. Available at:
https://ecrgroup.eu/article/eus_border_agency_beef_up_approved_by_mep_committee (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2016). *MEPs adopt 'lowest common denominator' report on migration* [Online]. Available at:
https://ecrgroup.eu/article/meps_adopt_lowest_common_denominator_report_on_migration (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2016). *Priorities, not wish lists, needed for a truly 'holistic' approach to the migrant crisis* [Online]. Available at:
https://ecrgroup.eu/article/priorities_not_wish_lists_needed_for_a_truly_holistic_approach_to_the_migration_crisis (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2016). *Syed Kamall MEP: 2015 was a bad year for the EU. Will 2016 really be any better?* [Online]. Available at:
https://ecrgroup.eu/article/syed_kamall_mep_2015_was_a_bad_year_for_the_eu_will_2016_really_be_any_better (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2017). *ECR leaders: Mandatory relocation does not work. EU must show pragmatism* [Online]. Available at:
https://ecrgroup.eu/article/ecr_leaders_mandatory_relocation_does_not_work_eu_must_show_pragmatism (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2017). *Kamall: Sanctions over migrant relocations unjustified* [Online]. Available at:
https://ecrgroup.eu/article/kamall_sanctions_over_migrant_relocations_unjustified

(Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2017). *Migration policy must have public support* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/article/migration_policy_must_have_public_support (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2018). *Kamall: Time running out for EU to start listening* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/article/kamall_time_running_out_for_eu_to_start_listening (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2018). *Syed Kamall: Juncker's legacy to date. The loss of a member state. And the slated rise of a crony* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/article/syed_kamall_junckers_legacy_to_date_the_loss_of_a_member_state_and_the_sl (Accessed: 12 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2020). *About* [Online]. Available at: <https://ecrgroup.eu/about> (Accessed: 27 December 2020).

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2020). *Safeguarding Citizens & Borders* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/vision/safeguarding_citizens_borders (Accessed: 17 November 2020)

European Conservatives and Reformists Group (2020). *Vision for Europe* [Online]. Available at: https://ecrgroup.eu/vision/improving_efficiency_effectiveness1 (Accessed: 27 December 2020).

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2014). *UKIP's Nigel Farage on Swiss Referendum Yes result UKIP leader Nigel Farage said in response to Yes vote...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1399673446959068/?d=n> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2015). *Common European Asylum System a direct threat to our civilisation...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1584869651772779/?d=n> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2015). *EFDD Co-president Nigel Farage spoke about the crisis in the Mediterranean weeks ago. He said the current*

system is not... [Facebook Post] Available at:
<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1622831877976556/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2015). *EFDD group member Mike Hookem MEP was threatened at gunpoint by migrants in French port' This situation is spiraling out...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1624679454458465/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2015). *EU leaders set to unleash NEW wave of migrants with 'mad' plot to woo African nations EFDD co-president Nigel Farage...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1650653125194431/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2015). *EU needs offshore refugee centres...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1633030480290029/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2015). *Rapid implementation of a common EU migration and asylum policy would be wholly unacceptable...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1584869291772815/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2015). *The Schengen Zone, which allows passport-free travel between many EU countries, was on the brink of collapse as nations across...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1632632333663177/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2015). *We must be mad to risk allowing Jihadists on our soil...* [Video File] Available at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pH46_PVpqnk (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2016). *Do you agree with EFDD co-president Nigel Farage?...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/efdgroupphotos/a.1395817900677956/1708362996090110/?type=3>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2016). *Louise Bours MEP slams bumbling EU chiefs after chaotic dealing of migrant crisis...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1687742551485488/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2016). *Nigel Farage earlier in the week, do you agree? Share if you do!...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/efdgroupphotos/a.1395817900677956/1689776417948768/?type=3> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2016). *UKIP Leader Diane James MEP outlines the madness of a borderless EU immigration system...*

[Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1775879929338416/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2016). *We must Leave the EU for the sake of our national security...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1687476688178741/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2017). *EU are deluded. Peoples of Europe do not want to be governed by Juncker and his unelected gang in Brussels...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1852167801709628/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2017). *EU begins proceedings against three countries over migrant quotas" Nigel Farage EFDD president commented: "This EU legal action demonstrates that national...* [Facebook Post]

Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1906400259619715/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2017). *I warned Europe in 2015 that boats arriving from war-torn regions posed a huge threat to our civilization. They ignored all...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1944035639189510/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2017). *New political parties are growing across the whole of the EU that want to decide their own migration policy...*

[Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/1970025326590541/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2018). *"Eurocrats set to use cash from taxpayers to pay migrants' rent" EFDD's Jonathan Bullock commented: "Simply put, not a penny..."* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/2023640501229023/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2018). *EFDD President Nigel Farage on the Italian election- "Congratulations to our EFDD Group colleagues MoVimento 5 Stelle Europa in topping..."* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/2039707659622307/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

European Freedom and Direct Democracy Group. (2018). *The European Union is not functioning. Even the President of the Commission admitted the EU is imperfect. The EU suffers...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/1393540474239032/posts/2190128227913582/?d=n>

(Accessed: 24 November 2020)

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. 1st edition. New York: Routledge

Fella, S. (2008) *Britain: Imperial legacies, institutional constraints and new political opportunities*. In *Twenty-First century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 181-197.

File, D. (2015) *Latin American inclusive and European exclusionary populism: colonialism as an explanation*, *Journal of Political Ideologies*, Vol. 20(3), pp. 263-283.

Free West Media (2017). *A gathering of patriots – headlines from Koblenz* [Online]. Available at: <https://freewestmedia.com/2017/01/22/a-gathering-of-patriots-headlines-from-koblenz/> (Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Georgitsopoulos, T. (2016). *EU Council must send a signal of unity on migration crisis: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/eu-council-must-send-a-signal-of-unity->

[on-migration-crisis](#) (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Georgitsopoulos, T. (2016). *Revision of the asylum system and visa liberalization: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/visa-liberalisation-and-eu-asylum-rules> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Georgitsopoulos, T. (2016). *Solidarity, cooperation and common asylum rules are the key to managing migration flows: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/managing-migration-solidarity-cooperation-common-rules> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Georgitsopoulos, T. (2016). *We can help Africa and we can stop illegal migration: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/we-can-help-africa-and-we-can-stop-illegal-migration> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Geurkink, B., Zaslove, A., Sluiter, R., and Jacobs, K. (2020) *Populist Attitudes, Political Trust, and External Political Efficacy: Old Wine in New Bottles?*, Political Studies, Vol. 68(1), pp. 247-267.

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2014). *Pittella: a 'European Migrant's Day' to force EU to build up a common European migrant's policy* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/pittella-european-migrants-day-force-eu-build-common-european-migrants-policy> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2015). *European Council must agree to fair distribution of migrants in need of protection say S&D MEPs* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/european-council-must-agree-fair-distribution-migrants-need-protection-say-sd-meps> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2015). *Parliament puts pressure on Member States to agree on refugee relocation numbers* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/parliament-puts-pressure-member-states-agree-refugee-relocation-numbers> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2015). *Pittella on migration: EU governments should put aside short-term political calculations* [Online]. Available at:

<https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/pittella-migration-eu-governments-should-put-aside-short-term-political-calculations> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2015). *Without a concrete and common response Europe is at risk - Pittella and French Interior Minister Cazeneuve discuss refugee crisis* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/without-concrete-and-common-response-europe-risk-pittella-and-french-interior-minister> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2016). *EU Asylum Agency needs to be bolstered to reflect reality of situation on the ground* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/eu-asylum-agency-needs-be-bolstered-reflect-reality-situation-ground> (Accessed: 19 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2016). *European leaders must now take the refugee crisis in their own hands. The future of Europe is at stake, says Gianni Pittella* [Online].

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2016). *Pittella: Europe cannot be à la carte – national solutions to refugee crisis are doomed to fail* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/pittella-europe-cannot-be-la-carte-national-solutions-refugee-crisis-are-doomed-fail> (Accessed: 21 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2016). *Refugee crisis shows EU migration policy is not fit for purpose - a complete overhaul is needed* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/refugee-crisis-shows-eu-migration-policy-not-fit-purpose-complete-overhaul-needed> (Accessed: 19 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2016). *Swift integration of refugees into the European labour market and society necessary to solve refugee crisis* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/swift-integration-refugees-european-labour-market-and-society-necessary-solve-refugee> (Accessed: 19 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2017). *Focus more on people and less on markets say S&Ds to Commission's globalisation paper* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/focus-more-people-and-less-markets-say-sds-commissions-globalisation-paper> (Accessed: 28 September 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2017). *Migrants and refugees' rights and dignity must be respected, regardless their legal status, say S&Ds* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/migrants-and-refugees-rights-and-dignity-must-be-respected-regardless-their-legal-status> (Accessed: 8 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2017). *Pittella: We need a new Europe closer to people's real needs* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/pittella-we-need-new-europe-closer-peoples-real-needs> (Accessed: 8 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2017). *S&Ds: It's time for a truly common European asylum system and greater solidarity* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/sds-its-time-truly-common-european-asylum-system-and-greater-solidarity> (Accessed: 8 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2018). *National governments again fail to provide answers on migration* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/national-governments-again-fail-provide-answers-migration> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2018). *National ministers' failure on asylum reform risks turning a manageable situation into a humanitarian crisis* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/national-ministers-failure-asylum-reform-risks-turning-manageable-situation-humanitarian-0> (Accessed: 8 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2018). *S&Ds call, with other pro-European forces, for breakthrough on migration challenge at next EU Council* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/sds-call-other-pro-european-forces-breakthrough-migration-challenge-next-eu-council> (Accessed: 8 October 2020).

2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2018). *S&Ds on migration: People come first!* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/sds-migration-people-come-first> (Accessed: 8 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament(2018). *Udo Bullmann: How many more lives must be lost in the Mediterranean for Europe to act?* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/udo-bullmann-how-many-more-lives-must-be-lost-mediterranean-europe-act> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2019). *European Parliament backs extra 10,000 staff to strengthen EU's external borders* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/european-parliament-backs-extra-10000-staff-strengthen-eus-external-borders> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament. (2020). *Who we are* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/who-we-are> (Accessed: 15 December 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2020). *Our achievements* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/what-we-stand-for/our-achievements> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2020). *What we stand for* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/what-we-stand-for/our-progressive-vision/our-campaigns> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2020). *Our president* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/who-we-are/our-president-and-bureau/president> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament (2020). *Committee on civil liberties, justice and home affairs* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/committees/committee-civil-liberties-justice-and-home-affairs> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Guibernau, M. (2010). *Migration and the rise of the radical right: Social malaise and the failure of mainstream politics*. Policy Network.

Halperin, S., and Heath, O. (2012). *Political research: methods and practical skills*. 1st edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heinisch, R. (2008). *Austria: The Structure and Agency of Austrian Populism*. In *Twenty-First century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 67-83.

Ibsen, M. F. (2019). *The populist conjuncture: Legitimation crisis in the age of globalized capitalism*, *Political Studies*, Vol. 67(3), pp. 795-811.

Identity and Democracy (2020). *About us* [Online]. Available at: <https://identityanddemocracy.eu/about-us/> (Accessed: 20 December 2020).

Identity and Democracy (2020). *Members/Delegations* [Online]. Available at: <https://identityanddemocracy.eu/members-delegations/> (Accessed: 20 December 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2015). *BELGIUM: Marine Le Pen (FN): There is no such a thing as a house without the walls and there is...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/874780272617789/?d=n> (Accessed: 2 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Alors que les États-Unis gagnent en souveraineté avec la sortie du TTIP, l'Union Européenne impose contre la volonté des peuples...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1208885912540555/?d=n> (Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Bravo aux Hongrois qui résistent face à Bruxelles pour préserver leur pays de cette submersion migratoire!* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1424147794347698/?d=n> (Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Ce n'est pas une "vague" migratoire: c'est un tsunami!* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1342595832502895/?d=n> (Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *En effet, les européens ne veulent pas de vous et votre supra-structure anti-démocratique ! Indeed, the Europeans do...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1222413347854478/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Grâce au Brexit, les britanniques vont pouvoir à nouveau contrôler leurs frontières ! Thanks to the Brexit, the British will...*

[Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1194943713934775/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Il est temps que l'Union européenne écoute les peuples. It is time for the European Union to listen to the peoples.* [Facebook

Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1192598414169305/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Il y aura encore bien d'autres soirées d'horreur si nous ne fermons pas les frontières!* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1332231566872655/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Juncker toujours aussi déconnecté des préoccupations réelles des peuples européens!* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1424449904317487/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Le chantage de cette Union européenne technocratique de Bruxelles doit cesser!* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1317372268358585/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Le futur de l'Europe n'est pas dans une Union européenne anti-démocratique, mais dans une coopération entre des Nations souveraines à...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/IDParty/photos/a.1106865449409269/1204783712950775/?type=3> (Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Le réveil des peuples européens a sonné : à l'exception des Allemands, les citoyens de tous les Etats-membres plaident pour...*

[Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1221448201284326/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Les peuples européens n'ont pas besoin de quotas de réfugiés mais de vrais frontières! Le MENL demande un...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1456644521098025/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Les politiques folles des élites européennes continuent contre les peuples! The insane policies of the European elites continue against...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1192582307504249/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Les responsables politiques de l'UE ne travaillent pas dans l'intérêt des peuples mais dans celui des multinationales! EU policy makers...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1228788010550345/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *L'éveil des peuples européens est en marche! The awakening of the European peoples is under way!* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1205595089536304/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *L'Italie submergée par une vague de 10 000 migrants africains en 48h, mais l'UE refuse d'ouvrir les yeux et d'agir!* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1360398127389332/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *L'idée selon laquelle les ONG représenteraient la société civile est très dangereuse : jamais elles n'ont été élues démocratiquement, elles...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1228126870616459/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *L'UE impose une nouvelle fois une vague migratoire aux peuples européens et menace de sanctionner si ils ne se...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1223684307727382/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *L'UE n'a pas à imposer sa folle politique migratoire au monde entier: les États-Unis sont libres de choisir qui...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1215834118512401/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Marseille : l'un des terroristes était un clandestin algérien connu des services de police, que faisait-il en France ? La...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1441816199247524/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *MENF members, Harald Vilimsky, Janice Atkinson and Michał Marusik, discussing of the quota of migrants imposed on the Member States of the EU, the result of the French presidential élection and the wind of freedom that blows in Europe:* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/IDParty/videos/1328061783956300/> (Accessed: 3

November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *No Mrs Mogherini, Europe does not need immigration, it needs borders! Non Madame Mogherini, l'Europe n'a pas besoin d'immigration, elle...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1223662101062936/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *Près de 79% des sondés dans les pays européens pensent que l'immigration a un impact négatif sur leur pays...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1430158957079915/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2017). *"We have had enough of a Europe ruled by the banks!" | Interview of Matteo Salvini:* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1203353956427084/?d=n>

(Accessed: 3 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2018). *A new movement is emerging in Europe: people are calling for a new model of citizen protection. We want to...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1903884773040662/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2018). *Aujourd'hui à Strasbourg, se tient notre colloque sur la jeunesse européenne ! Après le discours d'ouverture de Nicolas Bay, s'est...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1676647245764417/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2018). *The Nation-state is the highest form of freedom and democracy. We want the same rights for all Nations. The European...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1903812896381183/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2018). *The old times of multiculturalism and mass immigration is over. Populists are not the problem: we are the solution...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/1908003579295448/?vh=e&d=n> (Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2019). *Countries of the Visegrád Group have been attacked at the EU Court of Justice for "non-respect of their legal...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/2168253756603761/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2019). *Europe's heritage is a Christian cultural space in which nations must cooperate freely with each other. European bureaucrats must not...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/2156861561076314/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2019). *Hynek Blaško : « Those who keep supporting migration through nonsense directives, court decisions, inconsiderate policies giving unfair advantages to...* [Facebook Post] Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/2463003527128781/?vh=e&d=n> (Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2019). *In this historic election, the battle for our freedom will be decisive. Let us join forces: no matter how strong ...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/2139488519480285/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2019). *People are also tired of your policies! Respect democracy!* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/2037976032964868/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2019). *Still some hope left for Europe!* [Online]. Available at: https://www.id-party.eu/still_hope_left (Accessed: 31 October 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2019). *The problem of migration flows is one of the most difficult problems in Europe and proves that the EU is...* [Facebook Post]

Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/2474841749278292/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2019). *We want a Europe of the people and not a Europe of the bureaucrats. Our vision of Europe is totally...* [Facebook Post]

Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/2156797497749387/?d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2019). *You can change Europe's destiny and say « no » to this technocratic EU that despises peoples: on May 26th...* [Facebook Post]

Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/2171392939623176/?vh=e&d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2020). *Calling all migrants "refugees" is a DIRECT LIE! I come from Estonia and I represent my people, 65% of...* [Facebook Post]

Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/2741466069282524/?vh=e&d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Identity and Democracy Party. (2020). *Fighting terrorism without stopping immigration is an IMPOSTURE. This challenge of civilisation must today totally occupy our work because I...* [Facebook Post] Available at:

<https://www.facebook.com/819996268096190/posts/3336221373140321/?vh=e&d=n>

(Accessed: 6 November 2020)

Jagers, J., and Walgrave, S. (2007). *Populism as political communication style: an*

empirical study of political parties in Belgium, European Journal of Political Research, 46(3), 319-345.

Jeanne, M. (2015). *Asylum seekers: EPP Group calls for a binding quota for distribution in EU countries: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/asylum-seekers-epp-group-calls-for-a-binding-quota>

Jeanne, M. (2015). *EUCO: Member States' decisions are not up to the challenge: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/euco-member-states-decisions-are-not-up-to-the-challenge> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Jeanne, M. (2015). *EUCO: more political will needed to tackle the refugee crisis: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/refugee-crisis-more-political-will-needed> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Jeanne, M. (2015). *Mediterranean crisis will only be solved by common European response EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/migration-only-a-common-european-response-will-solve-crisis> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Jeanne, M. (2015). *Refugee Crisis: European Parliament sends a strong signal of solidarity: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/refugees-ep-sends-strong-signal-of-solidarity> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Jeanne, M. and Frappiccini, F. (2013). *Immigration: more Lampedusa tragedies if we do not act: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/immigration-more-lampedusa-tragedies-if-we-do-not-act> (Accessed: 23 September 2020).

Jeroen, R. (2019). *Renew Europe expects this Commission to eradicate Europe's "too little, too late" syndrome: Renew Europe* [Online]. Available at: <https://reneweuropesgroup.eu/en/news/1382-renew-europe-expects-this-commission-to-eradicate-europe-s-too-little-too-late-syndrome/> (Accessed: 24 October 2020)

Jeroen, R. (2019). *Renew Europe: Renew Europe* [Online]. Available at: <https://reneweuropesgroup.eu/en/news/1308-renew-europe/> (Accessed: 24 October 2020)

Johnson, A. (2019). *Expansion of Frontex should only happen with stronger*

fundamental rights: Frontex: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/expansion-of-frontex-should-only-happen-with-stronger-fundamental-rights/> (Accessed: 10 November 2020)

Johnson, A. (2019). *What's coming up in parliament: GREENS/EFA priorities – plenary session 15-18 April 2019* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/news/whats-coming-up-in-parliament-8393/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

Johnson, A. (2020). *Commission plans will not prevent another Moria disaster: migration pact: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/commission-plans-will-not-prevent-another-moria-disaster/> (Accessed: 10 November 2020)

Johnson, A. (2020). *EU must support victims of Moria fire: refugees: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/eu-must-support-victims-of-moria-fire/> (Accessed: 10 November 2020)

Jones, S. (2020). 'Socialists and podemos to rule together in Spanish coalition', *The Guardian*, 7 January [Online]. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/07/pedro-sanchez-spain-pm-government-vote-parliament> (Accessed: 28 February 2021).

Jonsson, S. (2020). *Populism without borders* [Online]. Available at: <https://tif.ssrc.org/2020/03/04/populism-without-borders/> (Accessed: 4 April 2020).

Kavanagh, G. (2015). *Fortress Europe must end! Europe needs a clear YES to welcoming refugees: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/fortress-europe-must-end-europe-needs-a-clear-yes-to-welcoming-refugees/> (Accessed: 22 November 2020)

Kavanagh, G. and Sullings, N. (2015). *Refugee crisis: time to move from words to deeds: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/refugee-crisis-time-to-move-from-words-to-deeds/> (Accessed: 22 November 2020)

Kavanagh, G. and Sullings, N. (2016). *EU-Turkey deal flouts international laws and conventions: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/eu-turkey-deal-flouts-international-laws-and-conventions/> (Accessed: 21 November 2020)

Kavanagh, G. and Sullings, N. (2016). *International asylum law must be respected!:* *The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/international-asylum-law-must-be-respected/> (Accessed: 21 November 2020)

Keller, S., Lambert, J., Sargentini, J., Valero, B., and Terricabras, J.M. (2016). *The green alternative to the Dublin system a preference based a location system for asylum seekers within the EU* [Online]. Available at: https://www.greens-efa.eu/legacy/fileadmin/dam/Documents/Policy_papers/Migration_asylum/2016-02-24_Dublin_paper_EN.pdf (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

Keller, S., Lambert, J., Sargentini, J., Valero, B., and Terricabras, J.M. (2016). *The green alternative to the Dublin system: a contribution by MEPS Ska Keller, Jean Lambert, Judith Sargentini, Bodil Valero and Josep-Maria Terricabras: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/document/the-green-alternative-to-the-dublin-system/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

Kutten, J. (2011). *GREENS/EFA round-up: debriefing of the plenary session in Strasbourg 9-12 May 2011: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/news/plenary-round-up-2373/> (Accessed: 10 November 2020)

Kutten, J. (2013). *GREENS/EFA round-up: debriefing of the plenary week Strasbourg 10-14 June 2013* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/news/greens-efa-round-up-4072/> (Accessed: 10 November 2020)

Leung, B. (2019). *FRONTEX's unchecked power grab endangers human rights: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/frontexs-unchecked-power-grab-endangers-human-rights/> (Accessed: 17 November 2020)

Leung, B. (2020). *Urgent & long-term solutions more necessary than ever after Moria fire: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/urgent-long-term-solutions-more-necessary-than-ever-after-moria-fire/> (Accessed: 17 November 2020)

Leung, B. (2020). *Urgent decongesting of Aegean camps needed to fend off deadly contagion: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/urgent-decongesting-of-aegean-camps-needed-to-fend-off-deadly-contagion/> (Accessed: 17 November 2020)

Liang, C. S. (Ed.). (2016). *Europe for the Europeans: The foreign and security policy of the populist radical right*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.

Louwerse, T., and Otjes, S. (2019) *How populists wage opposition: parliamentary opposition behaviour and populism in Netherlands*, *Political Studies*, Vol. 67(2), pp. 479-495.

Lundy, D. and Kavanagh, G. (2014). *Mediterranean mass murder highlights fiasco of EU migration and Middle East policy: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/mediterranean-mass-murder-highlights-fiasco-of-eu-migration-and-middle-east/> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

Macintosh, E. and Kavanagh, G. (2014). *No place for inhumane asylum and migration policies on shores of Europe: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/no-place-for-inhumane-asylum-and-migration-policies-on-shores-of-europe/> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

Macintosh, E. and Lundy, D. (2013). *Migration - EU must show solidarity: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/eu-must-show-solidarity-with-refugees/> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

Macphee, E. (2020). *Permanent solidarity mechanisms on migration and asylum will put an end to slow and unreliable responses: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/permanent-solidarity-mechanisms-migration-and-asylum-will-put-end-slow-and-unreliable> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Macphee, E. (2020). *S&Ds on new Pact on Migration and Asylum: solidarity has to be the rule, not the exception: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/sds-new-pact-migration-and-asylum-solidarity-has-be-rule-not-exception> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Martin De La Torre, V. and Macphee, E. (2020). *The drama on the Turkish border can only be addressed with EU-wide solidarity and respecting human rights, say S&Ds: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at:

<https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/drama-turkish-border-can-only-be-addressed-eu-wide-solidarity-and-respecting-human-rights> (Accessed: 3 October 2020).

Mastropaolo, A. (2008) *Politics against democracy: Party withdrawal and populist breakthrough*. In *Twenty-First century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 30-48.

Mazzoleni, G. (2008) *Populism and the media*. In *Twenty-first century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 49-64.

McDonnell, D. (2016) *Populist leaders and coterie charisma*, *Political Studies*, Vol. 64(3), pp. 719-733.

Metsola, R. (2015). *#TimeForAction on migration: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/timeforaction-on-migration> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Metsola, R. (2016). *Roberta Metsola maps out EU plan on migration EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/roberta-metsola-maps-out-eu-plan-on-migration> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Moffitt, B. (2016). *The global rise of populism: Performance, political style, and representation*. 1st edition. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Moffitt, B., and Tormey, S. (2014). *Rethinking populism: Politics, mediatisation and political style*, *Political studies*, Vol. 62(2), pp. 381-397.

Mudde, C. (2004). *The populist zeitgeist*, *Government and Opposition* Vol. 39(4), pp. 541-5463

Mussolini, A. (2016). *Illegal migrants must be returned: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/illegal-migrants-must-be-returned> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Müller, J. W. (2017). *What is populism?*. 2nd edition. London: Penguin UK.

Norris, P. (2020). *Measuring Populism Worldwide*, *Party Politics*, Vol. 26(6), pp. 697–717

Norris, P., and Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. 1st edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Otjes, S., and Louwerse, T. (2015). *Populists in parliament: Comparing left-wing*

- and right-wing populism in the Netherlands*, Political Studies, Vol. 63(1), pp. 60-79.
- Öniş, Z., and Kutlay, M. (2020). *Reverse transformation? Global shifts, the core-periphery divide and the future of the EU*, Journal of Contemporary European Studies, Vol. 28(2), pp. 197-215.
- Özdemir, M. (2010). *Nitel veri analizi: Sosyal bilimlerde yöntem bilim sorunsalı üzerine bir çalışma*, Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 11(1), 323-343.
- Pasquino, G. (2008) *Populism and democracy. In Twenty-First century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 15-29.
- Pierini, J.B. (2013). *GREENS/EFA round-up: debriefing of the plenary week Strasbourg 20-23 May 2013: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/news/greens-efa-round-up-4337/> (Accessed: 10 November 2020)
- Pierini, J.B. (2015). *GREENS/EFA round-up: debriefing of the Strasbourg plenary week 27-30 April 2015: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/news/greens-efa-round-up-5509/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)
- Pierini, J.B. (2016). *GREENS/EFA round-up: debriefing of the Strasbourg plenary week 1-5 February 2016: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/eu-summit-refugee-crisis/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)
- Politico (2021). *Poll of Polls* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.politico.eu/europe-poll-of-polls/> (Accessed: 28 February 2021).
- Raissi, H. (2019). *We want effective future spending on migration policy: The EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/we-want-effective-future-spending-on-migration-policy> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).
- Ramiro, L., and Gomez, R. (2017). *Radical-left populism during the great recession: Podemos and its competition with the established radical left*, Political Studies, Vol. 65(1_suppl), pp. 108-126.
- Renew Europe (2020). *About us* [Online]. Available at: <https://reneweuropesgroup.eu/en/about-us/> (Accessed: 19 December 2020).
- Renew Europe. (2020). *A renew europe vision for migration and asylum* [Online]. Available at:

https://m.box.com/shared_item/https%3A%2F%2Freneweuropegroup.box.com%2F%2F02cccblh8xsysg6zgs90cz2axwiun9s (Accessed: 24 October 2020)

Rhawi, C. (2020). *Moria fire shows urgent need for a future - proof new pact on migration and asylum: Renew Europe* [Online]. Available at: <https://reneweuropegroup.eu/en/news/1615-moria-fire-shows-urgent-need-for-a-future-proof-new-pact-on-migration-and-asylum/> (Accessed: 21 October 2020)

Rodriguez, E. and Luelmo, P. (2020). 'Factbox: Far-left ministers to enter Spain's new coalition government', Reuters, 9 January [Online]. Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-spain-politics-ministers-factbox/idUSKBN1Z814V> (Accessed: 28 February 2021).

Rooduijn, M. (2014). *The mesmerising message: The diffusion of populism in public debates in Western European media*, Political Studies Vol. 62(4), pp. 726 – 744

Rooduijn, M., Van Kessel, S., Froio, C., Pirro, A., De Lange, S., Halikiopoulou, D., Lewis, P., Mudde, C. and Taggart, P. (2019). *The PopuList: An Overview of Populist, Far Right, Far Left and Eurosceptic Parties in Europe* [Online]. Available at: <https://popu-list.org> (Accessed: 1 March 2021).

Ruth, S. P. (2018). *Populism and the erosion of horizontal accountability in Latin America*, Political Studies, Vol. 66(2), pp. 356-375.

Rydgren, J. (2008). *France: The Front national, ethnonationalism and populism. In Twenty-first century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 166-180.

Rydgren, J. (2008). *Sweden: the Scandinavian exception. In Twenty-First century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 135-150.

Save Europe Stop Migration Pact (2020). *Stop the EU migration pact* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.saveeurope.eu/petition> (Accessed: 31 October 2020)

Schmidt, F. (2018). *Drivers of populism: A Four-country comparison of party communication in the run-up to the 2014 European Parliament Elections*, Political Studies, Vol. 66(2), pp. 459-479.

Schulmeister, P., Chiesa, A., Friedli, M., Tsoulou Malakoudi, D. and Büttner, M. (2019). *Review of European and National Election Result Update: 2019*. European Union, Brussels.

Spruyt, B., Keppens, G., and Van Droogenbroeck, F. (2016). *Who supports populism and what attracts people to it?*, Political Research Quarterly, Vol. 69(2), pp. 335-346.

Stellini, D. (2016). *Asylum: European Parliament shows the way forward: EPP*

Group in the European Parliament [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/asylum-european-parliament-shows-the-way-forward> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Stellini, D. (2017). *Unifying standards for the reception of asylum seekers: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/unifying-standards-for-the-reception-of-asylum-seekers> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Stellini, D. and Agárdi, A. (2016). *Fundamental rights: a slap in the face to bare-faced populism: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/fundamental-rights-a-slap-in-the-face-to-populism> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Stellini, D. and Byczewska, A. (2016). *More security at EU external borders: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/more-security-at-eu-external-borders> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Stellini, D. and Da Silva, F.C. (2016). *New EU Asylum Agency strengthens EU's response to migration: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/new-eu-asylum-agency-strengthens-eu-s-response-to-migration> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Stellini, D. and Georgitsopoulos, T. (2015). *EPP Group supports Juncker proposals to tackle refugee crisis: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/epp-group-supports-juncker-in-tackling-refugee-crisis> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Stoker, G., and Hay, C. (2017). *Understanding and challenging populist negativity towards politics: The perspectives of British citizens*. *Political Studies*, Vol. 65(1), pp. 4–23.

Sullings, N. (2016). *MEPs report back from delegation to Greece: safe and legal access to Europe urgently needed: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/meps-report-back-from-delegation-to-greece-safe-and-legal-access-to-europe/> (Accessed: 21 November 2020)

Sullings, N. (2017). *Real solution for refugees in freezing weather is to be settled across Europe: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/real-solution-for-refugees-in->

[freezing-weather-is-to-be-settled-across-euro/](#) (Accessed: 19 November 2020)

Sullings, N. and Kavanagh, G. (2016). *54,000 refugees must be relocated from Italy and Greece to other member states: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/54000-refugees-must-be-relocated-from-italy-and-greece-to-other-member-stat/> (Accessed: 20 November 2020)

Sullings, N. and Kavanagh, G. (2016). *Commission proposal on refugee resettlement is designed only to control migration: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/commission-proposal-on-refugee-resettlement-is-designed-only-to-control-mig/> (Accessed: 20 November 2020)

Sullings, N. and Kavanagh, G. (2016). *EU must not accept 'poisoned chalice' deal offered by Turkey at summit yesterday: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/eu-must-not-accept-poisoned-chalice-deal-offered-by-turkey-at-summit-yester/> (Accessed: 21 November 2020)

Sullings, N. and Kavanagh, G. (2016). *GUE/NGL MEPs condemn European Council's approach to refugees and regional inequality: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/gue-n-gl-meps-condemn-european-councils-approach-to-refugees-and-regional-in/> (Accessed: 21 November 2020)

Sullings, N. and Kavanagh, G. (2016). *SUPERFRONTEX: New European Border & Coast Guard Agency is an undemocratic deportation agency: The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/superfrontex-new-european-border-coast-guard-agency-is-an-undemocratic-bord/> (Accessed: 20 November 2020)

Taggart, P. (2000). *Populism: Concepts in the Social Sciences*. 1st edition. Philadelphia: Open University Press

Tarchi, M. (2008). *Italy: A country of many populisms. In Twenty-first century populism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 84-99.

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2013). *Migration: human chain demonstration* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/migration-human-chain-demonstration/> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2014). *Commission must stand up for Syrian refugees on hunger strike in Athens!* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/commission-must-stand-up-for-syrian-refugees-on-hunger-strike-in-athens/> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2014). *Right to asylum should be defended in the EU* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/right-to-asylum-should-be-defended-in-the-eu/> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2015). *EU needs a permanent, obligatory and fair mechanism to distribute asylum-seekers* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/eu-needs-a-permanent-obligatory-and-fair-mechanism-to-distribute-asylum-see/> (Accessed: 22 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2015). *GUE/NGL condemns Council's failure to protect migrants and save lives* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/gue-ngl-condemns-councils-failure-to-protect-migrants-and-save-lives/> (Accessed: 22 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2015). *GUE/NGL condemns EU migration and asylum policies* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/gue-ngl-condemns-eu-migration-and-asylum-policies/> (Accessed: 22 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2015). *GUE/NGL MEPs deplore ghost ships in the Mediterranean; call for change of tack in migration policies* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/gue-ngl-meps-deplore-ghost-ships-in-the-mediterranean-call-for-change-of-ta/> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2015). *New plans to stem the flow of migration unacceptable* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/new-plans-to-stem-the-flow-of-migration-unacceptable/> (Accessed: 22 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2015). *Safe routes for migrants and asylum seekers needed, not more resources for FRONTEX* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/safe-routes-for-migrants-and-asylum-seekers-needed-not-more-resources-for-f/> (Accessed: 24 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2016).

Ensuring safe and legal pathways to Europe is the only way to respect refugee children's rights [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/ensuring-safe-and-legal-pathways-to-europe-is-the-only-way-to-respect-refug/> (Accessed: 19 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2017). *EU must change course on refugee policy* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/eu-must-change-course-on-refugee-policy/> (Accessed: 19 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2017). *Lack of solidarity continues to undermine EU migration policy* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/lack-of-solidarity-continues-to-undermine-eu-migration-polic> (Accessed: 19 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2017). *Maltese Presidency must change Europe's course on refugees, economy and animal welfare* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/maltese-presidency-must-change-europes-course-on-refugees-economy-and-anima/> (Accessed: 19 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2017). *State of the EU: Juncker's vision of a European project for the elite* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/state-of-the-eu-junckers-vision-of-a-european-project-for-the-elite/> (Accessed: 19 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2018). *Left MEPs slam Austria's "baby-faced Orbán" for toxic migration fear-mongering* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/left-meps-slam-austrias-baby-faced-orban-for-toxic-migration-fear-mongering/> (Accessed: 17 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2019). *Sira Rego's speech for the Presidency of the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/sira-regos-speech-for-the-presidency-of-the-european-parliament/> (Accessed: 17 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (2020). *EU asylum policy: war on the most vulnerable* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/eu-asylum-policy-war-on-the-most-vulnerable/> (Accessed: 17 November 2020)

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left. (2021).

About the group [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/about-the-group/> (Accessed: 5 January 2021).

The Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left. (2021). *What we stand for* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.guengl.eu/what-we-stand-for/> (Accessed: 5 January 2021).

The European Parliament Multimedia Center. (2019). *Parliamentary groups: identity and democracy* [Video File]. Available at: https://multimedia.europarl.europa.eu/en/parliamentary-groups-identity-and-democracy_N01-PUB-190720-IDGR_ev

The European Parliament. (2020). *About parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/about-parliament/en> (Accessed: 8 December 2020).

The European Parliament. (2020). *Political groups* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections-2014/en/political-groups/europe-of-freedom-and-direct-democracy> (Accessed: 31 December 2020).

The European Parliament. (2020). *Previous elections* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/about-parliament/en/in-the-past/previous-elections> (Accessed: 8 December 2020).

The European Parliament. (2020). *The president* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/the-president/en/the-presidency> (Accessed: 8 December 2020).

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2013). *GREENS/EFA round-up: debriefing of the plenary week Strasbourg 21-25 October 2013* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/news/greens-efa-round-up-4723/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2013). *GREENS/EFA round-up: debriefing of the plenary week Strasbourg 7-11 October 2013* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/news/greens-efa-round-up-4771/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2013). *Rescuing refugees at sea: Frontex treatment of refugees at sea to be retasked following EP vote* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/rescuing-refugees-at-sea-4602/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2014). *EU asylum rules: court ruling underlines need for overhaul of Dublin regulation* [Online]. Available

at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/eu-asylum-rules-4885/> (Accessed: 11 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2014). *GREENS/EFA round-up: debriefing of the Strasbourg plenary week 24-28 November 2014* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/news/greens-efa-round-up-5833/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2015). *EU summit/refugee crisis: small pieces of the puzzle agreed for EU asylum policy but comprehensive solution must follow* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/eu-summit-refugee-crisis/> (Accessed: 11 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2015). *Mediterranean migration crisis: destroying smugglers' boats would be further abdication of responsibility by EU to migrants* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/mediterranean-migration-crisis/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2015). *Refugee crisis: national egotism on refugee crisis must be overcome* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/refugee-crisis-6296/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2015). *Refugee crisis: chaotic and inhumane response across Europe cannot be tolerated* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/refugee-crisis-6310/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2016). *EFA group statement on EU-Turkey agreement & the refugee crisis* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/news/efa-group-statement-on-eu-turkey-agreement-the-refugee-crisis/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2016). *EU summit Greens/EFA co-president Philippe Lamberts at the European Council* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/eu-summit-5881/> (Accessed: 11 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2016). *EU summit: legally dubious agreement with Turkey* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/eu-summit-5879/> (Accessed: 11 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2018). *Open arms – 'saving*

life is not a crime' – MEP Ana Miranda: press release from EFA MEP Ana Miranda (Galicia) [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/open-arms-saving-life-is-not-a-crime-mep-ana-miranda/> (Accessed: 9 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2018). *Refugees in the Mediterranean – MEPs call for solidarity: press release from EFA MEPS Jordi Solé & J-M Terricabras (Catalonia)* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/refugees-in-the-mediterranean-meps-call-for-solidarity/> (Accessed: 10 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2020). *European Union* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/priority/group/european-union/> (Accessed: 24 December 2020).

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2020). *Opinions* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/newsroom/opinions/> (Accessed: 10 November 2020)

The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament (2020). *Transparency and democracy* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/priority/group/democracy/> (Accessed: 24 December 2020).

The Irish Times (2021). *Election 2020* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.irishtimes.com/election2020/results-hub> (Accessed: 28 February 2021).

Tuttles, U. and Martin De La Torre, V. (2016). *April 2016 plenary session: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/plenary-update-11-14-april-2016> (Accessed: 28 September 2020).

Tuttles, U. and Martin De La Torre, V. (2016). *March 2016 plenary session: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/plenary-update-7-10-march-2016> (Accessed: 28 September 2020).

Tuttles, U. and Martin De La Torre, V. (2016). *May 2016 plenary session: Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.socialistsanddemocrats.eu/newsroom/plenary-update-9-12-april-2016> (Accessed: 28 September 2020).

UKIP (2019). *2019 Manifesto for Brexit and Beyond* [Online]. Available at https://www.ukip.org/ukip-manifesto-item.php?cat_id=26 (Accessed 29 June 2020).

Vernet, L. (2020). *A comprehensive EU approach to prevent the next border crises*

and solve the current one: Renew Europe [Online]. Available at: <https://reneweuropengroup.eu/en/news/1451-a-comprehensive-eu-approach-to-prevent-the-next-border-crises-and-solve-the-current-one/> (Accessed: 24 October 2020)

Vladisavljevic, A. (2020). 'Croatia Parliament Votes in New Plenkovic Government', *Balkan Insight*, 23 July [Online]. Available at: <https://balkaninsight.com/2020/07/23/croatia-parliament-votes-in-new-plenkovic-government/> (Accessed: 28 February 2021).

Vlase, D. (2012). *Citizens' initiative: A tool to engage Europeans in EU debates: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/citizens-initiative-a-tool-to-engage-europeans-in-debates> (Accessed: 23 September 2020).

Vozemberg-Vrionidi, E. (2015). *We need a common European strategy to face the challenges of migration: EPP Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.eppgroup.eu/newsroom/news/we-need-a-common-european-strategy-to-face-the-challenges-of-migration> (Accessed: 25 September 2020).

Weir, D. (2017). *EU-Turkey Deal Left in Responsibility Vacuum: EU-Turkey deal: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/eu-turkey-deal-left-in-responsibility-vacuum/> (Accessed: 11 November 2020)

Weir, D. (2017). *Juncker Must Show Citizens That the EU Can Improve Their Lives: The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/juncker-must-show-citizens-that-the-eu-can-improve-their-lives/> (Accessed: 11 November 2020)

Weir, D. (2017). *Ska Keller on Brexit and Migration: European Council The GREENS/EFA Group in the European Parliament* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.greens-efa.eu/en/article/press/ska-keller-on-brexit-and-migration/> (Accessed: 11 November 2020)

Yannick, L. (2020). *Conference on the future of Europe: the time has come to democratize the European Union: Renew Europe* [Online]. Available at: <https://reneweuropengroup.eu/en/news/1406-conference-on-the-future-of-europe-the-time-has-come-to-democratize-the-european-union/> (Accessed: 24 October 2020)

Yetkin, B. (2010). *Populizm ve Özal-Erdoğan*. 1st edition. Antalya: Yeniden Anadolu ve Rumeli Müdafaa-i Hukuk Yayınları

Zulianello, M., and Larsen, E. G. (2021). *Populist parties in European Parliament elections: A new dataset on left, right and valence populism from 1979 to 2019*, *Electoral Studies*, 71, 102312.

