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Abstract: Populism is a topic that has been extensively researched during the last decade and the phenomenon has been shooting roots in many European countries. This thesis consists of a case study that focuses on populism in the Netherlands. In 2010 de Partij voor de Vrijheid (PVV, Party for the Freedom) gained the trust of almost 1.5 million Dutch voters. Different scholars (Kessel, 2011; Mudde, 2007; Vossen, 2010) have classified the PVV as a populist party, however, sometimes without clear argumentation or based on criteria that are difficult to measure. This study tries to find an answer to the following question: “To what extent can we consider the PVV as a populist party?” To give an adequate answer to this question use is made of a quantitative text analysis with a dictionary approach. This study utilises the dictionary created by Pauwels (2011) to measure the degree of populism among Belgian parties. The dictionary is used to analyse the party manifestos of the different Dutch parties as it enables us to measure the percentage of words parties dedicate to populism and other ideological dimensions.
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1. Introduction to populism, Wilders and the PVV

Geert Wilders and his *Partij voor de Vrijheid* (Party for the Freedom, PVV) have received a great amount of attention from the media and scholars. Wilders became widely known for his provocative statements about Muslims and his critiques on the political elite in The Hague. In March 2008 he released the movie *Fitna* which contains several anti-Koran and anti-Islamic features. Wilders has been prosecuted for, among other things, the instigation of discrimination and hatred towards Muslims but was, however, declared innocent by the court.

In 2004, Wilders split with the *Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie* (People’s party for Freedom and Democracy, VVD) because of irreconcilable differences concerning the possible accession of Turkey to the European Union (Lucardie, 2007b, p. 178). During the period of 2004-2005 he stayed in parliament as an *eenmansfractie* (one man party). With his one seat he created a parliamentary group with only one member, namely himself. In 2005 Wilders presented a statement of principles for the Group Wilders PVV and on the 22th of February 2006 the Dutch politician created a new political party, the PVV (Lucardie, 2007b).

During the parliamentary election of 2006 the PVV won 5.89 % of the vote and the confidence of 579.490 Dutch voters. The party also participated in the 2009 elections for the European Parliament and gained an impressive amount of 16.97 % of the vote. This made PVV runner-up, as the *Christen Democratisch Appel* (Christian Democratic Appeal, CDA) received only a slightly higher percentage of the vote namely 20.05 %. The party was able to retain its success during the parliamentary election of 2010 with a vote share of 15.45 %. At this point in time more than almost one and a half million Dutch voters decided to vote for the new party (EED, 2011).

Scholars have studied Wilders and his party in relation to populism. Different scientists have used the term populist party while discussing the PVV (Becker & Cuperus, 2010; Kessel, 2011; Lucardie, 2007a; Mudde, 2007; Vossen, 2010). In addition the Dutch media have often used the word populism referring to the party.

In his article ‘populism in the Netherlands after Fortuyn: Rita Verdonk and Geert Wilders compared’ Vossen (2010) labelled the PVV as a populist party. However the methodology of the research is questionable. The author conceptualised seven features of populism and analysed ‘a diversity of sources’ using a rather holistic approach (Vossen, 2010, p. 34). The diversity of sources consisted of 44 interviews with Geert Wilders and 30 coverage and portraits. Vossen concluded that Wilders cannot be identified in all his features of populism and therefore is not a straightforward case. In this thesis, I question the validity and reliability of this article since the method is not clearly explained. Moreover the analysis includes just one other populist party and, in my opinion, in order to label the PVV as a populist party to get an adequate indication one must also measure populism among other parties. Kessel (2011) on the other hand focuses on explaining the electoral performance of populist
political parties in the Netherlands rather than explaining why one must consider Wilder’s party as a populist party.

In the literature it is presumed very often that the PVV is a populist party however this has not been empirically tested and compared with other Dutch parties who might also possess populist elements. This leads to the focus of this thesis and the main research question:

“To what extent can we consider the PVV as a populist party?”

As this is a rather broad question the following sub questions have been developed to clarify the research objective to a greater extent:

1) What is the degree of populism in the party manifestos of the major Dutch parties for the parliamentary elections of 2010?

2) What is the degree of populism in the party manifesto of the PVV compared to the beginselverklaring (statement of principles) and the election pamphlet of 2006 of the PVV?

3) How much does the degree of populism vary between the PVV and Leefbaar Nederland (Liveable Netherlands, LN) and Lijst Pim Fortuyn (List Pim Fortuyn, LPF)\(^1\)

For sake of clarity, the goal of this thesis is not to place the PVV on a left-right ideological scale or dimension. Its aim is to measure the degree of populism of the different Dutch political parties. Populist elements or statements can most likely be found among all parties independent from their ideology. Stanley (2008) claims that “at any given point, certain parties and social movements will be ‘more populist’ than others, in that populism is a more salient aspect of their appeal” (Stanley, 2008, p. 108). One of the problems of the scientific research in the field of populism is that the term populism is used for certain parties or party leaders without systematic measurement (Hawkins, 2009, p. 1041). This thesis aims to provide an answer to the question as to in how far the degree of populism in the PVV is higher than among the other Dutch parties. This is done employing a quantitative text analysis using a dictionary approach measuring the degree of populism in different Dutch party manifestos in a systematic manner.

The research question: “To what extent can we consider the PVV as a populist party?” is of descriptive nature. I have deliberately chosen for a descriptive question as it streams from the research on populism that already has been done. Scholars have barely been able to agree on a definition of populism, therefore criteria and measures that can identify populism are still lacking. The sum of the answers of these three questions will give insight in the extent to which we can consider the PVV to be a populist party, or “the” populist party in the Netherlands.

---

\(^1\) In the year 2002, “Fortuyn, a columnist and former sociology professor, founded his party LPF after he was expelled from the also newly formed party LN” (Kessel, 2011, p. 73). Both parties are often categorized, by media as well as scholars, as populist parties.
The scientific relevance of this study is the fact that it contributes to the new trend of quantitative text analysis. Moreover if the dictionary proves to be adequate in the case of the Netherlands it might be possible to use the dictionary to measure populism in other Western European countries as well. The social relevance lies in the fact that populist parties are shooting roots all over Europe with major electoral gains in some countries. Rydgren states that “it is not an exaggeration to claim that the extreme far right for the first time since the Second World War constitutes a significant force in West European democracies” (Rydgren, 2003, pp. 45-46). Mudde even goes as far to say that: “the populist radical right is the only successful new party family in Europe” (Mudde, 2007, p. 1).

The Sweden Democrats, the Danish People’s Party and the Party for the Freedom are gaining political weight and have gained seats in government. These parties will be able to actively take part in the decision-making process and the governing of the respective countries. This is of great importance since “particularly in multi-party systems, small parties can weigh (heavily) on national policies and social values, even if in (semi-) permanent opposition” (Mudde, 2007, p. 2). The ideological view of the populist parties may have far reaching consequences for particular minorities within the European society. Foremost because the populist radical right is highly associated with and promotes xenophobia, racism, Islamophobia, nationalism, discrimination, anti-party attitudes, exclusionism, traditional values and has an anti-democratic character (Gündüz, 2010, p. 39).

The set up of this thesis is as follows. Chapter two consists of the conceptualisation of populism including a literature review and a discussion on whether to consider populism as an ideology. The third chapter sets out the methodology identifying the research design which consists of a quantitative text analysis of party manifestos using Pauwels’ (2011) dictionary. This is followed by a discussion on the use of computer coding and human coding to analyse political texts and in this case an argumentation for the use of computer coding is provided. In the fourth chapter all party manifestos are analysed and compared and an explanation of the main findings follows. The fifth chapter consists of a validation of the category populism and traces back the populist words in the manifestos to conclude if they were used in a populist manner making use of hand coding. Finally, this thesis concludes that based on the dictionary used in this analysis the PVV can be considered as “the” populist party of the Netherlands.

2. Conceptualizing populism

Even though the topic populism has received a great amount of scholarly attention, the main discussion point so far has been the conceptualisation of populism. What does populism entail and how can one identify its main features? Should populism be considered an ideology, normalcy, antagonism, political style or type of party organisation? This chapter starts out with a short literature
review followed by a conceptualisation of populism which includes a discussion on whether to consider populism as an ideology.

The most important concept of this thesis resulting from the main research question is, as mentioned above, populism. Scholars in this field of research have proposed numerous suggestions to clarify and define the concept. The following contains a short literature review on the study of populism.

Although a clarification of the main concepts is crucial for every study it seems to be even more necessary in this field of research. The need of a proper and clear definition stems from the broad applicability of the term. The difficulty lies in the fact that the term populism has been attached to many different phenomena. The list with a wide array of all different kinds of populism is endless and includes: penal populism, cultural populism, radical right populism, nationalist populism, agrarian populism and so forth. In addition populism has been used to describe Latin American leaders (Hawkins, 2009; Knight, 1998; Weyland, 2001) the peasant movement in Russia and farmers in America (Canovan, 2005).

For the abovementioned reason it is crucial to limit and clarify the focus of this study. This thesis covers “New Populism”, a term first used by Paul Taggart (Taggart, 1995) in his article: “New populist parties in Western Europe.” The topic gained major scholarly attention since the 1980s. This was also the time period the new wave of populism, “New Populism”, entered the political scene of Western Europe. These parties are “typically confrontational in style, they claim to represent the rightful source of legitimate power – the people, whose interests and wishes have been ignored by self-interested politicians and politically correct intellectuals” (Canovan, 2005, p. 74).

At this point it is important to make a distinction between New Populism and politicians’ populism. Politicians’ populism is a term that “refers to a classic tactic available to political insiders, a kind of ‘catch-all’ politics that sets out to appeal to the people as a whole” (Canovan, 2005, p. 77). Although both types differ in definition they have a similar focus on the people which may lead to confusion. Moreover, according to Mudde, populism is not a phenomena exclusively belonging to populist parties. It should be viewed as a regular feature of politics in western democracies used as well by outsiders as mainstream politicians (Mudde, 2004, p. 551). This definition of populism appears too broad as Di Tella accurately points out since: “this exceedingly wide use is not fruitful because it can end up applying to almost any politician capable of winning an election” (Di Tella, 1997, p. 188).

New Populism has been identified as: a feature of representative politics (Taggart, 2004), a political communication style (Jagers & Walgrave, 2007) or as a pathological normalcy (Mudde, 2010). Betz goes as far to claim it is both “a structure of argumentation, a political style and strategy, and an

---

2 I this thesis I use the terms “populism” and “new populism” interchangingly.
ideology” (Betz & Immerfall, 1998, p. 4). This is only a small selection of the different concepts that have been attached to populism.

**Populism as an ideology?**

Recent debates concern the discussion on whether populism actually does or does not constitute an ideology. Canovan (2005) claims that populism cannot be qualified as a full ideology. Her main argument rests on the fact that the term populism suggests a relation between other -isms. However when one considers the established ideologies these “range over widely varied phenomena, each gains a degree of coherence from a continuous history, willingness on the part of most adherents to identify themselves by the name, distinctive principles and policies” (Canovan, 2005, pp. 78-79). She argues populism lacks these common features.

Pauwels finds it “remarkable how the conceptualisation of populism as an ideology has recently won ground in the definitional debate” (Pauwels, 2011, p. 99). Indeed once can witness many scholars who can identify with the definition of populism as an ideology. Mudde even goes as far to claim that populism is a distinct ideology. However only a thin-centred ideology as “it does not possess the ‘same level of intellectual refinement and consistency [exhibiting] a restricted core attached to a narrower range of political concepts” (Mudde, 2004, p. 544).

This view has been endorsed by other authors. Abs and Rummens (2007) define populism “as a thin-centered ideology which advocates the sovereign rule of the people as a homogeneous body” (Abts & Rummens, 2007, p. 405). Stanley argues populism “should be regarded as a distinct ideology in that it conveys a particular way of construing the political in the specific interactions of its core concepts” (Stanley, 2008, p. 95). Nevertheless, it is only a thin-centred ideology since “it is unable to stand alone as a practical political ideology: it lacks the capacity of putting forward a wide-ranging and coherent programme for the solution to crucial political questions” (Stanley, 2008, p. 95).

After having identified the different definitions and features, scholars mention to identify populism, there is an overlapping feature or similarity that most scholars mention in relation to populism. This is the relationship between the people and the elite. Canovan claims: “populism in modern democratic societies is best seen as an appeal to ‘the people’ against both the established structure of power and the dominant ideas and values of the society” (Canovan, 1999, p. 3).

Mudde’s definition is slightly different: “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” (Mudde, 2004, p. 543). Mudde’s conceptualisation of populism is the definition used in this thesis. Because on the on hand it is conceptually clear (Pauwels, 2011, p. 99) and the main subject of the relationship of the people versus the elite has been agreed upon by several other scholars (Abts &
Rummens, 2007; Canovan, 1999, 2005; Jagers & Walgrave, 2007; Kessel, 2011; Stanley, 2008; Vossen, 2010). Furthermore this is the conceptualisation which is also used by Pauwels to create his dictionary. This is relevant because this thesis utilises his method to measure the degree of populism.

In sum, although scholars have constructed varying concepts there seems to be an overlapping element in most definitions, namely the relationship between the people and the elite. Populism can thus be defined as: “an ideology or style drawing upon the antagonistic relationship between “the people” and the “elite” (Pauwels, 2011, p. 97). The former discussion on whether to interpret populism as an ideology or not is very vital for further research in the field. For this thesis it is left aside as the main focus is laid on previously mentioned relationship between the people and the elite which dominates the literature. This thesis does not assume populism is just a political style, neither does it claim populism is a distinct ideology. Populism is considered to be a thin ideology as it possesses some features of a distinct ideology however not nearly all of them. But this choice is somewhat irrelevant since the most important aspect of the definition is the relationship between the people and the elite. Furthermore the definition is vague enough to consider populism as an ideology or to deny that claim.

3. Research methodology

This chapter sets out the research design and case selection of this thesis. This is followed by a discussion on the use of computer- and human coding. The method used in this thesis is a quantitative dictionary based approach. The set up of the dictionary is explained and especially the category populism is described in more detail. The chapter concludes with a section on the limitations of the study.

3.1 Research design

The research design of this study consists of a descriptive case study. Gerring (2004) defines the case study as “an intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of (similar) units” (Gerring, 2004, p. 342). This thesis focuses on the social phenomenon populism and more specifically populism in the Netherlands as portrayed by the PVV. The design is of a descriptive nature as this thesis aims to describe the degree of populism of the PVV and the other Dutch political parties. The unit of analysis according to Gerring connotes “a spatially bounded phenomenon – e.g., a nation-state, revolution, political party, election or person – observed at a single point in time or over some delimited period of time” (Gerring, 2004, p. 342). In addition it is “the type of phenomenon an inference attempt to explain” (Gerring, 2007, p. 19). The unit of analysis of this thesis is the PVV with the analysed Dutch party manifests as the units of observation. Therefore although this study comprises only one case, it consists of multiple within case observations, namely the analysis of the different Dutch party manifests. Furthermore, “one of the primary virtues of the case study method is the depth of analysis that it offers” (Gerring, 2004, p. 348).
One of the goals of this thesis is to thoroughly analyse the PVV in relation to populism, but also to place the findings in a broader perspective. This thesis makes use of a pre-constructed and tested dictionary created by Pauwels (2011). His dictionary is able to measure the degree of populism among Belgian parties. If this thesis successfully measures the degree of populism among Dutch parties it might be possible to come up with a more general idea of what populism entails and which words are specifically connected to the phenomenon. Subsequently, one might be able to use the dictionary to measure populism among similar units, namely other Western European countries where populist parties operate.

This study employs quantitative text analysis of party manifestos for the national Dutch parliamentary elections of 2010, the statement of principles of the PVV, the election leaflet of 2006 of the PVV and the party manifestos of the LPF and LN for 2002 and 2003. This thesis makes use of content analysis. Content analysis is defined by Neuendorf as “the systematic, objective, quantitative analysis of message characteristics” (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 1). Concerning the quantitative analysis, this thesis will employ a method that “does not treat texts as discourse to be understood and interpreted but rather, as data in the form of words” (Laver, Benoit, & Garry, 2003, p. 311).

To answer the main research question three sub questions have been derived, an elaboration about how they will be answered follows. Firstly, “what is the degree of populism in the party manifestos of the major Dutch parties in the 2010 national elections?” In order to answer this question the Dutch party manifestos published for the 2010 Dutch election are selected. Via a dictionary based approach the degree of populism among Dutch parties participating in the 2010 elections is measured. The study focuses on the main political parties of the Netherlands as identified by the European Election Database (EED) and Parlement en Politiek (Parliament and Politics). All political ideologies feature in this selection. These are also the parties who won seats during the elections (see Table 6). An addition to this list is the party Trots op Nederland (Proud of the Netherlands, ToN) which is also considered a populist party (Vossen, 2010). However it did not gain the successful results the PVV registered during the elections.

The second question, “what is the degree of populism in the party manifesto of the PVV compared to the statement of principles and the election pamphlet of 2006 of the PVV?” was set up for the following reasons. One could argue that the content of a party manifesto might be dependent on the political context of the election. However the statement of principles is a nineteen page document which sets out the main ideas the party is based upon. This document is therefore less dependent on the political context. In 2006 the PVV produced a flyer for the election, this document is also compared with the two former mentioned documents as this allows for a deeper analysis of the PVV.

Pauwels created a Dutch dictionary in 2010 however this was not used in this thesis for practical reasons. The article was unpublished and therefore one needed permission from the author to cite. However the analysis was also run with this Dutch dictionary, which did not differ to a great extent from the Belgian dictionary, and the results found using the Dutch dictionary showed the same trend as when using the Belgian dictionary.
Thirdly, “how much does the degree of populism vary between the PVV and LN and the LPF?” The PVV is not the only party that is considered populist in the Netherlands. Since the 1980s there is a new wave of populism that also occurred in the Netherlands. This third question compares the party programme of the PVV to two other parties labelled as populist who where active during the 21st century. Although the new wave already started in the 1980s and there were some radical parties in the Netherlands at that time, these parties have very short party programmes and therefore the comparability is very low. The party programmes of the LPF and LN are comparable as they constitute of a considerable length and are both considered to be populist (Koopmans & Muis, 2009; Lucardie, 2007b). This question aims to measure the degree of populism among different parties considered to be populist and unravel if the PVV is the most populist of them all. One of the main criticisms to this approach could be that the manifestos might not be comparable because of the differences in time and political atmosphere. However scholars (Betz, 1993; Mudde, 2004; Rydgren, 2005) have identified that the new wave of populism started to come up in the 1980s which makes it possible to place these parties in the same category.

My expectation based on the literature is that the PVV will turn out to be the party which scores the highest on the ideological feature of populism in comparison to other parties. It is important to compare the PVV to other parties as populism is not something solely confined to populist parties. Populism can also be found among established political parties. As Cas Mudde claims: “populism is not a normal pathology, populist discourse has become mainstream in the politics of contemporary western democracies which he names a “populist Zeitgeist” (Mudde, 2004, p. 562). Therefore it is wise to compare the PVV to all other parties to give a fair answer to the main research question.

3.2 Case selection

This thesis revolves around one specific case namely the Netherlands and more specifically Geert Wilders and his party the PVV. One of the main reasons to select the Netherlands and the PVV is because of the sudden success of the party during recent elections. As mentioned before, the party was very successful during the parliamentary elections of 2006 and 2010. In 2010, with 15.45% of the votes the party gained 24 seats. They were a close third behind the liberal party who gained 31 seats and the social democrats with 30 seats (EED, 2011). This lead to a somewhat strange situation since the liberal party and the Christian democrats formed the government with support from the PVV (gedoogsteun). This means that the party to some extent is responsible for governing the country and policy making. Moreover the PVV is a relatively new party, established in 2006, and therefore has not been thoroughly researched yet. Although, as has been mentioned in the introduction, there are some scholars who have studied the party, their focus is more on explaining the recent success of the party (see Kessel 2011).
The case selection is also connected to the research method. This thesis utilises a dictionary based approach to analyse the different manifestos and uses a pre-constructed dictionary set up by Pauwels (2011) for his analysis to measure the degree of populism among Belgium parties. Since the dictionary is set up in the Dutch language one is able to apply it to the Dutch party manifestos.

3.3 Analysing party manifestos: human coding versus computer coding

The aim of this thesis is to measure the degree of populism via the analysis of the party manifestos of the different Dutch parties. In this field of research one can identify two main streams to analyse political texts, namely human coding and computer coding. Of course both have their advantages and disadvantages. Therefore a short discussion on the matter is provided in the following.

In 1979 the Manifesto Research Group (currently: Comparative Manifesto Project, CMP) was established. This organisation coded numerous party manifestos on the basis of a classification scheme (Volkens, 2001, p. 36). The CMP employs hand-coding which means (normally trained) coders split up the entire manifesto in quasi-sentences and place them in one of the 56 standard policy preferences (Volkens, 2002). This is very time consuming for someone who is not a trained coder. Seventeen manifestos, with on average of around 60 pages each have to be coded in this project. Therefore it is not feasible to use this scheme for this Bachelor thesis because of time concerns. Furthermore one of the main reasons why this method cannot be employed in this thesis is because “populism has not been included in the coding scheme of the Comparative Manifesto Project” (Pauwels, 2011, p. 100).

Disadvantages of human coding include the fact that reliability is considered low. Coding manifestos by hand is very labour intensive and the coders might be subjective (Pauwels, 2011, p. 102). Although the validity of the method might be considered as relatively high, since every sentence is hand coded into the varying categories, reliability is considerably low mainly because of the following reason. Different coders perceive sentences differently and might place them into different categories which can lead to misclassification (Mikhaylov, Laver, & Benoit, 2010). Lastly the costs of categorising party manifestos are very high using “human” coders.

Another approach is to use computer coding. One can extract policy positions from political texts without treating the text as discourses but by treating the text as data in the form of words (Laver, et al., 2003, p. 311). In this case reliability is very high since the computer will present the same results each time the observations are repeated. However one might consider validity to be lower since the computer treats the words as data and does not rely on the meaning of the data. However this can be partly warranted by the creation of “proper dictionaries linking specific words or phrases to predetermined policy positions” (Laver, et al., 2003, p. 312). Moreover considering time limits this

---

4 Reliability: the extent to which a measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 113).
5 Validity: the extent to which a measuring procedure represents the intended, and only the intended concept (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 113).
approach is very useful since the computer can code one manifesto in a matter of seconds. This is why this thesis employs computer coding.

3.4 Method: measuring the degree of populism

3.4.1 Operationalisation: Pauwels’ dictionary

The current debate in this field of research has taken a new direction as it tries to move past the conceptualisation towards operationalisation and the measurement of populism. Scholars, the media and the general public often find themselves capable of pointing out those parties that portray populist elements. However this is often based on ideas, feelings and rather broad definitions. What actually is it that makes these parties populist while other parties are not? To what extent can a party be considered as populist?

Hawkins (2009) criticises researchers in the field of which a vast amount creates definitions which “are not applied towards measurement or are measured in a highly imprecise way that lacks standard tests of reliability and validity or descriptions of how the measurement takes place” (Hawkins, 2009, p. 1048). Pauwels (2011) agrees with this criticism: “despite the increased use of the term populism in vernacular and scholarly language, the measurement of this concept has long been neglected. In the worst case, the label is attached to a party or politician without any justification at all” (Pauwels, 2011, p. 114).

This thesis makes use of a pre-constructed and tested dictionary based approach created by Pauwels (2011). Since this is the dictionary used in this thesis some attention is paid to the construction of the dictionary. The dictionary Pauwels set up was based on the procedure used by Laver and Garry (2000). They defined their dictionary by “allocating words to the categories using a combination of a priori and empirical criteria” (Laver & Garry, 2000, p. 626). Most of the categories (e.g. immigration and conservatism) were designed by a priori reasoning and based on the dictionary that was already designed by Laver and Gary. The establishment of the dictionary a priori is very relevant because if variables are chosen and measured after the observation, using an inductive approach, the guidelines of scientific endeavour are violated. Therefore in the case of computer coding the dictionary must be established a priori (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 11).

For the category populism “only words that had a clear theoretical relationship with the concept of populism were retained in the dictionary” (Pauwels, 2011, p. 103). Table 7 contains the dictionary as set up by Pauwels. The words that are classified as populist by Pauwels seem to be a summary of concepts used by different scholars. Pauwels offers a category that combines different features acknowledged as populist into a measurable concept. The words placed in the categories match with the main body of literature although some words seem to be party specific.
This thesis makes use of the programme Yoshikoder\(^6\) to measure how often words are used in the different party programmes. As a result the different party programmes will score different percentages on the different ideological dimensions. As mentioned before the method is fairly reliable, has low costs and can be applied to many different manifestos in a limited time frame. Moreover the dictionary has proven to be reasonably adequate in measuring populism among Belgium parties.

This dictionary is also applicable to the case of the Netherlands since the categories are applicable to the Netherlands. This has to do with the way the dictionary was constructed. The categories: immigration, liberalism, conservatism, law and order and neo liberalism are fairly general ideological features that can easily be applied to other political systems. The only category that had to be deleted was Flemish nationalism as this is not relevant for the Netherlands. Moreover in the category liberalism the word *job* was replaced by the word *baan* because the word *job* is not used in the Dutch language.

### 3.4.2 Limitations

Although the advantages of the quantitative design have been pointed out all methods have their limits. First of all, the creation of the dictionary might be challenged, another dictionary will of course yield different results. Moreover since this is a quantitative measure that treats words as data the measure might under- or overestimate the degree of populism as some words might not be meant as populist and some populist words might not be detected (Pauwels, 2011, p. 114). Therefore in the fifth chapter of this thesis Pauwels’ dictionary is compared to a human coding approach.

In sum, the research design consists of a descriptive case study. The case selected is the Netherlands and more specifically the political party the PVV. The Netherlands was chosen because this thesis utilises Pauwels (2011) dictionary to analyse party manifestos. The dictionary contains words in the Dutch language and is therefore applicable to the Dutch case. The PVV was selected because of its recent success in the Dutch elections and the populist character it portrays according to scholars and the media. In first instance the thesis makes use of a computer coding approach which has the advantage of high reliability and the disadvantage of debatable validity.

### 4. Data analysis

This chapter starts out to specify the data that are used in this analysis. Afterwards the findings of the analysis are presented in the order the three sub-questions were presented earlier. Firstly, the degree of populism among the previously identified Dutch party programmes for the 2010 election is displayed. Secondly, the thesis takes a closer look at two other public documents published by the PVV namely the statement of principles and the election leaflet for 2006. Lastly, the party programme of the PVV 2010 is compared with two other Dutch parties from the past labelled as populist, LN and the LPF.

---

6 More detailed information about the programme and its functions is available at the following website: [http://www.yoshikoder.org/](http://www.yoshikoder.org/)
4.1 Data
To measure the degree of populism this thesis analyses party manifestos for specific reasons. There are several advantages for measuring policy positions by analysing political texts. Firstly, the manifestos that are published are publicly available and have a “high quality of reproducibility” (Mikhaylov, et al., 2010, p. 2). Secondly, since it is an unobtrusive method “the act of measurement does not disturb what is being measured” (Mikhaylov, et al., 2010, p. 2). Furthermore: “party manifestos or programmes offer voters a summary of the leading issue priorities for political parties. They are presented to the public only after a great deal of internal debate from within party ranks, usually at party conventions” (Cole, 2005, p. 209). Moreover, party manifestos are usually ratified by party conventions, “they are authoritative statements of party policies and represent the whole party, not just one faction or politician” (Volkens, 2001, p. 34). This stands in contrast with other party documents as for example speeches whose content is often highly dependent on the person speaking and the political atmosphere of that particular time. Lastly, the use of party manifestos creates a situation in which a fair comparison of the ideological features of the parties can be made. All documents amount to about the same number of pages and are written for a Dutch parliamentary election.

Considering the data collection all documents are retrieved from the Documentation Centre for Dutch Political Parties (DNPP) and the polidoc database (Benoit, Bräuninger, & Debus, 2009). The purpose of the DNPP is to “provide systematic and accessible information about political parties in the Netherlands” (DNPP, 2011). The DNPP has a database that includes party programmes from 1945 till today. The party manifestos analysed in this thesis can be found in Table 8.

4.2 Results
4.2.1 Measuring populism: the party programmes for the Dutch national parliamentary election of 2010
Table 1 presents the result of the analysis of the first sub question. These results are in line with the general ideas about the Dutch political parties as described in Table 6. The Partij Van De Arbeid (Labour party, PVDA), the social democratic party has the highest score in the category socialism in comparison with the other parties (34.8%). The Partij voor de Dieren (The Party for the Animals, PvdD), the special ecologist party, has an extremely high score on the category environment. Of the words categorised by the dictionary 47.7% fall in this category. The Democraten 66 (Democrats 66, D66) the social liberal party scores high on both of the dimensions, namely 27.7% in the category socialism and 19% in the category liberalism. Groen Links (Green Left, GL), the progressive green also gained a high score in the category environment (18.5%). This is the second highest score after the PvdD. Although this party is considered to be the green party of the Netherlands, the PvdD has a much higher score. This can be explained by the fact that this party is a special issue party so one would expect them to focus most of their attention to their special issue, which in this case is the environment.
The VVD, the liberal party pays a great amount of attention to their liberal roots (21.6%) and also to the category law and order (20.4%). The *Staatkundig Gereformeerde Partij* (The Political Reformed Party, SGP) is considered one of the most conservative parties of the Dutch party system. The findings support this claim since 19.3% of the words fall into this category. The SP, the socialist party has the highest score in the category socialism after the PVDA namely 29.2%. The *Christen Unie* (The Christian Union, CU), Christian social party, spends a great part of their manifesto on social issues (15.2%) however has the highest percentage in the category conservatism in the Dutch party system with 34.8% of the words which also confirms expectations. Lastly the CDA, Christian Democrats, have high scores on the dimension socialism and law and order. As mentioned before the results are in conformity with the general ideas about Dutch parties and their characteristics.

However what seems a little bit odd is the fact that the *Socialistische Partij* (Socialist Party, SP) has one of the highest scores on neo-liberalism since it is a categorised as a socialist party. Moreover the SP claims that neorealism is actually selling out civilisation (Becker & Cuperus, 2007, p. 7). A closer look was taken on the party manifesto and specifically the words that fell into the category neo liberalism. The deeper analysis showed that in reality the SP might mention these words, but often with a negative connotation. The programme could not detect this because it can only pick out the words however does not look at the context surrounding them. Interestingly Pauwels deducted the same finding from his analysis. “A closer look to the context of neoliberal words reveals however that the SP.a denounces neoliberalism instead of embracing it, casting doubt on the validity of the category” (Pauwels, 2011, p. 107). The SP also scores high on neo liberalism like in Pauwels’ article and therefore I support his claim that the validity of this category can be doubted.

After having discussed how the findings are in line with expectations about the Dutch party system we now move on to the most important category around which this thesis revolves. Considering the category populism the results confirm the expectation that the PVV is “the” Dutch populist party. With an impressive score of 13.9% on the dimension populism, in comparison with the other Dutch parties the PVV scores the highest percentage on this dimension. Although most other Dutch parties have a very low score in this category which varies between 1.1 and 3.9% there are two other parties with high scores in this category which are the ToN and SP which both score 6.4 %. The result that the ToN can be considered one of the most populist parties in the Dutch party system is more obvious. Different scholars have labelled the party as populist (Lucardie, 2007b; Vossen, 2010). However on first glance the label does not seem to fit the SP.

The perceived high level of populism in the party manifesto of the SP can be explained by the party’s past. March and Mudde (2005) consider the SP to be a social populist party that opposed the Dutch elite with several campaigns during the 1990s. Their slogan, vote against and the symbol of a flying tomato that squashed the politicians in power are a clear sign of a populist discourse (March & Mudde, 2005, p. 35). Ellemers (2004) claims that the SP is “the only populist movement that grew out to be a
disciplined opposition party” (Ellemers, 2004, p. 263). Kessel (2011) claims that although the SP could be considered a populist party during the 1990s however “the party now presents itself as a more leftist alternative to labour, rather than a pure populist anti-establishment party” (Kessel, 2011, p. 82). What can be concluded is that one can still see some of the leftovers of their populist roots in the party programme of 2010.
Table 1: The amount of attention for the different ideological dimensions of the party programmes for the 2010 Dutch parliamentary election.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PvdA</th>
<th>PvdD</th>
<th>D66</th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>VVD</th>
<th>SGP</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>PVV</th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>ToN</th>
<th>CDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environ ment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and order</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-liberalism</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>477</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations based on Pauwels’ dictionary
4.2.2 Measuring populism: the PVV’s statement of principles and the party pamphlet for the Dutch national parliamentary election of 2006

As mentioned before the reason to analyse multiple documents of the PVV is to, on the one hand give a more complete picture of the party and on the other hand to have some other documents to compare the party manifesto to. This is done to be able to check the findings of the previous section and to be able to base the findings on more than a single document. The two documents that were analysed are the statement of principles which was released in 2005 and the election pamphlet for the parliamentary election of 2006.

The aim is not to do a detailed analysis of the three documents. If the PVV is the Dutch populist party one should be able to detect if there is a pattern of populism that can be identified in all documents. At first sight the results confirm the expectation that the PVV is a party which uses a populist discourse since in both documents the amount of words in the category populism is considerably high also in comparison with the first analysis (see Table 2).

Table 2: The amount of attention for different ideological dimensions of the election leaflet of the PVV 2006 and the statement of principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Election leaflet PPV 06</th>
<th>PVV Statement of principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and order</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-liberalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations based on Pauwels' dictionary

The statement of principles was released in 2005. The dictionary found 33 words that indicated populism. Of those words seventeen were dedicated to the antagonistic relationship between the people and the elite. These included the following statements: the politicians in The Hague are incompetent, the elite exists of coward, frightened, self-righteous people who have lost their way and are alienated from the people (Wilders, 2005). There are four references to the people, who according to the PVV have to take back control over their own future. Moreover the call for a more democratic political system is exemplified by the reference to the need for a binding referendum and a more democratic political system.
Taking a closer look on the leaflet shows that most of the words used in the pamphlet of 2006 revolve around the same topics. The leaflet states the political elite keeps ignoring the interests and problems of the people, politicians only care about themselves, and there is a need for more direct democracy (PVV, 2006). Although this is a very short document we do see that the words that are used are linked to the same populist issues discussed in the statement of principles.

The party manifesto for the 2010 parliamentary election also contains a great amount of references to the antagonistic relationship between political elite and the people which is mentioned twenty four times. The manifesto contains statements like the following. “Should we watch submissive how everything that is cherished by us is demolished by the uncontrolled elite?” (PVV, 2010, p. 5). “The blame can be found with the leftist elite who think the world looks like Woodstock” (PVV, 2010, p. 5). “There is a clear difference between what the Dutch people think and what the elites think” (PVV, 2010, p. 17). The call for direct democracy can be recognized in the claim for a binding referendum on issues the people deem important. “For a flourishing democracy, with plenty of referendums let our people speak; together the citizens know better than the leftist elite” (PVV, 2010, p. 6).7

In sum, the words and sentences that are found in the category populism are very often closely linked to the definition of populism handled in this thesis. One can see a dominant use of the words elite and politician which refer to the antagonistic relationship between the people and the elite. Moreover the words referendum and direct refer to the quest for a more democratic political system.

4.2.3 Measuring populism: the party programmes of LN and LPF for the 2002 and 2003 Dutch national parliamentary election

This section compares the party programme of the PVV 2010 with the party programmes of other populist parties from the past. “Since 2002 the Dutch political landscape has been characterised by populist movements” (Becker & Cuperus, 2007, p. 8). These movements can be found on both sides of the spectrum represented by the SP on the left and the LN, LPF, PVV and ToN on the right side.

The findings support the general idea that LN is a populist party as it has a high score in the category populism, 20,3 % in 2002 and 10,7 % in 2003. The percentage of 2002 is even higher than the degree of populism found in the party programme of the PVV. However the dictionary overestimates the degree of populism and therefore the percentage probably has to be adjusted to a slightly lower percentage. Furthermore, one of the words in the dictionary is the words promise which is used twenty-two times in the party manifesto of 2003 and is linked to populism. However this words is not meant in a populist way. The title of the party programme is: this time they do what they really

---

promise. This sentence is used twenty-two times as a headline above every page. This gives a distorted picture as it doubles the amount of words in the category populism.

**Table 3:** The amount of attention for different ideological dimensions of the party programmes of LN 2002/2003 and LPF 2002/2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LN 02</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>LN 03</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>LPF 02</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>LPF 03</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and order</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15,6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21,9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27,9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-liberalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20,3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>37,1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations based on Pauwels’ dictionary

Interestingly the LPF actually has a rather low score on the dimension of populism. This is counter intuitive since many scholars have labelled the LPF as a populist party (Dorussen, 2010; Ellemers, 2004; Kessel, 2011; Koopmans & Muis, 2009; Pennings & Keman, 2002). However the 2002 party programme only contains two populist words. The programme of 2003 contains a slightly higher percentage of populist words. Many authors put a focus on the anti elite and anti establishment character of the party however the word elite is not found once in both party manifestos. The 2003 manifesto does call for direct democracy through referenda and the freedom of speech is emphasised.

This confirms the result of earlier research done by Raadt, Hollanders, Keman and Krouwel (2004) who did a thorough analysis of multiple European populist parties including the LPF. Although the LPF did score high on anti-establishment statements it did not score high on the anti-elite statements concluding that the nature of the party is more anti-establishment than anti-elite (Raadt, Hollanders, Keman, & Krouwel, 2004, p. 23). Therefore the findings do not confirm the expectation that the LPF is a populist party. Solely based on the two party programmes the party published it did not follow a populist discourse. This does not mean one can completely rule out the fact that the LPF is a populist party. There might be other party documents or speeches of the LPF that do portray more populist words. According to Kessel (2011) the book *the Shambles of eight years* purple contains numerous populist statements (Kessel, 2011, p. 73).

In sum, the first sub question confirms the expectation that the PVV is the most populist party of the Dutch party system. Both in the statement of principles and the leaflet the PVV published for the election of 2006 a considerably high percentage of populist words are found. This strengthens the idea that the PVV is the most populist party within the Dutch political system at this moment. The findings
also support the claim that LN is more populist than other Dutch parties however the claim that the LPF set out on a populist discourse cannot be deducted from the analysis. In contradiction the percentage the LPF scores on the dimension populism is much lower than expected.

5. The dimension populism

As already mentioned, the disadvantage of a quantitative dictionary approach is the fact that although reliability is considered to be high, validity might be lower. This because the dictionary treats the data as words and does not look at context in which they were used. Therefore this chapter firstly examines the exact set up of the dictionary. Afterwards the words that indicate a populist discourse are filtered from the analysis and examined in their context, as they are presented in the party manifestos. This allows us to see if the dictionary really measured what it intended to measure.

5.1 The set up of the dictionary and its consequences

One of the main critiques on the research design of this thesis is the fact that one cannot be certain that all the words in the category populism truly portray a populist discourse. The dictionary is not conclusive and if one would chose other words for the dimension populism this would of course lead to different results. This statement is correct and the only way to reply is to clearly explain how the category was set up so that readers can decide for themselves if they find the dictionary convincing.

Pauwels (2011) explains in his article that because of the novelty of his method there was little to fall back on to create the dimension populism. “Some of the older membership magazines of Vlaams Belang that had been identified by Mudde (2010) and Jagers and Walgrave (2007) as populist were analysed to explore which words belong to the populist discourse” (Pauwels, 2011, p. 103). He decided that only those words that had a clear theoretical relationship with the concept of populism would be retained in the dictionary. Because of this set up, the dictionary might contain words that are party specific for the Belgian case as they were not found in the Dutch manifestos. This means seven words can be deleted from the original dictionary.

There are certain words that are not used in any of the Dutch party manifestos. These include: *treason*, *betray*, capitul*, establishm*, particrat*, shameless. One could conclude from this that these words are specific for the Belgian case as they were not found in the Dutch manifestos. This means seven words can be deleted from the original dictionary.

Furthermore there are words that are only used scarcely, which is specified as less than three times in all the manifestos: *deceit*, *absurd*, *arrogant*, *ruling*, *caste*, *class*, *mafia*, *undemocratic*, *propaganda*, *shame*, *admit*. Interestingly, the parties that did use these words were very often labelled as populist parties. The following words were used very often: promis*, *corrupt*, *direct*, *elite*,
freedom of expression, politic*, referend*, regime*, tradition*, people. These are the words that are closely linked to the definition of populism utilised in this thesis.

Concluding, there are several words which are used very often by populists and these words are strongly linked to the definition of populism adopted in this thesis. In a way this strengthens the conceptualisation of populism employed in this thesis since the words a priori defined as populist, are found mostly in the party programmes of those parties labelled as populist. Furthermore there appear to be several words that are country specific to the Belgian case since these words were never used in the Dutch party manifestos. Other words characterised as populist might not be used very often however when used they are mostly used by the parties categorized as populist so this supports the claim that these words probably are connected with the populist discourse. One could therefore conclude that there might be a core set of populist words that are used very often by populist parties, which are words that are strongly linked to the definition of populism adopted in this thesis.

5.2 Validating the dimension populism

This section contains a validation of the dictionary because of the following reason. The dictionary is not able to interpret texts units as it treats words as data. Therefore the method might overestimate or underestimate the degree of populism (Pauwels, 2011, p. 114). As this is a valid claim I decided to analyse the party programmes in more depth making use of hand coding to see if the words that fall into the dimension populism were actually used in a populist manner. Afterwards the analysis is run again to examine how this affects the previous findings. In order to see whether words were used in a populist manner all words indicated as populist were studied in their context. Very often the sentence in which it was used was enough to clarify if the words were used in a populist manner although in some cases the whole paragraph was studied.

This thesis analyses if the words were used in a populist manner according to our pre-determined definition of populism. Populism is: “an ideology or style drawing upon the antagonistic relationship between “the people” and the “elite” (Pauwels, 2011, p. 97). Pauwels’ categorisation of populism has three basic underlying thoughts. Firstly, parties that refer often to the people are considered more populist. Secondly, populist parties depict the elite as a homogenous group of corrupt politicians. The people are lied to and betrayed by this elite. Finally populists favour more direct links between the people and the elite (Pauwels, 2011, pp. 104-105). The validation of the dictionary is based on these three underlying thoughts.

All words indicated as populist found through the Yoshikoder were studied in their context. Table 9 in the appendix depicts all words, indicated as populist, in the party programmes for the Dutch parliamentary election of 2010. To decide if these words were used in a populist manner the three underlying thoughts mentioned in the previous paragraph were always kept in mind.
In practice this meant that when the word “people” was mentioned to depict the antagonistic relationship between the people and the elite the word was categorised as populist. So was the word “traditional” when it referred to the traditions of the people or when parties in government were depicted as traditional. The words: “politician”, “elite”, “ruling”, “regime”, “promise”, “propaganda” and “corrupt” were only categorised as populist when they were portrayed as acting against the general will of the people. The words “direct”, “freedom of expression” and “referendum” were categorised as populist only when they aimed at more direct links between the people and the elite. Therefore during the process of validating the category populism I tried to stay as close as possible to the definition of populism employed in this thesis. Examples can be found in Table 9.

Table 4 presents the results of the analysis making use of computer- and hand coding. The percentage of populism measured by the dictionary was divided by the percentage of populism to calculate the ratios which can be found in the third column of Table 4. The findings show that the dictionary overestimates the degree of populism in all the party manifestos. However the PVV is still the most populist party followed by the SP and ToN. The ratios indicate that the overestimation of the degree of populism is greater among parties who were not labelled as populist. The overestimation was lowest with the parties who were categorized as populist by scholars and the media. Therefore it may be that the dictionary is more adequate in measuring populism among parties indicated as populist than parties who are not considered as populist.

The greatest differences between the percentages that were measured by the dictionary versus the hand coding can be found in the party programmes of the CDA and the SGP. None of the words coded as populist in the party programme of the CDA portrayed a populist discourse. The dictionary found 25 populist words in the party programme of the SGP however after hand coding only two words were found with a populist discourse. This does not mean the dictionary is not useful to measure populism among Dutch political parties. One just has to take into account that the degree of populism is overestimated, and to a greater extent overestimated with the parties not categorised as populist. What this means in practice is that after validation the degree of populism among populist parties, in comparison with the other Dutch parties, is even greater than measured with the dictionary.

In sum, the dictionary Pauwels set up contains some words that are party specific for the Belgian case. But this does not mean that the dictionary cannot be used in the Dutch case. The words that are very closely linked to the theory on populism are frequently used by the populist parties in their party programme. The analysis in Chapter 4 already indicated that the PVV, at the moment, is the party in the Netherlands with the highest degree of populism. After a validation of the dictionary this expectation is confirmed and the difference between the degree of populism in the party programmes of the PVV, ToN, SP and the other Dutch parties is even larger than with computer coding.
Table 4: The results of validating the category populism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PVDA</th>
<th>PvdD</th>
<th>D66</th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>VVD</th>
<th>SGP</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>PVV</th>
<th>CU</th>
<th>ToN</th>
<th>CDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>6,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own calculations based on Pauwels’ dictionary
6. Conclusions

The aim of thesis was to measure the degree of populism among the main Dutch parties using Pauwels’ (2011) dictionary. A quantitative text analysis approach was adopted to analyse the different Dutch party manifests. In first instance the computer coded the political texts, at a later stage in the research process use was made of human coding. This thesis tried to answer three sub questions before coming to the main research question.

Firstly, when the party manifests of the main Dutch parties for the 2010 election were compared, the PVV scored the highest percentage on the dimension of populism (13.9 %). The difference in comparison with the other parties was substantial as the degree of populism among the other Dutch parties varied between 1.1 and 3.9 % (see Table 1). There were two other parties who obtained a rather high score on the dimension populism, namely the ToN and SP with 6.4%. The ToN is often labelled by scholars and the media as populist, although the score was higher than for most Dutch political parties it was still lower than the percentage acquired by the PVV. The SP also gained a relatively high score because of the remainder of its socialist populist roots from the 1990s.

Secondly the PVV election manifesto of 2010 was compared with the statement of principles and the election leaflet for the election of 2006. Both also contained a substantially high degree of populism and support the claim that the PVV is a populist party (17.6 and 11.5%). These high percentages strengthen the claim that the PVV follows a populist discourse.

Lastly, when the party programmes of two populist parties from the past, LPF and LN, were analysed the results were somewhat surprising. The degree of populism among the party programmes of the LPF was considerably lower than expected, 2.3 % in 2002 and 3.5 % in 2003. The degree of populism in the party programmes of LN was as expected very high, 20.3 % in 2002 and 10.7 % in 2003. This means that in 2002 the degree of populism was even higher than that of the PVV in its 2010 election manifesto. The PVV can be considered as more populist than the LPF. The party programme of LN of 2002 did not contain a higher percentage of populism than the party programme of the PVV for 2010. The party programme of 2003 did contain a very high amount of populism, however the percentage difference with the PVV is small and the percentages have to be adjusted downwards because the dictionary overestimates the degree of populism. Furthermore, LN has left the Dutch political stage as the party has been dissolved.

Therefore the main research question ―To what extent can we consider the PVV as a populist party?‖ can be answered as follows. Taking into account the three sub questions, with the definition of populism applied in this thesis the PVV is at the moment “the” most populist party in the Netherlands. Therefore the findings confirmed the previous expectations set by scholars that the PVV is the most
populist party in the Dutch political landscape of the moment. The dictionary seems capable of adequately measuring populism in the Dutch party manifestos. In general parties that were labelled as populist by scholars and the media scored a high percentage on the dimension of populism, with the exception of the LPF.

Considering the limits of the findings threats to validity and reliability are mentioned in the following. This thesis employed two different methods to analyze political texts. Firstly, use was made of computer coding via the Yoshikoder. As mentioned earlier computer coding has the advantage of high reliability, although the validity can be questioned. Because the computer treats the words as data and does not take the meaning into account one cannot be very certain one measures what one intends to measure. Therefore the dictionary was validated making use of human coding. Although the validity was now increased reliability can be questioned because of the danger of misclassification and coder reliability (Mikhaylov, et al., 2010). Therefore the coding process was made as transparent as possible which I have done by including Table 9 with all the coded sentences.

After validating the dictionary results showed that the dictionary actually overestimated the degree of populism in all party manifestos. After calculating the ratios the overestimation of the degree of populism was greater among parties not considered as populist than parties who are considered to be populist. This does not mean the dictionary is not useful it just means that the original picture is somewhat distorted and has to be adjusted by lowering the initial scores. It also gives an indication that the dictionary is better able to detect populism among populist parties.

After taking a closer look at the words used by populist parties there seemed to be a core set of words linked to Mudde’s definition that was used very often by these parties. These words included: promis*, corrupt*, direct, elite*, freedom of expression, politic*, referend*, regime*, tradition*, people. All these words can be directly connected to Pauwels (2011) three basic underlying thought namely. Firstly, parties that refer often to the people are considered more populist. Secondly, populist parties depict the elite as a homogenous group of corrupt politicians. The people are lied to and betrayed by this elite. Finally populists favour more direct links between the people and the elite (Pauwels, 2011, pp. 104-105). These findings support the conceptualisation as words a priori defined as populist were found in the party programmes of those parties indicated as populist by scholars and the media. The PVV mentioned the people very often in its manifesto. Furthermore, the elite were often portrayed as a group of corrupt politicians and a more direct link with the elite was favoured, exemplified by a call for direct democracy and a call for binding referenda.

Although one could doubt the degree of generalisation of a case study, the fact that the dictionary is applicable to the case of the Netherlands and Belgium is a promising result. For future research it might be interesting to apply the dictionary to other European political systems in order to see if it is also accurate for these countries. Some words of the Belgium dictionary were not applicable to the
Dutch case therefore words might be country or party specific. There might also be other words that portray populism that were not yet detected (Pauwels, 2011, p 115). Therefore measurement in more countries is necessary. From there on one might be able to develop a dictionary that can measure the degree of populism in the political systems of Europe.

Pauwels mentions the fact that “since the populist discourse might vary from one context to another, it will be a difficult task to arrive at a discriminatory dictionary” (Pauwels, 2011, p. 115). Although I agree with this statement I would like to add the fact that it is a promising result that the words most closely connected to the definition were used very often by populist parties this supports the use of this definition and operationalisation which might be applicable across countries. Further research could therefore also focus on the set up of the dictionary and its application to other European political systems.

Lastly, although the computer coding did overestimate the degree of populism it was still able to portray the degree of populism among Dutch political parties. Therefore to get a first indication of the degree of populism among political parties computer coding might be a very beneficial method since it reduces time and costs in comparison with hand coding. However hand coding indicated the dictionary overestimated the degree of populism. Therefore both methods were complementary. I foresee a bright future for computer coding however in co-existence with hand coding.

In sum, based on the findings in this thesis the PVV can be considered as the Dutch populist party as indicated by different scholars. However this thesis was able to measure the degree of populism in a systematic, retraceable manner with a clear operationalisation and measurement of the concept of populism using a quantitative text analysis approach.
Appendix

Table 6: Main Dutch political parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes (%)</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VVD People’s party for freedom and democracy</td>
<td>Liberal (right)</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVDA Labour party</td>
<td>Progressive social democratic</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVV The party for the freedom</td>
<td>Anti-Islam party</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA Christian Democratic Appeal</td>
<td>Christian democrats (centre)</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP The Socialist Party</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D66 Democrats 66</td>
<td>Progressive social liberal</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL Green Left</td>
<td>Progressive green</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU The Christian Union</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGP The political Reformed Party</td>
<td>Conservative Christian</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PvdD The Party for the Animals</td>
<td>Special issue/ecologist</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on data from the EED and Parliament and Politics

Table 7: Original dictionary used by Pauwels (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>Dutch words</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>christ*; geloof; gezin; kerk; normen; porn*; seks*; waarden</td>
<td>christ*; belief; family; church; norm; porn*; sex*; values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>ecol*; groene*; klimaat*; milieu*; opwarming</td>
<td>ecol*; green*; climate*; environment*; heating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>moroc*; turk; allocht*; asiel*; halal*; hoofddoek*; illegi*; immigr*; islam*; koran; moslim*; vreemd</td>
<td>moroc*; turk; allocht*; asylum*; halal*; scarf*; illegal*; immigr*; islam*; Koran; muslim*; foreign*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and order</td>
<td><em>veilig</em>; criminal*; drug*; geweld*</td>
<td><em>safe</em>; criminal*; drug*; violence*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td><em>belasting</em>; <em>korting</em>; bureacrat*; concur*; dereg*; effici*; job*; taks*</td>
<td><em>tax</em>; <em>reduction</em>; bureaucrat*; compet*; dereg*; effici*; job*; tax*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-liberalism</td>
<td>regeldr*; vlaktaks*; zwartwerk*</td>
<td>informal labour*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populism</td>
<td><em>bedrog</em>; <em>verraa</em>; <em>verrad</em>; absurd*; arrogant*; belot*; beloof*; belov*; capitul*; corrupt*; directe; elite*; establishment*; heersend*; kaste; klasse; maffia; menig*; ondemsocatisch*; particrat*; politic*; propaganda; referend*; regime*; schaamtelooos; schand*; toegeven; traditio*; volk</td>
<td><em>deceit</em>; <em>treason</em>; <em>betray</em>; absurd*; arrogant*; promis*; promise*; capitul*; corrupt*; direct; elite*; establishment*; ruling*; caste; class; mafia; freedom of expression; undemocratic; particrat*; politic*; propaganda; referend*; regime*; shameless; shame*; admit; tradition*; people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>individu*; progressief; recht; Vrijheid; vrouw*; zelfbeschik*</td>
<td>individu*; progressive; right; freedom; woman; self-disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td><em>handicap</em>; armoed*; bescherming; eerlijk; gelijkheid*; onderwijs; pensioen*; social*; zwak*</td>
<td>handicap*; povert*; protection; honest; equal*; education; pension*; social*; weak*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8: Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Manifesto</th>
<th>Free translation in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National elections 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVD</td>
<td>Orde op zaken</td>
<td>Putting affairs in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVDA</td>
<td>Iedereen telt mee</td>
<td>Everyone counts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVV</td>
<td>De agenda van hoop en optimisme</td>
<td>The agenda of hope and optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Slagvaardig en samen</td>
<td>Alert and together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Een beter Nederland voor minder geld</td>
<td>A better Netherlands for less money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D66</td>
<td>Anders ja</td>
<td>Different yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Klaar voor de toekomst</td>
<td>Ready for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Vooruitzien</td>
<td>Looking ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGP</td>
<td>Daad bij het woord</td>
<td>Doing what one promises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PvdD</td>
<td>Recepten voor mededogen en duurzaamheid</td>
<td>Reccepies voor compassion and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToN</td>
<td>Vertrouwen en handhaven</td>
<td>Trust and uphold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documents PVV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVV 2005</td>
<td>Onafhankelijkheidsverklaring</td>
<td>Statement of principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVV 2006</td>
<td>Verkiezingspamflet</td>
<td>Election Pamphlet Group Wilders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other populist parties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPF 2002</td>
<td>Zakelijk met een hart</td>
<td>Corporate with a hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPF 2003</td>
<td>Politiek is passie</td>
<td>Politics is passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN 2002</td>
<td>Leefbaar Nederland</td>
<td>Livable Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN 2003</td>
<td>Deze keer doen ze wat ze echt beloven</td>
<td>This time they will do what they really promise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Hand coding of the category populism in the party programmes for the Dutch parliamentary election of 2010

**PVDA Iedereen telt mee**

| Overheden en politici kunnen daar iets aan doen, bijvoorbeeld met streng beloningsbeleid en stevig toezicht. | Not populist |
| Burgers moeten vertrouwen hebben in politici, politici in burgers. | Not populist |
| Minder bureaucratie, een effectievere parlement en de introductie van enkele vormen van meer directe democratie dragen bij aan het herstel van vertrouwen. | Not populist |
| En het maakt ons minder afhankelijk van olie en gas uit windstreken met politieke instabiliteit en dubieuze regimes. | Not populist |
| Politici moeten daartoe international bindende afspraken durven maken. | Not populist |
| De PvdA wil dat homoseksualiteit bespreekbaar wordt in religieuze kringen waar dit traditioneel moeilijk ligt. | Not populist |
| De vrijheid van meningsuiting, het recht op informatie en de privacy van burgers moeten worden gerespecteerd. | Not populist |
| Tegelijkertijd wil de PvdA de directe invloed van bewoners op de corporaties vergroten. | Not populist |
| Het vertrouwen in politici en politieke partijen is de laatste jaren sterk teruggelopen. | Not populist |
| Burgers willen directe invloed op het bestuur en vaker dan één keer per vier jaar. | Not populist |
| De PvdA heeft stelling genomen voor de door de Raad gekozen burgemeester, voor correctieve referenda, voor burgerinitiatieven, voor verbeteringen van het kiesstelsel. | Not populist |
| Doel is de modernisering van de representatieve democratie door op een verantwoorde manier vormen van directe invloed voor de burger in te voeren. | Not populist |
| Goed bestuur is cruciaal, corruptie bestrijden we en versnippering gaan we tegen. | Not populist |
| De overheid neemt een kritische houding ten aanzien van pensioenfondsen en banken, die investeren in bedrijven die kernwaps, landmijnen en clusterbommen produceren en bedrijven die wapens leveren aan omstreden regimes. | Not populist |
PvdD Recepten voor mededogen en duurzaamheid

Dit heeft een nieuwe politieke stroming op gang gebracht die uitgaat van het overstijgend belang dat zich niet laat vangen in termen van ‘links’ of ‘rechts’ of van traditionele levensbeschouwelijke stromingen.

De Partij voor de Dieren wil het heersende recht van de sterkste doorbreken en opkomen voor de belangen van de zwakste.

Het huidige stelsel van directe en onvoorwaardelijke subsidiëring van boeren moet worden afgeschaft.

Het welzijn van de dieren die gebruikt worden in media, kunst en (traditioneel) volksvermaak is vaak niet gegarandeerd.

Dergelijke traditionele volksspelletjes getuigen van een respectloze kijk op dieren en horen niet thuis in deze tijd.

Het raadgevend referendum moet een plaats krijgen bij belangrijke besluiten.

Er moet een stelsel van promotie en degradatie komen waarbij de toegewezen zendtijd en programmamiddelen behalve met ledental een directe relatie krijgen met de geleverde prestaties in relatie tot de taakopdracht van de publieke omroep.

In de plannen van de overheid worden internetproviders verplicht om het internetverkeer van hun klanten in de gaten te houden, waarmee het recht op privacy en communicatiegeheim, informatievrijheid en vrijheid van meningsuiting onder druk komt te staan.

Er moeten banken komen die louter aan traditionele financiële dienstverlening doen, zoals sparen, lenen en betalen.

D66 Anders ja

Een betrouwbare overheid vraagt om transparante politiek, met politici die voorbeeld zijn van wijsheid en beschaving.

Top clusters worden versterkt onder directe begeleiding van het Rijk. Kennisinstellingen worden aangemoedigd tot bundeling van krachten en specialisatie.

Failliet gaan moet geen schande en juridische ellende zijn, maar een leermoment, gevolgd door kansen op herstel, verbetering en vernieuwing.

Door dit onder eenzelfde fiscaal gunstig regime te brengen wordt mensen geen keuze voor het een of tegen het ander opgedrongen en kunnen de middelen flexibel worden ingezet.

Volgens D66 moeten de pensioenfondsen waarmaken wat ze beloven en helder aangeven wat de spaarders wel en niet kunnen verwachten.

In dat kader is het ook nodig om de woningmarkt beter te laten functioneren: starters kunnen zich nauwelijks een passend koop- of huurhuis veroorloven en het huidige belasting- en huursubsidie regime staan doorstroom op de woningmarkt in de weg.

De Nederlandse landbouwsector is zeer gevarieerd: met kennisintensieve agribusinesses en traditionele biologische veeteelt, maar ook met meer traditionele intensieve veeteeltbedrijven.

Sterker nog, juist consumenten hebben directe invloed op het bewerkstelligen van werkelijke veranderingen.

Juist de burger/consument heeft directe invloed om werkelijke veranderingen te bewerkstelligen: het is daarom belangrijk dat fors wordt geïnvesteerd in de verdere bewustwording van consumenten.

Teleurstelling over politici die van alles beloven, maar hun beloftes niet nakomen.

Politici en bestuurders moeten bereid zijn verantwoording af te leggen over bereikte resultaten.

Inspraak en referendum. Bestuurders moeten er voor zorgen dat burgers op meer manieren dan alleen via de verkiezingen betrokken zijn bij beslissingen die zij nemen.

Als het hele democratisch proces is doorlopen, moet als noodrem de mogelijkheid van het correctief referendum bestaan.

D66 vertrouwt erop dat inwoners van Nederland prima in staat zijn om te beslissen wat nodig is in hun directe leefomgeving.

Daarnaast zou een nader te bepalen categorie van fundamentele wijzigingen vervolgens door een referendum moeten worden bezegeld.

De Nederlandse bestuurscultuur kenmerkt zich traditioneel door een veelheid aan benoemde ambten, vormen van collegiaal bestuur en samengestelde organen.

En dit alles met minder administratieve lasten, waardoor er meer tijd over is voor de directe zorgverlening aan de patiënt.

Om nieuwe initiatieven de ruimte te geven wil D66 de ‘Wet marktordening zorg’ aanpassen van een ‘nee, tenzij’-regime naar een ‘ja, mits’-regime.

De registratie binnen de zorg moet vereenvoudigd worden met minder administratieve lasten waardoor er meer tijd over is voor de directe zorgverlening aan de patiënt.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vrijheid van meningsuiting. D66 vindt dat de grenzen van de vrijheid van meningsuiting voor iedereen gelijk moeten zijn, ongeacht de religieuze, culturele of maatschappelijke achtergrond.</th>
<th>Populist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aanvallen op digitale netwerken kunnen samenlevingen ontwrichten, grensoverschrijdende criminaliteit is moeilijk aan te pakken, fragiele staten zijn een gevaarlijk broeinest voor terroristisme, conflicten en onderdrukkende <em>regimes</em> brengen enorme vluchtelingenstromen op gang.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goed bestuur en <em>corruptie</em>bestrijding integraal onderdeel beleid. Het bevorderen van goed bestuur en tegengaan van <em>corruptie</em> verdient een hoge prioriteit</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrijpende wijzigingen van het Europees verdrag kunnen alleen bij Europees <em>referendum</em> worden goedgekeurd.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Als <em>traditioneel</em> voorstaander van een sterke internationale rechtsorde en bescherming van mensenrechten, versterkt Nederland zijn leiderschapsrol in de internationale HLBT-emancipatie</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voor minder <em>traditioneel</em> gezinsbeleid.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GL Klaar voor de toekomst |
|---|---|
| *Politici* moeten nu doen wat nodig is en denken aan de toekomst van onze kinderen. | Populist |
| Van consumenten, ondernemers en *politici* die gevangen zitten in hyperconsumptie en een creditcardcultuur. | Not populist |
| De overheid mag niet meer *beloven* dan zij kan waarmaken. | populist |
| Dat is de les van de Griekse begrotingscrisis. Een muntunie moet het politieke gezag hebben om in te grijpen wanneer nationale *politici* falen. | populist |
| Eerlijke globalisering: *corruptie*bestrijding. | Not populist |
| Dat vereist grotere inspanningen voor *corruptie*bestrijding, versterking van bestuur, rechtspraak, civiele organisaties en de positie van vrouwen, alsmede onderhandelingen met gematigde Taliban. | Not populist |
| Groen is het meest *belovende* exportartikel in een wereld die linksom of rechtsom duurzamer wordt. | Not populist |
| Gemeenten worden verantwoordelijk voor een sluitend aanbod van gespecialiseerde jeugdkrachten die *directe* ondersteuning bieden, in samenwerking met de eigen omgeving. | Not populist |
| Het Kamerlid dat opkomt voor de vrijheid van meningsuiting van haar felste tegenstander. | populist |
| De inburgering verzekert dat inburgeraars kennis hebben van grondrechten zoals de vrijheid van meningsuiting, het recht op zelfbeschikking en non-*discriminatie*. | populist |
| Er komt extra aandacht voor homoseksuelen en transgenders uit *traditionele* gemeenschappen, voor wie nu een groot gebrek aan opvang is. | Not populist |
| Zij zet zich in voor een Europees verbod op de export van software waarmee het internet gecensureerd en gefilterd kan worden naar landen waar de vrijheid van meningsuiting niet gegarandeerd is. | Not populist |
| Europawijdere correctieve *referenda*.Meer zeggenschap voor burgers. | populist |

| VVD Orde op zaken |
|---|---|
| Een te groot deel van de huidige ontwikkelingshulp komt terecht bij *corrupte* regeringen en draagt niet bij tot feitelijke verbetering van de economische, sociale of humanitaire situatie. | Not populist |
| Een terugtredende, krachtige en kleine overheid kan in de visie van de VVD weer orde op zaken stellen en de *directe* relatie herstellen tussen de mensen die cultuur maken en zij die ervan genieten. | Not populist |
| De overheid is niet de vertegenwoordiger van een kleine *elite* maar is van en voor iedere burger. | populist |
| De VVD staat voor minder bestuurders, minder *politici* en minder ambtenaren. Nederland functioneert beter met een derde minder bestuurders en ambtenaren. | Not populist |
| Ook werkt ontwikkelingshulp in zijn huidige vorm hulpverslaving en machtsbestendiging in de hand. De VVD wil daarom steun voor dubieuze *regimes* stopzetten. | Not populist |

| SGP Daad bij het woord |
|---|---|
| Wanneer we denken zonder gezinnen te kunnen, komen we *bedrogen* uit. | Not populist |
| Binnen de overzeese gebiedsdelen van het Koninkrijk is sprake van veel *corruptie*. Om kwijtschelding van de grote schulden aan Nederland te verkrijgen, moeten er effectieve maatregelen genomen worden om *corruptie* tegen te gaan. | Not populist |
| *Directe* financiering aan universiteiten (‘eerste geldstroom’) dient versterkt te worden. | Not populist |
| Dat kan als er in de *directe* woonomgeving goede voorzieningen zijn en ter plaatse hoogwaardige zorg geleverd kan worden. | Not populist |
Door meer gebruik te maken van de ervaringskennis van cliënten zelf en van de *directe* sociale omgeving van de cliënt, kan de hulp van professionele hulp- en dienstverlening gerichter plaats vinden.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door meer gebruik te maken van de ervaringskennis van cliënten zelf en van de <em>directe</em> sociale omgeving van de cliënt, kan de hulp van professionele hulp- en dienstverlening gerichter plaats vinden.</th>
<th>Not populist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De SGP is geen voorstander van <em>directe</em> democratie. <em>Referenda</em>, een gekozen burgemeester of minister-president en andere vormen van bestuurlijke ‘vernieuwing’ zijn een teken van armoede.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behoud van het Europees Gemeenschappelijk Landbouwbeleid en het instrument ‘<em>directe</em> inkomenssteun’ voor gezinsbedrijven is een voorwaarde voor een concurrerende en maatschappelijk verantwoorde land- en tuinbouw.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In veel staten (Indonesië, delen van Afrika en natuurlijk in het Midden-Oosten) is het de <em>heersende</em> godsdienst.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het seculiere pleidooi gaat vergezeld van stevige nadruk op <em>vrije meningsuiting</em>.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vrijheid van meningsuiting.</em></td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opmerkelijk en actueel, omdat juist de laatste jaren de <em>vrijheid van meningsuiting</em> steeds vaker wordt opgeroepen tot een vrijbrief om te beledigen en te kwetsen.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met niet nalatende ijver dringen veel <em>politici</em> en opinieleiders dit geloof op aan iedereen die zich in Nederland bevindt.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er zijn verschillende ingrijpende crises die de aandacht van wereldleiders en <em>politici</em> vragen.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Referendum.</em></td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beperkte mogelijkheden: een <em>volk</em> laat zich niet, of maar in beperkte mate, dwingen door wetten en regels.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wil er écht iets (kunnen) veranderen, dan hebben we <em>niet</em> minder nodig dan een Réveil, waardoor onsz <em>volk</em> weer veerkracht en vitaliteit verkrijgt.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Als er één <em>volk</em> is dat kan meepraaten over vervolging en onderdrukking, is het wel het Joodse <em>volk</em>.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het Joodse <em>volk</em> is Gods oogappel (Deuteronomium 32 vs 10).</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze en andere Schriftgegevens zijn beslissend voor de bijzondere band die de SGP heeft met het Joodse <em>volk</em> én met de Joodse staat Israël.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegenover de afbrokkelende steun van andere landen zou Nederland de verbondenheid met het Joodse <em>volk</em> juist moeten versterken.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat begint al <em>direct</em> met de opwaardering van het klassieke huwelijk en het <em>traditionele</em>, ofwel natuurlijke gezin: man, vrouw, en als het huwelijk tussen die twee bekroond wordt met de <em>kinderzegen</em>, kinderen.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SP Een beter Nederland voor minder geld

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDA, PvdA en ChristenUnie braken keer op keer hun <em>beloften.</em></th>
<th>Populist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoptie van buitenlandse kinderen moet daarom niet onbeperkt zijn. De overheid controleert nauwgezet of er <em>prake</em> is van kinderontvoering, kinderhandel of <em>corruptie</em>.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Directe</em> steun voor de overheidsbegroting is riskant.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nooit eerder zagen we een zo pijnlijke ontmaskering van de politieke en economische <em>elite</em>.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vrijheid van meningsuiting</em> is geen rechtvaardiging om mensen te beledigen.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Politici</em> hebben niet darematjes van hun beloften.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Politici</em> van rechts tot links lieten zich leiden door de luie gedachte dat de vrije markt alles beter kan.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het is niet voldoende dat <em>politici</em> spijt betuigen. <em>Politici</em> moeten de wereld niet anders interpreteren, zij moeten de wereld veranderen.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Politici</em> standen erbij en keken ernaar.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Politici</em> creëren angstbeelden, om zo de geesten rijp te maken voor verslechtering van onze <em>pensioenvoorziening</em>.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Politici</em> hebben geïnterpreteerd en geïnterpreteerd. <em>Politici</em> hebben als het ware een zinnige en willekeurige verklaring voor hun beloften en beloftengang.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De vergoedingen voor alle <em>politici</em> gaan omlaag.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Politici</em> hebben geïnterpreteerd en geïnterpreteerd. <em>Politici</em> hebben als het ware een zinnige en willekeurige verklaring voor hun beloften en beloftengang.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zij onthielden u een <em>referendum</em> over de Europese Grondwet.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herinplasing van gemeenten vindt alleen plaats als de inwoners daarmee instemmen, bijvoorbeeld via een <em>referendum</em>.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We geven mensen de mogelijkheid om via <em>referenda</em> hun mening te geven en hun vertegenwoordigers te corrigeren.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PVV** De agenda van hoop en optimisme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bestrijding fraude en bedrog, bij fraude vervalt het recht op een uitkering.</th>
<th>Not populist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corruptie</strong> altijd keihard aanpakken.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamisering, cultuurrelativisme, haat tegen het Westen, afkeer van alles dat riekt naar patriotisme bepaalt de denkwijze van onze elites.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bij veel van de problemen die Nederland teisteren is de diagnose hetzelfde: elites zijn losgeslagen van de werkelijkheid en zijn op eigen houtje dingen gaan doen waar gewone mensen niet beter van worden.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onze elites hebben zich bekeerd tot de illusie dat alle culturen (en daaraan verbonden waarden) gelijk zijn.</td>
<td>Populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moeten we lijdzaam toezien hoe alles dat ons dierbaar is vernacheld wordt door een losgeslagen elite?</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onze strijd is niet eenvoudig. Niet alleen hebben de linkse elites bezit genomen van veel cruciale plaatsen in de samenleving. Wij verklaren ons weer onafhankelijk van de elites en hun ‘idealen’.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De schuld ligt bij de linkse elites die denken dat de wereld er uit ziet als Woodstock.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uitkeringsafhankelijkheid, geweld tegen homo’s en vrouwen, eervraag, schooluitval etc. Zijn van alle tijden, maar zouden een stuk minder zijn als de elites zich niet hadden bekeerd tot het cultuurrelativisme.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er bestaat een wereld van verschil tussen wat het Nederlandse volk vindt en wat de elites vinden. De burger snapt het en de elites niet. Alleen een radicale democratisering kan de dominante van de linkse elites breken.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opnieuw: een volk dat geleid wordt door de verkeerde leiders moet afscheid van de heersende ideologie kunnen nemen.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De salarissen van politici moeten omlaag. Niet alleen politici moeten gekozen worden, maar ook de rechters en de officieren van justitie. Afschaffen luxe wartgeldregelingen voor politici: onder het normale wv-regime.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De PVV legt de rekening bij de politiek: minder politici, minder salaris en afschaffen van de wartgeldregeling.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sni j in de afdeling propaganda van multicultureel Nederland: de publieke omroep. Het zogenaamde parlement heeft geen enkele invloed. Met massieve propaganda probeert Brussel zich overeind te houden.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De staatsomroep heeft de afgelopen jaren miljoenen misbruikt om propaganda te maken voor de klimaattheorie. Een kleine overheid, zonder te veel betuttering. Voor een sprankelende democratie, met volop referendum.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dus kiest de PVV om te beginnen voor het bindend referendum. Het referendum over de Europese grondwet was daar een mooi voorbeeld van.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toegeven</strong> aan het tuig is het begin van het einde. De Nederlandse Antillen en Aruba alsnog uit het Koninkrijk. En vooral: we voeren het bindend referendum in. Nu wordt op veel plaatsen in Nederland het mooie traditionele Hollandse landschap verstoord met windmolens die niet op wind draaien, maar op subsidie.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De PVV kiest voor rechten van vrouwen en homo’s. De Partij voor de Vrijheid zet zich in voor de traditionele Joods-christelijke en humanistische waarden die van Nederland het succes hebben gemaakt dat het nu is. De keuze die 9 juni voor ons ligt is een simpele: nog verder de multiculturele afgrond in of herstel van onze traditionele normen en waarden.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ons volk moet niet met haar eigen belastinggeld iets worden aangepraat waar het tegen is.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isreal is de enige democratie in het Midden-Oosten, de thuisbasis van het Joodse volk na tweeduizend jaar ballingschap en het land dat als geen ander de klappen van de jihad opvangt.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederlanders zijn een volk dat zijn gelijke niet kent. Ons volk verklaarde zich onafhankelijk en stond alleen toen het tachtig jaren vocht tegen de grootste macht van Europa.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van een volk dat zelf zijn eigen lot bepaalde. De vraag waarom DenHaag doorgaat met heiloze maatregelen die niet gesteund worden door ons volk dringt zich bij steeds meer Nederlanders op. Laat ons volk zich maar uitspreken; samen weten burgers het beter dan de linkse kiezer.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het Nederlandse volk heeft niet om de massa-immigratie gevraagd moet daar dan ook niet de prijs voor betalen.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CU Vooruitzien

| Geen gouden bergen beloven, maar wel doen wat je hebt beloofd. | Not populist |
| Zolang er geen betrouwbare overheid is en corruptie welig tient, zijn er grote risico’s en kosten verbonden aan handeldrijven en het ontloopen van economische activiteiten. | Not populist |
| Er moet zeer terughoudend worden omgegaan met het geven van begrotingssteun, met name aan instabiele landen, omdat dit grote risico’s van hulpverslaving en corruptie met zich meebrengt. | Not populist |
| Ook na toetreding dient wordt scherp toegezien op naleving van benodigde nieuwe wetgeving in de praktijk en voortgaande bestrijding van corruptie. | Not populist |
| En Israel kan de Palestijnse Autoriteit bijstaan met het hervormen van de veiligheidsdiensten en het bestrijden van corruptie en terrorisme. | Not populist |
| Door een instabiele thuisituatie, schulden, criminaliteit in hun directe omgeving, en psychische problemen lopen zij een groot risico geen diploma te halen en maatschappelijk uit te vallen. | Not populist |
| Dit vormt een directe belemmering voor het realiseren van economische groei. | Not populist |
| De gemeente is de meest nabije bestuurslaag, met als kerntaak het behartigen van de directe leefomgeving en het sociale domein. | Not populist |
| Iedere Nederlander heeft de vrijheid van vereniging, godsdienst en meningsuiting. | Not populist |
| Aan bedoelingen van politici wordt getwijfeld. | populist |
| We hebben in de allereerste plaats integere politici nodig. | populist |
| Alleen integere politici kunnen aanspraak maken op een vertrouwensrelatie tussen overheid en burgers. | populist |
| We hebben daarom geen mensen nodig voor wie de macht of het aanzien van het ambt centraal staat, maar betrouwbare politici, die zich dienstbaar opstellen, trouw aan de publieke zaak. | populist |
| Wij zijn aan de slag gegaan en hebben ons laten kennen als een partij met ruggengraat en dienstbare politici. | populist |
| De invoering van een correctief referendum op verzoek van kiezers over een wetsvoorstel cq. verordening die door parlement, gemeenteraad of provinciale staten is goedgekeurd, is wenselijk. | Not populist |
| Een dergelijk referendum heeft alleen nut als het aantal handtekeningen om een referendum aan te vragen op een geloofwaardig niveau wordt vastgesteld, en de opkomstdrempel tenminste boven de 50 procent ligt. | populist |
| Het bijbehorend regime van toezicht en handhaving kan beperkt blijven tot acties op basis van risicoanalyse en verantwoording achteraf door de burgers die een vergunning hebben verkregen. | Not populist |
| Ze komen vaak in landen waar bilaterale programmema’s niet mogelijk zijn omdat het regime er te onbetrouwbaar is. | Not populist |
| Het regime (Iran) geeft weinig ruimte aan interne democratiseringsbewegingen en heeft rond de presidentsverkiezingen in 2009 demonstraties met geweld neergeslagen. | Not populist |
| Toch toont een bijvoorbeeld ‘ja’-referendum over een wetsvoorstel op verzoek van kiezers geen dreigementen. | Not populist |
| Nederland blijft zich sterk maken voor een internationale samenwerking op het gebied van traditionele visgebieden, een verbod op walvisvangst en een algeheel verbod op het gebruik van drijfnetten. | Not populist |
| Op bijbelse gronden weet een christen zich met het Joodse volk verbonden. | Not populist |

ToN Vertrouwen en handhaven

<p>| Hulp moet bij voorkeur ter plaatse of in de directe omgeving verleend worden, zodat vluchtingen in hun eigen omgeving kunnen blijven voor opvang. | Not populist |
| Burgers krijgen meer directe invloed op de politieke inhoud, hiertoe willen we dat het directiestelsel opnieuw wordt ingevoerd. | populist |
| Onderwijs moet kinderen prikkelen en stimuleren, dat kan alleen maar in directe contacturen. | Not populist |
| Middels directe (camera) regie kunnen hulpdiensten sneller ingeschakeld worden. | Not populist |
| De publieke financiering van het Koningshuis zal worden teruggebracht tot de Koningin en de directe kroonopvolging. | Not populist |
| De huidige bestuurlijke elite heeft ons absorptievermogen echter diep aangetast. | populist |
| Dat is helemaal niet zo moeilijk als de huidige politieke elite beweert. | populist |
| Alle mechanismen die gebruikt worden om de zittende bestuurlijke elite in het zadel te houden worden afgebracht. | Not populist |
| De oorspronkelijke rijkdom van de westere wereld is dan ook gebaseerd op het handhaven van de klassieke grondrechten: vrijheid van godsdienst, vrije meningsuiting, onderwijs en bescherming van eigendomsrechten. | populist |
| Wanneer mensen zich op Nederlandse bodem vestigen, dienen zij zich aan te passen aan onze normen en waarden en aan onze vrijheid van meningsuiting. | populist |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Populism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wij kennen in dit land namelijk een aantal ononderhandelbare vrijheden, waarden en normen, rechten en plichten: <em>de vrijheid van meningsuiting</em>, de vrijheid van godsdienst, de vrijheid van onderwijs, de vrijheid van vereniging, de gelijkwaardigheid van man en vrouw, alsmede de neutraliteit van de staat.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kort gezegd komt het erop neer dat er wel verantwoordelijke bestuurders en <em>politici</em> zijn, maar dat hun verantwoordelijkheid maar in beperkte mate wordt gekoppeld aan aansprakelijkheid.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bij vertrouwen hoort handhaven. Dat kan met veel minder ambtenaren en <em>politici</em>.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er komt een sollicitatieplicht voor oud <em>politici</em> en voor alle publieke functies geldt voortaan een open sollicitatieprocedure.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voor belangrijke zaken die alle burgers raken (zoals bijvoorbeeld uitbreiding van de Europese Unie) wordt een bindend <em>referendum</em> ingevoerd.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belangrijke besluiten, zoals uitbreiding van de EU in de toekomst, worden middels een bindend <em>referendum</em> aan de Nederlandse bevolking voorgelegd.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Traditioneel</em> roept de overheid bij economische tegenwind dat er zal moeten worden bezuinigd.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De <em>traditionele</em> politieke partijen hebben geen antwoord op de problemen van onze tijd, zij zijn er namelijk onderdeel van.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tussen het in bestuurskringen nog altijd bewierookte multiculturalisme en het snel opkomende idee van ‘eigen volk eerst’ bestaat een derde weg.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Een regering van en voor het <em>volk</em> is verworden tot een regering van en voor een zeer kleine minderheid van de Nederlandse bevolking.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het getuigt van een grote minachting voor het begripsvermogen van het Nederlandse <em>volk</em>.</td>
<td>populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze uitspraak is van Dr. A. P. M. Krouwel, universitair docent verbonden aan de faculteit <em>politicologie</em> van de Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CDA Slagvaardig en samen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Populism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanuit de eigen visie <em>beloven</em> wat je kunt waarmaken en doen wat je <em>belooft</em>.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corruptie</em> ondernijnt ontwikkeling en bestrijding ervan verdient daarom blijvende aandacht.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Een verschuiving van de <em>directe</em> naar de indirecte belastingen zorgt eveneens voor een meer robuust belastingstelsel.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De belastingdruk op activiteiten en consumptie in zowel de <em>directe</em> en indirecte belastingen dienen milieudruk te verdisconteren.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bij de aanpak van het wegenet wordt rekening gehouden met <em>directe</em> verbindingswegen voor fietsers.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afvalverwerking en/of -beheer mag geen nadelige consequenties hebben voor de gezondheid van burgers in de <em>directe</em> omgeving.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waar de structuur verbetert, zal dit immers doorwerken in de kwaliteit van de <em>directe</em> hulpverlening.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vrijheid, vrijheid van meningsuiting</em> en gelijkwaardigheid.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vrijheid, vrijheid van meningsuiting</em> en gelijkwaardigheid.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Referenda</em> passen niet binnen onze representative democratie en dragen ook niet bij aan de goede werking daarvan.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zolang Iran de internationale afspraken schendt, dienen de sancties tegen het <em>regime</em> opgevoerd te worden, zowel in Nederland als in EU- en VN-verband.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Een toenemend deel van de patiënten verkiest bijvoorbeeld GGZ-behandeling via internet boven meer <em>traditionele</em> behandelm formaten.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iedere jongere verdient onderwijs van wereldklasse.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landen, zoals Nederland, die dit nu al doen kunnen aan een lichter controle <em>regime</em> onderworpen worden vanuit de EU, dan lidstaten die nog geen managementverklaringen kennen.</td>
<td>Not populist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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