

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FAR RIGHT PARTIES IN EUROPE:  
NATIONAL FRONT IN FRANCE, FREEDOM PARTY OF AUSTRIA  
AND DANISH PEOPLE'S PARTY

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

BY  
AYŞEGÜL ER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF  
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

SEPTEMBER 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of  
Master of Science

---

Prof. Dr. Hüseyin Bağcı  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully  
adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zana Çitak Aytürk  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sevilay Kahraman (METU, IR) \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kürşad Ertuğrul (METU, ADM) \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zana Çitak Aytürk (METU, IR) \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name, Last name: Ayşegül Er

Signature:

## **ABSTRACT**

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FAR RIGHT PARTIES IN EUROPE:  
NATIONAL FRONT IN FRANCE, FREEDOM PARTY OF AUSTRIA  
AND DANISH PEOPLE’S PARTY**

Er, Ayşegül

M. Sc., International Relations

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zana Çitak

September 2014, 139 pages

This thesis aims to research the far right parties National Front (FN) in France, Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ) and Danish People’s Party (DF) in Denmark, comparatively. These parties have increased their support since the 1980s. First, the thesis will examine the historical background of these parties which is an important aspect for understanding their ideological development. Second, this thesis aims to analyze the parties on the issue regarding three parameters: national identity building process, immigration and globalization. Under each parameter, FN, FPÖ and DF will be examined separately and then they will be compared regarding their differences and similarities. Taking all of these elements into account, the main concern of this thesis is to present the main aspects behind increasing the support of the far right parties FN, FPÖ and DF which have the significant impact on international politics in the last decades, by analyzing differences and similarities among them .

Key words: Far right, National Front, Freedom Party of Austria, Danish People’s Party

## ÖZ

AVRUPA'DAKİ AŞIRI SAĞ PARTİLERİN KARŞILAŞTIRMALI ANALİZİ:  
FRANSA'DAKİ ULUSAL CEPHE, AVUSTURYA ÖZGÜRLÜK PARTİSİ  
VE DANİMARKA HALKININ PARTİSİ

Er, Ayşegül

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Zana Çitak

Eylül 2014, 139 sayfa

Bu tez, Fransa'daki Ulusal Cephe (FN), Avusturya'daki Avusturya Özgürlük Partisi (FPÖ) ve Danimarka Halkının Partisi'ni (DF) karşılaştırmalı olarak incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Söz konusu partiler 1980'lerle birlikte desteklerini önemli ölçüde arttırmışlardır. Bu kapsamda ideolojik gelişmelerini anlayabilmek adına öncelikli olarak partilerin tarihsel gelişim süreçleri ele alınacaktır. Ardından, FN, FPÖ ve DF ulusal kimlik inşa süreçleri, göç ve küreselleşme parametreleri çerçevesinde incelenecektir. Her bir parametre altında her parti ayrı ayrı ele alınacak ve söz konusu parametreye ilişkin partilerin farklılıkları ve benzerlikleri araştırılacaktır. Tezin esas amacı, son yıllarda uluslararası politikada etkisini giderek artıran aşırı sağ partilerden FN, FPÖ ve DF'nin farklı ve benzer yönlerini ortaya koyarak desteklerini arttırmalarındaki temel unsurları göstermektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Aşırı sağ, Ulusal Cephe, Avusturya Özgürlük Partisi, Danimarka Halkının Partisi

*To my precious mother Hülya Er*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zana Çitak for her patient guidance, enthusiastic encouragement and useful critiques. For almost five years she has showed tolerance for my complicated M.S. education journey. I would specially like to thank to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sevilay Kahraman and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kürşad Ertuğrul for their comments, corrections and precious contributions during the jury.

My special thanks to my dear and unique mother. I am grateful to my mother Hülya Er for her endless support during my study. Her situation may be the hardest one since she lived this hard process with me and tirelessly showed her kindness and patience to me.

My deepest gratitude for my colleagues in the Ministry for EU Affairs and especially to my unique friends of “Group Atomize”, Begüm İman, Ezgi Gizem Durumel, Çağla Şamiloğlu and Erençan Tezcan, for always being close to my heart and resisting to all my murmurs about the situation.

I also would like to thank to Serpil Erdoğan and Tekin Bayraktar who support and encourage me not only for this study, but also for every plan of my life. If they were not with me, I would have difficulties for finding my way.

Moreover, I would like to have special thanks to Sezin Özkaya and Tuğba Çelik who are my sisters and will be my best friends forever, for their understanding and support all through my life. Also, I would like to thank to my dear friend Burcu Öztürk to her patient support and warm help on the last weeks of my study. Lastly, for her angel light in my life, thanks a lot to Selen Tonkuş.

I have a lot of people to thank and I do not want to miss anyone out but I know that I could not mention every single person that has helped me in the process of my thesis. You know who you are and you should also know that every contribution you have made has meant a world to me. I thank you with all my heart. I feel myself as the luckiest person in the world for having such wonderful people in my life.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1.The Subject in Question .....	1
1.2.Methodology .....	4
1.3.Outline of the Thesis .....	4
2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	7
2.1. Introduction .....	7
2.2. The Freedom Party in Austria .....	11
2.3. The National Front in France .....	18

2.4. The Danish People’s Party in Denmark .....	29
3. NATIONAL IDENTITY BUILDING PROCESS.....	35
3.1. Introduction .....	35
3.2. Austria and the FPÖ .....	39
3.2.1. Austrian National Identity from the Habsburg Monarchy to the End of World War I.....	40
3.2.2. Austrian National Identity from the Collapse of the Austrian Empire in 1918 to the End of World War II.....	41
3.2.3. The End of World War II and its Impact on Austrian National Identity ..	42
3.2.4. Austrian National Identity and the Freedom Party of Austria .....	44
3.3. France and the FN .....	48
3.3.1. French National Identity from Napoleon to De Gaulle .....	50
3.3.2. French National Identity after WWII.....	54
3.3.3. French National Identity and the National Front .....	56
3.4. Denmark and the DF .....	57
3.4.1. Danish National Identity until the End of the Cold War .....	58
3.4.2. Danish National Identity and the Danish People’s Party.....	62
3.5. The Differences and Similarities of the FPÖ, FN and DF Regarding the National Identity Building Processes of Austria, France and Denmark.....	64

4. IMMIGRATION .....	67
4.1. Introduction .....	67
4.2. The Freedom Party in Austria and Immigration .....	69
4.3. The National Front in France and Immigration.....	74
4.4. The Danish People’s Party in Denmark and Immigration .....	80
4.5. The Differences and Similarities between the FPÖ, FN and DF Regarding Immigration .....	84
5. GLOBALIZATION .....	87
5.1. Introduction .....	87
5.2. The Freedom Party in Austria and Globalization.....	92
5.3. The National Front in France and Globalization.....	98
5.4. The Danish People’s Party in Denmark and Globalization.....	102
5.5. Differences and Similarities of the FPÖ, FN and DF Regarding Globalization... ..	105
6. CONCLUSION .....	108
REFERENCES.....	<b>Hata! Yer işareti tanımlanmamış.</b>
APPENDICES .....	127
A. TURKISH SUMMARY.....	127
B. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU.....	139

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

BZÖ	Alliance for the Future of Austria
DF	Danish People's Party
EEC	European Economic Community
EP	European Parliament
EU	European Union
FPÖ	Freedom Party of Austria
FN	National Front
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
MNR	National Republican Movement
ÖVP	Austrian People's Party
PS	Socialist Party
RPR	Rally for the Republic
SPÖ	Social Democratic Party of Austria
TV	Tixier-Vignancour
UDF	Union for French Democracy
USA	United States of America
VdU	League of Independents
WWI	World War I
WWII	World War II

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. The Subject in Question**

Since the early 1980s, far right movements have been an important subject of study in International Relations. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly, international politics experienced fascism before World War II, and the lessons learned demonstrated that when extremism rises in Europe, it is a big challenge for European values such as human rights, democracy and rule of law. Secondly, in spite of the concerns within European politics about extremism, during the 1980s far right parties emerged as significant players and challenge to politics.

Although there are some other terms such as “radical right” and “extreme right” used to describe this political grouping, I will use “far right” in the thesis because this is the term most widely-used in the literature examined. Moreover, I think that the term “far right” is more objective than other terms which are somehow prejudicial in labelling parties “radical” or “extreme”. These terms recall violent activities which is not the case for the parties on the issue. But the term “far right” is more neutral in that it recalls a party that remains far from mainstream parties.

In order to define a party as far right three conditions should be met, according to Piero Ignazi. First, there should be no party that falls within the right wing other than the far right party. Secondly, it should have an ideological link with fascist movements and lastly, the far right should have ideas which aim to weaken the existing system (Ignazi, 1996: 1). According to Ignazi, far right parties which

started to rise during the 1980s do not reject the system totally, like their predecessors. Rather they are against the existing system and use people's concerns about the system in order to gain support (Ignazi, 1996: 1).

Hans-Georg Betz argues that far right parties reject the present socio-cultural system and are against the integration of foreign groups into society. Even if they are not racist, they are xenophobic. Moreover, according to Betz, far right parties utilize the frustrations of the public by creating legitimacy problem to discredit mainstream governments (Betz, 1993: 413).

Cas Mudde also states that the far right has three characteristics. The first one is nativism, which maintains that domestic people should be protected from foreign influence, the only inhabitants should be native people; and the ones who are not should be removed because they constitute a threat to the homogeneity of the state (Mudde, 2010: 1169). The second characteristic of far right parties is that they demonstrate authoritarian tendencies. According to Mudde, authoritarianism, which foresees a strict control within society, is an important aspect of the far right. Lastly, far right parties have populist features which create a duality between the "pure people" and the "corrupt elite" (Mudde, 2010: 1170).

In the light of these definitions, in the thesis the main characteristics of far right parties can be characterized thus:

- There will be no party that falls within the right wing other than the far right party.
- Far right parties are the ones which reject societal equality and the integration of immigrants into society.
- Far right parties form their policies with regard to the frustrations of the public concerning the current government.
- Far right parties exclude all things that are not native.
- Far right parties use populism as an instrument for mobilizing sentiments of people.
- Far right parties are xenophobic.

In the literature there are many studies which analyse far right parties. Most of them focus on their general characteristics and reasons for their rise, and a considerable number of them examine only one party, while some others comparing two or three of them. In the literature, however, there is no comparative study of the far right parties in Austria, France and Denmark. Moreover, among the comparative studies, there is no study which compares the parties along different parameters. In that respect, this thesis will try to address a gap in the literature by studying three different parties in a multi-dimensional perspective. This thesis is important in terms of providing a detailed comparative analysis about the contemporary most important far right parties.

In this respect, I choose the Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ), the French National Front (FN), and the Danish People's Party (DF) as case studies because of their ongoing relevance to European politics. Furthermore, they have both similar and different characteristics which shape their policies. FPÖ is important as it is the single example that raised the concerns of European states when it entered into the ruling government in 2000 and faced sanctions. The FN is a significant actor in both French and international politics, with its continuing ability to determine the political agenda. And the DF is another important case, as it emerges in a state which has a strong welfare tradition and fewer economic problems.

In this thesis, I will compare the FN, FPÖ and DF according to three parameters: the national identity building processes of Austria, France and Denmark, in which I think the historical development of national identity, is one of the main determinants of policies of far right parties. The second parameter is immigration, one of the main tools for these parties to gain support. It is important to compare their ideas about immigrants and immigration. The last parameter is globalization. One of the main reasons for the rise of these parties is the increasing effect of globalization and neoliberal economic policies which began in the 1980s. In that respect, the choice of the FPÖ, the FN and the DF as case studies within these three parameters can bring about a new perspective upon the issue of rising far right parties.

## **1.2. Methodology**

There are specific studies concerning the far right parties in the literature. Most of them are general explanations of the rise of the far right parties since the 1980s. But I have three different parties and three different parameters to analyse; hence I have to look separately for all cases with regard to all three parameters. In that respect I do not have sources that address all three parameters in a comprehensive way; rather I examined the literature for each parameter and for each case. In this framework, the primary sources of the thesis are the official websites of the FPÖ, FN and DF. The party programs and statements of the party leaders are also used.

The secondary resources of the thesis are books, articles and reports about the far right parties and relevant to the parameters of the thesis. There are books about the rise of far right parties which deal with their general characteristics. Moreover, there are books written on the FPÖ and its leader Jörg Haider and the FN specifically, but there is no book examining the DF alone. Furthermore, there are many articles which examine the parties on the issue separately. Besides, I try to define the parameters in the thesis by searching different sources about national identity building processes, immigration, globalization, and neoliberal policies. Additionally, I look through different sources for each party along each parameter. In that respect, this thesis opened a way for me to learn about several issues and helped me to establish a link between different issues by comparing them.

## **1.3. Outline of the Thesis**

In the framework of these ideas, this thesis starts with the introduction of the main question. Then, in the second chapter, the historical background of the FPÖ, FN and DF will be examined. The aim of this chapter is to give general information about the historical developments of the parties on the issue. The chapter will first give brief information about the historical development of the far right and then it will focus on the three parties in the thesis. In fact, analysing historical background is

important in order to understand the ideas of the FPÖ, FN and DF, and to compare their rising periods and reasons. In that respect this chapter will give information about their history separately.

The third chapter starts with analysing the first parameter: national identity building process. The national identity building processes of Austria, France and Denmark will be discussed first, in that context. The chapter will begin by examining the terms “nation” and “national identity”. Besides, the national identity processes of the countries and their effects upon the FPÖ, FN and DF will be analysed separately. Then, these three parties will be compared with regard to the effects of national identity building.

The fourth chapter will examine the issue of immigration. First, the reason for the emergence of immigration as a problematic issue will be discussed. After that, the policies and ideas of the FPÖ, FN and DF about the immigration issue will be analysed separately. Moreover, their ability to impact the immigration policies of governments and their ideas about the impact of immigration upon cultural identity will be analysed, and then the parties will be compared with regard to their approach to immigration.

In the fifth chapter, the development of globalization and neoliberal policies will be examined. At the beginning, globalization and neoliberalism will be defined in the light of the ideas of some important scholars. After that, the effects of globalization and neoliberal policies upon the FPÖ, FN and DF will be analysed separately. Mainly, globalization has three effects on the rise of the far right parties. First, it opened a way for criticizing the governments by claiming that they could not respond the negative effects of neoliberalism and globalization effectively. Second, the far right parties focus on the destructive effects of globalization on cultural identity, as it gives a way to multicultural society. And last, “new issues” that emerged as new political areas are an important tool for the far right parties to gain support by using them in their discourses. In this framework, the different and similar

responses of the parties will be revealed and, in the light of this, the parties' reactions to the globalization process will be compared.

The study will end with a conclusion chapter summarizing the main findings of the research.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

#### **2.1. Introduction**

This chapter will give the historical background of the development of the far right parties that are selected as the cases of this thesis. The main concern of the chapter will be showing the ideological development of the parties and their emergence as important players in both domestic and European politics. This chapter will hence try to draw a comparative historical panorama of both the similarities and differences between these three parties.

Before explaining the historical background of selected cases, it is important to give brief information about the development of the far right in Europe, as the far right parties that emerged in the 1980s can be seen as being different from their predecessors. In that respect, the development of the far right in Europe can be divided into four periods: the far right before World War I, the inter-war period, after World War II (WWII) and after the 1980s. In fact the period after the 1980s is the main analytical point of the thesis.

Before World War I (WWI), far right movements were basically against enlightenment and capitalism. According to Martin Blinkhorn, in that period, far right movements were opposed to the values of the French Revolution and aimed to prevent the change which industrialization and capitalism caused (Blinkhorn, 2000: 13). Besides this, far right movements were also against modernization,

parliamentary democracy and equality. Furthermore, they supported communitarianism against individualism, and promoted amongst the public the value of protecting national heritage and being attached to the community (Vardar, 2004: 23).

It can be said that during this period, racism, which is a system that separates people according to their power, class and culture, established the basic ideological background of far right movements (Taş, 1999: 41). As Arthur de Gobineau argued, far right movements claimed that the most important reason for the collapse of civilizations was the mixture of races. In other words, the mixture of races decreases the quality of the race (Vardar, 2004: 46). Hence, modern values that support the mixture of races were the causes of collapse. For this reason, the main responsibility for the collapse was borne by the bourgeoisie who supported modernization.

Besides, before WWI, far right movements had national socialist and anti-Semitic tendencies. For instance, in France, *Action Française*, which was established in 1899, was affected by the idea of four confederated states. According to leader of the movement Charles Maurras, the Jews, together with Protestants, freemasons and foreigners formed a coalition and tried to cause the collapse of France. In that respect, Jews benefited from ideas such as freedom and equality that were revealed as a result of French Revolution (Vardar, 2004: 59). Hence, Jews were the main cause of French decline, which for Maurras, started with the French Revolution and reached its peak with the 1871 French defeat in Franco-Prussian war.

During the inter-war period, far right movements identified with fascism. According to Blinkhorn, there were three reasons for the rise of fascism. Firstly, the effect of the order that was established after WWI and the Treaty of Versailles. There were winners and losers, four important empires (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia and Ottoman Empire) collapsed, and these developments led people to interrogate their belonging. The second reason was the Great Depression of 1929, which led to an increase in inflation and unemployment which revealed the discontent of the public over the failure of the ruling governments. And the final reason is the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. A socialist state was established for the first time and

it changed political perception in the eyes of people as they started to see an alternative to the existing system (Blinkhorn, 2000: 19). All of these reasons stimulated insecurity and discontent in society, which increased support for the far right.

During the inter-war period, the far right was anti-liberal and anti-capitalist as it was before WWI. But this time, due to the effect of socialist ideas that emerged as a result of the Bolshevik Revolution, far right movements had an alternative way economically between capitalism and socialism: corporatism. Corporatism neither prioritized private property like capitalism, nor supported common property. It was kind of a third way between them. Corporatism suggested a system which depended upon discipline and hierarchy. It was state-centric, opposed to equality amongst people and encouraged professional organizations to be more active in the economy (Öztañ, 2007: 519).

After WWII, far right movements could not find much of a place in the international arena until the 1970s. In fact, the late 1970s and early 1980s witnessed the rise of the far right but this time differently from the far right movements of the past. For this reason, the general tendency in the literature is to classify the 1980s far right movements as the “new” far right. There are some differences between the “old” and “new” far right which should be touched upon. First of all, the old far right movements were generally totally anti-capitalist, and despite the fact that the new far right has some anti-capitalist discourses, it has a tendency to support the free market economy (Kitschelt, 1997: 30). In addition, new far right movements try to distance themselves from past fascist movements for eliminating reactions against their policies. Distinct from the old far right which tried to change the existing system totally, the main concern of the new far right is opposition to the system within the system and to the values of Western democracy with their xenophobic attitudes (Betz, 1994: 3).

In fact it can be said that new far right movements generally bear the characteristics of the neo-racism. In contrast with classical racism which was prioritized the race, neo-racists do not openly defend the biological superiority of

race (Vardar, 2004: 112). According to neo-racist movement culture is an important thing that should be protected and all cultures should be remained as what they are, all they have the right to be different (Vardar, 2004: 113). Neo-racist argued that they are against the foreigners not because of the biological diversity, but because the necessity to protect cultures in their pure form. People can only exist within a cultural community which constitutes his or her roots.

As Jed Fazakarley pointed out, according to Martin Barker, new racism is kind of a re-emergence of the discourses about biological superiority which became undesirable after the WWII (Fazakarley, 2010: 1). This time in contrast with classical racism, differences reveals not because of the biological superiority of one race to another, but because of the cultural values and traditions. In fact although it seems that race replaced by culture, the meaning does not change explicitly; rather it is somehow a way to eliminate reactions about racist discourses. In that sense, it can be said that new far right has these discourses for departing itself from the old and fascist one, by prioritizing the culture and protecting it from the destructive effects of the results of modern society.

Basically, new far right movements focus on three important things. The first one is economic. The unsuccessful economic policies of governments during the 1980s, and neoliberal policies and rising of inequality in distribution of income led to discontent within the lower and middle classes, which affected the rise of support to the new far right. Moreover, the new far right has developed a populist discourse against governments, claiming that they are elitist, corrupt and the main cause of deterioration in the society. Another important factor is related to national identity. In contrast to the old far right, the new far right focuses on cultural differences, rather than differences that originated from biological characteristics. For the new far right, globalization and immigration are mainly responsible for multiculturalism, which is seen as a threat to national identity (Betz, 1994: 3).

In the light of the abovementioned general characteristics of the far right, the aim of this chapter is to give the historical background of the National Front (FN), Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ) and Danish People's Party (DF) by pointing out

important developments. An important finding of this chapter is that although the internal dynamics of the countries were different, these parties gained greater influence around more or less the same time periods: the FN gained its striking success in 2002; the FPÖ achieved its best results in 1999, and the DF made its breakthrough in 2001. The chapter will also discuss the electoral profiles of the parties by considering that, as Kischelt argued, it was important to see the demand side of party politics, in addition to analysing the supply side. (Kischelt, 1997: 5) In other words, the demands and perspectives of people in the country are as important as the party's policies vis-a-vis the public. The parties regulate their policies also by the effect of voter behavior.

## **2.2. The Freedom Party in Austria**

Austria is a different case from France and Denmark, firstly because of its direct and clear linkage with the fascist movement in Germany, and secondly, due to the absence of a colonial past unlike France. In fact, in striking contrast to the FN and DF, the FPÖ constructed its support upon an open declaration of its fascist attachment.

The FPÖ emerged from an organization called the League of Independents (VdU) which was established in 1949 and had amongst its members many World War II veterans who were also former Nazis and pan-Germanists (Luther, 2000: 427). The new organization tried to combine economic liberalism and German nationalism. One of its aims was attributing the roots of national identity to the German-influenced past. It emphasized that Austria was a German state and German national community should be strengthened within the country (Ellinas, 2010: 45). Significantly, it gained 11.7% of votes in its first election in 1949 (Ellinas, 2010: 44).

In 1956, the VdU was replaced by the Freedom Party of Austria. The FPÖ emerged with a claim that it would be the “third camp” of the Austrian politics with its national and liberal values. It also attracted the support of the Austrians who felt left outside of both the country's socialist and conservative majorities (Wistrich,

2000: 32). At the beginning, its leader was Anton Reinthaller who was a minister in the government during 1938-1939. Then in 1958, Friedrich Peter, who was a member of a section of the Nazi infra-structure called the Waffen-SS, came to power. But the party's votes decreased and throughout the 1960s and 1970s, its vote was around 5.5 % (Luther, 2000: 428).

In 1979, the party became a member of Liberal International and in 1980 Nobert Steger was elected as a president with known liberal characteristics. In 1983, the party gained 5% of the votes and became part of the federal government with the Social Democrats (Luther, 2000: 429). But inside the party, nationals and liberals were in dispute. The liberal leader Steger was confronted by nationalists, including the future leader, Jörg Haider.

Radicalization in Austrian politics showed itself shortly before Jörg Haider's leadership of the FPÖ. First of all, this was because of the government's economic policies during the 1980s. The Grand Coalition which was formed by the Austrian People's Party (ÖVP) and the Social Democratic Party of Austria (SPÖ) in 1986, started to apply some new economic policies which aimed to effect a decline in social spending by reducing the national debt (Rodenberg, Rippert, 1999).

Moreover, there were two developments which reflected the tendency to refer to the Nazi past. In 1985, the former Nazi member and war criminal Walter Reder was released and met with the FPÖ defense minister. At that time, the FPÖ was in a coalition government with the SPÖ and this meeting caused reactions from its coalition partner. Haider supported the defense minister and found an opportunity to declare party's views about Austria's fascist past, and drew the attention of the media and the nationalist wing of the party (Ellinas, 2010: 50).

The second development was Kurt Waldheim's candidacy for presidency. The ÖVP nominated Waldheim, who was known for his former close relations with the Nazis. Haider also supported Waldheim. This development was an opportunity for Haider, after the Reder affair, to distance the nationalist camp from the liberal wing of the party and thereby enhance the nationalist camp. As a result, in 1986 the

nationalists won the conflict and Haider became a leader of the FPÖ. In the 1986 general elections, the party increased its votes and gained almost 10%. But this time FPÖ could not enter the government as no party achieved the necessary majority, the ÖVP formed a coalition with the SPÖ (Kitschelt, 1997: 171). Besides Haider's success in the 1986 elections, the most important success for Haider was in the 1989 provincial elections in Carinthia. Haider got a significant 29% of the votes and became the governor of the Southern Province of Carinthia by establishing a coalition with the Austria People's Party (ÖVP).

Jörg Haider's leadership was a turning point for the FPÖ. First of all, as Hans-Georg Betz argued, Haider broke down the belief that Austria was a victim of Hitler. Haider claimed that Austria did its duty for Nazis at that time, so he accepted Nazi past of Austria (Betz, 2001: 6). In fact, historically the FPÖ's clear endorsement of its Nazi past distinguished the FPÖ from the FN and the DF. In other words, the FPÖ established its discourse by clearly underlining its German and fascist past, especially under the leadership of Haider, who always declared it to be in favor of German identity. Thanks to Haider's populist and anti-system approach, the party gained more support.

In the 1990's the party's main issue became immigration. In 1990, the FPÖ announced a report entitled "Resolution on the Immigration Question" (Meret, 2009: 194). Although immigration had not been a significant issue, it became the instrument for gaining votes in the 1990s in Austria. The reasons for the situation will be dealt with in Chapter III. Besides, the discontent of the public over the mainstream right parties and the FPÖ's ability to use this situation to its advantage by emphasizing corruption, patronage and clientelism, increased the votes of the FPÖ in the 1990s.

As Kitschelt argued, the FPÖ's success came from its ability to combine two factors: On the one hand, it opposed Austria's traditional leading forces: Catholics and Socialists. On the other hand, it applied a party program which included both liberal and populist policies (Kitschelt, 1997: 166). In other words, Haider found an opportunity to promote the public's anger towards mainstream parties. Moreover,

Austria's membership of the European Union (EU) in 1995 also affected the FPÖ's support. Haider was strongly opposed to the economic costs of being a member of the EU, declared himself to be a protector of the farmers who were affected by EU policies (Sully, 1997: 95).

As a result of these developments, the FPÖ gained its most striking success in 1999 by getting almost 27% of the votes in general elections, coming second, after the ÖVP (Leconte, 2005: 620). The ÖVP gained 56 seats, and the FPÖ and SPÖ got 52 seats in the parliament according to proportional representation. None of the parties could provide the majority for forming a government alone. As the ÖVP and SPÖ did not compromise to establish a government, the ÖVP and FPÖ decided to form a government on 4 February 2000. But before declaring the decision to establish a government, the leader of the ÖVP, Wolfgang Schüssel, and Jörg Haider signed a declaration which stated that the government would respect democratic values, rule of law and human rights, and that it would work to avoid xenophobia, anti-Semitism and racism. In fact, this declaration, "Responsibility of Austria-A Future in the Hearth of Europe" aimed to prevent negative reactions from the international community, especially from the European states, that could occur because a far right party was in government. They declared that the government respects the principles of the EU and human rights, and condemned any kind of discrimination (Freeman, 2002: 119). But this declaration was not sufficient to prevent reactions.

Wolfgang Schüssel from the People's Party became the Chancellor and Susanne Riess-Passer from the Freedom Party, Vice-Chancellor. This created a lot of reaction, especially from Israel, the US and the member states of the European Union. Although Haider was not in government in May 2000, he resigned from the party leadership due to reactions from around the world. For instance, after the 1999 election results, Israel and the United States recalled their ambassadors from Austria and EU member states decided to cut off their relations and applied bilateral sanctions to the government (Meret, 2009: 232). The member states of EU thought that if they did not do anything then it would mean approval of Haider's

controversial views (Freeman, 2002: 110). There was no formal base within the framework of the EU to apply sanctions to Austria, but member states published a declaration arguing that there would be no bilateral contacts with Austria; that there would be no support for Austrian candidates who were seeking positions in international organizations, and that Austrian ambassadors in EU member states would only be accepted for technical issues (Freeman, 2002: 118).

After the resignation of Haider, the Vice-Chancellor of the government Susanne Riess-Passer became the party leader. But the withdrawal of Haider from the leadership did not mean that he completely withdrew from the party. He remained the Governor of Carinthia and continued his control over party policies. But this became problematic two years after the coalition government was established, when relations between the FPÖ and ÖVP started to crackle. In fact, within the FPÖ, some problems started as a result of the contradiction that the party which held an anti-systemic discourse in opposition was now in government as a coalition partner, thus endorsing implicitly the existing system.

The problems were revealed when Haider felt himself to be an outsider and put secret pressure on Riess-Passer to give the leadership back to Haider in the party congress (Luther, 2002: 6). But she did not accept it and remained the head of the party. Moreover, FPÖ members who were in government supported the delay in cutting taxes in line with ÖVP. But Haider strictly opposed this and argued that Riess-Passer remained under pressure from the ÖVP and forgot the real aim and promises that the FPÖ had declared soon before the 1999 elections. Besides, he wanted to become the president of the party again by arguing that Riess-Passer could therefore focus upon her job as a Vice-Chancellor. At the same time, he threatened that if the party did not apply policies in line with his ideas, he would not return to the party leadership (Leidig, 2002). In fact, this means that if Haider was not the president of the party during the elections then the FPÖ could lose the support of Haider's supporters. But she rejected this offer.

Moreover, the discontent within the FPÖ came to the surface in the early 2000s. Haider's supporters in the party presented a petition for an extraordinary party

congress, and they also declared that tax cuts should be applied by 2003 (Luther, 2002: 4). As a result of the disputes the Vice-Chancellor Riess-Passer eventually resigned from the leadership of the FPÖ. Besides her, the Finance Minister, Karl-Heinz Grassler, and the party's parliamentary group leader, Peter Westenthaler resigned from their positions in the government. Hence, early elections became inevitable. Before the elections, during the electoral campaign, one followed the other to become the leader of the party. Lastly, Herbert Haupt became the president; but all these led to an unsuccessful election campaign.

In the 2002 general elections, the ÖVP increased its votes to 42.3%, which was its best result since 1983 (Luther, 2002: 10). The SPÖ became the second party by gaining 36.51% of the votes. The FPÖ decreased its votes and experienced an unseen fall by getting 10.01% of votes, in contrast with its 26.91% in the 1999 elections. By this percentage the FPÖ had 18 seats in the parliament. According to Luther, the success and failure of the FPÖ was not related only to Haider's leadership and his skills but also to the failure or success of established parties in handling the apparent political issues such as immigration. (Luther, 2002: 17) Hence, it can be said that at that time the FPÖ was so preoccupied with its internal problems that it could not focus on problematic issues in the country, and lost a considerable number of votes. Interestingly, the ÖVP decided to form a government with the FPÖ again and focus on reforms such as the state pensions and taxation systems, the reduction of labour costs, and the privatization of the remaining state-owned industries.

During 2004 there were many elections, most of them regional. The FPÖ generally gained a low percentage of the votes in these elections, except the one in Carinthia where Haider gained 42.4% of the votes and was re-elected as a governor (Zimelis, 2010: 17). After this, he left the FPÖ because of disputes within the party, as mentioned above. Although the FPÖ's votes decreased, after the Carinthia success in 2004, he was sure that he had an individual power and influence among voters. In April 2005 Haider established a new party, called Alliance for the Future of Austria (BZÖ).

The BZÖ and FPÖ were rivals in the 2006 elections. The BZÖ, with Haider as its leader, continued its old discourses. It also tried to detach itself from the FPÖ by arguing that the BZÖ had constructive ideas and it prepared to take governmental responsibility. The FPÖ entered the elections with its new leader Heinz-Christian Strache. Strache kept the traditional arguments of the party. As a result of the elections the FPÖ won 11% of the votes and the BZÖ gained 4.1% of the votes and could not enter parliament. Besides, the SPÖ came first and took 35.3% of votes and the ÖVP came second with 34.3% of the votes.

Due to the frictions and disputes within the ÖVP-SPÖ coalition new elections were held in 2008. Both the FPÖ and BZÖ increased their votes. The FPÖ had 17.5% and the BZÖ gained 10.7% of votes. Both of them won seats in the parliament but none of them could enter the coalition. Again the ÖVP and SPÖ became the coalition partners. (SPÖ-29.3%, ÖVP-26%) (Luther, 2009: 1058) According to Luther, the BZÖ increased its votes within two years thanks to Haider (Luther, 2009: 1059). But Haider died soon after the election in a car crash. As Luther puts, his death strengthened the FPÖ. After Haider, Josef Bucher became the party leader in 2009, but the BZÖ could not reach its level of votes during Haider's term. However the FPÖ continued its ongoing success. Barbara Rosenkranz, in the 2010 presidential elections, gained 15,2 % of the votes. In the September 2013 general elections the FPÖ gained 20,5% of the votes while the BZÖ got 3,5% of the votes. This proves that the FPÖ was *the* far right party in Austrian politics.

Moreover, in the European Parliament election in May 2014, the FPÖ gained a significant amount of the vote and became the first party in Austria. The FPÖ got 19,7% of the votes and gained 3 seats (Website of European Parliament)<sup>1</sup>. It is a considerable success when compared with the 2009 European Parliament elections in which it gained only 2,6% of the votes. The FPÖ has close relations with the FN and was planning to become a member of the European Alliance for Freedom group led by Le Pen; but as of now, they have been unable to achieve this aim.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.results-elections2014.eu/en/election-results-2014.html>

### 2.3. The National Front in France

France differs from Austria and Denmark due to its experience of fascist movements and its colonial past. Fascist movements within France can be seen as a basis for development of National Front. Besides, France's colonial past has led to concerns about immigrants, especially after Algeria gained independence, which caused an increase of support to the far right.

France has had a far right experience since the end of the 19th century. According to Vardar, at that period France was in a transition period as a newly industrialized country and this opened a way for far right movements to gain support. One of these movements is Boulangism which was the movement of General George Boulanger, who used the frustration of people, especially small retailers and artificiers who were affected from the industrial transition very much, about the negative results of the policies of the Republic during the 1880s. In fact, economic crisis at that time in France, a drop in prices, a decrease in wages and unemployment caused an increase in support to Boulanger (Hutton, 1976: 88). Besides, Boulangism, the movement of *Action Française* can also be seen as an important far right movement at that time. It was against the values of French Revolution and saw it as a main responsible for the collapse in France by opening a way to Jews, Free Masons and Protestants (Vardar, 2004: 84).

But in order to understand the roots of the FN, it is sufficient to go back to World War II. Vichy government, between 1940 and 1944 under the leadership of the Marshal Philippe Pétain, had close relations with the Nazis in Germany. He used the terms “work, family, fatherland”, which, according to René Remond, was an alternative to the principles of the French Revolution: “freedom, equality, solidarity.” (Vardar, 2004: 93) Hence, it can be said that one of the basic characteristics of the French far right, especially in its initial development, is its opposition to the French Revolution. There was an idea that the French Revolution led to the deterioration of France. Moreover, the Vichy regime tried to take back the citizenship of French Jews, as a reflection of fascist ideology during the 1940s (Vardar, 2004: 93). As a

result, during the Vichy regime there was an effort to find a real, “pure” French identity.

Another far right movement emerged after WWII. This was René Binet’s *Mouvement Socialiste d’Unite Française*, which was established in 1948. As a leader of the movement, Binet defined culture as a product of race which was vital for people’s survival (Simmon, 1996: 17). He claimed that human races are not equal, regarding their distinctive blood and the European race was superior when compared with other races like the Semites, Mongoloids etc. (Shields, 2007: 58).

In 1956, a new extreme right-wing movement, so-called “Poujadism”, emerged under the leadership of Pierre Poujade. The movement started by the opposition of the Shopkeepers and Artisans Defense Union to the tax system in 1955 (Simmon, 1996: 27). This was a single-issue movement, which focused on the small scale capitalists and artisans, by opposing the economic system of the Fourth Republic (Vardar, 2004: 97). It was anti-Semitic and anti-parliamentarian (Simmon, 1996: 17). In 1956, the leader of the movement, Poujade, established a party called the French Union and Friendship Party which labeled itself neither leftist nor rightist but as a non-political party (Vardar, 2004: 98). In fact, for the French historian Pierre Milza, Poujadists were not fascist but more in the line of traditional anti-authority folk heroes, who were nationalistic, corporatist, extremist, xenophobic and anti-intellectual (Simmon, 1996: 33). This movement had a special importance because as a far right movement it entered parliament and their ideas had an important impact on the future leader of the FN, Jean-Marie Le Pen.

Jean-Marie Le Pen returned from Indochina in 1955, where he had joined the activists to fight against communists and met with Poujade. In 1956, he entered the parliament as a member of the Poujadist group. There is no doubt that Le Pen was influenced by Poujade, who saw himself as the embodiment of the people’s will. Poujade had said: “I was neither a deputy nor an inspector of finances. I didn’t know a thing about charts, opinion polls or statistics. I was only a reflection of opinion, a loudspeaker, and a flag-carrier.” (Simmon, 1996: 35). Similar populist discourses would be used by Le Pen in the 1980s and 1990s.

From the late 1960s to the early 1990s, these far right movements tried to dissociate themselves from fascist history and transformed their ideas in order to gain more support. The late 1960s witnessed the student movements with a strong anti-systemic discourse. The far right in France was also influenced by the student movement. It tried to reshape itself as different from the fascist movements of the past. GRECE was an example of this effort. It was established in 1968 and tried to distance itself from the former movements, which were perceived as militant (Shields, 2007: 145).

GRECE, as a word, had a special deep meaning. It was referring to ancient Greece, which was seen as the root of the Western civilization. GRECE, with its anti-Zionist and pagan ideas, argued that nation states would vanish and white pagans would establish a union which would include all of Europe (Vardar, 1997: 29). It claimed that both the collectivist ideology of Soviet Union and the capitalist model of the United States destroyed Europe's identity and refused to see inequalities between human beings and human societies (Shields, 2007: 148).

The leader of GRECE, Alain de Benoist, believed that there were only cultures, functioning according to their own laws and that, therefore, each culture has a right to be different (Shields, 2007: 149). Besides, Benoist argued that defending the right to be different means being against what he called, the social robotisation of capitalism, against political and philosophical universalism, and against the loss of collective identities and the mixing of peoples and cultures (Shields, 2007: 149).

In 1974, another far right movement emerged: Club de L'Horloge. This was slightly different from GRECE. In contrast to GRECE, Club de L'Horloge defended ultra-liberalism and looked favorably upon the economic system in the United States. It argued that cultures which were not European should go back to their own territory, without destroying the European culture (Vardar, 2004: 123). But both GRECE and Club de L'Horloge failed to get popular support. According to Shields, this was because of the influence of the socialists who were able to promote their views of egalitarianism and social liberalism which had a positive effect upon the

public (Shields, 2007: 157). In fact, in the 1981 presidential elections, socialist candidate François Mitterrand had 25,9%; in the legislative elections, the socialists took 37,52% of the votes, whilst the far right got approximately 3% of the votes (Election Resources)<sup>2</sup>. In other words, the early 1980s witnessed the failure of transition of the old far right into a party with new ideas. It can be said that the transition would be successfully completed by the National Front.

The main organization which opened the way of the National Front was the New Order, which was established in 1969. Different from the other organizations, the New Order focused on internal divisions within the nationalist right. Therefore, the main aim of the organization was providing a common ideology and uniting diverse forces within the far right by distancing itself from former activist and militant organizations (Shields, 2007: 159). It was anti-liberal, anti-capital and anti-Marxist. Besides, it supported nationalism, state intervention and private initiative, industrial development and protection of peasantry, and advocated the defense of small shopkeepers and artisans (Shields, 2007: 161). Most of these ideas would also be seen in the National Front's party program.

Le Pen's entrance to the New Order was a result of his withdrawal of support from a famous far right figure, Tixier-Vignancour (TV), who was a lawyer with an active role in French Algeria. Le Pen gave his support by establishing a TV Committee in the early 1960s (Simmon, 1996: 54). But because the TV became closer to the moderate right and afterwards declared its support for Socialist Party leader Mitterrand, Le Pen left the campaign. In the late 1960s, he entered the New Order. As a consequence of the movement's wish to emerge within an effective party structure, on 5 October 1972 the National Front for French Unity, whose name would later become National Front, was established under the presidency of Le Pen, and with the membership of other people who were essential members of New Order, like François Brigneau, Alain Robert, Pierre Durand. After Le Pen became the president of the party, he tried to respond to accusations that the FN was coming from the violent branch of New Order. He described the party's main objective as

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.electionresources.org/fr/president.php?election=1981>

winning the elections against the Communists and the Gaullists (Simmon, 1996: 63). He came up with the slogan “With us before it is too late” (Simmon, 1996: 62).

Le Pen argued that no other party had the courage to label itself as “right” before. FN defined itself as national right, loyal to traditional values and national culture (Simmon, 1996: 63). The party made references to the negative developments in the country due to the effect of increasing materialist values and the decline of religious and moral values. Moreover, Le Pen raised his concerns about uncontrolled immigration, which, he argued, would create employment and security problems (Simmon, 1996: 64).

Moreover, the arguments of the National Front were about protecting cultural differences. In contrast with the old far right movements, the new far right emphasized that different races cannot survive together, and turned its discourse from race to culture and supported the diversity of cultures (Shields, 2007: 149). As such, they could deny their fascist past and their connection with racism.

Initially, the FN used rather moderate language. For instance, in the 1973 elections, in order to distance itself from its previous radical position and gain more support, the party supported an extension of social services and aimed to protect French workers against foreign workers (Simmon, 1996: 64-65). But these electoral promises did not reach the public and the FN received 2.5% of the votes in the legislative elections. In the 1974 presidential election also, the FN continued its careful stance. For instance, it did not refer to the immigration problem, but it still could not gain more than 0.75% of the votes (Shields, 2007: 179).

In the 1980s, neoliberal policy trends affected France also. In France in 1981, François Mitterrand won the elections as a socialist leader and his new socialist economic and state-led policies for strengthening the economy had negative effects upon society. He increased government intervention in the economy and raised tax revenues. Besides, Mitterrand applied new immigration policies that proposed to give the right to vote to immigrants in local elections. But these policies led to a hike in inflation, trade deficit and unemployment (Shields, 2007: 199).

Mitterrand's policies affected the FN in two ways: Firstly, the FN found an opportunity to oppose the rights of immigrants, and elaborated its immigration policies more rigidly. Secondly, the FN gained an ability to claim the causal link between immigration and unemployment, law and order. All of these affected the FN's votes, leading to a considerable increase in its votes in the 1983 municipal elections, especially in Dreux (Simmons, 1996: 72). In the 1983 municipal elections, the FN achieved support from people whose jobs were at risk due to the effects of rising inflation and unemployment (Simmons, 1996: 76). In Dreux, the candidate of the FN, Marie-France Stirbois gained 12.6% of the votes. But due to claims of election error,<sup>3</sup> the 1983 election was repeated. This time Stirbois gained even more votes, 16.72% in the first round. In the second round, thanks to the Rally for the Republic (RPR) and Union for French Democracy (UDF), Stirbois was elected by 54.33 % votes (Simmons, 1996: 75).

It can be said that through the Dreux affair, the FN discovered the usefulness of immigration discourse for electoral support. Moreover, Le Pen continued to defend himself against the charges that he was racist and anti-Semitic, in order to achieve normalization of the party's image. Besides, he tried to change the focus of the threat. He claimed that there were two hegemonies which could be a threat. The first one was Soviet hegemony and the second was the demographic explosion of the third world, particularly Arab-Islamic communities (Simmons, 1996: 78-79).

After the success of 1983, in 1984 for the first time Le Pen appeared on television, which can be considered to be an important step in his political career. This was a way of proving himself as a reasonable politician (Simmons, 1996: 196). In the 1984 elections, the FN gained 10 of the 81 French seats in the European parliament. As a consequence of the successful process in 1983-84, the FN organized more deeply, by creating its own newspaper, "National Hebdo", its youth

---

<sup>3</sup> Before the elections an envelope of an Algerian immigrant was found. In the pamphlet, the immigrant said to his friend in Algeria: "we have become the lords and masters of Paris. Mitterrand has promised to grant us the right to vote very soon now. We kicked the French out of Algeria." There was a claim that this envelope was sent by FN and led the increase in the votes of Stirbois (Simmons, 1996: 74).

organization, and many party committees related to issues such as agriculture, education and immigration (Shields, 2007: 198).

1986 was the year in which the FN finally entered parliament. Besides the factors mentioned above, a change in the election system from two-ballot to proportional representation contributed to an increase in votes for smaller parties (Shields, 2007: 81). Mitterrand deemed that if the FN had an advantageous position in parliament, it would have the power to compete with the mainstream right parties, which would lose votes in their competition with the FN.

In the 1986 elections, the Socialists gained 30.8%; the combined forces of the mainstream right won 42.1%, and the FN won 9.8% and gained 35 seats in the parliament by proving itself as a major party (Shields, 2007: 83). The new Prime Minister, Jacques René Chirac from the RPR, and the Minister of Interior, Charles Pasqua, used some of discourses of the FN, emphasizing the relation between immigration and crime. Pasqua stated that “There are a few extremists in the FN, but basically, the FN has the same preoccupations, the same values as the majority. It merely expresses them in a more brutal and noisy way.” (Simmon, 1996: 91). This explanation can be seen as the mainstream right’s awareness about the impact of the FN’s discourses upon the public. Pasqua aimed to avoid being nearer to the FN, but at the same time he borrowed some of its discourses (Simmon, 1996: 91).

But after the FN entered parliament, most of the FN deputies began to use a more rigid language, as a way to distinguish themselves from the mainstream right by showing that they could speak in terms that the ordinary people could understand (Shields, 2007: 84). Le Pen pointed out, in response to criticism of their harsh behavior in parliament, that the FN places itself as a defender of the interests of French people in the face of the political class which betrays the will of people (Simmon, 1996: 85). But the FN could not stay in parliament for a long time because of the irreconcilability between its anti-systemic discourse and the pragmatics of operating within the system. In other words, whilst the FN had criticized parliament and governing elites before entering parliament, it was no surprise that when it

entered parliament it would be provocative because of its anti-system stance, which made the duration of the FN within the system that it criticized, so difficult.

In 1988, the FN's presidential election campaign mainly centered on the idea of "national preference", which means giving priority to French people over foreigners in employment, social services etc. (Shields, 2007: 220). In the first round of the elections, Mitterrand got 34.09%; Chirac got 19.94 % and Le Pen got 14.39%. It was the highest percentage that any far right candidate had received since 1945. Chirac needed the support of the FN for the second round. Le Pen proposed to support Chirac by arguing that the RPR was ready to make some concessions if the FN supported them, but this was rejected within the party. As a result, the party preferred abstention from the second round and Mitterrand won the elections.

Soon after, Mitterrand was re-elected president and called for legislative elections because the election system had changed again and proportional representation had been replaced by a two-ballot system which required party alliance. The change affected the FN negatively. In this election, despite the fact that it gained 9.5% of the votes, it only had one deputy, Yann Piat. The FN blamed the election system for being "unjust, wicked, and undemocratic" (Simmons, 1996: 94) But Piat left the party after Le Pen's Scandal of Rhyme<sup>4</sup>, which increasingly showed his anti-Semitic tendencies. So as a result of this, the FN lost its one and only deputy in the national assembly (Simmons, 1996: 94).

After the period of the 1988 elections, the FN party program started to change. This was because the socialist government changed its policies such as applying stricter policies regarding immigration and law and order, and focusing more clearly upon the market economy (Shields, 2007: 233). The fall of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union led to a change in the perception of threat. From now on, communism was not a big enemy for the FN. The biggest threat to national identity was now seen as immigrants.

---

<sup>4</sup> "The Scandal of Rhyme" occurred in 1988. During his speech in summer school of FN, Jean-Marie Le Pen rhymed the name of Jewish Minister at the socialist government, Michel Durafour. Le Pen used the word *crématoire* and said "Durafour- *crématoire*" which means an oven and he played with the word and led a pejorative meaning (Simmon, 1996: 94).

Although some of the FN's votes decreased in the 1989 elections, in the 1992 regional elections it gained 13.9% of the votes, in clear contrast with the 1986 regional elections in which it got 22,53 of the votes (Shields, 2007: 246). In fact, until 1995, the FN participated in many elections at all three levels, regional, cantonal and legislative. These elections showed that the FN was becoming a permanent actor in French politics. The FN's primary electoral support came mostly from urban areas characterized by high unemployment and high crime rates, and with large number of immigrants (Shields, 2007: 248). Also, the FN had votes from blue-collar workers, shopkeepers, artisans and small entrepreneurs, who are most vulnerable to economic downturns (Shields, 2007: 249).

The 1995 presidential elections had an important place in the history of the FN, because it achieved unprecedented success in the first round of the elections. Le Pen gained 15% of the votes and came after Lionel Jospin from the Socialist Party and Jacques Chirac. In electoral campaign Le Pen emphasized unemployment, "national preference" in employment, reducing public expenditure, bringing back the death penalty and establishing the Sixth Republic (Shields, 2007: 252). The FN wanted to establish the Sixth Republic by abolishing the fifth one. The Fifth Republic was established by Charles De Gaulle in 1958 by which he had aimed to revive the values of French Revolution, "freedom, equality and solidarity". However, FN opposed the values of the Revolution that it saw these values as the main responsible for the deterioration in the country. Hence, there should be a new republic based on the values of "work, family, fatherland".

After the presidential elections in 1995, the same year as municipal elections, the FN gradually increased its support regionally, especially in cities like Toulon, Orange, Marignane and Nice. These places had high crime and unemployment rates, a large working-class population, and concerns about immigrants, especially those from North Africa. At the regional base, FN emphasized that it would govern the city efficiently with transparency, honesty and integrity (Shields, 2007: 261).

In the 1997 legislative elections, the FN gained 15.24% of the votes, achieving its peak rate. Also in the 1998 regional and cantonal elections, it protected

its place by gaining 15% and 13.7% of the votes (Shields, 2007: 277-278). But the FN had some internal problems. In 1999, the second man of the party, Bruno Mégret split the FN and established a new party called the National Republican Movement (MNR) (Shields, 2007: 279). Mégret left because he thought that if the party could distance itself from the ideas and strict positioning of Le Pen, then it would get closer to the mainstream right, which could open the way to power (Hainsworth, 2004: 109). The division in the party led to a decrease in the FN's votes; it gained 5.7% in the 1999 European elections, whilst the MNR got 3.28% of the votes.

In fact, the most striking event occurred in the 2002 presidential elections, when Le Pen won 16.86% of the votes in the first round and defeated his rival Jospin. Although as a result of the second round, Chirac became the president, Le Pen's success created a big confusion within France that a far right leader got huge amount of votes, bypassing a socialist candidate. In the 2002 electoral campaign, Le Pen focused again on issues of immigration and law and order. He also emphasized tax reduction and a decrease in public expenditure, with a strong undertone of anti-Europeanism (Shields, 2007: 282). After the presidential election, there was 2002 legislative election in which the FN got 11.34%. In the first round of the 2004 regional elections, the FN gained 15.11% of the votes, and in the second round 12.78%, which proved that it had become an important power in French party politics (Shields, 2007: 298).

In fact, the FN could not repeat its success of the 2002 presidential elections until 2012. In the 2007 elections, Le Pen got 10.4%; in the 2010 regional elections it got 11.4%. It can be said that FN more or less had a consistent rate. In 2011, Jean-Marie Le Pen's daughter, Marine Le Pen, became the head of the party. She had different ideological discourses than her father. Marine Le Pen remained more moderate regarding the issue of immigration, and her anti-Semitism was less pronounced. Moreover, she benefited from the votes of the middle-class, frustrated by the effect of the economic crisis. The huge mistrust towards the mainstream right parties also contributed to the success of the FN in the last French elections. In the presidential elections of May 6, 2012, Marine Le Pen gained 18% of the votes in the

first round. It was big success for the FN. It was the first time in history of France that a far right party had won this amount of votes.

Marine Le Pen argued that the FN had proved its legitimacy in the eyes of the public and she refuted the description of “extreme right”, which she thought was used by political rivals with discriminatory aims. Rather, she described the FN as “patriotic, nationalist and even populist in the sense of being attuned to the concerns of the people and popular as a result.” (Time World, 3 May 2012). It can be said that one of the reasons behind the success of the FN in the 2012 elections was its increasing anti-EU stance in the public and the inability of the UMP and the Socialist Party (PS) to promote the political will within society regarding the EU, whose credibility had been damaged by the effects of the economic crisis. It was important because, in contrast to other parties, FN touched upon public concern about the global financial crisis (Williams, 2011: 688).

In the 2014 municipal and European Parliament (EP) elections, the FN had considerable success. In the municipal elections, compared to 2008, it won a considerable number of mayors and councilors (The Economist, 2014)<sup>5</sup>. In the European Parliament elections of May 2014 the FN got 24,9%<sup>6</sup> of the votes and significantly raised its vote when compared with the 2009 EP elections, in which it had 6,3% (Website of European Parliament)<sup>7</sup>. As a result, the FN emerged as France’s first party and gained 24 seats in the EP. Since the EP elections in May 2014, Le Pen had been trying to form a far right group in the EP, called the European Alliance for Freedom, by meeting the requirement of at least seven countries in order to establish a group in the EP. But recently, the FN had not been successful in forming a group, although it had strong allies like the Party for Freedom in the Netherlands and the FPÖ in Austria (New Europe, 2014)<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.economist.com/blogs/charlemagne/2014/03/frances-local-elections-0>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.results-elections2014.eu/en/country-results-fr-2014.html>

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/00082fcd21/Results-by-country-\(2009\).html](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/00082fcd21/Results-by-country-(2009).html)

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.neurope.eu/article/le-pen-wilders-fail-form-far-right-ep-party>

## **2.4. The Danish People's Party in Denmark**

Denmark is a different case than Austria and France with regard to its historical development. Although historically, Austria and France somehow resemble each other, because of their fascist past the emergence of far right parties in these countries depends on mostly upon their respective national identity building processes. In Denmark, however, fascism never played a significant role. Moreover, in Denmark the issue of far right parties at the time they were established was different. In the 1970s, the Danish Progress Party emerged as an anti-tax-party. It was opposed to the tax pressure and bureaucratic structure within the country (Rydgren, 2010: 59). Until the establishment of the Danish People's Party (DF), which can be seen as a successor of the Progress Party, immigration and national identity issues had not been handled as a key aspect of politics.

The Danish Progress Party was established in 1972 by a tax lawyer, Mogens Glistrup. The main aim of the party was the abolishment of taxes for low income people, giving more support for pensions, and increasing the conditions of health care (Andersen, 2003: 2). Jorgen Goul Andersen argued that the party represented a neoliberal populism, which means that on the one hand it supported the removal of public regulation and on the other hand it mobilized the people against bureaucratic elites with the idea that they were corrupt. The party also defended simplification of the "law jungle", reduction of red tape, and individual freedom. Although the party seems to be neoliberal, it supported welfare policies only on behalf of the Danish people. Initially, anti-immigration discourse was not powerful in the party. Rather, it was against multi-ethnicity because they saw it as a threat to national culture (Bjorklund, Andersen, 2002: 8).

In its first election in 1973, the Progress Party gained 15.9% of the votes. It can be seen as a success for a newly-established party. This was mainly due to the fact that it represented an alternative to the country's mainstream parties: Liberal Party and the Conservative People's Party. Although in the 1970s the Progress Party's votes were almost 10%, it started to decrease by the 1980s. Andersen argued

that this was because of the change of focus of the other parties. They put a more radical and offensive bourgeois alternative on the table. Moreover, in the 1980s, the neoliberal transformation in politics and the economy also affected the electoral structure. According to Andersen, this left little space for the Progress Party, which was in favor of welfare policies more than neoliberal tendencies (Andersen, 2003: 3). The votes for the Progress Party in 1981 and 1984 were insignificant: 8.9% and 3.6 % respectively.

The leader of the party, Glistrup, was imprisoned between 1984 and 1985 because of some financial problems. But his xenophobic declarations in the early 1980s also influenced the fall of the party's support. So, Pia Kjaersgaard, who became the leader of the party, was a new chance for the party to regain support. Kjaersgaard could be seen as a suitable actor for the new politics of the 1980s. She was decisive in making the party respectable and she was aware of the fact that if she wanted to increase the support of the party, she should co-operate with Denmark's main parties (Andersen, 2003:3).

Moreover, the 1980s were the years in which the saliency of the immigration issue increased, mainly because of the rise in the number of asylum-seekers. As a result of the increasing attention being paid to the immigration problem, the party's votes started to gradually increase after initially falling in the early 1980s. In 1987, it gained 4.8% and in 1988 it raised it to 9% (Andersen, 2003: 3).

In the late 1980s when Glistrup got out of prison, a dispute within the party started between Kjaersgaard and Glistrup. This was because of a power struggle for the leadership of the party and a split in opinion, whereby Kjaersgaard remained more moderate in contrast with Glistrup. So, Glistrup formed a new party called the Party of Well-Being, but it was unsuccessful. Besides, in 1990, the votes of the Progress Party declined as a consequence of the unrest within the party.

By 1994 discontent in the party increased as Kjaersgaard gained more and more power in public opinion. Kjaersgaard established a new party in 1995: the Danish People's Party. After Kjaersgaard, Kristen Jacobsen became leader of the

Progress Party until 2000, but then Glistrup again took the party leadership. Dramatically, in the 2001 elections the Progress Party gained just 0.6% of the votes and Glistrup closed the party. Hence, the Danish People's Party remained as a successor to the populist far right and as a significant alternative to the existing politics in Denmark. Andersen argued that it was a metamorphosis of the new right (Andersen, 2003: 4). The recently established party defined itself by its nationalist, eurosceptic, pro-welfare and anti-immigration stance (Andersen, 2003: 4). The DF's 1995 party program focused on the importance of the protection of the elderly and sick, and the improvement of the economy and the quality of life of the economically and socially disadvantaged in Danish society. So, the party promised more money for pensioners and better quality of service in the health system and education (Meret, 2009: 106-107).

One of its notable differences from the National Front is that the DF looked for cooperation with other parties. It was one of the critical strategies of the DF for gaining support and finding a significant place in politics. The party gained its first success in the 1998 elections as it won 7.4% of the votes. The 1998 electoral campaign should be mentioned also because of the efforts of the other parties, the Liberals and Social Democrats, to emphasize immigration as a main issue under the influence of the DF (Bjorklund, Andersen, 2002: 26). But in contrast to the FN, the DF did not present itself to be an enemy of these parties. Rather, the DF tried to find compromise with the others. As it put it in its 1996 party program, the main goal of the party was:

*...to give the Danish voters a real alternative to the politics pursued by the existing political parties, but also that such an alternative can play an active role in the parliamentary life reaching political results through collaboration with other parties because a political party must never be a goal in itself. (Meret, 2009: 99)*

Susi Meret argued that especially between 1996 and 2001 the DF was often portrayed as an extreme right wing party with racist and xenophobic features (Meret, 2009: 22). What changed this situation was the DF's entrance to the coalition with the Conservatives and Liberals. This effected a transformation of the political agenda

because when the Conservatives and Liberals started to handle the immigration issue more specifically, the DF's arguments over immigrants and immigration gained more respect. So this process could be seen as a normalization of the DF's policies which were seen as extreme before.

As a result of the 2001 elections, the Social Liberals who had been in government since 1993 lost power. The DF emerged as a main supporter of the Liberal-Conservatives by taking 13% of the votes. As Pedersen and Odmalm argued, the Liberals and Conservatives needed the support of the DF to avoid the Social Liberals coming into government (Pedersen&Odmalm, 2008: 375). So, at that time the DF was like an unofficial coalition partner of the government. As a result, the DF found the chance to be active in the decisions and policy making process.

According to Meret, the 2001 elections was somehow a turning point for the DF that can be interpreted as a popular revolt against the dominant cultural paradigm imposed by the political and intellectual left wing elite (Meret, 2009: 100). The only difference between the DF and the other coalition partners was its skepticism about the European integration process. It continued to support the abolishment of taxes such as direct taxation on companies and the existence of free trade. It also planned acceleration in public expenditure upon health care, education etc. (Meret, 2009: 104).

Since the 2001 election, Andersen had talked about a transformation in Danish politics in which the new right changed from a neoliberal populist position to a more centrist and less populist battle against immigration and in support of other values (Andersen, 2003: 1). Andersen explains this transformation by the process of globalization, and in the transformation from an industrial society to post-industrialism, which was mobilized through the logic of party competition (Andersen, 2003: 1).

As a result of the 2005 elections, there was no change in the government. Instead the existing government became more powerful as the Liberals and the Danish People's Party who were seen as the main supporters of the party increased

their votes. The 2001 coalition seemed successful as Denmark achieved one of the lowest unemployment rates in Europe and the Danish economy was strong in comparison to other countries. Besides, as a reflection of immigration policy, immigration through family reunification decreased respectively (Knudsen, 2005: 2). In the 2005 elections, the Danish People's Party increased its influence in the parliament by gaining two more seats. According to Knudsen, the party's strategy for changing from a radical anti-immigration party to a party whose main concern was securing the welfare benefits was responsible for its election success (Knudsen, 2005: 3).

Furthermore, the Liberals-Conservative government continued, as a consequence of the 2007 elections. Although the Liberals lost some of their votes,<sup>9</sup> the Social Democrat Party whose votes decreased in the 2005 elections, increased its votes and seats in the parliament. The Social Liberals lost ground in comparison with 2005. The Danish People's Party continued to increase its votes by from 13,3% to 13,9%, and it gained one more seat in parliament.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, the DF started to claim itself to be a defender of the welfare state. Hence, according to Meret there was an ideological shift from 1995 to 2007. The role of defender of the liberal state changed to the role of defender of the welfare state, especially through the DF's position as a supporter of the government (Meret, 2009: 105).

In fact the most important election for understanding the DF's recent situation was held in 2011. After the election, the discussion about whether the far right party was losing its support began. The far right discourses were losing ground, because the Social Democratic Party, whose votes had not been not so significant since 2001, made a breakthrough in the 2011 elections. On 15 September 2011, the Social Democratic Party became Denmark's second party gaining 24.9% of the votes, coming second to the Liberal Party who got 26.7% (Deloy, 2011: 1). The DF decreased its votes and won 12.3%. On 3 October 2011, the Social Democrats, the

---

<sup>9</sup>Liberals in 2005 elections gained 29%, 2007 election 26,3.

<sup>10</sup> <http://electionresources.org/dk/folketing.php?election=2007>

Social Liberals and the Socialist People's Party formed a new government, and Helle Thorning-Schmidt of the Social Democrats became Prime Minister.

In August 2012, Pia Kjaersgaard declared her resignation from the party and gave her seat to Kristian Thulesen Dahl. During his leadership, in the regional elections of November 2013 the DF got 10,1% of the votes, which increased in comparison to the 2009 regional elections. The next general elections, which will be held in 2015, will be important for the DF because whether the DF can gain the same amount of votes as in the 2011 election with the new leader Thulesen Dahl is a cause of curiosity. In the May 2014 European Parliament election, the DF increased its votes from 15,3% to 26,6% from the 2009 elections to emerge as the country's first party. This can be seen as a sign that the DF will probably increase its votes in the 2015 national elections.

## CHAPTER III

### NATIONAL IDENTITY BUILDING PROCESS

#### 3.1. Introduction

One of the important factors which affected the far right parties is the historical construction of national identity. To understand the factors that have been effective for the emergence of far right movements in the country, who define themselves as protectors of nation and national identity, it is important to examine the development of nation and national identity in our three cases. Before discussing the national identity building processes of Austria, France and Denmark, it is necessary to understand what nation and national identity are.

In the literature, there are many different definitions of “nation”. One important question is whether nation is a modern phenomenon or not. Some argue that nation is a natural concept, whilst others argue that nation is a modern phenomenon. Those who claim that nations exist naturally and will continue to exist separately from the conditions of the era are labeled as primordialists (Smith, 1986: 12). They argue that nations and ethnic communities are the natural units of history and integral elements of the human experience. Religion, race, ethnicity and territory are the basic principles of a nation and the existence of a nation is not related with modernism, so therefore it will not disappear after the end of the modern era. Naturally, people’s separation into different ethnic communities has been determined by their birth (Özkırımlı, 2008: 85). Moreover, there are perennialists within the

primordialists who argue that nation is a concept which has been in existence since antiquity (Smith, 1986: 12).

The idea that claims “nation” is a modern phenomenon argues that it is a product of modern developments such as capitalism, industrialization and bureaucratization (Smith, 1986: 8). Because, according to Ernest Gellner, nation-states could not be emerged under the conditions of agrarian society. He argues that within the agrarian society there was a stable technology, steady productive potential and strong hierarchical structure in the society (Gellner, 1996: 100). Hence, the community were divided by cultural lines which prevent an ideological development. For this reason, there were no nations or nationalism in pre-modern societies (Gellner, 1983: 6).

By the development of modern societies as a result of capitalism and industrial production necessity of cultural homogeneity existed. The necessity of cultural homogeneity is due to the requirements of modern society, in which the capitalist mode of production is the main economic aspect. Modern industrial society can only survive with a standardized culture (Gellner, 1983: 46). Because, industrial society requires mobile, literate and technologically capable and educated people for consisting qualified work-force. Standardized system was needed to provide the required work-force for industrial production (Smith, 1986: 10). For this reason, industrial society needs a common language and culture in order to be generic and to sustain growth. In that respect Gellner emphasizes that the transition from agricultural production to industrial production led to the emergence of nations and nationalism (Gellner, 1983: 40).

According to Gellner, there are two main characteristics of a nation. The first is that people in a nation share the same culture, which includes a system of ideas, associations and ways of behaving and communicating. The second is that people in a nation recognize each other as belonging to the same nation. Hence, nations are the products of people’s convictions, loyalties and solidarities (Gellner, 1983: 7).

Benedict Anderson also sees nation as a modern product. He claims that nation and nationalism emerged at the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century because of the effect of printed-capitalism, which can be seen as an important factor for the development of national consciousness. Printed-capitalism created unified fields of exchange and communication. Besides, it increased the power of language to promote-national sentiments (Anderson, 1983: 44-45).

Anderson claims that nation is an imagined community which is imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign (Anderson, 1983: 6). He argues that it is imagined because people in the nation can never know all of the members of the nation, but the image of the community is in the minds of the people. Nation is limited as it has borders and it is sovereign because nation is the product of Enlightenment conditions, which destroyed the legitimacy of the religious and dynastic realm. Besides, nation is a community as it has a spirit of fraternity amongst its members (Anderson, 1983: 6).

To define national identity it is necessary to make a distinction between nation and national identity. Anthony Smith defines nation as a named human population, sharing a historic territory, common myths and historic memories, a mass public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members (Smith, 1991: 14). In that respect, nation has a cultural and political bond that unifies a single community which shares a historical culture and homeland. In that sense, nation is a quiet stable concept that is hard to change with its defined borders, people and history.

Smith defines national identity as a continuous reproduction and reinterpretation of values, symbols myths and traditions of nation and identification of individuals by the patterns of nation (Smith, 2008: 19). In contrast to nation, national identity has a changing character that can be reinterpreted, reconstructed or reappropriated (Karner, 2011: 21). According to Karner, national identity can be redefined by the effect of historical change, institutions and social process (Karner, 2011: 22). In other words, with time, by the effect of historical developments, the

context of national identity can be transformed. National identity can be defined by different aspects in different periods.

Whether a modern phenomenon or not, nation has a significant importance for constructing the main principles of a state. According to Smith, nations are crucial instruments for controlling the destructive effects of social transformation. They also provide powerful belief systems that can secure order in society (Smith, 1986: 4). In that respect, the emphasis placed by far right parties upon the importance of protecting national identity takes its roots from the understanding that the globalized world and ongoing social transformation has been destructive of national identities, especially, as a result of the increasing transparency of borders and the rise of immigration.

Furthermore, nationalist sentiments rise with an idea that all nations have the right to protect their nation against the elements which are not part of it. At this point, it is important to determine which elements are seen as non-national by the nation. Non-national elements differ according to national identity building processes. National identity was constructed as a result of historical developments, and some factors are defined as non-national. Determining the “others” which are not seen as part of the nation is closely related with the historical construction of national identity. The “others” are the ones who are not including within the definition of the national identity of that nation. Moreover, due to cyclical developments of that period definition of non-national elements can become different also. For instance, before the end of the Cold War the main non-national element was generally communism for European nation states. But by the end of Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Muslim immigrants started to be defined as a significant non-national element of European society.

Regarding this, it is important to determine historical developments that effect national identity building processes of Austria, France and Denmark in order to understand the policies of the far right parties in our cases. Depending on the definition of non-national elements in the nation, the far right party shapes its main policy by opposing the non-national elements in that nation. Far right parties

establish their discourses in relation to the discourses that shape the identity of the nation. They identify non-national elements of the society, as the “other” of the nation.

The chapter aims to analyse how our cases, namely Austria, France and Denmark, define their national identity, and how the definition of their national identity affects the policies of the far right parties. Furthermore, it is necessary to find an answer to the following questions: how and when were the national identities of these countries were formed? How did their national identity emerge? How did they define national identity in different periods and historical developments, and as a result, how does their national identity reflect upon the policies of far right parties?

Therefore, this part of the chapter will examine the national identity building processes of Austria, France and Denmark and their effects on the respective far right parties, namely the FPÖ, FN, and DF. In that context, in this part, the most important points of the historical development of national identity for each country will be examined. Then the effects of these important points of the policies of the far right parties will be analysed, and lastly the FPÖ, FN and DF will be compared regarding the effects of national identity building process on their policies.

### **3.2. Austria and the FPÖ**

The development of national identity in Austria took place under the impact of three important periods. The first period starts in during the late 1700s and the early 1800s under the Habsburg Monarchy and continues until the end of World War I. The second period is from the collapse of the Austrian Empire in 1918 to the end of World War II. And finally, the end of the WWII affected the development of the national identity of Austria. Although the roots of Austrian identity are found in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the national identity of Austria was mainly shaped after WWII, in other words in the last period.

### **3.2.1. Austrian National Identity from the Habsburg Monarchy to the End of World War I**

The first period of Austrian national identity construction starts during the 1800s. Under the Habsburg Monarchy, a multinational empire, it was hard to talk about an Austrian national identity. Instead, there was a strong seizure of belonging to the lands of the Habsburg dynasty. Things began to change during the late 1700s and the early 1800s. In 1755, the ruler of the Empire, Maria Theresa, initiated the public high school that was seen as a step for national education (Bluhm, 1973: 13). More importantly, during the Napoleonic wars, there were some efforts to define the Austrian community. These efforts were mainly inspired by the slogan that was used during the struggle against Ottoman Empire in 1648 in Vienna, “Austria above all, if only she wills it!” and claimed that people in the Empire made themselves into a nation (Bluhm, 1973: 14). But these efforts were ineffective at creating an Austrian nation as, at the political level, the authority of the ruler was always respected, whilst the notion of an Austrian people’s state was seen as a threat to this authority (Bluhm, 1973: 15).

The process, starting with the 1848 revolutions and continuing until the unification of Germany, experienced the rise of German nationalism in Austria. Especially after the defeat of Austria by the Prussians in 1866, German nationalism within Austria strengthened and continued to be an important aspect for Austrians until the end of World War II (Morrissey, 2012: 14). The unification of Austria with Hungary in 1867 and the establishment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire deepened the multiethnic character, which led to the rise of national sentiments, especially against Hungarians. The unification of Germany in 1871 promoted the rise of German nationalism in the Habsburg Monarchy also, which affected Austrian identity, as it closely defined itself with being German, speaking German, sharing the same history with Germans.

According to Josef Langer, Austria had been associated with the Habsburg family for centuries, but after the collapse of the Empire, although Austria had

institutions which were defined as “national”, the national identity of Austria was perceived primarily as German (Langer, 1999: 159). There was some effort to search for a concept of Austrian nationhood. Some of these researches focused on the cultural aspects of the nation by emphasizing common values and spiritual goods, and attributing a divine mission to the Austrian people. But in spite of this research, the effect of German identity on Austrian identity gradually increased and became much stronger by the end of World War I and the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

### **3.2.2. Austrian National Identity from the Collapse of the Austrian Empire in 1918 to the End of World War II**

The second period which affected the Austrian national identity starts with the collapse of Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918. The First Republic of Austria was established and survived until the end of World War II. Especially during this period, Austria defined itself as not really distinct from the national identity of Germany. According to Jeltema, the identity crisis in Austria started with the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Because after living for several years in a huge multi-ethnic Empire, Austrians found themselves as a distinct entity apart from the Empire. Besides, because of the multiethnic character of the former Empire, people had little consciousness about their identity. So, as a result of the dissolution of the Empire, people questioned their belonging and identity (Jeltema, 2001: 16).

The other reason for the identity crisis is closely related with the economy. The new Republic, which was established after the dissolution of the Empire, was perceived as too small, especially economically, to survive independently. They needed to establish some historical and cultural distinctiveness so as to construct a special identity and stabilize the internal situation. In that respect, the new Republic was inspired by German culture, economic and political traditions, for the purpose of shaping its national identity. Furthermore, the Republic wanted to get the support of

Germans to survive (Jeltema, 2001: 16). For instance, in 1922 one of the Austrian politicians argued as follows:

*We shall only be able to keep alive...until the hour of our liberation comes, ... until we as Germans are able to choose that state to which we belong by the nature of things. (Bluhm, 1973: 29).*

Especially by the 1930s, Austria defined itself as somewhat distinct from German identity (Morrissey, 2012: 15). When Austria faced the Nazi invasion in 1938, according to Morrissey, for Austrian people it was an easy way to continue to claim their identity as German (Morrissey, 2012: 16). Thus, in the First Republic, it is hard to conceptualize an Austrian nation with its cultural and political aspects.

### **3.2.3. The End of World War II and its Impact on Austrian National Identity**

The end of WWII was crucial in Austria's national identity construction. In fact, until that period, Austria was strongly influenced by German identity, especially because of the common past and the strong influence of Germany on Austria. It is mainly after that period that Austrian nationalism developed significantly. The developments in the late 1930s were a turning point for separating Austrian identity from the German one. In 1938, Austria was invaded by the Nazis and Hitler declared that from then on Austria was part of the German Reich. According to Karner, Hitler's idea of declaring Austria as part of the Reich found a large audience in Austria. For instance the Austrian Nazi Party increased its members significantly (Karner, 2006: 412). In other words, during the Nazi invasion, Austria witnessed the increasing influence of German identity. But the situation would be reversed by the end of WWII. Karner argued that the invasion of Austria by the Nazis led to an increasing discontent in the society, because of linguistic and economic differences, trauma and casualties of war. As a result, after the World War II, German identity started to be perceived as an "other" (Karner, 2006: 416).

By the defeat of the Nazis, the Second Republic was established in 1945 and the Austrian government tried to form a national identity with a sense of unique

history and to find a place in the post-war order (Karner, 2006: 417). To achieve this aim, the government emphasized that Austria had been forced to form a union with Germany in 1938, but that Austria resisted it. The main aim of the government was to show Austria as a victim of the Nazis (Jeltema, 2001: 3). This stance of the Austrian government was supported by the Soviet Union with the Moscow Declaration in 1943, which claimed that “Austria was the first victim of Hitler”.

After the war, the Austrian government tried to conceptualize Austria as a unique nation, distinct from the German national identity, and dissociated itself from the Nazi past (Karner, 2006: 417). Peter Thaler argues that the construction of Austrian distinctiveness was driven by political elites and supported by its education system (Thaler, 2001: 121). The search for distinctiveness manifested itself also in foreign policy. In 1955, Austria declared its neutrality in the international arena, which could be seen as one of the efforts to strengthen the state independently against other countries, especially Germany.

The government passed several laws which prevented former German nationalists and the Nazis from reorganizing and participating in politics (Jeltema, 2001: 3). Although by the late 1940s, government turned from these exclusionary policies to a more integrative policy concerning people with a Nazi past, the general tendency was to exclude Nazis remnants from society. For instance, it implemented some educational policies to avoid the effect of the Nazi past and developed policies for educating new teachers on how to depart from Nazi influence (Bluhm, 1973: 134).

But in 1949 the government, which was managed by Liberals, Christian Democrats and Socialist, realized that if Austria wanted to overcome its past and become a unified society, the people who had a Nazi past should not be excluded from society. As a result, significant number of former Nazis acquired the right to vote (Jeltema, 2001: 4). This policy opened the way to a “third force” in domestic politics besides the conservatives, liberals, and socialists: the far right (Jeltema, 2001: 4). In the same year the League of Independents (VdU) emerged, formed by people who had relations with the Nazis. According to Jeltema, this third force has

been largely associated with a strong German nationalism. It significantly mentioned Austria as a part of the wider German nation (Jeltema, 2001: 4).

But the VdU could not survive for a long time as the coalition parties of the government prevented its active participation in politics. In 1956 the FPÖ, which included some members of the VdU, was established. The FPÖ strongly defended German national identity and protection of the German character of society (Jeltema, 2001: 5). It was committed to the independence and neutrality of Austria, but the FPÖ argued that it was important to preserve remnants of the German identity within the Austrian nation.

#### **3.2.4. Austrian National Identity and the Freedom Party of Austria**

During the 1980s some developments led to the rise of nationalist ideas in the country. Kurt Waldheim, who was known for its role in WWII as a soldier who fought on behalf of the Nazis, became a candidate for presidency from the ÖVP in 1986. This situation raised the controversies about Austria's Nazi past, which tried to create a victim perception whilst constructing its identity. Contrary to the policy of rejecting the Nazi past totally, Waldheim emphasized the naturalness of serving Germany according to the circumstances of the time. Accordingly, Austria fulfilled its duty as a part of the Reich for the dictatorship of Germany (Karner, 2006: 414). Therefore, many Austrians had no sense of responsibility because they just followed the orders of war (Matsuoka, 2003:73).

In other words, by the 1980s, Austria was disengaging itself from the German identity and rejecting it, whilst at the same time it confronted its Nazi past and emphasized a distinct Austrian identity. The government tried to draw an image of Austria as a distinct player in Europe, re-emerging in the European scene, with its sovereign and neutral characteristics and by its active participation in several international organizations. Thus, Austria established itself as an important buffer state between Eastern and Western Europe (Jeltema, 2001: 18).

After its establishment, the FPÖ strongly emphasized German identity and culture. But, especially under the leadership of Jörg Haider, the FPÖ changed its policy against the Nazi past of the country. When Haider became the leader of the FPÖ in 1986, contrary to the government policy of rejecting the Nazi past, he endorsed the fascist past of Austria. His discourse found supporters, as the Kurt Waldheim Affair was on the agenda at that time. It did not reject Austrian society's Nazi past and presented it as a legitimate service under the conditions of war time. In that sense, the FPÖ found a place for its policies as it was seen as a brave voice of Austria. This led to Austria's confrontation with its past and with the concerns of the Austrian people about the future of Austria.

In its 1995 party program, FPÖ defined nation as people who were bound together by common heritage, history, language and culture, thus forming a natural community. Moreover, it was stated that although the party respects ethnic communities, the national boundaries of Austria should be protected against the emergence of these ethnic communities (Sully, 1997: 45). The program emphasized German identity and argued that the majority of Austrians belong to the German ethnic and cultural community. It was added that the aim of the party was to formulate an identity for Austria which was within the framework of the German ethnic and cultural region, but which would shape its future autonomously (Sully, 1997: 46). So, in contrast with its initial discourses, the party drew its limits about German culture. Now the Austrian identity did not depend directly on German culture, but it was itself conditioned in the context of German culture by its intention to remain autonomous and protecting the Austrian identity.

According to Jeltema, Haider perceived himself as the true representative of the Austrian people and claimed that he understood their concerns about protecting their national identity, as they had a fear of remaining without an ethnic identity in Europe or the world (Jeltema, 2001: 31). To tackle that fear, the FPÖ developed the argument that it was the protector of the culture of the community, one that excluded foreigners. In line with the motto "Austria First", the FPÖ aimed to give priority to

Austrian citizens in all areas and to prevent the rise in immigrant numbers and limit their rights (Sully, 1997: 88).

In fact, the FPÖ found considerable support by underlining the importance of protecting Austrians and their culture against foreigners. This was one of the reasons why it gained a high amount of votes in the 1999 elections. The FPÖ consequently became part of the coalition government which raised the concerns of EU countries. In response to entrance of the FPÖ to government, EU member countries applied bilateral sanctions against Austria, which were mentioned in Chapter II. The EU was anxious about the FPÖ's nationalist stance as it was perceived as a threat to European identity, which foresees a multicultural and democratic Europe.

After the collapse of the Berlin Wall, a new necessity emerged for Austria, because it could no longer remain neutral. Hence, the EU became an important actor in Austrian politics. But because of the opposition to a more federal Europe and EU policies in the Maastricht Treaty, and due to concerns that the efforts for formation of European identity would destroy Austrian identity, support for the FPÖ increased (Jeltema, 2001: 23). Being a member of the EU requires somehow giving up some part of sovereignty and this concern positively affected support for the FPÖ. For this reason, the striking rise in the votes of the FPÖ in 1999 was not a surprise and it showed the reaction of people against the accession of Austria to the EU in 1995.

The FPÖ did not oppose the European Union totally. Before the referendum on the accession of Austria to the EU, the FPÖ was one of the Austrian parties that promoted membership of the EU. In the 2012 party program, it is stated that the FPÖ supports a "Europe of people" which developed through history, before it was affected by multiculturalism, globalization and mass immigration. The FPÖ underlines the fact that it supports Europe, which was a composition of self-determined people who cooperated under the basic principles of subsidiarity. Hence, the aim of European integration is to create Europe geographically, spiritually and culturally, by endorsing western values, cultural heritage and the traditions of the European people (Party Program, 2012). In other words, the FPÖ supports the cooperation among European states, but opposes the ongoing structure of the EU,

which opens the way to different cultures particularly through immigration, that constitutes a threat to national identity.

After its considerable success in 1999, the FPÖ could not achieve a similar success again. This was because of its anti-establishment character. Its government experience led it to decrease its tone against government policies. Moreover, there were intra-party disputes, and in 2005 Haider left the party and formed another party, the Alliance for the Future of Austria (BZÖ). This led to a division of votes. Heinz-Christian Strache became the leader of the FPÖ in 2005. Strache had parallel opinions to Haider on national identity. He was similar to Haider when he talked about the “true Viennese”, cleaned from the effects of foreigners, which echoed Haider’s “Austria First”. He had a hierarchical and multi-layered conception of Austrian identity. Accordingly, Austrians were first Austrian, then German, and finally European (Turner-Graham, 2008: 183).

In the FPÖ’s 2011 party program, it is stated that it is committed to protect the homeland of Austria and its national identity. However, emphasis upon the German language, history and culture continued. In the party program, it is stated that Austrians are part of the linguistic and cultural community of German people. Moreover, the party draws an integrative framework as it argues that the historical minorities like Burgenland Croats, Slovenians, Hungarians, Czechs and Slovaks are also integral parts of Austria and the Austrian nation (Party Program, 2011). Also in the party program, the importance of regular educational provision of German as a language is emphasized.

To sum up, Austrian national identity has developed under the strong impact of German identity. It was not until the end of WWII that as a result of Nazi invasion, there was an awakening for reviving Austrian national identity. Although there were efforts to promote the national identity of Austria during the First Republic, it was mainly the Second Republic that constructed a common Austrian identity by rejecting its Nazi past, classifying Germany as the “other”, and implementing policies like educational reforms. In contrast to governments’ rejection of Nazi past and German influence, the FPÖ emerged as an important actor that

endorsed the Nazi past and that sees German culture as a part of Austrian identity. Alongside the protective attitude of the FPÖ towards Austrian identity, it continues to emphasize the importance of German identity, which it sees as one of the constitutive components of Austrian identity. Moreover, the FPÖ supports limited cooperation between EU member states and is cautious about EU's effect on national identity.

### **3.3. France and the FN**

According to Liah Greenfeld, in France, national consciousness and national identity had not emerged until the 18<sup>th</sup> century (Greenfeld, 1991: 353). Greenfeld argues that although the national identity of France emerged in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the consciousness of being French might be said to have begun in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. In the 13<sup>th</sup> century *Francia* was adopted as the name of the country, which meant that *Francia* was the country which descended from the Franks (Greenfeld, 1992: 97).

Moreover, at that time, being French was defined as being a good Christian. Hence, when the King acquired the label of “most Christian King”, the separation of King from Church began. It was believed that God chose the King as the representative of Christianity, which weakened the power of the Church. From now on, the King had a dignity that passed through his sons by blood (Kaya, 2012: 304). The King had a centralized authority and held the loyalty of the people to the country synonymous with loyalty to the King (Kaya, 2012: 303). Furthermore, by the late 16<sup>th</sup> century, the source of the sovereignty of the King became the Christian God. As it separated totally from the Catholic Church, the power of Christian God was concretized in the King. In that sense, the King was divine. As a result, his property, the country, was also divine (Greenfeld, 1992: 112).

As an absolute representative of power, Kings had initiatives for developing the French language. For instance, in 1539, François I decided the use of French for judicial decisions and legislative acts. Moreover, there were some studies to establish a French Academy and compile a French dictionary (Dieckhoff, 2005: 3). According

to Dieckhoff, the main aim of the King's linguistic policy was to promote the French as the language of the state. They did not have the intention to standardize the French language all over the country. It was after the French Revolution that there were efforts to spread the use of the French language (Dieckhoff, 2005: 3). But the aim of the King to create a state language was not related to nation formation. It could just be seen as a reflection of the centralized authority of the King. Although the term "nation" was used, the meaning of the word at that time was not the same as the meaning it would have after the French Revolution. Instead, nation was perceived as people who were living within borders without having any consciousness of being a nation (Aktoprak, 2010: 420). Hence, the nation was a form of political realm for the King.

During the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the King gained a lot of power and, therefore, authority was very much centralized and the aristocracy started to have concerns about the power of the King as their status weakened as a result of the increasing authority of the King. Moreover, in the second half of the 1700s, the bourgeoisie and aristocracy had economic problems because of the King's policies. As a result, they formed an alliance against the royal authority. Both of them believed that the authority of the King should be weakened and reforms should be implemented which would protect their rights. The bourgeoisie defended general interest, patriotism, nation and fraternity against the absolute authority of the King. This time, "nation" had much more meaning than simply the people living within a state. Freedom and having property gained importance, as the King and the Church were seen as being mainly responsible for bad economic conditions. The bourgeoisie believed that only a nation which had equal and sovereign citizens could weaken the power of state and Church. By this idea, the source of sovereignty was redefined. Accordingly, the source of sovereignty was not the King but the nation whose legitimate rights were seized by the King and Church (Aktoprak, 2010: 424).

Like Greenfeld, Stanley Hoffmann argues that the sense of nation emerged in the 18<sup>th</sup> century as a result of opposition to the inefficient monarchy of the French King (Hoffman, 1993: 219). He emphasized that there were discontents about the

King, who was seen as responsible for the problems of the feudal order that affects society. Moreover, he added that society felt itself to be an outsider to a preexisting state, and that to solve this problem, the old institutions should be destroyed and “national” France should be built (Hoffmann, 1993: 220).

As a result of discontent amongst the people and demands for equality and freedom, in 1789 the French Revolution took place. By the Revolution, the monarchy was destroyed and the privileges of the aristocracy and clergy was abolished (Berdah, 2007: 143). As a result of the Revolution, Frenchness as an identity came to be defined as “national” identity. Now the citizens of the country who were legally equal were the French people.

### **3.3.1. French National Identity from Napoleon to De Gaulle**

In the period of Napoleon Bonaparte, who came to power in 1799, the power of authority increased. Napoleon did not aim to promote national sentiments, rather he wanted to establish a nation which was loyal to his authority (Aktoprak, 2010: 444). Napoleon intended to protect the unity of the nation in order to maintain the sustainability of his regime.

Napoleon saw education as an instrument for creating a loyal civil service and the military as an important aspect for serving his expansionist policies (Aktoprak, 2010: 442). After his defeat in the 1814 war, there were ideas to restore the Bourbon monarchy. Napoleon was concerned with protecting his authority and for this reason he strongly defended nationalism and the values of the Revolution. Hence, during the period, national identity was seen as bearer of the values of the Revolution (Kumar, 2006: 422).

After the Napoleonic period, Louis Philippe came to power and tried to continue to strengthen the authority of the state. But his power ended as a result of the 1848 movements in which people unified to oppose the state. In 1848, the Second Republic was established and Louis Napoleon came to the power. In 1852 he turned

the Republic into the Empire. According to Aktoprak, his policies promoted industrialization and thus contributed to the nation building process indirectly. As a result of his economic policies, peripheral regions in France were included in the economic system (Aktoprak, 2010:449).

During the Third Republic, which was established in 1870, policies for nation building were implemented more systematically. The Republic had policies to make national identity stronger. According to Hoffman, it was the republican regime that became the bearer of nationalism in France (Hoffman, 1993: 229). On the one hand, the Republican understanding of the nation was seen as the expression of the general will, superior to and excluding particular and group interests. On the other hand, Republicans wanted to ensure the liberal conception of representative and limited government, guaranteed rights, and divided powers (Hoffmann, 1993: 233).

According to Republican concept of nation, to be French, it was not necessary to be born from in a family who had French blood. In other words, being French was a somehow an acquired identity, instead of an innate attribute of an individual. This demonstrates the assimilative character of Republican French national identity. National identity did not exclude those who could adopt himself/herself to the values of the society; rather it included them within the nation. For this reason the Republic made efforts to developing education policies in order to open a way for people to acquire French identity (Aktoprak, 2010: 454). According to Hoffmann, to constitute a nation with the understanding of general will and providing liberal institutional building, Republicans used education as a tool. Moreover, Republicans gave importance to language because of its unifying characteristic, instead of giving importance to language as a main determinant of being French (Aktoprak, 2010: 458).

Moreover, 1871 can be seen as a critical year for French national identity. In 1871, German unification and the loss of the Alsace-Lorraine region led Germany to be perceived as a strong enemy. While Germans were external enemies, Jews were considered as internal enemies. Already, the *Action Française*, the fascist movement of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century, perceived the Jews along with Protestants and

Free Masons as “enemies within”. The new right nationalists who asserted that the inclusive policies of the Republic weakened the nation. According to Jennings, the very assimilation of French Jews and their entry to political and social positions promoted the perception that Republic itself was controlled by Jews (Jennings, 2000: 16).

Opposition to Jews was seen clearly in the Boulangist movement and the Dreyfus Affair<sup>11</sup> (Aktoprak, 2010: 460). It is important to emphasize that for the conservative nationalist group in the Dreyfus Affair, nation was not something that emerged with the 1789 French Revolution. Rather, French nation was an eternal concept which would continue forever (Aktoprak, 2010: 462). This notion would be a base for the FN’s national identity understanding.

Zana Çitak argues that two different understandings of French national identity emerged after the Revolution. The first one is a Republican tradition and the other one is a right-conservative tradition. According to the Republican tradition, French national identity was based on values of French Revolution (Çitak, 2006: 146). This tradition separated religion from national identity. Therefore, for Republican tradition, the “others” would be the ones who were not citizens (Aktoprak, 2010: 430), whilst before, “others” were defined by religion, those who had a different religion to the Christian King.

The right-conservative tradition claimed, however, that Catholicism is the essential part of French national identity. Accordingly, religion was one of the main aspects of national identity (Çitak, 2006: 147). Hence, “true” French people should have Catholic religion. It can be said that this idea inspired nationalist right-wing movements in France, such that Catholicism is an important aspect for their understanding nation.

---

<sup>11</sup> Although the Republican project was inclusive for Jewish people, in 1895 French officer Alfred Dreyfus, who had Jewish roots, was accused of passing military secrets to Germans. He was arrested and in 1899, was found guilty in another show trial and sentenced to 10 years in prison. But, in early 1900s he was released. Both the military and the Church led campaign against Captain Dreyfus. This affair was important to show the intensification of anti-Semitic feeling in France and the failure of the Republic to establish an integrative policy in the eyes of society (Britannica Website)

In spite of the assimilative policies of the Republic, new right nationalists, like Edouard Drumont, Charles Maurras and Maurice Barrès, had anti-Semitic discourses. Unlike the Republic administration's inclusive understanding of nation, Drumont, Maurras and Barrès had a more exclusionist understanding. They defined it as a historical concept whose defining character was birth. Besides, nation was a natural order, independent from social contracts which constituted the equality and liberty of individuals (Fieschi, 2004: 107). Hence, they rejected the idea that different people could live together equally, because the ones who were not part of the nation due to birth, could not be equal with the ones born into that nation. They claimed that French society was under threat of disintegration through the effects of social change and its impact on traditional values, and also by foreign influences, especially Jews (Hoffman, 1993: 239). Moreover, according to their ideas, the Republic could not protect the nation that was corrupted by Jews who were considered as foreign elements and by invading Germans. Jews were the main problems for them because they saw religion as one of the main elements of national identity and the Catholic Church as a power which defined the French nation and gave it strength (Çitak, 2006: 151).

At the beginning of the 1900s, international developments prevailed upon the agenda of France. Especially during WWI, *l'union sacrée* (sacred union) emerged between the advocates of different nationalist groups against German threat, so that nation had a closer meaning with patriotism for defending the country against foreign attacks. But this national unity proved short-lived.

After WWI, economic problems affected society negatively and the Great Depression in 1929 increased discontent. This led to the rise of nationalist movements that had relations with the Nazis. Moreover, because of bad economic conditions, immigrants became a problem. There were ideas that there were too many to integrate into the country. As a result, xenophobia rose and opened a way for the far right movements (Aktoprak, 2010: 465).

Besides, the invasion of France and the Vichy regime created a traumatic impact over the French national identity. In 1940, Marshal Philippe Pétain declared

the end of the Third Republic and formed a government by cooperating with Nazi allies. This event can be seen as a rupture in the historical development of French national identity. The values of Revolution like independence, democracy and fraternity were challenged by the Vichy regime, which collaborated with the Nazis. Moreover, the exclusionist stance of the Vichy regime against foreigners drew a strict line in the definition of being French. Racist discourse manifested itself in France, as Pétain saw foreigners as the main reason for French defeat and military collapse in WWII (Berdah, 2007: 147).

During the Vichy regime, anti-Semitism again prevailed in the ideas of new right movements. Moreover, the Vichy regime redefined French identity regarding the values of Catholicism and tradition (Aktoprak, 2010: 468). In contrast to the main values of the French Revolution that constructed the national principles - “freedom, equality, fraternity”- the Vichy regime determined the main values of the French nation as “work, family, fatherland”.

### **3.3.2. French National Identity after WWII**

After WWII, the Vichy regime ended and the Fourth Republic was established in 1946. It continued until 1958, Charles De Gaulle emerged with a mission to rescue French national identity from the destructive policies of the Vichy regime, to re-establish stability in France and remove the effects of the Algerian war which promoted nationalist and patriotic sentiments to defend a territory which was seen as a major part of the country.

When De Gaulle came to power and established the Fifth Republic in 1958, he aimed to increase the receptivity of French national identity in the international area, so the reconstruction of French national identity started. In this period, French national identity regained its inclusive characteristic. De Gaulle emphasized the importance of national independence and stood against the ideological effect of the Soviet Union and the cultural and economic effect of the USA. De Gaulle prioritized “Frenchness” and revived the main values of the French Revolution, like

sovereignty, independence, and democracy. He emphasized the importance of sovereignty as a crucial aspect of being a unique and a powerful country, and he tried to establish an historical link pre-revolutionary and post-revolutionary France (Marcussen, Risse, Martin-Engelmann, Knopf and Roscher, 1999: 9). Moreover, he believed that France had a mission to spread the values of the Revolution all over the world. Nationalist understanding of De Gaulle did not exclude Jews or have a xenophobic characteristic, unlike in the Vichy regime (Aktoprak, 2010: 469).

Besides, under De Gaulle, one of the critical issues for national identity was the European Economic Community (EEC). De Gaulle, as a leader who tried to prioritize the universal role of Frenchness and the superiority of France, had concerns about sovereignty (Hoffman, 1993: 254). De Gaulle was against the EEC's supranational character; rather he wanted to protect national sovereignty and promote French identity. Hence, De Gaulle was always cautious in European integration, because of the concern that the EEC could destroy national sovereignty. At the same time, however, he perceived the EEC as a booster for French power.

After De Gaulle, Mitterrand came to power in the 1980s. At the beginning of his Presidency he approached the identity issue like De Gaulle by prioritizing the importance of being French. But especially because of the economic problems for which Mitterrand was seen as being responsible, he was obliged to change policy, and started to have a pro-European discourse by underlining the common historical and cultural heritage of Europe (Marcussen&Risse, 1999: 10). The emphasis on the Europeanness of France had continued also after the end of the Cold War and the unification of East and West Germany.

Hence, after the Cold War, French elites realized that there was a unified Germany, which could again become a threat to national security. There was a need to define France within Europe. The roots of defining the Europeanness of France can be seen in Mitterrand's discourse "France is our fatherland, Europe is our future." Mitterrand realized the need for redefining the place of France in Europe as a significant player, rather than continuing to claim the uniqueness of French values and power. This approach can be seen clearly about the debates over the Maastricht

Treaty. In fact, during the discussions on the Maastricht Treaty, France showed its determination not to be outside of this organization, but defined its place as the “Europeanization of French distinctiveness” (Marcussen&Risse, 1999: 11).

### **3.3.3. French National Identity and the National Front**

According to Jean-Marie Le Pen, nation is an ethnically inspired, historical and traditional entity, which can be undermined by foreign values and cultures (Hainsworth, 2004: 106). For the FN, French national identity had historical roots. The *Action Française*, which emerged in 1899, had two main stances about national identity. First, they considered the Jews, the Protestants, and the Free Masons as “foreigners”. Second, they believed that only a monarchical regime can restore homogeneity (Vardar, 2004: 84). Hence, they were anti-Republican.

The FN echoed these ideas particularly with respect to Muslims. Accordingly, Muslims could not be part of the French nation which was defined as a family, and therefore endowed with biological reality (Hoffman, 1993: 257). Because Muslims were not of the nation, they were potential threats to national identity. The immigration of Muslim people could destroy French identity. Moreover, although France had an assimilative policy towards immigrants, Muslim immigrants could not be assimilated within French identity because of their deep religious tradition (Hoffman, 1993: 262).

Moreover, according to the FN, one of the main threats for national identity was the European Union. The FN also had anxieties about both the enlargement and the deepening of the EU. For the FN, EU enlargement means new immigrants and new economic and social problems. Besides, the deepening of the EU will cause national sovereignty problems as it foresees a supranational institutional setting. The current leader of the FN, Marine Le Pen, recently stated that, “Our Europe, a different Europe... We consider that the EU hurts our countries in every way: our economies, security, and immigration” (Irish Times website, 2014). The FN was clearly against the EU and claimed that France should exit from the Union.

In its last party program, the FN states that maintaining support for France's cultural exceptionalism, which favours the French audio-visual industry against foreign competition, especially competition with USA, is very important. Moreover, the FN strongly emphasizes the crucial importance of protecting the French language (Website of National Front)<sup>12</sup>. According to the FN, the French language should be aggressively promoted to restore French influence abroad. It can be said that for the FN, protecting culture and language is a significant aspect of gaining more power.

To sum up, the national identity understanding of the FN is strongly affected by the ideas of the nationalist movements that emerged in the late 1800s. Like these movements, for the FN, the nation is an entity that arises historically, and to be a member of the nation people should be born in the country from parents with French roots. In that sense, in contrast to the assimilative tradition of France vis-à-vis foreigners, the FN is exclusionist, especially rejecting the idea that different cultures can live together, and arguing that the main cause of the problems in the society are immigrants.

### **3.4. Denmark and the DF**

The construction of Danish national identity led to the emergence of a tendency towards a politics of neutrality and small state perception, especially until the end of the Cold War. Denmark has an influential supranational identity, which dominated its own national identity. Østergaard argues that, in Northern Europe, we find that Nordic identity prevails over national identity (Østergaard, 2000:1). Nordic identity can be defined in terms of a sovereign state in a peaceful society. It can be said that as a Nordic country, Denmark gives importance to its Nordic identity besides its national identity, besides in the last two decades European identity is also significant for the Danish people.

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.frontnational.com/le-projet-de-marine-le-pen/>

### **3.4.1. Danish National Identity until the End of the Cold War**

Apart from its Nordic identity, historically, Danish national identity started to develop by the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century. Benedikte Brincker defined the Danish state during the 18<sup>th</sup> century as a state with a multinational character that comprised the duchies of Slesvig and Holstein, the Jutland peninsula, and the territory which is today Norway and the islands of Zealand and Funen (Brincker, 2009: 356). The 18<sup>th</sup> century witnessed an increase in the studies of national identity related to growing national interest in Denmark (Brincker, 2009: 356). National identity became salient in 1776 with the Law of Indigenous Rights. According to the Law, only people born within the borders of the Danish state could work in official positions (Brincker, 2009: 357). This provision of the Law was especially to prevent German people working in official positions in the country. According to Brincker, some historians saw the law as a national law which was introduced to comply with the national ideas and feelings of the Danish people, which were based on common language and a common ancestry (Brincker, 2009: 357).

It was during the early 19<sup>th</sup> century that Danish people can be said to have started to share a national consciousness (Brincker, 2009: 357). Significantly, two developments led to the rise of nationalism. The first one has two aspects: the separation of Kingdom of Norway and Denmark in 1814 as a result of the Napoleonic wars, and the defeat of the Kingdom of Denmark in 1864. These led to a break between the Danish identity and the Norwegian identity. The second is the unification of Germany in 1871, which increased the importance of protecting Danish identity.

Until 1814, the name of Denmark meant a composite state, typical of the European era of territorial states, with its multinational character (Østergaard, 1992: 3). In 1814, the Norwegian part of the monarchy separated from Denmark. This was an important event for defining Danes without Norwegians. According to Jensen, besides 1814, the war of 1864 between Denmark and Germany, about a land dispute finalized by the defeat of Kingdom of Denmark, played a decisive role in the

formation of Danish identity (Jensen, 2008: 39). Jensen argued that the war of 1864 contributed to shape the feelings of the Danish people so that they could improve and break their fate, which always brought failure to them. Hence, the necessity for defining Danish identity emerged as a means for providing stability in the country. Denmark lost Schleswig and Holstein in the war, a territory with a significant German-speaking population. According to John Camphell and John Hall, thanks to the 1864 war, Denmark was no longer divided nationally, and the problem with the discontent of the German people was solved as Denmark lost its German majority region (Camphell and Hall, 2010: 95). Thus, the necessity to define a Danish national identity inevitably brought a homogenous understanding of the nation. This also meant promoting Germans as the “enemy” as a means to define national identity (Korsgaard, 2006: 137).

Moreover, after 1864, Denmark started to feel more vulnerable because there was tension between Germany, Britain and Russia, especially because of the expansionist politics of Germany at that time. Russia and Britain in particular saw Denmark as a buffer zone and supported its neutrality. From then on, Denmark could not play an influential role because of its neutral position and the crucial rivalry among the great powers (Camphell and Hall, 2010: 95).

The feeling of insecurity outside led Denmark to be oversensitive about domestic stability. At that point, national sentiments played an influential role. According to Camphell and Hall, the Danish conceptualized their identity as strong enough to help the nation survive even in the absence of a state. This strong national identity was to be based on ethno/religious homogeneity with a democratic and egalitarian culture (Camphell and Hall, 2010: 95). In other words, as Uffe Østergaard argued, the 19<sup>th</sup> century witnessed the dissolution of the multicultural and multilingual structure of the state and its gradual transformation into a homogeneous nation-state with a political culture based upon language and religion (Østergaard, 2006: 55).

The second factor which led to the rise of Danish national consciousness was the reunification of Germany in 1871. This event also caused a concern over national

identity formation, leading to the emergence of a peasant ideology in the state (Østergaard, 1992: 5). The peasant movement was able to gain a cultural, economic and political hegemony within the state. Especially as a result of the reunification of Germany, the national solidarity of Denmark became more vital. According to Østergaard, at that time the main strategy of Denmark was “winning inwards what had been lost to the outside”. And for implementing the strategy, peasants played an important role.

The construction of unity in Germany and Italy can be seen as a shift in the power structure of the European state system because these two countries emerged as new rivals in the competition of colonialism. But, colonial tendencies cannot be seen in the Kingdom of Denmark because, according to Østergaard, industrialization started late in Denmark due to a weak bourgeoisie (Østergaard, 2000: 5). He argued that for this reason peasant ideology became culturally, economically and politically dominant. Besides, peasants gradually developed a consciousness of being a class and supported their ideology with a free trade approach. Moreover, Østergaard argued that peasants also achieved success because of their ability to develop their own class consciousness and their self-perception as the backbone of society. Hence, they were able to establish a distinct culture with corresponding educational institutions of its own (Østergaard, 2006: 73).

From the 1870s until World War I, besides the peasants, Grundtvigians were also effective in shaping Danish national identity. The name Grundtvigians came from Nikolaj Frederik Severin Grundtvig, who was a poet, priest and politician. He created myths and images that contributed to nation-building in Denmark (Korsgaard, 2006: 143). He defined nation as a people who think of themselves as members of a nation, who can hear the mother tongue and who love the fatherland (Østergaard, 2006: 77). The main goal of Grundtvigians was to enlighten people vis-à-vis their identity, with the motto “enlightenment by the people, with the people and for the people” (Korsgaard, 2006: 144).

Grundtvig’s ideas emerged in conditions where peasants had an influential role in shaping national identity of Denmark. Different from Western European

countries at the time, bourgeoisie and aristocracy had a dominant role in the economic and social area. Rather, peasants who emerged as farmers took over the responsibility of economic development in Denmark. The reason why peasants were the main actors of society lay in the policies of monarchical rule. Unlike Western European societies, landowners could not gain huge profits and investment opportunities within the territory because the King did not allow them to incorporate farms. As a result, landowners sold their lands, and tenants in these lands started to transform themselves into farmers by continuing to work the land for their own interest (Østergaard, 1992: 15).

Furthermore, peasants were not only effective economically; they also had a consciousness about being Danish, in Grundtvig's term *folkelig*, which refers to the common feelings of people which originate in a historically developed national community and which had an impact upon peasants' awareness about nationhood. According to Østergaard, Grundtvig succeeded in transforming solidarity and the peasants' feelings of community into symbols and words with relevance to an imagined community (Østergaard, 1992: 23).

Moreover, farmers who were previously peasants had a consensus with industrial workers. Farmers had a compromise with industrial workers over an institutionalized social democracy and a sustainable welfare state (Campbell and Hall, 2010: 96). According to Campbell and Hall, the alliance between farmers and industrial workers helped to cope with unemployment problem, especially after the Great Depression of 1929, by giving way to public investments and the increasing competitiveness of Denmark in the international arena (Campbell and Hall, 2010: 97). In other words, as a result of democratization and the compromise of two important cleavages -farmers and industrial workers- of Danish society, Danish national identity became increasingly pronounced.

After WWII, when Soviet Union emerged as a threatening power in the international politics, it became hard for Denmark to continue its neutral politics among great powers. As a result, during the Cold War period, Denmark had close relations with Western countries. In 1949, it became a member of NATO (DIIS,

2005:1). Moreover, as a result of close relations with Western allies, Denmark is one of the countries which entered early into the European Economic Community. In 1973, Denmark became a member of the EEC. It can be said that after WWII, one of the important characteristics of the national identity of Denmark was being European also.

Denmark did not construct its nation by the upper hand of bourgeoisie; rather, its national consciousness emerged by the help of peasant ideology, which can be seen as a bottom-up response to enhance the position of Denmark in the international arena. Recently, history and Christianity have an important meaning for Danish national identity as stated in Pedersen's study, Danish people emphasized history as a part of being Danish, and they found Christianity to be an important part of being Danish (Pedersen, 2011: 29).

### **3.4.2. Danish National Identity and the Danish People's Party**

Denmark's distinct nation building process also affected its party politics. The far right party of Denmark, the DF, does not construct its basic principles over the identity issue. It did not emerge by creating an 'other' like the Nazis or communism. Instead, the Progress Party, the predecessor of the DF, emerged mainly by opposition to the tax issue. The founder of the Progress Party, Mogen Glistrup, supported the abolition of income taxes for those with low incomes, and promised higher budgets for old-age pensions and health care. In fact, it was because Denmark had a strong welfare state tradition, which was also one of the main promoters of national identity, that the DF established its main identity discourse on welfare issues, rather than exclusionary identity issue.

In the party program, preservation of Danish culture is prioritized. It is defined as the sum of the Danish people's history, experience, beliefs, language and customs (Party Program of DF). The main point of the DF about identity issue is its opposition to the EU. It is clearly stated in the party program that the DF opposes the European Union. There are concerns about the destructive effects of the EU over

national identity. It is obvious that the EU is seen responsible for increasing the multicultural structure of societies.

In 2000, the party leader Kjaersgaard opposed the European Union, as it was time for the Danish people to decide whether they wanted to continue with their national currency or enter the Eurozone. She declared that what was at stake was the preservation of Danish sovereignty. According to her, the euro would destroy the national sovereignty and identity, especially during the times of globalization that fosters multiethnic society (New York Times website, 2000). The DF rejects the formation of multiethnic society and refutes the idea of Denmark as an immigrant country. In the DF's party program, it is stated that it ought to be possible to absorb foreigners into Danish society provided that this does not put security and democratic government at risk. To a limited extent, according to special rules and in conformity with the stipulations of the Constitution, foreign nationals should be able to obtain Danish citizenship.

Furthermore, it can be said that Christianity was an important aspect of the DF's understanding of national identity. In its party program, it is stated that:

*Christianity has been honored in Denmark for centuries and is an integral part of Danish life. It is impossible to measure the significance Christianity has had and has on Danish life and the Danish way of life. Through the ages it has been a groundstone and given guidance to the people.* (Party Program of DF)

For the DF, Christianity has a crucial importance for any country's evolution, for freedom, openness and democracy; therefore, the government should support the national Church and religious freedom.

Besides Christianity, the DF also gives importance to historical aspects of Danish identity. As a result, it sees Danish monarchy as a real part of Denmark's political and cultural history and a symbol of Danish solidarity (Pedersen, 2011: 30). According to the DF, Danish solidarity is important for protecting the country against various threats, especially immigrants. The ones who are not sharing Danish history

and Christianity are not part of Danish national identity; hence they are threats to Danish society (Pedersen, 2011: 34).

### **3.5. The Differences and Similarities of the FPÖ, FN and DF Regarding the National Identity Building Processes of Austria, France and Denmark**

It should be stated that unlike the other comparative sections, comparing the parties in the context of national identity building means not only a comparison of the parties but of the societies. In that respect, the time and cause of the emergence of national identities in these countries will be analysed, and after that the national identity understanding of the FPÖ, FN and DF will be compared.

Firstly, it can be said that Austria's national consciousness emerged later than France and Denmark's. Austrian national consciousness emerged after World War II. This was because of the changing perception of German identity and the rejection of the Nazi past. Until that time, Austrian identity was defined as a different interpretation of German identity, which was then seen as a negative influence in society. Hence after WWII, being an Austrian had more meaning than being a German. On the other hand, the emergence of France and Denmark's national consciousness was close to each other; during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. In France as a result mainly of the French Revolution and in Denmark the 1864 defeat and separation from Norway promoted the national identity sentiments.

The reason for the emergence of national identity was different in all three countries. In Austria, national identity developed under the post-war conditions by the concern of Austria to survive as an independent state and avoid the influence of Germany. Therefore, the government was the main supporter of Austrian identity. But in France, the concept of nation was promoted by the aristocracy and bourgeoisie to weaken the centralized power of the King. The French Revolution caused national identity consciousness to develop from the bottom. Lastly, in Denmark, after the separation of Norway from Denmark, there was a need to provide stability and define Danish identity. Unlike France, in Denmark, there were no strong bourgeoisie and

aristocracy that promoted nationhood. Furthermore, in Denmark as a result of peasant tradition, national consciousness was not promoted by the rulers of the country. It was peasants and farmers who were promoting the national sentiments.

As an important similarity, German unification in 1871 had significant results for the identity construction of all three countries. In Austria, since the unification of Germany, German identity had a strong influence; such that being an Austrian had a same meaning with being a German. In France, as a consequence of 1871 was somehow another boost to new right nationalist movements as Germany started to be seen as an enemy much more than in the past. In Denmark, unification of Germany increased the solidarity among people, hence society became cautious towards outside threats, and in these circumstances the peasant tradition prevailed upon Danish identity. Moreover, it can be said that as a result of unification, France and Denmark started to see Germans as “other”, whilst Austria embraced German identity. However, it was only after WWII that Austria would see German identity as “other”.

When we looked at the FPÖ, FN and DF, the influence of the national identity building processes of the countries can be seen. In the FPÖ, besides protecting Austrian identity, the importance of German culture continues. In almost all of the FPÖ’s party programs, protection of German culture is stated. On the other hand, the FN is opposed to the values of the French Revolution by seeing them as mainly responsible for the destruction of France’s national identity. The FN was also against the assimilative character of French national identity, which was shaped starting with republican period and became strong during De Gaulle’s presidency. Finally in Denmark, as a result of peasant and welfare tradition, the roots of the DF emerged as a protector of these traditions. Hence, it did not emerge by excluding others, as in the FN, but it emerged with opposition to taxes when its name was the Progress Party.

FPÖ, FN and DF see history, language and culture as important aspects of national identity. According to the FPÖ, nation has a common heritage, history, language and culture. For the FN, nation is an ethnic, historical and traditional entity

which has a different culture that should be protected from foreign influences. In that sense, people who have different historical background and cultural tradition cannot be assimilated into the society. And for the DF, the nation is the sum of Danish people's history, experience, beliefs, and language. All of them see nation as a historic entity which should have common culture and language.

Lastly, all parties are against the European Union. While FPÖ and DF do not totally oppose the EU, the FN supports leaving it. For the FPÖ and DF, being European also has an importance besides protecting Austrian and Danish identity. They have concerns about the destructive effect of the EU as a supranational identity upon their national identity. They support the cooperation among member states but they oppose EU policies like economic and monetary union, a common foreign and defense policy, and European citizenship as they see it a threat to their sovereignty. In contrast, according to the FN, the EU is totally harmful to national identity with its economic and political policies, and therefore, if France exits the EU it will be more powerful as an independent state.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **IMMIGRATION**

#### **4.1. Introduction**

Immigration is one of the most important factors behind the rise of the new far right parties. Although immigration became a major problem during the 1980s, the roots of the issue can be found in post-war Europe. After WWII, it was vital for Western Europe to recover its economy (Betz, 1994: 72). According to Betz, rapid economic expansion during the 1950s and 1960s increased labor force requirements. For this reason, most of the Western European governments encouraged immigration by adopting recruitment treaties. Betz argued that, the huge demand for cheap labor created illegal immigration during 1960s, because required regulations for immigrants to enter the country were relaxed to allow them to apply after they entered (Betz, 1994: 72).

In fact, until the 1970s, immigrant workers were mainly guest workers who did not benefit from basic civil rights like family reunification, freedom of assembly and association and freedom of movement (Soysal, 1994: 122). They returned to their homeland after staying and working in the country. Hence, they were temporary workers who were just seen as a labor force. But by the 1970s, the economic crisis hit the Western Europe and immigrants started to stay in the country and they did not want to return. This led some economic problems for European countries. As a

result, the general tendency of the 1970s was stopping new immigration movements but allowing family reunification (Betz, 1994: 73).

In the 1970s, families of immigrant workers started to come to the countries. Besides, the number of European immigrants decreased and the number of non-European immigrants increased. This created a two-dimensional tool for the far right to use for electoral support. Firstly, the ambitions of employers for cheap labor created problems for labor forces within the country. The 1970s were the years of economic crisis. But, as will be detailed in the globalization section of the thesis, it was a kind of crisis of capitalism which brought a transformation in the economy, and especially after the 1980s it was a transformation to post-industrial production. So, although owners of the capital desired cheaper labor, unemployment as a result of economic crisis led to investigation of this cheap labor, immigrants and immigration policy of governments. For this reason, an opportunity was revealed to blame immigrants as the main cause of unemployment. The second dimension is about promoting people's cultural concerns. As increasingly non-European immigrants started to come to the country, cultural concerns became an important instrument for the new far right to use as an electoral tool.

In fact, one of the main characteristics of the new far right is their new focus point: culture. As a means of getting rid of the label of racist, the far right started to put the emphasis on culture rather than race. As a result, the immigration issue is problematized with reference to culture. According to Ferruh Yılmaz, the new far right made a polarization between a far right party which tries to protect its culture against immigration and represent the public, and immigrants and the cosmopolitan elite mostly within the government (Yılmaz, 2012: 372)

Another common point of these far right parties was that they see immigrants as a threat to the security of the country and stimulate the issue of insecurity caused by a rising number of immigrants. Yılmaz argued that the significant success of the new far right parties comes from their ability to increase the salience of the immigration issue (Yılmaz, 2012: 373). They have a general discourse that in the past ethnic minorities integrated successfully, but it is no longer the case happen

because of the incompatible character of Muslim culture with Western culture. So, according to the far right, the effort to integrate Muslims means to restart everything, because of the necessity of changing the ideas and habits which derive from their tradition (Yılmaz, 2012: 373). Gradually, the meaning of immigrants became equal to “Muslims” who are seen as dangerous people who have a potential to destroy the nation.

Despite the commonalities of far right parties about the immigration issue there are differences in their policy applications and impacts across their respective society. As it will be mentioned later, although the FPÖ was in government between the years 2000-2006, its ideas did not have much effect on the immigration policy. In contrast, although the FN and DF did not enter the government, they had more impact in shaping the immigration policy of their respective country.

#### **4.2. The Freedom Party in Austria and Immigration**

The immigration issue in Austria had not had much salience and did not emerge as a problem until the mid-1980s. The most important reason is that during the 1960s and 1970s there was a rotation system for immigrants. In this system, immigrants were staying in the country for a short period and then returning to their homeland. In the 1960s, immigration was mainly labor oriented and immigrants were mostly “guest workers” who left their home country after a few years on the basis of rotation (EMN, 2004: 3). But gradually immigrants, who were mostly male workers, wanted to stay in Austria, because of their need to earn money. Employers wanted to keep experienced workers for a long time (Meret, 2009: 193). But during the early 1970s, things started to change. Because of the international economic crisis, beginning with the oil crisis, the number of Austrians who were working abroad returned to Austria, and as a result, competition in the labor market increased (EMN, 2004: 11). This situation became a significant problem after the increase in the number of immigrants.

Until the early 1990s, the Austrian immigration policy was mainly shaped by economic concerns and especially by the interests of the business people (Kraler, 2004: 2). Between 1980 and 1985, there were 28.000 immigrants in Austria, which did not create an important problem for the labor market. But immigration started to be a more relevant issue, significantly as a result of developments which changed Austria's stance in international politics. Firstly in 1989, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and in 1991 the disintegration of the Soviet Union changed the focus point of Europe, as communism was no longer perceived as a threat. Yet, instead of communism, immigration from the Third World started to be seen as a potential threat. In these circumstances, Austria had a difficulty in continuing its neutrality policy in international politics, and saw the necessity to integrate with Western Europe. Beginning in 1992, it put out new immigrants regulations (Wischenbart, 2007: 73). In that sense, the importance of the European Union for being a part of Western Europe increased and in 1995 Austria became a member of the European Union.

Besides, the breakup of Yugoslavia led to the rise in the number of immigrants. Between 1992 and 1995, about 95,000 refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina started to live in Austria (Jandl and Kraler, MPI, 2003). The mobility of people increased as a result of opening the borders to Eastern and Southeastern Europe (Wischenbart, 2007: 74). This compelled Austria to pursue a more cautious policy, one aimed at preventing the emergence of a multiethnic society. For instance, in the early 1990s, the guest workers system, which foresees a temporary stay in the country, was replaced by the annual quota system, which gave long term residence permits to a limited number of foreigners (EMN, 2004: 4).

The FPÖ was influenced by these developments, as it recognized the rising importance of the immigration issue. In the early 1990s, Haider, as a populist leader, used discourses which addressed people's emotions. He succeeded in promoting the immigration issue as a source of inconvenience and insecurity. In 1993, Haider started a campaign using anti-immigration themes and promoted the twelve point- "Austria First" initiative. In that, Haider proposed to change the constitution of

Austria. Accordingly there should be a new provision in the constitution: “Austria is no country of immigration” (Sully, 1997: 87). By this, he tried to address those who were in the category of “losers” because of modernization and the new immigration wave (Wischenbart, 2007: 85).

According to Haider, Austria should struggle against the criminality of foreigners, strengthen its borders against illegal immigration, and make restrictions on naturalization (Wischenbart, 2007: 77). Furthermore, for Haider, the relation between immigrants and Austria is like parasitism. He argued that immigrants were the main cause of crime and the misuse of the welfare system. Besides, he claimed that unless Austria closed its borders to immigrants, there would be deep cultural conflicts in the country (Tennenbaum, 2000: 33).

In fact FPÖ votes started to rise by 1990. This was no surprise considering the increase in the number of immigrants. Between 1980 and 1985, the number of immigrants in Austria was around 28.000 (Jandl and Kraler, MPI, 2003). But it rose almost four times between 1985 and 1990 and the total number of immigrants became 137.000. Parallel to this development, the FPÖ’s votes raised also. In 1986, it gained 9,7% of the votes, whilst in the general elections in 1990 it had 16,63%, and in 1994 22,5% (Election Resources Website)<sup>13</sup>.

In its manifesto “Contract with Austria” in 1995, the FPÖ called for immigration limits. It was stated that immigration laws should not be softened and potential immigrants should prove that they have a job and accommodation. Moreover, the FPÖ argued that the right of immigrants to be a citizen of Austria after ten years of continual residence should be abolished (Sully, 1997: 126). As with its 2011 party program, in its 1995, manifesto it declared that foreigners who were convicted of a crime should be deported.

In its 1997 party program, the FPÖ drew the borders of the *Heimat*, which means “home country”, and FPÖ defined it as “The Democratic Republic of Austria and its federal states, including the historically settled indigenous groups (Germans,

---

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.electionresources.org/at/nationalrat.php?election=1990>

Croats, Roma, Slovaks, Slovenians, Czechs and Hungarians) and the culture moulded by them. The legal system in Austria presupposes that the overwhelming majority of Austrians is of German origin.” (The Party Program, 1997: 7). So it clearly excluded the ones who were not within the limits of this definition. In the program, it declared that the “home country” has the right not to allow uncontrolled immigration, because it would threaten cultural identity. Besides, it argued that every person who came to Austria has the right to protect his/her cultural tradition and return to his/her country of origin (The Party Program, 1997: 8). In these phrases, the FPÖ’s new far right stance can be seen clearly, as they emphasize the importance of culture rather than race. As a new far right discourse, it claimed that every person can declare their cultural identity and protect it. Moreover, the FPÖ was not in the government at that period, and for this reason it accused the government for its immigration policy (Zaslove, 2004: 110). Besides, for Haider the government had a poor employment policy, as did the industrialists who had close ties with the government and who were also responsible for the immigration problem as they were looking for cheap labor.

The FPÖ entered government in 2000, as a result of parliamentary elections in 1999. It gained 26,9% of the votes, formed a coalition with the ÖVP, and stayed in the government until 2006. Interestingly, by 2002, the FPÖ softened its discourse as a result of coming to power. It started to support the reduction of the number of immigrants, instead of eliminating them totally. Whilst in 1999, the FPÖ had promoted stronger border controls and consistent deportation of foreign criminals, in 2002 it changed the level of opposition. It supported the decrease in immigrant settlement quotas and defended the more effective use of detention prior to deportation (Duncan, 2010: 343).

The presence of the FPÖ in government could be evaluated in terms of its efforts over immigration control and the integration of immigrants into Austrian society. During the first term of the FPÖ and ÖVP coalition in 2000-2003, the government had an annual residence permit quota system, which was put in place by the ÖVP-SPÖ coalition government in 1993 (Duncan, 2010: 344). In 2002 some

reforms were introduced in the Alien Act to expand the number of temporary immigrants, especially highly-skilled ones, by not giving them the right to be a citizen and not guaranteeing their security of long term residence (Kraler, 2004: 2). In other words, the main tendency was limiting the immigration as much as possible with the highly-skilled labor immigrants, as well as increasing the use of temporary workers which was supported by business groups in order to benefit from the immigrants. Moreover, in 2003, the government made amendments in the Asylum Law, which restricted the appeals process of asylum application (Akkerman, 2012: 519). These restrictions limited the submission of new applicants and expanded the possibility of detention for asylum seekers (Duncan, 2010: 347).

As for the integration of immigrants into society, in 2005, by the amendment in the Alien Act of 2002, the application for a residence permit was facilitated and the scope of legal security was expanded on behalf of long term residents (Duncan, 2010: 346). Moreover, by this amendment the Integration Agreement was introduced. In fact, it can be argued that the government tried to make integration of immigrants a legal obligation. So, as Duncan argued, by making reforms in the 2002 Alien Act, the government aimed to make the integration compulsory for the immigrants (Duncan, 2010: 346).

There were two factors preventing FPÖ to have a significant impact on the immigration policies of the government. The first was the interest groups in the ÖVP. When the FPÖ tried to support the application of more restricted immigration policies, especially about labor immigration, interest groups played an influential role. Although the FPÖ was a coalition partner in government, and was therefore expected to be more active in achieving its policy aims, it faced limitations in realizing its aims, which were declared in its party program. Because, employers and traders in the ÖVP, such as the Business League and Chamber of Commerce (Duncan, 2010: 341), had an influential position in the party. Thus, the immigration issue had another meaning besides being a cultural concern. It was a kind of interplay between interest groups such as employers and business groups. And secondly, the FPÖ failed to construct an influential stance against immigration in government

because of its internal conflicts, as, after its entrance to government in 2003, the majority of the FPÖ ministries resigned (Akkerman, 2012:521). And, on 4 April 2005, the coalition government fell, with some members of the FPÖ, forming a new party, the BZÖ.

It was not surprising that the FPÖ lost a significant amount of votes during the elections in 2006. But in 2008, its votes increased again, because of its oppositional stance against the government. In fact, the FPÖ owned its strength traditionally to its anti-systemic stance, which meant that its entrance into the coalition government contradicted this stance.

Although Haider left the party and died in 2008, the FPÖ continued its anti-immigration stance, this time, with a stricter discourse compared to its period of being a coalition partner. In its 2011 party program, the FPÖ rejects that Austria is country of immigrants. It accepts the immigrants who can speak German and have an adequate level of knowledge of Austrian values and laws. For the FPÖ, these are the legitimate immigrants (The Party Program, 2011). In the 2011 party program, the FPÖ limited welfare opportunities for immigrants. For instance, it is stated in the party program that social housing only covers the residential needs of Austrian citizens. Or, again, in the party program, it declares that, for foreign citizens, access to Austrian health care benefits can only be possible if the independent social security system ensures it. So it refuses public support for social security to immigrants. Moreover, it is clearly stated that foreigners are the reason for security problems in the country. Foreigners are the cause of crime and they should be deported to their homeland (The Party Program, 2011).

### **4.3. The National Front in France and Immigration**

Starting with the independence of Algeria from France in 1958, the salience of the issue gradually increased in relation to the rise in the number of immigrants. In 1962, Evian Accords allowed the free circulation of people between France and Algeria. According to Simmons, at that time, although the French authorities were

concerned with the possible consequences of the immigration of Algerians to France, business interest groups demanded for cheap labor and the government had to respond these desires (Simmons, 1996: 152). Until the mid-1970s, immigrants, most of whom had come from Algeria, were seen as a short-term economic source who lived for a short time in the country and had little impact on society.

But according to Shields, during the Presidency of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, the leader of the National Federation of Independent Republicans, the situation of immigrants started to transform. Giscard d'Estaing tried to discourage immigration and construct a balance between strict immigration policies and integration of migrants to the society. For instance, in 1974, he adopted certain restrictive measures for closing the border to immigrants except seasonal workers and political refugees, except in the case of family reunion (Betz, 1994: 71). This restrictive stance was due to the economic crisis, which started in the early 1970s. Increasing unemployment rates led to growing hostility against immigrants in the society. In order to bring a solution to economic problems, Giscard d'Estaing forced the repatriation of immigrants (Simmons, 1996: 155).

During the 1980s, the salience of the immigration issue started to increase. Gradually, families of male workers began to move to France, especially as a result of Giscard d'Estaing's policy for family unification. The right to family unification led to the increase of immigration of families to France. When Mitterrand became president in 1981, he tried to develop policies to the integration of migrants into society. For instance, he proposed some new initiatives like giving the right to vote in municipal elections to migrants who had been living in France for at least five years and expanding the context of citizenship. But these initiatives for integration immigrants into the society were not very successful. Firstly, because of the economic crisis in the 1970s, immigrants were affected negatively and most of them could not find a job. Secondly, since the right for family unification was recognized, the families of male workers came to France, creating discontent in society which increasingly associated crime with migrants (Shields, 2004: 202).

In fact, this situation became beneficial for the FN argued that Mitterrand's initiatives were to make France lose its Frenchness. The anti-establishment and anti-immigration stance bore its fruits: FN votes rose in the 1983 municipal elections and 1984 European elections. In 1983, the FN candidate, Marie-France Stirbois, took 16.72 % of the votes in the first round in Dreux, which was a kind of breakthrough. Besides, in the 1984 European elections, the FN got 10.95% of the votes, which created a significant effect in French politics (Shields, 2004: 205).

From its establishment, the FN had a clear stance against immigration. However, at the beginning, such as in the 1973 electoral campaign, the FN behaved cautiously for not destroying the image of the party and refused the label "racist". It just declared that the party was against uncontrolled immigration (Simmons, 1996: 159). But by 1978, with the effect of economic crisis and the inefficient policies of the government, its discourse became stricter. For instance, in the 1978 election campaign its slogan was "A million unemployed is a million immigrants too many! France and the French first!" (Shields, 2007: 185). The FN linked immigration and unemployment by arguing that immigrants were the source of every problem and in order to solve these problems, immigrants must be forced to emigrate (Simmons, 1996: 80).

The FN's immigration policy was based on the idea of "national preference", which implied that jobs, services, benefits and opportunities would be prioritized on behalf of French citizens. According to "national preference", French citizens should have more rights than immigrant workers, who had legal permission to stay and work in France, and who paid taxes (Hainsworth, 2004: 106). Moreover, Le Pen as a populist leader of the FN, was clearly against immigration. Le Pen always declared that the FN's anti-immigrant stance did not mean that the FN was a racist party. Instead, Le Pen argued that, he was against immigration because; every different culture had a right to survive separately without facing with impact of foreign culture. The FN was anti-immigrant because the party believed that different races, different ethnic groups, different cultures and different people cannot live together;

they should not be mixed and they should protect their own identity (Shields, 2007: 187).

The FN made a distinction between European immigrants and immigrants who had a Third World origin. For the FN, Third World immigrants were difficult to assimilate because of their culture and religion. For this reason, the FN defended strict restrictions like family reunion and social benefits, and supported the return of illegal immigrants to their countries of origin (Shields, 2004: 212). Moreover, Le Pen argued that North African immigrants constituted a serious burden on the French economy, and they were the major sources of unemployment, delinquency and crime (Simmons, 1996: 160).

In the early 1990s, the FN proposed a tougher immigration policy. In 1991, it declared “50 Measures” against immigration. The general framework of measures envisaged giving citizenship on the basis of blood and reviewing all cases of naturalization, since 1974. It supported special taxes on employers, who employed immigrants. It also proposed bringing quotas for immigrant children in schools and deporting illegal and unemployed immigrants and those immigrants who were convicted of crimes (Shields, 2004: 240).

Moreover, according to the FN, there was a link between the European Union, immigrant workers and social crisis. For the FN, the principle responsible for the “collapse” in the society was immigrants, especially Muslim immigrants. One of the mottos of the FN was “No to Islamization of France!”. According to the FN, the EU was the promoter of the multicultural approach as it gave, for instance, the right to vote to immigrants. It saw the EU like a project of big world government, which destroys the structure of society with its economic and social policies (Vardar, 1997: 33).

In its 2001 party program, the FN argued that immigration should be totally banned, stricter penalties should be implemented on airline carriers and employers, and family reunion rights and facilities should be abolished. In brief, for the FN, there should be zero immigration to France (Hainsworth, 2004: 106). Moreover, the

FN defined the nation as a rooted, historical, traditional and ethnically inspired entity, which could be destroyed by alien values and anti-national influences like Third World immigrants, Islam, European integration and globalization (Hainsworth, 2004: 107). In fact the FN as a new far right party dealt with protecting indigenous culture against foreign values like American popular culture and the Islamic religious lifestyle (Betz, 2004:1). The FN argued that non-European immigrants could not integrate into French society, and this would create a danger for peace and welfare of France (Vardar, 2004: 153).

Shain argued that, the issue of immigration which was initially a labor market issue, turned into an issue of integration and national identity, and was transformed into a problem of education, housing, law and order and citizenship (Shain, 2006: 283). Furthermore he stated that, by the establishment of government by Socialist Lionel Jospin in 1997, the issue of immigration became more than a labor market issue. It started to be perceived as a problem of integration, national identity, citizenship and law and order. Because the FN gained 14,94% of the votes in the 1997 legislative elections, Jospin needed to respond to the rise of the FN. He established a commission on immigration and nationality policy reform and foresaw a change in the legislation which had been in force since 1993. These laws, called “Pasqua Laws”, named after the Minister of Interior Charles Pasqua, were enacted to tighten controls over immigration. They prohibited foreign graduates from accepting job offers by French employers and denying them a stable residence status, increased the waiting period for family reunification from one to two years, and denied residence permits to foreign spouses who had been in the country illegally prior to marrying (Guiraudon, 2002: 3). By this, Jospin aimed to overcome the influence of the FN in society about the immigration issue.

During the late 1990s and early 2000s, the leading position of the FN over the immigration issue increased. Jean-Marie Le Pen argued that the party tried to stop ongoing immigration and establish a national preference system, which prioritized citizens in job and welfare opportunities. Moreover, it would be more difficult for current immigrants to obtain citizenship and many would be expelled (Economist,

2002). According to him, immigrants, especially Muslim immigrants, were a big threat for society. For him, Islam was the “oldest son” of immigration, and Muslim immigrants were like an unarmed army which was more dangerous than a normal military army (Libération, 2012).

The 2002 presidential elections showed that the FN’s anti-immigration stance resonated with the public as Jean-Marie Le Pen got 16,9% of the votes in the first round. A lot of people were anxious about the immigrants because they thought that they were the cause of crime and unemployment. Hence it can be said that at that time a lot of people were not happy with the immigration policies of the politicians, which they claimed were inadequate to overcome the problems created by immigrants. But, in the 2007 presidential elections, Le Pen got only 10,4% of the votes, which meant that he lost almost 6%. One of the reasons for the decrease in his votes was his rival Nicholas Sarkozy’s influential election campaign about the immigration issue. For instance, Sarkozy proposed to create a Ministry of Immigration and National Identity to address immigration, promote and defend the culture and values of the French Republic by asking immigrants to learn French before arriving in France. Moreover, he made security and fight against crime a major component of his election campaign. He also stressed the non-negotiable nature of French values, tightened the rules for family reunification, and prohibited the re-entry of unauthorized immigrants who have been removed from France to their home country etc. (MPI, 2007)

In the 2011 electoral campaign, the new leader of the FN, Marine Le Pen, initially criticized the EU over immigration policy. She complained that because of the EU, France cannot define its immigration policy individually. According to her, every year growing number of immigrants came to France, which is too high a number to integrate into the society. And as France could not integrate these immigrants, cultural conflict would increase. Marine Le Pen explained that the FN was against immigration for three main reasons. First, immigration is not a humanist project; instead it is an instrument for strong capital, which has had negative impacts on the social rights of French workers. Second, immigration has a huge cost for the

country and, lastly, mass immigration is a kind of poison against national cohesion since because of it, there is growing Islamization which will weaken the French national identity (Website of National Front)

In fact, the relation between immigration and the rise of the FN's votes was questioned by some authors. For instance, Shvets argued that people who were living with immigrants were mostly accepting foreigners as more than enemies (Shvets, 2004: 4). According to Perrineau, in the regions where the daily interaction with the immigrants was high, the xenophobia was low. But, Perrineau also argued that in districts which were close to the regions with a large concentration of immigrants, fear of "the other" played an important role in the increase in FN votes (Perrineau, 2000: 264).

#### **4.4. The Danish People's Party in Denmark and Immigration**

In the 1960s, although there were guest workers in Denmark, immigration did not emerge as a problematic issue. This was because there were low numbers of guest workers and at that time the unemployment rate in Denmark was quite low. But by the mid-1980s the salience of the immigration issue had increased, especially because of the rise in the number of refugees. According to Bjorklund and Andersen, although the attractiveness of the immigration problem rose by the 1980s, it was not hostility, just a kind of awareness (Bjorklund&Andersen, 1999: 2).

In Denmark, there were high minimum wages, expanded social benefits and high barriers for jobs to immigrants. For this reason, in Denmark immigrants mostly did not have a huge place in the labor market. Instead they had a high dependency on welfare benefits (Green-Pedersen& Odmalm, 2008: 370) because, immigrants had less opportunity to work as cheap labor. Moreover, in the early 1970s there were efforts to limit labor immigration, and according to Green-Pedersen and Odmalm, trade unions had an impact on these efforts as they opposed the further immigration in Denmark (Green-Pedersen& Odmalm, 2008: 370).

In Denmark, immigrants were seen as a threat to Western values, culture and democracy (Meret, 2009:127). Especially during the early 2000s, Danish culture and values were seen as identical to Western culture and values. So, instead of prioritizing Danish identity, Western values had a significant place for cultural discourse (Meret, 2009:127). The DF did not place significant emphasis upon identity. It did not say that immigrants are a direct threat to the Danish identity. Instead, it emphasized that immigrants lack the fundamental principles of Danish society, like solidarity, collective interests, equality, tolerance, and working hard (Meret, 2009: 109). So the problem was cultural differences, not the superiority of the Danish identity over the immigrant's identity. Rather the main problem was that immigrants that could not internalize the main characteristics of the society.

In Denmark in the early 1980s, parliament proposed a more liberal immigration law. A law was adopted which proposed more rights to asylum-seekers and made the expulsion of foreigners difficult. The government's liberal stance against immigration was because of the concern of Liberals and Conservatives about losing the support of Social Liberals. During the 1980s, Social Liberals were a significant majority in the parliament in which the Liberal-Conservative coalition needed its support. Social Liberals are strong defenders of the immigration and multi-culturalism (Rydgren, 2010: 67), and the party has a left stance against non-economic issues, like law and order, environment, and immigration. So as Pedersen and Odmalm argued, the restrictive policies of Liberals and Conservatives on the immigration issue would mean that they could lose the support of Social Liberals, which threatened the government's survival (Green-Pedersen&Odmalm, 2008: 371).

Immigration became a political issue in the mid-1980s. The Danish Progress Party emphasized economic, cultural and social problems which could occur as a result of the increase in the number of immigrants and it wanted to tighten the measures against immigrants (Meret, 2009:23). In the manifesto of the Danish Progress Party, it was stated that foreigners would be welcomed to the country only if they did not impose extra social expenditure or risk increasing crime. The party called for the tightening of family reunions, limiting access to Danish citizenship so

that it would only be given to people who were able to care for themselves and had sufficient knowledge of Danish language and culture (Bjorklund&Andersen, 1999: 7). Moreover, the Progress Party stated that refugees should not be integrated into society and should not be stay permanently. According to the party, the right to vote in local elections for immigrants who stayed three years in the country should be abolished (Bjorklund&Andersen, 1999: 8). The main framework of the immigration policy of the Progress Party was welcoming the immigrants as long as they could provide basic needs for themselves and their family without requiring aid form Danish citizens (Meret, 2009: 116).

During the mid-1990s, the importance of the immigration issue raised significantly. Its increasing importance affected the agenda of the newly-established DF. It saw immigration as a burden on the welfare state and wanted to take measures like cutting down the number of immigrants coming to the country and guaranteeing citizens priority on welfare benefits. In other words, the welfare state must serve those who have paid for the state; namely tax payers (Meret, 2009:107). For the DF, the rights which would be given to immigrants could just be a reward for his or her successful efforts to integrate into Danish society in social, economic and cultural terms (Meret, 2009: 117).

The DF affected the politics of government through its influential stance against immigration, although it was outside the government. For instance, in 1997 there were some problems because of the Somalian refugees, which led to the emergence of discussions over the integration issue. At that time the supporters of the DF increased from 7,4% to 12%. When the DF gained 7,4% of the votes in the 1998 election, the leader of the Liberals, Rasmussen, realized the rising importance of the immigration issue (Green-Pedersen&Odmalm, 2008: 373). The Liberal Party used the immigration issue as a tool for gaining support against its rival Social Liberal government. These both increased the media focus on the issue, and legitimized the DF's stance against immigration, since the DF was perceived as a far right party (Bjorklund&Andersen, 1999: 25).

As a response, the Prime Minister Rasmussen deposed its Ministry of Interior by arguing that he was the responsible for the inadequate policies against refugees. According to Bjorklund and Andersen, although the DF lost its supporters which it recently gained because of the government's policy change over immigration, this event shows the ability of the DF for shaping the policies of government (Bjorklund&Andersen, 1999: 25). Moreover, as a result of the 2001 elections, government coalition of Conservatives and Liberals needed the support of the DF against Social Liberals, so DF became a significant supporter of the government and found a place for being effective on policies of the government.

In 2001, DF tried to take the attention to the new immigrants who were mostly of Middle Eastern origin. It argued that they could not be integrated into Danish society. Danish citizenship can only be given to one who accepts and assimilates the Danish culture, values and principles (Meret, 2009:120). In its 2001 party program, the DF clearly stated that immigration is a threat which would lead to a transformation from a homogeneous society to a multicultural society which is the cause of tensions and conflicts (Meret, 2009: 111).

In its principles which were framed in 2002, the DF stated that Denmark is not an immigrant country and it rejected the transformation of Denmark into a multiethnic society. Denmark could accept foreigners if they did not destroy the security and democratic government (Principprogram, 2002). Recently, in its party program the DF stated that because of the effect of immigration it has become hard to provide sustainable development. The place where Third World countries can find a solution for their problem is not Denmark; rather they should focus on their country and try to develop the main values of Western culture in their country. Moreover, the DF wants to bring tougher rules for family reunion and citizenship. It argued that as long as the immigrants carried out their commitments and responsibilities to Denmark and contributed positively to Danish society, they could have an opportunity acquire citizenship and permission for family reunion (Policy of Immigration, Website of DF).

#### **4.5. The Differences and Similarities between the FPÖ, FN and DF Regarding Immigration**

The FPÖ, FN and DF have a lot of similarities regarding the immigration issue. This is because immigration is the main issue for far right parties to enhance their support, and also because of the similar development of immigration as an important issue in Austria, France and Denmark. In all countries between the 1960s and 1980s immigrants were generally “guest workers”. After the 1980s immigrants wanted to stay at the country in which they were working and started to bring their families. This caused a problem for governments. Moreover, in the beginning of the 1990s, the dissolution of the Soviet Union changed the threat perception from communism to immigrants. The anti-immigration theme prevailed in the international arena. During this period, political parties realized the potential for gaining votes over the immigration issue.

There were some differences in Denmark when compared with the situation in France and Austria. These countries, in contrast with Denmark, were affected more by WWII both economically and culturally. First of all, the necessity of recovering from the economic situation and handling the labor force from outside was much clearer. So, although in France and Austria it was quite easy for immigrants to find a job, as the employers were looking for cheap labor, Denmark had no such a necessity.

Secondly, as an impact of the fascist invasion during the war, it can be said that France and Austria were more sensitive to the protection of culture against foreign effects. In these countries immigration was seen as a threat to the national identity. But in Denmark, immigrants were seen as a threat mainly to Western values, culture and democracy (Meret, 2009:127).

Moreover, especially France and Austria come to same line in their discourses about protecting national identity against immigrants. For instance, in 1995 the FPÖ started “Austria’s First” initiative which stated that Austria is no

country of immigration, so Austrians were placed first in contrast with immigrants. Similarly, FN published “50 measures” against immigration by arguing “France and the French first”. Besides, the FPÖ defines fatherland as *Heimat* by excluding the ones who didn’t have German and Austrian origin. The FN also has also a national preference policy which excludes the ones who do not belong to the French nation. It can be said that in contrast to the exclusive policies of the FPÖ and the FN, the DF is not as hostile to immigrants as they were not seen direct as a threat to identity, because in Denmark cultural differences were not seen as a problem for Danish identity. In that respect the DF is anti-immigrant not by arguing the superiority of Danish identity over immigrant identity, but because it believes that immigrants cannot embrace the main characteristics of society. But it can be said that in France and Austria, the immigration issue emerged as both an instrument and a consequence of hostility. But in fact the effects of immigration on culture were common amongst the FPÖ, FN and DF. They conditioned that only the immigrants, who accept the values of society and harmonized their tradition with these values can be integrated. For all of them, Muslims are perceived as incompatible within the ‘host’ society.

The most significant difference between the FN and the FPÖ and DF was its ability to affect the government’s immigration policies. Although the FN has never been in government, it has an impact on political leaders who need to take stricter measures against immigration. For instance, when the FN got considerable a considerable portion of the vote in the 1997 elections, President Lionel Jospin saw that its discourses about immigration gained a response from the public. Hence, he created a commission about immigration and national policy and tried to overcome the influence of the FN on the public. Moreover, after the striking success of the FN in 2002, Nicholas Sarkozy built an influential presidential election campaign on the immigration issue in 2007.

It can be said that the FN’s ability to affect the political agenda regarding the immigration issue is higher than the FPÖ and DF’s. Although the FPÖ was in government between 2000 and 2005, it wasn’t able to impose pressure on the coalition government. It was mainly because of strong relations with the government

and interest groups that the coalition government was always cautious about applying restrictive measures as a result of the concerns of business people. Moreover, in Denmark, in contrast with Austria, business people made an effort to limit immigration. This was a significant difference from Austria where traders and employers encouraged cheap labor. Although the DF has not been in government as a result of its critical position regarding Liberals and Conservatives, it could find a way to effect the government's immigration policies. As mentioned above the government needs the support of the DF against the Social Liberals in parliament. In that respect, the DF influenced the government in taking restrictive measures against immigration.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **GLOBALIZATION**

#### **5.1. Introduction**

In the early 1970s, especially the oil crisis of 1973, a significant economic crisis occurred throughout the world. In fact, it was because of the crisis of the capitalist mode of production. Capitalism entered a crisis in the 1970s, especially because of its need to expand the scope of capital. As Ellen Meiksins Wood argued, because of its systemic imperatives like competition and profit maximization, capitalism requires self-expansion (Wood, 2003: 131). Hence, capitalism needs to move beyond national borders. This need of capitalism brought neoliberal policies into the international area. Neoliberal policies reflect a kind of transformation in the economic field, which has impacts on the social and political realm as well. According to Wood, this transformation leads to the deepening of globalization. In that sense, globalization is both a kind of impetus for internalization of capital and a process which is intensified as a result of the imperatives of capitalism.

According to Stephen Gill, globalization serves the formation of a universal world economy which operates transnationally and is controlled by transnational firms (Gill, 1995: 405). Thus, by the effect of globalization, capital, which traditionally remained in the borders of the nation-state, moved cross border, and found itself new areas for creating new investments and money and expanding industrial production. As a result, especially by the early 1980s, the economic system

started to be shaped by neoliberal economic policies, which are defined by Gill as a discourse of political economy that promotes the power of capital through an extension and deepening of market values and disciplines in social life (Gill, 2002: 47).

In that sense, it is a fact that globalization and neoliberalism are simultaneous concepts that cannot be evaluated separately. Globalization has political, economic and cultural effects upon nation states. Cas Mudde argued that it linked politically to the USA's dominance in world politics, where economic globalization brought the control of world economy under US-based multinational corporations or institutions like the World Bank. Parallel with these, cultural globalization foresees the dominance of the American way of life (Mudde, 2007: 185). However, in reality, globalization expresses more than the multi-dimensional dominance of the USA. It is somehow a bearer of neoliberal policies which promote transformation in society.

Moreover, it can be argued that economic globalization is the driving force of political and cultural globalization. Economic globalization promotes the internationalization of capital, which can be seen as an economic process. It also shapes the state structures which need to secure the ownership of capital (Picciotto, 1993: 45). In that sense, in order to make neoliberal structural adjustments, transformations in state structures and social orders become necessary. The reasons for this necessity will not be examined in the context of the thesis. However, it is important to point out that the neoliberal structural adjustments like reduction of public health and educational provisions, monetary restraint, cut budgets, repaying of debts, removal of subsidies etc. can be seen as one of the reasons for the rising support to far right parties (Gill, 1995: 408). Moreover, Gill argued that restructuring processes over neoliberal policies led to social inequality, social and economic insecurity (Gill, 1995: 420), which are the main tools of the far right that they use to gain support in their election campaign.

Furthermore, economic globalization also led to a transformation by neoliberalism from industrial society to post-industrial society. Post-industrial society decreased production, especially in traditional sectors, and increased services

and technologies. The eroding effect of post-industrialism over traditional sectors changed the profile of workers by opening more opportunities for high skilled workers than low skilled ones. In this respect, low-skilled workers were affected negatively, so they were against globalization. In fact, far right parties benefited from this new reality also.

In this framework, as Borussalian argued, globalization of the nation state means its integration into the international market under the context of neoliberal policies (Borussalian, 2012: 2). Then, when the state's integration into the international market increased and when it combined with the increased mobility and the neoliberal policies of the state, unemployment of low-skilled workers increased. As a result of labor market mobility, the attractiveness of cheap labor increased and immigration intensified. Capital mobility gave employers a chance to seek cheaper labor markets and lower restrictions for employing foreign workers (Borussalian, 2012: 3). To attract and keep foreign investment, the nation-state imperatively regulated its rules and immigration policy. Thus, globalization decreased the ability of the state to apply its own macroeconomic policies. Because capital has an instable structure there was always a risk of losing foreign investment (Borussalian, 2012: 5). Since foreign investors favor low taxes, the states regulated their tax policies. Then, applying welfare state policies became difficult for a nation-state and it turned into trouble for governments. This reality suggested a new opportunity for the far right.

Besides, it can be said that deepening of globalization and expanding of neoliberal policies showed itself also in the Maastricht Treaty by bringing new steps for further economic integration in Europe. Creating the Eurozone area caused the reactions of far right parties with a concern to protect national sovereignty. Besides, the financial crisis that started in 2008 had negative effects on the countries that are in the Eurozone area. According to Bastiaan van Apeldoorn the crisis reveals that European Union has legitimacy problems while it controls economic policies in supranational level, it could not manage its national effects adequately (Van Apeldoorn, 2009: 26). Moreover, Hartleb argued that the crisis concretized the separation between the "givers" and takers" of the advantage of the economic

integration (Hartleb, 2012: 51). In that respect Eurozone crisis led to the increase in the future concerns of the society and to the decline in trust to both governing elites and European Union. As a result, far right parties started to find a way to gain more support.

Hence, all of these factors affected far right parties' stance on globalization. According to Cas Mudde, in contrast with neoliberal form of economy, the far right supports economic nationalism and welfare chauvinism, which means that the economy should be controlled just by the nation state and it should be organized by promoting the welfare of the people in the country (Mudde, 2003:5).

In terms of the effects of globalization on the rise of the far right parties, three main effects can be discussed. The first one is that by the effect of globalization and economic crisis, not only the economic but also social and political life has begun to transform since the 1960s. Globalization led to a transformation of state structures which led states to feel the effects of world economic crisis more than in the past. As will be pointed out, economic crisis spread easily all over the world and as a result, the mainstream parties in power entered a troubling situation. They mostly had unsuccessful economy policies, and mismanagement of the increasing mobility of workers around the world raised unemployment, especially amongst low-skilled workers.

The second effect of globalization is over cultural identity, which has started to change at the beginning of the 1970s as a result of permanent borders. People in one country started to encounter other identities and cultures more, especially with the help of communication and commodities which carry cultural characteristics across borders. The main discourse was about the destructive effect of globalization upon cultural identity, as multi-cultural society always had a potential for conflict and erosion of the national identity because of the incompatible character of the cultures.

The final effect is that as a result of globalization far right parties found opportunities to concentrate on "new politics". Especially after WWII, the economy

in Europe started to recover itself and the welfare of people gradually increased. As a result, people's economic concerns were displaced by different, more individual concerns (Poguntke, 1987: 77). According to Thomas Poguntke, in societies which had concluded their modernization, problems which industrialization created, like ecological issues and the effect of the development of information technology upon human rights, occurred (Poguntke, 1987: 77).

Information technology gained influence, which led to an increasing awareness of people both regarding themselves and the issues around them. Thus, individualization increased as the particularization amongst people rose. According to Betz, by the effect of globalization, identities and political loyalties became differentiated. Globalization opened a way to new parties for dealing with new issues and found a new space, if traditional parties were unable or unwilling to compete with them (Betz, 1994: 35). So, especially in the late 1960s, by the effect of the transition to post-industrial society, the importance of "externalized" people like homosexuals, and the environment increased, which far right parties used as a tool for gaining votes. Hence, by the term "new politics", I want to emphasize issues which are apart from the traditional understanding of politics. They are the issues distinct from general political, economic and social politics, like inflation, health, security etc.

Although "new politics" are related strictly with economic, political and social issues, they have different reflections in daily politics. Poguntke argued that "new politics" have three main characteristics: firstly, issues like protecting the environment, and having more participatory rights and self-realization come to the agenda. Secondly, these issues are voiced by boycotts, demonstrations and blockages that are not traditional methods. Finally, people who support new issues are generally youths, the middle class and excluded from the production process (Poguntke, 1987:78). In that respect, far right parties find an opportunity to promote issues of "new politics" and take the support of people who are sensitive towards them.

The FPÖ, FN and DF have policy stances against globalization and the spread of neoliberal policies. In fact all three parties used the effects of globalization as a

tool to increase their votes. But it should be noted that whilst the Freedom Party in Austria benefited much more from the anti-system discourse by criticizing the government for its weak response against neoliberal effects on the economy, the National Front in France dealt heavily with the impact of globalization upon cultural identity by strictly emphasizing the corrosive effects of globalization on identity. Lastly, the Danish People's Party benefited from the emergence of new issues more than the anti-system stance and the focus on cultural identity. These and their reasons will be discussed in the following sections.

## **5.2. The Freedom Party in Austria and Globalization**

The Freedom Party of Austria established its anti-globalization discourse by opposing government policies. These policies were affected by globalization and related to its neoliberal policies. The FPÖ has had an anti-system stance since it was established soon after the end of World War II. Since then, FPÖ has criticized the structure of the Second Republic of Austria and claimed that government had incorrect policies. Essentially, the FPÖ formed its basic ideology against the “taboos and self-deception” in the Second Republic which was a product of the Nazi past (Murphy, 2004: 300).

As a result of a series of crises in Austrian society since the 1960s, and the decline of economic and political stability in the 1980s, Austrian society started to change. When economic policies and society started to change, the political system had to change. It was problematic for the parties in power since 1945 as strong partners of coalition, the ÖVP and SPÖ, whether they could adapt themselves to the changing structure of economy and social life by transforming their political stance. It seems that these, the most powerful parties of the post-war period had difficulties adapting themselves to the transformative structure of Austria, especially starting in the early 1970s. The need for adopting new policies to cope with the effect of transformative developments was revealed when their votes started to decline, while the vote of FPÖ had started to rise by 1986.

When examining the characteristics of the two main parties in Austria, it is important to understand the effects of globalization upon them and how the FPÖ destroyed their dominance in Austrian politics. Shortly, after WWII, the ÖVP and SPÖ benefited from the concern for building a nation and necessity of avoiding the threat of communism (Chan, 2008: 33). Representing the Catholic and Socialist traditions, the ÖVP and SPÖ formed a “grand coalition” which had remained effective in Austrian politics and governed the state until the 1990s. The coalition government stabilized its presence by the help of its relations with some interest groups in the country. According to Chan, the mutual arrangement between the ÖVP and SPÖ was beneficial because it gave both parties and interest groups direct control over their ideological, political and socio-economic interests (Chan, 2008: 22).

Furthermore, with the help of the Proporz system, the grand coalition enhanced its presence in Austrian politics. The Proporz system, which was a kind of governance that depends on balanced administrative structure among both political and economic actors, foresaw a negotiating process and cooperation between interest groups and the parties in the government. Thus, the governance of the country was somehow a corporative management among government and interest groups. The ones who questioned the system were unable to change it, because the interests of trade organizations and state were intertwined (Chan, 2008: 34). In addition, auxiliary organizations reinforced the coalition by affecting social life and helping to spread loyalty among members of the party. By the help of these organizations, parties gained support of blue collar, urban, self-employed business people, farmers and white collar urban workers (Chan, 2008: 24).

When globalization accelerated and neoliberal policies spread the interest groups were affected economically because the necessity for transformation appeared and the transformative effects of neoliberalism showed in the early 1980s in the grand coalition. The SPÖ and ÖVP started to make economic reforms by enacting measures like tax reform, deregulation, efficiency in payment of state subsidies, nationalized industry management and balanced budgets (Chan, 2008: 42) These

reforms affected the relations between interest groups and state negatively, also did the effectiveness of the Proporz system which reflected a covert consensus among interest groups and the government.

Globalization expanded the scope of industrial production. Moreover, the growth of industry and services opened new opportunities to people, which gave way to the white collar workers to handle new job opportunities, in contrast with blue collar and self-employed business people (Chan, 2008, 36). Besides, it affected the agricultural sector and farmers. Hence, the economic situation destroyed some of the votes of the main parties ÖVP and SPÖ. Because, on the one hand the people who work for the agriculture or service sectors were affected because of the transformation towards industrial production. On the other hand, the profile of employed people started to change because of the increased mobility of people around the world. According to Sully, most of the people felt that they had been left in a bad position by the government (Sully, 1997: 4).

Most of the votes of self-employed and blue-collar workers moved to the FPÖ. White collar workers had much more secure jobs with better working conditions, but blue collar workers had less job security and less space to move to another job with higher quality working conditions (Chan, 2008: 58). Hence, while the white collar workers could handle the effects of increasing worker mobility around the world, blue collar workers had little opportunity to cope with the negative effects of the mobility of workers. For this reason, they were obliged to work with lower wages, since the wages decreased as a result of an increasing number of immigrant workers. As a consequence, in the 1986 elections 15% of self-employed and 11% of blue-collar voted for the FPÖ, in the 1999 election FPÖ votes increased to 33% and 48% (Luther, 2001: 5).

Recently, in the 2013 election campaign Starche argued that if the FPÖ comes to the power, Austria will not pay to the countries that experienced bankrupt like Greece and he criticized government for not opposing to give money aid to the countries that have economic problems. FPÖ raised its votes when it compared with

2006 elections. In contrast with 2006 elections that it got 11% of votes, in the 2013 elections FPÖ gained 20,5 %of the votes (Election Resouces Web Site).

The response of the FPÖ, especially the policies of Haider, against the negative situation created by globalization, was very effective. Haider benefited from the frustration of the people against government and became the hope to break down the duopoly of the ÖVP and SPÖ, who were the names of corporative government. This hope showed itself firstly in the 1986 elections, which was the year of Haider's leadership in the party. In 1986 the FPÖ gained a considerable amount of the vote, almost 10%, and became the second party after the SPÖ.

In fact, during the 1980s the FPÖ stood against the effect of neoliberal policies by, for instance, opposing privatization. But the main target was the government. Throughout the 1990s, which was the rising period of the FPÖ, it developed significant discourses and policies against the government and the negative effects of globalization. In 1995 it declared the "Contract with Austria". It was a kind of manifesto which argued that there has been an underdeveloped democracy in Austria. Democracy should be more direct and public opinion should be considered more (Sully, 1997: 17). According to Haider, Austria was under the control of a powerful bureaucracy and parties which were corrupt. Moreover, he emphasized that these parties were applying inadequate financial policies, and for this reason people in Austria had economic difficulties. So according to Sully, the aim of the Contract was to abolish the Second Republic, which was established after 1945 by passive participation of the public and domination of elites, and establish a Third Republic (Sully, 1997: 21).

In short, the FPÖ argued that there should be some change in Austrian politics. For the Third Republic, the FPÖ foresees flexibility, for which Haider argued "Call it what you will, Third Republic, it's only a working title." (Sully, 1997: 35). Thus, the main claim of the FPÖ was that there should be power for the public. For the FPÖ, civilization was threatened by bureaucracy who want a culture of irresponsibility, which was incompatible with freedom. In contrast to the government's culture of irresponsibility, Haider in 1995 argued that the goal of the

party was to minimize the state, where the people could take more responsibility over governance (Sully, 1997: 38).

As Murphy argued, the FPÖ was somehow a representative of the modernization of Austrian politics, which broke down the old cleavages (Murphy, 2004: 298). Duopoly of traditional parties was destroyed and opened a new area in the political rivalry. This helped the FPÖ to normalize its policies in the eyes of the people. Such much so that, especially in the late 1990s the main parties started to handle the same issues as the FPÖ according to the effect of voter concern.

During the mid-1990s and 2000s, the FPÖ had a liberal stance. In the FPÖ's party program, which was declared by its leader Heinz- Christian Strache at the Party Conference in June 2011, the neoliberal stance of the FPÖ barely showed itself. As it was stated in the program, the party supported the market economy and the protection of the private property. But it is important to point out that although party has a clear neoliberal stance, it tries to establish the balance between liberal and welfare concerns, as it emphasizes the healthy labor market and reduction of the taxes, and advocated the policies of farmers (The Party Programme, 2011). Hence, FPÖ continues to criticize economic policies of government.

As mentioned above, the impact of globalization over cultural identity that was caused by increasing mobility and blurred borders, can be seen as another factor in the rise of the votes of the far right. But the FPÖ did not intensify its discourse on the destructive character of globalization against Austrian cultural identity. For the FPÖ, Austrian culture is a part of German culture. In other words, the FPÖ defines Austria as a part of the German cultural region and gives importance to the cultivation of German culture and language (Sully, 1997: 46). The opposition of the FPÖ to the adverse effect of cultural identity derived mainly from its criticism against government. According to Murphy, Haider executed its critique of culture by attacking the Second Republic and the Proporz system (Murphy, 2004: 301). He criticized the artists, writers etc. as being the servers of neoliberal system.

Even so, in its party program the FPÖ emphasized the importance of culture. It is argued that respecting and protecting the culture of the country is important. Besides, the party is against the reduction of European culture to the EU and it rejects the formation of diverse European cultures by the effect of multiculturalism and globalization (The Party Programme, 2011).

The FPÖ has been using the benefits of promoting the new political areas, which gained more importance as a result of globalization. It started to emphasize “new politics” in the Haider era. He spoke on the relation between the destruction of the environment and the economy. He argued that the exploitation of nature for scientific purposes by human beings and technological and economic development threatened the worldwide economic system (Sully, 1997: 49). In its 2011 party program, the FPÖ began a title named “homeland, identity and environment” by again emphasizing the significance of natural protection. In it, the main argument is the importance of protecting the natural environment that is the basis of the existence of Austrians in the homeland. Hence, it is pointed out that biological diversity is essential. In this respect animals should be protected. It is also stated that the FPÖ rejects the use of nuclear power to generate energy (The Party Programme, 2011).

In fact it can be easily argued that the reaction of the FPÖ against globalization was focused on an anti-government and anti-system stance. In other words, it was against the negative effects of economic transformation in the context of globalization. The FPÖ argued that it was the government which was responsible for the bad effects of globalization. Thus, the FPÖ developed its stance over globalization by trying to destroy the government’s reliability among people. In short, the focus point of the party was government.

### **5.3. The National Front in France and Globalization**

The National Front in France was established in 1972, which can be seen as a critical period for overall transition of the world. Like the other two parties, the policies of the FN were also affected by globalization. Both the effects of globalization and its response of FN to these effects increased FN's support and gave FN an influential position in French politics. Different from FPÖ and DF, the cultural identity side of this response had a heavy status in its politics.

In fact the effects of globalization on the rise of the FN first can be explained by the dynamics in the government during the late 1970s and early 1980s. Inefficient economic policies of government in the 1980s led to a rise of FN votes. It can be said that there were three significant parties in French politics during the 1970s and 1980s. These were: the conservative UDF (Union for French Democracy) led by Valéry Giscard D'Estaing; RPR (Rally for Republic) the Gaullist party Jacques Chirac was leader of which represented a liberal stance, and lastly, there was the Socialist Party of François Mitterrand.

From 1974 to 1981 Giscard D'Estaing was President and Raymond Barre was the Prime Minister. But, according to Kitschelt, in the early 1980s, the division in French politics between Conservatives and Liberals progressively acquired starker differences in economic policy. This was because of the state-interventionist economic policy of the conservative government and Chirac's tendency towards neoliberal policies. Kitschelt argued that the hesitation on economic policies between interventionist and liberal created new ambition in voters so they started to search for a new alternative (Kitschelt, 2008: 96). As a result, in 1981 Mitterrand increased his support and became the President of the country. According to Simmons, by the Presidency of Mitterrand, France experienced the most radical change in economic policies since WWII (Simmons, 1996: 72). This was because of Mitterrand's expanding control over the economy, which he aimed to nationalize on behalf of pensioners and children etc. But the economic policy of Mitterrand led to an increase

in inflation, the unemployment rate and trade deficit, besides the investment fell down, especially because of the rise in taxes (Simmons, 1996: 72).

Starting with its establishment, the FN was generally in favor of liberal policies, such as supporting the free market economy and privatization: reducing state intervention. According to Shields, it was interesting that the FN did not emphasize corporatism, like the other extreme right movements that saw corporatism as a third way between capitalism and socialism (Shields, 2007: 189). Rather, the FN had a clear liberal stance that was useful for gaining support in the 1970s. As mentioned above, the Mitterrand period's economic policies led to frustration among the French people. This was one of the factors in the rise of the FN's votes in the 1984 parliamentary and regional elections, as it got almost %10 of the votes (Shields, 2007: 192).

However, by the mid-1990s the supportive policy of the FN over neoliberalism started to change. One of the significant factors behind this was the increasing salience of issues about the effects of globalization, both economic and cultural. According to Sophie Meunier, as a result of the debates over the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, which established the European Union's current form, the debates on the economic effects of globalization increased. In fact, due to the extending effect of globalization, the necessity for expanding capital markets could be seen as one of the reasons behind the Maastricht Treaty. It aimed to tackle the economic effects of globalization by deepening European integration.

As Meunier put it, the controversial essence of Maastricht led to an awakening amongst the public about the possible effects of increasing capital movements and the sharing of French sovereignty with a supranational organization (Meunier, 2004: 135). According to Meunier, starting with the debates over Maastricht, the globalization issue's rise in salience amongst the public, related to the anxiety of the French people about the acceptance of market capitalism by political leaders and the destruction of French sovereignty (Meunier, 2004: 135).

As mentioned, the FN's economic policies through the 1980s shifted when it came to the 1990s. Globalization had a significant impact over this transformation. The awareness amongst the public against the effects of globalization increased. The FN turned its face gradually from liberal policies to a social welfare understanding of the economy and protectionist policies. Since the mid-1990s the FN had been against the instrumentalism of national industry to global competition and supported the reduction of the tax burden, regulation of tariff barriers to overcome the negative effects of international competition, and opposed to the filling of jobs by immigrants (Shields, 2007: 273).

In fact the people who were not content with developments could be seen as the "losers" of the neoliberal economic policies of the 1980s. The people who had low skills and a low level of education were much more affected by these policies. For Le Pen the government was primarily responsible for this situation. He argued that issues like unemployment reflected the failure of the socialist government, and claimed that post WWII prosperity had been paralyzed for 30 years by the socialists. In fact he argued that almost everyone except himself was responsible for the bad economic situation. He proposed a solution: "French renaissance and a new defense of workers and the French people." (Berezin, 2005: 271).

Moreover, Marine Le Pen also tried to draw attention to victims of globalization. Recently in her speech Marine Le Pen claimed that the FN had important supporters from small shopkeepers and working classes who were afraid of modernization and globalization. Moreover, she avoided labelling them as supporters of the "right". Rather she preferred to label them as "neither nor-ers", which meant that they were neither left nor right. They were the people who were aware of the fact that no other party cares for them except the FN (Williams, 2011: 692).

Not only economically, but also identically Maastricht Treaty affected people. It led to controversies about sovereignty and the identity of the member states. There is no doubt that the FN benefited from these debates. The Maastricht Treaty established a three pillar structure which contains economical, juridical and common foreign and security policy cooperation among the member states of the European

Community. This opened new concerns about the identity issue. The term “Europeanization” and the giving of more rights to the EU, especially in political matters, constituted the main concerns of the people. Moreover, as a result of recent economic crisis FN increased its critics over European Union and to government not to leave it. In its 2014 European elections campaign, it argued that there is an imbalance in the redistribution of welfare among the member states and this will be caused the collapse of the system and the ones who are facing with problems should leave the Eurozone (House of Commons Library, 2014: 5).

As mentioned in the Chapter II, the leader of the GRECE organization - which can be seen as one of the roots of the FN - Alain de Benoist heavily emphasized the cultural issue. According to him, the Enlightenment and the French Revolution were the main reason for the “collapse” and “degeneration” in French culture (Vardar, 2004: 118). Emphasis on the degeneration of culture can be easily seen in the FN as well. But in the case of the FN, the reason for degeneration and collapse was globalization and post-industrial society, because they opened a way of living together with other cultures. In the 2011 party program, it was stated that the French culture and language have crucial importance in terms of identity, and are threatened by globalization. So, to protect the culture and language a national policy should be developed and French culture should be extended all over the world.

The increasing opposition among people against global market mobility and transfer of sovereignty because of the Maastricht Treaty to led an increase in Le Pen’s political attractiveness. In 1992 the FN started a campaign against Maastricht: “No to Maastricht, Yes to Europe des parties!” (Shields, 2007: 242) Moreover, during 1993 the FN made some movements against GATT, emphasized the protection of the national economy, and advocated the deportation of foreigners from the country (Güzel, 1995: 67).

For instance, according to FN the responsibility for the bad situation in the agriculture sector belongs to GATT and the EU. So, France should leave these organizations and establish its own national system under the Sixth Republic. The

FN also had ambitions to establish a new Republic by abolishing the Fifth Republic which had been continuing since WWII.

Discourses of the FN concerning new politics like environment, food security and animal protection, found more place in the party program, especially after the leadership of Marine Le Pen. Before Jean-Marie Le Pen, there was more severe discourse over “externalized” people. In its 2011 party program, the FN emphasized concern that in the long run ecology was very important in order to leave a healthy area for future generations. According to the FN the problems about the environment were closely related to globalization in that they bring the economic problems and international migration together. For this reason, ecologic problems should be the part of the political project. They are closely related with the security of the country (Website of National Front). Although new politics also affected the FN’s support, it can be said that it was not very influential for supporters of the FN, like promoting the issues of culture, immigration and economic in the context of globalization.

#### **5.4. The Danish People’s Party in Denmark and Globalization**

The Danish People’s Party can be seen as a different case, in contrast with the FN and FPÖ. This is because of the characteristics of the Danish economy. It was affected by globalization in a different way. Unlike France and Austria, since the beginning of industrialization in the mid-19th century in Denmark, there has been a consensus between the capitalist class and workers. It was kind of a participative transformation. As Klaus Nielsen and Stefan Kesting pointed out, in Denmark there has been symmetry between capital and labor relations. Denmark’s economic system was somehow a “democratic corporatism” that continued with the cooperation of capital owners and labors. Market competition was seen as an engine of growth, and has been combined with state intervention. In Denmark, the state aimed to provide fair functioning of the market and equal distribution of income (Nielsen&Kesting, 2003: 2).

Although globalization and neoliberal policies had a repressive effect on macro-economic policies and the welfare state, Denmark was successful in handling these effects. It gave priority to enhancing structural competitiveness and reducing unemployment. Moreover, it is interesting that even though globalization provided mobility around the world which in the end had a negative effect on low-skilled workers of the country, Denmark did not witness problems like unemployment of low-skilled workers. It is hard to say that low skilled workers started to give more support to the far right in Denmark because of employment problems. Rather it tried to enhance the knowledge and skills of those workers by education and training (Nielsen&Kesting, 2003: 11).

So, it is difficult to say that the impact of globalization turned people's votes from mainstream parties to the DF. The DF had not many opportunities to criticize the Liberal Party and Conservative Party which were at that time the most influential parties in Denmark. Firstly, this was because of the quiet successful policies of these parties in government during the late 1970s and 1980s. The capacity to deal with inflation and unemployment was comparatively good. Unlike the other two countries, the DF could not raise its voice against the bad policies of the government. Secondly, the DF had a parallel economic understanding with government. As Meret stated, during the 1970s and 1980s the Progress Party focused on the abolishment of taxes and less state intervention, more privatization and liberalization of the economy (Meret, 2009: 101). Because according to the Progress Party, the solution to economic problems like unemployment and inflation could be possible by abolishing taxes. So, establishing equilibrium between favouring neoliberal and welfare economic policies was parallel both in the Progress Party and the parties in the government.

After the establishment of the Danish People's Party in 1995, the economic policies of the party moved from a neoliberal line to pro-welfare line. Firstly, this was because of the increasing salience of the immigration issue by the mid-1980s. Secondly, the leader of the DF, Pia Kjaasgerd, recognized the potential of welfare issues for attracting more votes. Meret argued that electoral support would increase

when the welfare issue coupled with immigration, law and order discourse (Meret, 2009: 103). The party started to emphasize the free trade and self-regulative structure of the market as a stimulator for welfare opportunities. According to Meret, the economic stance of the DF at that time reflected welfare chauvinism and the effects of globalization (Meret, 2009: 108).

In the early 2000s, the DF started to define globalization and international capital as threats to the solidarity in Denmark, whilst trying to show itself as a protector of values like freedom, equality etc. (Meret, 2009: 110) In fact, although the DF seems discontent by the effect of globalization over society, the critical stance was not heavily on the government but the process. As a result of the 2001 elections, the DF became a significant supporter of the government, especially as a result of power struggles between conservatives and liberals. So, the DF anti-system stance intensified on the system of globalization, but not the system of government. The DF had a kind of consensus with Liberals and Conservatives, as it provided an opportunity for them to tackle the Social Liberals.

Moreover, opposition of the DF against globalization comes from the idea that globalization was also a threat for the homogeneous character of society. According to the DF, different cultures were not incompatible, but when the issue comes to put cultures which have distinct features together, it would be a danger which could erode the fundamental values of society (Meret, 2009: 111). In its 2002 party program, the DF stated that culture, which was the formation of the history, experiences, beliefs, and language of people, should be protected and strengthened. It was the prerequisite to survive as a free and enlightened society. Hence, the DF would never accept a transformation to multicultural society (The Principle Program of the DF, 2002).

Another effect of globalization was the increasing importance of “new politics” in the political field, which far right parties especially tried to use for its benefit. It can be said that in Denmark, new politics were effective tool for gaining support. This was because as mentioned above, the DF didn’t have much cause to criticize government because of its economic policies or because of the negative

effects of globalization on cultural identity. Since the DF had strategic relations with Conservatives and Liberals to be a part of the government and since the DF supported them to avoid presence of Social Liberals in the government, it was hard to be against the government.

Hence, emphasizing new political areas opened a good way for the DF increase its votes. The new politics that emerged as a result of the increase in industrial production, mobility of globalization and increasing importance of the “individual” include some debates over environmental concerns, immigration, and gender politics, or excluded people etc. For instance, in the DF’s 2002 party program, it was stated that Denmark should work to protect national and international resources to provide a clean and healthy environment for the next generations. Moreover, starting from its establishment, the DF supported the Muslim women whom it considered to be oppressed because of the cultural traditions of Islam. For the DF, if Muslim women decide to wear a headscarf in the West it could have been for two reasons: it may be imposed by her father or husband, or she uses it as a protector from sexual harassment. Interestingly, the party had a discourse that it would help the emancipation of the Muslim women (Meret, 2009: 131).

### **5.5. Differences and Similarities of the FPÖ, FN and DF Regarding Globalization**

As previously stated, globalization and neoliberal policies had three important impacts on the FPÖ, FN and DF: change of economic situation, “destructive” effects of globalization on cultural identity, and emergence of new political issues. Hence, while comparing the far right parties regarding globalization issue, these effects will be analysed.

It can be said that both the FPÖ and FN benefited from the negative effects of the policies of governments on the society. But they differed in their source of reaction to the government. The FN had had a neoliberal stance since its establishment. This continued until the 1990s when it realized that using the negative

impacts of neoliberal policies was useful for gaining more support. But at the beginning of the 1980s, while Mitterrand was President, because he used socialist economic policies that led to inflation and unemployment at that time, FN criticized Mitterrand for not applying more liberal economic policies. During the 1980s the FPÖ was against neoliberal policies and accused the ÖVP and SPÖ coalition of causing unemployment and inflation as a result of their liberal economic policies. Hence, when France is compared with Austria during the 1980s, the situation was a kind of reverse. Because, although in Austria the government's neoliberal tendency led to a loss of votes, and the FPÖ stood against these policies, in France the FN was against Mitterrand's state-interventionist policies and supported the neoliberal mood. So, it is clear that the conjunctural situation in the country was effective to determine the stance of the far right parties.

The DF had a different situation. It is difficult to say that the impact of globalization turned people's votes from mainstream parties to the DF. In contrast with the FN and FPÖ, the DF had not many opportunities to criticize the Liberal Party and Conservative Party which were at that time the most influential parties in Denmark. Because of the welfare tradition of Denmark, during the 1980s the economic situation was not very much affected by neoliberal policies.

Although globalization and neoliberal policies had a repressive effect on macro-economic policies and the welfare state, Denmark was successful at handling these effects. Hence, it is hard to say that low skilled workers started to give more support to the far right in Denmark because of employment problems, as it was in France and Austria. The reason was that Denmark recognized the threat of the unemployment of low-skilled workers, but unlike with other countries, it did not cut wages or welfare benefits. For this reason, the DF could not find a place to criticize government. Rather it criticized the system that globalization and neoliberal policies imposed.

When issue came to the destructive effect of globalization on cultural identity, this time the FPÖ differs from the FN and DF. The FPÖ was in favor of protecting German identity besides Austrian identity. It did not claim that Austrian

identity was superior compared with all other identities. Hence, although openness of borders raised concerns over multi-cultural society, the FPÖ did not see globalization as a direct threat to Austrian identity; instead it criticized government for not protecting German and Austrian culture effectively as a result of the government's policies to give priority to the benefits of interest groups. In contrast with the FN, there is no discourse emphasizing the superiority of the Austrian identity and culture when faced with the threat of globalization. However, when we looked to the FN it was clear that it focused on the cultural identity issue. Although it criticized the government because of its bad economic policies regarding the effect of globalization, the FN had more discourses on the destructive effect of globalization on the cultural identity of France. For the FN globalization was mainly responsible for the destruction of French culture and the values of the society. Hence, it can be said that the FN stimulated effects of globalization on cultural identity more than the FPÖ and DF.

Besides, DF claimed that globalization destroys homogeneity in society and it affects Danish culture negatively. But the emphasis on negative effects on cultural identity was not strong, as it was in FN. This was because of the historical development of national identity of Denmark. While France gave more importance to the identity issue, in Denmark it had not as much salience as in France, as it discussed in early chapters.

It can be said that all parties came to an almost identical line, when the issue came to the new political areas. Although when compared with the FPÖ and FN, new politics gave more of a way for the DF to gain support, the FPÖ and FN also benefited from issues like environment, nuclear energy, etc. to increase their support. As a result of globalization and neoliberal economic policies, the DF could not find an adequate place for criticizing the economic situation and for promoting cultural sensibilities. For this reason new political issues were much more important instrument for the DF, than the FPÖ and FN. On the other hand, for instance emphasizing protecting French culture was a more useful tool, whilst criticizing government was a good way for the FPÖ to raise its votes.

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **CONCLUSION**

This thesis examined the considerable recent rise of far right parties, with a particular focus on the three important of them, the FPÖ, FN and DF, in European politics, and compared them in three different parameters: national identity building process, immigration and globalization.

First of all, this thesis argued that during the 1980s far right parties started to rise by separating themselves from their predecessors who had a fascist tradition. The 1980s can be seen as a break down regarding the consequences of neoliberal policies in the economy, the cultural impacts of globalization and the emergence of immigration as a problem for most of the European states. Besides, the thesis found it crucial to analyse the FPÖ, FN and DF, the ones who had the most significant rise in those years. In that respect, the thesis first looked at their historical background to understand their ideological development. Examining historical development is important for understanding their ideological progress.

In this framework, when the historical developments were examined, the DF was seen as a different case when compared to the FPÖ and FN, because Denmark did not have a fascist past like Austria and France, or no colonial past like France. This affects the ideological stance of the parties. While the FPÖ and FN had links with fascist parties, the DF did not have such an experience. Furthermore, Austria's close relations with Germany and the impact of Nazis in the country, especially until WWII, led the FPÖ to become pro-German, such that the FPÖ is still defending the

protection of German identity beside Austrian national identity. Moreover, it accepts the Nazi past of Austria clearly. Also in France, its experience of Nazi invasion caused a fascist tendency in the country and there were movements whose ideological background affected the ideas of the FN. But in contrast with the FPÖ, FN always denies its linkage with fascist tradition and the Nazis, and tried to stand as a distinct actor. France's colonial past led to a problem about immigrants, especially after the independence of Algeria, so that the FN had stricter discourses against immigrants when compared with the FPÖ and DF. Moreover, the thesis found that historically all these three parties got their striking votes in almost the same period: the FPÖ got its highest result in 1999, the FN gained huge amount of votes in 2002 and the DF got a considerable amount of votes in 2001. Besides, in the last European Parliament elections all three parties gained a significant amount of votes and emerged as first party in their country.

This thesis compared the FPÖ, FN and DF regarding national identity building process, immigration and globalization. While comparing the FPÖ, FN and DF regarding the national identity building process, the thesis first examined identity construction in Austria, France and Denmark. In that respect the thesis found that, although national consciousness in France and Denmark emerged almost in same period, during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, awareness of Austrian identity was revealed just after WWII, because of the strong German influence until that time upon Austria. Besides, reasons for the emergence of national consciousness differ from one country to another. In Austria it was the concern to survive as an independent state. In France national identity emerged for responding to the power of the King, and in Denmark Danish identity prevailed as a result of weak industry and a strong peasant tradition. But it is similar for all countries that German unification in 1871 affected the national identity construction. Whilst in Austria it led to strengthening of German identity, in France it caused more protective policies and a perception of Germany as an enemy, and in Denmark it increased solidarity and closed society to foreign effects so that peasant ideology gained more importance on the formation of Danish identity.

The influence of the national identity building process on the FPÖ, FN and DF is significant. As a result of the strong impact of Germany on Austria, Austrian identity had always had a linkage with German identity, so that for the FPÖ, German identity was an indispensable part of Austrian identity, and German culture should be protected carefully. Whilst the French Revolution had an impact on the development of identity, the FN saw the Revolution as mainly responsible for the deterioration in French identity. For the FN, pure French identity could be found before the Revolution. But in contrast with the FN and FPÖ, the national identity understanding of the DF differs because it emerged by opposing welfare issues in the country as a result of its peasant tradition. It did not have a clear stance for promoting Danish identity, it had concerns for protecting the welfare and peasant tradition in Denmark.

Despite these differences, all three parties had a similar perception of nationhood. For the FPÖ, FN and DF, nationhood should have a common heritage, history, language and culture. Moreover, all three of them argue that the European Union as a supranational organization negatively affects national identities. Policies of the EU like common currency, common foreign policy and European citizenship have destructive effects on their identity. But while the FN is defending exit from the EU, the FPÖ and DF are against deepening cooperation by accepting that limited cooperation is beneficial for European countries.

After WWII, most of the European countries demanded cheap labour in the process of recovering their economics. For this reason, they accepted “guest workers”. But, these workers turned out to be an integration problem during the 1980s. This situation opened a way for far right parties to use the economic and cultural effects of immigration as a tool for gaining support. They argued that immigrants were mainly responsible for the crime rate, unemployment and increase in social expenditures. They aimed to gain support of the lower and middle classes who were affected negatively by the existence of immigrants.

In that respect, the thesis discussed the differences and similarities between the FPÖ, FN and DF regarding the immigration issue. In Austria, France and

Denmark, immigration emerged as a problem during the 1980s. Because the profile of immigrants started to change from European-orientated to Muslim people and the concept of “guest workers” gradually lost its meaning. The thesis found that although immigration was a significant problem for all three parties, the FPÖ and FN had more sensitivity over the issue. For them, immigrants were a direct threat to the cultural homogeneity of the country. Both argued that, different cultures could not live together. Immigrants had destructive effects on Austrian and French identities, therefore foreigners must go back to their countries. Hence, they were clearly exclusionist against immigrants. But in the DF, main opposition was not for the destructive effects of immigrants on Danish identity, but society. In other words, for the DF, immigrants became a problem when they could not compromise with the main characteristics of the society.

Moreover, the thesis argued that when the FPÖ, FN and DF are compared regarding the immigration issue, another important difference is revealed when the issue came to affect the immigration policies of governments. In that respect the FN and DF differ from the FPÖ regarding their ability to affect the immigration policies of government, although they were not in government. The discourses of the FN on immigration and immigrants led its votes to rise, so that the leaders of France had concerns about losing their support. As a result of this concern, they started to use harsher discourses and applied some restrictive policies against immigration; a clear example is Nicholas Sarkozy. Moreover, the DF also had an impact on immigration policies, especially of the Conservative-Liberal government during the early 2000s. Despite the fact that the DF was not in government, as a significant supporter of government, it found a way to influence the government to take-restrictive measures on immigration. But, in contrast to FN and DF, although FPÖ was in government between 2000 and 2005, it could not have an impact on the immigration policies of the government. This was because strong relation between ÖVP, coalition partner of FPÖ, and interest groups. Interest groups and business people were clearly benefiting from immigration. For this reason ÖVP remained conservative about taking restrictive measures for immigration. Hence, FPÖ did not find a way for applying preventive policies to immigrants.

The thesis argued that during the 1980s, as a result of the problems of capitalism, neoliberal economic policies emerged as a solution and the process of liberalization of markets, increasing competition, decreasing state intervention, supported by globalization that blurred the borders among nation states. As a consequence of this situation, on the one hand governments started to limit their welfare policies, on the other hand permanent borders raised people's concerns that their national identity would be damaged. At this point, far right parties emerged as severe critics of governments.

In this framework, the thesis also compared the FPÖ, FN and DF regarding the effects of globalization. In the thesis three important effects were discussed and the parties on the issue were compared in respect of these effects. The first effect of globalization is its supportive feature of neoliberal economic policies that affected governments negatively during the 1980s. The FPÖ and FN clearly benefited from negative effects upon governments. They strongly claimed that the government had incorrect policies. But they differ in their point of reaction. During the 1980s, whilst the FN opposed government for not applying neoliberal policies, the FPÖ objected to the neoliberal economic policies of the coalition government that led to a rise in inflation and unemployment. On the other hand, the DF could not find a way of criticizing government by claiming about the incorrect economic policies during the 1980s. Because of the strong welfare tradition in Denmark the government could handle negative impacts effectively.

The second effect of globalization was on cultural identity. Regarding this issue, the FPÖ differs from the FN and DF. Because of the fact that for the FPÖ German identity is important besides Austrian identity, although it had concerns over the effects of globalization on culture, the FPÖ primarily criticized government for not protecting German identity alongside Austrian identity. For the FN, globalization was mainly responsible for the destruction of French culture and values. The impact of globalization over culture was very important for the FN. Besides, the DF also emphasized the destructive effects of globalization on cultural identity, but it can be said that it was not much stronger than the FN. Furthermore, the third effect of

globalization was about the emergence of new politics. In that respect, the thesis argued that all three parties used new political areas for gaining support. They all emphasized the environment issue by underlining the importance of protecting the environment, opposing nuclear energy etc.

The thesis aimed to present important aspects of far right parties which led significantly to their rise. In that respect, the FPÖ, FN and DF are important examples as they are significant actors in their country. Although the thesis analysed the prominent differences between these parties, the main factors that prompted their rise are the perspectives in which the FPÖ, FN and DF are compared. National identity building process affects the far right parties to determine “non-national” elements and promote their discourses regarding “the others”. Besides, as a result of anti-immigrant stance, they attracted the votes of people who are negatively affected from immigrant workers and who had a sensibility about multicultural society. And also, globalization and neoliberal policies are strong instruments for these far right parties to criticize the government, to focus on what they perceive as destructive effects on cultural identity and to use new political issues as a tool for gaining support.

## REFERENCES

### I- BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Akkerman, Tjitske. (2012), “Comparing Radical Right Parties in Government: Immigration and Integration Policies in Nine Countries (1996-2010)”, *West European Politics*, 35 (3), pp. 511-529.

Aktoprak, Elçin. (2009), *Devletler ve Ulusları Batı Avrupa’da Milliyetçilik ve Ulusal Azınlık Sorunları*, Ankara, Tan Kitabevi Yayınları.

Andersen, Jørgen Goul. (2003), “The Danish People’s Party and New Cleavages in Danish Politics” *Department of Economics, Politics and Public Administration*, Aalborg University.

Anderson, Benedict. (1983), *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London and New York, Verso.

Berdah, Jean-François. (2007), “Citizenship and National Identity in France from the French Revolution to the Present”, *Frontiers and Identities*, pp. 141-153.

Berezin, Mabel. (2006), “Appropriating the ‘No’: The French National Front, the Vote on the Constitution, and the ‘New’ “, *Political Science and Politics*, 39 (2): pp. 269-272.

Betz, Hans-Georg. (1994), *Radical Right Wing Populism in Western Europe*, London, The Macmillan Press.

Betz Hans-Georg. (1993), “The New Politics of Resentment: Radical Right-Wing Populist Parties in Western Europe”, *Comparative Politics*, 25(4): pp. 413-427.

Blinkhorn Martin. (2000), *Fascism and the Right in Europe, 1919-1945*, Longman.

Bjørklund Tor. & Andersen, Jorgen Goul. (1999), “Anti-immigration Parties in Denmark and Norway: The Progress Parties and the Danish People’s Party”, *Politics and Public Administration Aalborg University*.

Bjørklund, Tor. & Andersen, Jørgen Goul (2002), “Anti-Immigration Parties in Denmark and Norway: The Progress Parties and the Danish People’s Party”, in M. Schain, A. Zolberg and P. Hossay (eds.), *Shadows over Europe: The Development and Impact of the Extreme Right in Western Europe*, New York, Palgrave.

Brincker, Benedikte. (2009), “When did the Danish Nation Emerge? A Review of Danish Historians’ Attempts to Date the Danish nation”, *National Identities*, 11(4), pp. 353-365.

Brubaker, Rogers. (2009), *Fransa ve Almanya’da Vatandaşlık ve Ulus Ruhu*, Ankara, Dost Yayınları.

Campbell, John L. & Hall, John A. (2010), “Defending the Gellnerian Premise: Denmark in Historical and Comparative Context” *Nations and Nationalism*, 16 (1), pp. 89–107.

Çitak, Zana. (2006), “Fransa’da Laiklik ve Milliyetçilik: 1905 Kilise-Devlet Ayrılığı Yasası”, *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi*, 38 (9), pp. 145-160.

“Denmark During the Cold War National Security Policy and the International Environment 1945-1991”, (2005), *Danish Institute for International Studies*.

Duncan, Fraser. (2010), "Immigration and Integration Policy and the Austrian Radical Right in Office: the FPÖ/BZÖ, 2000–2006", *Contemporary Politics*, 16 (4), pp. 337-354.

Ellinas, Antonis A. (2010), *The Media and the Far Right in Western Europe : Playing the Nationalist Card*, New York, Cambridge University Press.

Fieschi, Catherine. (2004), *Fascism, Populism and the French Fifth Republic in the Shadow of Democracy*, New York, Manchester University Press.

Freeman, Heather Berit. (2002), "Austria: The 1999 Parliament Elections and the European Union Members' Sanctions", *Boston College International and Comparative Law Review*, 25 (1), pp. 109-124.

Gellner, Ernest. (1983), *Nation and Nationalism*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Gellner, Ernest. (1996), "The Coming of Nationalism and Its Interpretation: The Myths of Nation and Class", in Gopal B. (eds.), *Mapping the Nation*, New York, Verso.

Greenfeld, Liah V. (1992), *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Greenfeld, Liah V. (1991), "The Emergence of Nationalism in England and France", *Research in Political Sociology*, 5, pp. 333-370.

Gill, Stephen. (1995), "Globalisation, Market Civilisation and Disciplinary Neoliberalism", *European Journal of International Relations*, 24 (3), pp. 399-423.

Gill, Stephen. (2002), "Constitutionalizing Inequality and the Clash of Globalizations", *International Studies Review*, 4 (3), pp. 47-65.

Guiraudon, Virginie. (2002), "Immigration Policy in France", *National Center for Scientific Research*.

Güzel, Şehmus. (1995), *Fransa'da Aşırı Sağ ve Irkçılık*, İstanbul, Belge Yayınları,

Green-Pedersen, Christoffer. & Odmalm, Pontus. (2008), "Going Different Ways? Right-wing Parties and the Immigration Issue in Denmark and Sweden", *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15 (3), pp. 367-381.

Hainsworth, Paul. (2004), "The extreme right in France: The rise and rise of Jean-Marie Le Pen's Front National", *The Journal of Representative*, 40 (2), pp. 101-114.

Hartleb Florian. (2012), "European Project in Danger? Understanding Precisely the Phenomena "Eurocepticism, Populism and Extremism" in Times of Crisis", *Review of European Studies*, 4 (5), pp. 45-63.

Hoffmann, Stanley. (1993), "The Nation, Nationalism, and After: The Case of France", *The Tanner Lectures On Human Values*, Princeton University.

Ignazi, Piero. (1996), "New Challenges: Post Materialism and The Extreme Right". *Estudio/Working Paper*, No. 91: pp. 1-30.

Jeltema, Laura A. (2001), *Politics for the People: The Significance of Austrian National Identity in the Rise of the FPÖ*, Honors Theses, Paper 910.

Jennings, Jeremy. (2000), "Anti-Semitic Discourse in Dreyfus-Affair France", in Arnold, Edward (ed.), *The Development of the Radical Right in France*, New York, St. Martin's Press.

Jensen, Tina Gudrun. (2008), "To Be 'Danish', Becoming 'Muslim': Contestations of National Identity?", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(3), pp. 389-409.

Karner, Christian. (2005), "The 'Habsburg Dilemma' Today: Competing Discourses of National Identity in Contemporary Austria", *National Identities*, 7(4), pp. 409-432.

Karner, Christian. (2011), *Negotiating National Identities*, England, Ashgate Publishing.

Kitschelt, Herbert. (1997), *The Radical Right in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*, University of Michigan Press.

Knight, Robert. (2000), "Contours of Memory in Post-Nazi Austria", *Patterns of Prejudice*, 34(4), pp. 5-11.

Korsgaard, Ove. (2006), "The Danish Way to Establish the Nation in the Hearts of the People" in Campbell, John L., Hall, John A., and Pedersen, Ove K. (ed.), *National Identity and the Varieties of Capitalism The Danish Experience*, Canada, McGill-Queen's Press.

Knudsen, Ann-Christina L. (2005), "The Danish General Election of February 2005", Election Briefing No.19, *European Parties Elections and Referendums Network*.

Kraler, Albert. (2004), "Immigrant and Immigration Policy Making- A Survey of the Literature The Case of Austria", Country Report, *First Annual Imiscoe Conference*.

Kumar, Krishan, (2006), "English and French National Identity: Comparisons and Contrasts", *Nations and Nationalism*, 12 (3), pp. 413–432.

Langer, Josef. (1999), "Last in, First out?- Austria's Place in the Transformation of National Identity" in Kriesi, Hanspeter, Armingeon, Klaus, Siegrist, Hannes and Wimmer, Andreas (ed.), *Nation and National Identity*, Indiana, Purdue University Press.

Leconte, Cecile. (2005), "The Fragility of the EU as a 'Community of Values': Lessons from the Haider Affair", *West European Politics*, 28 (3), pp. 620-649.

Luther, Kurt Richard. (2009), "The Revival of the Radical Right: The Austrian Parliamentary Election of 2008", *West European Politics*, 32(5), pp. 1049-1061.

Marcussen, Martin. & Risse, Thomas. & Martin-Engelmann, Daniela. & Knopf, Hans J. & Roscher, Klaus. (1999), "Constructing Europe? The Evolution of French, British and German Nation-State Identities", *ECISA International Conference*, Pittsburgh.

Matsuoka, Yuki. (2003), *Historical Memory and National Identity Comparison between Austria and Japan*, Master Thesis, European University Center for Peace Studies

Meret, Susi. (2009), "The Danish People's Party, the Italian Northern League and the Austrian Freedom Party in a Comparative Perspective: Party Ideology and Electoral Support" Aalborg University SPIRIT PhD Series, Thesis no. 25.

Meunier, Sophie. (2004). "Globalization and Europeanization: A Challenge to French Politics", *French Politics*, 22(2), pp. 125-150.

Migration Policy Institute (MPI), “*Immigration and the 2007 French Presidential Elections*”, No. 3, May 2007.

Morrissey, Jill. (2012), *The Republic of Austria: A State Without a Nation*, Master’s Thesis, The Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Brandeis University.

Mudde, Cas. (2007), *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*, Cambridge, UK, New York, Cambridge University Press.

Mudde, Cas, (2010), “The Populist Radical Right: A Pathological Normalcy”, *West European Politics*, 33: pp. 1167-1186.

Murphy, Anthony. (2004), “The Rise of the Austrian Freedom Party in the 1990s: A Culturalist Approach”, *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, 33(3) , pp.297-307.

Nielsen, Klaus. & Kesting, Stefan. (2003), “Small is Resilient-the Impact of Globalization on Denmark”, *Review of Social Economy*, 61 (3), pp. 365-387.

Noi, Aylin Ünver. (2007), *Avrupa’da Yükselen Milliyetçilik*, İstanbul, IQ Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.

Østergaard, Uffe. (1992), “Peasants and Danes: The Danish National Identity and Political Culture”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34 (1), pp. 3-27.

Østergaard, Uffe. (2000), “Paradox and Dilemma -Danish National Identity between Multinational Heritage and Small State Nationalism” in Branner, Hans and Kelstrup, Morten (eds.), *Denmark’s Policy towards Europe after 1945: History, Theory and Options*, Odense University Press.

Østergaard, Uffe. (2006), “Denmark: A Big Small State - The Peasant Roots of Danish Modernity” in Campbell, John L., Hall, John A., and Pedersen, Ove K.

(ed.), *National Identity and the Varieties of Capitalism The Danish Experience*, Canada, McGill-Queen's Press.

Özkırımlı, Umut. (2008), *Milliyetçilik Kuramları Eleştirel Bir Bakış*, Ankara, Doğu-Batı Yayıncılık.

Öztan, Gürkan G. (2007), "Korporatizm: Özgürlükten Yoksun Bir Üçüncü Yol Vaadi", *19. yy'dan 20. yy'a Modern Siyasal İdeolojiler*, (der. H. Birsen Örs), İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Pedersen, Mette. (2011), "National identity versus Islam-A comparative discourse analysis of the Danish People's Party, the PVV & the Sweden Democrats", *Master's Thesis*, Aalborg University Culture, Communication and Globalisation.

Picciotto, Sol. (1993), "The Internationalisation of the State", *Capital and Class*, 43 (1), pp. 43-63.

Rydgren, Jens. (2010), "Radical Right-wing Populism in Denmark and Sweden: Explaining Party System Change and Stability." *The SAIS Review of International Affairs*, 30(1), pp. 57-71.

Schain, Martin A. (2006), "The Extreme-Right and immigration policy-making: Measuring direct and indirect effects", *West European Politics*, 29 (2), pp. 270-289.

Shields, J.G. (2007), *The Extreme Right in France From Pétain to Le Pen*, New York, Routledge.

Simmons, Harvey G. (1996), *The French National Front, The Extremist Challenge to Democracy*, Oxford, Westview Press.

Smith, Anthony D. (1986), *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Smith, Anthony D. (1991), *National Identity*, London, Penguin Books.

Smith, Anthony D. (2008), *The Cultural Foundations of Nations*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Sully, Melanie. (1997), *The Haider Phenomenon*, New York, Columbia University Press.

Taş, Mehmet. (1999), *Avrupa'da Irkçılık*, Ankara, İmge Yayınevi.

Tennebaum, Silvia. (2000), "Haider's Culture War", *The Nation*, pp. 31-35.

Thaler, P. (2001), *The Ambivalence of Identity: The Austrian Experience of Nation-building in a Modern Society*, West Lafayette, Purdue University Press.

Turner-Graham, Emily. (2008), "Austria First": H.C. Strache, Austrian identity and the Current Politics of Austria's Freedom Party", *Studies in Language and Capitalism*.

Van Apeldoorn Bastian. (2009), "The Contradictions of Embedded Neoliberalism' and Europe's Multilevel Legitimacy Crisis: The European Project and its Limits" in Van Apeldoorn B. , Drahoukoupil J., Horn L.(ed.) *Contradictions and Limits of Neoliberal European Governance*. Palgrave.

Vardar, Deniz (2004), *Aşırı Sağ'dan Populist Radikal Sağ'a Fransa Örneği*, İstanbul, Bağlam Yayınları.

Yılmaz, Ferruh (2012), "Right-wing Hegemony and Immigration: How the Populist Far-Right Achieved Hegemony through the Immigration Debate in Europe", *Current Sociology*, 60 (3), pp.368-381.

Williams, Michelle Hale. (2011), "A New Era for French Far Right Politics? Comparing the FN under two Le Pens", *Análise Social*, 46 (201), pp. 679-695.

Wischenbart, Rüdiger. (2007), "National Identity and Immigration in Austria-Historical Framework and Political Dispute", *West European Politics*, 17 (2), pp.72-90.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins. (2003), "Globalisation and the State: Where is the Power of Capital?", Saad-Filho A. (ed.) *Anti-Capitalism, A Marxist Introduction*, London; Pluto Press, pp. 127-142.

Zaslove, Andrej. (2004), "Closing the door? The Ideology and Impact of Radical Right Populism on Immigration Policy in Austria and Italy", *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 9(1), pp. 99-118.

Zimelis, Andris. (2010), "Imagining Nations: Benedict Anderson's Imagined Communities and Jorg Haider's "Austrian" Nationalism", *Academic Journal*, 9 (2), pp. 5-27.

*European Migration Network. (2004), The Impact of Immigration on Austria's Society.*

## **II- CITED ELECTRONIC RESOURCES**

Borussalian, Kasia. "Labor Market Insecurities and the Rise of Far Right Parties", *Journal of Political Inquiry*, <http://jpi-nyu.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/JPI2012Borussalian1.pdf> (accessed on 23.03.2012)

Fazakarley, Jed. "Racism Old and New at Handsworth, 1985", <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=13-fazakarley-april2010-2&site=15> (accessed on 23.08.2014)

Leidig, M. (2000), "*Haider Derides EU over Sanctions*", *The Telegraph*, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/austria/1355405/Haider-derides-EU-over-sanctions.html>. (accessed on 04.03.2014)

Mudde, Cas. (2003), “Globalisation and the Extreme Right Backlash”, [socialhistory.org/sites/default/.../mudde.doc](http://socialhistory.org/sites/default/.../mudde.doc) (accessed on 17.04.2014)

Wistrich, Robert (2000), “The Roots of Haiderism”, <http://www.ajiac.org.au/review/2000/253/essay253.html> (accessed on 04.03.2014)

“France’s Front National (FN)”, (2014), *House of Commons Library*, [www.parliament.uk/briefing.../SN06925.pdf](http://www.parliament.uk/briefing.../SN06925.pdf) (accessed on 28.08.2014)

[http://www.fpoe.at/fileadmin/Content/portal/PDFs/2012/2012\\_parteiprogramm\\_englisch\\_web.pdf](http://www.fpoe.at/fileadmin/Content/portal/PDFs/2012/2012_parteiprogramm_englisch_web.pdf) (accessed on 04.03.2014)

[http://www.fpoe.at/fileadmin/Contentpool/Portal/PDFs/Parteiprogramme/Parteiprogramm\\_eng.pdf](http://www.fpoe.at/fileadmin/Contentpool/Portal/PDFs/Parteiprogramme/Parteiprogramm_eng.pdf) (accessed on 04.03.2014)

[http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/Udl%C3%A6ndinge-\\_og\\_asylpolitik.asp](http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/Udl%C3%A6ndinge-_og_asylpolitik.asp) (accessed on 21.12.2013)

[http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/The\\_Party\\_Program\\_of\\_the\\_Danish\\_Peoples\\_Party.asp](http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/The_Party_Program_of_the_Danish_Peoples_Party.asp) (accessed on 21.12.2013)

[http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/Dansk\\_Folkepartis\\_principprogram.asp](http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/Dansk_Folkepartis_principprogram.asp) (accessed on 21.12.2013)

<http://www.frontnational.com/le-projet-de-marine-le-pen/avenir-de-la-nation/culture/> (accessed on 03.06.2014)

<http://www.electionresources.org/at/nationalrat.php?election=1986>  
(accessed on 03.06.2014)

<http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=105>  
(accessed on 15.03.2012)

<http://electionresources.org/at/nationalrat.php?election=1994>  
(accessed on 03.06.2014)

<http://www.economist.com/node/1011490> (accessed on 03.06.2014)

[http://www.liberation.fr/politiques/2012/09/22/a-la-baule-les-le-pen-jouent-la-fermete\\_848169](http://www.liberation.fr/politiques/2012/09/22/a-la-baule-les-le-pen-jouent-la-fermete_848169) (accessed on 15.03.2012)

[http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/arc/2087\\_01.htm](http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/arc/2087_01.htm) (accessed on 03.06.2014)

<http://world.time.com/2012/05/03/french-presidential-election-marine-le-pen-haunts-the-sarkozy-hollande-debate/> (accessed on 03.05.2012)

<http://www.nytimes.com/2000/09/10/world/identity-crisis-for-denmark-are-we-danes-or-europeans.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm> (accessed on 03.06.2014)

<http://www.irishtimes.com/news/world/europe/french-national-front-leader-calls-for-the-explosion-of-europe-1.1650083> (accessed on 12.01.2014)

[http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/The\\_Party\\_Program\\_of\\_the\\_Danish\\_Peoples\\_Party](http://www.danskfolkeparti.dk/The_Party_Program_of_the_Danish_Peoples_Party)  
(accessed on 21.12.2013)

[http://www.fpoe.at/fileadmin/Content/portal/PDFs/2012/2012\\_parteiprogramm\\_englisch\\_web.pdf](http://www.fpoe.at/fileadmin/Content/portal/PDFs/2012/2012_parteiprogramm_englisch_web.pdf) (accessed on 21.12.2013)

[http://www.fpoe.at/fileadmin/Content/portal/PDFs/\\_dokumente/2011\\_graz\\_parteiprogramm\\_englisch\\_web.pdf](http://www.fpoe.at/fileadmin/Content/portal/PDFs/_dokumente/2011_graz_parteiprogramm_englisch_web.pdf) (accessed on 21.12.2013)

<http://www.results-elections2014.eu/en/country-results-fr-2014.html> (accessed on 20.06.2014)

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/00082fcd21/Results-by-country-\(2009\).html](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/00082fcd21/Results-by-country-(2009).html) (accessed on 20.06.2014)

<http://www.electionresources.org/fr/president.php?election=1981> (accessed on 24.04.2014)

<http://www.electionresources.org/at/nationalrat.php?election=1990> (accessed on 24.04.2014)

<http://www.neurope.eu/article/le-pen-wilders-fail-form-far-right-ep-party> (accessed on 27.06.2014)

## APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY

1980'lerle birlikte yükselen aşırı sağ hareketler günümüzde giderek daha fazla tartışma konusu edilmekte, Avrupa'nın temel değerlerine karşı tehdit oluşturduğuna yönelik görüşler ağırlık kazanmaktadır. Avrupa'nın birçok ülkesinde aşırı sağ partiler uluslararası politikada varlıklarını hissettiren ve desteklerini her geçen gün artıran aktörler olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Bu doğrultuda, aşırı sağ partilerinin görüşlerinin çok boyutlu bir şekilde incelenmesi önemli hale gelmiştir.

İngilizce literatürde "aşırı sağ" terimine karşılık gelecek "radical right", "extreme right" ve "far right" gibi terimler kullanılmaktadır. Bu tez kapsamında ise, "far right" kavramının kullanılması tercih edilmiştir. Bunun nedeni ise, diğer terimlerin söz konusu partilere yönelik "radical" ve "extreme" oldukları yönünde subjektif ve şiddet içerikli bir söylemi içinde barındırmalarına karşılık, "far right" teriminin en sağda yer alan partiye atıf yapması ve daha nesnel bir anlama sahip olmasıdır.

Piero Ignazi'ye göre bir partiyi "aşırı sağ" olarak adlandırabilmek için üç temel koşulun karşılanması gerekir. Bu üç koşul aşırı sağın, siyasi alanda sağ cemahta kendisinden başka hiçbir partinin daha sağda yer almayacağı bir konuma, faşist hareketlerle ideolojik bir bağa ve mevcut siyasetin temel yapısını zayıflatmayı amaçlayan görüşlere sahip olmasıdır (Ignazi, 1996: 1). Ignazi, 1970 ve 1980'lerde yükselmeye başlayan aşırı sağın, önceki biçimlerinden farklı olarak demokratik olmayan bir yapıyı desteklemediğini, bunun yerine var olan parlamenter sisteme duyulan güvensizliğin üzerinden bir meşruiyet sorunu yaratmaya çalıştığını vurgulamaktadır (Ignazi, 1996: 1). Bir başka deyişle Ignazi'ye göre aşırı sağ partiler, geçmişte faşist partilerin yaşattığı deneyimin aksine demokrasiye değil, mevcut sistemin yapısına karşı bir duruş sergilerler. Bu da genel olarak, mevcut hükümetler üzerinden bir karşı çıkıştır. Bunun yanı sıra, Richard Deangelis'e göre, aşırı sağ partiler faşist ideolojinin aksine şiddet içeren araçlardan yana değildirler (Deangelis,

2003: 84). Bunun yerine, şiddet içermeyen ancak toplumu derinden etkileyebilecek söylemlere başvururlar. Avrupa'daki bütün aşırı sağ partiler açısından bu tespit doğru olmasa da, genel olarak geçmişteki aşırı sağ hareketlere oranla 1980'lerle birlikte yükselen aşırı sağın şiddetten daha uzak bir tavır sergilediği görülmektedir.

Hans-Georg Betz ise, aşırı sağ partilerin mevcut sosyokültürel sistemi reddettiklerini, toplumsal eşitliği göz ardı ederek marjinal grupların toplumsal entegrasyonuna karşı çıktıklarını, ırkçı olmasalar da yabancı düşmanı olduklarını vurgulamaktadır. Betz'e göre aşırı sağ partiler toplumdaki kaygıyı ve toplumun mevcut yapıya karşı duyduğu hayal kırıklığını araçsallaştırırlar (Betz, 1994: 413). Aşırı sağ partiler üzerine çalışan bir başka önemli düşünür Cas Mudde aşırı sağın üç temel özelliği bulunduğunu vurgulamaktadır. Bunlardan ilki nativizmdir. Bu düşünceye göre, yerli halk yabancı etkisinden korunmalı, ülke yerli halk tarafından iskan edilmeli, yerli olmayan her türlü kişi ve görüş, devletin homojen yapısını tehdit ettiğinden bertaraf edilmelidir (Mudde, 2010: 1169). Aşırı sağın ikinci özelliği ise, otoriter bir eğilim göstermesidir. Mudde'a göre toplumda katı bir düzen öngören otoriterlik aşırı sağın önemli bir parçasıdır. Son olarak Mudde, aşırı sağın popülist olma özelliğine vurgu yapar. Mudde'a göre aşırı sağın popülistliği saf insanlar ve yozlaşmış elitleri karşı karşıya getirir (Mudde, 2010: 1170). Yozlaşmış elit olarak nitelendirdikleri iktidarı eleştirmelerinin arkasındaki temel mesele ise mevcut düzenin eleştirisine dayanmaktadır.

Bu tanımlar çerçevesinde tez boyunca ele alınacak aşırı sağ kavramından esas olarak;

- Sağ cemahtan kendisinden başka bir parti yer almayan,
- Toplumsal eşitliği kabul etmeyerek göçmenlerin topluma entegrasyonunu reddeden,
- Toplumun mevcut yönetime karşı duyduğu hayal kırıklığı üzerinden siyaset yapan,
- Yerli olmayan her türlü unsuru dışlayan,
- Yabancı düşmanı,
- Popülist

bir hareket kastedilmektedir.

Bu kapsamda bu tez, Avrupa'da yükselişe geçen aşırı sağ partilerden Ulusal Cephe (FN), Avusturya Özgürlük Partisi (FPÖ) ve Danimarka Halklarının Partisi'ni (DF) örnek olarak ele alacaktır. FN'nin seçilmesinin nedeni hem Fransa siyasetinde hem de uluslararası siyasette gündemi belirleyebilme kabiliyetiyle önemli bir aktör olmasıdır. FPÖ, ise 2000 yılında hükümet ortağı olduğu için Avrupa Birliği (AB) üyesi ülkelerin uyguladığı yaptırımlarla karşı karşıya kalmış tek örnek olması sebebiyle seçilmiştir. DF'nin ise, FPÖ ve FN ile karşılaştırıldığında, refah geleneği gelişmiş ve göreceli olarak daha az ekonomik problemle karşı karşıya bir ülke olan Danimarka'da yükselişe geçmesi bakımından daha farklı bir konumu olduğu göz önünde bulundurularak incelemeye dahil edilmiştir.

Literatürde aşırı sağ partileri karşılaştırmalı olarak ele alan çalışmalara rastlanmakla birlikte FPÖ, FN ve DF'yi inceleyen bir analiz görülmemiştir. Ayrıca, farklı partileri, farklı parametreler üzerinde ayrı ayrı değerlendirerek karşılaştıran bir çalışmaya da rastlanmamıştır. Bu çerçevede bu tezin literatürdeki bu eksikliği gidermeye yönelik bir katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Söz konusu partiler üç ana parametre üzerinden incelenmeye çalışılacaktır. Bunlar, ulusal kimlik inşa süreçleri, göç ve küreselleşmedir. Ulusal kimlik aşırı sağ partilerin politikalarını belirleyen unsurlardan biri olduğu için, Avusturya, Fransa ve Danimarka'nın ulusal kimliklerini inşa süreçlerini incelemek önem taşımaktadır. Göç ise, aşırı sağ partileri destek toplamalarındaki en önemli araçlardan biri olarak karşımıza çıkarken, küreselleşme 1980'lerle birlikte aşırı sağın yükselişinin arkasında yatan en önemli nedenlerden biridir.

Bu kapsamda bu tezde öncelikle FPÖ, FN ve DF'nin tarihsel gelişim süreci incelenmiştir. Tarihsel olarak ele alındığında, her üç partinin de en dikkat çekici sonucu olarak önemli bir başarı elde ettikleri seçimlerin birbirine yakın dönemlerde gerçekleştiği görülmektedir. FN 2002 yılında aldığı %16,9'luk oy oranı ile, FPÖ 1999 seçimlerindeki %26,9 ve DF 2001 yılındaki %12 düzeyinde aldığı oy ile buldukları ülkelerde önemli bir etki yaratmışlardır. Bunun yanı sıra, her üç partinin

de 2014 yılının Mayıs ayında gerçekleşen Avrupa Parlamentosu seçimlerinde oldukça önemli bir oy oranıyla kendi ülkelerinde birinci sırada yer almaları aşırı sağ partilerinin yükselişinin bir diğer önemli kanıtı olmuştur.

Tez kapsamında seçilen parametrelerden ilki ulusal kimlik inşa sürecidir. Ulusal kimliğin tarihsel inşasının aşırı sağ partilerin politikalarının şekillendirilmesinde etkili olduğu düşünülmektedir. Aşırı sağ partiler söylemlerini millet tanımı dışında kalan unsurları belirleyerek ve bunları “öteki” olarak adlandırarak kurarlar. “Öteki”ler o milletin ulusal kimlik tanımı içinde yer almayanlar için kullanılan dışlaştırıcı bir tabir olarak karşımıza çıkar. Bu çerçevede, tezin üçüncü bölümünde öncelikle Avusturya, Fransa ve Danimarka'nın ulusal kimliklerinin tarihsel gelişimi incelenmiş ve ardından FPÖ, FN ve DF'nin ulusal kimliğe ilişkin söylemler karşılaştırılmıştır.

Avusturya'nın ulusal kimliğinin esas gelişiminin II. Dünya Savaşı sonrası gerçekleştiği görülmektedir. Bu döneme kadar, özellikle 1871 yılında Alman Birliği'nin kurulmasıyla birlikte Avusturyalı kimliği Alman kimliğiyle yakından ilişkilidir. Özellikle I. Dünya Savaşı'nın ardından Avusturya-Macaristan İmparatorluğu'nun dağılmasıyla Alman kültürü Avusturya halkını çok daha fazla etkilemeye başlamıştır. Ancak II. Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra Almanya'daki faşist rejimin yenilgiye uğramasıyla birlikte, Avusturya'da İkinci Cumhuriyet kurulmuş ve Avusturya'nın Naziler tarafından mağdur olduğu iddia edilerek, Alman kimliğinin etkisinden uzaklaştırılarak Avusturyalı kimliği oluşturulması hedeflenmiştir.

1986 yılında FPÖ'nün liderliğini üstlenen Jörg Haider, hükümetin Nazi geçmişini reddederek Avusturya ulusal kimliğini inşa etme politikasının aksine, Avusturya'nın faşist geçmişini kabul ederek, o dönem Nazilere hizmet etmenin savaş koşulları düşünüldüğünde meşru bir tutum olduğunu iddia etmiştir. FPÖ'ye göre, Avusturya kimliği Alman etnik ve kültürel özellikleri çerçevesinde şekillenmiştir. Bu yüzden Avusturya kimliğinin yanı sıra, Alman kültürünün korunması da önem taşımaktadır. Bu açıdan FPÖ'nün Alman kökene sahip olmayan ve tarihsel olarak

Habsburg İmparatorluğu sınırları içerisinde bulunmayanları, Avusturya kimliğinin bir parçası olarak saymadığı ve dışlayıcı bir davranış içinde olduğu görülmektedir.

Fransa'nın ulusal kimliğinin ise esas itibarıyla 18.yy ile birlikte şekillenmeye başladığı görülmektedir. Bu dönemden önce Fransız olmanın anlamının, iyi bir Hıristiyan olma ve Kral'ın otoritesine sadık bir insan olmayla sınırlı kaldığı söylenebilir. Ancak Fransız Devrimi'yle birlikte Kral'ın otoritesine karşı burjuvazi, eşit ve egemen millet söylemiyle ulusal duyguların güçlenmesine destek olmuştur. 1870'te kurulan Üçüncü Cumhuriyet ile birlikte Fransız kimliği Cumhuriyetçiler tarafından şekillendirilmeye çalışılmıştır. Bu anlayışa göre Fransız olabilmek için, Fransız kanı taşıyan bir aileden doğma zorunluluğu yoktur. Kendini toplumun temel değerlerine adapte edebilen herkes millet içinde yer alabilir. Bu dönem 1871 yılında Alman Birliği'nin kurulmasıyla birlikte Almanların giderek “öteki” olarak görülmeye başladığı söylenebilir.

1940 yılında Fransa'da kurulan faşist Vichy rejiminin ise Fransa için dramatik bir etkisi olduğu görülmektedir. Vichy rejiminin Fransız Devrimi'nin temel değerleri olan “eşitlik, özgürlük, kardeşlik”in yerine “iş, aile, vatan” kavramlarını koyarak Cumhuriyetçi ulusal kimlik anlayışına karşı duruş sergilemiştir. II. Dünya Savaşı'nın ardından ise 1958 yılında kurulan Beşinci Cumhuriyet'in Cumhurbaşkanı olan Charles De Gaulle, Fransız kimliğinin yeniden tanımlanmasında rol oynamıştır. Bu dönem Fransız Devrimi'nin temel değerleri yeniden canlandırılmış ve Fransa'yı Avrupa'da güçlü bir aktör olarak tanımlama çalışmaları yürütülmüştür.

FN ise, Cumhuriyetçi anlamda kapsayıcı ulusal kimlik anlayışına karşı olduğu, Fransız Devrimi'nin temel değerlerini toplumdaki yozlaşmanın sebebi olarak gördüğü söylenebilir. FN'e göre gelecek, saf Fransız kimliğini bulmak için Devrimden önceye gidilmelidir. Millet etnik temellere dayalı, ortak gelenek ve tarihi paylaşan bir topluluktur ve yabancılar milletin değerlerine tehdit oluşturmaktadır.

Danimarka'ya gelindiğinde ise, temel olarak iki gelişmenin ulusal kimliğin inşa sürecini etkilediği söylenebilir. Bunlardan ilki, 1814 yılında Danimarka ve Norveç'in ayrılması ile 1864 savaşında Danimarka'nın yenilmesiyle ortaya çıkan

ülke içinde istikrarı sağlama ihtiyacıdır. İkincisi ise, 1871 yılında Alman Birliği'nin kurulmasıyla içerde istikrarı sağlama ihtiyacının yanına, dış tehditlere karşı ülke güvenliğini sağlama gereksiniminin de eklenmiş olmasıdır. Bu gelişmelerin sonucunda, Danimarka'da istikrar ve güvenliği sağlamaya yönelik ihtiyaç ulusal kimliğin oluşmasını da beraberinde getirmiştir. Köylüler ulusal duyguların şekillenmesinde ve dayanışmanın sağlanmasında oldukça önemli rol oynamışlardır. Danimarka'da güçlü bir burjuva sınıfının olmayışı, ulusal kimliğin yönetici elit tarafından değil, ama bizatihi halkın içinden köylüler tarafından şekillendirilmesine neden olmuştur.

Danimarka'da ulusal kimliğin birilerini dışlamak üzerine kurulmaması ise DF'nin politikalarına da yansımıştır. DF'nin çıkış noktası ülkedeki vergi sisteminin yeniden düzenlenmesi gerektiğine karşı oluşturdukları politikalarıdır. Bunun yanı sıra, DF için yabancılar doğrudan Danimarkalı kimliğine tehdit oluşturmamaktadır, ancak toplumdaki dayanışma ve refah devleti geleneğini bozucu etkileri olabileceğinden kendi değerlerini toplumun değerleriyle uyumlaştıramayan yabancılar ülkede barınmamalıdır.

Ulusal kimlik inşa süreçleri bakımından her üç ülke ve her üç parti karşılaştırıldığında, Avusturya'nın ulusal bilincinin, Fransa ve Danimarka'da daha geç geliştiği görülmektedir. Avusturya'da ulusal kimlik II. Dünya Savaşı sonrası gelişmeye başlarken, Fransa ve Danimarka'da 18.yy da ulusal bilincin geliştiği söylenebilir. Avusturya ulusal kimliği, savaş sonrası koşullarda tek başına bağımsız bir devlet olarak ayakta kalabilme ve Almanya'nın etkisinden sıyrılma amacıyla gelişirken, Fransa'da Kral'ın otoritesine karşı ortaya çıkmış, Danimarka'da ise ülkedeki istikrarı koruma kaygısıyla şekillenmiştir. Her üç ülkenin de Alman Birliği'nin kurulmasından etkilendiği söylenebilir. Alman Birliği'nin kurulmasıyla birlikte Avusturya'da Alman kimliğinin etkisi giderek artarken, Fransa ve Danimarka ise Almanları öncekinden daha fazla “öteki” olarak görmeye başlamışlardır.

FPÖ için, Avusturya kimliğini korumanın yanı sıra, Alman kültürünü korumak da önemliyken, FN Fransız Devrimi'nin temel değerlerine karşı çıkararak

yabancıları dışlayıcı bir anlayışla hareket etmekte, buna karşılık DF ise köylü ve refah devleti geleneğinin etkisiyle, ülkedeki dayanışmayı korumanın önemine odaklanmaktadır. Her üç partinin de tarih, dil ve kültürü ulusal kimliğin önemli bileşenleri saydıkları ve her üç partinin de Avrupa Birliği'ne ulusal kimliğe tehdit oluşturan bir yapısı olduğu gerekçesiyle karşı oldukları söylenebilir.

Tezin ikinci parametresi göç, dördüncü bölümde ele alınmıştır. Aşırı sağ partilerin güvenlik açısından göçmenleri suç oranlarındaki artışla, ekonomik açıdan ise işsizlik oranlarındaki ve sosyal harcamalardaki artışla ilişkilendirdiklerini ifade etmektedir. Siyasi olarak ise, hükümetlerin uyguladıkları yanlış politikalar yukarıda da değinildiği gibi söz konusu partilerin temel söylemlerinden birini oluşturmaktadır. Bu doğrultuda, aşırı sağ partiler için göçün önemli bir sorun olarak ortaya çıkmasındaki temel nedenler hükümetlerin uyguladığı hatalı göç politikaları, göçmenlerin ulusal kimliğe tehdit olarak görülmeleri, toplumsal huzursuzluğun, suçun ve işsizliğin nedeni olmaları ve sosyal devleti suiistimal eden kişiler olarak algılanmalarındadır.

Avrupa'da göç hareketleri II. Dünya Savaşı sonrası hız kazanmıştır. Özellikle, II. Dünya Savaşı'nın ardından Avrupa'da başlayan ekonomik toparlanma ve sanayileşmede ilerleme ihtiyacı, beraberinde işgücü gereksinimini doğurmuştur. 1950'lerle birlikte "misafir işçi" olarak göçmen işçiler artan oranda Avrupa'da ortaya çıkmaya başlamıştır. Söz konusu işgücü gereksinimini karşılamak üzere Avrupa'ya gelen misafir işçilerin, aileleri yanlarında olmadan, sözleşmeye dayalı iş ve zaman sınırları içerisinde çalışmaları öngörülmüştür. Bu dönem Avrupa'da oldukça yüksek miktarda misafir işçinin bulunduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Öyle ki, misafir işçilerin yasal olarak ülkeye girişlerinde uygulanan prosedürün süreyi uzatacağı düşüncesiyle, bu dönemde hükümetlerin bilgisi dahilinde yasa dışı pek çok göçmenin söz konusu ülkelere girdikleri bilinmektedir.

Misafir işçi kabul eden ülkelerin temel politikaları, söz konusu göçmen işçilerin kalıcı olmadıkları sürece ucuz işgücü ihtiyacını karşıladıkları ve ülkede yaşanabilecek olası bir işsizlik artışı durumunda ülkelerine geri gönderilebilecekleri

yönündedir. Ancak, 1970'lerle birlikte misafir işçiler ile ilgili durum beklenenin aksine gelişmiştir. Misafir işçiler ülkelerine geri dönmek yerine, çalıştıkları ülkenin eğitim, sağlık gibi olanaklarından yararlanmanın avantajlarını görmüşler ve ailelerini de çalıştıkları ülkeye getirmeye başlamışlardır. Bu durum, işveren ülke için sosyal harcamaların artması anlamına gelmiş ve ucuz işgücü hükümetler açısından artı yük yaratmaya başlamıştır.

Bunun yanı sıra, artan göçmen sayısına karşın, 1970'lerin ikinci yarısında ve 1980'lerde yaşanan teknolojik gelişmeler sanayide niteliksiz işgücü ihtiyacını azaltmıştır. Bir yandan göçmen işçilerin çalıştıkları ülkeye yerleşme arzusu, diğer yandan ülkelerin söz konusu işçilere duydukları ihtiyacın azalması beraberinde toplumsal sonuçlar getirmiştir. Ayrıca, daha evvel ağırlıklı olarak Müslüman olmayan ülkelere gelen göçmen işçilerin yerini, 1960'larda Cezayir gibi bağımsızlıklarını kazanan eski sömürge ülkelerinden gelen Müslüman işçiler almaya başlamıştır. Bütün bu gelişmeler aşırı sağ partilerin göçmen karşıtlığı üzerinden destek toplamasına yardımcı olmuştur. Aşırı sağ partiler, göçmenleri toplumdaki ekonomik sorunların temel sorumlusu ve kültürel değerlere temel tehdit olarak göstererek, başlangıçta sadece emek piyasasına ilişkin olan göçmen sorunlarını, ulusal kimlik ve entegrasyon sorununa dönüştürmüşlerdir. Aşırı sağ partiler, kendilerinin kültürel kimliği, göçmenlere ve göçmenlerin ülkeye girmesine neden olan yönetici elite karşı koruduklarını iddia ederler.

Bu çerçevede FPÖ, DF ve FN'nin görüşlerini karşılaştırdığımızda, FPÖ ve FN, göçmenleri Avusturya ve Fransız kimliklerine doğrudan tehdit olarak görürken, DF için göçmenlerin temel olarak Danimarka toplumunun temel değerlerine, bir başka deyişle Danimarka yaşam tarzına tehdit olarak görüldüğü söylenebilir. Her üç parti arasındaki bir diğer önemli fark, hükümetlerin göç politikalarını etkileyebilme kabiliyetleri karşılaştırıldığında ortaya çıkmaktadır. FN hiçbir zaman hükümette yer almamasına karşın, göç konusunda hükümetin politikalarını etkileyebilme kapasitesi FPÖ ve DF'den daha yüksektir. FPÖ ise, 2000-2005 yılları arasında hükümette yer almasına karşılık çıkar gruplarının hükümet üzerindeki etkisiyle ve parti içinde yaşanan anlaşmazlıkların bir sonucu olarak hükümet politikalarını etkileme olanağı

bulamamıştır. DF'nin ise, FN ile karşılaştırıldığında daha az, ama FPÖ ile karşılaştırıldığında daha çok, göç politikalarını etkilediği görülmektedir. Bunun nedeni ise, hükümette yer alan Liberal ve Muhafazakarların parlamentoda DF'nin desteğine ihtiyaç duymasıdır.

Her üç partinin de kendi değerlerini, buldukları ülkenin değerleriyle uyumlaştırabilen göçmenlerin topluma entegre edilebileceğini, ancak uyumsuz değerlere sahip olmaları nedeniyle Müslüman göçmenlerin topluma hiçbir şekilde entegre edilemeyeceğini savundukları görülmektedir. Bunun yanı sıra, her üç parti de her kültürün farklı olmaya hakkı olduğunu, göçmenlerin de buna hakkı olduğunu bu yüzden kendi kültürlerinden farklı bir ülkede kalmak yerine ülkelerine geri dönmeleri gerektiğini düşündükleri söylenebilir.

Tez kapsamında beşinci bölümde ele alınan son parametre ise küreselleşmedir. Aşırı sağ hareketlerin yükselişini tetikleyen temel faktörlerden biri küreselleşme ve bununla eş zamanlı gelişen neoliberal politikalar. Kapitalizmin 1970'lerde -özellikle 1973 yılında yaşanan petrol kriziyle kendini gösteren- yaşadığı kriz neoliberal politikaları tetiklemiştir. Ellen Meiksins Wood'a göre kapitalist üretim biçiminin rekabet ve kar maksimizasyonunu sağlamak gibi sisteme içkin zorunluluklarından dolayı, kapitalizm ölçeğini sürekli genişletme ve ulusal sınırların ötesinde genişleme ihtiyacı duymaktadır. Bu durum da, 1970'lerin sonunda neoliberal ekonomi politikalarını gündeme getirmiştir. Neoliberal ekonomi politikaları temel olarak ticaret engellerinin kaldırılması, sermayenin serbest dolaşımı, çokuluslu şirketlerin ulus devletlerde kolaylıkla yatırım yapabilmesi için geliştirilen politikaları içermektedir.

Wood'a göre, neoliberal politikaların toplumsal ve siyasi alanlarda yarattığı dönüşümün bir sonucu olarak küreselleşme hız kazanmıştır. Dünya çapında uzak mesafeleri birbirine bağlayan, sosyal ilişkileri yoğunlaştıran, ekonomik ve toplumsal alanda sınırları bulanıklaştıran özellikleriyle küreselleşme, yapısal olarak neoliberal politikaları besleyen bir durumdur. Nitekim, neoliberal politikaların önemli

dayanaklarından biri olan sermayenin akışkanlığı, küreselleşme sayesinde sağlanabilmektedir.

Stephen Gill'e göre neoliberal politikalar aracılığıyla ve küreselleşmenin etkisiyle kapitalizm, 1980'lerin başından itibaren, hem pazar ekonomisinin değerlerini ve disiplinlerini toplumsal hayata yayma hem de ulus devlet sınırları dışında yeni yatırım ve endüstriyel üretim imkanı bulmuştur. Bu açıdan küreselleşme sermayenin uluslararasılaşmasına katkıda bulunmuştur. Ekonomik anlamda gerçekleşen bu dönüşüm ise siyasi ve kültürel alana da sirayet etmiş, sürekli olarak yabancı yatırımları kaybetme riski ile karşı karşıya bulunan devlet, sermayenin ülke sınırları içinde kalmasını sağlamak amacıyla refah politikalarında çeşitli değişiklikler yapmıştır. Devlet, neoliberal politikaların ulusal ekonomide yol açacağı enflasyon ve işsizlik gibi sıkıntıları bütçe kesintileriyle aşmaya çalışmış, bu ise sağlık ve eğitim masraflarının azalması, sübvansiyonların kaldırılması, yabancı yatırımcılara düşük vergiler uygulanması gibi sonuçlar doğurmuştur. Mevcut hükümetlerin izlediği refah devletini kısıtlayıcı bu politikalar ise, Gill'e göre toplumsal eşitsizliğe ve güvensizliğe yol açmıştır.

Borussalian'a göre devlet, neoliberal politikalar aracılığıyla uluslararası pazar ile bütünleştikçe işgücü piyasası da akışkanlık gösterir. Bunun bir sonucu olarak, sınırlar arası geçirgenlik artar ve bu da düşük vasıflı işgücüne olan talebi artırır. İşgücü piyasasındaki hareketliliğin bir sonucu olarak ucuz işgücüne talep artar ve bu da göçü tetikler. Bir başka deyişle, neoliberal politikalar aynı zamanda Avrupa'daki göçmen sayısının artışı ve buna bağlı olarak yabancı düşmanlığının yükselişinde de pay sahibidir. Aylin Ünver Noi, küreselleşme ve yabancı düşmanlığı arasındaki bağı küreselleşmeden faydalananların topraklarını, küreselleşmenin faydalarından dışlanan ve bundan oldukça fazla şekilde etkilenen kişilerle paylaşma zorunluluğu ile açıklar. Başka bir şekilde ifade etmek gerekirse, ulusal sınırların aşınmasına neden olan küreselleşme sonucu, ulusal anlamda gerçekleşen faydadan, ülke vatandaşlarının dışında uluslararası alanda göçmenler gibi sınırlardaki akışkanlıktan faydalanarak ülkeye giren insanların da yararlanması, yabancı düşmanlığının önünü açan unsurlardan biridir.

Küreselleşme ve neoliberal politikaların özellikle ekonomik ve kültürel anlamda toplumda yarattığı söz konusu etkiler aşırı sağın destek kazanmasının yolunu açmıştır. Refah devletindeki kısıtlamalar ve devletlerin hareket kabiliyetinin daralması sonucu ortaya çıkan yüksek enflasyon ve işsizlik rakamları, yine neoliberal politikalar ve küreselleşme sonucu artan göçmen sayısına bağlı olarak yükselen yabancı düşmanlığının aşırı sağın oy potansiyelini genişlettiği söylenebilir. Aşırı sağın yükselişinde küreselleşmenin üç temel etkisinin olduğu görülmektedir. Bunlardan ilki, küreselleşme ve neoliberal politikalara uyum sağlamaya çalışan hükümetlerin başarısız politikalar uyguladıkları iddiasıyla aşırı sağ partiler tarafından eleştirilmeleridir. Diğerleri ise, aşırı sağın küreselleşmenin kültürel kimliğe zarar verici etkisi olduğunu savunarak, toplumdaki hassasiyetler üzerine oynaması, son olarak, küreselleşmeyle çevre, nükleer enerji gibi yeni politika alanlarının ortaya çıkması ve bu konuların aşırı sağ partiler tarafından destek toplamak üzere araçsallaştırılmasıdır.

Bu çerçevede, FPÖ, FN ve DF karşılaştırıldığında, FPÖ'nün hükümeti başarısız neoliberal politikalar uyguladığına ilişkin eleştirerek desteğini artırdığı görülmektedir. FPÖ'ye göre ülke güçlü bir bürokrasi ve yolsuzluk yapan partiler tarafından yönetilmektedir. Buna karşın, FPÖ'de küreselleşmenin kültürel kimlik üzerindeki etkisine yönelik vurgu çok kuvvetli değildir. Bu hususta FPÖ yine hükümeti eleştirerek, küreselleşmeye karşı hükümetin Avusturya ve Alman kültürünü yeterince korumadığını iddia etmektedir. FN'de ise küreselleşmenin kültürel kimliğe zarar verici etkisi üzerine vurgunun daha fazla olduğu söylenebilir. FN'e göre, küreselleşme Fransız kimliğini tehdit etmektedir. DF'ye baktığımızda, hükümeti eleştirecek fazla bir alan bulamadığı görülmektedir. Danimarka'daki güçlü refah devleti geleneği nedeniyle, ülkenin neoliberal politikalara uyum sağlama sürecinde ekonomik olarak diğerleri kadar olumsuz etkilenmemesi, DF'nin hükümeti eleştirerek destek toplamasına olanak vermemiştir. DF'de FN'deki gibi küreselleşmenin kimlik üzerindeki zarar verici etkisine çok fazla odaklanılmadığı, küreselleşmenin temel olarak toplumun homojen yapısına karşı bir tehdit olarak görüldüğü söylenebilir. Bunun yanı sıra, her üç partinin de yeni politika alanlarını oy oranlarını artırmak için kullandığı görülmektedir.

Sonuç olarak değerlendirildiğinde, FPÖ, FN ve DF'nin 1980'lerden başlayarak aşırı sağ partilerin yükselen trendi içerisinde en önemli aktörler arasında yer aldıkları söylenebilir. Bu durumda ise, tez boyunca ele alınan ulusal kimlik inşa süreci, göç ve küreselleşme parametrelerinin büyük bir payı olduğu görülmektedir. Ulusal kimlik inşa süreçleri, söz konusu partilerin milletin dışında yer alan "öteki"leri belirleyerek dışlayıcı söylem geliştirmelerine, göçmen karşıtı tutumlarıyla hem ekonomik olarak göçmen sayısındaki artıştan olumsuz etkilenen hem de göçmenlerin ulusal kimlik üzerinde yaratacağı etkiden rahatsızlık duyanlardan destek toplama yolunda gitmelerine, küreselleşme ve neoliberal politikalar ise, hükümetleri eleştirmelerine, küreselleşmenin kültürel kimlik üzerindeki olumsuz etkisine ve yeni politika alanlarını kullanarak destek toplamalarına katkı sağlamıştır.

## APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

### ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

### YAZARIN

Soyadı :

Adı :

Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans

Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınmaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: