

PSYCHO-POLITICAL REASONS OF RISING POPULISM AND POPULIST MOVEMENTS

Zübeyr Şakar¹

Abstract: Populism is a rising phenomenon all over the world and is a global issue. Populism is associated with psychological concepts such as archaic fear, belonging, exclusion, and othering that have been seen since the first emergence of human existence. Populism is also a socio-psychologic reaction to the corruption of democracy in general, its corrupt institutions, the political establishment and the political-bureaucratic elites. In other words, populism is a social reality that emerges from the traumatic destruction of emotions and emotional capital in contemporary democracy psychologically. The research aims to examine the emotional, traumatic and political psychological dynamics of populism, in short, based on psychology. Therefore, the study examines how the psychological consequences of the destruction of liberal democracy reveal populism. One of the psychological causalities in the rise of populism is that feelings of belonging and othering, instead of pluralism, are socially and politically decisive dynamics in an age where emotions and feelings gain

¹Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Polis Akademisi, Polis Meslek Yüksekokulu, zubeyr.sakar@egm.gov.tr, ORCID: orcid.org/000-0003-3220-09-4X. Doi: 10.5281/zenodo.14767537

Geliş Tarihi: 12 Ekim 2024
Received: 12 October 2024

Kabul Tarihi:30 Ekim 2024
Accepted:30 October 2024

Bu makaleye atf için/ *To cite this article:* Şakar, Z. (2024). Psycho-Political Reasons of Rising Populism and Populist Movements. *Politik Psikoloji Dergisi*, 4(2), 6-22.

importance. Populism and populist movements, especially in the West, seem related to liberal democracy's tendency towards elitism and bureaucratic hegemony and its loss of legitimacy.

Keywords: populism, otherness, emotions, political communicate, ontological security.

Popülizmin ve Popülist Hareketlerin Yükselişinin Psiko-Politik Nedenleri

Abstract: *Popülizm, küresel bir mesele olarak tüm dünya üzerinde yükselen bir olgudur. Popülizm kavramı, ilk insan deneyimlerinden ve doğa durumundan beri görülen arkaik korku, ait olmak, dışlamak ve ötekileştirmek gibi psikolojik kavramlarla ilişkilendirilebilir. Ayrıca popülizm, demokrasinin yozlaşmasına, onun yozlaşan kurumlarına, siyaset kurumuna ve siyasal-bürokratik elitlere sosyo-psikolojik bir tepkiyi ifade eder. Diğer bir ifadeyle popülizm, çağdaş demokraside duyguların ve duygusal sermayenin psikolojik olarak travmatik tahribinin bir neticesi olarak ortaya çıkan sosyal bir olgu ve gerçekliktir. Araştırma, popülizmin duygusal, travmatik ve kısacası onun psikolojiye dayalı olan siyasal psikolojik dinamikleri irdelemek ve incelemek amacındadır. Dolayısıyla çalışma, liberal demokrasinin tahribinin psikolojik sonuçlarının popülizmi nasıl ortaya çıkardığına ilişkin soruya cevap aramaktadır. Duyguların ve hislerin önem kazandığı bir çağda çoğulculuğun yerine aidiyet hislerinin ve ötekileştirmenin sosyal ve siyasal olarak yeniden belirleyici bir dinamik olması da popülizmin yükselişindeki psikolojik nedenselliklerden biridir. Popülizm ve popülist hareketler, özellikle Batı'da liberal demokrasinin elitizm ve bürokratik hegemonyaya yönelmesi ve meşruluğunu kaybetmesiyle ilgili görünmektedir.*

Anahtar Kelimeler: *popülizm, ötekilik, duygular, duygusal sermaye, ontolojik güvenlik.*

INTRODUCTION

Psycho-political concepts such as security and dignity have played substantial roles in practical politics for the past few decades (Sirin, Valentino, Villalobos, 2021: 3; Ditto, Rodriguez, 2021: 28; Forgas and Crano, 2021). For example, when Trump talks about building a wall for the argument of security, he sloganises "Make America Great Again" for his reputation. This example of policy rhetoric is an emotional state for Americans to restore lost dignity and prestige for the globe and bring security concerns to the fore. Also, the

emergence of similar policies in real politics in Europe is a cue that security and dignity policies are on the rise and that these policies exist within a particular global trend dimension. It would be meaningful to evaluate the process of leaving the EU in Britain, the change in the social structure of post-industrial Britain with the policies of free movement of labour, and the psychological reaction that justified the loss of “UK old dignity” by turning into a social psychological trauma in the society (Brubaker, 2017: 359). It is another fact that these political reactions gradually have gained strength and have come into power worldwide. Likewise, the same policymaking has emerged in Poland. It would be meaningful to read the desire of the Polish Law and Justice Party to be brought to power by the people to purify its Catholic heritage and traditionalism from the corruption of the former communist regime and to belong to NATO as a psychological restoration of dignity (Richards, 2019: 45; Manners, 2021: 197). These examples support the argument that social and political traumas revive populism as a new way of making politics. In this context, in terms of political science and its advanced readings, the practical and theoretical psychological impact on politics is as effective and substantial as in other fields such as economy, military, commercial, and social. At the same time, it is sayable that these examples are one-by-one reactions to the degeneration and disregard of traditional and cultural codes of societies by the Enlightenment and modernism.

Therefore, as states Richards (2019: 49), analyzing the political consequences of populism for its psychological reasons is effective both in understanding the political impacts of emotions and emotional capital, which is a type of human capital and in explaining the psychological effect resulting from increased elected victories or traumas in the political breakdowns of contemporary events. Because of this, real politics is going through emotional transformations especially actual global phenomena and events.

This study explores the psycho-political reasons behind the global rise of populism, a contemporary phenomenon. The research question of this study is what the psycho-political reasons for the emergence of the populism concept. A further objective of the study is to undertake a comparative analysis of right-wing and left-wing populism. Thus, the base assumption of the study is that populism is a socio-psychological and political psychological reaction of societies to the destruction of traditions and culture caused by modernization and globalization.

The research uses group psychology, mass psychology, large group psychology, belonging-otherness psychology, and emotions theories and concepts of social

psychology and political psychology. The study tries to explain the political-psychological reasons as much as the economic and social reasons for the conception of populism and discusses the distinctive features of Right and Left Populism comparatively.

I. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: CONCEPT OF POPULISM AND THEORIES OF POPULISM

Populism, contrary to the rights-based individualist approach of democracy, is a radical collectivist ideological understanding with sociological, psychological and political “walls” (Sirin et al., 2021: 7; Forgas and Crano, 2021: 36; Brubaker, 2017: 360). While liberal democracy promotes the humane and autonomous side of the enlightenment, populism fundamentally opposes this conceptualization and feeds on the romanticism of the collective society. Populism does not recognize a liberal or free space for the individual and makes her/him the object of the group to which she/he belongs. Despite the polyphonic and pluralistic principles of democracy, populism links with moral absolutism, monism, and collectivism.

The concept of populism is influenced by several social, psychological and political factors. A plethora of definitions have been proposed to explicate the concept of populism. While some descriptions define the concept as the reflection of demography, rhetoric and rhetoric in the people, for some, populism sees as the result of the corruption of bureaucratic elites, and institutions, namely democracy (Forgas and Crano, 2021: 77). According to another definition, populism originates from manipulating empathy towards the in-group rather than the out-group (Sirin et al., 2021: 9-11). When we look at the real-politic plane in the world, it can be said that the interpretations that look at the concept from different angles are complementary to each other (McDermott, 2004: 36-37). Because democracy is both the result of a vertical social relationship starting from the demos and it exists with political elites and institutions (Moffitt, 2016: 36). Also, democracy is both the result of a vertical social relationship starting from the demos and it exists with political elites and institutions (Held, 1995: 11). Therefore, instead of looking to blame for the emergence of populism, it is essential to evaluate both the social dynamics of the causes of the decline of democracies and the evidence of the corruption of political elites and institutions. In other words, to examine the background of populism that threatens liberal, pluralistic and cosmopolitan democracy, it is beneficial to understand the psychological dynamics of the process from the grassroots to the political elite.

Populism, as Forgas and Crano (2021: 9); De Blasio and Sorice (2018: 7) state, is an ideology of collectivism and a form of fundamental opposition to and challenge to reform, renaissance, enlightenment, and humanism. In a typical populist democracy, political elites or institutions are excluded by populist leaders. Also, they are humiliated by populist movements. Economic crises, social changes and all-natural or human disasters are the factors that affect the emotional capital of the individual. Drawing upon the findings of political psychology studies, it can be posited that such events and phenomena have the capacity to engender a range of emotional responses, including anxiety, empathy, uncertainty, and frustration, among others. These sentiments can be transformed into feelings of resentment and anger, particularly fear. Thus, the widespread rise of populism in this era is neither accidental nor surprising. In this context, the emotions of society can easily be manipulated in the age of globalization, where speed gains importance and technical and technological moves are the principal determinant of human life.

I.A. THE FUNCTIONALITY OF TRANSFORMATION OF FEAR AND ANXIETY INTO ANGER IN TERMS OF POPULISM

Many types of populism can be said to be associated with the presence of narcissism. According to Volkan (2014b: 47-48), who developed the theories of Freud (1955: 24) in politic-psychology, narcissism can be the subject of politic-psychological investment. In leader and personality psychologies, narcissism has a pragmatic and conciliatory aspect as well as a traumatic and destructive aspect (Volkan, 2001: 81-82; Houghton, 2014: 79). Conciliatory narcissism is democratic, while malignant narcissism is autocratic or radical populist (Arditi, 2005: 95). One of the two types of narcissism, malignant (traumatic) narcissism is common in extreme, ethnic and racist forms of populism, especially nationalist populism in today's world.

The concept of malignant (traumatic) narcissism is instinctive and is an emotional state that increases with anger. As Sirin et al. (2021: 19) emphasized, the rise of populist movements in the contemporary political plane is related to the manipulation of the psychological investments of the crew in their self-esteem. This phenomenon, which kneads itself with the concept of unification that takes place in an idealized thought, and which corresponds to the disappearance of the subject in the national body, is also related to the notions of post-truth politics. Malignant (traumatic) narcissism, in the political context, is a state of defence and the continuous operation of a defence mechanism against the humiliation, isolation and extinction that a nation may encounter (Volkan 2014a: 47). However, this state of defence can turn into a state of sway,

differing from person to person and from subject to subject; because the threats attributed to the nation are integrated with the threats directed at them in the subconscious of the individuals. This state of unification causes the subject and the individual to mentally unite with the concept of nation and body, and national threat perceptions become reflections of the threats directed against the subject and the individual.

The anxiety experienced by the individual by integrating with the national identity can become the main feeder of left and right populism examples. Left populism is powered by the psychological envisioning of individual material and economic concerns in a national body. Individuals need to feel their economic-based issues in the national political arena. This situation feeds left populism psycho-politically. There is a danger that left populism by financial issues may turn into hostility towards production and economic concern and even violence as it radicalizes.

Secondly, once the need for a safe shelter, a secure homeland and a pure place is seen as belonging only to oneself and those who are like oneself, this housing right can be associated with blood and lineage with the effect of feelings of fear and anxiety, and openly give rise to right-wing populism. In this way, it expresses a populist nationalism and racism that feeds on narcissism (Volkan, 2001: 84; Decker, 2008: 122). This dangerous possibility of the understanding of purity shows itself when the anxiety of being homeless is integrated with the perception of distrust and humiliation of the other. Similarly, as Kinnvall (2002: 81) states, the perpetual division of extremist or radical groups within themselves stems from the eternal belief in the impossible that the trusted object ensures security. This state is a phenomenon that fosters authoritarian and right-wing populism types. In this context, in terms of political psychology, the radicalization of the left and right of populism poses a threat to democracy as much as a predisposition to violence and terrorism. For example, the increasing Islamophobia and the rising extreme populist right in Europe have harmed the social peace of Europe, the Middle East, Asia and of course the world community.

Populism is not inherently universal and is limited to the national scope. However, language has powerful tools like imagery and symbols universally define national identity. Expressions such as “homeland” or “father state” are symbolic expressions that carry meaning and purpose and contain imagination. It is seen able that these two expressions can easily be used by nationalist populism today. It is also a fact that these two expressions, found in almost every language, can be used by nationalist populism as a politic-psychological

strategy. The association of such concepts of nation, state and authority with the notions of parent and family is meaningful in this respect (Richards, 2019: 61). Populism, which blesses the state with the perception of economics or security, can often be used to propagate the protective, and helpful impulse of the family and the parent in the psychology of the individual. It is a fact that unhealthy obedience, admiration, and aggression create a socio-psychological environment that fosters dangerous consequences in political psychology and the sociology of narcissism. Symbolizing the parents and the family means that protecting the state would be identified with protecting the parents and increase the emotional load intensifying with economic populism and nationalist populism, making it a propaganda power (Erisen, 2018: 35). This phenomenon not only emerges in times of war but also manifests itself in populist movements in contemporary politics. Narcissism can be associated with a political ideology or an ideal concept such as nationalism, especially in social structures that have styles of making politics based on violence and fear. The feeling of fear, shyness, opposition or guilt in the relationship and communication with the parents corresponds to the problematic state of nationalism in the connection to the state or nationality in political psychology.

The cognitive and psychological perception of the concept of a nation as a family or a parent has remained a practice of the past century that keeps itself alive symbolically in instruments such as the anthem (Sherif, 1936: 122). However, family is also substantial psychologically, sociologically and politically as it is the source of emotional capital of individuals. Protection, care and shelter are not only symbolized by the family but also a part of the bond that the individual forms with the nation and the nation to which belong of the individual (Houghton, 2014: 81). Similarly, as a response to the need for addiction, the nation is both a protective object and an inclusive and encompassing psychological symbol. It is a fact that the concepts of parent and family are objectified in the political arena with the notion of nation, corresponding to needs like security and honour as much as the need for loyalty. Today the need for nation and nation-state has not decreased in the world where almost every object and product are globalized (Surowiecki, 2004: 33). Also, nations with many official languages experience conflicts and contradictions within themselves compared to those with only one official language. Since similarities are the tools that hold people together and explain recognition and identification, they naturally form the psychological infrastructure of the concept of a nation.

I.B. THE INTENSITY OF IN-GROUP EMPATHY AND LACK OF OUT-GROUP EMPATHY

As posited by Sirin et al. (2021: 23), the escalation in populism, particularly that of a right-wing nature, can be attributed to the protective nature of empathy within a group. This phenomenon is associated with chauvinist nationalism, discrimination, and social exclusion. The fear based on social trust, which is archaic, takes a form that excludes the difference by strengthening empathy within the group. The impact and dynamics of in-group empathy are of considerable importance in the strength of populism, chauvinist nationalism, discrimination and univocal majority oppression in the contemporary world. Since the first human society, fears of competition and exclusion have been instrumental in the easy establishment of intragroup empathy in human existence. Although not as effective as in-group empathy, out-group empathy is a phenomenon that has emerged as a result of experience and social experiences and has focused on being the voice of polyphony, democracy and pluralism. Out-of-group empathy can process to prevent populism, nationalist chauvinism, discrimination and racism. It has significant functions in terms of reducing the traumatic effect of populism, which is a contemporary problem and motivating to live together psychologically.

For instance, the rhetoric of Trump and his campaign to construct a border wall between the United States and Mexico symbolises political issues, with the potential to impact financial, economic, diplomatic, geographical, geological, and environmental factors (Forgas and Crano, 2021: 46). In addition, Trump has made this an unlawful discourse by directly blaming immigrants and refugees for crimes that require severe legal sanctions, such as drug smuggling and human trafficking (Sirin, 2021: 49). Therefore, in terms of populism, in-group motivation is tolerably strong politically and can be used in any period.

Trump was so discursive in affinity with the concept of in-group empathy that he even called the slogan “Blacks Live Matter” discriminatory and racist, and He was pragmatic enough to argue that “it segregates whites” (Sirin, 2021: 58). In addition, Trump is a robust populist example with enough populist propaganda to sharpen discrimination in excluded different sections of society. He also manipulated in-group empathy while using this discriminatory language by using post-truth politics (Yılmaz and Geylani, 2021: 20). As a right-wing populist, Trump is a leader who can develop a discourse against different lifestyles, just like other autocratic and populist leaders (Sirin, 2021: 62). These discourses pave the way for social crises and divisions.

According to a study by Sirin et al. (2021: 77), Trump's political actions and discourses have highlighted social polarization and separation based on differences. In the research, significant decreases have been observed in the values of empathy and tolerance towards Latinos and African Americans, especially among white supporters of Trump.

The Trump era is an example of a provocative, divisive discourse and a polarizing political plane. In the age of Trump, politics is full of rhetoric and actions targeting all non-white Americans and all immigrants. Sometimes even discrimination and racism have been committed against children (Sirin, 2021: 80). In this period, as politically avoiding empathy was a priority, there was also the tragedy of the spread of discrimination. While Trump unwaveringly conveyed to his supporters and voters that Latino and refugee children from Mexico “are not his us children”, he was causing stereotyping of these children. It served to spread this discriminatory perception not only in the US public and practical politics but also in world public opinion. This period, which is also sloganned as the “Trump Effect”, describes a period that exemplifies the populist politics that builds the politics of division, separation and polarization in society by using action and discourse together and causing it to spread to the world. For example, Sirin et al. (2021: 91) underline that it is possible to see threats of similar language in the mosque attack in New Zealand in March 2019. Therefore, the role of actors like Trump is very effective in becoming a dangerous psychological epidemic of populism and threatening multiculturalism, polyphony and democracy around the globe.

In the Trump example, radical right-wing populism, reinforced by rhetoric of “Building a Great” and “Building a Great America Again”, and phrases such as “fugitive” and “criminal” developed for immigrants and refugees, and put into practice with the “wall” policy, promoted democracy in many parts of the world. So, populism has reached a position that can threaten human rights, the rule of law and polyphony (Sirin, 2021: 93). Thus, the example of Trump using anger and hatred as weapons against out-group empathy is empirically meaningful. However, the antidote to in-group empathy is out-group empathy.

This process, whose effects are economic, has a structure based on psychological foundations. According to the studies of Sirin et al. (2021: 94-95) group empathy had a decisive impact on the Brexit process. The election victory of Trump and Johnson and Brexit include substantial causes and consequences in terms of social psychology and political psychology. It is remarkable that countries with very different political dynamics, such as the USA and the United Kingdom, have undergone similar processes. As can be seen, the

conjuncture and political atmosphere in the world cause the development of populism even in developed democratic countries. Those who voted for Trump in the USA, Johnson in the UK, Orban in Hungary and Putin in Russia voted with remarkably similar motivations and feelings. According to Sirin et al., (2021: 99-101), group empathy is a phenomenon, theory and approach that can be evaluated in terms of understanding populism and the political processes of populist leaders and can be claimed to be a source of motivation.

It is sayable that chauvinist nationalism and populism are supported not by economic foundations but by psychological motivations such as the intensity of security concerns and in-group empathy. In all populist movements, in-group motivations and interests play a substantial role in the political and psychological discourse (Sirin, 2021: 103). In addition, it has been expressed in many studies, situations and cases that the accusatory or stereotyping language, discourse and actions against refugees periodically or historically do not have a practical and factual counterpart. Another factor that proves this theory is that multicultural groups or communities with high out-group empathy have low criminality (Sirin, 2021: 109). Therefore, it is sayable that populism in all of world politics by chauvinist nationalism and post-truths strengthened by perceptual and traumatic foundations, not factual ones. These extremely radical populist movements, which benefit from the lack of empathy, include the strategic mistakes of the left and liberal parties but are also related to the inability of political leaders and elites to contribute to the development of out-group empathy in society.

I.C. ABSOLUTE MORALITY INSTEAD OF THE CONCEPT OF RIGHTS

As Ditto and Rodriguez (2021:11) emphasized, the essence of practical politics is about mobilization. But populism is a form of policymaking that focuses on mobilizing morality. Populist movements do not hesitate to use incontrovertible moral values as a political strategy. Strong emotional language and discourse are powered weapons of populism. So, morality is a functional and pragmatic method for populism.

For instance, sociological grievance is a moral phenomenon. This moral fact constitutes one of the foundations of populism (Richards, 2019: 64; Fassin, 2018: 72; Laclau, 2018: 26). There is a deep relationship between complaining and the psychology of populism. Since it is impossible to discuss morals, the transformation of judgments such as “good”, “truth”, and “morality” into normative form is a paradoxical advantage of moral-based teachings such as

positivism. Sociological grievance is a tool that corrupts populism and increases the perception of crisis in social issues. So, populist movements have a normative characteristic that pragmatically benefits from the principle of unquestioning morality.

II. DESTRUCTION OF EMOTIONAL CAPITAL AND EMOTIONS

Emotional capital is a concept of psychological that reflects emotions and concepts like trust, dignity, belonging, otherness, and tolerance in society and political practice (Richards, 2019:67). “Emotional capital” turns into trauma or triumph consequent on social psychological investments. If mass practices their “emotional capital” for living together, this turns into social reconciliation and victory, and if they practice a divisive and confrontational investment in language, discourse and action, it turns into trauma. Social psychological triumphs depend on everyone's tolerance and trust in the non-self and making a social contract. Social traumas are also the results of intolerance and distrust and the psychological investment of a segregationist understanding (Laclau, 2018: 41; Volkan, 2001: 87). The first is the form of political resolution and is a psychological projection of political science's conceptualization of consensus, consent, and contract. Secondly, the reverse destruction of emotional capital and its reversal in a discriminatory, angry, aggressive and vengeful manner indicates the insolubility of the political institution and authority and social disintegration (Erisen, 2018: 44). This politic-psychological dynamic plays a substantial role in national and international policy-making processes. However, in today's national and international politics, ethnic nationalism is a constant threat due to the possibility of destroying the feelings such as social trust and honour and creating traumas, but citizenship-based nationalism; should be emphasized that it is a basic need as long as liberal democracy, the rule of law and universal legal codes do not erode these feelings. In this context, it needs to be emphasized that the concepts of human dignity or national dignity are not only legal concepts but also a substantial part of emotional capital and a psychological concept that open the door to peace or war.

However, the existence of ongoing violence or terrorist attacks may affect this function of reconciliation and resolving social crises, by stoking using the feeling of anger and thus fueling the deadlock (McDermott, 2004: 55-56). This destruction can be a substantial reason for the non-functional of social and emotional capital for many years or generations. The reason is that political and social problems have come to a deadlock, the political institution has become dysfunctional, and the public has lost their trust. In other words, the existence of any traumatic event or phenomenon like violence, terrorism and war is a

psychological factor that escalates right-wing populism and nationalism. Therefore, traumatic events cause more traumatic events in social psychology and this is a phenomenon that turns into a vicious circle.

Therefore, it is sayable that the movements against globalization and its consequences came to power in all the national states about 15-20 years after 9/11 attacks by referring to national identities. In other words, the emergence and strengthening of counter-movements of globalization in a short time and the transfer of these movements to power in many states do not seem to be a coincidence when considered in social psychology and political psychology. Economic globalization, which is always present in crises, causes societies to withdraw into themselves and cling to their national identities in times of crisis (Volkan, 2014a: 55). Despite economic globalization, social, cultural and psychological integration carries the danger of being dragged into an impasse, which cannot be resolved, as borders are a psychological barrier. The main reason for this problem should be sought in the destruction of traditional and cultural values by enlightenment and modernization and its socio-psychological consequences. The efforts of enlightenment and modernism to standardize urban people and the acceleration of this effort with globalization have produced new oppositions in socio-psychological and political psychological views. As can be seen, the institution of democracy in the West seems to have entered a significant crisis through the denial of differences. When examining the example of Trump and its counterparts in Europe, it is seen that the weakness of out-group empathy produces populism that includes xenophobia, divisiveness, Islamophobia and racism.

III. CHARACTERISTICS AND COMPARISON OF CONTEMPORARY RIGHT AND LEFT POPULISM

Right populists try to gather votes with the perception of security, while left populists with the perception of an economic guarantor. While right populism feeds on anti-refugee sentiment, left populism feeds on unemployment and financial concerns (Laclau, 2018: 54; Moffitt, 2016: 54-56; Mouffe, 2019: 52). These populism types of motivations are based on the process of social psychology and political psychology. In other words, left and right populism widely are effected emotional statements. Firstly, right-wing populism fuels the rapid change of cultures by globalization, while left-wing populism feeds on dynamics such as unemployment and low income, which globalization temporarily causes during periods of economic recession, recession and stagflation. While left-wing populism emerges in short-term economic confidence crises, right-wing populism exists with social problems such as rapid

cultural changes and immigration issues (Mouffe, 2005: 57; March, 2017: 287). While left-wing populism is gaining strength and rapidly gaining mass as it develops a policy on economic distress and tends to collapse more quickly, right-wing populism is a much more fundamental, permanent and hard-to-destroy movement because it strengthens by emphasizing cultural elements such as nationalism, sociological and religious differences. The right populism has a psychology fueled by needs, demands and expectations based on psychological foundations such as security and reputation (Decker, 2008: 125). Left populism, on the other hand, receives support from the psychological comfort zone brought by short-term economic relief that isn't based on economic rationale. Left populism is on the rise during terms of inflation, recession and stagflation. In this way, left populism tries to get stronger with a psychological return based on economic foundations. In terms of maintaining power, left-wing populist politics is short-lived and temporary, as it can be difficult to maintain its economic discourse in the medium and long term. Since right populist politics are evolved with cultural codes in the society or the world, its collapse would be long-term. While left-wing populism harms society economically and indirectly causes economic trauma, right-wing populism has a more damaging function in social psychology and political psychology, as it can sometimes feed on polarization, separation and even racism. Thus, the motivation of populist movements links to the loss of belief that elites and institutions can solve contemporary and universal problems. The drop of this belief paves the way for the emergence of populist movements, and the trend shows that populism can into a permanent process.

CONCLUSION

The first thing that has been accepted as legitimate since the emergence of the modern democratic state order is legality and the rule of law. In the psychology of politics, the law also represents an externalized authority. The law with traditional, patriarchal and punitive mechanisms, but therewithal gives a sense of security and protection; It is the externalized form of the superego.

In addition, just like parental authority, legal authority has two different breakdowns, which can cause emotional confusion to the individual. Not only can be used the monopoly of using force, which is legitimate and legal, to keep its citizens in peace and prosperity but also, legitimacy crises may arise with the abuse of this power. Therefore, in the psychology of politics, authority is in a structure that is prone to be broken on both sides, and the determinant of this situation is how much this authority is legally limited. In the face of these two aspects of the concept, societies become “adults” if they manage to draw

political authorization within legitimate limits, just like the adolescence period of the individual. It is sayable that the theory of democracy finds a response in practice if societies learn to live together through contracts and take this issue of political authority into the legitimate field.

The authority crisis of the modern world has turned into a global problem with populism. As a current threat to pluralism, coexistence, democracy and multicultural structure, populism causes crises and traumas in political psychology and political economy. With the prominence of in-group empathy and the exclusion of out-of-group empathy processes, many political, economic and sociological problems that have already existed, have both become complicated with the rise of populism and leave the new knotted issues in the arms of real politics in the world. In addition, the fact that globalization is open to the rapid and rapid expansion and growth process provides significant gains for some, while it is a very traumatic and humanely humiliating process for others. For this reason, it can be noted that all social traumas can support radical movements. It is seen able that the increase in corruption traumas infiltrating individual, social, institutional and all layers in the world, when evaluated both based on social sciences and psychologically, does not create global risks such as populism that cause deadlocked and destructive and traumatic consequences. Of course, the share of institutions, political elites, the political establishment and politicians in this corruption is inevitable, but the issue is more systematic than this and is related to the deterioration of the structure of the demos. In other words, it is indisputable that all layers of society, from the public to the political elite, have a share in a global phenomenon such as populism. It can be said that populism, which is the opposite of corrupt democratic institutions, also poses a threat of corruption.

It is a fact that the twenty-first century is a populist era and that the driving force and dynamism of politics is populism. However, the types of corrupt populism that emerge along with psychological damage contain possible dangers that could threaten the coexistence of societies. For example, while corrupt right-wing populism is a threat to pluralism, corrupt left-wing populism carries the danger of destroying social peace by causing economic disruptions. The conflict between globalization and its opposition creates a socio-psychological and political psychological process in societies, giving rise to degenerate types of populism. Every modernist intervention into the affiliations and cultural values of individuals and societies increases the degenerating psychological effect of populism. The economic, social and political destruction created is also psychologically based and transforms real politics, social

relations, international relations and the world into the psychology of segregationist, racist and unhealthy populist forms, not the form of coexistence and democracy. Considering the close relationship of all past high human civilizations with cosmopolitanism, overcoming the populism crisis seems psychologically possible by returning to the theory and practice of democracy, multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism.

REFERENCES

- Arditi, B. (2005). "Populism as an Internal Periphery of Democratic Politics". Francisco Panizza Ed. in. *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy*. London & New York: Verso. p. 72-99.
- Brubaker, R. (2017). Why populism? *Theory and Society*, 46(5), p. 357-385.
- De Blasio, E. and Sorice, M. (2018). "Populism Between Direct Democracy and the Technological Myth". *Palgrave Communications*. 4 (15). p. 1-11.
- Decker, F. (2008). "Germany: Right-wing Populist Failures and Left-wing Successes". Daniele Albertazzi and Duncan McDonnell Ed. in. *Twenty-First Century Populism*. Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan. p. 119-135.
- Ditto P. H. and Rodriguez, C.G. (2021). Populism and the Social Psychology of Grievance. Forgas, J.P., Crano, W.D., & Fiedler, K. (Eds.). *the Psychology of Populism: The Tribal Challenge to Liberal Democracy*. New York: Routledge.
- Erisen, C. (2018). *Political Behavior and the Emotional Citizen: Participation and Reaction in Turkey*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fassin, E. (2018). *Popülizm: Büyük Hınç*. Çev. Gülener Kırnalı ve İlker Kocael. Ankara: Heretik.
- Forgas, J.P. and Crano, W.D. (2021). the Tribal Challenge to Liberal Democracy Forgas, J.P., Crano, W.D., & Fiedler, K. (Eds.). *the Psychology of Populism: The Tribal Challenge to Liberal Democracy*. Routledge.
- Freud, S. (1955). Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. In *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, James Strachey (ed). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Held D. (1995). *Democracy and the Global Order*, Standford: Standford University Press.

- Houghton, D.P. (2014). *Political Psychology: Situations, Individuals, and Cases*. New York: Routledge.
- Kinnvall, C. (2002). "Nationalism, Religion and the Search for Chosen Traumas", *Ethnicities*, Vol: 2, (1), p. 79–106.
- Kinnvall, C., I. Manners and J. Mitzen. (2018). "Ontological (in)security in the European Union", *European Security*. 27(3), p. 249–265.
- Laclau, E. (2018). *Popülist Akıl Üzerine*. 3. Baskı. Çev. Nur Betül Çelik. Ankara: Epos Yayınları.
- McDermott, R. (2004). *Political Psychology in International Realitons*, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Manners, I. (2021). "Political psychology of Emotional Norms in European Foreign Policy", *Global Affairs*, 7(2), p. 193-205.
- March, L. (2017). "Left and Right Populism Compared: The British Case". *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. 19 (2). p. 282-303.
- Moffitt, B. (2016). *The global rise of populism: Performance, political style, and representation*. Stanford University Press.
- Mouffe, C. (2005). "The 'End of Politics' and the Challenge of Right-Wing Populism". Francisco Panizza Ed. in. *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy*. London & New York: Verso. p. 50-72.
- Richards, B. (2019). *The Psychology of Politics*, New York: Routledge.
- Sirin, C. V., Valentino, N. A. & Villalobos, J. D. (2021). *Seeing Us in Them: Social Divisions and the Politics of Group Empathy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many Are Smarter Than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economies, Societies and Nations*. Doubleday.
- Sherif, M. (1936). *The psychology of social norms*. Harper.
- Volkan, V. (2001) *Transgenerational Transmission and Chosen Traumas: An Aspect of Large-Group Identity*. *Group Analysis* 34, 79–97.

Volkan, V. (2014a). *Enemies on the couch: A psychopolitical journey through war and peace*. Pitchstone Publishing (US&CA).

Volkan, V. (2014b). *Blind trust: Large groups and their leaders in times of crisis and terror*. Pitchstone Publishing (US&CA).

Yılmaz, A. and Geylani, D. (2021). *Post Truth (Hakikat Sonrası), Global Siyaset ve Türkiye: Metodolojik Bir Yaklaşım*. Alim Yılmaz & İkrâm Bağcı Ed. *in Teoriden Pratiğe Türkiye Siyaseti*. Liberte Yayınları, Ankara.