Constructing ‘the People’ and the Past:
The *Alternative für Deutschland*, Collective Memory, and Populism as a Repertoire

by

Andrew Edwin Prosser
Bachelor of Arts (Honours), University of Waterloo, 2017

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Political Science
University of Victoria

Constructing ‘the People’ and the Past:
The *Alternative für Deutschland*, Collective Memory, and Populism as a Repertoire

By

Andrew Edwin Prosser
Bachelor of Arts (Honours), University of Waterloo, 2017

Supervisory Committee:

Dr. Avigail Eisenberg, Co-Supervisor
Department of Political Science

Dr. Oliver Schmidtke, Co-Supervisor
Department of Political Science, Centre for Global Studies

Abstract

Populism is a key, albeit ambiguous, feature of the contemporary political landscape. Prevalent conceptualizations of ‘populism’ are not analytically useful in understanding the nature of the phenomenon; such conceptualizations are useful for identifying populist actors, rather than revealing the specificity of populism. Conventional conceptions of populism do not adequately address the core feature of populism: the construction of ‘the people’ against ‘the elite.’ The thesis argues that conceptualizing populism as a ‘discursive repertoire’ accounts for how populists construct ‘the people’ in practice through identity politics. The thesis tests the efficacy of this approach through a discourse-historical analysis of a ‘hard’ case of populism, the Alternative für Deutschland (AfD), and focuses on how the AfD constructs ‘the people’ through the identity politics of collective memory. The analysis revealed that the AfD uses collective memory to establish continuity between ‘the people’ and the past in ethnocultural terms while simultaneously transcending ethnocultural nationhood by invoking ‘the people’ in the immediate through direct action. Thus, the populist invocation of 'the people' is temporally complex. Therefore, conceptualizing populism as a repertoire reveals the specificity of populist identity politics and, more specifically, the populist use of history.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgments

Firstly, I would like to thank the University of Victoria and the Department of Political Science. Specifically, I would like to thank Joanne Denton. I am also thankful for the various funding opportunities I have received through Teaching Assistantships, Research Assistantships, and Graduate Scholarships. This thesis would not have been possible without the support and guidance of my two supervisors, Avigail Eisenberg, and Oliver Schmidtke. I am grateful for Dr. Eisenberg's endless patience with me. Her incredible abilities to ask deep questions and to boil down my muddled thoughts into something coherent fundamentally shaped this thesis. Most importantly, I am thankful for Dr. Eisenberg's frequent encouragement to find my voice. In the same vein, I am deeply indebted to Dr. Schmidtke whose insights into German history and politics were a constant source of inspiration. Additionally, Dr. Schmidtke's comments throughout the writing process were invaluable in thinking through the difficulties of writing and thinking. I am very fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with such caring, attentive, and supportive supervisors.

I am incredibly grateful to be part of such a supportive cohort. Completing my thesis in the company of such unique and bright individuals broadened my academic horizons and, more importantly, encouraged me in all situations. I'd also like to thank my friends and interlocutors from various walks of my life, each of whom has contributed to this thesis in some way. I am deeply indebted to my friends and professors from the University of Waterloo, Cam Hale, Sam Nolan, Phoenicia Kempel, Dr. William Coleman, and Dr. John Jaworsky. I'd also like to thank my dear friends Justine Bochenek, Luke Travers, Sarah Fleck, Dale Wilson, and Ashley Jeffries. The importance of your friendship in my life cannot be overstated.

I'd be remiss if I did not acknowledge the cats in my life. I'd like to thank the best one-eared cat in the world, Topaz. Thank you for your cuddles, head butts, and naps, and for allowing me to make your food. I'd also like to thank the best polydactyl cat in the world, Mumford. Thank you for giving me a thumbs-up and watching movies with me.

It is difficult to imagine how I would've made it through this thesis, let alone my time at grad school, without my best friend and partner, Lauren Yawney. You were there for me through all the stressful times and the times when I felt inadequate and unconfident. For that, I am forever thankful. Your constant support, encouraging words, and willingness to get sushi after a difficult week have made my grad school experience incredibly fulfilling. Thank you for always being willing to listen to my ramblings on populism, obscure German parties, and the innumerable times I asked: "does this make sense?".

Lastly, and most importantly, I would like to thank my Mom, Karen, and my sister, Kandi, for being a constant presence of love and support in my life. Mom, thank you for always being so supportive of me and for shaping me into the person that I am today. I know I would not be writing this today if not for your love and wisdom in my life. Kandi, thank you for picking me up from the airport on snowy days, always singing Little Shop of Horrors with me, and for being one of my best friends. Our trip to Snoqualmie will always be one of my favourite memories. I would not be where I am today without both of your love in both the good and the bad.

‘Populism’: Useful Analytic Concept?

Populism is a key feature of the contemporary political landscape. Disparate contemporary political movements and actors have been characterized as ‘populist,’ ranging from Geert Wilders and Marine Le Pen to Podemos and Bernie Sanders. Along with these actors, regional variations of populism have emerged, with the exemplary forms being Western European *authoritarian populism* and Latin American *egalitarian populism*. In line with these empirical developments, interest in populism within political science has increased dramatically since the early 2000s. However, there is still little theoretical and empirical consensus on how best to conceptualize populism. Predominant definitions and analytic categorizations of populism fail to grasp the particularity of populism in the current ‘national-populist’ conjuncture (Taguieff 1995; Brubaker 2017a).[1] Indeed, given its widespread application, some scholars have questioned whether ‘populism’ itself is even a useful analytic concept (Canovan 1981). In other words, the ambiguity of ‘populism’ calls into question the validity of the concept as such, and definitions of the concept often appear as attempts “to fit a square peg in a round hole” (Moffitt & Tormey 2014, p. 381).

The ambiguity surrounding the concept of populism has led various scholars to call populism an ‘essentially contested concept’ (Mudde & Kaltwasser 2017, p. 2; van Kessel 2014). Along these lines, populism is an *internally complex* phenomenon in that it refers to many other concepts such as ‘democracy’ and ‘sovereignty,’ and is *open* in its applicability to several political contexts (Connolly 1983[1974]). ‘Populism’ is continually open to debate regarding its correct usage and application that stem from different normative, theoretical, and empirical

[1] Taguieff (1995) and Brubaker (2017) understand the contemporary conjuncture of populism to be a ‘national-populist’ conjuncture. This means that both up-down and inside-outside exclusions characterize contemporary populisms.

assumptions (Bellamy & Mason 2013). Departing from the ambiguity of 'populism,' this thesis offers a critique of the dominant conceptions of populism and argues for a *situated* concept of populism (see Chapter 1). Before developing such an account of populism, it is necessary to consider the theoretical and empirical problems with current conceptualizations of populism.

The limitations of 'populism': Literature Review

The most common categorization regarding populism is the dichotomy of right-wing and left-wing populism. This dichotomy posits that right-wing and left-wing populisms represent disparate phenomena, united by the populist claim to represent 'the people' against 'the elite.' Right-wing populism is understood as only peripherally populist and is characterized by authoritarianism, nativism, and anti-democracy (Mudde 2007). Exemplary instances of right-wing populism are the Front National (FN) in France and Donald Trump in the United States (Inglehart & Norris 2017), with less-authoritarian instances of right-wing populism consisting of parties such as the Belgian Libertair, Direct, Democratisch (Pauwels 2010). 'The people' in right-wing populist discourse is understood in ethnocultural terms. Left-wing populism, exemplified by Syriza, Podemos, and Latin American populism is viewed as 'inclusionary' and promoting plurality and difference (Katsambekis 2016; Stavrakakis et al. 2016). However, I criticize attempts to understand populism as either a left-wing or right-wing phenomenon, since such a conceptualization ignores how populist actors seek to transcend the left-right divide (Taguieff 2016; Wodak 2015). Accordingly, categorizing populist actors along the left-right divide does not capture the specificity of populist discourses. My second critique emerges from these scholars' use of examples in their categorizations. While the FN is the quintessential case of right-wing populism in Western Europe, other anti-foreigner populist actors may not reflect

the authoritarian, anti-democratic, and nativist characteristics of the FN. As a result, researchers rely on the use of the language of 'degreeism' (Sartori 1991), where it becomes unclear how populist an actor must be to be considered a 'full' case of populism.

Beyond the categorizations outlined previously, three theoretical frameworks have been developed to conceptualize populism: 'populism-as-a-logic,' 'populism-as-a-discourse,' and 'populism-as-an-ideology.' 'Populism-as-a-logic' emerges from the work of Ernesto Laclau. Laclau (2005) sought to understand the ontological status of 'populism' and argued that populism is *the* logic of 'the political' (p. 154). Following Carl Schmitt's (2007) 'friend-enemy' distinction, Laclau and Mouffe (1985) understand 'the political' as premised on the division between two antagonistic groups that are formed through equivalential chains. Populism, which according to Laclau (2005) is the production of an equivalential chain of 'the people' against 'the elite,' is the political *tout court* (p. x). From Laclau's formulation, populism is *the* form of emancipatory democratic politics that functions through the constitution of 'the people.'

Despite the importance of Laclau's analysis, I take issue with his account of populism on two accounts. First, there is a slippage of concepts throughout Laclau's work. While Laclau and Mouffe (1985) argued that 'the political' is *hegemony* (p. 193), Laclau (2005) later argued that "populism is the royal road to understanding something about the ontological constitution of the political as such" (p. 67). More importantly, however, I argue that Laclau's conceptualization is too broad to be meaningfully applied to empirical cases. While Laclau criticizes 'ontic' conceptions of populism (meaning studies that emphasize the concrete practices of politics), scholars that have applied his theory appear to do what he critiques (for example, see Panizza 2005). As such, Moffitt and Tormey (2014) state that "Laclau's attempt to equate populism with the political is of little help in understanding sameness or difference" (p. 385).

The discursive approach to populism draws on Laclau's fundamental assumptions about 'the political' and its relationship to populism. This approach considers populism to be a "dichotomic discourse in which 'the people' are juxtaposed to 'the elite'... Populist politics thus claim to represent 'the people' against an 'elite' that frustrates their legitimate demands and presents these demands as expressions of the will of 'the people'" (De Cleen & Stavrakakis 2017, p. 310). I argue that this approach, while drawing on a rich methodology, serves not to analyze populism, but rather to verify the universal applicability of the Laclauian approach to populism, making the definition of little analytic import.

Proponents of the 'ideational approach' to populism define it as a "*thin-centered ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic camps, 'the pure people' versus 'the corrupt elite,' and which argues that politics should be an expression of the* volonté générale *(general will) of the people*" (Mudde & Kaltwasser 2017, p. 6). While Mudde and Kaltwasser (2012, p. 7-8) understand this as a Sartorian (1970) minimal definition, the definition is simultaneously too minimal and not minimal enough. On the one hand, Mudde and Kaltwasser's (2012) argument that populism is primarily "a form of *moral* politics" (p. 8) may not be true in all populisms, where the opposition between 'the people' and 'the elite' can be a socio-economic antagonism. On the other hand, Mudde and Kaltwasser's definition accounts for the *vertical* dimension of populist politics ('the people' vs. 'the elite'), while ignoring the *horizontal* dimension of excluding outside groups from 'the people.'[2]

More recently, Stavrakakis et al. (2017) and De Cleen and Stavrakakis (2017) argue for a sharp conceptual distinction between populism and nationalism, with the former articulated in the vertical dimension as 'the people-as-underdog,' and the latter in the horizontal dimension as

[2] Beyond this critique, Moffitt and Tormey (2014, p. 383-384) argue that populism does not fit the criteria of a 'thin-centred ideology,' as developed by the founder of the morphological approach to ideology, Michael Freeden.

'the people-as-nation.' However, I argue that the attempt to "purify" (Stavrakakis et al. 2017, p. 424) populism by reducing it solely to the vertical dimension does not address the aforementioned conceptual ambiguity of the concept and, more fundamentally, does not contribute to understanding how populism functions at the contemporary conjuncture.

In summary, I argue that the dominant conceptions of 'populism' are not useful in three ways. First, most conceptions of populism focus solely on the *vertical* opposition between 'the people' and 'the elite,' which does not capture the specificity of the contemporary 'national-populist' conjuncture. Second, 'minimal definitions' of populism are useful for *identifying* populist actors, but not for analyzing the populist construction of 'the people.' Lastly, traditional concepts of populism either pejoratively dismiss actors as 'populist' or affirm populism as an emancipatory form of democratic politics. However, central to all of the dominant conceptualizations of populism is the core element of populist discourse: to speak and act in the name of 'the people.' In this regard, Müller (2016) and others (Marchlewska et al. 2018; Melendez & Kaltwasser 2017; Wodak 2015) argue that populism is a form of identity politics centred on the construction of 'the people.'

Research Question, Case Study, and Argument

From this framing, I pose the following research question and subquestions: what is the best way to conceptualize 'populism' to understand how populism functions in the contemporary 'national-populist' conjuncture? How does populism as a form of identity politics interact with particular sociopolitical contexts in which it is employed? How does populism structure 'the people' using different elements of identity formation, such as history and ethnicity?

Following Ludwig Wittgenstein (2009[1958]), I argue that 'populism' is a 'family resemblance' concept, meaning that 'populism' is best understood as "a complicated network of similarities overlapping and criss-crossing: similarities in the large and in the small" (p. 36). Conceptualizing populism as such serves two purposes. First, Wittgenstein argues that 'family members' can legitimately change their meaning depending upon which *language games* are being played. Therefore, the 'best' definition of populism is the one that accomplishes the task that theorists and analysts set for themselves. Thus, it becomes necessary to conceptualize 'populism' that accounts for the specificity of populist identity construction in the 'nationalist-populist' conjuncture.

Second, and central to this thesis, *I argue that populism is best conceptualized as a discursive repertoire.* As a repertoire, populism is a set of discursive and stylistic elements that, although consisting of a set of relatively standardized elements, are elaborated and imbued with particular contents from particular sociopolitical contexts. My argument draws on the discursive and stylistic turn in populist studies and stems from Ruth Wodak's (2015, p. 1) charge to focus on the ontic contents of populism (Brubaker 2017a; Jansen 2011, 2016). Populism-as-a-repertoire also takes on the form of a 'family resemblance' concept, where, just as in a 'family resemblance,' it may not be fruitful to specify a sufficient set of elements for characterizing political actors as populist. Instead, actors draw on elements that, when combined, can be considered populist. In this sense, the populist repertoire is a set of discursive elements that are built around the construction of and claim to represent 'the people.'

To test the concept of populism as a discursive repertoire, I will analyze a 'hard' case study (Sartori 1970), which, according to van Kessel (2014), shows that "using a clear minimal definition of populism does not necessarily guarantee a meaningful and accurate application of

the concept" (p. 101). I will study the Alternative für Deutschland (AfD), a party categorised almost universally as "right-wing populist" in German political science literature (Arzheimer 2015; Lees 2018; Berbuir et al. 2015; Grabow 2016; Patton 2017; Schmitt-Beck 2017; Siri 2018). During the 2017 Federal Election, the AfD became Germany's third largest political force, thus becoming the first far right-wing party since the 1950s to have national electoral success in Germany (Berbuir et al. 2015; Goerres et al. 2018). The AfD is a fruitful 'hard' case study for two reasons. First, the AfD frequently transcends the left-right discursive spectrum and has a tight discursive interweaving of vertical and horizontal oppositions. Second, the sociopolitical and discursive horizon of the German context interacts in particular ways with the construction of identity, being particularly centred on the collective memory of Germany's National Socialist and communist pasts (see Olick 2016; Shoshan 2016).

Applying the research questions to this case study, I ask the following questions: how does the AfD construct 'the people' by using various discursive strategies that draw on elements of identity in the German context, primarily Germany's collective memory? How does the populist construction of 'the people' differ from conventional nationalist forms of identification? I argue that the populist construction of 'the people' is distinct from nationalist forms of identification due to its *temporal complexity*. While the AfD draws upon German collective memory and history to produce a sense of continuity within the identity of 'the people,' the AfD also emphasizes that 'the people' comes into existence in *the immediate* through direct action and crisis. Through direct action, 'the people' includes subjectivities that would be excluded under an ethnocultural conception of 'the people.' In this sense, 'the people' is both a historically stable identity position as well as an occasional and intermittent collectivity (Canovan 2002).

Outline of Thesis

To develop the concept of populism as a discursive repertoire, I will conduct a critical discourse analysis (CDA) by using the discourse-theoretical approach (DHA), as developed by Ruth Wodak and her interlocutors (see Reisigl & Wodak 2009; Wodak & Richardson 2013; Wodak 2009, 2015). In particular, the DHA allows for the identification of discourses which are used "to construct positive self- and negative other- presentations" (Wodak 2015, p. 52). In this way, I will identify discourses that construct 'the people' and 'the elite' and illuminate the connections between in-groups and out-groups. Crucially, the DHA emphasizes the importance of situating political discourses in their particular sociopolitical contexts.

In Chapter 1, I will develop the DHA as a methodology for the present study, as well as analytic categories central to a study of populist discourses. Furthermore, I will develop critical theoretical concepts that will act as a point of trajectory for the present study. Thus, I will discuss concepts central to understanding the present 'national-populist' moment, such as identity construction, nationalism, and populism. I will conclude this chapter by engaging with relevant literature on populism to begin to add some 'tools' to the populist repertoire that will be empirically tested later.

The following three chapters provide what Wodak (2015) terms the 'four-level model of context.' According to Wodak, discourses must be situated within their appropriate context to be understood (Reisigl & Wodak 2009, p. 89) and, as such, four levels of context must be specified: first, the historical development of the respective party or political actor; second, discussions which dominated a specific debate/event; third, a specific text; and fourth, other related events, discourses, and texts which have influenced the specific discursive practice in manifold ways (Wodak 2015).

As such, Chapter 2 will conduct a historical analysis of the prominent debates and discourses about German identity since the end of WWII, with a particular focus on various competing models of nationhood. In this chapter, I will outline the discursive arguments that were employed to make certain conceptions of German identity taboo (Olick & Levy 1997). I will conclude with a summary of the various discourses and debates around national belonging that emerged in the postwar era.

In Chapter 3, I will conduct a discourse analysis of Angela Merkel's and the CDU's particular conception of nationhood by examining CDU speeches made during recent prominent debates, namely Euroscepticism and the European Migration Crisis. While the AfD is the focus for this thesis, I argue that, following Stavrakakis et al. (2018), "populist discourses never operate in a vacuum and need to be studied within the context of political antagonism, within the broader hegemonic struggle" (p. 5). It is necessary to establish the content and symbolic boundaries of the present hegemonic discourses to understand the AfD's discursive construction of 'the people.' As such, I will identify the broad discursive patterns of the CDU's conception of national identity, with a particular focus on the CDU's delegitimization of populism and continuity with past identity debates in Germany.

In Chapter 4, I will conduct a discourse analysis of the AfD and its prominent leaders, namely Björn Höcke, Alexander Gauland, and Alice Weidel by examining speeches. During my discourse analysis, I sought to identify the broad discursive patterns that the AfD used to describe the populist 'people.' The present discourse analysis involves two elements: first, to identify who constitutes 'the people' in the AfD's discourse; second, to identify the discourses used to construct the people, and reflecting on how these diverge from Merkel's conception of national identity. Finally, I will examine the effect of the AfD's critique of German memory

politics on the types of configurations of symbolic boundaries of national belonging that are possible in the present context. I will also situate the AfD's discourse within the broader discourses about German nationalism and belonging stemming from the German far-right and extremist political context.

In Chapter 5, I will conclude with an overview of my findings of the discourse analysis and will argue that understanding populism as a repertoire is a fruitful development for understanding the specificity of populism in the 'national-populist' conjuncture.

Chapter 1: Discourse, Populism, Identity, and Collective Memory

In seeking to uncover the specificity of contemporary populist discourses, it is necessary to clarify certain conceptual ambiguities surrounding nationalism, populism, discourse, and identity. I will begin by providing an overview of the methodology and central analytic concepts that will be used throughout this thesis, namely the discourse-historical approach (DHA) for analyzing discourses on identity. Following this, I will further elaborate a conceptualization of populism as a repertoire and situate it within what certain theorists of populism term the 'national-populist conjuncture' (Taguieff 2016; Brubaker 2017a). Following this, I will provide definitions of identity, national identity, and collective memory. For the particular German context, collective memory plays a fundamental role in identity construction. As such, I will engage with sociological and philosophical interventions into the study of collective memory to connect collective memory to the discursive construction of identity. The definition of identity provided emphasizes the contingent and fluid nature of identity construction. Throughout this chapter, I aim to avoid any movements to essentialize populism and its relationship to identity (for example, by avoiding categories such as 'inclusive' and 'exclusive' populism).

Discourse-Historical Approach

To delineate the symbolic boundaries of the normative national identity of both Merkel and Germany's consensus, and the AfD and the German extreme right, this thesis will employ a *discourse-historical approach* (DHA). The DHA allows relating "the macro- and meso-level of contextualization to the micro-level analyses of texts," (Wodak 2015, p. 50) which is necessary to understand how these discourses relate to the broader socio-political German context. The DHA consists of three levels of analysis: after (1) identifying the *contents* or *topics* of a specific

discourse[3], (2) *discursive strategies* are investigated. Then (3) *linguistic means* and the context-dependent *linguistic realizations* are examined (Reisigl & Wodak 2009, p. 93; Wodak 2015). The following section will outline central analytic categories to develop the present thesis' research methods.

Texts, Discourse and Context

The DHA focuses on *texts*, whether they are audio, spoken, visual, or written, as they relate to *discourses*. *Discourses*, for Wodak, are "a cluster of context-dependent semiotic practices that are situated within specific fields of action," are "socially constituted and socially constitutive" and "related to a macro-topic," and are "linked to the argumentation about validity claims such as truth and normative validity involving several social actors who have different points of view" (Reisigl & Wodak 2009, p. 89).[4] In other words, texts, owing to their inherent ambiguities as *texts*, cannot be understood without considering layers of *context*. The DHA follows a 'four-level model of context' that was outlined in the introduction. In short, DHA considers the (1) socio-political/historical context, (2) the current context, (3) the text-internal co-text, and (4) intertextual and interdiscursive relations between utterances, texts, and discourses (Wodak 2015).

Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity

Intertextuality and interdiscursivity are central to the DHA. The DHA examines the intertextual and interdiscursive relationships between different discourses and utterances and seeks to explore how discourses change according to the sociopolitical context (Reisigl & Wodak 2009, p. 90). Intertextuality signifies that texts are linked to other texts, both in the past

[3] van Dijk (1991) states that *discourse topics* "conceptually, summarize the text, and specify its most important information" (p. 113).
[4] Crucially, Reisigl and Wodak (2009) state that it is difficult to delimit the borders of a discourse and to differentiate it from other discourses since the boundaries of any particular discourse are fluid (p. 89).

and the present (Reisigl & Wodak 2009). These connections are established through a clear surface relationship between texts as well as through implicit thematic chains that relate to each other through underlying assumptions.

Interdiscursivity refers to the presence of multiple discourses within particular political projects; this means "both the mutual relationships of discourses and the connection, intersecting or overlapping, of different discourses 'within' a particular heterogeneous linguistic project" (Wodak & Reisigl 2001, p. 37). Recontextualization is a key process within intertextuality and interdiscursivity. Recontextualization refers to the process whereby a textual or discursive element is taken out of a specific context (or de-contextualized) and then inserted into a new spatial or temporal context (Wodak & Fairclough 2010). In the process of recontextualization, the element acquires new meaning, "since meanings are formed in use" (Reisigl & Wodak 2009, p. 90). Richardson and Wodak (2009) point out that recontextualization is not value-neutral and right-wing political actors are particularly adept this process. For this thesis, the analysis of intertextuality and interdiscursivity will focus on how recontextualized practices and discourses are operationalized within particular populist strategies. Returning to the current topic, the DHA enables an understanding of the specificity of populist discourses in the German context while avoiding the normative implications of other discourse-analytical perspectives on populism (i.e., the approach established by Laclau and Mouffe). More clearly, the present methodology aims to unveil the different ways in which 'the people' (*Volk*), a deep-seated German concept, is employed in various identity discourses.

Populism as a Repertoire and the DHA

While discussed briefly during the introduction, the conceptualization of populism as a discursive repertoire necessitates further development and justification. The notion of 'political repertoires' emerges from the scholarly literature on contentious politics (see Tarrow 1998; Tilly 2008). Initially, the concept of repertoire was meant to "capture some of the recurrent, historically embedded character of contentious politics" (Tilly 2006, p. 34) through which political actors articulate demands, interests, and identities. Applied to populism, the concept of repertoire effectively captures how populist actors articulate their interests and demands through a series of discursive strategies that are historically embedded. In recalling the prior discussion of Wittgenstein, understanding populism as a 'family resemblance' concept accounts for the diversity of actors that are coined 'populist' as well as the lack of uniformity regarding the ideologies employed by populist actors. In this way, the discursive strategies in the populist repertoire "must be filled out with particular content and adapted to local circumstances when they are used" (Brubaker 2017a, p. 361). Thus, populists use these discursive strategies to construct 'the people' and 'the elite.' Crucially, the contentious politics literature on repertoires emphasizes how political practice is best understood as a product of contextually situated innovation by political actors. Because of this, I will now turn to justify my use of the DHA as an appropriate methodology.

Jansen (2016) argues that to study political repertoires effectively, researchers must attend to some features. First, researchers must study "the nature of the social and political conditions shaping a given context of action and structuring the possibilities for political innovation" (Jansen 2016, p. 326). Second, researchers must attend to the situational construction of "the relevant collective political actors" (Jansen 2016,p. 327). Lastly, researchers must analyze "the formation of the problem situations that these actors confront" (Jansen 2016, p.

327). In this way, analyses of repertoires must take the historical preconditions of identity formation seriously and must resist assuming causality or structural determinism; researchers must emphasize that political actors are shaped by their sociopolitical contexts but still create anew within these contexts. Because of this research programme, I argue that the DHA effectively accounts for these elements due to its established focus on providing historical and contemporary context and by situating itself in the middle of the agency-structure dichotomy (Reisigl & Wodak 2009).

Theorizing the 'National-Populist' Conjuncture

During the introduction, I argued that, following Taguieff (1995) and Brubaker (2017a), the current era of populism is best characterized as a 'national-populist' conjuncture. National populism is defined by the opposition between 'us' and 'them' in both vertical and horizontal dimensions (Jansen 2011). In this section, I briefly turn to demarcate populist and nationalist discourses to better describe the current 'national-populist' conjuncture (Caiani & Kröll 2017).

Populism and Discourse

Despite my critiques of conventional definitions of populism of not capturing the specificity of populism, these approaches to populism have delineated the core concepts of populism. Most accounts argue that populism involves the claim to speak and to act in the name of the people and against 'the elite' (see Stavrakakis et al. 2017; Canovan 1999; Mudde & Kaltwasser 2012). Populism is structured around a *vertical, up/down* axis that refers to "power, status, and hierarchical socio-cultural and/or socio-economic positioning" (De Cleen & Stavrakakis 2017, p. 312). The identities associated with this axis are "the people" (or a variant of this) in the down position and "the elite" (or another similar label) in the up position. Wodak

and Forchtner term this orientation as '*vertical affect'* (2014). Therefore, by using spatial-orientational terms, it becomes possible to better understand the specificity of populism's affective appeal (Demertzis 2006; Caiani & Kröll 2017).

Nationalism and Discourse

To address the horizontal dimension, I will now develop the concept of nationalism used for this thesis. For this thesis, I draw on the previous research on the discursive construction of national identities (Wodak et al. 2009; de Cleen 2013). Stemming from the research of Benedict Anderson (1983), I assume that nations are best understood as 'imagined communities' (p. 6). The discursive construction of the nation is accompanied by deep emotional attachments and feelings of belonging, and such emotions defend particular political practices (Freeden 1998). The meaning and contents of 'nation' are closely related to other concepts like 'Heimat.'

Wodak et al. (2009) argue that a discursive understanding of the 'nation' and national identity implies "a complex of similar conceptions and perceptual schemata, or similar emotional dispositions and attitudes, and of similar behavioural conventions" (p. 4). For the present study, national identity for Germany can consist of "a common homogeneous culture extending into the past, present and future," "a distinctive national territory", and "notions of and attitudes towards other national communities and their culture, history and so on" (Wodak 2015, p. 77).

Constructionist approaches to nationalism (Bhabha 1990; Norval 1996) emphasize that 'nations' are social constructions that are contingent and fragmented (de Cleen & Stavrakakis 2017). These approaches to nationalism do not seek to identify a national essence, or what defines national belonging (Brubaker 1992), but rather the particularities of how nationalist discourses construct the nation. In this way, nationalist discourses define similarities and differences, or, put differently, draw clear boundaries between 'Us' and 'Them' through

discursive strategies of positive-Self and negative-Other representation. As De Cleen and Stavrakakis (2017) argue, the particular discursive formation of nationalism is best understood in spatial terms: "Nationalist discourse is structured around an in/out relation, with the "in" consisting of the members of the nation and the "out" comprising of non-members" (p. 309).

Discursively, the in/out relation of nationalism is enacted in three ways. First, and stemming from Anderson's (1983) conception of the nation as an 'imagined community,' the nation is *limited* and can only be constructed according to its relationship to other limited communities. Second, the nation is understood as a community that is discursively constructed as an "organic community that all members are considered to be a part of" (De Cleen & Stavrakakis 2017, p. 310). Lastly, the nation is constructed as sovereign and, in particular, the shared time (past, present, and future), and space (a shared territory with delineated borders) differentiates the in-group from the out-group and obscures the historical contingency of the nation (Wodak et al. 2009). Therefore, for this thesis, I am interested in how hegemonic and elite discourses in Germany define 'Germans' and create an 'imagined community' of 'Germans.'

National-Populist Discourses

Having identified the theoretical particularity of populist and nationalist discourses, I will now draw these discourses together to reflect on the 'national-populist' conjuncture. In contrast to Stavrakakis and others who seek to differentiate between "primarily 'nationalist' and 'racist' discourses" and populist discourses (Stavrakakis et al. 2017, p. 137), I argue that contemporary national populism brings together the vertical and horizontal dimensions.[5] In practice, national populism typically characterizes 'the elite' as being both 'outside' as well as 'above', meaning

[5] My challenge to Stavrakakis and his interlocutors is premised on the ambiguity of assessing phenomena 'degrees of populism', or by examining how central populist discourses are to particular political actors. More importantly, I argue that the specificity of populist identity construction emerges by analyzing how populism exists in ontic terms.

that ‘the elite’ are “not only...insensitive to the economic struggles of ordinary people, but also as indifferent or condescending towards their way of life” (Brubaker 2017b, p. 1192). Furthermore, ‘the elite’ are viewed as favouring a world without borders, which undermines the economic self-determination and bounded solidarity of the nation-state. Because of this, ‘the elite’ are seen as advocating for multiculturalism, speaking for minority rights *against* majority rights, and for denouncing common people as racist. Finally, the ‘national Other’ or, as is typically the case in Western European populist discourse, Islam can also be understood as being ‘above’ and ‘outside’, where Muslims are portrayed as external to and a threat to the dominant culture as well as having an alliance with elite forces in society. Speaking of populism in this two-dimensional perspective produces a sense of populist collective identity by relying on an assertion of difference.

‘The People’ in the National-Populist Conjuncture

In spatial terms, the national-populist conjuncture is characterized by the tight discursive interweaving of both vertical (against those ‘on top’) and horizontal (against those ‘outside’) oppositions. However, I argue that the populist construction of ‘the people’ is different from nationalism in a *temporal* dimension. As explained above, nationalist communities are premised on and sustained by various imaginaries or myths, and they aim to produce a sense of constancy throughout history by discursively producing a common history and a shared destiny. I argue that populists, similar to nationalists, attempt to ground ‘the people’ in collective memory, but they supplement ‘the people’ with an additional temporal dimension: *the immediate*.

According to Stoica (2017), political communities are sustained around four well-established *political myths* that are the driving force behind ideologies. The first and central myth is the conspiracy myth, which refers to the perceived existence of an esoteric and occult

organization that plans to conquer the world "with the intention of ruling against the general will" (Stoica 2017, p. 67). Second, the myth of the saviour describes the existence of a communal hero whose fate is tied to that of the community. Next, the myth of the golden age is strongly related to nostalgia and implies a spectrum of symbols that derive from different political contexts. Lastly, and most importantly, the myth of unity, which cannot be dissociated from the idea of a shared destiny, resembles the image of a sum of individuals who live together in harmony (Stoica 2017). The ultimate goal of the myth of unity "is to pull together all forces and to avoid that the society becomes atomized in the sense of annihilating all collectively coherent action" (Stoica 2017, p. 68). I agree with Stoica's (2017) contention that populists structure 'the people' with these myths. However, I argue that 'the people' are united through direct action and narratives of crisis. In this sense, populists move beyond an ethnocultural conception of 'the people' to include other subjectivities against a common enemy. To better develop this line of thought, it is necessary to discuss the relationship between collective memory and identity formation as a process of *making sense of the past*.

Identity and the Politics of Collective Memory

The previous section developed and elaborated the conceptualization of populism as a repertoire, and situated this within a broader theorization of the 'national-populist' conjuncture. From this, the following section will orient the present discussion around the relationship between identity, identity politics, and collective memory.

Collective Memory and National Identity

Memory

According to Reinhart Koselleck (1985), historical consciousness arises in the polarity between *experiential space* and the *horizon of expectation*. Experiential space signifies "the entire heritage of the past to which a person or a group has access" while the horizon of expectation "refers to the anticipation of a particular future that is full of wishes and fears, plans and visions" (Wodak & de Cillia 2007, p. 343). The polarity of these two modes of being is realized in the present of a particular culture, meaning that the present is the *mediation of the past and the future*. Therefore, given this temporal interaction, historical consciousness develops in "a continuous process, starting from the horizon of expectation and acting upon the reservoir of past experience" (Heer & Wodak 2008, p. 2). The encounter between the horizon of expectation and past experience generates 'subject matter' for the construction of meaning in the present, which produces particular actions.

Through the continuous process of historical consciousness, individuals produce "frameworks or schemata of interpretation" that render "what would otherwise be a meaningless aspect of the scene into something that is meaningful" (Goffman 1975, p. 21, as cited in Heer & Wodak 2008). Furthermore, Goffman concludes that the primary frameworks of a particular social group are a central element of its culture (Heer & Wodak 2008). Therefore, memory is a practice of 'meaning-making' (Olick 2016) that relies on particular 'frames' to render historical events meaningful. Teun van Dijk (1984) argues that cognitive schemata, or 'frames,' determine how perceptions are experienced and remembered.

Collective Memory

From this framing, the concept of 'collective memory,' as developed by Maurice Halbwachs, becomes a useful analytic category. Halbwachs begins his study by observing that since individuals do not remember independently but instead draw on the memories of others

(presented in the form of gestures, images, or architecture) consisting of strange pasts that transcend and precede individual experience, collective memory must exist: “I would readily acknowledge that each [individual] memory is a viewpoint on the collective memory” (1980, p. 48). Using Ricoeur, Wodak and de Cillia (2007) argue that collective memory can assume the attributes of individual memory, specifically that collective memory can provide continuity and confer identity. As such, Ricoeur (1997) views collective memory as “a collection of the traces of defining events for the historical development of a particular group” (p. 438f, as cited in Heer & Wodak 2008). Through this process, collective memory produces a form of continuity and, as such, it can come to constitute an identity. Thus, as Halbwachs observed, “when it considers its own past, the group feels…that it has remained the same and *becomes conscious of its identity through time*” (1980, p. 85).

Politics of the Past

Beyond existing as a sociological and anthropological category of analysis, collective memory can exert a critical influence on ‘experiential space’; by shaping and reforming cognitive schemata, collective memory transforms what is considered meaningful. Collective memory in this regard is the result of ongoing struggles for hegemony between differing interests and identities. Crucially, political actors “all act from the vantage point of the present and to the future; legitimized by the ‘expectation horizon’...and using particular ‘value judgments,’ they practice *Geschichtspolitik*, the functionalization of history for political ends” (Heer & Wodak 2008, p. 5). In liberal-democracies, *Geschichtspolitik* is continually practiced and challenged by elites who shape and define the symbols, norms, and values that constitute political communities. Therefore, “*Geschichtspolitik* is...a field of action and policy in which different political actors

load the past with their particular interests and wrestle for public approval" (Wolfrum 1999, p. 58, as cited in Heer & Wodak 2008).

(National) Identity and Collective Memory

Halbwachs' claim that groups become conscious of their identity through time necessitates a closer engagement with the term 'identity.' William Connolly (1995) defines identity as "a constructed, relational formation *that engenders human differences, resistances, remainders, and surpluses through the very politics of its consolidation*" (p. 89). Furthermore, Jan Assmann (1992) defines collective identity as "the image that a group builds up of itself and with which its members identify. Collective identity is a matter of identification on the part of the participating individuals. It does not exist 'in itself,' but only ever to the extent that specific individuals subscribe to it" (p. 132). Framed as such, identity is socially-constructed and relational, meaning that it is defined through inclusions and exclusions.[6] Identity is also contingent on difference and 'remainders and surpluses,' an element that, I argue, is of central importance to the relationship between collective memory and identity since historical consciousness is never closed.[7] As such, societies "provide the raw material for (collective) identity formation by virtue of their multi-layered, mostly dissonant, discourses" (Heer & Wodak 2008, p. 7). Then, political actors interpret and mediate this raw material and produce meaningful understandings of the past that influence identity. Following from this line of thinking, Zelizer (1998) understands collective memory as creatively and purposefully contributing to the boundaries of national identities by allowing for "the fabrication, rearrangement, elaboration, and

[6] All methods of critical discourse analysis in the post-Saussurian tradition share an understanding of identities as fluid and temporary concepts based on how actors define themselves and others (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002).
[7] Later in *The Ethos of Pluralization*, Connolly (1995) terms these surpluses and remainders 'Diference,' which "points to the noise, energies, and remainders that circulate through every cultural configuration and are not captured by their self-identifications" (p. 99). The recognition of the fact that identities can never fully integrate all elements of society is similar to Laclau and Mouffe's conception of 'field of discursivity,' which represents meanings that are excluded by a particular discourse (or identity) (Howarth & Stavrakakis 2000).

omission of details about the past...to accommodate broader issues of identity formation, power and authority, and political affiliation" (p. 3). Zelizer's statement, as well as the thought of Halbwachs, Koselleck, and Ricoeur emphasizes the *dependency of memory and identity*: identity is sustained by remembering and what is remembered is defined by identity (Gillis 1994). As such, "identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by and position ourselves within the narratives of the past" (Hall 1996, p. 213) but the past is also interpreted and shaped to produce particular forms of meaning for the present.

For this thesis, and indeed for German memory politics, a central concept is *Vergangenheitspolitik*, the politics of dealing with the past. Petra Bock and Edgar Wolfrum define *Vergangenheitspolitik* as being concerned with the question "how, after overthrowing a dictatorial or authoritarian regime, do you come to terms with its immediate human and material legacy?" (Bock & Wolrum 1999, p. 8f, as cited in Heer & Wodak 2008). Therefore, through *Vergangenheitspolitik*, national communities aim to make sense of the national past to produce a sense of continuity in the collective self-image. Importantly, *Vergangenheitspolitik* is a continuous and conflict-ridden process, resulting from communicative and hegemonic struggles. Therefore, in summary, there are both past- and future-oriented components to collective memory. Collective memory draws on the material of the past to produce continuity and identity while the recollection and rearrangement of this material are conducted according to, in this case, a nation's ambitions, anxieties, and dreams. To configure group boundaries, "storytelling about the past 'per-forms' the group by 're-member-ing' it" (Olick 2016, p. 14).

Collective Memory and Identity Politics

For this thesis, I understand *Vergangenheitspolitik* as a form of identity politics. According to James Tully (2008), identity politics have three central characteristics. Firstly,

identity politics are characterized by 'diversity' in that identity demands are articulated "around criss-crossing and overlapping allegiances," such as nationality, culture, region, religion, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, immigration, etc. (Tully 2008, p. 167). As such, identity politics are enacted across differences and aim to bring together different allegiances under a common political struggle. Second, identity politics recognize that "the priority granted to one identity [and] the way and by whom it is articulated...are always open to question, reinterpretation, deliberation and negotiation by the bearers of that identity" (Tully 2008, p. 168). Third, identity politics concerns one's 'practical identity,' which is their mode of being in the world with others (Tully 2008, p. 168-169). One's practical identity is "relational and intersubjective...[in that] it is acquired and sustained in relation with those who share it and those who do not" (Tully 2008, p. 169).

Similarly, *Vergangenheitspolitik* is practiced by diverse actors and shapes and is shaped by various elements of identity. *Vergangenheitspolitik* also recognizes the openness and contestability of pre-existing interpretations of history and identity. Lastly, *Vergangenheitspolitik* concerns the construction of collective identity that impacts how individuals relate intersubjectively by promoting a particular attitude towards the national community.

Methods and Conclusion

By way of conclusion, I will provide a summary of the methods I will employ for the discourse analysis. I will conduct a thematic discourse analysis, a method whose flexibility is particularly suitable for abductive approaches (Braun & Clarke 2006; Gerbaudo & Screti 2017). Specifically, I seek to identify the main discursive strategies present in the speeches of the AfD, with a particular interest in how the party employs collective memory to construct a collective

identity. A theme is an abstract idea in a text which "captures something important about the data in relation to the research question and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set" (Braun & Clarke 2006, p. 82). In other words, a theme is the main topic of a discourse (van Dijk 1991).

My analysis will proceed in two steps. The first step is purely inductive and data-driven and operates as a content analysis for the patterns and strategies that emerge throughout the texts. In practice, my first round will consist of identifying the existence of these strategies and noting the frequency of these strategies.[8] The second step is mainly deductive and based on the strategies identified previously. During this round of analysis, I will focus on illuminating how the AfD constructs 'the people' by engaging with collective memory and pre-existing identity debates in the German context, including constitutional patriotism and *Leitkultur*. My dataset is comprised of significant speeches by prominent AfD politicians, namely Alexander Gauland, Alice Weidel, Björn Höcke, and Bernd Baumann from 2015-2018.

Elite Discourses and the Construction of Identity

As a final point, it is necessary to justify the use of elite political speeches and modes of communication as mediators of collective identity. Elite-centred analyses of collective identity have been criticized for not accurately depicting how collective identity is negotiating and interpreted by individuals (Miller-Idriss & Rothenberg 2012; Fox & Miller-Idriss 2008). While agreeing with these critiques and appreciating the importance of studying everyday understandings of nationhood, I agree with van Dijk (1993) that "since the elites dominate [the] means of symbolic reproduction [ie. mass media, politics, etc.], they also control the

[8] This thesis is oriented around Moffitt's (2016) contention that quantitative analyses of populism do not help researchers understand what populist discourses *mean*. Despite this, the frequency of populist discursive strategies will be available in the Codebook (see Appendix).

communicative conditions in the formation of the popular mind and hence, the ethnic consensus" (p. 10). Therefore, I argue that while elites do not determine how individuals interpret and internalize collective identity, elite discourse produces, reproduces, and creates hegemonic identities that shape and decontest[9] the identities of individuals.

To conclude, I will provide a summary of the utility of understanding populism as a discursive repertoire. Conceiving of populism as a situated political practice that draws on a set of discourses that are historically embedded is broad enough to account for the ambiguity of populism (particularly in its engagement with various ideologies) while capturing the specificity of how populism constructs 'the people' and 'the elite' in particular ways. Additionally, examining populist discourses for important discursive strategies reveals how populists construct 'the people' as a group rooted in a common history, as well as a group that comes into being in the *immediate.* Following this, I developed my understanding of identity, identity politics, and collective memory that will be used throughout this thesis. In the following chapters, I am concerned with how identity continually remains a socially constructed and contested concept that is mobilized to particular political ends. Central to identity politics in the German context is collective memory and how the German past is understood from the vantage point of present political interests. In the next chapter, I will develop how collective memory functioned in the German context since the end of WWII to develop the appropriate context for the discourse analysis of the AfD.

[9] According to Michael Freeden (2003), 'decontestation' is the process of removing the meaning of concepts from contestation (p. 54). In this case, elite discourses 'decontest' notions of identity by establishing what is intelligible regarding definitions of 'Us' and 'Them.'

Chapter 2: Remembering Germany's "Two Dictatorships": *Vergangenheitspolitik* and National Identity

The various discursive strategies populists use to construct in-groups and out-groups must be situated within their appropriate historical contexts of identity formation. This chapter seeks to develop the context of German identity politics to illuminate the intertextual and interdiscursive elements of identity discourses (Wodak et al. 2009, 7-10). In other words, providing this context will allow for an analysis of how competing discourses draw upon pre-existing debates around German identity. As I will show throughout this chapter, I argue that political actors must draw on contextualized discourses to sustain a sense of continuity with the past, a central element of identity construction. Additionally, rather than merely restricting the discursive construction of identity, these context-specific discourses are a source of creativity from which political leaders draw to produce particular subject positions. This chapter will begin with an overview of the general theoretical and historiographical trends regarding German identity. Following this, I will analyze the prominent debates and identities that emerged in post-WWII East and West Germany, as well as the lasting effects of reunification.

German National Identity after National Socialism: Literature Review

Beginning with a series of historical studies from the late 1990s and early 2000s (Fullbrook 1999; Niven 2002; Manz 2004) and continuing into contemporary studies on nations and nationalism (Shoshan 2016; Olick 2016; Miller-Idriss 2017; Beckstein 2013; Piwoni 2015), a consensual view that German identity is premised on "the constitution of distance with the historical past" (Shoshan 2016, p. 9) has emerged. The German historical past typically refers to the legacies of National Socialism and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) (Gook 2015).

Regarding the former, National Socialism operates as a *constitutive outside* for German identity. Mouffe (2000) describes the constitutive outside as "present within the inside as its always real possibility" (p. 21). Through the constitutive outside, the 'self' and the 'Other' are formed in a contested process of continuous reconstruction (Beckstein 2013). Therefore, National Socialism is simultaneously incommensurable with, and the condition of possibility of the German nation (Shoshan 2016), and the articulation of German identity is dependent upon the projection of National Socialism.

Nitzan Shoshan develops this view by discussing how National Socialism structured the discursive possibilities for identity construction available in postwar Germany and the boundaries of the political community. Shoshan (2016) describes National Socialism and right-wing extremism as 'otherwheres' (Pred 1997), which is a "space into which a whole range of anxieties can be projected" (p. 9). Given this, Shoshan states that the 'constitutive outside' is beyond the frontiers of the political community and, therefore, cannot be challenged politically. Because of this, both right-wing extremism and the German collectivity undergo a process of (discursive) homogenization, where they appear as uniform and coherent (Shoshan 2016). As such, the status of National Socialism as the constitutive outside has two effects. First, National Socialism and its associated elements, such as nativism, ethnocultural nationalism, anti-Semitism, discourses of racial purity, and authoritarian power structures, are located outside the boundaries of the political community and are viewed as illegitimate means of discourse and identity construction.[10] Second, the homogenization of German identity ('us') and National Socialism ('them') produces a restrictive approach to the boundaries of national belonging and a sociopolitical context that has a more cautious approach towards alternative identities.

[10] Piwoni (2013) terms this restriction on political discourse the "Holocaust blockade."

To a lesser degree, the GDR or, later, East Germany has functioned as an 'Other' for the development of West German and Unified German identity. Due to its authoritarian past, the GDR was understood to have positive orientations towards similar forces that brought about National Socialism, such as Kaiser-era cultural norms and family structures (Butterwegge & Meier 2002). Given this association, the East appears as the authoritarian and socialist other of the democratic and liberal West (Maier 2017). As Shoshan (2016) elaborates, the othering of East Germany has produced "a dialectic of proximity and distance with the easterner as a subaltern national figure" (p. 42). Therefore, German national identity is at once articulated in opposition to both a temporal Other (National Socialism) and an internal Other (Easterners).

Returning to the previous discussion of National Socialism, beyond acting as the constitutive outside for Germany identity, National Socialism also serves a prominent national *myth*. This thesis employs Cynthia Miller-Idriss' conceptualization of national myths, which she defines as "a particular subset of myth that shape and reflect national imaginaries and tell foundational stories about core national values, principles, and beliefs" (2017, p. 83; see also Attebery 2014). However, unlike most national myths, Germany's foundational myth of National Socialism functions negatively. Like other national myths, Germany's foundational myth retains the notion of a "quasisacralized common narrative" (Nienass 2013, p.45) about the origins of the polity and the view that this narrative provides legitimacy and identity for the political community. However, while a founding myth typically provides a "WE-identity" and "temporal continuity" (Probst 2003, p. 46), National Socialism as a negative foundational myth constitutes a set of "avoidance imperatives" (Dubiel 2003, p. 60). Therefore, German national identity challenges what theorists of identity typically understand as an essential feature of national identity, namely that national identity "embodies historical continuity" (Miller 2000, p. 28).

As will become apparent through the subsequent overview of German identity and collective memory, it is increasingly apparent that the Holocaust is losing significance in German culture (Langenbacher 2010b), in foreign policy debates (Wittlinger & Larose 2007; Kundani 2012; Matthay 2017), and, crucially, in notions of German pride and identity (Wittlinger 2010; Lutz 2012). While the Holocaust was central to Germany's post-War construction of national identity, over time the Holocaust was decentered in German popular consciousness, particularly with the emergence of East German memories and differing interpretations of the past.

German Memory Politics and the Faces of the Nation

West German Identity from Post-WWII to early 1980s

While West Germany's postwar national identity was constructed in opposition to National Socialism, it must also be understood in the context of the historical legacies of national identity and citizenship regimes in Germany. In his seminal study on citizenship regimes, Rogers Brubaker (1992) argues that Germany has a primarily ethnocultural understanding of citizenship and national identity or, in other words, an "ethnocultural, differentialist way of thinking" (p. 14). This image of Germany is reproduced in its 1913 Imperial Citizenship Law (*Reichs- und Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz*), which conceives of citizenship as *ius sanguinis* and is contrasted to the French conception of citizenship as *jus soli*. The German use of *ius sanguinis* included ethnic German communities living through the USSR's territory. However, Brubaker (1992) also states that "in Germany, the ethnocultural idiom of nationhood has represented only one strand of a more complex national self-understanding" (p. 14). Therefore, German national identity is a constellation of historical legacies of nationhood and ongoing identity debates.

In desiring to build a new nation in the aftermath of National Socialism, West German politicians implemented many practices and policies concerning national remembrance and identity. To describe the general orientation of postwar national projects, Beckstein (2013) terms them as revolving around self-criticism and self-indictment (see also Rüsen 2005, p. 200-201). In practice, Germany's memory culture during this era is typically described as a period of silence in which memories of individuals and collective failures and crimes were repressed, silenced, and downplayed (Frei 2002). However, as Herf argues, rather than merely being a struggle between "silence and memory," the discussion around Nazism addressed "which of Germany's pre-1933 traditions were most deeply implicated in the disaster, and which formed a basis for postwar renewal" (1993, p. 47). Therefore, rather than adopting a nuanced and pluralistic remembrance culture, German politicians attempted to produce a break with the National Socialist past to present the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) as a new nation. Beckstein (2013) has defined this approach as the 'non-ideological position' (since it claims to be above nationalism and ideology), which "does not stage the past as present. More precisely, it denies that Nazi past a...place in the German identity. National Socialism is retained as absence, retained as that for which there is no room, either materially or symbolically" (p. 771).

From this non-ideological position, Olick (2003a) argues that Germany aimed to present itself the "reliable nation." In other words, politicians aimed to garner legitimacy for the new West German nation by presenting the state as reliable to the global community. Two main events reframed West Germany as reliable: the new constitutional provisions and the reparations paid to Israel. First, the Basic Law (the German constitution) identified the "causes" of the

"catastrophe" of the German past through human rights provisions (Olick & Levy 1997).[11] Early leaders, namely Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, emphasized that these constitutional provisions rectify the problems that led to the emergence of National Socialism (Olick & Levy 1997). Second, West Germany paid reparations to Israel, which indicated to the international community that the new nation was accountable for its past and that it would learn from its past to produce a new political system. As such, West Germany aimed to present itself as a nation that was oriented towards its Western allies and to the creation of a supranational European community that guaranteed peace and cooperation, rather than political isolation (Grimm 2015; Marcussen et al. 1999; Risse et al. 1999; Wittlinger 2010).

By the early 1960s, the non-ideological position towards Germany's past was challenged by advocates of the anti-fascist stance, who used psychoanalytical categories to "delegitimize the non-ideological position as a pathological inclination to repress an uncomfortable past" (Beckstein 2013, p. 772). This perspective produced the view that postwar West Germany suffered from an 'inability to come to terms with past' or 'strategic amnesia' (Large 2001, p. 438). In response, by the late 1960s, West Germany underwent a shift in *topos* from the 'reliable nation' to the 'moral nation' (Olick 2003a), a shift caused by two developments. First, a new generation had come of age in West Germany, one whose formative experiences had come after the Nazi period and, as such, they questioned whether or not certain traits of the political culture of Nazi Germany still prevailed in the new Federal Republic (Olick 2016, p. 284). Second, and crucially, the Holocaust was reinterpreted as a "sacred-evil" myth, which is "an evil that recalled a trauma of such enormity and horror that it had to be radically set apart from the world and all

[11] As Olick & Levy note, the description of the Third Reich as a "catastrophe" was popularized by German historian Friedrich Meinecke. This characterization implies that the Nazi years were "a natural disaster beyond human control that [swept] over a landscape," invoking inevitability rather than culpability (Olick & Levy 1997, p. 926).

of its other traumatizing events, and which became inexplicable in ordinary, rational terms" (Alexander 2002, p. 27). Interpreted abstractly as a "radical evil," the Holocaust became an abstract signifier of violence against minorities that is detached from its time and context (Levy & Sznaider 2006), or an "event out-of-time" (Alexander 2002, p. 30). In Germany, this renewed and unique focus on the Holocaust signified a return to the symbolism of the particular crime of the Holocaust.

Because of this understanding of the past, Germany emerged as the "moral nation" that was willing to confront and draw more fundamental lessons from the past (Olick 2003a). Acknowledging the central role of the Holocaust for German identity "constituted the very core of Germany's political culture and its self-image as a nation" (Levy & Sznaider 2006, p. 104). As Moses argues, this period saw the emergence of the "non-German German," a subjectivity that claims to have learned the lessons of the past and understood itself as 'antinational' (2007b). As such, the Holocaust came to be seen as the "thorn in the flesh that provokes critical reflection and the dissolution of the national 'we'" (Moses 2007b, p. 65). Therefore, the *second phase* of memory politics, despite being contested by some, understood the Holocaust as the constitutive outside for German identity.

Moving away from a specific discussion of West Germany's postwar memory culture, I will reflect on the broader implication these developments have on German identity in this period. Postwar German identity developed in response to National Socialism, first through silence about the past and then through critical self-reflection. As a result, Beckstein (2013) argues that West Germany employed "the methodology of…sober-minded functionalism that allowed for the overcoming of National Socialism both as a factual reality and as a real memory" (p. 771; see also Moeller 2003, p. 15-19). This functionalism produced a notion of West German

nationhood structured around material prosperity and economic competitiveness (Habermas 1991; Borneman 1997; Huyssen 2000). Productivity and increasing purchasing power "defined the parameters for officially endorsed expressions of patriotic pride and for the German state's...modes of self-legitimation and of managing the problem of its past" (Shoshan 2016, p. 13-14). To this point, Michel Foucault, in 1979, wrote:

> History had said no to the German state, but now the economy will allow it to assert itself. Continuous economic growth will take over from a malfunctioning history. It will thus be possible to live and accept the breach of history as a breach in memory inasmuch as a new dimension of temporality will be established in Germany that will no longer be a temporality of history, but one of economic growth… We have what we can say is a radically economic state...that is to say, its root is precisely economic. (2008, p. 86)

Therefore, in the immediate postwar era, leaders in the FRG responded to their National Socialist past through silence and attempting to reconcile the past through functional policies, such as paying reparations and focusing on economic prosperity. These policies also served a foreign policy goal of reforming the international image of Germany as dependable and encouraging international cooperation. German identity was defined against the constitutive outside of National Socialism, albeit in a distinct method from how it would be defined later. Importantly, there was little public debate surrounding national pride, and the German people were expected to be 'post-national.' However, as the following section will reveal, as the discourse of 'economic prosperity' began to be challenged, so was German identity, a process that brought 'the national' to the centre of public debate.

German Identity from the 1980s until the mid-2000s

By the 1980s, and specifically by the end of the Cold War, German memory culture and German identity were fundamentally reshaped. By the end of the Cold War, Shoshan (2016) states defining national identity on economic lines was delegitimized, given the failure of promises of universal prosperity. As such, West Germans sought other horizons of national identification, a process which brought to the surface lingering notions of ethnocultural nationhood and placed them at the center of public debates (Shoshan 2016). The emergence of models of ethnocultural nationhood into the public sphere is particularly apparent through various debates, beginning with the *Historikerstreit* in 1985 and proceeding through the memory debates around reunification, citizenship laws, *Leitkultur*, and the display of national pride at the 2006 World Cup.

During these debates, a contested trend of 'normalization as relativization' of the past attempted to normalize (West) Germany's historical trajectory and nation-building project. The *third phase* of German memory politics is characterized by the legitimation profile of the 'normal nation' (Olick 2003a). To this point, conservative commentators emphasized the fact that all nations carry the burden of their founding violence and crimes against minorities in the process of nation-building. During this time, there were attempts to decenter the Holocaust in German identity by promoting pride in German history and a *relativization* of the crimes of the past (Olick 2003b). The normalization of Germany's past attempted to produce a positive identity, anchored in a patriotic conception of the past.

Historikerstreit **(1986-1987)**

The *Historikerstreit* was an exchange of articles in West Germany's major newspapers by historians and philosophers concerning the implications of the Nazi past for contemporary

German identity.[12] If an "unthinking national pride or taken-for-granted patriotism" (Fulbrook 1999, p. 2) as a form of German national identity was not possible after Auschwitz, the *Historikerstreit* was the first challenge to the centrality of the Holocaust in constraining German identity.

In essence, the *Historikerstreit* catalysed an ongoing discussion about whether to focus on German guilt or on producing a positive identity. In 1986, the two dominant intellectual traditions of West German republicanism came to a head. First, the *integrative* view (Gook 2015, p. 33) desired a positive sense of national continuity and identity. Conservative historians, Namely Ernst Nolte, Andreas Hillgruber, Klaus Hildebrand, and Michael Stürmer argued for a 'normalization' and 'relativization' of the Holocaust (Fulbrook 1999). The most influential article of the *integrative* view was "The Past That Will Not Pass" by Ernst Nolte. Nolte argued that Auschwitz was not more evil than other significant acts of violence, from Turkish Armenia to the Soviet Union's (USSR) gulags (1986). Additionally, Nolte argued that the Nazis had defensive motivations for their actions, stating that the Nazis acted as they did to prevent the USSR from committing "Asiatic deeds" against Germany (1993, p. 22). As such, Nolte's account, as well as those of other historians, challenged the place of the Holocaust as a singular event in human history, by comparing it to other atrocities. In broader terms, the *integrative* view attempted to secure a form of nationalism that began to move past Germany's guilt.

Second, the *redemptive* view "wished to divorce the present from a corrupt national tradition" (Gook 2015, p. 33). Left-liberal historians, mainly Jürgen Habermas, wanted to secure a post-conventional (rather than a national) identity. For Habermas (1993), the singularity of the Holocaust ensured that Germany could not return to "forms of conventional" and non-reflective

[12] For intellectual histories of the *Historikerstreit,* see Maier (1988) and Evans (1989).

identity (p. 43). Rather, "the only patriotism that will not estrange [Germans] from the West is a constitutional patriotism" (Habermas 1993, p. 43). Müller (2007) defines 'constitutional patriotism' as "a conscious affirmation of *political* principles" (p. 26) that stems from the disenchantment of modernity and the delegitimation of traditional forms of individual and collective identification. Habermas argues for the development of 'post-conventional identities' wherein individuals adopt an impartial perspective and step back from their desires "and from the conventional social expectations with which society" and its institutions confront them (Müller 2007, p. 27). In practice, Habermas's normative vision of German nationhood stems from his belief that Auschwitz has discredited the German idea of a *Kulturnation*: "Unfortunately, it took Auschwitz to make possible to the old culture nation of the Germans binding universalist constitutional principles anchored in conviction" (Habermas 1993, p. 43-44). Thus, the Holocaust and the Nazi past works as a constraint against "a non-critical identification with national history" (Piwoni 2013, p. 8).

The *Historikerstreit* was significant for three reasons. First, the debate introduced two prominent conceptions of German identity, namely an *ethnocultural* identity based around a positive identity and traditional nationalist elements and a *post-conventional* identity based on constitutional patriotism that emphasized basing nationhood on civic, rather than pre-political, elements. Second, the *Historikerstreit* illustrates the salience of the German past on debates surrounding identity and how different groups interpret German history to satisfy particular interests in the present.[13] In this sense, the *Historikerstreit* is an example *sine qua non* of *Vergangenheitspolitik.* Lastly, the *Historikerstreit* transformed the Holocaust from "a field of

[13] On this point, Gook (2015) recognizes that the differing conceptions of identity responded to postmodernity in particular ways, with proponents of *ethnocultural identification* arguing that the German public needed historical orientation and a return to tradition (p. 33).

taboo into a field of prohibition" (Olick & Levy 1997, p. 931). A taboo, in this sense, refers to an 'avoidance practice' where specific topics, ideas, and practices are avoided on the grounds of the object is treated as dangerous, morally repugnant or contagious and, ultimately, operates according to a mythic logic in that a taboo is beyond rational debate (Olick & Levy 1997, p. 924). By contrast, prohibitions operate through appeals to rationality and "exogenously constituted interests" (Olick & Levy 1997, p. 924). Therefore, the *Historikerstreit* transformed the role of the Holocaust in German politics from an unchangeable mythic boundary to something open to scientific investigation, rational debate, and deliberation.

National Identity in the GDR (1945-1989)

Up until this point, I have focused on the transformation of national identity in West Germany. I have done this since many scholars acknowledge that United Germany was institutionally an extension of the FRG to include the GDR. I will briefly discuss the national identity of the GDR and its relationship to the Nazi past. According to Diner and Gundermann (1996), the GDR claimed an 'antifascist identity', which was centred on two elements: (1) a particular perception of the Soviet Union (USSR) following the defeat of Nazi Germany and (2) the denouncement of 'certain material preconditions' that led to the emergence of fascism. Regarding the former, the GDR's new attitude towards the USSR formed the core of their identity. East Germans collectively confessed guilt not only for Nazi Germany but also Germany's imperialism during WWI. The antifascist identity was also structured around the historical-philosophical belief that, since the USSR beat the Nazis, the USSR's social formation and its teleological interpretation of reality was considered superior (Diner & Gundermann 1996). The GDR also rejected the 'material preconditions' of fascism, such as imperialism,

militarism, and revanchism, and saw West Germany as the continuity of Germany's fascist tradition due to its economic continuity, or capitalist social order (Diner & Gundermann 1996).

The GDR antifascist identity was also structured around a particular *paradoxical* orientation to the Nazi past. The paradox of East German identity emerges from its claim to oppose the fascist experience of its German population and, simultaneously "denying the actual National Socialist past" (Diner & Gundermann 1996, p. 123). It was this denial of the German past, coupled with the decline of the USSR and communism in Europe, which led to the delegitimization of the GDR polity (Herf 1997).

Therefore, both East and West Germany understood the *other* Germany as the container that holds the primary legacy of National Socialism (as continuing intolerance, aggression, and authoritarianism) or, put differently, the side that did not learn the lessons of the past. With this negativity projected onto the still-existing other, both East and West Germany relied on myths of positivity within the nation, which was understood as the *negative* of National Socialism. For West Germany, the persistent myth was centred on the country's economic success. For East Germany, the GDR's anti-fascist identity and communistic paternalism of its leaders were seen as separating the GDR from capitalism, and, thus, fascism (Gook 2015). While these subjectivities remained separate due to the Berlin Wall, the reunification debates problematized easy identification with these identities. As such, the East-West imaginaries, including their understanding of the past, were opened to contestation.

Vereinigungsdebatte **(1990s): The Unification Debates**

The next instance of public debates around German identity occurred following the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989, when Germans constructed a new state. This 'Berlin Republic,' which was institutionally an extension of West Germany to include East Germany,

had a population of East and West Germans who previously regarded each other as ‘foreigners’ (Götz 2016). The end of the Cold War and the founding of Unified Germany led to debate and contestation surrounding German national identity, stemming, in part, from how these debates were suppressed in the GDR. Reunification introduced a new element to German *Vergangenheitspolitik*: the question of how to accommodate biographical experiences and the memories of both East and West Germans (Olick 2016). These dynamics converged, resulting in public debates about German nationalism and identity (Borneman 1997; Jarausch 1997; Müller 2000). The poignancy of these debates was exacerbated by the upsurge in xenophobia, violence, and right-wing nationalism, which many left-wing politicians and intellectuals understood as stemming from the ‘re-nationalization’ of identity politics (Jarausch 1995).

These public debates concerned whether a German national identity was necessary or should be encouraged and to what extent the Nazi past should still inform Germany’s attitude towards national identity. The conservative approach to these issues argued that a ‘healthy’ patriotism would promote a sense of belonging and stability for unified Germany and that recovering the culture of ethnic Germans as the primary culture (‘*Leitkultur*’) would provide immigrants with the incentive and orientation to assimilate into German society (Piwoni 2013). Other intellectuals critiqued multiculturalism and universalism as degrading German national identity and belonging. Martin Walser attributed the proliferation of nationalist crimes to Germany’s fixation on the Holocaust by arguing that the denigration of the German nation had caused extremists to “[take] nationalism into their care” (1993, as cited in Shoshan 2016). In other words, “neglect of the nation” spurred right-wing extremist groups to promote nationalism through extra-political means (Walser 1993, as cited in Shoshan 2016). Therefore, conservative politicians argued that an emphasis on national pride by focusing on culture and tradition would

better unite Germany and that Germany should move past its 'self-hatred' towards self-confidence (Götz 2016).

In contrast, the left-liberal camp emphasized the continuing importance of the Nazi past as the absolute negative for German identity, which blocked forms of identification that relied on culture and tradition. Furthermore, the social democrats, liberals, and the Green Party said that these debates were superfluous and dangerous since they led to simplification, homogenization, and the exclusion of minorities. Just as in the *Historikerstreit*, left-liberal intellectuals warned against a 'normalization of the national' (Götz 2016, p. 808). This camp advocated for a Western model of the state that was based on a constitutional patriotism and was open to cultural pluralism. For example, Naumann argued that unified Germany should be a "political nation," or "a community of will [that is]...based on a 'daily plebiscite:' That is, the unity of the nation is never definite but has to stand the test of the democratic process" (1990, as cited in Götz 2016). During this time, Habermas rearticulated his view that National Socialism delegitimized any model of German nationhood based on unreflective prepolitical elements (1991).

Finally, some prominent intellectuals, such as Maier (1994) and Winkler, mediated between the two prominent camps by arguing for a '*Neubildung der deutschen Nation'* ('rebuilding of the German nation') while grounding this nation in Western values and situating it in the European community. For example, Winkler argued for an "emotional patriotism," or "the conscious remodeling of the community of descent into a community of vote" (1993, as cited in Götz 2016).

The reunification process also invigorated the question of "which kind of memory to preserve, how to do it, in whose name, and to what end" (Young 1992, p. 270). Beckstein (2013) argues that memory politics during this period represented the continued conflict of the German

'self' against its constitutive outsides, National Socialism and the GDR. Germany used a multiplicity of commemorative strategies to renegotiate national identity to include East Germans, even though "the cultural heritage to be [memorialized was] not a source of pride but an undesired legacy" (Beckstein 2013, p. 773). As will be apparent in the following sections, the particular memory politics that emerged from this period was a continuation of the 'othering' of National Socialism while simultaneously challenging the perpetuation of national shame (Olick 2016). This positive self-identification was seen as a necessary element of producing a collective identity in Unified Germany.

Beyond these debates, particular concepts and discourses that were previously delegitimized re-emerged in public debates and the discursive field. These concepts, which were typically references to traditional national imagery, include '*Volk*,' 'fatherland,' 'nation,' 'national pride,' 'national consciousness,' and 'German' (Miller-Idriss & Rothenberg 2012). Additionally, the German national flag was increasingly used to represent national pride (Miller-Idriss & Rothenberg 2012), and public intellectuals elevated the term 'nation' to the status of an analytical category' (Jarausch 1995). However, the most important of these terms was the reemergence of '*Volk*,' which was used in two senses. First, '*Volk*' was employed in the sense of the republican 'demos,' which referred to East Germany's self-liberation through street protests and peaceful revolution against authoritarianism (an event that was interpreted by some historians as a 'foundation myth' for Unified Germany) (Götz 2016). Second, '*Volk*' was used in the traditional sense of 'ethnos': as Götz notes, it was important for Germany that the Germans as 'one people' would rebuild the nation by quickly 'growing together' (2016). The conception of '*Volk*' as 'ethnos' produced a discourse of 'internal unity' ('*innere Einheit*'), which was informed by ethnocultural conceptions of nationhood (Brubaker 1992; Jarausch 1997).

In response to the discourse of internal unity, German political scientist Hans-Joachim Veen (2001) argued that the "dream of inner unity" would produce a new myth of community and would lead to an extension of the "required congruences between East and West Germans" (p.11, as cited in Gook 2015). Additionally, Veen viewed the quest for 'internal unity' as a reification of the ideology of the "unity of the people" (2001, as cited in Gook 2015). In practice, while 'Ethnos' appeared to form the basis of the new Germany, the stereotypical image of 'mental walls' (Gook 2015) illustrated that, despite having a common ethnic descent, West Germany and East Germany were not unified in terms of culture, society, and identity (Götz 2016). Therefore, despite these discourses of internal unity, West and East Germans began to define themselves in opposition to each other, as separate and distinct collectives, or as "distinct 'ethnic' groups through dissociation" (Götz 2016).

Beyond these debates surrounding German national identity, a concept of *European* identity emerged as a veritable challenge to national identity by accounting for the complexities of reunification in particular ways. While notions of European identity existed in German discourse since the end of WWII, and often merged and related to Germany's 'post-national identity,' European identity emerged during the post-reunification in response to both domestic and international issues. European identity is viewed as cosmopolitan and exempt from the exclusionary underpinnings of national identities (Giesen & Eder 2001) since it lacks a cultural or ethnic foundation. Despite its cosmopolitan and inclusionary aspects, European identity does not exclude the necessary exclusion of defining the political community. In practice, proponents of European identity will rely on the construction of the 'pre-political' sense of community (myth of common descent and common fate, etc.) to demarcate the borders of the community (Schmidtke 2013). European identity emerged in the post-reunification era (and continues to be

relevant today) as a functional identity that better accounted for ethnic and cultural diversity. Concerning foreign policy, Germany's European identity was buttressed by two interlocking narratives. First, a negative discourse connected Germany's experience with two dictatorships, war and genocide, and the irreversibility of Germany's integration into a larger European community (Banchoff 1999). In this sense, the collective memory of the Holocaust and the GDR underpinned Germany's European identity after 1990. Banchoff (1999) also argues that German politicians viewed the EU in redemptive terms: since the EU emerged from conflict and disaster, it could redeem such violence to act as a starting point for German foreign policy.

Leitkulturdebatte **(2000s)**

Along with the challenges of unifying East and West Germany, "migration and growing cultural diversity across society have both served as vehicles for a critical self-re-evaluation of German political identity" (Schmidtke 2017, p. 499). The reform of German Nationality Law in 2000 was a watershed moment in acknowledging Germany's status as a country of immigration and diversity. The previous German citizenship law was enacted in 1913 and was based on *ius sanguinis*, or citizenship based on blood or lineage (Brubaker 1992). By preserving the citizenship of *Auslandsdeutsche* (ethnic Germans living abroad), "the 1913 law severed citizenship from residence and redefined the citizenry more consistently as a community of descent" (Brubaker 1992, p. 115). The 2000 law recognized *ius soli*, or citizenship based on territorial residence, meaning that children born in Germany to 'foreign' parents would become German citizens from birth (Brubaker 1992). Additionally, immigrants who were well integrated into German society were encouraged to become Germans (Götz 2016).

In light of these dramatic changes in citizenship law, the notion of *Leitkultur*, or 'leading culture', gained prominence as a challenge to the redefinition of German citizenship as

territorially-based. Bassam Tibi, a Syrian-German political scientist, first introduced the concept of a European *Leitkultur* and argued that Europe must defend a *Leitkultur* premised on republican and civic values to properly integrate immigrants (Manz 2004) and general European culture (Pautz 2005). Operating under a European *Leitkultur*, the German nation could resituate itself in the enlightened European modernity; by accepting a Europeanized cultural identity, German identity could detach itself from the legacy of the Holocaust (Pautz 2005). Within public discourse, conservative German politicians produced a particular ethnocultural conception of German *Leitkultur*, meaning that belonging to Germany meant being part of Germany's historical *Volk* (Manz 2004). In summary, *Leitkultur* led to a shift towards the creation of a *culturally*, rather than territorially or ethnically, focused immigration policy, or the continuity of *ius sanguinis* in the shape of *ius cultus* (Pautz 2005).

Leitkultur continued to 'normalize' German identity by redefining 'Germanness' in European terms. For example, Pautz (2005) argues that European *Leitkultur* supersedes Germany's "obsolete blood-and-soil definition" of the *Volk* by interpreted belonging in a "more flexible, yet essentially racist, definition of cultural belonging as distinguishing the nation" (p. 47). In this sense, European *Leitkultur* allowed German nationalism to reemerge under the rubric of Europeanness. In summary, "Germanness is now part of a wider, but equally essentialist and exclusionist, cultural realm" (Pautz 2005, 49). As will be portrayed in the next chapter, *Leitkultur* continues to be a touchstone in the construction of national identity, with Angela Merkel advocating for a Germany that is self-confident, conscious of its past, and open to the world.

In contrast, many opposed the notion of *Leitkultur* and sought to reconstruct Germany as a country of immigration. In this way, proponents of this view demonstrated that Germany was increasingly being accepted as a country of immigration at the political level, and is expressed in

different policies and speeches by politicians. These shifts in German identity affected citizenship tests, which now only requires immigrants to accept the German constitution and to know the German language and key historical events, but ignores notions of cultural identity (Müller 2006). Similarly, former German President Horst Köhler argued for a nation based on a common culture, or a '*Kulturnation*' - a term that had previously been taboo in an official context - "but described German national culture as the culture of a colorful and productive immigration country" (Götz 2016, p. 813).

This trend is also recognized in German memory culture through debates about how to accommodate migrant and immigrant memories within public displays of German memory (Motte & Ohlinger 2004). Additionally, and more interestingly, historians questioned how immigrants should be taught to deal with the Holocaust. From this context, a new model of Holocaust remembrance emerged which sought to universalize and denationalize the experience of the Holocaust and the displacement of WWII by creating a common European and transnational memory (Levy & Snyder 2006). Thus, because the perpetrators of the Holocaust have died, everyone, regardless of ethnicity, should bear witness to the lessons of the Holocaust (Diner 1998).

Therefore, *Leitkultur* was a flashpoint for the content of German national identity, and in particular Germany's place in Europe. The *Leitkulturdebatte* was significant in two ways. First, the *Leitkulturdebatte* showed that, despite differences over the inclusion of ethnic elements into German identity, both camps recognized that Germany is, at least in part, a civic nation (Piwoni 2013). Both ethnic and civic conceptions of the German nation existed and interacted in unique ways. Second, regarding German memory politics, the Holocaust became less of a problem for both camps of the debate, since they can both claim to have learned their lesson from the past,

due to their advocacy of the civic nation model and situating themselves within a European *Leitkultur*, respectively (Piwoni 2013).

The *Patriotismusdebatte*: The Mastered Past?

Finally, the *Patriotismusdebatte* arose around the 2006 World Cup of soccer in Germany, in which "certain expressions of identification became broadly legitimated for the first time" (Kersting 2007, p. 281). The *Patriotismusdebatte* was centered around evaluating the meaning of Germans' extensive public partying during the World Cup: was the partying "harmless 'partyotism'" (Fuhr 2007, as cited in Piwoni 2013) or was it the realization of new, open, cosmopolitan, and pluralistic understanding of nationhood (Stehle & Weber 2013)? Both among the intellectuals in the *Patriotismusdebatte* and the advertising campaigns during the 2006 World Cup, it was widely held that the latter was the case (Sark 2012). Regarding advertising campaigns, Kersting argues that two social marketing campaigns aimed to promote an inclusive conception of German nationhood while strengthening hospitality and reducing xenophobia (2007). Similarly, Green Party politician Tarek Al-Wazir articulated the link between German patriotism and processes toward cosmopolitanization:

> In comparison to 1990...the German flag is no longer the symbol of a rightist or conservative Weltanschauung [(worldview)]. I appreciate the way in which both naturalized Germans and migrants living in Germany cheer for the German team… When you consider that Miroslav Klose and Lukas Podolski were born in Poland and that David Odonkor has a black father and is...unconditionally seen as German, then this indicates that both the fans and the team and thereby the country have changed for the better.
>
> Piwoni 2013, p. 17

As such, there was a broad consensus that the 2006 World Cup represented the emergence of a "post-nationalist German patriotism" (Koepnick 2010, p. 71). In other words, this form of German patriotism reflected the middle-ground of the debates on reunification, in that German nationhood was conceived as being rooted in a pluralistic German nation.

Crucially, the Holocaust did not feature in the *Patriotismusdebatte* prominently and, as Piwoni (2013) argues, the new-found consensus surrounding German nationhood and belonging shifted patriotism out of the realm of taboo. This is because a conception of an open, inclusive, pluralistic, and cosmopolitan understanding of nationhood appears to take into account the 'lessons of the Holocaust experience' (Kopietz & Echterhoff 2014). As such, it was widely accepted that Germany's unmasterable past had finally been mastered adequately. To this point, Daniel Bax stated that Germany's new patriotism "does not relativize the past - on the contrary: the memory of the Holocaust and the responsibility that arises from it has become an irrevocable element of German identity" (2006, as cited in Kopietz & Echterhoff 2014).

These final statements reflect the emergence of the *fourth phase* of German memory politics, which is characterized by two specific features: (1) the postheroic element[14], which represents a continuation of the "moral nation," and (2) the "metadiscursive" element, or "a discussion about the discussion itself" (Gudehus 2008, p. 101, 103). In this phase, the object of collective memory and debate is now the memory politics and remembrance *itself* (Langenbacher 2008; see Olick 2003b, p. 114). Thus, debates address the *role* of history and memory and are centred on questions of *how*, rather than *what*, to remember (Hoye & Nienass 2014). In

[14] It is worth developing the notion of "postheroic" as it is deployed in this chapter. According to Bernhard Giesen, the notions of redemption and repentance as essential to the emergence of postheroic relations to the past. Giesen argues that those who confess the guilt of their nations reproduce "a pattern of Christo-mimesis deeply rooted in occidental mythology" (2009, p. 120). Therefore, postheroic relations to the past entail the confession of the sins of the nation, followed by redemption and repentance as the nation learns from its past. In this way, Germany's "politics of regret" are presented as an example of a new European or cosmopolitan memory paradigm (Nienass 2013).

education, this tendency towards studying the history of memory politics is expressed through teaching an *attitude* toward history as a whole, rather than focusing on specific contexts or events (Gudehus 2008; Levy and Dierks 2002; Miller-Idriss 2009, 2017). Thus, this tendency emphasizes the "constructed" nature of historical knowledge and leads to a general skepticism that "does not...correlate with heroic narratives" (Gudehus 2008, p. 104).

Therefore, Germany's fourth phase of memory politics represents a reorientation of the German nation towards "postnationalism," but in a way that "upholds the postheroic [(moral)] ethos that emerged in the 1960s" (2014, p. 430). Furthermore, "Germany's current discourse is probably best described as a national postnationalism: Germany can claim to be - somewhat paradoxically - *particularly* postnational" (Hoye & Nienass 2014, p. 430). Finally, Gudehus asserts that the "narrative of learning from a 'negative past' of not constructing a heroic, nationalistic version of the past...delivers a model of a positive, even heroic narrative on how well Germans have dealt with their problematic history" (2008, p. 109).[15]

Beckstein (2013) links this phase to the emergence of Germany's 'postfascist' memory politics, wherein "the fascist legacy is invoked not to articulate the imperative of remembering the historical guilt...but to witness the present accomplishments" (p. 773). Beckstein (2013) identifies this as a dialectical relationship where "thesis (fascist past) and antithesis (self-indictment) are superseded by a cathartic synthesis that portrays the German nation as having successfully mastered its...past" (p. 773). Recent examples of memorialization, namely the Berlin Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, perform this function as 'counter-monuments' (Young 1992). 'Counter-monuments' overwhelm the spectator by acting as "brazen, painfully

[15] Historian Paul Ankersmit understands this process as a "disassociation from the past," in which a "previous 'consciousness' has now become 'an object' for the new 'consciousness'" (2001), p. 318). Nations aim to incorporate the past into their national imaginary and, if the past proves to be 'nonincorporable,' "the result will then be a historicization of how [the nation] dealt with these" (Ankersmit 2001, p. 322).

self-conscious memorial spaces" (Young 1992, p. 271) and illustrate that Germany has, indeed, mastered its past. During this phase, therefore, the German 'self' continues to be grounded in the constitutive outside of 'National Socialism' and, because of this, Merkel argues that Germany can be confident since it successfully overcame the past (Beckstein 2013). However, this is not to say that Germany's past is no longer contested, as will be indicated in the following chapters on populism.

Conclusion

This chapter outlined the prominent debates around German identity since the end of WWII, with a particular emphasis on East-West Germany dynamics and the impact of migration of German national identity. Additionally, I emphasized how collective memory and changing perceptions of National Socialism and the GDR were used to produce different conceptions of German nationhood. A central motif throughout this chapter was the shifting importance of the Holocaust in German historical consciousness, which began as a blockade to any source of national pride that was not rooted in economic prosperity or postnationalism to being *the impetus for German national identity, since Germany "learned the lessons of its past" and, as a result, can feel confident in its postheroic memory politics*. In addition to this, this section illustrated the field of discursivity surrounding Germany memory politics, including significant concepts (such as 'Volk', 'fatherland', 'German', 'economic prosperity', 'constitutional patriotism', 'civic nationhood' etc.) and argumentation strategies (such as the Holocaust blockade, relativization, and 'learning the lessons of one's past'). While this chapter outlined a linear progression of how discourses about German identity emerged and receded, it is important to note, following Laclau

and Mouffe (1985), that these ‘discursive moments’ can always be articulated by different political actors towards particular ends.

This chapter added a layer of context to the DHA and focused on how populist discourses are constrained and influenced by pre-existing identity debates and concepts. As I hope to illustrate throughout the following discourse analyses, I argue that both Angela Merkel and the AfD draw on preexisting discursive moments to offer particular subject positions, and filter these through various discursive strategies in the populist repertoire.

Chapter 3: Merkel and the Construction of the Anti-Populist Frontier

The previous chapter provided a broader intertextual context of German identity debates which, I argue, is central to the discursive repertoire of populism. In this chapter, I seek to analyze the transformations in German national identity under the chancellorship of Angela Merkel. In particular, I will show how Merkel's particular orientation towards the German past undergirds her understanding of both German identity and foreign policy. Merkel assumes ongoing responsibility for National Socialism and broadens her memory paradigm to include the GDR as a constitutive outside of German identity. In this way, Merkel continues the Habermasian tradition of constitutional patriotism by emphasizing the importance of tolerance and diversity. However, as I will indicate throughout this chapter, German *Leitkultur* shapes Merkel's national identity, producing a site of contention between constitutional patriotism and *Leitkultur*. Additionally, it is necessary to take into account the "wider hegemonic environment within which populist actors have to operate" (Stavrakakis et al. 2018, p. 13). Taking into account other hegemonic political projects serves two purposes: first, such an analysis allows for a comparison between populists and other projects; second, this analysis reveals the emergence of a political antagonism: the frontier between populism and anti-populism. In this sense, "populism is inconceivable without anti-populism; it is impossible to effectively study the first without carefully examining the second" (Stavrakakis et al. 2018, p. 15).

Drawing from DHA, I conducted a discourse analysis of various speeches and publications from Angela Merkel and prominent members of her party, namely Federal Minister of the Interior Thomas de Maizière and Federal Commissioner for Culture and the Media Monika Grütters. My analysis consisted of two rounds of systematically reading the data set. The first round identified particular identity positions, characteristics, and political issues that

consistently appeared as central to either German identity or as a threat to German identity. These identity positions were coded using the NVivo software for qualitative data analysis. To organize these codes, I created three "Parent Nodes" ("Us," "Them," and "Elements of Identity"), and organized the codes under their respective "Parent Nodes" (i.e., "European Union" was included under the Parent Node "Us"). In the second round, I used NVivo's Query Matrix Coding feature which displays how often and when nodes appear with each other. From this, I identified recurring narratives that established clear 'Us' and 'Them' categories, as well as how Merkel and the CDU frame right-wing populism as opposed to the German people. I argue that Merkel's conception of national identity is characterized by tensions between debates in the German context: *Leitkultur* and constitutional patriotism; normalization and responsibility.

Angela Merkel's German Identity: Unity, Europe, and Responsibility

Scholarly literature on contemporary German national identity is linked to the profound social, political, and economic transformations that occurred following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the process of reunification (Lang et al. 2017). As the previous chapter outlined, the post-1989 period in German identity politics can be understood as a process of 'normalisation', whereby public debates transcended the narratives of German identity as constructed ex negativo, which characterized Germany's approach to both National Socialism and the division between the FRG and the GDR (Schmidtke 2017). As I will illustrate below, Merkel's conception of German national identity challenges the prevalent tendency towards 'normalising' German identity and instead emphasizes Germany's ongoing responsibility towards the past. Beyond this, I argue that Merkel's understanding of German identity is best understood as a combination of 'constitutional patriotism' and *Leitkultur*.

In combining constitutional patriotism and German *Leitkultur*, both being essential signifiers of identity in the German context, various tensions and contradictions arise that are reconciled (albeit impermanently) in practical policy decisions. Constitutional patriotism refers to a mode of attachment whereby citizens are bound together by subscription to democratic values, the constitution, and human rights, rather than pre-political ties. Central to constitutional patriotism are notions of positive law, deliberative democracy, democratic institutions, republican conceptions of autonomy and citizenship, and the constitutional state (Müller 2007). Furthermore, the following discourse analysis undergirds Müller's (2006) contention that German constitutional patriotism consists of 'memory', which was examined in the previous chapter, and 'militancy', whereby the German state defends itself from "the enemies of democracy, mostly through judicial means such as banning parties and restricting free speech" (p. 279). *Leitkultur*, on the other hand, describes the view that, to successfully integrate immigrants, nation-states must promote a 'leading culture,' typically imbued with ethnocultural and 'civilizational' elements (Pautz 2005). The relationship between constitutional patriotism and *Leitkultur* is constituted by tensions between *more inclusion* (including ethnic, religious, and gender diversity) and *deeper ethnic belonging*; put differently, these two perspectives represent the tension between *broader inclusion and the democratic necessity of delineating 'the demos.'*

Merkel and the Politics of the Past: Against Normalization?

Under Merkel's chancellorship, questions regarding Germany's politics of the past came to the fore: would she continue the institutionalization of Holocaust-centred memory and complement it with a recognition of German suffering? Would she attempt to align herself with Helmut Kohl's ambitions for 'normalisation'? The ambiguity surrounding these questions was exacerbated by Angela Merkel's status as being a chancellor "of many political 'firsts'"

(Mushaben 2016, p. 2), including being the first East German and female chancellor.[16] Merkel's upbringing in the GDR can, in part, explain her opposition to all forms of political extremism, right-wing or otherwise (Mushaben 2017a).

According to Ruth Wittlinger (2008), the memory politics of Merkel's chancellorship consists of three key features: (1) "an unambiguous acknowledgement of German historical responsibility arising from its Nazi past without any attempts to 'normalize' the German past"; (2) "A clear appreciation of German suffering coupled with an unambiguous acknowledgement that this happened as a consequence of Nazi Germany's aggressive expansionism"; (3) "the creation of a link between past, present, and future, signifying the impact of Germany's historical responsibility on discourse and policy" (p. 14). First, Merkel assumes historical responsibility without 'normalisation,' as by in Merkel's German-Israeli relations, which emphasized the "special relationship" between the two states and the singularity of the Holocaust (see Mushaben 2017a, p. 84-112). Second, Merkel institutionalized memories of German suffering through various speeches and through their support for setting a "visible sign" in Berlin with a Centre against Expulsions (Wittlinger & Boothroyd 2010, p. 494).[17] The third feature is displayed through her international promotion of the rule of law, freedom, and justice in her bilateral relations with the United States and Russia (Langenbacher 2014). Merkel's discourse of

[16] For an in-depth analysis of the gender aspect of Merkel's chancellorship, see Mushaben (2017a).

[17] The debates surrounding the establishment of the Center Against Expulsions illustrate Merkel's particular attitude toward the German past. Erika Steinbach, the president of the Federation of Expellees, advocated for the creation of a national monument dedicated to the German victims of flight and expulsion during WWII. Crucially, Steinbach sought to dissolve the causal link between the Nazi war of annihilation and German flight and expulsion (Luppes 2016). In doing so, Steinbach sought to decontextualize the general issue of 'expulsions' from the German context. Critics of Steinbach often argued that her understanding of German history was part of the revisionist effort to overshadow the crimes of National Socialism (Lutomski 2004). While recognizing the importance of and supporting the establishment of a Centre Against Expulsions, Merkel emphasized the link between expulsion and National Socialism by stating that "remembering the flight and expulsion of the Germans means...not forgetting that [this] would not have happened without National Socialism" (Luppes 2016, p. 80). Thus, Merkel simultaneously recognizes Germany's responsibility to the issue of expulsions while emphasizing the need to broaden the question of expulsion to include contexts beyond German expulsion (Feindt 2017).

responsibility stems from the constitutional patriotic conviction that Germany must maintain a self-reflective national identity, which informs Germany's foreign policy.

Merkel's engagement in memory politics has challenged the process of 'normalising' German identity, in that she invokes the past not to oppose old taboos but to make claims about Germany's responsibility to act and lead because of its past (Yoder 2017). In this way, rather than arguing that "the constraints of the past…are falling away" (Langenbacher 2015, p. 2), Merkel argues that Germany's past obliges it to particular global responsibilities and values. Jennifer Yoder (2017) argues that Merkel contributes to Germany's culture of remembrance in three ways: first, by arguing that, due to the "Catastrophe" of National Socialism, Germany bears a distinct responsibility to foster tolerance, human dignity, and freedom globally; second, that, drawing on the experiences of 1989/1990, change for the better is possible when people work together; third, that humanitarianism is the only appropriate policy response to the past, as illustrated by Merkel's approach to the migration crisis. Merkel further develops Germany's memory regime not only by continuing the dominant memory of WWII and the Holocaust but also through the inclusion of GDR memories. Crucially, "as the first East German chancellor, she brings to the project of remembrance and commemoration in Germany a perspective that seeks to integrate the GDR, FRG, and pre-1945 pasts" (Yoder 2017, p. 11).

Rather than challenging these observations, my discourse analysis revealed a continuing relevance of Germany's past in contemporary policy decisions and identity construction. Grütters, speaking at an event about the German Historical Museum, further broadened Germany's remembrance culture by emphasizing the importance of bringing to light "Germany's historical responsibility to" the former African colonies and the importance of "dealing with legally, historically, politically, and morally difficult issues of dialogue" surrounding Germany's

colonial history (2018, June 7). Grütters used the themes of reconciliation and responsibility to emphasize Germany's accountability to both the global community, and Africa more specifically. Speaking on the anniversary of the 1953 People's Uprising in East Germany (*Volksaufstand in der DDR*), which started as a worker's strike by construction workers in East Berlin and became a larger demonstration, Grütters argued that such demonstrations cultivate "identity and cohesion, [strengthen] the forces of civil society and thus the resilience of our democracy" and a passion for defending freedom and democracy (2018, June 17). In these speeches, Grütters emphasizes Germany's ongoing responsibility for the Holocaust, as well as the necessity of 'working together' towards achieving political ends. These factors contribute to Grütters's understanding of German identity as premised on self-reflection, responsibility, and solidarity through *democratic action*. Grütters's decontextualization of the People's Uprising in East Germany emphasizes the necessity of democratic action in creating cohesion amongst diverse populations.

Constitutional Patriotism and *Leitkultur:* Blurring Lines around German Identity

As mentioned previously, I argue that Merkel's conception of national identity is located in the site of contention between constitutional patriotism and *Leitkultur*. At this point, I further this by contending that, in Merkel's discourse, the distinction between constitutional patriotism and *Leitkultur* becomes less clear in that 'Germanness' is imbued with both political and pre-political elements. In the present discourse analysis, numerous instances were uncovered wherein Merkel argued that present policy decisions must be based on "our value base, our constitution, our understanding of man" (Merkel 2018, July 4). Similarly, Merkel emphasized that the values of freedom, solidarity, and justice make Germany "strong as a community and a country" and that the "constitutional state" is a "guardian of order" (Merkel 2018, June 15). In an article

written for the German tabloid newspaper Bild, Merkel outlined what it means to be German in her mind. In this article, Merkel identified Article 1 of the Basic Law, freedom of the press, law and order, representative democracy, and diversity as fundamental elements of Germanness (2017, June 22).

Furthermore, de Maizière argues that some of the central values of the German political community are that "We respect fundamental rights and the Basic Law. Respect for human dignity is paramount. We are a democratic state governed by the rule of law" (2017, May 1). Therefore, according to Merkel and the CDU, constitutional patriotism is central to German national identity. However, as de Maizière questions, "is that all? Democracy, respect for the constitution and human dignity apply in all Western societies" (2017, May 1).

The second component of German identity is *Leitkultur*. According to de Maizière, it is necessary for Germany to uphold certain "well-tested and traditional habits" to sustain what makes Germany unique. He also posits a number of theses towards the CDU's understanding of Leitkultur. First, Leitkultur necessitates the promotion of a democratic political culture, which is premised on openness and appearing in public. Under this framing, de Maizière and Merkel argue that burkas should be banned in Germany since, "showing your face" "is an expression of the way we live together in our democracy" (2017, May 1). Second, education is central to German identity and should be treated as a right, rather than as a means to an end. Third, German identity is based around the pillars of personal achievement in sports, society, academia, politics, or business. However, while valuing and incentivizing personal achievement, de Maizière also emphasizes the importance of welfare and assistance for those in need. Fourth, Germany's history is central to German identity, in that "our history has been a struggle for German unification in freedom and peace with our neighbours…, the struggle for freedom and an

acknowledgment of the darkest periods of our history" (2017, May 1). Fifth, the CDU promotes a broader understanding of German culture to include classical composers and the particular German music school. Sixth, while emphasizing the importance of religious freedom, Germany is "based on Christian tradition… Religious holidays are part of our calendar [and] church spires are part of our landscapes" (2017, May 1). Seventh, a German Leitkultur emphasizes the importance of compromise as a constituent element of democracy, the promotion of diversity, and civic culture. Lastly, Germans should understand themselves as 'enlightened patriots,' meaning that "an enlightened patriot loves his country and does not hate others… Our national flag and our national anthem are a natural part of our patriotism: unity and justice and freedom" (2017, May 1). Therefore, German identity under the CDU is constituted by a constitutional patriotism and *Leitkultur*, which governs integration and promotes an, albeit limited form of, national pride.

Having identified these discourses, I seek to identify instances where there is slippage between constitutional patriotism and *Leitkultur*. In particular, de Maizière's first thesis of German *Leitkultur* embodies the merging of these two discourses. Under this thesis, a central aspect of German identity and culture is the promotion of a democratic political culture, which is open, inclusive, and public. As both Habermas (1994) and Hannah Arendt (1998) recognize, the maintenance of the public democratic sphere is a central element of constitutional patriotism since these scholars maintain that the rise of National Socialism was caused, in part, by the destruction of democratic political culture. In the promotion of a self-reflective identity, constitutional patriotism requires an open public sphere to ensure consistent debate surrounding elements of identity. However, de Maizière and Merkel argue that burkas should be banned to

ensure the 'publicness' of the public sphere. This example exemplifies the merging of *Leitkultur* and constitutional patriotism.

Migration without Multiculturalism: Multiculturalism has "utterly failed"

Perhaps the greatest challenge to Merkel's chancellorship has been the dramatic increase in migration since the 2015 European Migrant Crisis. Despite Germany being a 'polyethnic society,' meaning that it is characterized by cultural diversity that is predominantly immigration-induced, German has a substantial history of anti-foreigner sentiment (Wasmer 2013). As noted throughout this chapter, Merkel's conception of national identity is, in part, premised on a form of *Leitkultur*. However, as Schmidtke (2017) notes, Merkel and the CDU began to move away from an ethnocultural sense of nationhood for four main reasons: (1) growing societal diversity, (2) the prevalence of a European identity, (3) party politics, (4) and pragmatism in governing migration. I will briefly discuss the first and fourth reasons identified above. While increased migration has led to a hardening of ethnocultural modes of identification for some political actors (see next chapter on the AfD and PEGIDA), for Merkel, migration produced a more inclusive model of national belonging. Similarly, the normalization of migration as a policy field undermined the salience of Germany's ethnocultural mode of belonging (Schmidtke 2017). Central to this development has been the role of cities in regulating migration and implementing integration initiatives to welcome newcomers. In this sense, an ethnocultural conception of identity has become incompatible with "the challenges on the ground" (Schmidtke 2017, p. 511). Therefore, increased migration undermined the traditional German ethnocultural conception of belonging, thus leading to a 'redefinition' of German identity (Mushaben 2017b).

Extremism as the Other: No Place for "rabble-rousing, violence and Nazi Slogans"

Beyond these positive features, Merkel's conception of German nationhood is a continuation of the understanding of right-wing extremism as the constitutive outside of German identity. Merkel articulates the 'Othering' of (right-wing) extremism through two modes of argumentation: by appealing to Germany's unique responsibility from the Holocaust and by upholding a commitment to the German constitution. Just as in the postwar period, Merkel links right-wing extremism to National Socialism: "Right-wing extremism is by no means a thing of the past… Xenophobia, racism, and Anti-Semitism must have no place in Germany or elsewhere in the world. However, our country has an additional responsibility, which arose for us from the civilizational rupture of the Shoah in Germany during National Socialism" (Merkel 2018, May 29). Merkel broadened her opposition to right-wing extremism to the level of Europe by stating that "too painful was the centuries-long bloodshed on our continent, [including] the civilization break of the Shoah committed by Germany. However, after all the horrors of the past, we can tell that, in Europe, we have finally learned how to handle our diversity" (Merkel 2015, January 15). Because of the European past, the values of freedom and tolerance must be defended against forces that seek to threaten diversity in Europe. Similarly, Merkel condemns left-wing extremism due to its association with the GDR and the experience of dictatorship. Similarly, Merkel promotes freedom and tolerance to act as a blockade to extremism.

Secondly, Merkel argues that right-wing extremism threatens Germany's constitutional values and law and order. To delegitimize right-wing extremism, Merkel frequently cites Article 1 of the German constitution, which states "Human dignity shall be inviolable. To respect and protect it shall be the duty of all state authority" (Merkel 2018, September 12). Right-wing extremism, Merkel argues, contravenes this article and thus "tak[es] an axe to the roots on which our coexistence grows," such as the values of unity, justice, freedom, and the rule of law (Merkel

2018, September 12). As such, a government spokesperson stated that "it is our duty to defend our democratic culture of debate and discussion. There can be no place in our society for an anti-democratic movement" (Merkel 2018, August 29). Furthermore, Merkel stated that the full realization of constitutional values occurs when Germany defends religious freedom and freedom of expression (Merkel 2015, September 5). Crucially, Merkel's distinction between right-wing extremists and constitutional citizens became more defined during the Chemnitz riots in August 2018. Merkel distinguished between "people taking to the street to demonstrate [who] are making use of their 'constitutional rights'" and individuals who use their constitutional rights "as an excuse for 'rabble-rousing, […] violence, Nazi slogans, hostility towards people who look different, or attacks on police officers" (Merkel 2018, September 12). Similarly, Horst Seehofer, Minister of the Interior in Merkel's coalition government, made a similar distinction by stating that "If I had not been a minister, I would have taken to the streets as a citizen, but of course not with the radicals" (TeleSUR 2018, September 6, emphasis my own).

Therefore, German identity continues to be structured around the constitutive outside of (right-wing) extremism in such a way that contemporary German values, such as freedom and tolerance, are promoted to negate instances of extremism. Merkel's understanding of German identity is embodied in the tense relationship between constitutional patriotism and a particular form of *Leitkultur*.

Anti-Populism in the German Context

Finally, this chapter will turn to an analysis of Merkel's construction of the populism/anti-populism frontier. The frontier between populism and anti-populism is characterized by competition over national identity and the characteristics of 'the people.'

Typically, anti-populist discourses emphasize the inefficacy of populism to providing lasting solutions to complex managerial problems and, therefore, emphasize the necessity of mainstream parties. (Stavrakakis 2014). Following the PDT understanding of identity, as constituted by difference (de Saussure 1959, p. 120; Connolly 1991, p. ix), a close examination of the populism/anti-populism frontier reveals how the identity of both camps is mutually shaped.

The anti-populist discourses of Chancellor Merkel and the 'traditional parties' (CDU, CDU/CSU, and SPD) sought to establish a frontier against the AfD (Kim 2018). I assert that Merkel understands right-wing populist parties as an extension of right-wing extremism. Furthermore, right-wing populism is understood as antagonistic to the predominant understanding of German history and, as a result, constitutional patriotism. Merkel criticizes right-wing populism on two fronts: first, she argues that isolationism and "national egotism" do not adequately address the challenges of the contemporary era; second, the success of (and inefficacy of) right-populism is attributable to its tendency to over-simplify complex sociopolitical phenomena. While less apparent in her discourse, Merkel also argues that the CDU is the only actor capable of "get[ting] [right-wing populism] under control" (Donahue & Czuczka 2018). In what follows, I will develop these two lines of critique.

Merkel argues that "withdrawal and isolation" (2016, November 23) are inadequate in addressing the complexity of transnational and global issues, such as migration, economics, security, and climate change. Merkel refers to the "lessons of 20th-century economic conflicts and wars" to argue that nationalism and protectionism do not guarantee security and economic prosperity (Donahue & Czuczka 2018). Broadening her historical scope, Merkel also states that "Since the days of the Roman Empire and the Great Wall of China, we have known that isolationism does not bring security" (2018, January 24). At the national level, Merkel's critique

of right-wing populism is centred on the populist over-simplification of complex issues, such as identity formation, economic policy, and migration. To this point, Merkel emphasises that "Right-wing populism...is not the consequence of any sort of austerity Diktat. It comes from over-simplification, but it does, of course, give grounds for concern" (2012, May 14). Particularly regarding the populist construction of 'the people,' Merkel argues that "We all get to determine who 'the people' are - not just a few, no matter how loud they are" (The Strait Times 2016). Additionally, Merkel states that Germany should be "skeptical about easy answers" since "the world is not black and white" and "rarely is it the easy answers that bring progress to our country" (The Strait Times 2016). Merkel's cautioning against the populist tendency to essentialize political problems reflects her particular model of national identity as inherently fragmented, fluid, and pluralistic; whereas populists construct identity along a simplified reduction of politics as between 'the people' and 'the elite', Merkel emphasizes that there is no pre-political and straightforward basis for identity.

In response to "populism," Merkel articulates particular identities and demands that, she argues, are satisfied through technocratic, neo-liberal governance. Séville (2017) calls this discourse the "There is no alternative" (TINA) political strategy, which serves to emphasize the legitimacy of political actors by circumscribing "the realm of feasible policy choice" (p. 451). Additionally, Séville (2017) states that TINA can be used to "scale back democracy and diminish an electorate's expectations" (p. 451). Merkel uses TINA in various ways. First, Merkel argues that the identity positions of 'Europe' and 'European Union' are opposed to the simplicity of populism: "Our future lies in Europe's cohesion, not in a patchwork of small states, not in a withdrawal into isolationism and not into national egotism" (2018, May 21). Instead, Germany and its allies "must together carry out into the world the values that we believe are right and

important" (2016, November 23). Finally, Merkel directly discusses the importance of multilateralism: "you need to have the patience to find multilateral solutions and not slip into the apparently easier solution of pursuing national interests. Once you have a national response, at some point you lose" the opportunity for dialogue (Donahue & Czuczka 2018).

In summary, Merkel understands populism as antagonistic to central elements of German identity, such as the constitution, democracy and freedoms, Europe, and the German lessons from the past. By contrast, Merkel argues that multilateralism and technocratic governance are central to adequately addressing and responding to the complexity of the contemporary era. Additionally, Merkel's form of governance is also understood as the appropriate response to Germany's lessons from the past and towards satisfying central identity positions.

Conclusion

This brief chapter reconstructed Angela Merkel's and her party's conception of German identity and nationhood through the discourse analysis and situated this within the broader identity debates and discourses since German reunification. Merkel's chancellorship has been noted as a significant period in German identity politics, partly stemming from her unique biography as the first female and East German chancellor. In practice, Merkel's chancellorship can be seen as both a continuation and a disruption of elements of German identity: while she continued a focus on European identity and the 'othering' of right-wing extremism, her politics of the past, and the role the German past plays in its present, is a noted shift away from the prevalent strategy of 'normalising' German identity. Furthermore, Merkel's understanding of German identity as constituted by constitutional patriotism and *Leitkultur* represents a synthesis of two debates that, at an earlier point, may have been paradoxical.

This chapter also outlined the contours and contents of Merkel's populism/anti-populism political antagonism. I concluded that Merkel's approach towards populism in a pejorative sense employs central elements of German identity-formation to delegitimize (right-wing) populism as an extension of right-wing extremism. Crucially, she accomplishes this by arguing that populists oppose democracy and the constitution and that they are ignorant of the 'lessons of the German past.' By contrast, Merkel's anti-populism frontier illustrates the importance of technocratic politics in promoting multiculturalism, intercultural communication, and adherence to constitutional and democratic values. Thus, while recognizing the shortcomings of technocratic governance, Merkel argues that it is necessary for the governance of the complexity of the contemporary era.

With the construction of the discursive hegemonic environment as its background, it is now possible to study the discourses of the AfD. In particular, as I will illustrate in the following chapter, I am particularly interested in how the AfD discursively engages with and challenges notions of Germany as a community of responsibility, Germany as a European state, and their particular interpretation of the constitution.

Chapter 4: Populism as a discursive repertoire: a discourse analysis of the AfD

By this point, I have provided two levels of context according to the DHA: the broader sociopolitical and historical context and the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, and discourses (Reisigl & Wodak 2009). In this chapter, I seek to develop the notion of populism as a repertoire by analyzing the discourses of prominent members of the AfD, namely co-presidents Alexander Gauland and Alice Weidel, and Björn Höcke, a highly publicized politician within the party. Upon conducting a discourse analysis (see Research Design later in this chapter), I abductively identified discursive strategies within the populist repertoire, namely: speaking in the name of and constructing, 'the people' against 'the elite,' antagonistic repoliticization, majoritarianism, anti-institutionalism, and protectionism.[18] In particular, I emphasize how these strategies utilize identity elements from the German context, such as collective memory, and how the AfD challenges, shapes, and continues hegemonic conceptions of identity. Specifically, I focus on how German history, including but stemming beyond National Socialism, is appropriated to produce exclusions against 'the elite' and 'outsiders,' while simultaneously producing a sense of continuity for 'the people.' I argue that understanding populism as a repertoire allows analysts to conceptualize how populists construct the identity position of 'the people' in particular socio-historical contexts, while also emphasizing the fluidity and ambiguity of identities. First, I will provide the immediate context of the development of the AfD from a Eurosceptic party to a more traditional right-wing populist party. Then, I will outline the Research Design and present the findings of my analysis.

The AfD as "Competition Populist"

[18] These categories emerge particularly from the work of Brubaker (2017) and Wodak (2015) but are also observed by other theorists of populism.

Since the AfD's inception in 2013, the categorization of the party as a right-wing populist party has been a point of contention amongst scholars, and members of the party itself (Decker 2016). Indeed, the ideological and programmatic development of the party consisted of three visions for the party: an economically liberal, a national-conservative, and a right-wing populist one (Werner 2015). In practice, these different currents lead to the emergence of an 'economic wing,' which emphasized the party's opposition to the Euro, and a 'national-conservative wing,' which sought to play up "identity politics" through populist appeals to voters (Decker 2016).

However, scholars have noted that the early party program and discourses constitute a particular form of populism, that of *competition populism* (Bebnowski and Forster 2014). According to Bebnowski and Forster (2014), competition populism reified the antagonism between 'the people' and 'the elite' by articulating both groups in *neoliberal* terms (Havertz 2018). The AfD emphasized that the EU and 'the elite' undermine the economic competitiveness of Germany and its citizens. Under competition populist discourse, the AfD argued for a "Europe of competition," and an EU structured around subsidiarity and limited mechanisms of EU policymaking. Thus, the AfD sought to protect Germany's competitive advantage and economic interests from the policies of the EU. In this sense, "competition populism" established a frontier between "the people" "blocked in their sovereignty and the top-down, 'competition'-endangering menace of 'the *Altparteien*' and 'the unity-Euro'" (p. Kim 2017, p. 5). Competition populism appealed to the sovereignty of "the peoples of Europe" while linking this to *German* 'competition' interests, which suggested the coupling of "cultural feelings of superiority with economic outcomes" (Bebnowski 2015, p. 15).

At this point, it is necessary to discuss a central view of populists from different ideological orientations, namely Euroscepticism. Euroscepticism is a common trait of

contemporary far right-wing parties (Mudde 2007) and non-party organizations (Caiani & Della Porta 2011; Vorländer et al. 2018). According to Hooghe, Marks & Wilson (2002), Euroscepticism stems from "a series of perceived threats to the national community" (p. 976), including immigration, multiculturalism, and the loss of national sovereignty and traditional values. However, Halikiopoulou et al. (2012) and Rooduijn and Akkerman (2017) emphasize that left-wing populists can also be Eurosceptics, who instead emphasize socioeconomic issues, such as the protection of labour rights.

The ideological reorientation of the AfD from a "competition populism" to a "right-wing populism" can be attributed to the internal tensions of the former. While Decker (2016) states that eurosceptic positions can be "integrated effortlessly" (p.4) into right-wing discourses, Kim (2017) argues the tensions between the nodal points of "peoples of Europe" and "competition" (in the form of nationalist neo-liberalism) eventually led to a rift in the party's leadership.

The AfD, PEGIDA, and the European Migration Crisis

A controversial aspect of the AfD's shift towards right-wing populism has been its ambiguous relationship with PEGIDA ('Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamization of the West'), a far-right movement that formed in October 2014 (Vorländer et al. 2018). PEGIDA organizes weekly demonstrations in Dresden and mobilizes "several thousand people, at times even ten thousand" (Salzborn 2016, p. 51). While a systematic analysis of PEGIDA is beyond the scope of this study (for such studies, see Dostal 2015; Coury 2016; Druxes 2016; Virchow 2016; Vorländer et al. 2018), this section will illustrate the intersections between the discourse of the AfD and PEGIDA. Kim (2017) notes that PEGIDA signals "the single biggest break in the discursive order of the past decade in Germany, if not of the entire post-reunification period" (p.

5). However, the ideological orientation of PEGIDA has been noted to be characterized by a degree of "fuzziness" (Vorländer et al. 2018) and as a "liquid 'word cloud' of concepts, symbols and statements [within which] sometimes conflicting, or contradictory concepts are expressed" (Önnerfors 2017, p. 173). I will illustrate the discursive elements that comprise the identity construction of PEGIDA.

An overview of the literature on PEGIDA reveals that it is typically understood as a populist (Vorländer et al. 2018) and a New Right movement (Salzborn 2016). Regarding its populist characteristic, PEGIDA appropriated the slogan "We are the people" (*Wir sind das Volk*) from the 1989/1990 anti-regime protests in the GDR (Vorländer et al. 2018) as a *nodal point* which condensed various demands and identities into the populist representation of society with "*das Volk*" opposed to "Merkel", "traitors of the people" (*Volksverräter*), "Islamization", and the "lying press" (*Lügenpresse*)[19] (Kim 2017). Bridging on the intellectual tradition of the New Right (see Wood 2006), PEGIDA argues for a *volkisch*, or ethnonationalist, conception of national identity. Additionally, undergirding this conception of identity is a broader concept of sovereignty, namely that of 'ethnopluralism' (*Ethnopluralismus*). Based on an ideology of racial inequality, ethnopluralism advocates for the segregation of ethnic and cultural groups into self-governing territories (Schellenberg 2013) and states that to "preserve the unique national characters of different peoples, they have to be kept separated" (Rydgren 2005, p. 427). Ethnopluralism attempts to undermine the liberal multiculturalism of the European nation-state (Spektorowski 2003).

[19] *Lügenpresse* has a long history in Germany. Its first usage was following the failed revolutions of 1848 and was used to imply that Freemasons or Jews controlled the media. The term was also used to characterize the French media, following the Franco-Prussian war, and the press of various Allied countries in WWI. Most importantly, the Nazis used the term to critique the alleged Jewish and Bolshevik media (The Economist 2016). In all these instances, the term *Lügenpresse* is used to delegitimize any medium that does not reflect an actor's worldview, and, therefore, must be run by the 'Other.'

The ‘Them’ of PEGIDA’s dichotomous representation of society is better developed, compared to their construction of “the people.” PEGIDA frequently cites “Merkel” as its constitutive outside, by depicting the German Chancellor in a Nazi-like uniform (with the swastika replaced by a Euro sign), in a headscarf, and superimposing her onto the GDR coat of arms with the caption “National Stasi Agency” (Kim 2017, p. 5). In other words, both Angela Merkel and the European Union take on connotations of being authoritarian, anti-democratic, and opposed to the national community. *Lügenpresse,* which is mainstream media outlets, are frequently demonized in PEGIDA’s discourse, due to (often anti-Semitic) conspiracy theories (Salzborn 2016). Additionally, scholars (Dostal 2015; Salzborn 2016; Önnerfors 2017) have noted that PEGIDA’s focus on “Islamization” functions as a nodal point in their discourse, as both a catch-all term for a multitude of crises (loss of identity, loss of sovereignty, democratic crisis, economic crisis, etc.) and as a pretext for inserting racist and *volkisch* positions into public discourse. In this sense, “Islamization” signified the gradual destruction of Germany’s traditions, homeland, and identity by the elite-driven projects of integration and multiculturalism (Vorländer et al. 2018, p. 21).

The AfD approached associating itself with PEGIDA cautiously, illustrated by AfD officials calling the movement both an exercise of civic rights and freedoms (AfD 2014a) and cautioning against being associated with extremism and violence (AfD 2014b). By 2015, however, intra-party conflicts led Thuringia and Saxony-Anhalt AfD leaders Björn Höcke and André Poggenburg to draft the “Erfurt Resolution,” which levied critiques against the national party leadership. In this document, Höcke and Poggenburg argue that the success of portraying the AfD as a “democratic force with expertise” is endangered by the fact that the AfD “unduly and needlessly limit[s] its political range” by staying “away from civic protest

movements...although thousands of AfD members take part in these awakenings as demonstrators" (Der Flügel 2015). Therefore, the AfD sought to extend its conception of 'the people' to include PEGIDA, an association most recently displayed at the 2018 Chemnitz Riots (Meyer & Holscher 2018).

Research Design

Within CDA, discourse analysis is 'abductive' in nature (Wodak 2004), meaning that theoretical ideas were developed alongside an empirical analysis. For the present analysis, the abductive approach was used to conceptualize the discursive strategies in the populist repertoire by consulting both the empirical analysis and theoretical literature on populism. Additionally, CDA encourages researchers to engage in a close reading of specific texts to uncover general discursive patterns and strategies (Fairclough 2003; Wodak & Meyer 2009). My discourse analysis consisted of two rounds of reading a selection of political speeches by prominent AfD politicians. In the first round, I identified broad discursive patterns and strategies in the discourses of the party. In the second round, I coded the speeches using NVivo qualitative data analysis software according to the discursive strategies I identified in the first round to how these strategies define 'the people,' 'the elite,' and national outsiders. In doing so, I sought to identify continuities and divergences from past identity debates and discourses.

Findings: The AfD and the Populist Repertoire

In Table 1, I provide a summary of the coding process through Nvivo. Table 1 displays the elements of the discursive repertoire, the codes used in Nvivo, what function these elements perform in identity construction, and the historical reference points that each strategy uses.

Table 1

The Function of Elements of Discursive Repertoire and their Historical Reference Points

Discursive Repertoire	Codes in NVivo	Main Function	Historical Referent(s)
'The People' against 'the Other'*	For 'the people' Against 'the elite' Against out-groups	Emphasize responsibility for NS, but broadening memory paradigm to include instances of German pride Emphasize continuity between 1989 protestors and 'the people' Frame 'the people' as ethnic Germans who love Germany Compare 'the Elite' to past dictatorships and as opposed to Germany Emphasize the incompatibility of Islam with German values	1989 Monday Demonstrations in GDR Extensive – To Promote German Pride Extensive – To Relativize National Socialism (NS) WWII Dictatorship in GDR
Antagonistic Repoliticization	Opposition to *Altparteien* Opposition to European Union (EU) Freedom of Expression	Emphasize how 'the Elite' are destroying Germany and do not serve Germans Frame AfD as promoting Freedom of Expression	NS – Suppression of Political Opponents Extensive – Refer to Martin Luther to Promote Free Speech WWII
Anti-Institutionalism	Against mediating institutions** Against mainstream media Direct democracy***	Emphasize 'undemocratic Elite' and 'democratic People' antagonism *Emphasize diversity of 'the people' through direct action*	NS 1989 Monday Demonstrations in GDR 2015 New Year's Attacks in Cologne Dictatorship in GDR
Majoritarianism	Welfare Chauvinism Against Multiculturalism	Promote (ethnic) majority rights over minority rights.	1989 Monday Demonstrations in GDR

	Protection of LGBTQ Community		Extensive – Promote German Pride
Protectionism	Cultural Economic Demographic Securitarian Crisis Narrative	Produce a sense of an overall crisis of German culture, economy, security, and population. 'The elite' and national outsiders are *actively* destroying Germany	2015 New Year's Attacks in Cologne Dictatorship in GDR Extensive – Protect German Heritage WWII

Notes.

*'The Other' refers to both 'the Elite' and national out-groups
**Mediating institutions refers to courts and the Bundestag
***Direct democracy includes referendums and civic demonstrations
****'Extensive' signifies historical referents that extend beyond recent memory, including prominent historical figures, symbols, and events. I will specify why these types of historical referents were utilized.
*****World War II refers to the War in general, not National Socialism or the Holocaust

In what follows, I will develop each of these discursive strategies to reveal how they construct identity in particular ways and how the AfD uses historical referents to justify these identities.

Constructing 'the people': against 'the elites' and outsiders

The core element of the populist repertoire is the construction of 'the people' and the claim to speak for and represent such an entity. The literature on populism has universally recognized this discursive element as central to, or even constitutive of, populism (see Canovan 2005; De Cleen & Stavrakakis 2017). However, Canovan (2005) notes that the populist employment and construction of 'the people' is ambiguous.[20] This ambiguity is represented in how populists claim to represent the "people-as-excluded-part" to claim power as the "people-as-sovereign-whole" (Canovan 2005; Stavrakakis 2014). In other words, the populist 'people' is delineated as a part of the population (defined in ethnic, economic, or other terms) that claims the sovereign authority of all the people. To operationalize 'the people' as a discursive strategy, it is

[20] Canovan (2005, p. 79) goes to great lengths to illustrate the different, and at times, contradictory meanings of 'the people.' Canovan highlights three overlapping senses of the use of 'the people': (1) as rightful sovereign (or, loosely, *demos*), (2) as downtrodden economic class, (3) as nation (or *ethnos*). Beyond this, Canovan also highlights the differences of 'the people' in different historical and political contexts (i.e. *Volk* in German as opposed to *Peuple* in French).

necessary to develop its relationship to identity formation, and what *function 'the people' performs in forging a particular political identity*.

For Canovan (2004), 'the people' is a site of contention over competing discourses of political identity and a "repository of a series of unresolved political problems that are half-articulated and half-concealed by the term's contradictions" (p. 248). In this sense, residual identity discourses and debates continue to shape the boundaries of 'the people.' Moving beyond 'the people' generally, I turn to elaborate the function of representation in populism. According to Arditi (2007, p. 63-67), the populist claim to represent 'the people' involves the task of 'rendering-present' the people, which involves "a drive to configure the identity and interests of the represented by addressing the classical political questions of 'who we are' and 'what do we want'" (p. 64). Therefore, the claim to represent 'the people' is simultaneously distinguishing between 'us' and 'them.' Finally, the populist 'people' is deliberately vague, so that the contours of 'the people are blurred "as to encompass anyone with a grievance structured around a perceived exclusion from a public domain of interaction and decision" (Arditi 2007, p. 65).

Having established that the populist representation of 'the people' involves the construction of 'us' and 'them,' I will now elaborate the forms of exclusion employed in these constructions. As is recognized broadly in populism literature, 'the people' is primarily identified as being opposed to 'the elite' (Mudde & Kaltwasser 2012). However, as maintained throughout this thesis, it is more accurate to understand populism within a "*two-dimensional* vision of social space, defined by the *intersection* of vertical and horizontal oppositions" (Brubaker 2017a, p. 362). Thus, 'the people' is also identified with horizontal exclusions, which is often exemplified, in more or less explicit ways, through xenophobia and nativism. Additionally, the vertical and horizontal exclusions often intersect in the populist portrayal of 'the elite' in that 'the elite' are

represented as both ‘on top’ and ‘outside.’ ‘The elite’ are framed as having affective, cultural, and economic investments that easily move across national borders, meaning that their cultural identity and economic prosperity is not linked to those of ‘the people.’ In summary, the construction of ‘the people’ is constituted by both *vertical* and *horizontal* oppositions.

Upon completing the discourse analysis, I identified two differing (and at times complementary and contesting) antagonistic frontiers that are discursively constructed by the AfD. I will begin by outlining these frontiers, which will illuminate the constructions of ‘the people’ and ‘the elite’ in the process. The first and central frontier in the AfD’s discourse is established between those who seek to destroy the future of Germany (including its culture, values, people) and those who want to defend Germany and its right to its territory. Importantly, this frontier emphasizes the two-dimensional vision of social space articulated above, since both ‘the elite,’ through their multicultural policies, and national outsiders are understood as seeking the destruction of Germany.

In this first articulation of the populist frontier, the AfD define ‘the people’ in cultural terms, with an emphasis on patriotism and an extensive, albeit selective, use of mnemonical events. Since patriotism is a central feature of the AfD’s discourse[21], I will instead begin by discussing the AfD’s conception of German culture. As mentioned previously, the AfD challenges the dominant memory paradigm by conceiving of German history beyond National Socialism. Gauland identifies German history as stemming from Charlemagne and including figures such as Charles V, Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, and Frederick the Great (2018).

Additionally, Gauland argues that there is significant ethnic diversity in Germany’s history by speaking to the struggles of German Jewry and framing it in such a way that Hitler’s

[21] For example, “We are Germans, we are proud of it, we love this country” (Gauland 2018); “I love my home… I will do everything in my power to defend the future of my people” (Höcke 2015, October 7).

extermination of the Jews is understood simultaneously as an attack on Germanness (Gauland 2018). Höcke also draws on more recent historical events, such as the fall of the GDR and subsequent reunification as an illustration of the diversity of Germany (the merging of the East and West). Beyond being rooted in the past, the AfD frequently discusses the extension of the German people into the future. Beyond frequent statements that Germany must be preserved for future generations "as we have inherited it from our fathers," the AfD also focuses centrally on children, grandchildren, and the protection of the nuclear family model (Gauland 2016). Therefore, the AfD's conceptualization of German culture and identity based on rootedness in history and continuity into the future strongly resemblances traditional nationalist discourses around the imagined community (Wodak et al. 2009).

These nationalist discourses are directly related to the notion of an ancestral homeland, or, in the German context, a *Heimat*. The notion of *Heimat* (homeland) carries a long history of usages and appropriations that are explicitly linked to German national identity and cultural history. Beyond the ethnic specificity of the concept, *Heimat* is intrinsically tied to issues of *collective memory* and *locality* in that belonging to a *physical Heimat* is mediated by individual and collective memory (Eigler & Kugele 2012). Importantly, *Heimat* is an internally complex concept with a "Janus-face" (Boa & Palfreyman 2000): on the one hand, *Heimat* has been used to assert difference through the homogenizing tendencies of globalization and modernity; on the other hand, "*Heimat* discourse buttresses group identity. This interplay of identity and difference can take on many political shades depending on historical context" (p. 204). Applications of the notion of *Heimat* are deeply imbued by collective memory and take on narratives of loss, nostalgia, trauma, and repression (usually understood in the aftermath of National Socialism) as well as in literatures on exile and as a challenge to exclusion and persecution (Eigler & Kugele

2012). Therefore, while indeed carrying the connotation of nostalgia for a homeland, *Heimat* is a flexible concept that structures difference, loss, and desire (James 2009). Given the centrality of contested memory discourses and notions of difference and identity, questions of the meaning of *Heimat* are questions of what constitutes a legitimate community.

Beyond this explicit culturalist notion of 'the people,' Weidel emphasizes the central role that democratic and constitutional freedoms factor in German culture. While this will be elaborated below in a slightly different sense, I am concerned here with the AfD's argument that German values are being destroyed by 'the elite' and national outsiders. In her discussion of homosexuality, Weidel emphasizes that the freedoms that allow for the diversity of the German population, including racial, sexual, and gender diversity, are threatened by multiculturalism and 'foreign' values (Berger 2017). Through this equivalence, Weidel includes the LGBTQ+ community in 'the people', despite directly challenging the AfD's support of the nuclear family model.

By contrast, 'the elite' in the AfD's discourse is understood as not loving Germany and German culture and history, so much so that they seek to abolish Germany (Gauland 2018) in some form of a pathological self-hatred. Additionally, 'the elite,' which includes churches, the EU, and other organizations, are seen as being complicit in the destruction of the German people for particular political ends. To illustrate this point, Höcke discussed an instance where the Federal Minister of Justice averted his eyes when Höcke pulled the German flag out of his jacket pocket and stated that "it was like showing Dracula the cross!" (2015, October 21). In summary, a consistent feature throughout the discourses of the AfD is that 'the elite' are filled with self-hatred to the point that they seek to destroy Germany and German culture.

Additionally, the AfD argue that 'the people' whom the CDU and the *Altparteien* serve are not the German people, but rather an artificial construct. To illustrate this, Gauland points to the controversial art piece by Hans Haacke, entitled *Der Bevölkerung* ('The Population'). Introduced in 2000, the art piece, which consists of a box filled with gravel, soil, and plants and has the phrase "*Der Bevölkerung*" in the middle, refers to the famous inscription at the Reichstag building, "*Dem deutschen Volke*" ("To the German People"). The art piece challenged the notion of 'the German people,' particularly in the context of increased migration, diversity, and reunification. Gauland argues that this art piece illustrates how the *Altparteien* sought to "wipe out the German… great German history, tradition, and culture" (2016).

Furthermore, Weidel accuses Merkel and the *Altparteien* as no longer feeling obligated to working for 'the German people. Instead, Merkel is framed as "want[ing] to choose and assemble the people [herself]" (Weidel 2018). Weidel's critique here functions in two ways: first, it frames Merkel as being loyal to another artificial 'people' (in this case, the technocrats of the EU and Muslims); second, Weidel's framing complements the AfD's broader discourse that Merkel seeks to replace 'the German people.' Gauland argues a similar point by stating that Merkel "completely transforms a people and grafts many strangers into the people and forces us to recognize them as our own" (2016). Lastly, for the discussion of German memory politics, 'the elite' are understood as both directing a disproportionate amount of attention towards National Socialism as a fundamental aspect of German identity as well as ignoring German history altogether.

In contrast to other right-wing populist parties in Europe (Marzouki & McDonnell 2016), the AfD includes churches and, in particular, church elites in 'the elite.' Within the context of the European migrant crisis, churches in Germany have supported immigration and have framed

themselves as a site of dialogue between ethnic Germans and migrants (Strickland 2017). Church leaders argue that promoting a welcoming culture upholds the Christian responsibility of seeing "every human [as having been] created in the image of God. [Therefore,] everyone is equal and has equal rights" (Strickland 2017, n.p.). Additionally, churches link their responsibility to support migration to churches' complicity to and support of Nazism. Because of this, church elites have condemned the AfD for being against the biblical teachings on equality and diversity (Knight 2017). In response, Höcke (2015, October 21) challenges the church elite by stating that the inclusion of Islam will lead to the persecution of Christians in Germany and Europe. Instead, the AfD seeks to preserve Europe as "a haven for persecuted Christians" (Höcke 2015, October 21). Like the *Altparteien,* the AfD frames the church elites of both Catholicism and Protestantism as opposing the German people and continue to move "further and further away from their people" (Höcke 2015, October 21). Lastly, the AfD critiques churches as jeopardizing the integrity of the separation of church and state. To this point, Weidel argues that the churches' support for migration ignores the separation of church and state, which mirrors the role that churches played during the Third Reich (Knight 2017). Therefore, the church elites are understood as being opposed to German Christians and as ignoring the 'actual' lessons of the past: instead of not excluding minorities and promoting racial hierarchies, the AfD argues that the real lessons from National Socialism are not to ignore the separation of church and state. In summary, the AfD believes that church elites, through their support of migration, have corrupted the long-standing cultural institutions of Germany.

Having described the contents of the AfD's conception of 'the elite' under the first antagonistic frontier, I will now turn to a discussion of 'national outsiders.' Gauland emphasizes that the AfD does not reject migrants on the basis of race, but rather on the perceived

incompatibility of German values and Muslim values: "I do not care if one is dark or fair-skinned… If he joins this country, if he lives the traditions...he is welcome as a German. But please: I have doubts about people who are walking around the Kaaba[22]" (Gauland 2016). In her discussion of homosexuality, Weidel argues that Muslim values are in direct opposition to Germany's "way of living and the freedoms that especially girls and women enjoy [in Germany], not only sexually, but generally in shaping their lives" (Berger 2017). Additionally, Gauland states that migrants "cannot relate to German history or German culture" and are, therefore, difficult to integrate (2018). The AfD politicians also oppose the formation of 'parallel societies' (Gauland 2016), which refers to the self-organization of a minority, with the intent of reducing spatial, social and cultural contact with the majority society.[23] Therefore, the AfD advocates for a German *Leitkultur* to successfully integrate migrants: "There is also the possibility of becoming German through immigration. By adaptation. By accepting our culture… By living with us and acknowledging that the German *Leitkultur* is the decisive culture in this country and everything else has to be subordinated" (Gauland 2016). Following Pautz (2005), the AfD's approach to national outsiders draws on the *ius culturis* (Pautz 2005) discourse established during the 2000s *Leitkulturdebatte*, where culture, not race, becomes the point of exclusion. However, as Gauland's comment "But please: I have doubts about people who are walking around the Kaaba [about their ability to conform to German *Leitkultur*]" implies, the politicians of the AfD believe that Muslims are not capable of becoming 'German.' Given these doubts, I posit that, following Wodak (2015), the AfD promotes an exclusive conception of *Leitkultur*, but attempts veil the exclusions to avoid being termed 'racist' or 'exclusionary.'

[22] The Kaaba is a building in the centre of Islam's most important mosque, Al-Masjid Al-Haram. It is considered the most sacred site in Islam and is the destination of pilgrimages for millions of Muslims globally.
[23] While not discussed previously, the notion of parallel societies has existed in German discourse around multiculturalism since the 1990s.

The second antagonistic frontier established by the AfD is between ‘the democratic and constitutional people’ and ‘the undemocratic and illegitimate elite.’ While I identify this antagonism as distinct from the first one, there is substantial overlap, since the AfD regards democracy, democratic values, and the constitution as central aspects of traditional German identity. Regarding ‘the elite,’ Chancellor Merkel is frequently called names, such as “Chancellor Dictator” (Gauland 2016) and the AfD often compares the CDU and *Altparteien* to the socialist dictatorship of the GDR (Höcke 2015, September 23). Put more poignantly, Bernd Baumann compares the CDU to the Nazi party by comparing the exclusion of the AfD from public debate to the Nazi exclusion of political opponents during the rise of Nazism (AfD 2018, October 24). As a final point, ‘the elite’ is further characterized as undemocratic and cowardly, due to the perceived suppression of freedom of expression by the *Altparteien*. Höcke states that “without freedom of expression, democracy cannot be thought of. In Germany of the year 2015, however, freedom of expression is practically overridden by the laws of political correctness!” (2015, September 16). In this antagonistic frontier, ‘the people’ is not imbued with as much content. Beyond being vehemently opposed to political correctness and supporting freedom of expression, the AfD emphasizes how protests and demonstrations are needed to reinvigorate Germany’s democracy (Höcke 2015, October 21). Despite its simplicity, the AfD constructs an additional antagonistic frontier between ‘the democratic and constitutional people’ and ‘the undemocratic and illegitimate elite.’

Antagonistic Repoliticization

Following the construction of ‘the people’ and ‘the elite,’ the next discursive strategy of the populist repertoire is what Brubaker (2017a) terms *antagonistic repoliticization*: “the claim to reassert democratic political control over domains of life that are seen...as having been

depoliticized and de-democratized, that is, removed from the realm of democratic decision-making" (p. 364). Theorists of populism in the tradition of Laclau, such as Mouffe (2005) and Stavrakakis (2014) emphasize how populist discourses challenge the hegemonic neoliberal claim that there is no alternative to administrative and technocratic decision-making. In particular, for the AfD, populist discourses oppose the stifling of debate about political questions from grand coalitions or 'party cartels', as well as the abdication of national sovereignty to the European Union. The populist repoliticization draws a clear distinction between 'the people' and 'the elite,' thus emphasizing the identity politics of populism (Canovan 1999).

The AfD employs antagonistic repoliticization in three ways: opposition to the EU, opposition to the stifling of debate by the *Altparteien*, and, uniquely, opposition to the prevailing attitude towards German history. Despite moving away from an explicitly anti-euro platform, the AfD continues to criticize the abdication of national sovereignty to the EU and the euro. For the AfD, Euroscepticism serves two purposes: to reassert economic sovereignty over Germany's budget; and to promote an ethnopluralist conception of national identity. Like their construction of the antagonism between 'the people' and 'the elite', the AfD emphasizes the undemocratic nature of the EU, or in Höcke's words "the principle of popular sovereignty has been trampled on more and more rights being placed in the clutches of the democratically unjustified bureaucratic monster in Brussels" (2015, September 16). Weidel (2018) continues this by stating that the EU contradicts a central tenet of parliamentary democracy, namely "no taxation without representation" in that the German people (and, indeed, the various peoples of Europe) do not have adequate representation in the EU.

Additionally, Gauland critiques the loss of national sovereignty to the EU as a loss of self-determination over national identity and culture. Against a conception of European identity,

Gauland argues that "our national state is the vessel in which inner and outer security should be realized… All attempts to replace the nation-state by constructing 'Europe' have gone awry… The self-determination of a people is realized in his nation-state and only there" (2016). Therefore, according to Gauland, nation-states should have the right to their tradition and their future (2016).

Second, as outlined in the previous chapter, Merkel uses a "There is no alternative" (TINA) strategy (Séville 2017) to delegitimize the emergence of populism. To counter this, as I will illustrate, the AfD challenges Merkel's TINA strategy with one of their own that emerges from their particular conception of the German 'people.' In particular, the AfD systematically aims to repoliticize the debate on multiculturalism in Germany by arguing that the current policies have been imposed on the German people by a self-interested, out-of-touch, and undemocratic elite. The critiques of the *Altparteien* in this context ranges from accusing them of being ignorant of the big picture ("overlooking the proverbial 'elephant in the room' with their tunnel vision of ever more silly topics, the only great danger that threatens us - Islamization" (Berger 2017)) and stifling, or being unwilling to engage in debate ("ghost debate" (AfD 2018, August 17), "they only throw smoke bombs" (Höcke 2015, September 16)), to trying to hegemonically impose their own vision of the world onto the German people against the people's sovereign will ("They try to enforce their dream of 'colourful Thuringia' and the 'colourful Republic of Germany' with a crowbar!" (Höcke 2015, September 2016). Beyond this, the hegemonic imposition of multiculturalism contributes to the AfD's populist antagonism of those who want to destroy Germany and those who want to defend it:

> The *Altparteien*, above all the CDU, which is the longest ruling party in the Bundestag, are responsible for the parallel societies that have emerged in recent decades and for the

> multicultural revolution from above that is supposed to end the history of our people… Please, serve your country, end the grand coalition and finally have new elections in the Federation! Höcke 2016, January 13

Therefore, by repoliticizing the debates surrounding multiculturalism and refugee policy, the AfD frames itself as the only real alternative to the *Altparteien*: "The AfD is the only serious and genuine opposition party in Germany. It stands in natural opposition to all *Altparteien* because it does something monstrous: the AfD represents German interests" (Höcke 2015, September 16). Framing the AfD as the sole alternative allows AfD politicians to portray themselves as non-partisan and beyond the left-right divide, and as being the only party that will represent the interests of minorities against the intentional destruction of the German people.

Finally, and perhaps less explicitly, the AfD seeks to repoliticize the debate surrounding Germany's attitude toward history, again arguing that the prevailing model seeks to destroy and degrade the German people. In his highly publicized speech, Höcke argues that for the German people to have future, "we have to become ourselves again [and] we will only become ourselves if we rebuild a positive relationship with our history… We urgently need a turnaround in memory policy of 180 degrees, as never before" (2015, September 16). In practice, Höcke advocates for a "living culture of remembrance, which first and foremost brings us into contact with the great achievements of the ancients" (2015, September 16). Therefore, for Höcke, a critique of the current collective memory paradigm *is not the denial of National Socialism, but rather an emphasis on other (particularly positive) aspects of German history*.

To be sure, the AfD does not reject National Socialism as a part of German history and emphasizes its centrality to Germanness: "We do not have to convince ourselves of the unworthiness of National Socialism; we have this unworthiness in our blood" (Gauland 2018).

Instead, the AfD emphasizes that while they are committed to responsibility for National Socialism, “Hitler and the Nazis are just a scarecrow in our over one thousand years of history” (Gauland 2018). However, the AfD’s commitment to responsibility for Nazism is by no means as extensive as that of Merkel and the CDU, for whom National Socialism is central to Germany’s foreign policy and self-identity. Instead, the AfD argues that “the great figures of the past...are the yardstick by which we must direct our actions” (Gauland 2018). In this sense, since Germany had assumed responsibility for its past, Germany no longer requires a self-reflexive identity and can fully appreciate a more extensive view of its past. Therefore, Gauland and Höcke typically cite various events, figures, and symbols throughout German history, such as the conquests of Frederick the Great, the Austro-Prussian War, the German flag, various cathedrals, and the enlightenment. The AfD’s particular attitude towards National Socialism has an essential function in the production of German identity, namely that Germany no longer requires the constitutional patriotic model of a self-reflexive identity. As such, the AfD justifies their ethnocultural interpretation of the German political community through relativization and normalization of German identity.

Lastly, AfD politicians critique the current formation of German identity that has National Socialism as the constitutive outside since, they argue, it stifles debate. In this way, Gauland, Weidel, and Höcke criticize the frequent association made between the AfD and National Socialism, which removes them from the realm of public debate: “We are being vilified, slandered and constantly associated with the darkest period of the German past” (Berger 2017); “if you speak that way...you are now accused of not respecting European values. Yes! That one did not learn from history. Auschwitz quickly comes into play. The moral arrogance of this nonsense could break our necks!” (Gauland 2016).

Majoritarianism

The second element of the populist repertoire is *majoritarianism*, or "the assertion of the interests, rights, and will of the majority against those of minorities" (Brubaker 2017a, p. 365). Majoritarianism is particularly compatible with the two-dimensional social space of contemporary populism since it can be directed against those at the top or on the outside. Particularly important for the present analysis, majoritarianism can reject the discourses of multiculturalism, diversity, or minority rights (Mudde 2007).

Like the construction of 'the people' and 'the elite' outlined above, majoritarianism in the AfD's discourse is generally centered around opposition to the imposition of multiculturalism which threatens the existence of 'the people.' The element of "Today we are tolerant and tomorrow we are foreign in our own country" is present in the AfD's majoritarian discourses. In contrast to multiculturalism, the AfD promotes a German *Leitkultur* (similar to that of the CSU) that emphasizes that migrants must accept German culture, traditions and acknowledge that everything else must be subordinated to the *Leitkultur*.

To a lesser degree, the AfD also employs an economic majoritarian discourse that is expressed as welfare chauvinism and Euroscepticism. The AfD's justification for welfare chauvinism is that the current welfare system treats Germans "unequally" (Höcke 2016, January 20) due to Merkel's open border policy. To this point, the AfD critiques the *Altparteien* by stating that "the aid of refugees is at the expense of the poorest Germans" (Höcke 2016, January 20). Again, this discourse reinforces the populist antagonism between those who want to destroy the German people and those who want to defend them. To contextualize this claim, the AfD politicians question how the *Altparteien* can extend welfare to refugees when the German people are suffering. Höcke states that: "We have over 2 trillion euros in government debt… 12.3

million people live below the poverty line, and 2.8 million children in our allegedly rich country are at risk of poverty." (2016, January 20). Weidel (2018) argues against the refugee policy of the *Altparteien* by stating that "they [the *Altparteien*] obstruct the chances of future generations. The foundation of our state is the people who live and work here... We have a primary responsibility for the people, the families who have lived here for a long time - these are the people you have to serve."

Regarding Euroscepticism, Gauland and Weidel emphasize how the EU and the Euro, in particular, threaten German economic sovereignty and self-determination. For example, Gauland argues that "the Italians have every right to take their fate into their own hands - but please do not do it with German tax money… It does not work to give different economies a single currency and believe that they do not undermine national economic cultures" (2018). Furthermore, Höcke emphasizes how the "Euro experiment" puts the German taxpayer at significant risk (2016, January 27).

Anti-Institutionalism

The next element of the populist repertoire is *anti-institutionalism* (Huber & Ruth 2017; Brubaker 2017a). Populists consistently oppose democratic and mediatory institutions and, once in power, seek to dominate or delegitimize such institutions (Müller 2016, p. 61-62). Beyond opposing parliamentary institutions, Urbinati (2015) also illustrates that populists distrust the mediating functions of political parties, 'mainstream' media, and the courts (see also Finchelstein 2014). Given their opposition to mediatory institutions, some scholars have termed populism an "ideology of immediacy" (Innerarity 2010, p. 41; Urbinati 2015). Freeden (2017) argues that populism operates in the immediate where, in contrast to parliamentary mediation, current events are immediately interpreted into political problems (p. 5-6). Populism's opposition to

representative democracy is accompanied by the promotion of forms of 'direct democracy,' most often through majoritarian procedures such as referendums (Urbinati 2015; Tormey 2015).

Anti-institutionalism is not as significant a factor in the discourses of the AfD since, while the party critiques existing political parties and the media (*Lügenpresse*) as anti-democratic, the AfD views these actors as contaminating or acting outside of pre-existing institutions, such as the Bundestag and the constitution. AfD politicians consistently point to how the *Altparteien* have undemocratically imposed policies that seek to destroy the AfD's conception of 'the people.' For example, Gauland states that Merkel's open border policy towards migrants was conducted "without the participation of the German Bundestag" (2018). Additionally, Weidel argues that the "multicultural revolution from above" works against the interests and rights of minority communities in Germany, such as the LGBTQ+ community (Berger 2017).

The AfD is equally opposed to the *Lügenpresse,* which is understood to be biased (or one-sided), anti-democratic, opposed to the German 'people,' and out-of-touch with 'the people.' The AfD frequently accuses the *Lügenpresse* of not conducting objective journalism (Höcke 2015, October 21) to support particular political ends, like multiculturalism. Additionally, the AfD states that there is a growing gap between public opinion on contentious political issues and the published opinions of the *Lügenpresse*. As Höcke argues, "the media suggest that everyone is looking forward to the uncontrolled influx of asylum seekers. On TV and in the newspapers you can almost only see images of families with children" (2015, September 16). Weidel suggests that 'the people' are recognizing the political intention behind the reporting of the *Lügenpresse* and have become immune to the "constant excessive exaggeration against false or at least tendentious reports of the *Lügenpresse*" (Berger 2017). For the AfD, this divergence between

published and public opinion is an untenable basis for a healthy democracy, since "hardly anyone dares to state their opinion freely" (Höcke 2015, September 16).[24] Framing the *Lügenpresse* as such allows the AfD to frame itself as the true democrats who fight for freedom of expression since, because the AfD "says what should not be said" (Höcke 2015, November 18), the *Lügenpresse* silences the party rather than dealing with the party regarding their content. Another example of this pertains to when the Bild Zeitung, a German tabloid newspaper that the AfD pejoratively calls "Blöd-Zeitung" ("Stupid Newspaper"), characterized Höcke as the new Hitler and, thus, attempted to remove the AfD's content from public debate. Additionally, Höcke states how the *Lügenpresse* actively seeks to conceal and falsify the actions of political alternatives to downplay the significance of the movement (2015, September 30).

In response to the AfD's distrust of mediating institutions, AfD politicians frequently encourage forms of direct participatory democracy, such as referendums and demonstrations, and the reinvigoration of national sovereignty. The call for immediate elections and referendums on contentious issues is a frequent antagonistic element employed to delineate the 'democratic, sovereign, and aware people' and the 'undemocratic, illegitimate, self-interested, and ignorant elite.' For example, Höcke states that:

> there is nothing but the people, the citizen, the little man. We are to dig ourselves out of the mess that the *Altparteien* cartel has gotten us in… Here is the people. Here stands the watchful people. And if you [the *Altparteien*] do not soon introduce referendums at the federal level, then we will do that! Citizens no longer have faith in politics… We are no longer deceived! 2015, November 18

[24] Interestingly, Höcke critiques online newspapers that publish editorials and letters to the editor that diverge dramatically from public opinion by states that "the contents [of these publications] do not correspond with the comments on the internet, if you'd have activated the comment sections for the important topics."

Similarly, the AfD threatens to introduce referendums on contentious issues such as multiculturalism (Höcke 2015, November 18; 2015, September 16), Germany's national budget (Weidel 2018), and whether Germany should continue to participate in the EU (Weidel 2018).

The AfD's call for demonstrations amongst AfD supporters emphasizes the antagonistic frontier constructed between the 'democratic people' and the 'undemocratic/unconstitutional elite.' Referring to a situation where the German police shut down an AfD demonstration, Höcke argued that the elites violated the Right to Assembly as outlined in the German constitution and that regulatory measures are disproportionately applied to AfD demonstrations. Demonstrations also act as an event wherein various identities and demands are reconciled into 'the people' since Höcke emphasizes how "no people are marginalized" (2015, October 21) at AfD demonstrations. Additionally, Höcke states how demonstrations consist of the "old and young," "families with children," and people who are "more conservative, more socialist or liberal" (2015, October 21). Thus, through direct action, the AfD grafts together individuals with diverse and disparate identity positions and political orientations into 'the people' against the common enemies of 'the elite' and 'the people.' In other words, *'the people' come into existence through direct action*.

The central mnemonic referent point to the AfD's anti-institutionalist discourse is the GDR and, in particular, the East German protests that lead to the collapse of the GDR regime. This reference to the GDR serves two purposes: first, the AfD frames institutions, such as the mainstream media, political parties, and churches as undemocratic and opposed to constitutional and Western freedoms, similar to the GDR dictatorship; second, the AfD frames their movement as akin to the 1989 East German protests. Regarding the former, Höcke frames how the media and the Bundestag exclude the AfD from public discourse as "GDR-style intimidation attempts" (2015, October 7). Additionally, throughout their speeches, the AfD view the 'imposition' of

multiculturalism on Germany as undemocratic and in opposition to the democratic values of Germany. The AfD emphasizes this by quoting the former CDU politician Steffen Heitmann as saying "I have never - even in the GDR - felt so strange in my own country" (Höcke 2016, January 13). In response to this, Höcke and Gauland emphasize the necessity of direct (democratic) action through demonstrations and referendums. To this point, Höcke links together his opposition to hegemonic parties and mainstream media and situates it within the GDR legacy: "I ask you: In 1989 during our peaceful revolution, did we throw the socialist dictatorship into the trash bin of history in order to live 25 years later in a paralyzed party democracy with predominantly unified media? No!" (2015, September 16).

Protectionism and Crisis: "After Cologne"

The fourth and final element I identified was *protectionism,* or the claim to protect or defend 'the people' from outside and above forces. In particular, I observed that cultural, economic, securitarian, and demographic protectionism feature strongly in the AfD's discourse. Economic protectionism emphasizes the threat to domestic economic competitiveness and the appropriate functioning of the welfare state. Cultural protectionism highlights threats to Germany's 'life world' (Brubaker 2006) from others who have different religious beliefs, cultures, values, and traditions. Securitarian protectionism highlights threats to 'the people' from crime. Lastly, demographic protectionism emphasizes the threat to the German population, a discursive strategy that Wodak (2015) understands as the protection of the *Body Politic* of populism. This is often combined with the use of *crisis narratives* (Moffitt 2015). Typically, scholars ascribe a causal relationship between crisis and populism: "several independent crises have converged in recent years to create a 'perfect storm' supremely conducive to populism" (Brubaker 2017a, p. 373). However, 'crisis,' rather than being a neutral category of social

analysis, is a category of social and political practice that is mobilized towards particular ends (Brubaker 2011). In this sense, populist discourse does not simply respond to a pre-existing crisis, but also *creates crisis* frames, and constructs its characteristics socially and discursively (Moffitt 2015; Stavrakakis et al. 2018). According to Laclau (1990), crisis, or in his words 'dislocation', both threatens existing identities and produces the necessary terrain upon which new identities can be formed. Thus, populists use crisis to delineate an enemy ('the elite' or outsiders) which simultaneously triggers the construction of the people. However, as I will illustrate at the end of this section, these various forms of protectionism interact to produce one all-encompassing crisis with cultural, economic, security, and demographic issues.

The AfD's protectionist discourses are mostly based on cultural protectionism, particularly regarding language, Western enlightenment values, and traditions). A central signifier within this discourse is cited by both Gauland and Höcke, the notion that "Today we are tolerant and tomorrow we are foreign in our own country." As such, Gauland emphasizes how multiculturalism has "ruin[ed] the language spoken at school" (2016) and, specifically, how Islam is incompatible with Western enlightenment values, namely gender and sexual rights (Berger 2017), religious freedom, and civil and political liberties. To illustrate this, Gauland uses the hypothetical extreme of asking whether a Muslim majority would accept traditional German values (2016). These cultural protectionist discourses are also linked to 'the elite,' with Gauland stating that "our ancestors did not build this land so that this political elite would ruin it and let it go to the dogs. That is why we are now called upon to preserve the inheritance of our fathers and forefathers" (2016). Therefore, Weidel concludes that the "AfD is the only party that stands for law and order and the preservation of our liberal Western culture and civilization… We are the only political force that dares to address the threats to...Germany" (Berger 2017).

The other fundamental protectionist discourse of the AfD is demographic protectionism. In particular, Höcke emphasizes how increased migration will allegedly 'replace' the German population: "The current immigration and family reunification policies will mean that, in the medium term, at least half of the population in Germany will be Muslim. We cannot permit that!" (2015, October 7). This particular view resembles the ethnopluralist view recognized above where nations should not be mixed and belong in delineated territories: "the Afghans [still have] their Afghanistan, the Senegalese their Senegal" (Höcke 2015, September 30).

The AfD use economic protectionist discourses to illustrate the unsustainability of the current spending towards migrant integration programs and to welcoming migrants into the social security system. To this point, Weidel (2018) argues that "taxpayers are sitting on a huge debt that future generations will inherit" in such away that current budgets "obstruct the chances of future generations." More poignantly, Weidel (2018) argues that "Burkas, kerchief girls, alimented knives and other goodies will not secure our prosperity, economic growth and especially the welfare state." Similarly, Höcke emphasizes the burden migrants will have on the German welfare system and questions why Germany is allowing in migrants when "12.3 million [Germans live] below the poverty line, including 2.8 million children" (2016, January 13). Therefore, these discourses can be understood as promoting welfare chauvinism, the notion that welfare benefits should be restricted to the native population. Additionally, the AfD's economic protectionist discourses reify the opposition between 'the people' and 'the elite' and the incompatibility of national outsiders with the German economy.

Finally, the AfD uses securitarian discourses to emphasize the perceived loss of law and order as well as a decline in German state sovereignty over the control of its borders. The decline in the rule of law is attributed to Merkel: "this...Chancellor has nullified the rule of law wherever

she could… Mrs. Merkel has opened the borders [and] internal security has fallen apart" (Gauland 2016). Additionally, Weidel (Berger 2017) emphasizes how the increased migration has led to increased violence and crime against minority communities, in particular, the LGBTQ+ community and women. In practice, these forms of protectionist discourses converge to produce a broader narrative of the necessity of protecting 'the people.' For example, while the AfD seeks to protect the culture (including traditions and values) of 'the people,' 'the people' in this sense are simultaneously understood as *bearers of German culture and tradition*, necessitating the continuation of the German people into the future (demographic protectionism). Additionally, the AfD's economic protectionist discourses emphasize how by extending the German welfare state to include migrants, 'ordinary Germans' suffer. Lastly, these discourses are imbued by a broader securitarian protectionist discourse of lamenting the decline in the rule of law and sovereignty over borders. Therefore, these discourses converge to produce an ethnocultural conception of 'the people' that, to guarantee its continuation into the future, must be protected in the present.

Shifting to a discussion of the AfD's crisis narratives, while early AfD discourses emerged within the European financial crisis, and the Eurozone sovereign debt crisis (Kim 2017), contemporary AfD discourses construct and are centred on the 'cultural break' ("*Kulturbruch*") of the events on New Year's Eve 2015/2016 in Cologne. Following the New Year's celebration in Cologne, hundreds of cases were submitted to the police which detailed instances of sexual assault, theft, and violence against women, committed mainly by migrants from the Middle East and North Africa (Hölter & Schirmer 2016). These events significantly transformed the mood towards migrants in Germany, with many turning against Angela Merkel and her open borders policy towards asylum seekers (Fitzpatrick 2016). The crisis narrative of

‘After Cologne’ allows the AfD to frame the German nation as under threat and in need of protection, to portray the elites as at fault for these attacks due to their imposition of multiculturalism, and allows for a particular construction of ‘the people.’

Building off the aforementioned protectionist discourses, the AfD frames the *Altpartein* as responsible for the attacks in Cologne due to their support of open borders and multiculturalism. Additionally, the signifier ‘After Cologne’ connotes the AfD’s broader view that the German elites are aiming to destroy the German people. To this point, Gauland argues that the “policy of human flooding...is an attempt to gradually replace the German people with a population from all over the world” (2016). As such, Höcke states that the future of Germany depends on “ending the suicidal policies of the *Altparteien*” (2016, January 13). Höcke also implies that the *Altparteien* are either complicit in the degradation of the German people, or are ignorant as they are “unwilling to solve the crisis. They only throw smoke bombs” (2015, September 16). In addition to this, the *Altparteien* are framed as being undemocratic and ignorant in the aftermath of the *Kulturbruch* of Cologne, which the AfD calls a “wake-up call (*Weckruf*)...[against] the disease of thought and speech bans” (Höcke 2016, January 27). The crisis narrative further reinforces the antagonistic frontiers established between ‘the democratic, self-confident German people’ and the ‘undemocratic and self-loathing elites.’ Additionally, the AfD’s crisis narrative is a continuation of the view that ‘the elite’ are making the German people feel foreign in their own country.

Finally, through expressing an ‘ideology of immediacy,’ the AfD’s crisis narrative allows for the inclusion of different groups and subjectivities that would not normally be included under purely nationalist discourses. Alice Weidel, who is a lesbian and has two adopted children with her partner, has consistently been questioned regarding how she can reconcile her lifestyle with

the policies of the AfD, which oppose both same-sex marriage and adoption rights for gay couples (Schuster 2017). By engaging with a crisis narrative, Weidel resolves this paradox:

> Now, almost all bars in the largest gay and lesbian nightlife district in Cologne have security personnel. That would have been unthinkable in the past. Nevertheless, you can see police operations against stealing, robbing, beating, and groping. And they come from the same perpetrators as those from New Year's Eve 2015… These people are not gone. They are no longer in masses but now in small groups, and they continue unabated. And the gay and lesbian scene is one of their favourite places to prowl. Berger 2017

Therefore, despite the AfD's opposition to LGBTQ+ rights, and minority rights more generally, Weidel argues that the AfD is a true supporter of the LGBTQ+ community since they promise to defend the German population against Islam.

In his analysis, Kim (2017) furthers this point by emphasizing how, in local level elections, the AfD campaigned towards the LGBTQ+ community by framing Islam as a fundamental threat to gay rights. For example, an AfD billboard in Berlin showed a gay couple with the quote: "My partner and I place no value on acquaintance with Muslim immigrants, for whom our love is a deadly sin" (Weingärtner 2016). The inclusion of the LGBTQ+ community in the AfD's definition of 'the people' illustrates one of the conceptual ambiguities of populism: while right-wing populism is typically understood as exclusionary and defines 'the people' in ethnonationalist terms (Akkerman 2015; Brubaker 2017b), the inclusion of the LGBTQ+ community displaces the AfD's reification of the "classical family" model to the exclusion of the *ultimate* "them", intolerant Muslims.

Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter identified discursive strategies in the populist repertoire that, I argue, reveal the specificity of how the interpretative frame of 'the people' and 'the elite' is mobilized to particular identity constructions and political ends. Through analyzing the AfD's discourses of speaking in the name of and constructing 'the people' against 'the elite,' I identified two, at times contradictory, antagonisms. First, the AfD structures the political field into those who destroy Germany, including its culture (albeit a static conception of culture), territorial integrity, and population, and those who seek to defend the German people's right to territory and culture. In this sense, 'the people' is understood in ethnocultural terms that is rooted in a particular conception of German history. Contrary to Merkel's self-reflective confidence that stems from a particular engagement with National Socialism, the AfD's national pride emphasizes a diverse set of historical experiences and cultural continuities that leads to a nationalist conception of 'the people', connotating a particular connection to a common past and a common set of traditions and behaviours. Additionally, the AfD consistently relativizes Germany's perceived right to a homeland by using a wide range of countries that have a strong congruence between the nation and the state, such as Afghanistan, Senegal, Eastern Europe, and Turkey.

By contrast, 'the elite' are understood as a self-hating class that seeks to construct its own artificial 'people,' to the destruction of the German people, culture, and history. Similarly, national outsiders are perceived as having values that are incompatible with German enlightenment values. As such, framing the antagonism in such a way allows the AfD to interweave the horizontal and vertical oppositions that threaten Germany. These discourses draw upon previous debates within German identity politics, namely *Leitkultur* and *Vergangenheitspolitik* (or "coming to terms with the past"). Regarding *Leitkultur*, it is

emphatically apparent that the AfD define 'the people' in ethnocultural terms (with culture moving from different levels of abstraction, such as being specifically German or more broadly Western). This resembles Pautz's (2005) argument that the *Leitkulturdebatte* introduced new forms of exclusion around 'culture,' rather than race.

In this sense, the AfD's conception of *Leitkultur* is a less-conflicted form compared to that of the CDU: while the CDU's model of *Leitkultur* is informed and challenged by constitutional patriotism, the AfD bypasses this limitation on *Leitkultur*. The differences here result from the AfD's and CDU's differing orientations towards history. While the CDU agrees with Habermas that the experience of National Socialism necessitates that Germany has a self-reflexive identity premised on pre-political elements, the AfD argues that Germany has already assumed responsibility for National Socialism and, therefore, does not have to base current policies off of that legacy.

While constitutional patriotism, as practiced by the CDU, is premised on a self-reflective approach to German history and the view that an ethnocultural conception of nationhood is not an appropriate model of German identity, the AfD challenges this approach to Germany's history by arguing that a German identity premised on National Socialism can never produce proper integration or patriotism. Instead, the AfD advocates for a more extensive view of German history, and relativizes National Socialism amongst the Cold War, the memories of German suffering during the World Wars, and various figures, symbols, and events in German history. Beyond challenging Merkel's approach to the past, the AfD's *Vergangenheitspolitik* challenges the paradigm of the GDR, namely that it is necessary to begin from a denial of the fascist experience. By contrast, the AfD recognizes and takes responsibility for National Socialism, but

argues that a deliberate focus on National Socialism produces fascist tendencies (such as the exclusion of political opponents and the unification of media).

Moving beyond a discussion of mainstream identity debates, I will briefly turn to discuss how the AfD draws on the far-right discourses outlined above. First, the AfD's opposition to and vilification of the *Lügenpresse* is directly related to PEGIDA's critique of mainstream media. Second, 'Islamization' or the encroachment of Muslim values on European values is employed in a similar way in both the AfD's and PEGIDA's discourses. Specifically, 'Islamization' operates as a catch-all term for the loss of identity and loss of sovereignty, as well as allowing the AfD to insert particular ethnonationalist notions of identity into public debate. Third, in their discourses about the EU and multiculturalism, the AfD consistently articulates an ethnopluralist conception of the global order. Fourth, similar to the PEGIDA, the AfD compares Chancellor Merkel to a dictator, albeit in a less visceral way, by referring to the dictatorship in the GDR rather than Nazi totalitarianism. Therefore, the AfD effectively combines mainstream identity discourses with far-right and marginal viewpoints on culture, identity, and sovereignty.

This chapter also developed the discursive strategies of antagonistic repoliticization, majoritarianism, anti-institutionalism, and protectionism, all of which solidify the antagonistic frontiers between 'the people' and 'the elite.' In a broader sense, these discursive strategies are primarily effective in their appeal to other forms of authority and legitimacy. For example, antagonistic repoliticization and anti-institutionalism necessitate acting in the immediate and, therefore, function in particular ways towards identity construction. Regarding immediacy, populism also benefits from the immediate interpretation and inclusion of events in the populist antagonism between 'us' and 'them.' Additionally, majoritarianism and protectionism appeal to the ethos of legitimation through majority.

In summary, this chapter illustrated the utility of the conceptualization of populism as a discursive repertoire in assessing how, and through what means, populists create the identity positions of ‘us’ and ‘them.’ In a broader sense, understanding populism as a set of discourses rather than as an ideology or an ontological category reveals the various tensions at play between the inclusionary and exclusionary tendencies of populism (as exemplified by the inclusion of the LGBTQ+ community) as well as the contingency of populist discourses on preexisting identity debates. Such an analysis also reveals how underdeveloped and underutilized concepts such as immediacy and crisis affect identity formation. However, what becomes apparent through such an analysis is the status of populism a site of contention between sovereign will and representation, inclusion and exclusion, liberalism and democracy, and differing conceptions of the impact of the past on present identity formation. I will return to these sites of contention in the concluding chapter. In particular, I will examine the populist use of history in sustaining and legitimizing ‘the people’ over time and in the immediate.

Conclusion: 'The People' and the Past

In this thesis, I contributed to two main bodies of literature. First, at the outset of this thesis, I contended that despite it being a seemingly ubiquitous phenomenon, populism is an 'essentially contested concept,' the meaning of which has been clouded by different pejorative and normative uses of the term. In this sense, dominant conceptions of populism fail to grasp the *specificity* of populism and the populist construction of 'the people.' In this thesis, I have proposed a particular conceptualization of populism as a discursive repertoire to account for how populists construct 'the people' through identity politics. Through the case study of the AfD, I illustrated the utility of this conceptualization by presenting the discursive strategies of *speaking in the name of 'the people' against 'the elite,' antagonistic repoliticization, anti-institutionalism,* and *majoritarianism*.

Second, this thesis also contributed to the theoretical literature on collective memory and identity. The central reference point for German identity construction is collective memory, specifically memories of the Third Reich and the GDR. The various debates surrounding German history are best described as *Vergangenheitspolitik* (the politics of dealing with the past). The centrality of *Vergangenheitspolitik* to identity formation illustrates the theoretical assumptions established in Chapter 1: identity and collective memory are 'continuous processes' that are shaped by different identities and interests. As such, competing political actors, including populists, functionalize collective memory to produce particular boundaries of the political community. These various interpretations of collective memory and identity compliment, challenge and contest each other in a continuous process of *Vergangenheitspolitik*. For the remainder of this chapter, I will revisit these central arguments: first, concerning the populist use

of history; second, concerning the utility of conceptualizing populism as a discursive repertoire within the national-populist conjuncture.

The Temporal Complexity of 'the People'

The temporal complexity of populist discourses illustrates both the differences between nationalist and populist discourses as well as the ambiguity of articulations of 'the people.' Regarding the former, as outlined in Chapter 1, nationalists construct 'the nation' by emphasizing the origins and continuity of 'the nation,' thus producing an image of 'the nation' as unchanging and uniform. Such discourses produce notions of a shared foundational myth and national destiny, as well as "the fictitious idea of a '*pure, original people'"* (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 24). In Koselleck's language, the particular narration of national identity emerges in the polarity between 'experiential space' and the 'horizon of expectation,' where the latter is understood as a shared national destiny. For De Cleen and Stavrakakis (2017), the characteristic of 'shared time' (a shared past, present, and future) is exclusively a feature of nationalist discourses; populist discourses that construct a vision of shared time are considered to be more 'nationalist' than 'populist.' Scholars of populism and memory offer a similar assessment of populist memory politics, where 'the people' are rooted in the past and rely on myths of origin and destiny in the same way as 'the nation' (Cento Bull 2016; Hoskins 2013; Molden 2016; Savage 2012). From this perspective, there is no uniquely *populist* use of history.

As indicated in the previous chapter, the AfD politicians indeed construct 'the people' as having a shared past rooted in an extensive view of German history. 'The people,' in the AfD's construction, shares a special national destiny. However, the discourse analysis also revealed an additional function of the populist use of history that pertains to 'the people's' Other. Like the

populist construction of ‘the people,’ the populist construction of ‘the elite’ and national outsiders are also imbued with historical connotations. For example, the AfD frequently refers to Chancellor Merkel as ‘Chancellor Dictator,’ a reference to both the GDR and National Socialism. However, unlike ‘the people,’ ‘the elite’ and national outsiders are not understood as having existed continuously across history and, instead, exist as a *recent* threat to ‘the people.’ Such a conception of the Other allows the AfD to reinforce the dichotomy of ‘the *authentic* and *natural* people’ and ‘the *artificial* and *corrupt* elite.’ This particular temporal conception of ‘the elite’ is supported by the AfD’s support of and desire to protect existing institutions: rather than seeking to operate outside of the Bundestag and to overturn the constitution, the AfD perceives ‘the elite’ as having contaminated the Bundestag and having disregarded the constitution. Similarly, the AfD opposes church elites, rather than the churches themselves.

Beyond this, the particular populist treatment of ‘the elite’ as historically-present, yet emergent, entity serves the purpose of providing a sense of urgency to ‘the people.’ In this sense, the AfD framed both ‘the elite’ and national outsiders as threats to and co-conspirators against ‘the people’ through crisis narratives. In practice, the immediacy of these discourses allowed the AfD to include groups that are conventionally excluded from ethnocultural conceptions of ‘the people,’ specifically the LGBTQ+ community (because of their perceived opposition to family values and their inability to perpetuate bloodlines) and non-ethnic Germans who assimilate to an exclusive form of German *Leitkultur*. Thus, through the performance of crisis, the AfD seeks to broaden the subjectivities accounted for within ‘the people’ by constructing an imminent threat to both the German people and Western values. A focus on the temporal complexity of populism reveals that populists practice a particular form of memory politics that draws from a traditional nationalist conception of history while simultaneously transgressing such a conception.

In other words, the temporal complexity of ‘the people’ interacts with the fundamental political myths that sustain communities. Indeed, ‘the people’ are sustained by myths of the saviour and the golden age through producing continuity over time and a shared destiny. However, ‘the people’ are also sustained through the temporally-recent conspiracy myth (of ‘the elite’ and national outsiders destroying Germany) and the myth of the saviour, which is rendered present through crisis narratives that tie a potentially catastrophic destiny to the conspiracy myth. Most importantly, however, the temporal complexity of ‘the people’ is exemplified through the myth of unity: ‘the people’ is understood as being united through a shared history and cultural values as well as being united in the present, while drawing in more subjectivities, through collective action against a common enemy.

I will now return to the research question that sought to understand populism as a form of identity politics that constructed ‘the people’ by drawing on collective memory. As is revealed through the discourse analysis, populists use collective memory in, perhaps unsurprisingly, ambiguous and instrumental ways. Rather than being an unchanging and permanent collectivity, ‘the people’ is consistently reshaped to include other subjectivities in opposition to a threatening Other (or Others). This observation reflects previous discussions of populism as being motivated by an ‘ideology of immediacy’ (Urbinati 2015) or a ‘speed of penetrability’ (Freeden 2017): current events have an immediate impact on the ideas and beliefs of populists and are filtered into the populist mentality in the immediate. In other words, the horizon of expectation of populists, or the spectrum of aspirations and fears, is continually affected by current events, resulting in a fluid interpretation of the experiential space that results in a particular shape of ‘the people.’ Therefore, the populist use of history is an ongoing process that interprets collective memory in the interpretative frame of ‘the people’ and ‘the elite’ in ways that impact the

construction of these categories in the present. In this sense, 'the people' "is a construction which…[refers] to a specific interpretation and simplification of reality" (Hirvonen & Pennanen 2018, p. 7), as well as of history and collective memory.

Populism as a Repertoire

I will now return to the central contention of the thesis: to understand the specificity of populism and populist identity politics, it is necessary to conceptualize populism as a discursive repertoire. Populism, under this framing, is a set of discursive strategies that reify the antagonism between 'the people' and 'the elite,' rather than an overarching and coherent value-system such as an ideology. Understanding populism as such suggests that the repertoire consists of a set of "limited though historically evolving set of...standardized elements" (Brubaker 2017a, p. 361) that are elaborated and improvised in particular sociocultural contexts. These elements can be drawn on by a wide range of ideologies and political projects.

Additionally, populism-as-a-repertoire takes the form of a Wittgensteinian *family resemblance* concept in that the discursive elements of the repertoire, taken individually, are not uniquely populist and can be taken up by different political projects. However, when these elements are combined and are centred on the core element of claiming to speak for 'the people' against 'the elite,' a political actor can be described as populist. Therefore, the discursive elements of speaking for 'the people' against 'the elite,' antagonistic repoliticization, majoritarianism, anti-institutionalism, and protectionism (Brubaker 2017a) are elaborated with content from specific political contexts to develop the populist simplification of social reality further. In what follows, I will elaborate three distinct advantages in understanding populism as a

discursive repertoire as compared to other approaches to populism to best illuminate populist identity politics.

First, understanding populism as a discursive repertoire produces a conception of populism that is situated in particular sociopolitical contexts and identity debates. Conventional definitions of populism typically reduce particular *forms* of populism to being structured around specific ideologies and models of nationhood. For example, Mudde & Kaltwasser (2012) argue that right-wing populism is based around an exclusionary model of nationhood and nativist ideologies, while left-wing populism is inclusionary and more focused on socioeconomic emancipation. However, as the previous discourse analysis revealed, situated case analyses typically challenge such attempts to essentialize populism.

The conception of populism as a discursive repertoire emphasizes that 'the people' and populist discourses are characterized by *emptiness*. In this sense, defining populism as a 'thin-centred ideology' (Mudde & Kaltwasser 2017), an 'empty signifier' (Laclau 2005), or as a disursive repertoire emphasizes that populism is given content and substance through its use in particular sociopolitical contexts. However, against these other approaches, the present conception of populism avoids the problematic normative assumptions of Laclau's approach and the understanding of populism as an ideology. Populism-as-a-repertoire reveals how discursive strategies (speaking in the name of 'the people,' antagonistic repoliticization, majoritarianism, protectionism) draw on pre-existing identity debates (in the German context, *Leitkultur*, ethnocultural nationhood) to construct 'the people,' as well as the productive capacity of populism to transgress these debates and concepts.

Second, as indicated through the previous discussion of the temporal complexity of populism, populism-as-a-repertoire accounts for the ambiguities and contradictions involved in

the construction of 'the people.' In more specific terms, populism-as-a-repertoire bypasses the reductionist conceptions of right-wing populism as anti-democratic, exclusionary, and based on a uniform model of ethnocultural nationhood. In practice, such an understanding of populism allows researchers to uncover a more nuanced formation of 'the people,' a form characterized by ambiguities and discontinuities. As indicated previously, the complexity of 'the people' emerges from the AfD's use of pre-existing identity debates in Germany, as well as crisis narratives and repoliticization that conceptualize 'the people' as emerging in the immediate through collective action. Additionally, through analyzing the populist uses of various discursive strategies unveils how populists cut across the traditional left/right divide. As such, in the German context, populism, when understood as a discursive repertoire, more closely reflects the reality of identity politics as a fragmented, ongoing, and impermanent process in that the prevalent ethnocultural model of nationhood is continually challenged and reformed (Brubaker 1992). Populism, in this form, represents a more complicated phenomenon that must be situated within the broader identity politics of particular sociopolitical contexts to elucidate the content of 'the people,' as well as proposing effective alternatives to populism.

A final function of conceptualizing populism as a discursive repertoire is its capacity to account for the complexity of identity formation in the 'national-populist' conjuncture. In particular, this aspect of the identity politics of populism illustrates how populists seek to "construct *new social divides*" (Wodak 2015, p. 22). The dominant approaches to populism (Laclau, Mudde and Kaltwasser, Stavrakakis) reduce populism solely to the vertical opposition between 'the people' and 'the elite.' By contrast, the present approach to populism recognizes the contemporary tight discursive interweaving of *vertical* and *horizontal* oppositions. In the discourse analysis of the AfD, the discursive interweaving is present in the AfD's antagonism

between those who seek to destroy Germany ("them") and those who seek to defend Germany ("us"). The "them" identity position, in this sense, is comprised of both 'the elite' (vertical opposition) who are seen as betraying 'the people' through imposing multiculturalism and diversity and abdicating national sovereignty to the EU as well as national outsiders who are understood as being a threat to Germany's culture and traditions and the German population itself. In this sense, both 'the elite' and national outsiders are framed as being opposed to German culture and the German people and as conspiring together to destroy Germany. As such, 'the people' gains its motivation and solidarity by 'protecting' Germany from those who seek to destroy it. In practice, the recognition of the overlap of horizontal and vertical oppositions accounts is a central element to how populists construct the identity position of 'the people.'

Avenues for Future Research

To conclude, I will reflect on some limitations of the present study. First, this thesis neglected to consider the performative aspects of populist *style*. This neglect was intentional since it would have required elaboration of a separate methodology specific for the analysis of video and a separate theoretical framework to capture the complexity of populist performances (Moffitt 2016). However, future research, particularly on the AfD, would benefit from an engagement with how populist reflect/challenge tropes of populist dress, language usage, and choreography (Connolly 2017).

A central limitation of this thesis is its focus on elite discourses in interpreting collective memory and mediating collective identity. As I noted during Chapter 1, the focus on elite discourse ignores how 'ordinary people' receive and mediate elite discourses on identity and how these mediations vary according to different subjectivities (i.e., migrant background,

socioeconomic status, age). Thus, future research should focus on how 'ordinary Germans' understand nationhood and the degree to which they feel a part of the populist 'people.'

A final avenue for future research would be a comparative analysis of how ideologically-diverse populist actors employ the populist repertoire to construct the parameters of 'the people.' Specifically, future research should examine the similarities and differences between (traditionally-understood) authoritarian populism and (traditionally-understood) egalitarian populism and how these forms of populism interpret collective memory in particular ways. In particular, a fruitful case study for such an analysis could be the future political landscape in Germany, where populism continues to emerge as a prominent political force. Questions surround not only the AfD and whether they will maintain electoral support but also Sahra Wagenknecht's new *Aufstehen* movement which views itself as a left-wing populist alliance to counterbalance the AfD (Spiegel 2018). For future research specifically in the German context, scholars should carefully analyze the anti-populist discourses of Merkel and the CDU to reveal how her conception of national identity has shifted following the tumultuous negotiation of migrant policy by the CDU/CSU coalition (Der Spiegel Staff 2018).

References

Abadi, T., D'Haenens, L., Roe, K., & Koeman, J. (2016). *Leitkultur* and discourse hegemonies: German mainstream media coverage on the integration debate between 2009 and 2014. *The International Communication Gazette, 78*(6), 557-584.

AfD. (2014a, December 19). Gauland: Beleidigungen sind der falsche Weg. *Alternative für Deutschland*, accessed August 28, 2018, http://www.alternativefuer.de/gauland-beleidigungen-sind-der-falsche-weg/.

AfD. (2014b, December 15). Henkel: Die AfD verurteilt Brandanschläge auf Asylbewerberheime. *Alternative für Deutschland*, accessed August 28, 2018, http://www.alternativefuer.de/henkel-die-AfD-verurteilt-brandanschlaege-auf-asylbewerberheime/.

AfD. (2018, August 17). Alice Weidel: Gespensterdebatte um ein Einwanderungsgesetz ist Ablenkungsmanöver vom migrationspolitischen Versagen der Bundesregierung. *www.AfD.de*, accessed September 2, 2018, https://www.afd.de/alice-weidel-gespensterdebatte-um-ein-einwanderungsgesetz-ist-ablenkungsmanoever-vom-migrationspolitischen-versagen-der-bundesregierung/.

AfD. (2018, October 24). Bernd Baumann: Schluss mit Tricksereien im Bundestag. *www.afd.de*, accessed October 11, 2018, https://www.afd.de/bernd-baumann-schluss-mit-tricksereien-im-bundestag/.

Akkerman, T. (2015). Gender and the radical right in Western Europe: A comparative analysis of policy agendas. *Patterns of Prejudice, 49*(1-2), 37-60.

Alexander, J.C. (2002). On the social construction of moral universals. *European Journal of Social Theory, 5*(1), 5-85.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.

Ankersmit, F.R. (2001). The sublime dissociation of the past: Or how to be(come) what one is no longer. *History and Theory, 40*(3), 295-323.

Arendt, H. (1998). *The human condition.* Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press.

Arzheimer, K. (2015). The AfD: Finally a successful right-wing populist eurosceptic party for Germany? *Western European Politics*, 38(3), 535-556.

Assmann, J. (1992). *Das Kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und Politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen.* Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck

Attebery, B. (2014). *Stories about stories: Fantasy and the remaking of myth*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Banchoff, T. (1999). German identity and European integration. *European Journal of International Relations, 5*(3), 259-289.

Bebnowski D (2015) *Die Alternative für Deutschland. Aufstieg und gesellschaftliche Repräsentanz einer rechten populistischen Partei.* Springer VS, Wiesbaden.

Bebnowski D and Förster L J (2014) Wettbewerbspopulismus. *OBS Working Paper 14,* http://www.demokratie-goettingen.de/content/uploads/2014/03/2014_03_27_AfD_Papier.pdf.

Beckstein, M. (2013). Nation-building in contemporary Germany: The strange conversion of Hitler's 'world made of stone'. *Nations and Nationalism, 19*(4), 761-780. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12024

Bellamy, R., & Mason, A. (2013). Introduction. In R. Bellamy & A. Mason (Eds.), *Political concepts* (pp. 1-3). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Benhabib, S. (1996). *Democracy and difference.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Berbuir, N., Lewandowsky, M., & Siri, J. (2015). The AfD and its sympathisers: Finally a right-wing populist movement in Germany? *German Politics*, 24(2), 154-178.

Berg, N. (2015). *The Holocaust and the West German historians: Historical interpretation and autobiographical memory*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Berger, D. (2017, September 20). Alice Weidel: "Die AfD ist die einzige echte Schutzmacht für Schwule und Lesben in Deutschland. *Philosophia Perennis*, accessed September 7, 2018, http://philosophia-perennis.com/2017/09/20/alice-weidel-interview/.

Berghahn, V., Flynn, G., & Lützeler, P.M. (1997). Germany and Europe: Finding an international role. In K. H. Jarausch & V. Grasnow (Eds.), *After unity: Reconfiguring German identities* (pp. PAGE NUMBERS). Oxford: Berghahn.

Bhabha, H.K. (1990). *Nation and narration*. London: Routledge.

Boa, E., & Palfreyman, R. (2000). *Heimat, A German dream: Regional loyalties and national identity in German culture, 1890-1990*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Borneman, J. (1997). State, territory, and national identity formation in the two Berlins, 1945-1995. In A. Gupta & J. Ferguson (Eds.), *Culture, power, place: Explorations in critical anthropology* (pp.93-117). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Brubaker, R. (2006). *Nationalist politics and everyday ethnicity in a Transylvanian town.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brubaker, R. (2011). Economic crisis, nationalism, and politicized ethnicity. In C. Calhoun & G. Derluguian (Eds.), *The deepening crisis: Governance challenges after neoliberalism* (pp. 93-108). New York: Social Science Research Council and New York University Press.

Brubaker, R. (2017a). Why populism? *Theory and Society*, *46*(4), 357-385. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-017-9301-7

Brubaker, R. (2017b). Between nationalism and civilizationism: the European populist moment in comparative perspective. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *40*(8), 1191-1226. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1294700

Butterwegge, C., & Meier, L. (2002). *Rechtsextremismus*. Freiburg: Herder.

Caiani, N., & Della Porta, D. (2011). The elitist populism of the extreme right: A frame analysis of extreme right wing discourses in Italy and Germany. *Acta Politica*, *46*(2), 180-202.

Caiani, M., & Conti, N. (2014). In the name of the people: The Euroscepticism of the Italian Radical Right. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, *15*(2), 183-197. https://doi.org/10.1080/15705854.2014.885766

Caiani, M., & Kröll, P. (2017). Nationalism and populism in radical right discourses in Italy and Germany. *Javnost - The Public*, *24*(4), 336-354. https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2017.1330084

Canovan, M. (1981). *Populism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanich.

Canovan, M. (1999). Trust the people! Populism and the two faces of democracy. *Political Studies*, *47*(1), 2-16. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00184

Canovan, M. (2002). The people, the masses, and the mobilization of power: The paradox of Hannah Arendt's "populism." *Social Research*, *69*(2), 403-422.

Canovan, M. (2004). Populism for political theorists? *Journal of Political Ideologies, 9*(3), 241-252. https://doi.org/10.1080/1356931042000263500

Canovan, M. (2005). *The people*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cento Bull, A. (2016). The role of memory in populist discourse: The case of the Italian Second Republic. *Patterns of Prejudice, 50*(3), 213-231. https://doi.org/10.1080/0031322X.2016.1208863

Connolly, W.E. (1983[1974]). *The terms of political discourse*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Connolly, W. (1991). *Identity/difference: Democratic negotiations of political paradox.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Connolly, W.E. (1995). *The ethos of pluralization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Connolly, W.E. (2017). *Aspirational fascism: The struggle for multifaceted democracy under Trumpism*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.

de Cleen, B. (2013). The stage as an arena of political struggle: The struggle between the Vlaams Blok/Belang and the Flemish City theatres. In R. Wodak, M. KhosraviNik, & B. Mral (Eds.), *Right-wing populism in a context of discursive struggle: Politics and discourse* (pp. 209-221). London, UK: Bloomsbury.

de Cleen, B., & Stavrakakis, Y. (2017). Distinctions and articulations: A discourse theoretical framework for the study of populism and nationalism. *Javnost - The Public, 24*(4), 301-319. https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2017.1330083

de Saussure, F. (1959). *Course in general linguistics.* New York: Philosophical Library.

Decker, F. (2016). The "Alternative for Germany": Factors behind its emergence and profile of a new right-wing populist party. *German Politics & Society, 34*(2), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.3167/gps.2016.340201

Delanty, G. (2005). The idea of a cosmopolitan Europe: On the cultural significance of Europeanization. *International Review of Sociology, 15*(3), 405-421. https://doi.org/10.1080/03906700500272434

Demertzis, N. (2006). Emotions and populism. In S. Clarke, P. Hoggett, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Emotion, politics and society* (pp. 103-121). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Der Flügel. (2015, March 14). Erfurter Resolution. *Der Flügel*, accessed August 29, 2018, http://www.derfluegel.de/erfurter-resolution/.

Der Spiegel Staff. (2018, June 22). Germany's conservative meltdown: The approaching end to Merkel's tenure. *Spiegel Online*, accessed October 2, 2018, http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/migrant-policy-conflict-could-spell-the-end-for-merkel-a-1214503.html.

Die Bundesregierung. (2018, June 17). Rede von Kulturstaatsministerin Grütters bei der Gedenkveranstaltung der Bundesregierung zum 65. Jahrestag des Volksaufstands in der DDR vom 17. Juni 1953. *Die Bundesregierung*, accessed June 5, 2018, https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/aktuelles/rede-von-kulturstaatsministerin-gruetters-bei-der-gedenkveranstaltung-der-bundesregierung-zum-65-jahrestag-des-volksaufstands-in-der-ddr-vom-17-juni-1953-1141766.

Diner, D. (1998). Nation, migration, and memory: On historical concepts of citizenship. *Constellations, 4*(3), 293-306. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.00056

Diner, D., & Gundermann, C. (1996). On the ideology of antifascism. *New German Critique, 67*, 123-132.

Dostal, J.M. (2015). The Pegida movement and German political culture: Is right-wing populism here to stay. The Political Quarterly, 86(4), 523-531.

Druxes, H., & Simpson P.A. (2016). Introduction: Pegida as a European far-right populist movement. *German Politics & Society, 34*(4), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.3167/gps.2016.340401

Dubiel, H. (2003). The remembrance of the Holocaust as a catalyst for a transnational ethic? *New German Critique, 90*, 59-70.

Eigler, F., & Kugele, J. (2012). Introduction: *Heimat* at the intersection of memory and space. In F. Eigler & J. Kugele (Eds.), *Heimat: At the intersection of memory and space* (pp. 1-12). Berlin: De Gruyter Inc.

Eriksen, E.O., & Weigard, J. (2003). *Understanding Habermas: Communicative action and deliberative democracy.* London: Continuum.

Evans, R. J. (1989). *In Hitler's shadow: West German historians and the attempt to escape from the Nazi past.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Longman.

Feindt, G. (2017). From 'flight and expulsion' to migration: Contextualizing German victims of forced migration. *European Review of History*, *24*(4), 552-577. https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2017.1307813

Finchelstein, F. (2014). Returning populism to history. *Constellations, 21*(4), 467-482. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12131

Fitzpatrick, M. (2016, December 15). How Cologne sexual assaults 'changed German mood completely'. *The Local*, accessed October 1, 2018, https://www.thelocal.de/20161215/year-after-cologne-sex-assaults-germany-frets-over-integration.

Forchtner, B. (2011). Critique, the discourse-historical approach, and the Frankfurt School. *Critical Discourse Studies, 8*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2011.533564

Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France, 1978-1979.* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fox, J., & Miller-Idriss, C. (2008). Everyday nationhood. *Ethnicities, 8*(4), 536-576. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1468796808088925

Franzmann, S. (2016). Calling the ghost of populism: The AfD's strategic and tactical agendas until the EP election 2014. *German Politics, 25*(4), 457-479.

Freeden, M. (1998). Is nationalism a distinct ideology? *Political Studies, 46*(4), 748-765. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00165

Freeden, M. (2003). *Ideology: A very short introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Freeden, M. (2017). After the Brexit referendum: Revisiting populism as an ideology. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 22*(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2016.1260813

Frei, N. (2002). *Adenauer's Germany and the Nazi past.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Fullbrook, M. (1999). *German national identity after the Holocaust.* Malden: Polity Press.

Gardner Feldman, L. (2012). *Germany's foreign policy of reconciliation: From enmity to amity*. Lanham, MD:Rowman & Littlefield.

Gauland, A. (2016, June 2). Gaulands Rede im Wortlaut. *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, accessed June 2, 2018, http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/inland/zum-nachlesen-gaulands-rede-im-wortlaut-14269861.html.

Gauland, A. (2018, June 2). Vollständige Rede Dr. Alexander Gaulands vom 02. Juni 2018, *AfD Bundestag,* accessed June 2, 2018, https://www.afdbundestag.de/vollstaendige-rede-dr-alexander-gaulands-vom-02-juni-2018/.

Gauna, A.F. (2017). Explaining populism beyond Laclau: A historical-comparative assessment of *On Populist Reason*. *Thesis Eleven, 140*(1), 38-55. https://doi.org/10.1177/0725513617700401

Gerbaudo, P., & Screti, F. (2017). Reclaiming popular sovereignty: The vision of the state in the discourse of Podemos and the Movimento 5 Stelle. *Javnost - The Public, 24*(4), 320-335. https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2017.1330089

Giesen, B. (2009). From denial to confessions of guilt: the German case. In J. Alexander (Ed.), *Remembering the Holocaust: A debate* (pp. 114–122). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giesen, B., & Eder, K. (2001). Introduction: European citizenship: An avenue for the social integration of Europe. In K. Eder & B. Giesen (Eds.), *European citizenship between national legacies and postnational projects* (pp. 1-16). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Gillis, J.R. (1994). Memory and identity: The history of a relationship. In J.R. Gillis (Ed.), *Commemorations: The politics of national identity* (pp. 3-24). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Goerres, A., Spies, D.C., & Kumlin, S. (2018). The electoral supporter base of the Alternative for Germany. *Swiss Political Science Review Special Issue*, 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12306

Gook, B. (2015). *Divided subjects, invisible borders: Re-unified Germany after 1989*. London, UK: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Götz, I. (2016). The rediscovery of 'the national' in the 1990s - contexts, new cultural forms and practices in reunified Germany. *Nations and Nationalism, 22*(4), 803-823. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12171

Grabow, K. (2016). PEGIDA and the Alternative für Deutschland: Two sides of the same coin? *European View, 15*, 173-181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12290-016-0419-1

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith (Eds.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Grimm, R. (2015). The rise of the German eurosceptic party Alternative für Deutschland: Between ordoliberal critique and popular anxiety. *International Political Science Review, 36*(3), 264-278. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512115575384

Gudehus, C. (2008). Germany's meta-narrative memory culture: Skeptical narratives and minotaurs. *German Politics & Society, 26*(4), 99-112.

Habermas, J. (1991). Yet again: German identity; A unified nation of angry DM-Burghers? *New German Critique, 52*, 84-101.

Habermas, J. (1993). A kind of settlement of damages. In J. Knowlton & T. Cates (Eds.), *Forever in the shadow of Hitler: Original documents of the* Historikerstreit, *the controversy concerning the singularity of the Holocaust* (pp. 34-44). Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press.

Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The collective memory.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Halikiopoulou, D., Nanou, K., & Vasilopoulou, S. (2012). The paradox of nationalism: The common denominator of radical right and radical left Euroscepticism. *European Journal of Political Research*, *51*(4), 504-539.

Hall, S. (1996). Cultural identity and diaspora. In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader* (pp. 227-237). London, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Haller, A., & Holt, K. (2018). Paradoxical populism: how PEGIDA relates to mainstream and alternative media. Information, Communication & Society, https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1449882.

Hansen, M.A., & Olsen, J. (2018). Flesh of the same flesh: A study of voters for the Alternative for Germany (AfD) in the 2017 Federal Election. *German Politics,* https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2018.1509312.

Havertz, R. (2018). Right-wing populism and neoliberalism in Germany: The AfD's embrace of ordoliberalism. *New Political Economy,* https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2018.1484715.

Heer, H., & Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Collective memory, national narratives and the politics of the past. In H. Heer, W. Manoschek, A. Pollak, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The discursive construction of history: Remembering the Wehrmacht's War of Annihilation* (pp. 1-15). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Herf, J. (1993). Multiple restorations: German political traditions and the interpretation of Nazism, 1945-1946. *Central European History*, *26*(1), 21-55. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008938900019956

Herf, J. (1997). *Divided memory: the Nazi past in the two Germanys*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hirvonen, O., & Pennanen, J. (2018). Populism as a pathological form of politics of recognition. European Journal of Social Theory, https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431018766271.

Höcke, B. (2015, September 16). Rede zur Demonstration in Erfurt am 16. September 2015. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Höcke, B. (2015, September 23). Rede zur Demonstration in Erfurt am 23. September 2015. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Höcke, B. (2015, September 30). Rede zur Demonstration in Erfurt am 30. September 2015. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Höcke, B. (2015, October 7). Rede zur Demonstration in Erfurt am 07. Oktober 2015. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Höcke, B. (2015, October 21). Rede zur Demonstration in Erfurt am 21. Oktober 2015. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Höcke, B. (2015, October 28). Rede zur Demonstration in Erfurt am 28. Oktober 2015. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Höcke, B. (2015, November 18). Rede zur Demonstration in Erfurt am 18. November 2015. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Höcke, B. (2016, January 13). Rede zur Demonstration in Erfurt am 13. Januar 2016. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Höcke, B. (2016, January 20). Rede zur Demonstration in Jena am 20. Januar 2016. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Höcke, B. (2016, January 27). Rede zur Demonstration in Magdeburg, 27. Januar 2016. *AfD Thueringen*, accessed June 3, 2018, https://afd-thueringen.de/reden/.

Hölter, K., & Schirmer, S. (2016, January 5). Übergriffe in Köln an Silvester: Das sind die Fakten. *Spiegel Online*, accessed October 2, 2018, http://www.spiegel.de/panorama/justiz/koeln-was-wir-bislang-ueber-die-uebergriffe-an-silvester-wissen-a-1070561.html.

Hooghe, L., Marks, G., & Wilson, C.J. (2002). Does left/right structure party positions on European integration? *Comparative Political Studies*, *35*(8), 965-989.

Hoskins, G. (2013). On stories of peoplehood and difficult memories. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, *39*(1), 63-77.

Howarth, D. (2000). *Discourse*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Howarth, D., & Stavrakakis, Y. (2000). Introducing discourse theory and political analysis. In D. Howarth, A. J. Norval., & Y. Stavrakakis (Eds.), *Discourse theory and political analysis: Identities, hegemonies and social change* (pp. 1-23). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Hoye, J. M., & Nienass, B. (2014). Authority without foundations: Arendt and the paradox of postwar German memory politics. *The Review of Politics*, *76*(3), 415-437.

Huber, R.A., & Ruth, S.P. (2017). Mind the gap! Populism, participation and representation in Europe. *Swiss Political Science Review*, *23*(4), 462-484. https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12280

Huyssen, A. (2000). Present pasts: Media, politics, amnesia. *Public Culture*, *12*(1), 21-38.

Innerarity, D. (2010). *The transformation of politics: Governing in the age of complex societies.* Brussels: Peter Lang.

Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2017). Trump and the populist authoritarian parties: *The Silent Revolution* in reverse. *Perspectives on Politics, 15*(2), 443-454. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592717000111

James, J. (2009). Retrieving a redemptive past: Protecting heritage and *Heimat* in East German cities. *German Politics & Society, 27*(3), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.3167/gps.2009.270301

Jansen, R.S. (2011). Populist mobilization: A new theoretical approach to populism. *Sociological Theory, 29*(2), 75-96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2011.01388.x

Jansen, R.S. (2016). Situated political innovation: Explaining the historical emergence of new modes of political practice. *Theory and Society, 45*(4), 319-360. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-016-9272-0

Jarausch, K.H. (1995). Normalisierung oder Re-Nationalisierung? Zur Umdeutung der deutschen Vergangenheit. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft, 21*(4), 571-584.

Jarausch, K.H. (1997). Reshaping German identities: Reflections on the post-unification debate. In K. H. Jarausch & V. Grasnow (Eds.), *After unity: Reconfiguring German identities* (pp. PAGE NUMBERS). Oxford: Berghahn.

Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method.* London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Katsambekis, G. (2016). Radical left populism in contemporary Greece: Syriza's trajectory from Minoritarian opposition to power. *Constellations, 23*(3), 391-403. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12234

Kersting, N. (2007). Sport and national identity: A comparison of the 2006 and 2010 FIFA World Cups. *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies, 34*(3), 277-293. https://doi.org/10.1080/02589340801962551

van Kessel, S. (2014). The populist cat-dog: Applying the concept of populism to contemporary European party systems. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 19*(1), 99-118. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2013.869457

Kiess, J., Brähler, E., Schmutzer, G., & Decker, O. (2017). Euroscepticism and right-wing extremist attitudes in Germany: A result of the 'Dialectic Nature of Progress'? *German Politics, 26*(2), 235-254. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2016.1226810

Kim, S. (2017). The populism of the Alternative for Germany (AfD): An extended Essex School perspective. *Palgrave Communications, 3*(5), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-017-0008-1

Kim, S. (2018). Populism and anti-populism in the 2017 Dutch, French, and German elections: A discourse and hegemony analytic approach. *POPULISMUS Working Papers No. 7*, http://www.populismus.gr/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Kim-WP-7-upload.pdf.

Knight, B. (2017, December 21). AfD leader Alice Weidel: We are christian, but churches are too political. *DW*, accessed October 12, 2018, https://www.dw.com/en/afd-leader-alice-weidel-we-are-christian-but-churches-are-too-political/a-41891976.

Koepnick, L. (2010). Public viewing: Soccer patriotism and post-cinema. In J. Fisher & B. Prager (Eds.), *The collapse of the conventional: German film and its politics at the turn of the twenty-first century* (pp. 63-80). Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Kohli, M. (2000). The battlegrounds of European identity. *European Societies, 2*(2), 113-137. https://doi.org/10.1080/146166900412037

Kopietz, R., & Echterhoff, G. (2014). Remembering the 2006 Football World Cup in Germany: Epistemic and social consequences of perceived memory sharedness. *Memory Studies, 7*(3), 298-313. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1750698014530620

Koselleck, R. (1985). *Futures past: On the semantics of historical time.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Krupp, T. (2010). Constitutional patriotism. In M. Bevir (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of political theory* (pp. 295-297). Thousand Oaks, Cal.: SAGE Publications Inc.

Kundani, H. (2012). The concept of 'normality' in German foreign policy since unification. *German Politics & Society, 30*(2), 38-58.

Laclau, E. (2005). *On populist reason.* London: Verso.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics.* London: Verso.

Lacroix, J. (2002). For a European constitutional patriotism. *Political Studies, 50*, 944-958.

Lang, S., Mushaben, J.M., & Wendler, F. (2017). German unification as a catalyst for change: Linking political transformation at the domestic and international levels. *German Politics, 26*(4), 443-456. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2017.1367384

Langenbacher, E. (2003). Changing memory regimes in contemporary Germany? *German Politics & Society, 21*(2), 46-68.

Langenbacher, E. (2008). Twenty-first century memory regimes in Germany and Poland: An analysis of elite discourses and public opinion. *German Politics & Society, 26*(4), 50-81.

Langenbacher, E. (2010a). Still the unmasterable past? The impact of history and memory in the Federal Republic of Germany. *German Politics, 19*(1), 24-40. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644001003588473

Langenbacher, E. (2010b). The mastered past? Collective memory trends in Germany since unification. *German Politics & Society, 28*(1), 42-68.

Langenbacher, E. (2014). Does collective memory still influence German foreign policy? *Brown Journal of World Affairs, 20*(2), 55-71.

Large, D.C. (2001). *Hitlers München. Aufstieg und Fall der Hauptstadt der Bewegung.* München: Dtv.

Lasch, C. (1996). *The revolt of the elites and the betrayal of democracy*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Lees, C. (2018). The 'Alternative for Germany': The rise of right-wing populism at the heart of Europe. *Politics, 38*(3), 295-310. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263395718777718

Levy, D. (2010). Changing temporalities and the internationalization of memory cultures. In A. Brown, Y. Gutman, & A. Sodaro (Eds.), *Memory and the future: Transnational politics, ethics, and society* (pp. 15-30). London, UK: Macmillan.

Levy, D., & Dierkes, J. B. (2002). Institutionalising the past: Shifting memories of nationhood in German education and immigration legislation. In J-W. Müller (Ed.), *Memory and power in post-war Europe: Studies in the presence of the past* (pp. 244-264). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Levy, D., & Sznaider, N. (2005). Memories of universal victimhood: The case of ethnic German expellees. *German Politics & Society, 23*(2), 1-27.

Levy, D., & Sznaider, N. (2006). *The Holocaust and memory in the global age.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lochocki, T. (2016). The specter haunting Europe: Will the German center hold? *Journal of Democracy, 27*(4), 37-46. https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2016.0060

Luppes, J. (2016). Mission accomplished? Erika Steinbach and the Center Against Expulsions in Berlin. *German Politics & Society, 33*(3), 80-87. https://doi.org/10.3167/gps.2015.330305

Lutomski, P. (2004). The debate about a Center against Expulsions: An unexpected crisis in German-Polish relations? *German Studies Review, 27*(3), 449-468.

Lutz, F. P. (2012). Evolution and normalization: Historical consciousness in Germany. *German Politics & Society, 30*(3), 35-63.

Maier, C. S. (1988). *The unmasterable past: History, Holocaust, and German national identity.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Maier, C. S. (2017). Lost in transition: Reflections on the spectral history of the GDR. In F. Lys & M. Dreyer, *Virtual walls? Political unification and cultural difference in contemporary Germany* (pp. 19-38). Rochester, NY: Camden House.

Manz, S. (2004). Constructing a normative national identity: The Leitkultur debate in Germany, 2000/2001. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 25*(5-6), 481-496. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630408668920

Marchlewska, M., Cichocka, A., Panayiotou, O., Castellanos, K., & Batayneh, J. (2018). Populism as identity politics: Perceived in-group disadvantage, collective narcissism, and support for populism. *Social, Psychological, and Personality Science, 9*(2), 151-162. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617732393

Marcussen, M., Risse, T., Engelmann-Martin, D., Knopf, H. J., & Roscher, K. (1999). Constructing Europe? The evolution of French, British and German nation state identities. *Journal of European Public Policy, 6*(4), 614–633.

Markzouki, N., & McDonnell, D. (2016). Populism and religion. In N. Marzouki, D. McDonnell, & O. Roy (Eds.), *Saving the people: How populists hijack religion* (pp. 1-12). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Matthay, S. (2017). Negotiating national identity: German intellectuals debate the 2015 migrant influx. *The European Legacy*, *22*(7-8), 769-778. https://doi.org/10.1080/10848770.2017.1370920

Melendez, C., & Kaltwasser, C.R. (2017). Political identities: The missing link in the study of populism. *Party Politics*, https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068817741287.

Meyer, K., & Holscher, M. (2018, September 1). Demonstrationen in Chemnitz: Der Schauermarsch. *Spiegel Online*, accessed September 10, 2018, http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/chemnitz-afd-pegida-und-pro-chemnitz-schliessen-sich-bei-demo-zusammen-a-1226122.html.

Miller, D. (2000). *Citizenship and national identity*. Oxford: Polity.

Miller-Idriss, C. (2009). *Blood and culture: Youth, right-wing extremism, and national belonging in contemporary Germany.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Miller-Idriss, C. (2017). *The extreme gone mainstream: Commercialization and far right youth culture in Germany.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Miller-Idriss, C., & Rothenberg, B. (2012). Ambivalence, pride and shame: Conceptualisations of German nationhood. *Nations and Nationalism*, *18*(1), 132-155. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8129.2011.00498.x

Moeller, R.G. (2003). *War stories: The search for a usable past in the Federal Republic of Germany*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Moffitt, B. (2015). How to perform crisis: A model for understanding the key role of crisis in contemporary populism. *Government and Opposition, 50*(2), 189-217. https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2014.13

Moffitt, B. (2016). *The global rise of populism: Performance, political style, and representation.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Moffitt, B., & Tormey, S. (2014). Rethinking populism: Politics, mediatisation, and political style. *Political Studies, 62*(2), 381-397. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12032

Molden, B. (2016). Resistant pasts versus mnemonic hegemony: On the power relations of collective memory. *Memory Studies, 9*(2), 125-142. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698015596014

Moses, A. D. (2007a). *German intellectuals and the Nazi past.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Moses, A. D. (2007b). The non-German German and the German German: Dilemmas of identity after the Holocaust. *New German Critique, 34*(2), 45-94.

Motte, J., & Ohliger, R. (2004). *Wir sind auch das Volk. Geschichte und Gedächtnis in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft. Migration zwischen historischer Rekonstruktion und Erinnerungspolitik.* Freiburg: Klartext-Verlag Essen.

Mouffe, C. (2000). *The democratic paradox.* London: Verso

Mouffe, C. (2005). *The return of the political*. London: Verso.

Mouffe, C. (2018). *For a left populism*. London: Verso.

Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist radical right parties in Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C.R. (2012). Populism and (liberal) democracy: a framework for analysis. In C. Mudde & C.R. Kaltwasser (Eds.), *Populism in Europe and the Americas: Threat or corrective for democracy?* (pp. 1-26). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C.R. (2017). *Populism: a very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Müller, J-W. (2000). *Another country: German intellectuals, unification and national identity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Müller, J-W. (2006). On the origins of constitutional patriotism. *Contemporary Political Theory*, *5*, 278-296.

Müller, J-W. (2007). *Constitutional patriotism.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Müller, J-W. (2016). *What is populism?* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mushaben, J.M. (2017a). *Becoming Madam Chancellor: Angela Merkel and the Berlin Republic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mushaben, J.M. (2017b). Wir schaffen das! Angela Merkel and the European Refugee Crisis. *German Politics, 26*(4), 516-533. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2017.1366988

Nienass, B. (2013). Postnational relations to the past: A "European ethics of memory"? *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society, 26*(1), 41-55.

Niven, B. (2002). *Facing the Nazi past: United Germany and the legacy of the Third Reich.* London, UK: Routledge.

Niven, B., & Paver, C.E.M. (2010). Introduction. In B. Niven & C.E.M. Paver (Eds.), *Memorialization in Germany since 1945* (pp. 1-12). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian.

Nolte, E. (1993). The past that will not pass. In J. Knowlton & T. Cates (Eds.), *Forever in the shadow of Hitler: Original documents of the Historikerstreit, the controversy concerning the singularity of the Holocaust* (pp. 10-15). Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press.

Norval, A.J. (1996). *Deconstructing Apartheid discourse.* London: Verso.

Norval, A.J. (1998). Memory, identity and the (im)possibility of reconciliation: The work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa. *Constellations, 5*(2), 250-265.

Norval, A.J. (2006). Democratic identification: A Wittgensteinian Approach. *Political Theory, 34*(2), 229-255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591705281714

Norval, A.J. (2007). *Aversive democracy: Inheritance and originality in the democratic tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norval, A.J. (2012). "Writing a name in the sky": Rancière, Cavell, and the possibility of egalitarian inscription. *The American Political Science Review, 106*(4), 810-826.

Olick, J. K. (2003a). What does it mean to normalize the past?: Official memory in German politics since 1989. In J. K. Olick (Ed.), *States of memory: Continuities, conflicts, and transformations in national retrospection.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Olick, J. K. (2003b). The guilt of nations? *Ethics & International Affairs, 17*(2), 109-117.

Olick, J. (2016). *The sins of our fathers: Germany, memory, method*. Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press.

Olick, J.K., & Levy, D. (1997). Collective memory and cultural constraint: Holocaust myth and rationality in German politics. *American Sociological Review, 62*(6), 921-936.

Önnerfors, A. (2017). Between Breivik and PEGIDA: The absence of ideologues and leaders on the contemporary European far right. Patterns of Prejudice, 51(2), 159-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/0031322X.2017.1302642

Panizza, F. (2005). Introduction: Populism and the mirror of democracy. In F. Panizza (Ed.), *Populism and the mirror of democracy* (pp. 1-31). London: Verso.

Patton, D.F. (2017). The Alternative for Germany's radicalization in historical-comparative perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe, 25*(2), 163-180. https://doi.org/10.1080/25739638.2017.1399512

Pautz, H. (2005). The politics of identity in Germany: The *Leitkultur* debate. *Race & Class, 46*(4), 39-52. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396805052517

Pauwels, T. (2010). Explaining the success of neoliberal populist parties: The case of Lijst Dedecker in Belgium. *Political Studies, 58*(5), 1009-1029.

Pelinka, A. (2013). Right-wing populism: Concept and typology. In R. Wodak, M. KhosraviNik, B. Mral (Eds.), *Right-wing populism in Europe: Politics and discourse* (pp. 3-23). London: Bloomsbury.

Piwoni, E. (2013). Latent but not less significant: The Holocaust as an argumentative resource in German national identity discourse. *German Politics & Society, 31*(3), 1-26.

Piwoni, E. (2015). Claiming the nation for the people: the dynamics of representation in German public discourse about immigrant integration. *Nations and Nationalism, 21*(1), 83-101. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12084

Pred, A.R. (1997). Somebody else, somewhere else: Racialisms, racialized spaces and the popular geographical imagination in Sweden. *Antipode, 29*(4), 383-416.

Probst, L. (2003). Founding myths in Europe and the role of the Holocaust. *New German Critique, 90*, 45-58.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism.* London: Routledge.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 87-121). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Richardson, J., & Wodak, R. (2009). Recontextualizing fascist ideologies of the past: Right-wing discourses on employment and nativism in Austria and the UK. Critical Discourse Studies, 6(4), 251-267.

Risse, T., Engelmann-Martin, D., Knopf, H. J., & Roscher, K. (1999). To Euro or Not to Euro? The EU and identity politics in the European Union. *European Journal of International Relations, 5*(2), 147–187.

Rohrschneider, R., & Whitefield, S. (2017). Party positions about European Integration in Germany: An electoral quandary? *German Politics, 26*(1), 83-103. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2016.1189532

Rooduijn, M., & Akkerman, T. (2017). Flank attacks: Populism and left-right radicalism in Western Europe. *Party Politics, 23*(3), 193-204. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068815596514

Rüsen, J. (2005). *History: Narration, interpretation, orientation.* Oxford: Berghahn.

Rydgren, J. (2005). Is extreme right-wing populism contagious? Explaining the emergence of a new party family. *European Journal of Political Research, 44*, 413-437.

Salzborn, S. (2016). Renaissance of the New Right in Germany? A discussion of New Right elements in German right-wing extremism today. *German Politics & Society, 34*(2), 36-63. https://doi.org/10.3167/gps.2016.340203

Sark, K. (2012). Fashioning a new brand of "Germanness": The 2006 World Cup and beyond. *Seminar: A Journal of Germanic Studies, 48*(2), 254-266. https://doi.org/10.1353/smr.2012.0013

Sartori, G. (1970). Concept misinformation in comparative politics. *The American Political Science review, 64*(4), 1033-1053. https://doi.org/10.2307/1958356.

Sartori, G. (1991). Comparing and miscomparing. *Journal of Theoretical Politics, 3*(3), 243-257.

Savage, R. (2012). From McCarthyism to the Tea Party: Interpreting anti-leftist forms of US populism in comparative perspective. *New Political Science, 34*(4), 564-584.

Schellenberg, B. (2013). Developments within the radical right in Germany: Discourses, attitudes and actors. In R. Wodak, M. KhosraviNik, & B. Mral (Eds.), Right-Wing populism in Europe: Politics and discourse (pp. 149-162). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Schmidtke, O. (2013). Toward a cosmopolitan and inclusive European identity? Negotiating immigrants' inclusion and exclusion in the new Europe. In A. Salvatore, O. Schmidtke, H-J. Trenz (Eds.), *Rethinking the public sphere through transnationalizing processes* (pp. 269-287). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schmidtke, O. (2017). Reinventing the nation: Germany's post-unification drive towards becoming a 'country of immigration'. *German Politics, 26*(4), 498-515. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2017.1365137

Schmitt, C. (2007). *The concept of the political*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Schmitt-Beck, R. (2017). The 'Alternative für Deutschland in the Electorate': Between single-issue and right-wing populist party. *German Politics, 26*(1), 124-148. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2016.1184650

Schuster, K. (2017, April 9). AfD's Alice Weidel: The pride of the populists, a mystery to everyone else. *DW*, accessed October 3, 2018, https://www.dw.com/en/afds-alice-weidel-the-pride-of-the-populists-a-mystery-to-everyone-else/a-40356769.

Séville, A. (2017). From 'one right way' to 'one ruinous way'? Discursive shifts in 'There is no alternative'. *European Political Science Review, 9*(3), 449-470. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773916000035

Shoshan, N. (2016). *The management of hate: Nation, affect, and the governance of right-wing extremism in Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Siri, J. (2018). The Alternative for Germany after the 2017 Election. *German Politics, 27*(1), 141-145. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644008.2018.1445724

Spektorowski, A. (2003). The New Right: Ethno-regionalism, ethno-pluralism and the emergence of a neo-fascist 'Third Way'. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 8*(1), 111-130. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310306084

Spiegel. (2018, September 4). Wagenknechts Bewegung "Aufstehen": "Wir haben eine Krise der Demokratie." *Spiegel Online*, accessed October 2, 2018, http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/aufstehen-sarah-wagenknecht-a-1226419.html.

Stanley, B. (2008). The thin ideology of populism. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 13*(1), 95-110. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310701822289

Stavrakakis, Y. (2004). Antinomies of formalism: Laclau's theory of populism and the lessons from religious populism in Greece. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 9*(3), 253-267. https://doi.org/10.1080/1356931042000263519

Stavrakakis, Y. (2014). The return of "the people": Populism and anti-populism in the shadow of the European crisis. *Constellations, 21*(4), 505-517. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12127

Stavrakakis, Y., Kioupkiolis, A., Katsambekis, G., Nikisianis, N., & Siomos, T. (2016). Contemporary left-wing populism in Latin America: Leadership, horizontalism, and postdemocracy in Chavez's Venezuela. *Latin American Politics and Society, 58*(3), 51-76. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-2456.2016.00318.x

Stavrakakis, Y., Katsambekis, G., Nikisianis, N., Kioupkiolis, A., & Siomos, T. (2017). Extreme right-wing populism in Europe: Revisiting a reified association. *Critical Discourse Studies, 14*(4), 420-439. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2017.1309325

Stavrakakis, Y., Katsambekis, G., Kioupkiolis, A., Nikisianis, N., & Siomos, T. (2018). Populism, anti-populism and crisis. *Contemporary Political Theory, 17*(1), 4-27. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41296-017-0142-y

Stehle, M. & Weber, B. M. (2013). German soccer, the 2010 World Cup, and multicultural belonging. *German Studies Review, 36*(1), 103-124.

Stoica, M.S. (2017). Political myths of the populist discourse. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies, 16*(46), 63-76.

Strickland, P. (2017, September 5). Populism and the fight for the soul of German churches. *Al-Jazeera*, accessed October 12, 2018, https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2017/07/populism-fight-soul-german-churches-170724140321875.html.

Taggart, P. (2004). Populism and representative politics in contemporary Europe. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 9*(3), 269–288. https://doi.org/10.1080/1356931042000263528

Taguieff, P-A. (1995). Political science confronts populism: From a conceptual mirage to a real problem. *Telos, 103*, 9-43.

Taguieff, P-A. (2016). The revolt against the elites; or, the new populist wave: An interview. *Telos, 176*, 213-224.

Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement.* New York: Cambridge University Press,

The Economist. (2016, November 24). The original German: America's alt-right learns to speak Nazi: "*Lügenpresse*". *The Economist*, accessed October 21, 2018, https://www.economist.com/europe/2016/11/24/americas-alt-right-learns-to-speak-nazi-lugenpresse.

Tilly, C. (2006). *Regimes and repertoires.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tilly, C. (2008). *Contentious performances*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tormey, S. (2015). *The end of representative politics*. Malden: Polity Press.

Tully, J. (2002). Reimagining belonging in circumstances of cultural diversity: A citizen approach. In U. Hedetoft & M. Hjort (Eds.), *The postnational self: Belonging and identity* (pp. 152-177). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Tully, J. (2008). *Public philosophy in a new key: Volume 1: Democracy and civic freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Urbinati, N. (2015). A revolt against intermediary bodies. *Constellations, 22*(4), 477-486. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12188

van Dijk, T. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

van Dijk, T.A. (1991). *News as discourse*. New York: Erlbaum.

van Dijk, T.A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Virchow, F. (2016). PEGIDA: Understanding the emergence and essence of nativist protest in Dresden. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 37*(6), 541-555. https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2016.1235026

Vörlander, H., Herold, M., & Schäller, S. (2018). *PEGIDA and new right-wing populism in Germany*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wasmer, M. (2013). Public debates and public opinion on multiculturalism in Germany. In R. Taras (Ed.), *Challenging multiculturalism: European models of diversity* (pp. 163-189). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Weidel, A. (2018, May 16). Rede von Alice Weidel zur Haushaltsdebatte im Bundestag. *AfD Bundestag*, accessed August 10, 2018, https://www.afdbundestag.de/rede-von-alice-weidel-zur-haushaltsdebatte-im-bundestag/.

Weingärtner, W. (2016, July 22). Die AfD spielt Schwule und Muslime gegeneinander aus. *Berliner Zeitung*, accessed October 2, 2018, http://www.berliner-zeitung.de/berlin/Kommentar-die-afd-spielt-schwule-und-muslime-gegeneinander-aus24438548

Welch, S., & Wittlinger, R. (2011). The resilience of the nation state: Cosmopolitanism, Holocaust memory and German identity. *German Politics & Society, 29*(3), 38-54.

Werner, A. (2015). Vor der Zerreißprobe: Wohin treibt die AfD? *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik, 60*(2), 83-90.

Wilds, K. (2000). Identity creation and the culture of contrition: Recasting ‘normality’ in the Berlin Republic. *German Politics, 9*(1), 83-102. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644000008404581

Wittgenstein, L. (2009[1958]). *Philosophical investigations: Philosophische untersuchungen*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Wittlinger, R. (2006). Collective memory and national identity in the Berlin Republic: The emergence of a new consensus? *Debatte: Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe, 14*(3), 201-212. https://doi.org/10.1080/09651560601042837

Wittlinger, R. (2008). The Merkel government's politics of the past. *Germany Politics & Society, 26*(4), 9-27.

Wittlinger, R. (2010). *German National Identity in the Twenty First Century: A Different Republic After all?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wittlinger, R., & Boothroyd, S. (2010). A "usable" past at last? The politics of the past in united Germany. *German Studies Review, 33*(3), 489-502.

Wittlinger, R., & Larose, M. (2007). No future for Germany's past? Collective memory and German foreign policy. *German Politics, 16*(4), 481-495.

Wodak, R. (2004). Critical discourse analysis. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 185-202). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual.* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Wodak, R., & de Cillia, R. (2007). Commemorating the past: The discursive construction of official narratives about the 'Rebirth of the Second Austrian Republic'. *Discourse & Communication, 1*(3), 337-363. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481307079206.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-33). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R., & Fairclourgh, N. (2010). Recontextualizing European higher education policies: the cases of Austria and Romania. *Critical Discourse Studies, 7*(1), 19-40. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900903453922

Wodak, R., & Richardson, J. (2013). *Analysing fascist discourse: European fascism in talk and text.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Wodak, R., & Forchtner, B. (2014). Embattled Vienna 1683/2010: right-wing populism, collective memory and the fictionalisation of politics. *Visual Communication, 13*(2), 231-255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470357213516720

Wood, R. (2006). On forgetting and remembering: The New Right since German Unification. In A. Fuchs, M. Cosgrove, & G. Grote (Eds.), *German memory contests: The quest for identity in literature, film, and discourse since 1990* (pp. 271-286). Rochester, NY: Camden House.

Yoder, J.A. (2017). Angela Merkel's discourse about the past: Implications for the construction of collective memory. *Memory Studies*, https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698017727807.

Young, J.E. (1992). The counter-monument: Memory against itself in German today. *Critical Inquiry, 18*(2), 267-296.

Zelizer, B. (1998). *Remembering to forget: Holocaust memory through the camera's eye*. Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press.

Appendix: AfD Discourse Analysis Codebook

Antagonistic Repoliticization	15	59
Freedom of expression	9	16
Opposition to *Altparteien*	13	27
Opposition to EU	7	11
Anti-Instutionalism	14	61
Claim to promote direct democracy through referendum	6	8
Distrust of institutions and courts	14	26
Distrust of media	11	21
History	12	18
Majoritarianism	15	88
Defending LGBTQ+	1	8
Rejection of Multiculturalism	15	39
Welfare Chauvinism	8	14
Protectionism	15	120
Crisis Narrative	9	15
Cultural Protectionism	8	17
Demographic Protectionism	12	19
Economic Protectionism	7	11
Securitarian Protectionism	12	21
Speaking against national outsiders	7	24
Speaking against the elite	15	73
Speaking in the name of the people	15	52

*Extracted from NVivo