the populist

charismatic

leader

How to know one when you see one

by Takis S. Pappas

Modern populism is a novel political system that combines democratic electoral politics with disregard for established liberal institutions. It can be conceptualized neatly, and defined minimally, as democratic illiberalism—a kind of rebuttal to contemporary liberal democracy. Under this definition, the term describes a class of political parties whose members have the specific characteristics of being at once democratic and illiberal.

Recent comparative research has shown that, to emerge and develop as a noteworthy political force, populism requires a particular type of leadership that is wholly personal and aims at the radical transformation of the established liberal order. This is the domain of leadership that, more than a century ago, German sociologist Max Weber termed "charismatic" in order to distinguish it from the other two types of authority: traditional, where people obey because of seniority, long-established norms, or custom, and legal-rational, which is best typified by the impersonal modern state administration.

With no significant exception, all successful populist leaders in modern and contemporary times have exercised charismatic leadership. But what are the characteristics of this extraordinary type of leadership?

This infographic explains.



Charismatic leadership is highly **personal**. It always refers to a single individual leader, never to a collective body of leaders. Charisma cannot be shared, transferred, delegated or inherited.



Charismatic authority is achieved and cannot be conferred. As it is nonpermanent, charisma needs to be continuously proven by the leader. It disappears when the followers cease to believe in the worth of their leader.



leaders create their own parties or movements. But even when they rise within already established parties, they completely seize their organization and alter their ideological and programmatic tenets.



Political charisma is radical in that it goes against tradition or customs and seeks to introduce a wholly new political order. Charismatic leaders seek

to re-institute authority

and constitute afresh the

political system.

plebiscitary

Charismatic leadership usually has a pronounced plebiscitary quality. It requires the implicit acknowledgement that the leader is above institutions and that these can be changed as he or she thinks fit.



leader and led is **irrational**. It is built upon strong emotions with a distinctly moral character that encourage risk-taking rather than more sensible, risk-averse logic.





Charismatic leaders assume a distinctly

missionary stance toward society and politics. They seek to forge moral communities of supporters and have them rescued from impending catastrophe.



Charisma is a socially **divisive** force. It is typically

opposed by established power groups, vested interests and time-honoured allegiances, which are set against the community of the charismatic leader's followers.



crisis generator in itself. Such leaders may trigger crisis cycles that undermine traditional institutional structures that may even harm democracy.



Charismatic leadership is rare, especially in

the context of modern liberal democracy which is designed to work on the basis of stable impersonal institutions in a procedural, expertisebased, and moderate way.

Prominent populist leaders who exercised charismatic leadership Each of the following leaders is "populist" because, under his rule, the respective nation's

democracy was led away from liberalism and toward an illiberal, and even autocratic, direction.

They are prominent among other reasons because, save Trump, each has served at least two terms in office. Their group represents postwar European and American, left and right populisms. Each and all of these populists, presented here in order of historical appearance, exhibit the ten characteristics of charismatic leadership listed above.



Juan Perón



Viktor Orbán

Rafael Correa





Silvio Berlusconi



Jarosław Kaczyński





Hugo Chávez



phenomena. On this distinction, see TS Pappas, "The Specter Haunting Europe: Distinguishing Liberal Democracy's Challengers," Journal of Democracy 27:4 (October 2016), 22-36. One major difference between populism and nativism is that, as a rule, nativist leaders are not

Donald Trump





Sources On the empirics and theory of populism, with detailed analyses of the cases mentioned above, see TS Pappas, Populism and Liberal Democracy: A Comparative and Theoretical Analysis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019). Populism is often confused with nativism, but they are different

charismatic. On populist charismatic leadership more specifically, see TS Pappas, "Political Charisma and Modern Populism," in J. P. Zúquete (ed.), Routledge International Handbook of Charisma (Abingdon: Routledge, 2020), 226-37. For much more on both populism and charisma, visit my blog www.pappaspopulism.com. Citation





This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822337.

You may refer to this infographic as: Takis S. Pappas (2021), The Populist Charismatic Leader: How to Know One When You See One [infographic]

Photos: public domain