



Welfare Chauvinism, Populist Radical Right Parties and Health Inequalities

Comment on “A Scoping Review of Populist Radical Right Parties’ Influence on Welfare Policy and its Implications for Population Health in Europe”

Clare Bambra^{1*}, Julia Lynch²

Abstract

In this short commentary, we examine the implications of the welfare chauvinism of the populist radical right (PRR) for health inequalities by examining the international evidence about the impact of previous periods of welfare state contraction on population health and health inequalities. We argue that parties from various political traditions have in fact long engaged in stigmatisation of welfare recipients to justify welfare state retrenchment, a technique that the PRR have now ‘weaponised.’ We conclude by reflecting on implications of the rise of the PRR for the future of welfare states and health inequalities in the context of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).

Keywords: Politics, COVID-19, Social Policy, Public Health

Copyright: © 2021 The Author(s); Published by Kerman University of Medical Sciences. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Bambra C, Lynch J. Welfare chauvinism, populist radical right parties and health inequalities: Comment on “A scoping review of populist radical right parties’ influence on welfare policy and its implications for population health in Europe.” *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2021;10(9):581–584. doi:10.34172/ijhpm.2020.149

Article History:

Received: 2 July 2020

Accepted: 1 August 2020

ePublished: 10 August 2020

*Correspondence to:

Clare Bambra

Email:

clare.bambra@newcastle.ac.uk

In their scoping review, Rinaldi and Bekker¹ examine the welfare policy consequences of the rise of populist radical right (PRR) parties in Europe and the implications for population health. They conclude that the exclusionary welfare chauvinistic positions of PRR parties are likely to have negative effects on access to welfare and healthcare provision, adversely impacting the health of vulnerable population groups. Whilst their review is wide-ranging and covers various PRR policy mechanisms, one of the key factors that Rinaldi and Bekker identify is the PRR division of welfare recipients into ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ – with knock-on impacts on the overall size, shape and acceptability of public welfare provision for everyone. In this short commentary, we examine the implications of this in more detail by examining the international evidence about the impact of previous periods of welfare state contraction on population health and health inequalities. We argue that parties from various political traditions have in fact long engaged in stigmatisation of welfare recipients to justify welfare state retrenchment, a technique that the PRR have now ‘weaponised.’ We conclude by reflecting on implications of the rise of the PRR for the future of welfare states and health inequalities in the context of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).

PRR parties – including the Rassemblement National (French National Front), the Austrian Freedom Party, the Italian Northern League, the Alternative for Germany, the Polish Law and Justice Party, the Dutch Party for Freedom,

the UK Independence Party, the Finns party and the Sweden Democrats – are nationalist/nativist, authoritarian and populist (privileging the ‘common sense’ of ‘the people’ over elite knowledge).² Their approach to the welfare state has been described as ‘welfare chauvinism’ because it involves increasing or defending welfare provisions (notably social security and healthcare) for the native-insider population whilst limiting access and eligibility for outsider groups – most notably immigrants and ethnic, religious, cultural, and linguistic minorities (although the wider PRR agenda also includes reducing the rights of LGBTQ+ [lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and others] minorities and women’s reproductive rights).² Welfare chauvinism links native birth or ethnicity (and sometimes other attributes related to religion, culture, and language) to moral ‘deservingness,’ which entitles those who possess it – and only those – to state support in time of need.³ So, PRRs in government *can* lead to an increase in welfare state generosity.⁴ However, deservingness criteria can also be used to restrict welfare provision for other individuals and groups in the population, too, and are seen for example in policies that aim to reduce welfare ‘dependency’ amongst those characterized as shiftless, improvident, or otherwise undeserving of social support.¹

The implications of the linkage of nativity with deservingness for the health of minority groups is as straightforward as it is awful. Minority ethnic groups have worse health than the native population – for example, they have higher rates of

hypertension, diabetes, asthma, heart, liver, renal disease, cancer, cardiovascular disease, obesity and smoking.⁵ And yet, as Rinaldi and Bekker point out in their review, the influence of PRR welfare chauvinism has led to calls for – and in some countries such as the UK implementation of – restrictions on access to healthcare and welfare state support for immigrant communities.¹ This has huge public health implications – not just for the health of the excluded population groups, but also, in the context of endemic infectious disease (notably tuberculosis and COVID-19), for the entire population. The nativist and authoritarian combination within PRR welfare chauvinism also results in restrictions on welfare state access and social citizenship for lower socio-economic groups within the native/insider community themselves. The trope of deserving and undeserving recipients is used to further retrench the welfare state for everyone – particularly in relation to unemployment support and pension provision.¹

The tactic of splitting welfare recipients into deserving and undeserving is not novel or exclusively one of the PRR.⁶ Initially based in Protestant charity doctrine, and hence less prevalent in Catholic countries,⁷ there is nevertheless a long history in social policy in Europe and other high income countries of distinguishing between deserving insiders (eg, hard-working families, widows) and undeserving outsiders (eg, scroungers, shirkers, unwed mothers). This is most notable in the liberal Anglosphere,⁸ but elements of deservingness narratives are also visible in the social policies of the Nordic countries, for example.⁹ Such narratives have been cultivated and put to use for decades – largely by the mainstream political right (eg, Conservative, Republican, Liberal, and Christian Democrat parties) but also in some cases by Social Democratic parties – to justify cutting the welfare state *for everyone*.^{8,9} Notable examples of this are in the United Kingdom where unemployment, lone parent and even disability benefits were ‘reformed’ (retrenched) by successive governments of both the mainstream political right and left from the 1980s onwards.¹⁰ Benefit values relative to wages (replacement rates) in the United Kingdom fell (eg, the replacement value of unemployment benefit decreased from 45% of average wages in 1980 to just 16% in 2000), entitlement restrictions and increased qualifying conditions reduced coverage (the population coverage of unemployment benefit in the United Kingdom decreased from 90% in 1980 to 77% in 2000), duration of benefit receipt were considerably shortened, and most recently, sanctions were introduced for those who fail to meet increasingly strict entitlement criteria.¹¹ These changes – amounting to a recommodification of labour – were reflected to a greater or lesser extent in other countries.¹¹ For example, in Germany the replacement value of unemployment benefit decreased from 68% of average wages in 1980 to 37% in 2000, and in Norway from 70% to 62%.¹¹ Similarly, in the United States (where deservingness is also highly racialised¹²) reductions in welfare support and increasing work requirements targeted at ‘undeserving’ minority lone parents (‘welfare queens’) were found to have negative health impacts on mothers and their children.¹³ More broadly, both hostility toward non-natives and reductions

in social protections in the United States – beginning in the 1980s and continuing through the post-global financial crisis (GFC) recession – have resulted in increasing health inequalities and worsening population health, including rising ‘deaths of despair’ among white Americans¹⁴ (conversely, expansions of generosity and eligibility in specific programs had beneficial effects on health^{15,16}). The PRR have merely newly ‘weaponised’ what are unfortunately long-standing and divisive political and cultural narratives.

The impact of these substantial reductions in the generosity and universality of welfare state programs on health inequalities has been empirically examined in multiple countries.¹⁷ For example, studies have found that health inequalities increased when significant cuts to the welfare state and public spending were implemented by many European countries as a response to the 2008 GFC. For example, in England, studies have found that inequalities in mental health and well-being increased at a higher rate between 2009 and 2013, with people living in more deprived areas experiencing the largest increases in poor mental health and self-harm.¹⁸ Similarly, increases in child poverty since the implementation of austerity in England were associated with increased inequalities in infant mortality rates (IMRs) (deaths aged under 1 year), with every 1 per cent increase in child poverty associated with an extra 5.8 infant deaths per 100 000.¹⁹ Inequalities in IMR, life expectancy, and mortality amenable to healthcare in England also increased from 2010 onwards.^{20,21} Across Europe, reductions in spending levels and increased conditionality may have adversely impacted the mental health of disadvantaged social groups.²²

These findings about the effects of austerity on health inequalities are in keeping with previous studies of the effects of public sector and welfare state contractions in the United Kingdom, the United States, and New Zealand in the 1980s and 1990s. Krieger et al found that inequalities in premature mortality (deaths under age 75) and IMRs by income and ethnicity increased in the United States between 1980 and 2002 – a period when Republican right-wing governments (starting with Ronald Reagan 1980–1988) cut public welfare services (including healthcare insurance coverage) and reduced social assistance benefit levels.²³ Similarly, research into the health effects of Thatcherism in the United Kingdom (1979–1990 – right-wing Conservative government) found that the welfare state retrenchment pursued in this period was accompanied by increased socio-economic inequalities in life expectancy and IMR.²⁴ These findings are mirrored in studies of welfare state reductions in New Zealand which found that while general mortality rates declined, socioeconomic inequalities amongst men, women, and children in all-cause mortality increased in the 1980s and the 1990s during a period in which New Zealand underwent major structural changes (including more targeted social benefits, privatisation of public housing, user charges for welfare services).²⁵ Even in the later-liberalizing countries of continental Europe, the dominance since the 1990s of a neoliberal master-narrative that privileges budgetary restraint and limited state action has hampered efforts to reduce health inequalities.²⁶ Population

health as a whole has suffered, too: Welfare provision is not just beneficial for the health of the most disadvantaged and marginalised, but also for the whole population, reducing total mortality and increasing life expectancy.^{11,17}

This body of work provides the best insights into the potential impact of PRR welfare chauvinism on the health of vulnerable and lower socio-economic groups. It makes for grim reading: welfare chauvinism is yet another lever for scaling back the welfare state, resulting in increasing health inequalities. The COVID-19 pandemic may well further enhance the political influence of the PRR. Nativist discourses and authoritarian measures (eg, the first post-war lockdown across Europe including closed borders) have become increasingly mainstreamed during the pandemic, and are likely to worsen as the economic ramifications of the pandemic, including mass unemployment expected across Europe and other high-income countries, take hold. A widespread economic depression is likely to increase health inequalities, especially if further welfare state retrenchment is enacted as a result.²⁷ The PRR may well contribute to – and benefit from – economic volatility by further promoting welfare chauvinism and protectionist trade policies. This will test the legal and constitutional barriers (eg, in the European Union where the European Court of Justice is a strong defender of cross-border welfare rights) that currently offer some protection against welfare chauvinist policies from being fully enacted. Beyond welfare chauvinism, other notable areas of public health policy that have been beneficial for reducing health inequalities are under threat from PRR parties, include tobacco control (eg, the Austrian coalition government incorporating the PRR Austrian Freedom Party cancelled the planned public smoking ban) and reproductive health rights (eg, in the United States, Trump is championing the restriction of access to abortions and birth control).^{28,29} As the Rinaldi and Bekker review shows, it is increasingly pressing for public health and health policy researchers and policy makers to understand the potential threats posed by the PRR and welfare chauvinism for increasing health inequalities.¹

Ethical issues

Not applicable.

Competing interests

Author declares that he has no competing interests.

Authors' contributions

CB led on conception and design, analysis and interpretation, drafting of the manuscript and critical revision of the manuscript. JL contributed to analysis and interpretation, drafting of the manuscript and critical revision of the manuscript.

Authors' affiliations

¹Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK. ²Department of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

References

- Rinaldi C, Bekker MPM. A scoping review of populist radical right parties' influence on welfare policy and its implications for population health in Europe. *Int J Health Policy Manag*. 2020. doi:10.34172/ijhpm.2020.48

- Falkenbach M, Greer SL. Political parties matter: the impact of the populist radical right on health. *Eur J Public Health*. 2018;28(suppl 3):15-18. doi:10.1093/eurpub/cky157
- Ennsner-Jedenastik L. A welfare state for whom? a group-based account of the Austrian Freedom Party's social policy profile. *Swiss Political Sci Rev*. 2016;22(3):409-427. doi:10.1111/spsr.12218
- Röth L, Afonso A, Spies DC. The impact of Populist Radical Right Parties on socio-economic policies. *Eur Political Sci Rev*. 2018; 10(3):325-350. doi:10.1017/s1755773917000133
- Meeks KA, Freitas-Da-Silva D, Adeyemo A, et al. Disparities in type 2 diabetes prevalence among ethnic minority groups resident in Europe: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Intern Emerg Med*. 2016;11(3):327-340. doi:10.1007/s11739-015-1302-9
- Piven FF, Cloward RA. *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*. New York: Vintage Books; 1971.
- Kahl S. The religious roots of modern poverty policy: Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed Protestant traditions compared. *Arch Eur Sociol*. 2005;46(1):91-126.
- Deeming C, Johnston R. Coming together in a rightward direction: post-1980s changing attitudes to the British welfare state. *Qual Quant*. 2018;52(1):395-413. doi:10.1007/s11135-017-0473-z
- van Oorschot W. Making the difference in social Europe: deservingness perceptions among citizens of European welfare states. *J Eur Soc Policy*. 2006;16(1):23-42. doi:10.1177/0958928706059829
- Bambra C, Smith KE. No longer deserving? sickness benefit reform and the politics of (ill) health. *Crit Public Health*. 2010;20(1):71-83. doi:10.1080/09581590902763265
- Schrecker T, Bambra C. *How Politics Makes Us Sick: Neoliberal Epidemics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 2015.
- Gilens M. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1999.
- Gibson M, Thomson H, Banas K, et al. Welfare-to-work interventions and their effects on the mental and physical health of lone parents and their children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2018;2(2):CD009820. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009820.pub3
- Knapp EA, Bilal U, Dean LT, Lazo M, Celentano DD. Economic insecurity and deaths of despair in US counties. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2019;188(12):2131-2139. doi:10.1093/aje/kwz103
- Beckfield J, Bambra C. Shorter lives in stingier states: social policy shortcomings help explain the US mortality disadvantage. *Soc Sci Med*. 2016;171:30-38. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.10.017
- Popham F, Dibben C, Bambra C. Are health inequalities really not the smallest in the Nordic welfare states? a comparison of mortality inequality in 37 countries. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2013;67(5):412-418. doi:10.1136/jech-2012-201525
- Bambra C. *Health Divides: Where You Live Can Kill You*. Bristol: Policy Press; 2016.
- Barr B, Kinderman P, Whitehead M. Trends in mental health inequalities in England during a period of recession, austerity and welfare reform 2004 to 2013. *Soc Sci Med*. 2015;147:324-331. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.11.009
- Taylor-Robinson D, Lai ETC, Wickham S, et al. Assessing the impact of rising child poverty on the unprecedented rise in infant mortality in England, 2000-2017: time trend analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(10):e029424. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029424
- Barr B, Bambra C, Whitehead M. The impact of NHS resource allocation policy on health inequalities in England 2001-11: longitudinal ecological study. *BMJ*. 2014;348:g3231. doi:10.1136/bmj.g3231
- Robinson T, Brown H, Norman PD, Fraser LK, Barr B, Bambra C. The impact of New Labour's English health inequalities strategy on geographical inequalities in infant mortality: a time-trend analysis. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2019;73(6):564-568. doi:10.1136/jech-2018-211679
- Niedzwiedz CL, Mitchell RJ, Shortt NK, Pearce JR. Social protection spending and inequalities in depressive symptoms across Europe. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2016;51(7):1005-1014. doi:10.1007/s00127-016-1223-6
- Krieger N, Rehkopf DH, Chen JT, Waterman PD, Marcelli E, Kennedy M. The fall and rise of US inequities in premature mortality: 1960-2002. *PLoS Med*. 2008;5(2):e46. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050046
- Scott-Samuel A, Bambra C, Collins C, Hunter DJ, McCartney G, Smith K. The impact of Thatcherism on health and well-being in Britain. *Int J*

- Health Serv.* 2014;44(1):53-71. doi:[10.2190/HS.44.1.d](https://doi.org/10.2190/HS.44.1.d)
25. Blakely T, Tobias M, Atkinson J. Inequalities in mortality during and after restructuring of the New Zealand economy: repeated cohort studies. *BMJ.* 2008;336(7640):371-375. doi:[10.1136/bmj.39455.596181.25](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39455.596181.25)
26. Lynch J. *Regimes of Inequality: The Political Economy of Health and Wealth.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2020.
27. Bambra C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2020. doi:[10.1136/jech-2020-214401](https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2020-214401)
28. Thomson K, Hillier-Brown F, Todd A, McNamara C, Huijts T, Bambra C. The effects of public health policies on health inequalities in high-income countries: an umbrella review. *BMC Public Health.* 2018;18(1):869. doi:[10.1186/s12889-018-5677-1](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5677-1)
29. Rosenbaum S. Reproductive health: assessing the damage. *Milbank Q.* 2019;97(2):399-402. doi:[10.1111/1468-0009.12382](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12382)