Wawrzyniec Konarski
Vistula University in Warsaw
ORCID: 0000-0001-9634-9933

ETHNICITY, NATIONALISM AND POLITICS. PROLEGOMENA TO TERMINOLOGY AND EXEMPLIFICATION OF LEADING ETHNONATIONAL TRADITIONS IN CENTRAL EUROPE IN NEWEST HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Abstract: The considerations in this article concern the scale of the impact of political traditions – based on the combination of ethnicity and nationalism – occurring in four Central European countries. In the first part, the author refers to the concepts of: ethnicity, nationalism and politics (and related concepts) and the relationships between them on the basis of selected research approaches, including by recalling his own, original understanding of nationalism. In this way, it creates a theoretical basis for the considerations in the second part focused on the reflection of the above--mentioned connections from the perspective of the political history of the recent and contemporary countries mentioned above. The author verifies the assumption to what extent the political tradition established earlier in these countries (or their predecessors, vide: Czechoslovakia as a past existence), based on the link between ethnicity and nationalism, is still alive today. The descriptive-historical method is therefore of leading importance in the comparative research approach used. This, in turn, makes it possible to formulate a general conclusion that the vitality of the political traditions

of the above mentioned it is maintained while remaining diversified in terms of the strength of their present impact.

ETNICZNOŚĆ, NACJONALIZM I POLITYKA. PROLEGOMENA DO TERMINOLOGII I EGZEMPLIFIKACJI WIODĄCYCH TRADYCJI ETNONACJONALNYCH EUROPY ŚRODKOWEJ W NAJNOWSZEJ PERSPEKTYWIE HISTORYCZNEJ

Streszczenie: Rozważania w niniejszym artykule dotyczą skali oddziaływania tradycji politycznych – opartych na powiązaniu etniczności i nacjonalizmu – występujących w czterech państwach Europy Środkowej. W części pierwszej autor odnosi się do pojęć: etniczności, nacjonalizmu i polityki (i pojęć pokrewnych) oraz zachodzących między nimi relacji na kanwie wybranych podejść badawczych, w tym także przez przywołanie własnego, autorskiego rozumienia nacjonalizmu. W ten sposób tworzy teoretyczną bazę do rozważań w części drugiej skupionych wokół odzwierciedlenia ww. powiązań z perspektywy politycznych dziejów najnowszych oraz współczesnych wspomnianych państw. Autor dokonuje weryfikacji założenia, na ile powstała wcześniej w tych państwach (lub ich poprzednikach, *vide*: Czechosłowacja jako byt przeszły) tradycja polityczna, oparta na powiązaniu etniczności i nacjonalizmu wykazuje żywotność także i dzisiaj. Metoda opisowo-historyczna ma tu zatem rangę wiodącą w zastosowanym porównawczym podejściu badawczym. To zaś umożliwia sformułowanie wniosku generalnego, iż żywotność zapoczątkowanych wcześniej tradycji politycznych jest utrzymana, pozostając zarazem zróżnicowaną pod kątem siły ich obecnego oddziaływania.

Słowa kluczowe: etniczność, nacjonalizm, polityka, etnopolityka, Europa Środkowa.
Kody JEL: Y8

Introduction

The appearance of three terms exposed in the title of the article remains a basis for further considerations. The theoretical remarks in regard to the topic and selected exemplification create a natural space for the research analysis accompanied by four case studies. The narration is placed in the newest history comparative perspective and divided into two parts. In the first one the reflections in reference to the above terms are presented and supplemented by the author's individual approach towards understanding the notion of nationalism in particular. The latter corresponds with manifold concepts of this notion within the space limited by its political profile from the one side and ethnic one from the other. In the second part the ideological traditions around ethnicity and nationalism's mutual ties are debated having the Central Europe's newest political history as a point of reference. In this part I focus on the most influential and specific for Central European four states (see below) ethnonational political traditions in regard to their ethnically exclusive or inclusive images. I am interested in the enquiries on their organizational forms and doctrinal standpoints – political parties in particular, what remains deliberate choice here from both: cognitive and analytical points of view. I recall such political structures and their leaders, firstly in reference to the interwar period, and go furthermore with the reflections on some currently existing political parties of similar profile, namely during the systemic transformation after 1989. These are delineated timeframes for the considerations. I do not simultaneously omit the fact that those traditions' influence is diversified in Central European realities now. Thus three main research questions appear to be considered furthermore in regard to the states belonging to this region:

What was the origin and organizational forms of those historically identified ethnonational traditions? Is their current ideological image inherited by existing political parties in similar – as before – or modified shape? Is their political representation diversified as far as popular support for them is concerned?

Descriptive and historical methods are applied here as useful and necessary what is additionally endorsed by comparative approach. However due to the limits of the hereby text's volume the theoretical concepts and definitions – as presented here – are selected in a way which may be helpful to the submitted narration. The author is aware indeed the debate on the main terms which appear in this article is very extensive and continued by many participants involved. Their contribution is observed intensively by him across recent

decades and has its reflections in the author's previous publications (Konarski 2001, p. 27–69).

As for the term Central Europe (furthermore as CE – WK) its genesis is commonly coincided with newest history and geopolitics. As a separate and invented concept it is attached to Friedrich List, German nineteenth century economist (Altermatt 1988, p. 308–309). CE as a separate notion was revitalized after the Cold War has been over and currently is identified with four countries, namely Poland, Czechia, Slovakia and Hungary (known as a Visegrad group). There are also some speculations whether to include Slovenia and Lithuania into this space however such a view is shared on rather limited scale (Stefanowicz 1993, p. 65 and passim). Nevertheless this term still demonstrated popularity among citizens of these countries is also a result of their historically inherited complexes, namely lack of interest to be correlated with the Eastern Europe as an obsolete part the entire continent.

1. Ethnicity

The term *Ethnicity* derives from the Greek notion *ethnikos*, the adjective of *ethnos* and is referred to other terms as company, group, people or even nation (*Us and Them…* 1987, p. 19). This category introduction to social sciences goes back to the year 1953 and is connoted with an American sociologist, David Riesman (Glazer, Moynihan 1975, p. 13), however it is hard to choose just one commonly approved definition. Most researchers on the ethnicity refer to objective and subjective criteria of its identification, and do not additionally omit different contexts Thus Jerzy Nikitorowicz, a Polish pedagogist maintains that "(…) in most cases ethnicity is defined in the context of the group with common cultural traditions and sense of identity" (Nikitorowicz 2010, p. 25). The qualitative criteria matter as well. Two following opinions, namely: "At the heart of ethnicity is the feeling of being special" and "Distinctiveness and uniqueness are universally attributed to the ethnically different" reflect the synthesis of the research debate about ethnicity (*Us and Them…* 1987, p. 22, 21).

The term ethnicity is usually equivalent with an *ethnic group*. Thus Max Weber in his classic definition perceives an ethnic group as "(...) a human collectivity based on an assumption of common origin, real or imagined" (*Us and Them…* 1987, p. 20). It remains an inspiration for many other researchers in decades which followed to quote Ellis Cashmore who identifies ethnic group as

"(…) a self-conscious collection of people united, or closely related, by shared experiences" (Cashmore 1984, p. 85). Additionally the contributors to this debate are often interested to find mutual connections between ethnicity and national aspects. Thomas Spira does it through analysis of the structure of ethnicity and by making references to derivative and useful terms (Spira 2004) whereas Philip Payton places ethnicity within the Western European context and inherited experiences (Payton 1999).

Summing up the elements of vital importance for an ethnic group usually are: culture, especially language and religion; genealogy, including race and origin; special personality features and occupied territory. The significance of the above features are confirmed by many western researchers – however not only by them (Conversi 2004), and also by several Polish sociologists or political scientists, to quote here a.o.: Antonina Kłoskowska (1996, p. 19), Ewa Nowicka (1989, p. 44) or Andrzej Wierzbicki (2014, p. 19–26 and passim).

2. Nationalism

The term ethnicity remains in close connection with the national identity, which is – in political terms – pursued by the notion *nationalism*. The latter's origin goes back to the industrial revolution's epoch, becoming a politically oriented incarnation of a chronologically older term of national consciousness, also known as protonationalism (Hobsbawm 1990; Zientara 1985). However its first literary appearance sometimes is coincided with 1798 (Connor 1994, p. 98, 115).

Nationalism is usually perceived as ideology and expressed parallelly as a sociopolitical stand or form of behavior (Kellas 1991, p. 3–4; Kulesza 1996, p. 24). It is a term with enormous cognitive diversification and dynamism, and depending on the interpretation given by protagonists of manifold intellectual and political traditions.

The word *nation* is the basis for this term. Its semantic origin comes from Latin what is demonstrated by the verb *nasci, nascere* ("to be born"), and interpreted as "community of birth or origin", and as the noun *natio* ("birth", "nation", "people") (Kłoskowska 1996, p. 15; Kwaśniewski 1996, p. 59; *Us and Them…* 1987, p. 23), but also as "(…) ethnic community, tribe or nation" (Bromke 1995, p. 9). In last more than 200 years nationalism has grown to be

one of the most powerful integrative ideology and thus appearing independently on the class stratification. It has also become a real motivating force for individuals and large social groups in regard to politics, ethnicity and culture or even economy.

Nationalism does not have the same meaning if to place it within the cultural context. It appears as often provocative ideological phenomenon due to its structure and socio-political influence what is proved by manifold interpretations depending on spatially identified cultural habits. A definition once formulated by Hans Kohn is considered to be a model one for the upcoming decades. Kohn claims that nationalism is "(…) a state of mind, in which supreme loyalty of the individual is felt to be due the nation-state" (Kohn 1965, p. 9). For another classical thinker, Peter Sugar nationalism "(…) is an expression of group psychosis based on nationality" (Sugar 1997, p. 8). Tom Garvin, an Irish academician maintains that nationalism is "(…) a culture phenomenon with political consequences" (Garvin 1990, p. 21), and for Carlton Hayes it is "(…) fusion of patriotism with a consciousness of nationality" (*Us and Them…* 1987, p. 23). The latter divides nationalism into several periods starting from humanitarian nationalism of the Enlightenment Age, and continuing across Jacobinian nationalism of the French Revolution, then traditionalist, liberal and integral one (Altermatt 1998, p. 33). His typology may be combined with the idea of H. Kohn (and others) who perceives nationalism as two antagonistic concepts of political versus ethnic (or ethnic and linguistic) phenomena (Walicki 1982, p. 66–69; Walicki 1989, p. 4–7). The earlier is based on the theory of peoples' sovereignty, and linked to democracy development and is frequently called *western*. The latter, called *eastern,* is identified with backwardness, lack of democratic tradition and inferiority complex (Altermatt 1998, p. 82), what corresponds with the C. Hayes's above integral nationalism.

The quoted dichotomy goes along and in natural way with the general typology of nations. Nation is a flexible concept, which – due to the European intellectual traditions acknowledged by Jean Jacques Rousseau and Johann Gotfried Herder – refers to two basic dimensions: the political and ethnic (ethnocultural), hence the adopted parallel division on political and ethnic nations. This typology should be perceived as a result of problems arising from the divergence of state and ethnic boundaries within the European realities.

Where there is a long tradition of a state based on a particular nation, like in the Kingdom of England, France or Denmark, whose identity and independence was almost never questioned, nationhood, although based on an ethnic

identity (e.g. language or genealogy), acquired more or less political (equal rights on certain territory) overtones. Thus the concept of political nation refers in most cases to those entities with strong and long lasting tradition of independent statehood even in its dynastic understanding. Where the tradition of a state was interrupted (either as a result of foreign conquest such as in Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland or Serbia, or as a result of political fragmentation, such as in Germany and Italy), the awareness of a twofold dimension of nationality – political and ethnic – remained more alive. Thus the concept of ethnic nation refers to those entities with strong and long lasting tradition of separate culture existence, namely a language and/or religion and not a state (Krejči, Velímský 1981).

In regard to above considerations nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe would have a narrow, ethnically exclusive character and be a pejorative notion, while in the West the dominating one would be its broad, ethnically inclusive and semantically indifferent profile (Bromke 1995, p. 9–10). The tragic Balkan events of the 1990s seem to confirm it but on the other hand it seems to be an exaggeration as any negative stereotype.

Each ideology contains a set of social reality evaluations made due to the assumed axiology and also directives stemming from this axiology. Edward Shils underlines the expressive side of nationalism by stating that it "(…) takes form of movements and parties with real leaders and supporters. Nationalism has programs and platforms" (Shils 1996, p. 9). Thus I try to modify the popular and already mentioned division of nationalism into eastern and western ones by introducing two other basic approaches, namely: *pluralistic* and *monistic* (Konarski 2001, p. 66–69). In the first approach nationalism is perceived as a collection of a few idea orientations which are expressed by concrete political organizations or literary parties, and their actions, both ethnically inclusive and exclusive in character, directed at realization of the goals of nation's or a community related to it (Belgium, Finland, Ireland, also Catalonia and Scotland). In the second one, namely monistic, nationalism appears as the name of one-idea orientation, expressed by one or more political organizations or parties that are politically related one to another, and their actions, mainly ethnically exclusive, and which aim at realization of goals of communities defined as in the pluralistic approach (Poland and Ukraine, Croatia and Romania in the end of 19th and first three-four decades of 20th centuries) (emphasis by WK).

If to combine the both approaches above with earlier quoted authors the strategic and tactic aims of nationalism require to be formulated. A model

definition of nationalism by Hans Kohn is here a starting point again. There are two factors which attract attention: assessment and effective ones. The first one is expressed by "the supreme loyalty of an individual towards a 'nation-state", namely by individual activity of a person (or group) driven by nationalistic views. Thus the nation-state is here a strategic goal which is – for Norman Davies – a "(…) state in which prevailing majority of citizens are aware of common national identity and belong to the same culture" (Davies 1999, p. 863). There is a dispute about whether its appearance should be linked solely to modern era (19th – 20th centuries) or if we can reach back as far as the turn of 15th and 16th centuries (Tilly 1975). There is, however, no doubt that the idea of a nation-state was verbally formulated in the mid-19th century) by Italian lawyer Pasquale Stanislao Mancini (Waldenberg 2000, p. 37). Nation-state can be perceived as strategic aim of political activities based on nationalistic ideology. In case such ideology is linked to an existing state, the notion state nationalism is formulated as Charles Tilly does. If, however, nation-state is a postulated category, Tilly calls it *state-building nationalism* (Tilly 1997, p. 66). In reference to the latter it allows to underline tactical aims of nationalism. In some circumstances it can be assumed that chronologically closer aims – possible to be reached first – are structures which are not synonymous to fully sovereign statehoods, e.g. territorial autonomies. They are considered as stages on the way to reach fully sovereign state.

3. Politics

Politics is the most capacious term which connects those considered above. Metaphorically speaking this term is understood as an art of governance connected with the power's performing in peaceful and/or conflictual way (Heywood, 3–27; *Słownik politologii* 2008, p. 425–427). However in respect to the pluralistic circumstances which are linked to the four case studies below it may be defined as an activity which makes it possible to reconcile the interests of various social groups living at an area subject to one power, by granting them the access to the power proportionally to their importance for survival and well-being of the whole community (Crick 2004, p. 28). Thus Bernard Crick who is the author of such approach understands politics as a non-violence category (Crick 2004, p. 191). However, such approach narrows down the historically verified meaning of the term politics and omits the fact that the history of

mankind has shown very clearly that politics in the form of war is also politics. A classical approach to the latter opinion is traditionally identified with the Prussian general and writer, Carl P.G. von Clausevitz (Herberg-Rothe, Honning, Moran 2011).

The essence of politics is naturally linked to its effectiveness. Effective politics depends on the own goals fulfillment both by political and military means including the changing of the allies. Such an idea has been expressed in the form of famous axiom by Henry J. Temple, Viscount Palmerston, British Prime Minister twice. In reference to the British foreign policy he said: "We have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and these interests it is our duty to follow" (…) ("The New Indian Express" 2011; Kissinger 1996, p. 101). It may have its application in the considerations below.

4. Ethnopolitics

Ethnopolitics remains a semantical new construction in order to link ethnicity with political activities and it was popularized by Joseph Rothshild more than forty years ago. He defined it as a process of ethnicity's translation into political space. He perceived ethnopolitics with its "Ianus-like image" – constructive and destructive one, eligible to legitimate and delegitimate political systems of states, and stabilize or undermine their regimes and governments (Rothschild, passim). Due to another researcher, Rasma Karklins ethnopolitics is understood "(…) as a concept that refers to all types of politics involving ethnic entities" (Karklins 1994, p. 3). It has to be admitted this term has currently become popular as a research and explanatory category in almost entire world.

The Ianus-like image of erthnopolitics is confirmed neatly by John T. Ishiyama and Marijke Breuning who maintain that "(…) although ethnopolitics can be conflictual, it can also be cooperative. They also claim that "(…) the organizational expression of ethnopolitics is the ethnopolitical party" (Ishiyama, Breuning 1998, p. 4). However, I am aware it concerns more entities and not only political parties literally. As manifold examples confirm paramilitary aspect cannot be neglected here, to remind mostly known Irish Republican Army (IRA) (Konarski 2019; Moloney 2002) or Euskadi ta Azkatasuna (Basque Country and Freedom, ETA) (Ramirez, Sullivan 1987).

5. Selected amalgamations of ethnicity and nationalism as points of references for political traditions in Central Europe (CE) states – newest history perspective

In regard to the CE newest historical experiences in the process of ethnicity and nationalism amalgamation is identified with leading political personalities. Thus to a large extent the role of leader (frequently called a chief) remained there a cohesive factor for such an amalgamation what is repeated across generations (Stomma 2014, p. 320–326).

6.1. Poland

There are two overwhelming traditions of the above amalgamation in newest Polish political history which are recalled until now, namely: National Democracy movement and Sanification camp.

National Democracy (*Narodowa Demokracja*, *ND*), was established in 1887, during the partition of Poland period and since then it has been personified by its main ideologist, founder and long-lasting leader, Roman Dmowski. Due to the initial program points of ND future Poland was perceived as nationally homogeneous state, strategically pro-Russian and anti-German, and also anti-Semitic (Bromke 1967; Dmowski 1989; Zamoyski 1997, p. 329 and passim). The extreme wing of ND, namely the *National-Radical Camp* (*Obóz Narodowo-Radykalny, ONR*), established in 1934 approved the Italian fascism and German nazism, being extremely anti-Semitic and ethnically exclusive hence understanding of Polishness as a homogenous ethnopolitical idea (Rudnicki 1985). Thus the entire profile of ND (and derivative organizations) may be perceived as ethnically exclusive nationalism or a monistic one.

Sanification (*Sanacja*) or *Piłsudskities (Piłsudczycy)* was the political camp, and not just a separate political party formed by its main inspirer and leader, Józef Piłsudski, named in this way after the military coup d'Etat in May 1926 (Garlicki 2017; Zamoyski 1997). In its initial stage – at the end of WWI – the program of Piłsudski was focused around independent Poland as multicultural and anti-Russian federation. In the years ahead the Sanification camp developed its program points towards anti-minorities image and anti-Soviet, and pursued towards creating then Second Polish Republic as regional power.

Such efforts may be called a state nationalism – in reference to one above mentioned notion of C. Tilly – however endorsed by ethnically inclusivist idea of powerful Poland. Due to the typology formulated by me it may be closer to the pluralistic than monistic concept of nationalism however oriented towards step by step polonization of non-Polish sections of the society.

Within the largest Polish political parties today both leading traditions of nationalism, namely one of ND and second Piłsudskities' are combined in different proportions by *Law and Justice* (*Prawo i Sprawiedliwość*) party of Jarosław Kaczyński, in existence since 2001 (http://pis.org.pl/partia/prawo-i-sprawiedliwosc, access: 17.12.2020). Its ideological image is antiliberal, conservative in terms of morality and socially leftist. However in terms of its ethnic image this party is ethnically exclusive and endorsing Catholicism. It used to be a governing party in 2005–2007 and since 2015 it rules again.

Until the end of the first decade of the XXI century more or less ethnically exclusive nationalistic profile was maintained by *League of Polish Families* (*Liga Polskich Rodzin, LPR*) (https://wiadomosci.wp.pl/liga-polskich-rodzin-6358575114397825c, access: 20.12.2020). Established in 2001 remained a moderate version of prewar ND, but since the end of first decade of XXI century it began to decline. Now it is without political significance.

In recent years the image as such remeined chronologically identified with *National Movement* (*Ruch Narodowy, RN*) established in 2012 as a common initiative of radical nationalistic traditionalists, close to the pre-war ONR. RN adopted an anti-German, panslavic and literally not anti-Russian, and definitely anti-EU position. In 2019 it entered a new political structure of very similar ideological orientation called *Confederation Freedom and Independence* (Konfederacja Wolność i Niepodległość), commonly known under the abbreviation *Confederation* (Konfederacja) (https://wiadomosci.onet.pl/kraj/konfederacja-partia-konfederacja-wolnosc-i-niepodleglosc/jxe02gj, access: 20.12.2020). Currently it is smallest but politically very active fraction within the first chamber – Sejm – of Polish Parliament.

6.2. Czechoslovakia during the interwar period and currently Czechia

The interwar Czechoslovakia was the only example of the parliamentary democracy system in Central Europe during 1918–1938 period (Korbel 1977;

Tomaszewski 1997). It was "filled in" by multiparty system (like in Poland until 1926) which effectively functioned for slightly less than twenty years. The then existing political parties' continued their competition by applying also ideological approaches and were identified with some ambitious political leaders. However the democratic profile of the first Czechoslovak Republic did not entirely exclude ethnonational context from the political realities of this state. It was illustrated by generally two significant political traditions personified by their representative heroes although their significance was of much difference.

The first and prevailing one was represented by Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk – political rationalist, leader of *Progressive Party* (*Česká Strana Pokroková*) in the years 1900–1918 and president of Czechoslovakia since 1918 until 1935 (Gruchała 1996). However he was not just the elected symbol of the state and leader of his own camp. His role was of much larger significance than just the leading politician. The title *Father of the statehood* or *the Republic* has been recalled even after many years since his death, including some of my academic Czech colleagues. Then Czechoslovakia consisted of three large ethnies, namely Czechs, Germans and Slovaks and four smaller: Hungarians, Polish, Ruthenians and Gypsies. Masaryk was the inventor of the concept of *czechoslovakizm* – a state-building idea invented by him as functional towards constructing ethnonational cohesiveness of the citizens of the Republic. It was in fact a deliberate idea to provide the supremacy position for Czechs at the cost of Slovaks in particular (Gruchała 1996, p. 165; Korbel 1977, p. 94–96). Therefore the Masaryk's concept may be called as Ianus-like ethnopolitical endeavor. From the viewpoint of officially adopted state doctrine it was just a confirmation of the pluralistic understanding of nationalism. However from the other side it may be the illustration of the state nationalism concept with Czechs as leading ethnia there and then accompanied by the enmity towards Hungarians and Poles. However his conciliatory or at least neutral approach towards Sudeten German numerous minority did not discourage the latter from anti-state activities, especially after Adolf Hitler has got the power in Germany (Burks 1960, p. 131–134). This ethnonational entity mobilization finally led to the creation – by Konrad Henlein in April 1935 – the *Sudeten Germans Party* (*Sudetendeutsche Partei* or *Sudetoněmecká strana*). It became a successor of the *Front of the Sudeten German Homeland* (*Sudetendeutsche Heimatfront*) (Korbel 1977, 119–120 and passim). Influenced by Nazi ideology and Pan-germanism it represented ethnically exclusive political profile and ultimately undermined the independence of Czechoslovakia by pursuing to its territorial partition.

The unequal treatment of the mentioned above ethnies by Czechoslovak Republic authorities – closely linked to the idea of czechoslovakizm – has become a practical confirmation of the Ernest Gellner's concept of nationalism as an ideology which creates the nation, and not a vice versa (Gellner 1992, p. 64, 72–73).

Another political and to lesser extent popular tradition in the pre-war Czechoslovakia was personalized by Karel Kramař, panslavist and a leader of *Czechoslovak National Democracy* (*Československá národní demokracie*). This right-wing party was oriented on the endorsement of newly established state and underlined the pre-revolutionary Russia's role, i.e. her conservative image as a potential unifier of Slavs at the cost of Austria-Hungary then (Eberhardt 2016; Tomaszewski 1997, p. 53). Due to the fact Kramař and his ideas have always been under the shadow of Masaryk's thought and political position the revitalization of the former panslavic orientation as a specific ethnonationalism across boundaries was unsuccessful. It is improper to say such panslavic perception was continued during the Communists rule since 1948 however this party pro-Soviet profile may be called as a modified ideological version of previous pro-Russian orientation in new political circumstances (Taborsky 1961).

In the realities of contemporary Czechia (since 1993) rather more radical ethnonational approaches (if not ethnonationalist) are demonstrated not by any party on pan-national scale but only by some minor entities and of temporary existence. The ethnically exclusive approach or monistic type of nationalism, e.g. hatred towards Roma (and some other minorities, eg. Poles) has been in use by only a few political parties. They were in particular, successively:
1. *Republicans of Miroslav Sladek* (*Republikáni Miroslava Sladká*) and
2. *National Party* (*Národní strana*) – both active until the end of first decade of XXI century,
3. *Workers' Party* (*Dělnická strana) and*
4. *Freedom and Direct Democracy (Svoboda a přímá demokracie)* – a right-wing populist party gaining 10,6 % of votes in the parliamentary elections in 2017.

It was formed in 2015 by senator Tomio Okamura – racially inspired populist, and formerly leader of the similar profile party *Dawn of Direct Democracy* (*Úsvit přímé demokracie*) (https://bridge.georgetown.edu/research/factsheet--freedom-and-direct-democracy-svoboda-a-prima-demokracie-spd/, access: 18.12.2020).

6.3. Slovakia as a part of both Czechoslovak Republics

In the newest history period the ethnonational parties' profiles were demonstrated by especially two political entities in (then non sovereign) Slovakia. The first one was *Slovak National Party* (*Slovenská národná strana*), functioning in 1871–1938 – conservative, legalistic and loyalist towards Austria-Hungary. However the ethnically exclusive profile was reflected by *Slovak People's Party* (*Slovenská ľudová strana)*, active in 1906–1945 (under changing names) led by rev. Andrej Hlinka. The latter party is identified across many decades as firstly anti-Hungarian and then anti-Czechoslovak (Korbel 1977, 91, 93 and further; Lettrich 1956).

However such tendencies among Slovaks in the pre-war Czechoslovakia have been politically ineffective for some years but the Hlinka's party activities remained a threat for the internal stability of this state. The frequent ethnonational issues present in the history of Slovakia as a part of Czechoslovakia firstly and also during the WWII – being a satellite pro-Nazi state – were following:

1. reluctance/hostility towards any centralistic tendencies represented by the government in Prague;
2. fear of Hungarian revisionism in the interwar period;
3. anti-semitism of Slovak State during WWII; and consequently
4. deeply rooted interethnic cleavages, especially with respect to the Hungarian minority and the Roma people since 1993 either.

6.4. Slovakia since 1993

Since 1993 the extreme appearance of ethnonational aspects in the Slovak parties' profile are demonstrated in the activities of especially three of them, namely:

1. *People's Party – Movement for a Democratic Slovakia* (*Ľudová strana – Hnutie za demokratické Slovensko*), active in 1991–2014 – conservative, nationalistic and populist, anti-Hungarian and anti-Roma; (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/People%27s_Party_%E2%80%93_Movement_for_a_Democratic_Slovakia , access: 18.12.2020);

2. *Slovak National Party*, reestablished in 1989 – populist radical right, anti-Hungarian & anti-Roma (http://www.ceeidentity.eu/database/manifestoes-coun/slovak-national, access: 20.12.2020); and

3. *Kotlebists – People's Party Our Slovakia* (*Kotlebovci – Ľudová strana Naše Slovensko*) known under this name since 2019, formerly acting a.o. as *People's Party Our Slovakia (Ľudová strana Naše Slovensko)* – far-right, neo-nazi, xenophobic, anti-Hungarian, anti-Roma and anti-NATO (http://www.ceeidentity.eu/database/manifestoescoun/peoples-party, https://sk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kotlebovci_%E2%80%93_%C4%BDudov%C3%A1_strana_Na%C5%A1e_Slovensko, access: 18.12.2020).

It has to be noticed that only the first party among three mentioned above has been a national scale governing one – however for not very long period, whereas two other belong to territorially limited in their support political entities.

6.5. Hungary in the twentieth century and currently

Recollections of the Hungary's powerful status during the Austro-Hungarian period, namely until 1918 created the basis for the authoritarian-like system of governance personified by admiral Miklós Horthy (Kochanowski 1997). The regent of the Kingdom of Hungary – his officially adopted position – was accepted by prevailing circles of the society after WWI has been over. Such a system remained an endorsement for the interwar Hungarian state revisionism and a hostile attitude towards neighboring states. Thus the Hungarian ethnic nationalism of the interwar period was stimulated by governing forces of the authoritarian profile. In fact it was an image of monistic concept of state nationalism.

The political regime of Horthy was not in fact a most radical representative of ethnopolitical extremism in the Hungarian XX century history. This position has been assigned to *Arrow Cross Party* (*Nyilaskeresztes Párt – Hungarista Mozgalom*), established in 1935 as *Party of National Will*, and reconstructed in 1937. Since the beginning it represented extremely nationalistic, anti-Communist & anti-Semitic profile, hence it was very often called as a fascist-like movement in then Hungary (Kochanowski 1997, p. 92–93 and passim).

Hungarian revisionism was hibernated during the Communist rule after WW II, and revitalised temporarily during the premiership of József Antall (1990–1993). The latter tendency was continued further, namely during the first (1998–2002) and second (since 2010) premiership of Viktor Orbán, leader of Fidesz – Hungarian Citizens' Union (Fidesz – Magyar Polgári Szövetség). This name was adopted in 2003 but formerly – since 1988 – it appeared as Fidesz – Hungarian Citizens' Party (Fidesz – Magyar Polgári Párt). Both structures represented conservative, nationalistic, populist & anti-Roma profile (https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fidesz, access: 23.12.2020).

More extreme ethnonational political profile than Fidesz is represented by Jobbik the Movement for a Better Hungary (Jobbik Magyarországért Mozgalom), established in 2002 as the Right-Wing Youth Association (Jobboldali Ifjúsági Közösség – thus JOBBIK) – radical nationalist, especially anti-Roma, ani-Semitic, called also homophobic, racist and/or neo-nazi. In 2018 due to internal cleavages the party began its fragmentation which resulted in the formation of Our House Movement (Mi Hazánk Mozgalom) sectional organization of even more extreme profile (https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jobbik, access: 23.12.2020).

Conclusion

The amalgamation of ethnicity, nationalism and politics in Central Europe is inherited and still demonstrated however its image is diversified in terms of political attractiveness and support from the voters. In reference to four states identified with this region the enquiries oriented towards combination between the ethnonational structure of their societies and newest historical experiences are cognitively inspired. The above factor is literally and strongly recalled and revitalized in the political realities of Hungary and Slovakia in particular, whereas it has moderate impact in Poland and Czechia. Thus the hereby considerations may serve as not only the author's contribution to the debate on ethnonational traditions' inheritance across epochs and in states mentioned above. It has also a practical meaning for generally understood public sphere, including both groups, namely spectators and literally involved participants of political activeness.

The appearance and continuity of the above amalgamation is also coincided with the rising issue of populism which is different in regard to its social,

economic and ethnic basis as well as in terms of its electoral support. Thus in Central Europe populism may be currently rooted not only in socio-economic differences but also ethnonational – ethnically exclusive traditions – in particular. The considerations presented here may prove the latter and serve as a an encouragement for further research about populism as a fertile focusing research subject.

Bibliography

Printed books and articles

Altermatt U. (1998), *Sarajewo przestrzega. Etnonacjonalizm w Europie* (*Das Fanal von Sarajevo. Ethnonationalismus in Europa*), Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków.

Bromke A. (1995), *Nacjonalizm we współczesnym świecie (Nationalism in Contemporary World),* (in:) Helnarski S. (red.) *Nacjonalizm. Konflikty narodowościowe w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej* (*Nationalism. Nationalities' Conflicts in Central-Eastern Europe*), Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.

Bromke A. (1967), *Poland's Politics. Idealism versus Realism*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass.).

Burks R.V. (1961), *The Dynamics of Communism in Eastern Europe*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Cashmore E. (1984), *Ethnicity,* (in:) Cashmore E. (Ed.), *Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations*, Routledge and Kegan Paul. London.

Connor W. (1994), *Ethnonationalism. The Quest for Understanding*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Conversi D. (Ed.) (2004), *Ethnonationalism in the Contemporary World. Walker Connor and the Study of Nationalism*, Routledge, London-New York.

Crick B. (2004), *W obronie polityki* (*In Defence of Politics*), Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

Davies N. (1999), *Europa. Rozprawa historyka z historią,* Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków.

Dmowski R. (1989), *Polityka polska i odbudowanie państwa,* Vol. 1 & 2, Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, Warszawa.

Eberhardt P. (2016), *Koncepcja Rzeszy Słowiańskiej według Karela Kramářa,* „Przegląd Geopolityczny", No. 18.

Garlicki A. (2017), *Józef Piłsudski 1867-1935*, Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak, Kraków.

Garvin T. (1990), *The Return of History. Collective Myths and Modern Nationalisms*, "The Irish Review", No. 9.

Gellner E. (1992), *Narody i nacjonalizm* (*Nations and Nationalism*), Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa.

Glazer N., Moynihan D.P. (1975), *Introduction,* (in:) Glazer N., Moynihan D.P. (Eds.), *Ethnicity. Theory and Experience*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass.).

Herberg-Rothe, A., Honning, J.W., Moran, D. (Eds.) (2011), *Clausewitz. The State and War*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Sttutgart.

Hobsbawm E. (1990), *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ishiyama J.T., Breuning M. (1998), *Ethnopolitics in the New Europe*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder (Co.)-London.

Karklins R. (1994), *Ethnopolitics and Transition to Democracy. The Collapse of the USSR and Latvia,* The Woodrow Wilson Center Press-The Johns Hopkins University Press, Washington-Baltimore-London.

Kellas J.G. (1991), *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, Palgrave, London.

Kissinger H.A. (1996), *Dyplomacja* (*Diplomacy*), Philip Wilson, Warszawa.

Kłoskowska A. (1996), *Kultury narodowe u korzeni* (*National Cultures in their Roots*), Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

Kochanowski J. (1997), *Węgry. Od ugody do ugody*, Wydawnictwo Trio, Warszawa.

Kohn H. (1965), *Nationalism. Its Meaning and History*): Van Nostrand*,* Princeton (New Jersey).

Konarski W. (2001), *Pragmatycy i idealiści. Rodowód, typologia i ewolucja ugrupowań politycznych nacjonalizmu irlandzkiego w XX wieku* (*Pragmatists and Idealists. The Origin, Typology and Evolution of the Political Parties in the 20th Century Irish Nationalism*), ASPRA-JR, Pułtusk – Warszawa.

Konarski W. (2019), *Partyzanci, doktrynerzy, terroryści. Chronologiczne studium fenomenu Irlandzkiej Armii Republikańskiej* (*Partisans, Doctrinaires, Terrorists. Chronological Study of the Irish Republican Army Phenomenon*), Akademia Finansów i Biznesu Vistula, Warszawa.

Korbel J. (1977), *Twentieth-Century Czechoslovakia. The Meanings of Its History*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Krejči J., Velímský V. (1981), *Ethnic and Political Nations in Europe*, Croom Helm, London.

Kulesza W.T. (1996), *Ideologie naszych czasów* (*Ideologies of Our Times)*, Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, Warszawa.

Kwaśniewski K. (1996), *O nacjonalizmie inaczej* (*On Nationalism in a Different Way*), „Sprawy Narodowościowe. Seria nowa", Vol. V, Issue 1(8).

Lettrich J. (1956), *History of Modern Slovakia*, Atlantic Press, London.

Moloney E. (2002), *A Secret History of the IRA,* Allen Lane-The Penguin Press, London.

Nikitorowicz J. (2010), *Grupy etniczne w wielokulturowym świecie* (*Ethnic Groups in Multicultural World*), Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Sopot.

Nowicka E. (1989), *Etniczność a sytuacja mniejszościowa* (*Ethnicity versus Minority Situation*), „Przegląd Polonijny", Vol. 15, No. 1.

Payton P. (1999), *Ethnicity in Western Europe Today,* (in:) Cordell K. (Ed.), *Ethnicity and Democratisation in the New Europe*, Routledge, London-New York.

Ramirez J.M., Sullivan B. (1987), *The Basque Conflict,* (in:) Boucher J., Landis D., Clark K.A. (Eds.), *Ethnic Conflict. International Perspectives*, Sage Publications, London-New Delhi.

Rothschild J. (1981), *Ethnopolitics. A Conceptual Framework*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Rudnicki S. (1985), *Obóz Narodowo-Radykalny. Geneza i działalność* (*National-Radical Camp. Genesis and Activity*), Czytelnik, Warszawa.

Shils E. (1996), *Naród, narodowość i nacjonalizm a społeczeństwo obywatelskie* (*Nation, Nationality and Nationalism versus Civic Society*), "Sprawy Narodowościowe. Seria nowa" Vol. V, Issue 1(8).

Słownik politologii (2008), Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN SA, Warszawa.

Spira T. (2004), *Ethnicity and Nationality. The Twin Matrices of Nationalism,* (in:) Conversi D. (Ed.), *Ethnonationalism in the Contemporary World. Walker Connor and the Study of Nationalism,* Routledge, London-New York.

Stefanowicz J. (1993), *Rzeczypospolitej pole bezpieczeństwa* (*The Polish Republic's Security Space*), Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.

Stomma L. (2014), *Polskie złudzenia narodowe* (*Polish National Illusions*), Wydawnictwo Iskry, Warszawa.

Sugar P.F. (1997), *Government and Minorities in Austria-Hungary – Different Policies with the Same Result,* "Der Donauraum", No ½.

Szacki J. (1983), *Historia myśli socjologicznej* (*History of Sociological Thought*), Vol. 1, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa.

Taborsky E. (1961), *Communism in Czechoslovakia, 1948-1960*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Tilly C. (Ed.) (1975), *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Tilly C. (1997), *Rewolucje europejskie. 1492-1992* (*The European Revolution, 1492–1992*) Wydawnictwo Krąg – Oficyna Wydawnicza Wolumen, Warszawa.

Tomaszewski J. (1997), *Czechosłowacja* (*Czechoslovakia*), Wydawnictwo Trio, Warszawa.

Us and Them. The Psychology of Ethnonationalism (1987), Report No. 123. Formulated by the Committee on International Relations – Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Brunner/Mazell, New York.

Waldenberg M. (2000), *Narody zależne i mniejszości narodowe w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej. Dzieje konfliktów i idei* (*Dependent Nations and National Minorities in Central-Eastern Europe: History of Conflicts and Ideas*), Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

Walicki A. (1982), *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism. The Case of Poland*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Walicki A. (1989), *The Enlightenment and the Birth of Modern Nationhood. Polish Political Thought from Noble Republicanism to Tadeusz Kościuszko*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame (Indiana).

Wierzbicki A. (2014), *Etniczność i narody w Europie i Azji Centralnej. Perspektywa teoretyczna i egzemplifikacyjna* (*Ethnicity and Nations in Europe and Central Asia. Theoretical and Exemplifying Perspective*), Wydział Dziennikarstwa i Nauk Politycznych – Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa.

Zamoyski A. (1997), *The Polish Way. A Thousand-year History of the Poles and Their Culture*, John Murray, London.

Zientara B. (1985), *Świt narodów europejskich. Powstawanie świadomości narodowej na obszarze Europy post-karolińskiej* (*The Dawn of European Nations. Birth of National Awareness in the post-Carolinian Europe Area*), Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, Warszawa.

Internet materials

https://bridge.georgetown.edu/research/factsheet-freedom-and-direct-democracy-svoboda-a-prima-demokracie-spd/ [dostęp: 20.06.2021].

https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fidesz [dostęp: 20.06.2021].

https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jobbik [dostęp: 20.06.2021].

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/People%27s_Party_%E2%80%93_Movement_for_a_Democratic_Slovakia [dostęp: 20.06.2021].

http://newindianexpress.com/magazine/voices/article227499. ece [dostęp: 20.06.2021].

http://pis.org.pl/partia/prawo-i-sprawiedliwosc [dostęp: 20.06.2021].

https://wiadomosci.onet.pl/kraj/konfederacja-partia-konfederacja-wolnosc-
    i-niepodleglosc/jxe02gj [dostęp: 20.06.2021].
https://wiadomosci.wp.pl/liga-polskich-rodzin-6358575114397825c
    [dostęp: 20.06.2021].
https://sk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kotlebovci_%E2%80%93_%C4%BDudov%C3%A1_
    strana_Na%C5%A1e_Slovensko [dostęp: 20.06.2021].
http://www.ceeidentity.eu/database/manifestoescoun/peoples-party
    [dostęp: 20.06.2021].

Afiliacja: **dr hab. Wawrzyniec Konarski**
             Akademia Finansów i Biznesu Vistula
             ul. Stokłosy 3
             02-787 Warszawa
             e-mail: w.konarski@vistula.edu.pl