FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SCIENCES OF THE COMENIUS UNIVERSITY IN BRATISLAVA

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE FAR RIGHT IN SLOVAKIA AND ITS RHETORIC OF EMOTIONS

(Working Paper #1 for the Jean Monnet Project EUPOLSOC)

Bratislava 2019

by

Mgr. Anton Gazarek

INTRODUCTION

This paper elaborates a new approach in studying far right political parties. It looks at the election manifestos of two far right political parties in Slovakia. In this exploratory research I intend to discover new connections between emotions and far-right ideology. This is a *terra incognita* in the field of far-right research. I apply mixed (qualitative and quantitative) content analysis in order to determine what emotions are these parties using to attract their voters. The research question is: How do the far-right political parties in Slovakia facilitate emotions in their political manifestos?

The firstsection deals with the theoretical background regarding the far right in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, the section clarifies the terms such as "far right," "radical right," "extreme right," "fascism and "right-wing extremism" in the academic debate. It also conceptualizes the terms the radical right, the extreme right and the far right. Then it defines variables according to which a far-right party is discernible. Last, but not least, the section looks at the state of academic discourse on the topic of emotions in the far right and brings conceptual innovation of binary relations of emotions.

The second section is dedicated to determiningif the two parties which are considered to be far right are indeed far-right parties. In Slovakia there are two such parties: 1) the newly founded Kotleba – People's Party Our Slovakia (Kotleba – Ľudová strana Naše Slovensko, or ĽSNS) and 2) the Slovak National Party (Slovenská národná strana, further SNS), which has a long tradition in post-communist Slovakia.The Slovak media and politicians denounce ĽSNS as being extremist or even fascist. ĽSNS vehemently dismisses these claims. Thus, this raises the question is it really an extreme right party and does it belong to what Cas Mudde (2000) calls "extreme right party family"? There has not been agreement among scholars on if SNS is an extremist (Mudde,2005), radical (Kupka, et al. 2009) or mainstream nationalist party (Mesežnikov, 2011). For the clarification of this inconsistency I will use Cas Mudde's (2000) categorization of what he calls the extreme right, which I enriched with an important feature of populism, which Mudde (2007) himself acknowledged that he missed in his categorization.

The third and the last section uses a mixed (qualitative and quantitative) approach of content analysis to decipher the emotions used in election programs of ĽSNS and SNS.

1.1 CONCEPTUALIZATION: TERMINOLOGY OF FAR RIGHT

Slovak media and politicians designate Kotleba - People's Party Our Slovakia (ĽSNS) either as a (right-wing) extremist or a fascist party. However, the scope of terms used in academic literature describing the phenomenon of far right in Europe is much broader. Slovak national party (SNS) is perceived to be a mainstream nationalist party (Mesežnikov 2011).

Mudde (2007) tries to clarify the terminology for analyzing the far right. He dedicates a whole section to conceptualization of the term and he points out that the academic literature uses a plethora of terms such as "extreme right, far right, radical right, right, radical right-wing populism, national populism, xenophobic populism, fascism, nativism*"* (p. 11-12) and more.

After researching definitions of fascism I realized that this term is really difficult to grasp. For Kevin Passmore current far right parties represent a modern form of fascism (Passmore 2014, p. 90). Accordint to Walter Laqueur, the goal of modern far right parties is to clear the country of the immigrants and that shall resolve problems with unemployment, criminality and multiculturalism (Laqueuer 1997, p. 132). The meaning of fascism varies from a simple synonym for "bully" as George Orwell wrote in his essay "Politics and the English language." Orwell further claims:, "The word fascism has now no meaning except in so far as it signifies 'something not desirable'"(Orwell, 1956). Then the meaning of fascism drifts further through the Foucault's criticism that the term fascism has been abused to insult others (Foucault, n.d. in Chow, 1995). Deleuze and Guattari (2000) explicate "fascism is in us all" as they put it, "in our heads and in our everyday behaviour, the fascism that causes us to love power, to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us" (p. xiii). These definitions however do not help a researcher to grasp the definition of fascism. Roger Griffin (2000, p. 14) delivers what he calls a "new consensus" on the meaning of fascism:

> Fascism is a genus of modern politics which aspires to bring about a total revolution in the political and social culture of a particular national or ethnic community. While extremely heterogeneous in the specific ideology of its many permutations, in its social support, in the form of organization it adopts as an anti-systemic movement, and in the type of political system, regime, or homeland it aims to create, generic fascism draws its internal cohesion and affective driving force from a core myth that a period of perceived decadence and degeneracy is imminently or eventually to give way to one of rebirth and rejuvenation in a post- liberal new

order. (Griffin)

Nevertheless, it is not my intention to drown in the fluidity of the term fascism, and even the Griffin's "new consensus" definition recognizes that in current academic debate it is highly problematic to specify what fascism means. Therefore, I have decided to avoid the term fascism.

Berndt Hagtvet (1994) uses the term right-wing extremism. He summarizes right-wing extremism in nine main points. Firstly, right-wing extremists "reject existing forms of representative government and the liberal democratic values" (p. 241) mocking values and advents of liberal democracy. Secondly, right-wing extremists are "populist." They are successful at pointing out current problems of society, they say what crowds want to hear, bringing no real solutions however. Thirdly, right-wing extremists are nationalist. Seeing their own nation as the only one to have right to occupy the territory of the national state. Fourthly, "right-wing groups are exclusive…ethno-centric which often assumes racist expression" (Hagtvet, 1994, p. 242). The focal point of their hateful attention includes Jews, immigrants, homosexuals, ethnic minorities and all parts of societies which bear some form of otherness. Fifthly, the prevalent view of the current society as rotten and decadent which can be resolved only by keeping traditional norms, ethnic and cultural purity and strict hierarchical order. Sixthly, the right-wing groups stress the importance of military discipline. They are advocates of the gun-rights and they want to militarize society. Seventhly, right-wing extremism do not oppose violence, quite the opposite, they see violence as "creative, even a cleansing act". Eightly, right-wing groups are against both liberalism and communism. Liberalism represented by liberal democracies, which allow for international capital (often supposedly Jewish) to control states and nations. Communism calling for equality across nations, thus taking the national sentiment away from people. Lastly, right-wing extremist economic policy includes corporatism, the role of a strong state, which a intervenes heavily in the economy and engages in central planning (Hagtvet, 1994, p. 242). Although fascism and right-wing extremism share a lot of features and overlap in many aspects, Hagtvet (1994) findsan important difference between the fascism of 1930s and current right-wing extremism, "one central fascist feature is conspicuously absent from the contemporary list of right-wing characteristics: an expansionist foreign policy" (p. 244). Even if Hagtvet's characterization of extreme right is a quite concrete, he does not put the nine points to an empirical test.

Michael Minkenberg (2017) uses the term radical right. He sees the radical right as a "collective actor with an ideology, the core element of which consists in a myth of homogeneous nation, a romantic and populist ultranationalism". The ideology of the radical

right is not directly anti-democratic such as fascism, nevertheless it stands on the very edge of liberal democratic political spectrum. It radicalizes the criteria of the "we group" (nation). The issue of who should be included and excluded from society depends on criteria such as "ethnicity, religion and/or gender" (p. 144). In Minkenberg's view, the radical right is not directly against the democratic system, which confirms the view of such scholars as Kupka (2009), Mesežnikov (2011) and Kopeček 2007). In defining the radical right, Minkenberg (2017) proclaims, "this term can best capture various actors on the far right in all parts of (democratic) Europe, covering party actors, as well as non-party or movement-type actors"(p.9). In his viewradical right is a broad term, which he uses for placing the radical right on the spectrum of the left-right division.

For the purpose of further analysis, I have chosen to opt for the Cas Mudde's (2000) definition of the extreme right: "the concept of right-wing [Mudde uses right-wing extremism and extreme right interchangeably] extremism is usually defined as a political ideology composed of a number of different features." (p. 178). Mudde (2000) claims there are seven main variables which characterize extreme right parties. First, **"nationalism"** in the sense that state should be mono-cultural, it should come to internal "congruence of state [political unit] and nation [cultural unit]", meaning that only the members of the nation should live within the borders of the state, what he also calls an "internal homogenization". All the foreigners should either "assimilate or repatriate". The second characteristic of the extreme right is **"exclusionism"**. Some parties accept the European meta-culture, they believe that people are rooted in their ethnic origins. Therefore, Europeans can integrate, while other foreigners should return the state of their origin. Racism and anti-Semitism is an internal feature of exclusionism. The third characteristic is "**xenophobia"**: everything that is 'alien' is seen as negative (ethnic communities, homosexuals). Concerning xenophobia, the biggest bogey is immigration (because of alleged competition for jobs, rising crime, moral decay etc.). European integration is perceived as a threat, eliminating sovereignty of the state. Under xenophobia Mudde also includes anti-Americanism, as the USA is seen as an imperial power. Fourth, the "**strong state"** puts emphasis on "law and order", including a stronger role for the police and army. However, Mudde recognizes that there are no signs of militarism among the extreme right and these parties consider NATO membership to be the "lesser evil". The fifth chacteristic is "**welfare chauvinism"**, which is connected to socio-economic policy. Social benefits should be dedicated foremost, if not only, to "their own people". It stresses the importance of national agricultural production and the protection of "their own" small businesses against multinational corporations. Sixth, "**traditional ethics"**, deals with the purported "moral decay" as a part of

the "international conspiracy". The traditional nuclear family stands in the core of society. The family consists of one man and one woman with many children. They reject abortions, rights for homosexuals and divorce. The woman is seen mostly as a mother. These parties base themselves on the "European and Christian tradition"; however, they refute institutionalized Christianity in the form of the Church, seeing it as being "degenerated, left-wing and anti-national". Last, the seventh characteristic is **"revisionism"** (p. 169 – 176), which is mostly present in Germany and means condoning (forgiving) the collaborating German soldiers. Mudde (2000) acknowledges that to speak of right-wing extremism it is not required that all the characteristics need be present, but there should be a combination of some of these features. (p. 178). Based on these seven criteria, I will now evaluate if the Slovak ĽSNS fall under what Mudde calls the "extreme right party family".

In a later text, Mudde (2007, p. 22-23) revised his definition of the *extreme right*. He even changed the term from *extreme right* to *populist radical right*. The new definition of *populist radical right* bears three core features: "nativism, authoritarianism and populism". Nativism is an ideology, according to which the state should be inhabited only by members of the nation – "native group". Non-natives are considered to be threatening to the state and its culture. Furthermore, Mudde (2007) elaborates that nativism combines nationalism and xenophobia. Secondly, authoritarianism is supports a "strictly ordered society, in which infringements of authority are to be punished severely." Under the authoritarianism he includes *law and order*. Authoritarianism does not necessarily mean opposition to the democratic system, but it also does not require it. The third key feature is populism. Mudde (2007) defines populism as the division of two inherently antagonistic groups: "the pure people" and "the corrupt elite". Nothing is more important than will of the people, "general will", not even human rights or constitution guarantees.

However, in his later text, Mudde left out some of his previous features, such as exclusionism. In my view, this term could be also added under the nativism. He also left out the **strong state**, which could be filed under authoritarianism. As for welfare chauvinism, it "can be understood as a nativist vision of the economy" and he does not consider it of utmost importance, as the economic policy does not belong to the ideological core of the populist radical right. Furthermore, traditional ethics and revisionism were left out in his later text without any further explanation.Nonetheless, Mudde (Mudde,2007) added an important feature of populism to his definition: "populism was disregarded in the content analysis. In retrospect this was an unfortunate decision, based largely on my too limited knowledge of the broader literature of populism at the time." (p. 21). This is certainly a valid realization, as populism

certainly is an integral part of far-right ideology. I believe that Mudde failed to recognize that his comparative study of 5 western European parties published in 2000 was indeed a study of extreme right parties, whereas the comparative study of 2007 is more overarching as it considers far right parties in 34 countries of the European continent.

There is a difference between the radical right and extreme right, even though these terms are sometimes used interchangeably. Mesežnikov (2011) distinguishes between the radical right and the extreme right. The radical right bears a lot of similar features with the extreme right. The difference lies in its position towards liberal democracy. Whereas the radical right approves of the liberal democratic system, the extreme right is anti-systemic. (p.14). Mareš (2003), Charvát (2007) and Kopeček (2007) also see extremism as being opposed to liberal democracy, anti-parliamentary and counter-constitutionalist goals. Meanwhile, radicalism reflects a tendency which does not necessarily need to be connected with anti-democratic, right-wing populist, or right-wing authoritarian parties.(in Kupka et. al, 2009, p. 18).

Therefore, what Mudde (2007) calls *populist radical right* is actually a larger family of the far right and the extreme right is a subgroup of this family. Hence, I would not dismiss Mudde's (2000) categorization of "extreme right party family" as such, instead I will treat it as a valid theoretical model for identifying and categorizing of extreme right, although the feature of populism could be indeed added to Mudde's (2000) definition.

According to Kupka et. al (2009), radicalism is mostly defined as set of political attitudes which do not lead to the elimination of the democratic political system and move within constitutional limits, although they reach its edge. It is important to bear in mind that there is no clear-cut boundary between radicalism and extremism. Political parties or other organizations can communicate radical stances on the outside, but can communicate completely extremist goals on the inside. For this reason, Kupka opts for the term "far right."

Similarly, David Art (2011) adopts the term far right "as an umbrella term for any political party, voluntary association, or extraparliamentary movement that differentiates itself from the mainstream right" (p. 10). Even though he realizes that the term can be "potentially misleading," he decided to embrace it because of its wide usage.

Based on the literature overview above, I embrace the term far right as the overarching term for the political parties, movements and organizations that includes the radical right and extreme right. The radical right as an ideology standing on the far right of the democratic political spectrum, xenophobic, populist and authoritarian. Whereas the extreme right sharing the same characteristics, but inherently anti-systemic, opposed to liberal democracy. This clarification was needed in order to be certain that my research really involves far right parties.

The parties and their program profile will be put to the empirical test in the second section of this article.

1.2 EMOTIONS IN THE ACADEMIC DISCOURSE OF FAR RIGHT

In the research on the far-right right the role of emotions has been neglected. Mudde (2007) acknowledges that emotions matter, in noting that the populist radical right bases its strategy on fear: "The populist radical right is a clear example of the politics of fear, which has become even more pronounced in Europe with the end of the Cold War and the terrorist attacks of 9/11." Fear is an important factor in "homogenizing the ingroup and polarizing the relationship towards outgroup" (Mudde, 2007, p. 109). In other words, fear works as a societal glue, which gives an individual higher sense of belonging to a certain group. The belonging works like a shield and gives an individual the feeling of safety. The community will protect the individual..

Although the scholars of the far right do not research the role of emotive rhetoric directly (see Mudde, 2007; Art, 2011; Kupka, 2009), from their comparative studies is clear that the far-right parties, movements and organizations use emotions in their rhetoric. One of the strongest emotions that far right parties try to invoke in their audiences is fear. The politics of fear is a well-known concept in terrorist and antiterrorist campains (e.g. Stern, 2004 in Mudde 2007). The politics of fear have been often used in political discourse on immigration and crime (Furedi, 2005 in Mudde, 2007, p. 109). Immigration and rising crime happen to be a frequent rhetoric embraced by the far right.

However, it is not only about spreading fear from immigration and crime. Often these groups focus on fears of losing national sovereignty and identity. The rhetoric of the far right often bears conspiratorial aspects. Among the notoriously famous conspiracy theories is the theory of the New World Order or the Zionist occupation government, according to which western governments (first and foremost the U.S. government) are controlled by Jews. "Populist radical rightists around the globe fear the ever-growing international political cooperation between states, in particular the involvement of the United Nations" (Mudde, 2007, p. 193). Not only is international cooperation is considered as a "threat" to national sovereignty and identity, further integration of the European Union member states is perceived as perhaps an even greater threat. As will be pointed out later, this is also one of the central topics of the far right in Slovakia. This fear of globalization spread by the far right is sometimes called "globaphobia." Globalization is supposed to threaten the "independence and purity of the

nation-state" and is "feared and rejected" (Held & McGrew, 2000, p. ix). Mudde (2007) calls this process "Americanization."He also argues that "populists radical right parties particularly oppose neoliberal economics and mass immigration" (p. 196). Globalization is seen as the means of implementing neo-colonial politics of the United States, which are aimed at subordination of other nations. Globalizationalso has a very important cultural aspect, and the far right parties want to protect their nations from having their native cultures wiped out. They believe globalizationthreatens to "annihilate the cultural diversities of nations and create wrong culture" and to establish the "American culture of materialism and nihilism" (Mudde, 2007, p. 196). This rhetoric is aimed at invoking fear and the far right represents itself as the saviour against this mighty enemy. As will be theorized in the next section, invoking fear is connected with offering a saving hand. If you are not in fear, not threatened, there would be no need for protection. Therefore, the creation of the enemy is crucial for the far-right ideology.

Although Mudde (2007) does not analyze emotions in the rhetoric of far right, he directly acknowledges that, "the perfect breeding ground for populist radical right parties is one in which there are widespread insecurities and resentment" (p. 297). Insecurity and resentment are (negative) emotions and with this he accepts, that the emotions are a crucial factor in support of the far right. Mudde (2007) connects this "breeding ground" with his three core features of the populist radical right, thus *nativism*, "feeds upon the feeling of endangered or threatened ethnic or national identity", the bogeys are the European integration, immigration and multiculturalism. The second core feature *authoritarianism* should protect those "who are worried about crime and the wavering of traditional values" (p. 298). Again, an emotion is present, this time it is the worry (which is indeed a similar emotion to fear). The third core feature of the far right, or in Mudde's terms the populist radical right, *populism* "speaks to dissatisfaction with political representation". Mudde (2007) adds "populist radical right parties are unique in their integration of all these sentiments" (p. 298). Why Mudde (2007) did not delve deeper into the analysis of the emotions present in the far right rhetoric could be explained by this sentence: "the breeding ground [collective emotional settings]…is linked to processes like modernization in general and globalization in particular. However, these processes are so broad and vague that they are of little use in empirical research" (p. 298) Here, I would like to add that I will not focus on the processes of modernization and globalization, but rather on how they are facilitated by the far right in their rhetoric. To recapitulate, Mudde directly mentions these type of emotions: insecurity, feeling of danger and threat

1.3 EMOTIONS IN GENERAL ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Research on emotions has been gaining relevance in the field of social studies. Krämer (2014) holds that media populism has these important traits: "emotionalizing, personalizing, and ostentatiously plainspoken discourse" (p. 48). Emotionalizing comes as first in this definition of populism, which is one of the basic features of far-right ideology for many scholars (see Mudde, 2007; Art 2011; Mesežnikov & Gyárfášová, 2008). Sheve and Salmella (2014) note the importance of emotions and add that: "the nature of these collective emotions can greatly vary depending on what is focused on, e.g., a minister who inspires feelings of reverence versus a political leader who encourages hate. They can range from shared feelings of joy, pride, or hope to anger or disgust" (p.315). The role of rituals such as different types of gatherings, ceremonies, masses, public speeches etc, which can cause collective emotions. They hold that the emotions "enhance actors' fervor, commitment, and devotion to the ritualized actions and beliefs of the group during the event. This condition then affects the dedication and loyalty of individuals to the group and ultimately social bonds and integration" (Scheve & Salmella, 2014, p. 319).

Fear is an important emotion for populist movements. For example, a common characteristic of them is xenophobia. The word "phobia" means fear. Xenophobia, as one of the attributes of the extreme right, is characterized as "psychological state of hostility or fear towards outsiders" (Reynolds & Vine, 1987 in van der Veer et al. 2011) or "an intense dislike or fear" (Crowther 1995, p. 1385 in van der Veer et al., 2011). For this reason, all the attributes so typical for extreme right xenophobia, islamophobia, homophobia, globaphobia inherently bear the emotion of fear. It seems like fear is the emotion number one in the far-right rhetoric. If it is so in the case of Slovakia will be clarified in the last section.

1.4 CONCEPT: BINARY RELATION OF EMOTIONS

In this paper, I will analyze emotions by applying a binary analysis. The binary relation of emotions has as its starting point that the emotions are mutually interconnected in pairs. In order to alleviate an emotion, it has to be replaced by its binary pair. It could be better comprehensible on an example. We can logically assume that a story with a message about an exploded nuclear plant in the vicinity of 100 km from us would certainly cause collective fear. In order to alleviate this fear, this emotion must be replaced by its binary emotion of feeling safe. Once we would be evacuated and we would become assurances that everything will be fine, this would make us feel safe, which would at least to a certain extent alleviate our fear. This is not to say that

these emotions cannot coexist – this is just to point out that they have a binding relation to each other. When we are angry, we need the emotion of feeling calm. These emotions have a neutralizing effect on each other. This is an epistemological assumption, which holds that an emotion could not exist without its binary pair. How would we know what it is like to feel safe without feeling fear? Because emotions have their binary, by referring to one emotion we automatically refer to its binary pair.

Wilhelm Wundt (1896) developed the notion of binary pairs. He holds that emotions (feelings) have three "main directions" (*Hauptrichtungen*, p. 97) or "dimensions" (p.93), which "extend between certain feeling-opposites of dominant character…[and] therefore [should] be labelled by pairs of names which suggest opposites" (p. 97), the emotions are set in pairs "Pleasure – displeasure (*Lust – Unlust*), excitement – inhibition (or tranquillization) (*Erregung – Beruhigung*) and tension – relaxation (*Spannung – Lösung*) (Wundt, 1896, p. 98 in Reisenzein p. 145, 1992). This is in line with my claim that emotions have their pair or opposite (binary). In my interpretation, the three "dimensions," represent the valence of an emotion – positive, neutral, negative. Wundt (1910) holds that an essential characteristic of feeling (emotion) is the "movement between opposites" (p. 347 in Reisenzein, 1992, p. 158) and can be therefore "labelled by pairs of antonyms" (Reisenzein, p. 158). One can imagine it as an axis ranging from the positive all the way to the negative. Moreover, Wundt (1910) theorizes that pair of emotions have a number of subtype feelings, "just as the category red comprises many different shades of red-sensations (Wundt, 1910, p. 300 in Reisenzein, 1992, p. 146). Wundt (1896) gives an example: "the displeasure feeling of a painful touch, of harmonic dissonance, of intellectual failure etc. are all qualitatively different forms of displeasure (p. 99 in Reisenzein, 1992, p. 146). This is important for my analysis, as under the category of fear fall a lot of qualitatively different categories of fear (xenophobia, islamophobia, globaphobia but also anxiety, worry etc).

How can this be applied to content analysis? If, for example, we talk about such a common word as protection, protection is here to make us safe, but we already know that feeling safe has its binary emotion in fear. Therefore, by referring to protection, we are simultaneously referring to fear. Simply put, if we address something positive, there is also the negative aspect present, as it has its binary (see table 1.1). We do not refer to one emotion, but to a binary of emotions, as one cannot exist without the other. If someone tells us, "we will make you safe," they also imply that we do not have to be afraid (we do not have to have fear). But to be afraid of what? There is always hidden message and this hidden message is what matters in the analysis. It allows us to identify not only the topics addressed, but also the emotional valence

(positive, negative) behind it. The focus of the analysis is based on negative and positive valence of emotions. The neutral valence is not important in this analysis, while it represent the state of balance. The neutral emotional meaning would be also very difficult, if not impossible, to track.

| 1.1 Binary Relations of Emotions ||
Positive	Negative
Fear/anxiety	Safe/secure
Anger	Calm
Shame	Pride
Indifference	Compassion
Despair	Hope
Hate/Antipathy	Love/Symphaty

The binary relation of emotions is important when recognizing the emotion's opposite. It is not always clear to which category a statement fits, as it can be the bearer of more than one emotion. The binary relation of emotions helps the mental process of recognition. What would be the opposite claim to a statement? That is highly likely the binary where to place the emotion in.

The binary emotion content analysis will focus on written text, which does not bear any meaning caused by tone of voice. The tone adds emotion to text. One can say, "I am calm" in a very angry way. However, a written text must have an emotional meaning on its own, which makes the task of coding the words easier.

2. FAR RIGHT IN SLOVAKIA

This empirical section will first determine if the parties in this study really belong to the far right. As I determined in the first section, the term far right is an overarching term for the radical right and extreme right, they both stand on the far right of the political spectrum and bear most of the same features with one important exception: the radical right stands within the borders of liberal democracy, does not want to overthrow it, whereas the extreme right is anti-systemic, postulating attitudes opposed to liberal democratic system. In this study I will analyse two Slovak far-right parties, namely the Slovak National Party (*Slovenská národná strana* – further SNS) and Kotleba – People's Party Our Slovakia (*Kotleba – Ľudová strana naše Slovensko* – further ĽSNS). For his analysis of extreme-right parties, Mudde (2000) uses two sources – party programs and party newspapers. Minkenberg (2017) focuses on the "programmatic profile" of the parties. In this study, I have limited myself to the party programs as my research sample. I

have decided to only take quotes, which fall under one of Mudde's (2000) seven attributes plus the attribute of populism, Mudde (2007) added in 2007.

2.1 CASE I: KOTLEBA - PEOPLE'S PARTY OUR SLOVAKIA (ĽSNS)

This section analyzes the party program of ĽSNS taken from its official webpage www.naseslovensko.net. The party program of ĽSNS has ten points and it is also available in English; therefore, there is no risk of words or phrases getting lost in translation. I left them under the numbers as stated in the official ĽSNS program. For this purpose, I employ qualitative content analysis (see Halperin & Heath, 2016).

The first point of the program states "… that high politics is no more the most organized criminal profession." This expresses the variable **traditional ethics**, portraying current political system as rotten. Furthermore, "We will accept laws focused on proving the origin of the property and re-investigate the process of privatization. Formerly plundered assets will be returned to state ownership" (Our Program – Ten Commandments of Our Party). This quote represents **populism,** as the party wants to return assets from the hands of multinationals to the hands of the state. It is a typical example of doing "justice" to rich elites, who act against the interest of the ordinary people.

The second point of the ĽSNS program falls under **welfare chauvinism,** "we will put a stop to the preferential treatment of all social parasites, including gypsy parasites. Parasites who will refuse to work, will receive nothing for free – no housing or other benefits and allowances" (Our Program – Ten Commandments of Our Party). This quote is literal enough, saying that other ethnic group – the Roma – should not receive any state aid. Also calling a certain ethnic group, "parasites," is clearly racist. Therefore, this point falls under **welfare chauvinism** as wells as the variable of **exclusionism.**

Points three and four deal with the salaries of politicians and giving work to unemployed people, these two points do not fall under any of Mudde's seven variables of extreme right.

Point number five of the program deals with **militarism**, "[w]e will establish a domestic-militia and volunteers among decent people will be given the opportunity to actively protect the lives and property of themselves and their loved ones. We will expand the right to protect life and property to include protection by a gun" (Our Program – Ten Commandments of Our Party). Even though Mudde does not categorize militarism as a feature of extreme right-wing parties, it is present in the case of ĽSNS. I feel it is ok to include it since other scholars

writing on right-wing extremism also include it (Falter & Schuman, 1988; Griffin, 2002). This perhaps means that the Slovak ĽSNS is even more radical than the western European extreme right parties that Mudde (2000) analyzed.

The sixth point of the ĽSNS program falls under **strong state** as well as **traditional ethics**, "[e]ducation of youth will be built on traditional national and Christian principles and values. We will return the authority and dignity to the teachers by stating them as public officials" (Our Program – Ten Commandments of Our Party). The party wants to return authority to the educational system and anchored in Christian values.

Point number seven is a clear example of **welfare chauvinism**, "We will restore agricultural, economic and energetic self-sufficiency of Slovak Republic. We will prevent foreigners from buying land in Slovakia and we will increase subsidies for farmers. We will stop preferential treatment of foreign companies and introduce a reduced VAT rate of 10 % for food products from Slovak manufacturers" (Our Program – Ten Commandments of Our Party).

Point number eight of the ĽSNS program includes **nationalism, xenophobia** as well as **welfare chauvinism, "**we put Slovak interests above the dictate of Brussels and therefore we refuse to restrict the sovereignty of member states of the European Union. [nationalism] We will never support any form of state aid to irresponsible private banks or foreign governments [welfare chauvinism]. We will strengthen the control of illegal employment of foreigners, immigration and visa policy [xenophobia]" (Our Program – Ten Commandments of Our Party).

Point number nine states, "[w]e will not allow any violation of Slovakian territorial integrity and we will strengthen the defense of the country. We will leave the NATO terrorist pact…" (Our Program – Ten Commandments of Our Party). This point of the voting program bears signs of **nationalism** and **strong state.** Here there is also a difference between the Slovak ĽSNS and western European extreme right parties that Mudde studied. The extreme right parties in his study, by contrast, supported NATO membership. Differences in historical developments certainly matter. In addition, in contrast to the anti-Russian sentiments of many Western extreme right parties, there is a strong pro-Russian sentiment within ĽSNS.

And finally, point ten of the program falls under the category of **xenophobia,** "We refuse registered partnerships, adoption of children by gay couples and promotion of sexual deviations." (Our Program – Ten Commandments of Our Party)

To sum it up the program of the ĽSNS contains seven out of seven plus one (populism) of Mudde's categories for extreme right parties. However, it should be added that the last category, **revisionism,** is also present int the party's manifesto. Under the section of the webpage "About us" is this sentence, "The People's Party Our Slovakia continues in the legacy

of our national heroes – Ludovit Stur[1], Dr. Andrej Hlinka[2] and Dr. Jozef Tiso. (About us). Dr. Jozef Tiso was a president of the Slovak [fascist] state between 1939 – 1945 and he was responsible for the deportations of Slovak Jews to concentration camps.After the war he was convicted and executed as a war criminal. Calling him a national hero, therefore, is quite contentious to say the least.

So does the ĽSNS belongs to what Mudde calls "the extreme right party family"? It meets 7 criteria for being a extreme right party. However, there is a difference between the 5 western European parties and Slovak ĽSNS. Ľ'SNS also shows signs of militarism (it wants to create militias to protect Slovak people against alleged Roma violence), and in contrast to her western sisters, ĽSNS is also openly against NATO. However, based on Mudde's characterization ĽSNS surely meets the criteria of being a right-wing extremist party. Similarly,other scholars, such as Mesežnikov and Gyarfášová (2018) , also designate this party as "right extremist" (p. 19). This is important, because the ĽSNS itself complains if someone labels her as extremist or fascist.

2.3 CASE II: SLOVAK NATIONAL PARTY (SNS)

I will now analyze the program of SNS. It is not surprising that ĽSNS fulfils the criteria for belonging to the extreme right, because, as already mentioned, they are frequently labelled "extremist" by other politicians and the media. However, the case of SNS is not that clear at all. Kupka et al. (2009) labels SNS as far right party with radical national attributes (pp. 48-49). Mudde (2005) claims that SNS is an "racist extremist party" (p.165). I should mention that personally it is a surprise to find SNS among far right, radical or even extreme parties, as it is not so perceived in Slovak political discourse, to support this claim Mesežnikov (2011) categorizes SNS as "mainstream nationalists" (p.11). The election program of SNS is available only in Slovak language, therefore if there are multiple possible translations I will put them in brackets. The party program starts with a preamble of Andrej Danko, the incumbent party leader and also a speaker of the Slovak National Council (parliament). The program itself is divided

---

[1] Ľudovít Štúr encoded the official Slovak language in early 19th century, he is an important Slovak national figure.
[2] Andrej Hlinka was a Slovak Catholic priest who during his life fought for the independence of Slovakia from Czechoslovakia. Although he died before the World War II, the party bearing his name Hlinka's Slovak People's Party was the governing party during the war Slovak fascist state (1939 – 1945). Therefore, his name was for a long time connected with the fascist regime.

into twelve sections (sections). I will analyse section after section and look for variables of extreme right, similarly as in previous section.

The preamble of the SNS election program 2016 – 2020 signed by the party leader, Andrej Danko, t contains statements that can be labled **populism**. For example, "in the cynical times of global crises of elites and ruthless governance of supranational organizations." This statement clearly differentiates the "global elites" as "them" who are opposed to "us" – i.e. the poor Slovaks. It continues, "[t]he old continent is currently facing organized process of dismantling of our old civilisation, based on a national state and also aspirations to cultural, political and ethnic elimination of original European nations." (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.5). This is rather conspiratorial rhetoric, but under Mudde's (2000) schema it falls under a category of **xenophobia.**

The first section starts with words "strong national state.". It is important that the preamble acknowledges the right of minorities living in Slovakia with the sentence: the "Slovak Republic…creates conditions for full-fledged life of non-Slovak nationalities on the basis of cultural diversity." **N**ationalism is also present in the first section, the "Slovak nation is for a long time anchored in the land (territory) of Slovakia…" and **traditional ethics** "…it draws from traditions of its Slavic ancestors, Christian basis (background) and other European civilizational influences" and traditional ethics are also present in a sentence that SNS aims for "cessation of radical political agenda of LGBTI minorities" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.7).

The second section of the SNS party program contains **populism:** "we will cancel the collective responsibility of the public administration employees and we will shift their individual responsibility to the sphere of civil and criminal law." With this sentence they again create a picture of rotten elites, who should be punished. It seems like the SNS is trying to moderate its rhetoric: "We will preclude dissemination of chauvinism [as an extreme form of nationalism], national intolerance, disturbance of internal and external unity of the state by extremist political parties, movements and individuals" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.9). From this statement it is clear that there is a shift in rhetoric in comparison to SNS under its old chair Ján Slota, who was well-known for his anti-Roma and anti-Hungarian statements (see Kupka et. at, 2009).

The third section is richly woven with **populism**, statements about how Slovakia "will resist supranational groups" and "interest groups of oligarchs." It also contains **exclusionism**, "protection of the rights of the Slovak citizens from mass and uncontrolled invasion of illegal migrants, particularly in regard to our membership in the European Union and Schengen area."

This is a quite peculiar rhetoric. It rejects immigrants, thus excluding them from the society. Therefore, they demand "protection…from any form or [an attempt] to disturb Slovak ethnic, cultural, religious and social integrity" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.11). However, it accepts membership in the European Union, but want the outside border of the organization to be protected. This is in stark contrast to the rhetoric of ĽSNS which is strongly against the European Union.

The fourth section deals with social policy. It only briefly contains the concept of **traditional ethics**. It mentions support for the "natural family and its essence – bond of a man and a woman" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.13).

The fifth section does not contain any statements that are characteristic of the extreme right.

The sixth section introduces a vision for an "educated state." It includes one case of **nationalism**, in stating "we will strengthen education of pupils and students towards patriotism, national pride and protection of national culture" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.22).

The seventh section includes a feature of the **strong state** and it puts forth a vision of the state having "decisive influence in strategic enterprises of state". It also contains **welfare chauvinism**, in stating that "citizens, freelancer, small and middle-size businesses on one side and global monopolies, banks and oligarch on the other" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.26).

Section eight, the "Ecological state" includes some elements again of welfare chauvinism and populism with the sentence, the "Slovak republic will not give in to pressure of corporations which interest is uncontrolled exploitation of natural resources" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.31).

The ninth section, which discusses the "Law state," does not contain any elements from the extreme right.

In contrast to the tenth section, which uses **populism** claiming "[w]e will make sure that Slovak republic can fully defend itself." This is a completely unrealistic claim for a country with only 5.4 million inhabitants. Furthermore, in this section they support introducing military education so that the "young generation can deal with critical situations" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.37).

The eleventh sectionshows some signs of **xenophobia**. For example, "we will hinder the unnatural change of cultural, religious, ethnic and language character of our state." It also contains **exclusionism**. Thus, "[b]y registration of new churches we will consider not only the number of believers, but also their affiliation to Slovak republic (nationality)" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.42).

Finally, the twelfth section contains a quote about multiculturalism and "its pernicious influence on national societies of the old continent" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.46), which is a clear case of **xenophobia**.

To sum it up. This subsection has examined the SNS election program 2016 – 2020 for signs of extreme right. A qualitative content analysis has shown that the programcontains seven out of Mudde's (2000) eight criteria for the extreme right, namely nationalism, exclusionism, xenophobia, traditional ethics, strong state, welfare chauvinism, as well as populism. Only revisionism is missing in this case. It confirms Mudde (2005) and Kupka's (2009) claim that SNS is an extremist party and it goes against Mesežnikov (2011), who calls SNS "mainstream nationalists." However, as explained above, the main difference between the radical and extreme right lies in their position towards democracy. SNS does not oppose liberal democracy in any sentence of its program. On the contrary, the program expresses support for the democratic system and supranational institutions such as the European Union.

Although SNS meets seven out of the eight criteria of the extreme right, it must be stressed that they are apparently trying to soften their rhetoric and they claim that they will fight against extremism, chauvinism and intolerance among ethnic groups living in Slovakia (in Slovakia there is a large Hungarian minority). It is also worth mentioning that SNS has given up their former anti-Roma rhetoric, which was so typical for the period when Ján Slota (before 2015) was the party leader (see Kupka, 2009). The question of the Roma minority is left out from the party program of 2016 -2020. Therefore, considering all these factors I would not call SNS extreme right, but rather radical right, as they are not opposed to the liberal democratic system.

2.4 DISCUSSION

In conclusion of this section I would like to stress the difference between the extremist ĽSNS and radical SNS. The main difference lies in their stances towards the membership within the European Union. ĽSNS is against and claims that by entering the European Union, Slovakia lost its "pride, independence and sovereignty." There is also a distinction when it comes toto the Roma minority in Slovakia. Whereas ĽSNS call them literally "parasites" or they directly mention "the gipsy problem" (10 bodov za naše Slovensko), SNS does not mention the Roma community in their program. SNS wants to help "the real refugees" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.11), whereas ĽSNS rejects all foreigners. SNS on the other hand claims that it will fight chauvinism as an extreme form of nationalism, and opposes national intolerance. This

tells us that SNS has moderated its rhetoric under the new party leader Andrej Danko, who became the chair in 2012.

SNS and ĽSNS also share a lot of similarities, especially in their rhetoric about Slovakia belonging to Slovaks and stopping immigration, needing protection against supranational corporations on different levels and support for local food production. Last, but not least, they both oppose the rights of the LGBTI community and support national, Christian and traditional values.

The main difference can be seen immediately after opening the ĽSNS website. Their slogan is: "With courage against the system" ([www.naseslovensko.net)](www.naseslovensko.net). This shows that this party is striving for change outside the borders of the liberal democratic system. The SNS, by contrast, sees Slovakia as being firmly anchored in the European Union and does not mention any change of the current political setting. Therefore, I claim that ĽSNS is indeed an extremist right party, whereas SNS is a radical right party. Nonetheless they both belong to far right.

Now, when the analysis has shown that both parties SNS and ĽSNS belong to the far right, we can analyse how they facilitate emotions in their programs.

3. EMOTIONS IN THE RHETORIC OF THE FAR RIGHT IN SLOVAKIA

As mentioned in the first section, I will now employ content analysis of election programs of the far right parties in Slovakia. I will use a mixed approach by using qualitative content analysis to analyse to which category of emotion binary the sentence/statement belongs. I will also use aquantitative approach tocalculate which emotion binaries are used more often. Tables 3.1 – 3.6 contain statements or sentences from the party programprograms of ĽSNS and SNS. Theprogram complete programs of both parties are only available in Slovak; therefore, I translated the sentences. I tried to keep the original meaning of the statements and not alter them in any way. So if some statements seem really extreme, it is because they truly are extreme.

I must acknowledge that by doing this analysis I have realized that some sentences can contain more than one emotion. For example, a sentence, "[d]ecent people in Slovakia are daily being robbed, raped and murdered by gypsy extremists" (10 bodov za naše Slovensko) could be categorized fear, but it be categorized as hate, or even anger. It can also be tricky to decide

where to place a statement within the emotional binary. Let's say there is a sentence: "we will protect you from the killers in the streets." This sentence would certainly evoke fear, but if you already have fear from the killers in the street, then this information would probably calm you down. It can also depend on the context of the sentence how it is emotionally formulated. In the case when the statements fit more emotions than one, I doubled the sentence in the chart and put it in green colour, signalling that the sentence could be the bearer of more than one emotion. I also realize that this would need a "second reviewer," as the interpretation of the emotion, which the text bears, is a subjective matter.

A problem arises in translating terms as the meaning might possible be slightly shifted through my personal translating skills which could change the kind of emotion that one feels from reading these terms. Now that I have discussed the possible limitations of this research the next subsections deal with the empirical research of binary emotions in ĽSNS and SNS programs.

3.1 EMOTIONS IN THE MANIFESTO OF KOTLEBA - PEOPLE'S PARTY OUR SLOVAKIA (ĽSNS)

The ĽSNS party program has 1838 words. This quite short program is abundantly filled with statements containing emotions. In the table 3.3 one can see the total number of statements. There are four cases bearing the emotion of *fear*, the feeling of being *safe* contains six sentences, which makes the total of 10 for the binary *fear/safe*. Anger is the most common emotion with 20 cases. Eight statements convey feeling *calm*; therefore this binary totals 28 cases. Then comes *shame*, which was present 4 times, while *pride* had 2 appearances, making it six cases for this binary. *Indifference* and *compassion* are not present in the program of ĽSNS. The emotion of *despair* is communicated six times and *hope* is not in the program, which means six for this binary as well as for *Hate/Antipathy.* Meanwhile, *Love/Sympathy* is not mentioned in the program of ĽSNS.

In summary, the *anger/calm* binary comprise the most common emotions in the ĽSNS program. However, fear is the most common emotion, as it is used 20 times. Could it be, that the voters of the ĽSNS are most motivated by anger? Are they angry? Well, in Slovakia they have many reasons to be. After countless corruption scandals and suspicions of government officials having connections to the mafia, it is no wonder some people could be angry. A Slovak sociologist Ľubomír Falťan commented on the societal mood in Slovakia: "People are very

disgusted and angry" (own translation), the current situation is perceived as "chaos and mess" (own translation) (Krempasky, 2018). If anger is what attracts extremist voters, then at least we know what we are dealing with and we can better address it as a society. The second most present binary of emotive relations is *fear/safe* with the negative emotion fear appearing 4 times and the positive one (calm) appearing 6 times.

The ĽSNS program contains 40 statements/sentences with negative emotions compared to 17 positive.

These findings are in odds with what the literature says about the extreme right. Fear should be the leading emotion (see p. 12), but (at least) in this case it is anger.

Table 3.1

ĽSNS	FEAR	SAFE	ANGER	CALM	SHAME	PRIDE	INDIFFERENCE	COMPASSION	DISPAIR	HOPE	HATE/ANTIPATHY	LOVE/SYMPATHY
	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive
PREAMBLE			Prevent further robbery (massive stealing) of Slovakia									
CHAPTER 1.			government thiefs live in unseen luxury and parasites have everything for free		many families live under terrible conditions				Money is missing for everything			
CHAPTER 1.			the biggest thief is privatization...This way we have lost equity of incalculabe value!	No politician will any longer and without punishment steal and live on the cost of the nation.					We suffer by decreasing life standard of decent people	We will free Slovakia from the slavory of international bankers		
CHAPTER 2.											We will make order with parasites in colonies (meaning Roma settlements)	
CHAPTER 2.		We will protect people from rising gypsy terror										
CHAPTER 2.	Decent people in Slovakia are daily being robbed, raped and murdered by gypsy extremists	We will not allow to gypsy extremists to further endanger decent people in Slovakia			Government does not have courage to act against the gypsy terror				Government protects thiefs and parasites and not the victims		Decent people in Slovakia are daily being robbed, raped and murdered by gypsy extremists	
CHAPTER 3.			Gypsy parasites get everything for free									
CHAPTER 3.			Government gave retirees a silly 1,90 EUR raise		Government gave retirees a silly 1,90 EUR raise						A person who worked their whole life have lower income as never working gypsy thief	
CHAPTER 3.			parasites which did not work a day have everything for free	we will eliminate this appaling injustice..we will stop these asocial parasites								

Table 3.2

ĽSNS	FEAR	SAFE	ANGER	CALM	SHAME	PRIDE	INDIFFERENCE	COMPASSION	DISPAIR	HOPE	HATE/ANTIPATHY	LOVE/SYMPATHY
	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive
CHAPTER 4.	We will not allow that our woman are being harassed by agressive immigrants	We will protect ourselves!	We refuse to commit a national suicide								We will not allow that our woman are being harassed by agressive immigrants	
CHAPTER 4.	Muslim immigrants...commit many crimes and are enourmous burden for original inhabitants										Muslim immigrants...commit many crimes and are enourmous burden for original inhabitants	
CHAPTER 4.			Immigrants have everything for free. Each of them costs us up to 1500 EUR per month									
CHAPTER 4.		We will protect our land with no regard to what the EU will think about it	Standard political parties have sold us									
CHAPTER 5.			Private companies made business from health insurance. They have enourmous profits and refuse to pay their insurees adequate health care									
CHAPTER 6.			The rubbish which no one wants to eat in the west is forced to us by business chains						Agriculture, which we used to be proud of, is in ruins.			

Table 3.3

ĽSNS	FEAR	SAFE	ANGER	CALM	SHAME	PRIDE	INDIFFERENCE	COMPASSION	DISPAIR	HOPE	HATE/ANTIPATHY	LOVE/SYMPATHY
	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive
CHAPTER 7.			Traditional values...are being replaced by consume and borderless	Marriage will be considered only as a bond of man and woman								
CHAPTER 7.				ĽSNS will not allow that our children are being fooled by perversities in								
CHAPTER 7.				we will implement clear rules for control of broadcasted content								
CHAPTER 8.		We will build a genuine Slovak army	Slovakia...is member of criminal organization NATO...which serves to enforcement of power interest of the USA									
CHAPTER 8.			We dont want Slovakia to be a complice of American war crimes						Slovak army is in ruins			
CHAPTER 8.			Slovakia is no longer independent and sovereign state			We will restore pride, independence and sovereignty of Slovak republic						
CHAPTER 9.			In the wake of this bullying hundreds of Slovak companies have closed down									
CHAPTER 9.			Many products we buy overpriced from abroad									
CHAPTER 10.				We will protect our environment	Slovakia is being devastated	God gave us the most beautiful land in the world						
TOTAL EACH	4	6	20	8	4	2	0	0	6	1	6	0
TOTAL BINARY	10		28		6		0		7		6	

3.2 EMOTIONS IN THE MANIFESTO OF SLOVAK NATIONAL PARTY (SNS)

The SNS party program has 6744 words.Table 3.6 shows the total number of statements/sentences containing emotions. There are eight cases of statements containing the emotion of *fear*, and 24 statements containing the emotion of being *safe* which makes 32 cases for the binary *fear/safe*. *Anger* appears five times, while *calming* does not appear at all in the SNS program. *Shame* appears twice as well as its opposite *pride*, which brings the total to four for the binary *shame/pride. Indifference* is not present in this program, and *compassion* appears only once. The last two binaries *despair/hope* and *hate(antipathy)/love(sympathy)* do not appear in the text.

What does it say about the program of SNS? The word "protection "and its variations are abundantly present in its election program. The binary *fear/safe* is the most common one, with the positive emotion appearing 24 times compared to eight appearance of the negative binary. This is a ratio of 3:1 of positive to negative for this binary. The second most common binary is *anger/calm*, which appears five times. However, it represents a big plunge compared to 32 for the *fear/safe* binary. What is the party trying to sell to its voters? Do the voters of SNS miss the emotion of being safe? Are they scared? This could be worth further research.

Regarding the ratio between the positive and negative emotional background, there are overall 27 statements containing positive emotions and 15 containing the negative ones. This result is in congruence with my educated guess from section 1.4 that fear would be the leading emotion in far right.

Table 3.4

SNS	FEAR	SAFE	ANGER	CALM	SHAME	PRIDE	INDIFFERENCE	COMPASSION	DISPAIR	HOPE	HATE/ANTIPATHY	LOVE/SYMPATHY
	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive				
PREAMBLE	our land is vulnerable	we protect our homeland			in times of lost identity	the most beautiful corner of the world						
PREAMBLE	elimination of original european nations											
PREAMBLE	in current turbulent times											
CHAPTER 1.		protection of slovak language and culture			to put a stop to radical political agenda of LGBTI communities							
CHAPTER 1.		Protect and develop its natural riches										
CHAPTER 1.		protection and help to pregnant mothers										
CHAPTER 2.	prevents internal disintegration of the state	protects civic principle										
CHAPTER 3.	prevent disturbance of the unity of the state by foreign extremist parties...	Slovakia will resist to the influence of supranational groups	cessation of influence of supranational corporations...which humiliate Slovakia					help in need to real refugees				
CHAPTER 3.	cessation of all...attempts for elimination of Slovak nation	protection of borders from mass invasion of illegal migrants										
CHAPTER 3.		protection of health and safety										
CHAPTER 3.		protection from infiltration of international terrorist cells										

Table 3.5

SNS	FEAR negative	SAFE positive	ANGER negative	CALM positive	SHAME negative	PRIDE positive	INDIFFERENCE negative	COMPASSION positive	HOPE	DISPAIR	HATE/ANTIPATHY	LOVE/SYMPATHY
CHAPTER 4.												
CHAPTER 5.												
CHAPTER 6.		protection of Slovak national culture				strengthen the education of pupils and students to patriotism, national pride and protection of national culture						
CHAPTER 7.		protects national economic interests of Slovakia	"VAT mafita which...strips Slovak republic off millions EUR each year									
CHAPTER 7.		ban on transefs of the land to foreighners	banks and telecommunicati on companies abuse their dominant position in the market									
CHAPTER 8.		protection and restoration of the environment	will not give in to the pressure of corporations which interest is uncontrolled exploitation of natural resources									
CHAPTER 9.												
CHAPTER 10.		cares of safety of Slovak citizens										
CHAPTER 10.	Modern style of waging war (terrorism, cyber attacks)	Professional protection of its interests, as well as lives...										

Table 3.6

SNS	FEAR	SAFE	ANGER	CALM	SHAME	PRIDE	INDIFFERENCE	COMPASSION	HOPE	DISPAIR	HATE/ANTIPATHY	LOVE/SYMPATHY
	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive	negative	positive				
CHAPTER 11.		Protect and develop inheritance of its ancestors										
CHAPTER 11.		protects and develops Slovak language										
CHAPTER 11.		ensure ...that affiliation to church could not be expressed by covering a face										
CHAPTER 12		the highest value is peace	getting back vitally important national competencies from the byrocratic grasp of Brussels									
CHAPTER 12	multiculturalism and its malign influence on national societies of the old continent	if some of the commitments harms state interest of Slovak republic, we will support its legal cessation										
TOTAL EACH	8	24	5	0	2	2		1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL BINARY	32		5		2		1		0		0	

3.3 DISCUSSION

As determined in the section two, I consider ĽSNS to belong to the extreme right and SNS to be a radical right party, so although they are different they both belong to the broader family of the far right. ĽSNS emphasizes mostly on the binary *anger/calm*, with the dominant role of the negative emotion *anger*. In contrast, the most present emotional binary in the SNS program is *fear/safe,* with positive emotions dominating. The word protection and its variations is indeed a leading word in a program of SNS. The program of SNS does not involve binaries of *hope/despair* and *hate(antipathy)/love(sympathy)* (see table 3.6)*,* while the program of ĽSNS contains both of these binaries with highly negative emotions (see table 3.3).

This study shows there is a big differences in the Slovak far right and in the emotions their programs contain. The program of ĽSNS has 1838 words, whereas the program of SNS has 6744 words. T ĽSNS's prorgram is not even one-third the length of SNS'. Nonetheless it contains 51 statements containing emotions. SNS' program is much longer and it contains 40 statements containing emotions. It means that ĽSNS' program is filled with emotions, with almost each sentence containing some emotion. SNS's program is much more factual and neutral.

It could be concluded that ĽSNS mostly uses the emotion of *anger,* but it facilitates the feeling of being *safe* (mostly by providing protection against something what one could be afraid of). In addition, *despair* and *hate* play an important role in the emotional setting of their program.

SNS is a different case. Its program mostly facilitates the binary *fear/safe*, where the positive emotion *safe,* is the most common emotion. They also use *anger,* which appears five times less than feeling *safe*. Therefore, the most used emotions in the SNS program are feeling *safe*, *fear* and *anger.*

CONCLUSION

Thispaper conceptualizes the terms "radical right," "extreme right" and "far right." I use the term far right as the overarching term for the political parties, movements and organizations belonging to the radical right and the extreme right. The radical right as an ideology stands on the far right of the democratic political spectrum. Even though the extreme right shares the same characteristics, it is inherently anti-systemic and opposed to liberal democracy.

This paper analyses two Slovak far right parties. Kotleba – People's Party Our Slovakia (ĽSNS) and Slovak National Party (SNS). The main difference lies in their stances towards membership in the European Union. ĽSNS opposes membership and claims that by entering the European Union, Slovakia lost its "pride, independence and sovereignty" (10 bodov za naše Slovensko). There is also a distinction when it comes to its approach to Roma minority in Slovakia. Whereas ĽSNS calls them literally "parasites" or directly mentions "the gipsy problem" (10 bodov za naše Slovensko), SNS does not mention the Roma community in its program. SNS wants to help "the real refugees" (Volebný program pre silný štát, 2015, p.11) even if they oppose an ethnic and cultural change of the Slovak population. Nevertheless, ĽSNS is against having any foreigners in the country. However, SNS and ĽSNS also share a lot of similarities, especially in their rhetoric about Slovakia belonging to Slovaks, stopping immigration and protecting domestic enterprises against supranational corporations .Last, but not least, they both oppose the rights of the LGBTI community and support national, Christian and traditional values.

The main difference is striking as immediately after opening ĽSNS website, one sees their slogan: "With courage against the system" (www.naseslovensko.net). This shows that this party is striving for a change which is outside the borders of liberal democratic system. While SNS sees Slovakia firmly anchored in the European Union and does not mention any change of the current political setting. Therefore, I claim that ĽSNS is indeed an extremist right party, whereas SNS is a radical right party. Nonetheless, despite these differences they both belong to the far right.

This study shows that large differences exist among the Slovak far right including the emotions their programs contain. ĽSNS' program has 1838 words, while SNS' program has 6744 words. The party program of ĽSNS is not even a one third of a length of the program of SNS, nonetheless it contains 51 statements containing emotions. The program of SNS is much longer but it only contains 40 statements containing emotions. It means that the ĽSNS' program is filled with emotions, as almost each sentence encompasses some kind of emotion. SNS's

program is much more factual and neutral. It could be concluded that ĽSNS mostly uses emotions of anger, then it facilitates feeling of being safe (mostly by providing protection against something what one could be afraid of). Despair and hate also play an important role in the emotional setting of their program. SNS is a different case. It mostly facilitates the binary emotions fear/safe. – especially the emotion safe. The party also uses anger, which appears five times less often than feeling safe (see table 3.6). Therefore, the leading emotions in SNS' program are feeling safe, fear and anger.

Theorists of emotions suggest (subsection 1.3 and 1.4) that the main emotion within the far right should be fear. However, this is only the case for SNS and it mostly stresses the binary fear/safe; the party mostly offers protection from what there is to be feared. Nonetheless, in the case of ĽSNS the prevalent emotion is anger.

FURTHER RESEARCH

It would be interesting to investigate parties with different ideological backgrounds as well (conservative, liberal, social democrats) to see what emotions they facilitate in selling their political agenda. This study was based on party manifestos, which is somewhat different than what the parties present every day on their social networks. Social networks have become a real game-changer for extreme right parties; they allow them to easily find auditorium and create communities of like-minded individuals and recruit new people for their ideology. Therefore, an analysis of emotional content of their presence at social media could be a next step for this type of research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

10 BODOV ZA NAŠE SLOVENSKO! *10 BODOV ZA NAŠE SLOVENSKO!*Retrieved from http://www.naseslovensko.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Volebný-program-2016.pdf

Art, D. (2011). *Inside the Radical Right: The Development of Anti-Immigrant Parties in Western Europe*. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Chow, R. The Fascist Longings in Our Midst. *Linked Histories*, 21–44.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari Félix. (2000). *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Athlone.

Falter, J. W., & Schumann, S. (1988). Affinity towards right-wing extremism in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, *11*(2), 96–110.

Griffin, R. (2002). The Primacy of Culture: The Current Growth (or Manufacture) of Consensus within Fascist Studies. *Journal of Contemporary History*, *37*(1), 21–43.

Hagtvet, B. (1994). Right-Wing Extremism in Europe. *Journal of Peace Research*, *31*(3), 241–246.

Halperin, S., & Heath, O. (2017). *Political research: methods and practical skills*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Held, D., & McGrew, A. G. (2000). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Houghton, D. P. (2015). *Political psychology situations, individuals, and cases*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Krempaský, J. (2018, December 26). Po tvrdej ruke volá takmer štvrtina obyvateľov Slovenska. Retrieved from https://domov.sme.sk/c/22014141/prieskum-focus-pre-sme-demokracia-vs-autoritativny-rezim.html

Krämer, B., & . (2014). Media Populism: A Conceptual Clarification and Some Theses on its Effects. In *Communication Theory*(Vol. 24, pp. 42–60). Oxford : Oxford Academic.

Kupka, P., Laryš, M., & Smolík, J. (2009). *Krajní pravice ve vybraných zemích střední a východní evropy: Slovensko, Polsko, Ukrajina, Bělorusko, Rusko*. Brno: Mezinárodní politologický ústav Masarykovy Univerzity.

Laqueur, W. (1997). *Fascism: past, present, future*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Mesežnikov, G. (2011). *Tí praví.../The Right Ones*. Nadácia otvorenej spoločnosti - Open Society Foundation.

Mesežnikov, G., & Gyárfášová, O. (2017). *Heutiger Rechtsextremismus und Ultranationalismus in der Slowakei*. Bratislava: Inštitút pre verejné otázky - Hanns-Seidel-Stiftung.

Minkenberg, M. (2017). *The radical right in Eastern Europe Democracy under Siege?*New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mudde, C. (2000). Extreme-right Parties in Eastern Europe. *Patterns of Prejudice*, *34*(1), 5–27.

Mudde, C. (2000). *The ideology of the extreme right*. New York: Manchester University Press.

Mudde, C. (2005). Racist Extremism in Central & Eastern Europe. *East European Politics and Societies*, *19*, 161–184.

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

Orwell, G., & Rovere, R. H. (1956). *The Orwell reader: fiction, essays and reportage*. New York: A Harvest Book.

Our program – Ten Commandments of our Party. Retrieved from http://www.naseslovensko.net/en/our-program/

Passmore, K. (2014). *Fascism: a very short introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reisenzein, R. (1992). *A structuralist reconstruction of Wundt's three-dimensional theory of emotion.* In Westmeyer (Ed.), The structuralist program in psychology: Foundations and applications (pp. 141 – 189). Toronto: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.

Scheve, C. von, & Salmela, M. (2014). *Collective emotions: Perspectives from Psychology, Philosophy, and Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van der Veer, K. A., Ommundsen, R. A., Yakushko, O. A., Higler, L. A., Woelders, S. A., & Hagen, K. A. (2011). Psychometrically and qualitatively validating a cross-national cumulative measure of fear-based xenophobia. *Quality and Quantity*, *47*, 1429–1444.

Volebný program pre silný štát 2016 – 2020. (2015). *Volebný program pre silný štát 2016 – 2020*. Retrieved from http://www.sns.sk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/SNS_Volebny_program_2016_2020.pdf