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Abstract

The implementation of identity politics policies conceived at a supranational level appears to motivate the coordination of populist movements, the radicalization of their discourses, and an increasing resentment towards minority groups. I investigate the reaction of populist sovereignist political movements, among recently admitted EU member states, to the implementation of European Union policies that involve the positive discrimination of minority groups and mandated refugee relocations. The implementation of such policies seems to have contributed to the resentment toward policy-favored minorities, the increase of anti-immigration values, the success of extremist political expressions, and the mistrust of political institutions and traditional parties. The research relies on a multiple case studies approach to identify the effects of the implementation of EU-mandated affirmative action and immigration policies. The political and economic landscapes of study cases, taken from post-communist Eastern Europe (primarily, Poland, Slovakia, and Hungary), are described based on the existing literature. The general arguments are supported through a review of quantitative studies that incorporate regression analyses on electoral data and web content analysis. Arguments are also complemented by a review of World Bank, OECD and Eurostat reports, election results, as well as the theoretical literature on ethnic competition, welfare spending, multiculturalism, and the specifics of the political parties and systems of the selected countries.
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Party Catalogue

Slovakia

Slovak National Party (SNS): right-wing, populist.
Direction - Social Democracy (Smer - SD): center-left, social democrat.
People's Party - Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (L'S-HZDS): center-right.
Kotleba - People's Party our Slovakia (L'SNS): radical-right, populist.
We Are Family (Sme Rodina): center-right: populist.
Freedom and Solidarity (SaS): libertarian.
Bridge, Most-Hid (Most-Hid): center-right.
Ordinary People (OL'aNO): center.

Poland

Law and Justice (PiS): right-wing, populist.
League of Polish Families (LPR): right-wing, populist.
Civic Platform (PO): center-left, social democrat.
Democratic Left Alliance (SLD-UP): center-left.
Social Democracy of Poland (SDPL): center-left.
Kukiz'15 (Kukiz'15): right-wing, populist.

Hungary

Fidesz (Fidesz): center-right, right-wing, populist.
Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP): center-left, populist.
Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ): center, libertarian.
Hungarian Democratic Forum (MDF): center-right.
Christian Democrat People's Party (KDNP): center-right.
Independent Smallholders, Agrarian Workers, and Civic Party (FKgP): right-wing.
Jobbik (Jobbik): right-wing, populist.
I. National Sovereignty, Radicalism and Populism

Radical expressions of nationalism, like those often found among populist political platforms, have seen an uptick in popularity across both Western and Eastern Europe in recent years (Jones, 2007). New protectionist radical left and populist right parties have forcefully entered the political arenas of various European countries (Mudde, 2007; March 2012; Chiocchetti, 2016). What explains the increasing popularity of such movements? Might it be attributed to the EU-required implementation of minority-protection and free-market enhancing policies (e.g. redistributive social welfare, opening of borders, market integration)? What economic conditions contribute to the attractiveness of such political expressions?

This research is an effort to explain why populist movements have been especially prolific in European politics in recent years, rising to the forefront of the political scenes in countries such as Hungary, Poland, the U.K., Austria and Sweden. I propose a theoretical template, which incorporates the economic precarity of citizens in these countries, the process of EU accession, and the EU's handling of certain issues like the refugee crisis in 2015, to explain why populist movements have been able to garner political success and why an apparent natural progression to radicalism seems to be taking place.

Citizens may find themselves in a position of economic precarity because they lack the education necessary to enter knowledge based economic sectors. The same individuals may inhabit regions, whose economies have incorporated outdated industries (e.g. labor-intensive
agriculture, mining, crude manufacturing) that have been adversely affected by economic liberalization because they fail to remain competitive against open market forces. After EU accession, such regions did improve subtly because of regional development funding, but did not experience the same resounding success that modern regions, which incorporated knowledge-based sectors, experienced from the streamlined economic coordination that came from EU membership. This situation has contributed to significant regional economic disparities, exhibited especially in the case studies on Slovakia and Hungary detailed in Chapter 2. These economic conditions also seem to have fostered the type of political discontent among citizens, where economically struggling individuals perceive that they have been dealt an unfair deal through EU accession, which provides populist political entrepreneurs with an initial foundation of support.

When countries enter the EU, they are also mandated to comply with supranational policy directives, of which certain policies (e.g. national Roma integration strategies framework) require member states to tailor economic assistance programs specifically directed to minority groups which have experienced integration problems (discussed further below). Such EU policy mandates, coupled with a disaffected population already experiencing lagging economic conditions, appear to have provided political entrepreneurs with the fertile ground they need to spin a campaign of rhetoric against the EU and minority groups. Such rhetoric (detailed in subsequent chapters) attacks the EU for unfairly undermining national political autonomy, while claiming that such assistance programs force the redirection of scarce economic resources, which should be used to help the 'native' population, to an undeserving, parasitic minority. Such rhetoric will be evidenced in all the case studies below (Slovakia, Poland, Hungary). These tactics seem to be especially prevalent for their ability to appeal to a fundamental human psychology. As will be
seen, populist political entrepreneurs attempt to spin such policy mandates in terms of a coaltional threat against the sovereignty of their respective countries. From the perspective of citizens on the ground, the effectiveness of such rhetoric relies more on how political issues are perceived, rather than how they truly exist.

When thousands of refugees from the war-torn Middle East and North Africa fled to Europe in 2015, a substantial burden on Italy and Greece who received a disproportionate number of refugees. The EU would intervene by mandating compliance with an obligatory relocation scheme (discussed further in Chapter 2), through European Council decisions 2015/1523 and 2015/1601, which called for the relocation of 40,000 (2015/1523) and 120,000 (2015/1601) asylum seekers (European Commission, 2015). Member states were obligated to accept an EU allocated number of such persons to maintain legal compliance. The policy appears to have been an issue capable inciting immense scrutiny from populist movements throughout Europe (detailed in subsequent chapters). Populist political entrepreneurs would use the situation to fuel their rhetoric, by claiming that the EU's handling of the issue was a threat to national sovereignty and security. Rhetoric would frame the situation as a security threat by calling for the militarization of borders and the erection of border walls. Political entrepreneurs would also claim that the introduction of 'culturally foreign' individuals, who were argued to be culturally incompatible, would raise integration concerns, leading to the development of isolated communities prone to extremism. In all the case studies detailed below, it appears that the refugee crisis, and the EU's obligatory relocation scheme, was the central issue that provided populist political entrepreneurs with the fertile ground they needed to crystalize their support.

Labeling a political movement 'radical' means what exactly? Mudde (2007) notes that the term 'radical', in its modern usage, is often associated with right-wing political expressions, even
though the term was originally used to label the militant left during the French revolution. Today ‘radical’ is still used to qualify left-wing parties such as the French *Parti Radical de Gauche* (Radical Left Party) (Mudde, 2007, pp. 24 - 25). For Mudde (2007), examining the typical political messaging of the radical movements should facilitate the more precise operationalization of the concept of radicalism. It often contains anti-establishment expressions, incorporating virulent attacks against institutions, social programs, and statutes of liberal democracies. Critiques of political pluralism and constitutional provisions to protect social constituencies (e.g. minorities, refugees) figure prominently in such attacks (Betz & Johnson, 2004). For this study, a political movement is considered 'radical' when it incorporates in its political platform demands for drastic institutional changes and explicit, strong and definitional expressions of intolerance for a mainstream political system.

How to identify and operationalize political populism properly has also been the subject of much debate (see Mudde 2004; Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2012; Mudde, 2013). This political family is often categorized as 'anti-political establishment' (e.g. Abedi & Schneider, 2004). The exploitation of political resentment and discontentment are generally at the core of the identity of such political coordination (Lane & Ersson, 1999). There is some consensus in the literature that populism typically incorporates an opportunistic and simplified political signaling aimed at triggering its audience’s gut reactions (e.g. Taggart, 2004; Mudde 2004; Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2012; Mudde, 2013; De Spiegeleire, S., Skinner, C., & Sweijs, T., 2017). For the purpose of this study, this set of features would not stand as a reliable operationalization because they are relatively subjective. Furthermore, mainstream parties have often partially incorporated such features too. Mudde (2004, 2013) defines populism as ”an ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the
corrupt elite’, and which argues that politics should be an expression of the general will of the people” (2013, p. 3). Who might belong to the category of 'the pure people' varies in accordance with the success of this or that specific political entrepreneur or movements. The depiction of the political elite as a main enemy, however, seems to be a constant in populist discourses. Stanley (2008) offers a similar criterion for operationalizing populism. Such political movements incorporate rhetoric highlighting (1) “The existence of two homogeneous social units: ‘the people’ and ‘the elite’”, (2) an antagonistic relationship between those two groups, (3) the question of national sovereignty, and (4) a positive portrayal of ‘the people’, opposed to a demonization of 'the elite' (Stanley, 2008, p. 108).

In the present study I identify populism through the analysis of political rhetoric portraying the idea of a fundamental antagonism between a parasitic political elite and an imagined homogeneous *gemeinschaft*. Political rhetoric is assessed by analyzing the framing methods implemented by burgeoning political entrepreneurs in each respective case study. More recent evidence of such rhetoric is gathered from the websites and social media platforms implemented by radical parties. To assess the temporal trajectory for such rhetoric, publications detailing each movements history and past strategies are included.

Hungary’s Jobbik party is a perfect example of European populism. Also known as the movement for a better Hungary, the Jobbik party has won considerable popular and electoral support. It has emerged as Hungary’s third largest party in the National Assembly since it obtained 20 percent of the votes in the 2014 parliamentary elections (Karacsony & Rona, 2011; Varga, 2014). The Jobbik party has met great success after its adoption of a political platform that includes left-wing populist economic policies (i.e. anti-free market), social conservatism, and hostilities toward minorities (Kovacs, 2013). Jobbik displays the typical features
characteristic of populist movements in its endorsement of a nativist stance – emphasizing a pure people with a history and a territory – and a staunch criticism of the European Union.

The present study focuses on the factors (e.g. economic precarity, policy implementation) that might have contributed to the increase in popularity of the European populist movements. Specifically, the attention is focused on the study of former soviet satellite states - Slovakia, Hungary, and Poland - that have recently undergone the transition from communism to representative democracy. During a relatively brief period of liberalization and democratization (spanning approximately 15 years each), these three countries have experienced social contestations of the communist polity, the generalization of free market exchanges, the development of democratic political institutions, and the efforts to accede into the European Union. The swift political changes that have occurred in Eastern Europe, especially the rapid transition from socialism to capitalism, came with rapid and dramatic disruptions of the social world, which seem to have encouraged political movements promoting ‘radical’ policies. These policies include overhauling the various institutions (e.g. judiciary, electoral laws, parliamentary representation) which support a stable set of checks and balances, to centralize and consolidate power (discussed further in Chapter 3). Radical ideas, also perpetuated by the same political movements, involve a radical anti-minority (e.g. Jews, Roma) discourse, which frames such groups as a threat to national sovereignty.

II. Post-Communist Societies – A Historical Background

From socialism to capitalism.

Prior to the revolutionary agitation that started in 1989, several Eastern and Central European states (i.e. the Eastern Bloc) were under direct soviet rule and treated as satellite states
of the Soviet Union. Beginning in Poland, eventually spreading to other countries such as Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Bulgaria, swift revolutions dismantled the communist control apparatus (Kuran, 1991). Post-revolutionary time, incipient market economies emerged in the recently liberated countries. However, economic conditions and living standards eventually deteriorated during the protracted process of democratization (Pridham & Vanhanen, 2002).

In Poland, a comprehensive overhaul of the governments political institutions was undertaken, which involved regional power devolution and comprehensive administrative reforms (Nunberg, 1999). Following Round Table discussions in 1989 between Solidarność, a trade union movement that had been spearheading the opposition to the communist rule, and the communist government, a parliamentary system was established, which incorporated proportional voting (Nunberg, 1999). During the same period, new political parties materialized that appealed to divergent pockets of an already fragmented electorate. A contentious issue of the time was the extent and the breadth of the government decentralization. Social Democrats advocated moving most administrative control to local entities, while post-socialist coalitions favored maintaining a stronger centralized administrative authority (Nunberg, 1999). Though coalition governments of the era were relatively unstable, they remained functional, meeting the major legislative demands associated with the burdens of democratization and transitioning to a market economy.

When Hungary began its transition to an open society model of governance in 1989, it did so with a slight economic advantage over other Eastern European countries, given its higher living standards and pre-existing market-responsive economic policies (The World Bank Group, 2003). Under pressure from the street, the Communist Party relented and quickly after, in October of 1989, the parliament passed legislation that allowed a multi-party parliamentary and direct presidential election (Brown, 1991). A center-right coalition, led by the Democratic Forum (MDF),
garnered 60 percent of the votes, which earned it a parliamentary majority (Brown, 1991). Although the initial economic reforms were successful in attracting foreign investments, by the mid 1990's fiscal deficits would largely be responsible for an economic decline (discussed further in Chapter 2), spurring additional comprehensive structural reforms (The World Bank Group, 2003).

Following Poland and Hungary, in November of 1989 Czechoslovakia underwent its own nezna revolucia ('gentle revolution'), launched with large protests from students and dissidents (Glenn, 1999). By December of 1989, Czechoslovakia adopted a coalition government that was still partially controlled by a communist minority. In June of 1990, Czechoslovakia held its first free parliamentary and federal elections, which ushered in a political regime that has been described as authoritarian in nature (Pridham & Vanhanen, 2002). Movements coordinated by President Vaclav Havel, among which the Czech Civic Forum (center left) and the Slovak Public Against Violence (center left), were able to command a strong majority in the House of the People and the House of Nations (the two chambers of Czechoslovakia's Federal Assembly). The coalition also attempted to firmly entrench its power by coercing other political parties into the coalition (Pridham & Vanhanen, 2002). After the dissolution of Czechoslovakia in January of 1993, Slovakia formed a ministerial coalition government with proportional representation in parliament. Through the mid 1990's, rivalries between coalitions with divergent political agendas impeded a quick and smooth opening to a market economy and led to the failure of initial attempts to join the European Union (Pridham, 1999).

The Accession Process

As economic and political conditions somewhat improved in the second half of the 1990’s, several leaderships of Central and Eastern European countries engaged in negotiations to join the

European Union accession is contingent upon properly addressing the common legal rights and fundamental freedoms outlined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, as stipulated in Article 6 of the Treaty of the European Union (Official Journal of European Communities, 2002). This is done primarily through the transposition of the body of laws and regulations previously adopted by the European Union – also known as the Community Acquis – in the national legislations of the country to be admitted. E.U. directives about multiculturalism and equality are some of such dispositions that must be transposed in the national legislation of any new member state. Those directives include stipulations about (1) the prevention of discrimination against ethnic minorities, (2) the guarantee of free movement of workers regardless of their ethnicity, and (3) the protection of equal employment opportunity for men and women. For instance, the European Council directive 2000/43/EC stipulates that all EU member states shall adopt minimal requirements in their legislation to combat xenophobia and racism.

All member states must also participate in EU programs supporting ethnic minorities. In most of Europe, the Roma have been largely maintained segregated from the national communities in which they reside. In 2011, the EU council adopted the National Framework for Roma Integration Strategies (NRIS) platform that was elaborated in conjunction with various organizations of the civil society (European Commission, 2014). The platform facilitates the coordination of the development of policies for the inclusion of Roma communities across member states. The NRIS includes EU-wide council measures and directives, as well as country-specific policy recommendations to combat discrimination and to improve living conditions of the Roma
minority (European Commission, 2014). These measures and policy recommendations largely focus on the means to improve employment and educational outcomes through Roma-specific programs. Member states receive EU funding through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund (ESF) to develop such programs.

The transposition of the Community Acquis, which entails a partial relinquishment of national autonomy, has not been without opposition. During the preparation to the EU accession, ‘single-issue' parties had already started to emerge in Eastern Europe, with platforms entirely defined by their Euroscepticism. (Kopecky & Mudde, 2002). In Poland, far-right parties gained considerable popularity immediately before and upon accession to the EU in 2004 (Pankowski, 2010). The Polish Peasant Party (PSL) provides a perfect example of the dynamics at play. The PSL is a successor to a former satellite communist party, representing the interests of both rural and capitalist farmers. As Kopecky & Mudde (2002) point out, Polish agriculture was confronted with the EU requirement of opening its market to competition during the accession negotiations. As such, prior to and during the process of EU accession, the PSL redefined its party platform on hard-lined EU accession negotiations, endorsing protectionism. The PSL, along with the Self-Defence of Poland (Samoobrona), a far-right populist party also representing agricultural interests, quickly emerged as the strongest sceptics of EU integration (Kopecky & Mudde, 2004).

III. Research Questions

The emergence of populist parties in Poland, as well as other parts of Eastern Europe, may be related to resentment over a perceived loss of national sovereignty (Grabbe, 2003). In situations where communities are in precarious economic conditions, resentment toward policies that would privilege the interests of some groups over others is quick to emerge. Naturally, although underdeveloped regions have benefitted from EU funds, those in need of assistance are likely to
perceive such policies as an unfair allocation of national resources. This may lead to suspicion about the legitimacy of political action and the fairness of political institutions. Such resentment seems to be compounded through the political rhetoric of political entrepreneurs that attack the legitimacy of the EU and obligatory minority and refugee assistance programs. The research investigates if certain factors (e.g. the popularity of populist movements, resentment of minorities, losses of trust in EU institutions, the radicalization of populist rhetoric) have changed after accession to the EU and the adoption of minority assistance policies conceived at the supranational level. This study will address the following specific questions:

1a. Does political discontent seem to emerge more in economically underdeveloped regions, which have not benefitted substantially, relative to more developed regions, from economic liberalization and EU accession?

1b. Are increases in the popularity of populist movements, distrust of mainstream political parties and the European Union, and increases in the resentment of minority groups, more likely in regions that are underdeveloped economically?

2. Has there been a marked change in how populist movements express themselves politically (e.g. emphasis on specific issues, rhetorical framing strategies) in Poland, Hungary, and Slovakia since the refugee crisis in 2015?

IV. Methodology

The research utilizes a systematic multiple case studies approach to investigate the situational template and research questions mentioned above. Case studies will focus specifically on the former communist countries of Slovakia, Poland, and Hungary, which have all experienced a protracted period of economic development after undertaking post-transition economic
liberalization, contain significant regional economic disparities, have seen radicalized activity from populist political movements, and have undertaken the institutional changes associated to EU accession (all being involved in the 2004 EU expansion). In addition to the specific case studies, general arguments are supported by evidence (e.g. social survey data, public rhetoric, voting results) from similar situations throughout Europe, where populist movements have seen an uptick in popularity, including the U.K., Sweden, Austria and Italy.

In all the case studies addressed, a level of systematicity is adhered to, in which the political systems, political parties, economic factors (e.g. regional disparities, GDP trends, GINI, sector development), and reaction to specific political issues (e.g. refugee relocation, EU minority assistance programs) is incorporated. Underpinning research questions 1a and 1b is an argument regarding economic precarity and its potential for providing populist political entrepreneurs with a fertile ground to spread their messages. To investigate the effect of economic precarity, a regional analysis is provided for each case study which incorporates data on regional GDP trends, regional reliance on certain economic sectors, and GINI coefficients, obtained from reputable research firms such as the World Bank and Office of Economic Coordination and Development (OECD). Economic data is then supported by election data showing where specific parties did well. Statistical regressions that analyze the regional determinants motivating voting behavior (e.g. unemployment, education, minority population) are included in the Slovakia and Hungary case studies for additional support. If it is observed that populist parties do well specifically in economically underdeveloped regions, and support is increasing during relevant periods, such as the refugee crisis, implementation of minority assistance programs, and various litigation announcements made by the EU for legal noncompliance, this would see to support question 1a.
The inclusion of GINI coefficients, which serve as a measure for income inequality, is especially relevant for determining the economic underpinnings behind political discontent and societal instability (Nagel 1974). A given country's GINI coefficient reflects inequalities inherent in that country's wealth (income) distribution, which is commonly referred to as the Lorenz curve (Subramanian, 2002). The Lorenz curve plots income percentiles, among the population, along its X axis and cumulative income along its Y axis. The GINI coefficient is effectively double the area between the Lorenz curve and a line that should reflect perfect income equality (Investopedia, 2018). As Subramanian (2002) puts it, the GINI coefficient can be thought of simplistically as, "in ‘equivalent’ welfare terms [...] the proportion of a cake of given size going to the poorer of two individuals in a two-person cake-sharing problem" (p. 1). The GINI coefficient ranges from values of 0 to 1, where a value of 0 would indicate perfect income equality, and a value of 1 would indicate total inequality (where the top income percentile would reap all the income in a respective country) (World Bank Group, 2018; Investopedia, 2018). It's important to note that a country may very well have a high absolute income, but if significant inequalities exist, such a country can still have a high GINI coefficient. A body of empirical research has suggested that income inequality (as evidenced through GINI), and individuals' negative assessments of their relative economic standing, is a significant motivator behind political discontent (Nagel, 1974; Nafziger & Auvinen, 2002; Sigelman & Simpson, 1977; Lichbach, 1989). In all the case studies addressed in this research (i.e. Slovakia, Hungary, Poland), it can be observed that the GINI coefficient increased significantly after EU accession.

To assess factors underpinning research questions 1b and 2 (e.g. regional attraction of populist movements, rhetorical framing strategies), evidence of populist political rhetoric is provided, collected through published reports online social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)
behavior, media reports, peer-reviewed academic articles (e.g. web content analysis studies), and survey studies implemented by public policy research firms. If it is observed that an increase in the radicalization of rhetoric regarding the EU and minority assistance programs is being exhibited by parties, that are also finding their support base in economically precarious regions (as evidenced through election results), it can be inferred that citizens in these regions are indeed perceiving such programs negatively. Survey data results can also shed light on issues regarding trust in the EU, and mainstream parties, among such supporters. Finally, through the evidence of rhetoric, including its specific framing and frequency during relevant periods, research question 2 can be supported.

V. Theoretical Background

Economic precarity, niche overlap & ethnic competition

This research will pay specific attention to regions that seem to offer a fertile ground to political entrepreneurs seeking to gain power through populist movements (both from the Left and the Right). That is, regions where there is high unemployment, low income, regional GDP far below the EU average, and a significant presence of minority populations. Individuals sharing a common identity finding themselves in precarious economic conditions (e.g. low income, unemployed) may perceive to be in competition over scarce resources (e.g. jobs, welfare benefits) with members of other socially distinct groups. Typically, these distinct groups will be comprised by those perceived as outsiders from the majority, whether through recent migration waves (newcomers), or through persistent and long-lasting social exclusion. When there is a visible social distinction, because such groups may carry with them different cultural markers or phenotypic features, political entrepreneurs that seek to capitalize on such situations are likely to frame these perceived problems in terms of ethnic opposition (Olzak, 1992). Prior research investigating this
phenomenon largely focused on immigration (Esses et al. 2001; Citrin et al. 1997). Composition and scale of the fluxes greatly impact the perceived threat associated with immigration, where a large-scale influx during a short window of time is generally perceived as more salient and threatening (Olzak, 1992; Schneider, 2008).

Central to ethnic competition theory is the concept of niche overlap, in which minority groups attempt to enter economic niches already occupied by segments of the majority population (Hannan, 1979; Barth, 1998). Those framed, by political entrepreneurs, as categorical outsiders to the majority population (e.g. asylum-seekers, immigrants, segregated minorities) will often attempt to enter low-skilled labor positions (e.g. labor-intensive agriculture, mining, crude manufacturing) that do not require intensive education. Citizens, inhabiting economically precarious positions, may perceive that they are in competition for the same positions. In situations where such niche overlap occurs, combined with high unemployment, social welfare policies discriminating between ethnic groups (e.g. NRIS job training programs) have the potential to exacerbate hostility and resentment.

Situations in which economic and political conditions fuel the resentment toward ethnic minorities constitute a fertile ground for political entrepreneurs and populist movements. A good example of that dynamic is provided by Marian Kotleba, the leader of the far-right populist People's Party that has remained in power since 2013 in Banska Bystrica, a region of central Slovakia where the per capita GDP is at 61% of the EU average (Eurostat, 2017). Kotleba’s political rhetoric during campaigning relied on virulent criticisms of social welfare programs for the ‘undeserving’ Roma minority (Kluknavska, 2015). According to the European Commission, the Roma - Slovakia's largest ethnic minority - comprise 9.02% of the total Slovak population. Banska Bystrica represents a perfect example of an area economically lagging, while also
containing a substantial, largely segregated minority population. It has provided a fertile ground for a political entrepreneur to emerge on the base of an exclusionary program (discussed further in subsequent chapters).

*The welfare state and multiculturalism*

The implementation of multicultural policies in ethnically heterogeneous societies seems to have contributed to the increase in resentment toward minorities, as well as a decrease of support for the welfare state. A common feature unifying progressive political platforms is the support of policies that increase multiculturalism, whether it is implemented through immigration strategies, positive discrimination, or redistributive assistance programs. A growing body of literature has been devoted to investigating the relationship between welfare states and multiculturalist policies (Mau & Burkhardt, 2009; Senik et al. 2009; Tolsma et al. 2008, Banting & Kymlicka, 2003). This research seems to indicate that implementing multicultural policies (e.g. redistribution on the base of cultural identity and positive discrimination), in regions that are either ethnically heterogeneous or have experienced recent immigration waves, can increase tensions among majority residents. Scholars have called this tension the "progressive's dilemma" (Goodhart, 2004; Pearce, 2004). Banting (2010) argues that multicultural policies increasing the visibility of diversity has progressively eroded social solidarity in Europe. As majority populations begin to pull their support for progressive policies, for diverse reasons such as the perceived cultural threat or the fears responding to Islamic terrorist acts, political coalitions that once built the welfare state are beginning to fragment (Banting, 2010). A generous welfare state could be incompatible with multicultural policies, hence, the 'dilemma' (see Kymlicka & Banting, 2006).

Alesina, Baqir, and Easterly (1999) have shown that, in the United States, social expenditures typically decline with increases in diversity. Diversity may be the reason why the
United States has failed to establish the large-scale redistributive policies alike the ones in Europe and Canada (Alesina et al., 2001). The United States spends approximately 15.1 percent of total GDP on social programs yearly (as of 1995), compared to the European Union, which spent 25.4 percent of its GDP (Alesina et al., 2001). It should be noted, however, that the margin between the EU and the United States has decreased in recent years. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United States increased social spending to 19.3 percent in 2016, while most EU member states have remained relatively stable.

According to the OECD, Sweden spent 30.6 percent of its total GDP on social programs in 2016, making that country rank as one of the largest redistributive welfare states in the world (OECD, 2017). Eger (2009), by analyzing survey responses assessing attitudes towards social expenditures, has shown that, in Sweden, recent immigration waves, and subsequent increases in ethnic heterogeneity negatively affected attitudes towards redistributive social welfare. Eger (2009) also found negative attitudes to be stronger among those from low economic positions, those with fewer educational attainments, and those with a greater history of receiving social assistance. Sweden has shown a 3 percent decrease in social spending over the last ten years (Office of Economic Coordination and Development, 2017). In analyzing time-series data spanning from 1994 to 2010, Schmidt-Catran & Spies (2016) found that, in Germany, residents showed a decline in support for welfare programs, as the foreign-born population increased at the regional level. Aligning with what could be predicted from ethnic competition theory, Schmidt-Catran & Spies (2016) also found this effect to be significantly stronger in regions with high unemployment rates.

As shown in studies based on responses to social surveys (e.g. Eger, 2010; Schmidt-Catran & Spies, 2016), individuals in economically precarious positions tend to decrease their support for
welfare spending as the foreign-born population increases. However, these studies do not address the specific economic niche occupied by individuals immigrating and thus lack a proper explanatory model. Ethnic heterogeneity alone does not help explain decreases in support for spending. Other features that explain the phenomena should include the specific economic niche occupied by newcomers, or marginalized and ostracized minorities, coupled with redistributive assistance programs to targeting specific groups. The combination provides political entrepreneurs, seeking to exploit situations where niche overlap is occurring, with a fertile ground to rally support.

Although the 'Progressive's Dilemma' appears to hold in Europe, Soroka, Johnston, Banting (2004) have found that this effect - decreases in support for welfare spending when the foreign-born population is increased - doesn't necessarily hold in Canada. Although not as prolific a social welfare spender compared with Europe, Canada still exceeds U.S. levels for social program spending (Alesina et al. 2001). Interestingly, Canada is also quite ethnically heterogeneous, with 18 percent of its population being born outside of the country (Kymlicka & Banting, 2006). A common assumption among scholars (e.g. Alesina et al. 2001, Alesina et al. 2003, Alesina et al. 2012) is that ethnic heterogeneity decreases interpersonal trust - a factor necessary for supporting a large welfare state. Kymlicka & Banting (2006, ) have found that trust (measured through e.g., questions assessing respondents’ confidence in having a lost wallet returned) decreased in Canadian neighborhoods that were more ethnically diverse, providing some support for the assumption. However, with further investigation, Kymlicka & Banting (2006) found that, even after controlling for income, support for welfare programs did not decline in the same, ethnically diverse neighborhoods. Canada stands as an exception to the 'progressives' dilemma'.
Euroscepticism

In regions where strong national identification is the norm, fears associated with European integration provide an exploitable opportunity for political entrepreneurs. Although research has focused on how national identity can suppress support for European integration, there is a dearth of research that investigates whether accession to the EU and implementation of policies directed towards specific groups might motivate and strengthen nationalistic expressions.

Individual assessments of the trustworthiness in political institutions are especially relevant for the discussion and largely depend on the perception that institutions are performing their intended function and that politicians are adequately representing the interests of the electorate (Lenard, 2012). When politicians do not represent the interests of the electoral majority enough (e.g. when politicians complying with supranational EU directives selectively allocate funding, in short supply, to specific groups), trust in both politicians, and the institutions they represent, might suffer. If politicians comply with EU obligations mandating them to develop economic assistance programs for select categories of individuals, like the NRIS, residents occupying positions of economic precarity might perceive such allocation as a direct threat to their interests, thus undermining trust in such politicians. Politicians that attempt to fulfill certain EU obligations (e.g. those parties that lead EU accession negotiations) could alienate a portion of the electorate. My research investigates reactions to such political leadership (i.e. those representing mainstream political parties, favorable to EU), and how they vary depending on the economic circumstances associated to specific regions. It's expected that highly developed regions, which have incorporated knowledge-based sectors that have benefitted from EU accession, will remain partial to mainstream parties partial to Europeanization. It's also expected that these same parties will lose considerable support among economically underdeveloped regions that, although benefitting
slightly from EU accession, have not seen the same success experienced by more developed regions.

Consensus among European citizens in favor of European integration has eroded in recent decades (Krouwel & Abts, 2007). A body of research has investigated the negative relationship between the process enlargement, the expanding influence of the European Union, and institutional trust in member states (Hudson, 2006; McLaren, 2007; Abts et al. 2009; Arnold et al. 2012) The decline of trust in the EU, and its progressive enlargement, has been termed "Euroscepticism". Euroscepticism might be driven by citizens’ dissatisfaction with their respective national political institutions (Gabel, 1998; McLaren, 2002). Krouwel & Abts (2007) have shown empirically that Euroscepticism may be associated to a broader decline in trust in democratic institutions (both at the national and supranational level), partially spurred by the increasing influence of populist political entrepreneurs that successfully tap into various regional forms of political discontent.

Human, social and economic capitals play an essential role in moderating individuals’ opinion toward European integration (Marks & Hooghe, 2003). Those with a greater skill set, better social networks and more resources have generally been better equipped for dealing with market liberalization (Gabel, 1998). Indeed, individuals with economic ties to international markets have greatly benefited from the removal of exchange barriers or the use of a common currency that came with EU membership. Low-skilled workers have been faced with much greater hurdles once integration in the competitive international market took place. Economic sectors incorporating low-skilled labor (e.g. labor-intensive agriculture, crude manufacturing, mining) have not been able to sustain competitiveness when faced with the open market forces associated to economic liberalization and European integration (Swank & Betz, 2003). As will be seen in Chapter 2, this dynamic has contributed to significant unemployment, often necessitating the need
for countries (e.g. Hungary) to accept substantial external economic stimulus packages to prevent economic collapse.

Economic precarity alone is insufficient as an explanation for why political discontent, including harsh Euroscpticism and extreme expressions populist sovereignism, emerges in economically underdeveloped regions. Such regions did benefit slightly from EU accession through economic assistance from EU regional development and social funds, but not close to the extent that economically modernized regions, incorporating knowledge-based sectors, flourished. As Nagel (1974) argues, high income inequality (as evidenced through GINI) is a significant factor behind political discontent. Thus, a citizen's baseline assessment of their economic standing, relative to others, should be a more significant motivator, in relation to precarity alone, behind political discontent. As Nagel (1974) puts it, as a citizen "measures his lot against another's" the relative disadvantage and dissatisfaction that can emerge spurs political discontent (Nagel, 1974, p. 454). Research on the base-rate fallacy (as it relates to economic assessment) has also shown that humans have an innate tendency to adjust the assessment of their relative economic standing by ignoring base-rate information (i.e. previous economic condition) and focusing solely on individuating information (i.e. current economic standing), rather than integrating both (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981; Bar-Hillel, 2002). Thus, although citizens in underdeveloped regions may have seen a slight increase in their economic standing after EU accession, they will likely ignore information about their previous economic standing and focus solely on information regarding their current standing, relative to those that have benefitted substantially in more developed regions.
Chapter 2
National Sovereignty

I. Introduction

The accession to the European Union comes with a partial relinquishment of national autonomy. Member countries must adopt EU policy directives that curtail sovereignty to some extent. This was seen especially with the refugee relocation scheme, implemented by the EU in 2015, which mandated that member states take in a specific number of refugees, proportionate to their population, to relieve the burden on Greece and Italy, who received a disproportionately large and unmanageable number of refugees (European Commission, 2018). Is relinquishing some national autonomy by a state perceived as a threat by its citizens? If so, does the perceived threat motivate nationalist movements? In the case of refugee relocation scheme, it does appear that the EU's handling of the issue compounded frustrations with the EU and motivated the rhetoric of populist political entrepreneurs (addressed below).

The 2015 large influx of asylum-seekers and refugees has put a strain both on the societies of member states and the EU institutions (Carrera et al., 2015). To ensure the ‘sharing of the responsibility,’ the European Union adopted a refugee relocation scheme that guaranties the equitable redistribution of displaced people across member states (Baubock, 2018). The program is enforceable in accordance with Article 63.1 of the Treaty of Nice that holds that EU member countries are bound to protect the rights of refugees and asylum seekers. The policy was intended to alleviate the burden placed on Italy and Greece, which, at the time, received approximately 80% of the refugees moving to Europe (Baubock, 2018). Many political leaders, especially in Eastern Europe, opposed the quota system since its inception (Baubock, 2018).
At the height of the migration crisis, in 2015, both Hungary and Slovakia’s European Council representatives voted against the implementation of the refugee quota system, arguing that their current institutions could not handle the increasing numbers of persons (Crisp & Day, 2010). When Hungary openly opposed the refugee crisis by building border walls, the EU’s migration commissioner, Dimitris Avramopoulos, warned that if Hungary "[were to continue] to refuse to accept refugees, it would be referred to the European Court of Justice for breaches of EU law", which could have potentially resulted in large fines (Crisp & Day, 2010). In September of 2017, Slovakia and Hungary challenged the EU’s compulsory migrant quota system in the European Court of Justice. With regards to the quota system, Hungary’s foreign minister, Peter Szijjarto, the leader and spokesman of Fidesz, a right-wing, populist political party, is quoted as having said in a local news conference: "politics has raped European laws and values" (Crisp & Day, 2010).

Carrera et al. (2015) argued that the welcoming of refugees and their assimilation into the labor force could increase GDP in member states by up to 0.2% per year. Previous migrant assimilation programs have had limited success in Europe, however (see Cesari, 2009). Unassimilated communities prone to extremism have sometimes emerged because of such population movements (Cesari, 2009). In their 2015 study Lilly and Shapiro proposed that the 1,255,600 first-time asylum seekers applying for international protection across Europe in 2015 alone, would likely stretch the institutions in charge of sponsoring migrants’ integration into labor forces and social structures (Lilly & Shapiro, 2015). Desiderio (2015) argues too that refugees’ integration requires "deep, up-front investments in […] education and labor market activities (in an already tight fiscal context) for the benefit of people who, in the end, may be required to return home". Funds that are used for the development of integration programs for refugees and asylum seekers may be scarce resource for countries with lagging, underdeveloped economic regions. This
opens the opportunity for populist political entrepreneurs to engage in a rhetoric that attacks the EU for mandating integration and assistance programs and the subsequent loss in political autonomy. Populist political entrepreneurs may argue that the funds should be used for helping citizens in underdeveloped regions, rather than provided to those categorized as outsiders (i.e. immigrants, asylum seekers, Roma minority).

Desidiero (2016) studied immigration across all OECD countries and notes that refugees’ labor qualifications belong primarily to low-skilled occupations and primary economic sectors, such as agriculture, manufacturing, and the service industry. Employers in these fields of occupations receive financial incentives from their national governments (e.g. Sweden, Germany) and the EU, for hiring refugee workers (Lilly & Shapiro, 2015; OECD/UNHCR, 2018). The European Social Fund and the Asylum Migration Immigration Fund (AMIF) both contain instruments to provide funding to host countries to streamline refugees’ access to their respective labor markets (European Commission, 2018). Such schemes have the unintended consequence of putting working class citizens of host countries at a disadvantage.

In Sweden, the "100 club" program guarantees governmental wage subsidies for employers who commit to hiring 100 refugees over the course of three years (OECD/UNHCR, 2018). The Swedish government has experienced considerable political backlash for accepting a relatively large influx of migrants (i.e. approximately 2 percent of the total population) and providing advanced assistance to immigrants, rather than directing that portion of the budget to security (Reuters Staff, 2016). In a similar vein, 82 percent of Hungarians agreed with the statement that refugees were a burden because they took jobs and benefits from citizens (Reuters Staff, 2016). In the 2018 Swedish parliamentary election, the Swedish Democrats, a right-wing nationalist party led by Jimmie Akinson (who also served as the leader in various neo-Nazi movements), gained 29
seats over the previous election of 2014 (Pollard & Ahlander, 2018). Sweden currently (as of 2018) is grappling with a hung parliament as a result.

The EU’s control of aspects of member states’ policy elaboration could be linked to the recent success of populist parties. Those parties typically promise to recover national sovereignty, that is, to regain control over its governance, unburdened by supranational interference (Lilly & Shapiro, 2015). Such parties depart from the mainstream European political consensus on migration, trade, and affirmative action policies and special programs for minorities. Promoting a populist sovereignist political agenda, those parties identify supranational actors and global-market agents as enemies, dismantling the institutions of the societies of the peoples that they propose to defend, as well as limiting their capacity of self-determination (De Spiegeleire, Skinner, & Sweijs, 2017).

Populist sovereignty advocates that the interests of the nation should be strictly prioritized over foreign interests. The recent 2016 GOP campaign run by U.S. president Donald Trump seems to have adopted such political message. The campaign slogan "America First" and the promise to transfer power "from Washington D.C. to the American people" are good illustrations of the tenor of the nationalist and populist messaging favored by populist sovereignist parties (De Spiegeleire, Skinner, & Sweijs, 2017). The depiction of a parasitic elite from which the power to govern should be wrestled away to be returned to the people figures prominently in the political message of populist parties operating in Europe (Mudde, 2013).

In 2016, the United Kingdom held a referendum on exiting the European Union (Brexit), resulting in a slim majority, 51.9 percent, expressing its wish to leave the EU (Freeden, 2017). During the preparation for the referendum, the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), a Eurosceptic populist party, strongly advocated for an exit. One of the primary issues highlighted
by UKIP was the compulsory refugee quota. Other issues raised were related to migrant access to welfare, and border security (Vasilopolou, 2016). UKIP’s messaging seems to have responded to a groundswell of discontent. Indeed, according to the 2015 wave of the Eurobarometer public opinion poll, over 61 percent of British respondents claimed that immigration was the most pressing issue currently facing the U.K. (Vasilopolou, 2016).

Vasilopolou (2016) analyzed public opinion surveys from the U.K.; specifically, responses to the question "when negotiating Britain's relationship with the EU, in which of the following areas do you think David Cameron should seek to change our relationship?" (p. 223). Among the British respondents, 52 percent ranked "to regain greater control of borders and immigration from the EU" as the most pressing issue, while 46 percent of respondents wanted to limit the state benefits for which EU migrants qualify (Vasilopolou, 2016, p. 223). Additionally, 29 percent of respondents wanted greater powers for their national parliament to block EU policies, which would indicate that a significant proportion of the general public sought greater political autonomy (Vasilopolou, 2016, p. 223). Here, it is important to note that, among the general public and the rhetoric implemented by political entrepreneurs, it does not appear that a clear distinction is made between immigrants, refugees, and asylum-seekers. Rather, it appears that they are broadly categorized as outsiders and, in extreme cases of radicalized rhetoric, regarded as 'foreign invaders' and a threat to the homogeneity and sovereignty of the respective host country (discussed further in Ch. 3).

The EU's influence on the United Kingdom’s migration policy (as well as other issues, like trade and labor mobility) provided a fertile ground for UKIP to agitate for the recovery of a greater national sovereignty and, eventually, a European Union exit. Vasilopolou (2016) noted the relevance of the socioeconomic status for the support of an EU exit. A greater affluence and a
higher education level guaranteed a greater support for remaining in the Union (Vasilopolou, 2016). As Vasilopolou argues, individuals with higher levels of education and income "tend to consider themselves ‘winners’ of globalization and are thus less likely to express dissatisfaction, more likely to reap the economic benefits of European integration and less likely to feel threatened by other cultures" (Vasilopolou, 2016, p. 224).

In theory, populist sovereignty does not constitute necessarily an authoritarian threat to liberal democracy. These movements generally demand an increase in popular sovereignty and public participation in democracy (De Spiegeleire, Skinner, & Sweijjs, 2017). Mudde & Kaltwasser (2012) argue that it could serve as a needed corrective against the possible corruption of liberal democracy. However, when in power, populist sovereignist movements often contribute to the erosion of the institutional pillars of liberal democracies (Mudde, 2007, p. 31). Such pillars include the institutions (e.g. irremovable judiciary, electoral laws, regional parliamentary representation) that maintain a proper system of checks and balances.

Corduwener (2014) analyzed party documents from the Freedom Party of Austria (FPO), a far-right populist party, to determine which features of liberal democracies it adopted, and which were rejected. The FPO attacks the legitimacy of the Austrian traditional parties by accusing them of coordinating as members of a supranational political elite that would have stolen control over decisional institutions. FPO’s political messaging often attempts to persuade its audience of the systematic lack of neutrality of government institutions (Corduwener, 2014).

Italy's Five Star Movement (M5S), led by former comedian Beppe Grillo, stands as another example of populist movement, which met considerable success in the 2013 Italian general elections by adopting an anti-establishment stance. The party line presented a virulent opposition to mainstream political figures and parties, which the Five Star Movement’s political rhetoric
depicted as a cartel (Bordignon & Ceccarini, 2015). In the views of the M5S’ leadership, inexperienced citizens would have done a better job than career politicians, the inexperience of the former being considered a strong moral guarantee (Bordignon & Ceccarini, 2015). To fill the 163 parliamentary seats (i.e. Chamber of Deputies and Senate) it had won in the election, the M5S held party-members-only online elections, in which ordinary citizens were selected as running candidates. The incumbents had to be certified by Grillo himself. Grillo's inclusion criteria specified that they could not have criminal convictions and they could not be members of other mainstream parties (Bordignon & Ceccarini, 2013; Bordignon & Ceccarini, 2015). The party’s objective was a parliament composed of 'ordinary people', with all economic strata represented and an increase in women and youth representation (Russo, Tronconi, & Verzichelli, 2014). The move has forced other mainstream parties, including the PD (Social Democrat Party), to follow suite to remain competitive (Russo, Tronconi, & Verzichelli, 2014). The election of ordinary citizens to MP positions, as a check to political careerism and its perceived natural consequence, corruption, became much more frequent in Italian politics (Bordignon & Ceccarini, 2015).

A more troubling feature exhibited by the Italian Five Star Movement is the "strong man" nature of its leader. Such authoritarian leaders maintain central control over decision making, reject the delegation of power to other governing institutions, and occupy an antagonistic relationship with other ‘competing’ agencies of the state (Dix, 1985) Beppe Grillo has consistently criticized the complexity and intrusiveness of state bureaucracy, going as far as to justify publicly the act of tax evasion (Bordignon & Ceccarini, 2015). As the party became more successful, many (including party members) began to accuse Grillo of acting increasingly in an authoritarian fashion, exerting much control over the movement’s strategic choices (Bordignon & Ceccarini, 2013).
Populist sovereignist movements seem to achieve the most popularity in working-class constituencies that face difficulties competing in an open labor market (Betz & Meret, 2012). Populist parties’ leaders often link free-market institutions with a remote, globalist political elite in an antithetical position to the interests of the working class (Mudde, 2007). The institutions and policies supportive of a market economy are generally under attack from such movements, while protectionist economic measures are proffered (Mudde, 2007). Trump followed a similar logic in his 2016 campaign promoting an anti-globalization position, attacking global trade deals (e.g. Transpacific Partnership, North American Free Trade Agreement) and promising additional tariffs on imports.

As Rodrik (2017) notes, global trade causes economic frictions, among which, job displacement for some groups. But trade is only one factor that impacts labor markets. Other critical factors include demand shocks, domestic technological innovation, and ordinary competition with other domestic firms (Rodrik, 2017). Why would populist movements consistently attack foreign trade over other economic forces? Foreign trade is often presented as tantamount to a foreign influence and a threat to national sovereignty, hence, attacking it may be used to steer political constituencies to action, especially if those constituencies find themselves in fragile economic conditions. Also, publicly criticizing foreign trade may constitute a strong political signal as it taps into concerns about justice and fairness: ‘by playing an unfair game, they are robbing us of what is ours.’

Starmans, Sheskin, & Bloom (2017) have observed in laboratory studies that humans reliably prefer fair inequality over unfair equality. When in small groups, individuals typically express preferences for equality. However, in acknowledging individual differences in merit (e.g. work ethic, perseverance), general aptitudes, and moral integrity, people also recognize that an
equal distribution could be inherently unfair, rewarding free-riders at the expense of those more deserving (Rodrik, 2017). People don’t necessarily have a preference against unequal wealth distributions, but rather, an aversion to perceived unfairness (e.g. exploitation of market conditions). This finding extends as far back as the foundational work done by Kahneman, Knetch, & Thaler (1986). Trade is particularly salient because it can be framed in terms of economic unfairness. As Rodrik (2017) explains, "It's one thing to lose your job to someone who competes under the same rules as you do. It's a different thing when you lose your job to someone who takes advantage of lax labor, environmental, tax, or safety standards in other countries" (p. 15).

It's not uncommon for populist political entrepreneurs to attribute the lack of economic success to international economic agents they depict as a globalist elite that thrives by evading national constraints. Far-right populist parties, such as the Lega Nord in Italy, the Austrian Freedom Party, and the French National Front, are highly critical of the financial power and influence of large, international corporations and supranational political actors like the EU (Zaslove, 2008). Italy's Lega Nord primarily represents a core constituency of working and lower-middle class supporters in small townships in North-Eastern Italy (Beirich and Woods, 2000). During its time in parliament, the Lega Nord intensified its attack on what it called domestic and international political elites (Zaslove, 2008). Mainstream politicians, at the national level and representing the European Union, were portrayed as corrupt careerists. Lega Nord also became especially vocal in its support for trade barriers to protect local industries from the forces of the global market. The party has criticized the EU for not implementing measures to protect Italian products from external competition (Zaslove, 2008).

Across Europe, the growing representation of populist movements in national parliaments appears to be constraining the policy proposals and rhetoric of more centrist political parties. In
Denmark, the Danish People's Party, a right-wing populist movement, has seen considerable recent success, obtaining 12.3 percent of the parliamentary vote in 2011, and jumping to 21.2 percent in 2015 (Judis, 2016, p. 132). The Danish People's Party has campaigned on a Eurosceptic platform, calling for the bolstering of border controls and restrictions on immigration. Because of its success, the Danish Peoples Party was capable of providing informal support to the Liberal Alliance, blocking the Social Democrats from forming a government in 2015. In exchange for their informal support, the Liberal alliance adopted many of the Danish Peoples Party’s favored policies (Judis, 2016, p. 133). Those policies included cutting refugee and immigrant benefits by up to 45 percent, and compelling schools to introduce pork in their lunch menus in defiance to Islamic religious requirements (Judis, 2016, p. 133).

Populist parties with nativist tendencies have increased their influence, resulting in a loss of seat-share among mainstream parties unwilling to shift from the center-left or center-right (Galston, 2018). In 2006, the Czech Social Democrats, categorized as ideologically center-left, garnered almost one third of the seats (i.e. 70 seats, 30.2% parliamentary total) of the national parliament. In the 2017 Czech parliamentary elections, the party plummeted to only 15 seats, or 7.3% of the total seats in parliament. Indeed, social democrats have lost shares of the electoral votes in all countries that have seen the strong resurgence of sovereignist populists, including the Czech Republic, the Netherlands, Austria, and France (Karnitschnig, 2015). Over the last two decades, populist sovereignist parties have increasingly garnered electoral support with approximately 10 % of the parliamentary vote in over half of the countries in Western Europe (Swank & Betz, 2002). In the next sections I focus specifically on study cases from Eastern Europe.
II. Slovakia

When the European Union proposed its compulsory migrant quota scheme in 2015, Slovakia, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Romania opposed the implementation of the policy in a vote at the European Council. Playing on fears that the refugee's presented a threat to security and national sovereignty, during the 2015 refugee crisis the Slovak government refused to accept refugees and initiated the building of border walls in violation of Article 78(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), which stipulates that "in the event of one or more Member States being confronted by an emergency situation characterized by a sudden inflow of nationals of third countries, the Council, on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament, may adopt provisional measures for the benefit of the Member State(s) concerned" (European Commission, 2015). Furthermore, when Slovakia agreed to accept 200 refugees from Syria, they did so with the stipulation that they had to be Christians (Park, 2015, Jancarikova, 2016). Can these actions be linked to a broader push for national sovereignty? If so, who are the political entrepreneurs promoting such a political agenda?

Many Slovak political leaders have argued against accepting refugees, with in mind the threat to the Slovak national identity, the risk of spread of Islam in Europe, and the potential of creating pockets of unassimilated Muslim communities (Cuprik, 2017). According to the Office of Economic Coordination and Development (OECD), of the 35 most highly developed countries in the world, Slovakia (ranked 27th for GDP per capita) ranks last in terms of the numbers of refugees they've accepted. Justifying Slovakia's stance on the refugee question, Anton Hrnko, the Deputy Chairman of the Slovak National Party (a self-described nationalist political party espousing Christian values), linked the crisis to the expansion of Islam and its threat to Slovak culture (Cuprik, 2017). Referencing Muslims, Hrnko wrote on his Facebook page that “For over
150 years we had them at the borders, and we know how much blood and sweat it took to send them back to where they came from” (Cuprik, 2017). In January of 2016, Prime Minister Robert Fico defended Slovakia’s slow admission of asylum seekers, claiming that it was necessary for the country to "prevent the creation of a compact Muslim community in Slovakia" (Cuprik, 2017). Around the same time, Direction (Smer) - Social Democracy (the party in which Robert Fico leads), purchased billboards across Slovakia which read: "We Are Protecting Slovakia" (Hlavac, 2016).

In October of 2017, representatives from Slovakia and Hungary challenged the legality of the migrant quota scheme in the European Court of Justice (ECJ). In a press briefing on the matter, Laszlo Trocsanyi, Hungary's Justice Minister, stated that, among other reasons, the admission of refugees "was an issue of national sovereignty" (Linos, Jakli, & Carlson, 2017). After hearing arguments by representatives from both countries, the ECJ decided to uphold the policy (i.e. migration quota scheme) on the grounds of Article 78(3) of the Lisbon Treaty and the TFEU, which stipulates that "in the event of one or more Member States being confronted by an emergency situation characterized by a sudden inflow of nationals of third countries, the Council, on a proposal from the Commission, may adopt provisional measures for the benefit of the Member State(s) concerned. It shall act after consulting the European Parliament" (European Commission, 2015). The refugee quota was adopted by the EU because Greece and Italy took in a disproportionately large and unmanageable number of refugees, which the EU regarded as an emergency situation. Regarding the ruling, Hungary's foreign minister Peter Szijjarto quoted in a news conference that "the Hungarian government considers today's decision by the European court to be appalling and irresponsible" (Crisp & Day, 2017).
The Slovak National Party (SNS) is right-wing populist party that has seen considerable success over the last century. The SNS has adopted a platform oriented specifically towards ethnic Slovaks, has remained highly skeptical of European integration and, at times, has promoted strong xenophobic sentiments (Kopecky & Mudde, 2002; Deegan-Krause & Haughton, 2009). In 2006, the SNS was the junior partner (i.e. winning 11.73 % of the parliamentary seats) in a coalition with leader Robert Fico, representing the Direction (Smer) - Social Democracy party. At that point, the SNS occupied a relatively radical, xenophobic position in the coalition, which heavily scapegoated Slovakia's Roma minority, as well as the Hungarian (Magyar) minority (Milo, 2005, pp. 213-214; Jancarikova, 2016).

In the 2012 parliamentary election, the SNS suffered a severe dip in electoral support, winning no parliamentary seats, while Robert Fico and Smer-SD held parliamentary majority. Andrej Danko, the leader of the SNS, adopted a more moderate platform after their loss in 2012, advocating for tax cuts for small businesses and immigration reforms (Jancarikova, 2016). However, the refugee crisis in 2015 seems to have reinvigorated the more radical stance previously held by the SNS. In the 2016 parliamentary election, the party campaigned on a platform that depicted the refugee crisis as a severe threat to border security and national sovereignty. Regarding migrants, Andrej Danko is quoted as having said in a news interview that “migrants disrupt the EU’s administrative system and pose a security threat. It does not matter that they are unarmed; it is a mass incursion” (Jancarikova, 2016). In the vein of nationalist sovereignty, the SNS party has also placed emphasis on supporting features associated to the Slovak culture, including its Christian past. Andrej Danko has mentioned publicly that the party intended to increase public funding for Christian churches (Jancarikova, 2016). Finally, SNS promised in their campaign to
address regional economic disparities, and to increase the regional development of the east through targeted stimuli and subsidies (Hlavac, 2016).

In the 2016 parliamentary election, Direction (Smer) - Social Democracy, led by Robert Fico, still captured the most seats (i.e. 83 seats, 44.4 % total), but lost its majority position. Perhaps riding on a migration-fueled popular discontent, more radical right-wing parties saw a resurgence in support in 2016. The SNS, led by Andrej Danko, gained 15 seats (i.e. 8.6 % total), an important increase from 0 seats in 2012. Meanwhile, Kotleba - People's Party Our Slovakia (L'SNS), a radical right-wing party defending extreme nativist positions (discussed further in Chapter 3), saw considerable success, securing 14 seats, or 8% of the seat share, the first time the party obtained parliamentary representation. Parties that were previously a mainstay in Slovak politics, like the Slovak Democratic and Christian Union—Democratic Party (SDKÚ-DS), which led the pro-market economic reforms of the early 2000's, suffered a severe decline (SDKÚ-DS only received 0.3% of the votes) (Hlavac, 2016). When Robert Fico was invited by Slovak President Andrej Kiska to engage in government formation talks, a wave of anti-fascist protests ensued in Bratislava, Slovakia's most economically prosperous region (The Slovak Spectator, 2016). All parties that secured a parliamentary seat, with the exception of We Are Family (a newly-formed populist party campaigning on preventing government corruption), refused to engage in government formation talks with L'SNS (The Slovak Spectator, 2016).

Economic Trajectory/ Regional Analyses

Slovakia's transition from a centrally-planned economy to a market economy experienced a tumultuous start. Prior to joining the EU in 2004, Slovakia experienced a stagnant economy largely due to structural deficiencies in its Government (Marcincin & Bevlavy, 2000). According to an OECD study (1993), the government that emerged from the 1992 parliamentary elections
sought to slow the pace of economic reform, targeting privatization (Marcincin & Beblavy, 2000). That government, led by president Vladimir Meclar of The People's Party - Movement for a Democratic Slovakia, commanded a strong minority presence with 74 out of 150 seats. This party was also joined in 1993 by the Slovak National Party to form a strong majority coalition. The coalition largely favored protectionist economic measures that would distance the state from the more open policies set forth by the Czech Republic. These efforts initially crippled economic growth throughout Slovakia. According to Marcincin & Beblavy (2000), economic restrictions led the general population to lose trust in its government. The cabinet led by president Meclar was subsequently ousted by a vote of no confidence in 1994.

Although much of the public attributed post-transition economic decline to policy makers, a study by the World Bank (1995) did find that macroeconomic instability was largely the result of state formation and the establishment of new legal institutions. By the mid to late 90's, Slovakia's decision-making sector determined that it needed to aggressively address the consequences of foreign policy failures (Marcincin & Beblavy, 2000). In 1994, Slovakia's economy experienced a revitalization. Okali et al. (1995) argue that economic growth in the mid 90's was largely influenced by (a) restrictive fiscal and neutral monetary policies, (b) policies that improved export and foreign trade balances, and (c) a natural end to the recession that emerged after splitting from the Czech Republic. In general, it could be argued that the economic policies that were adopted favored growth over the development of a sound institutional framework (Marcincin & Beblavy, 2000).

Slovakia's economic development intensified in the mid 90's, with GDP growth of 6.9% in 1995, an inflation rate of 7.2%, and an active trade balance (Kallaste et al., 1995). Unemployment
also hovered around 11 to 13 percent during this period (Kallaste et al., 1995). According to Marcincin & Bevlavy (2000) demand quickly exceeded GDP growth, leading to a trade imbalance.

In the later part of the 90's (problem in the sequence as you go back to 1995 afterward for the application to EU), as Slovakia's economy began to stabilize, politicians began to set their sights on joining the European Union. On June 27th, 1995, Vladimir Meclar (the leader of numerous coalition governments during the 90's) submitted to the European Council the Slovak Republic’s application to join the EU. The move would streamline economic coordination with the European market, with economic gains stemming from increased trade and foreign investment. To gain these benefits, however, Slovakia would need to adhere to the European Union's human rights conditions, achieve a sufficient level of institutional stability, and be able to withstand the competitive pressures that come with the opening to the EU market. According to Marcincin & Bevlavy (2000), initial negotiation attempts faltered because Slovakia's institutions were perceived by the EU lawmakers as inadequate and unreliable.

East/ West disparity

Slovakia currently ranks 6th, among all OECD countries, for regional economic disparities. Bratislava, located in Western Slovakia, just east of Vienna, Austria, has a thriving economy. Meanwhile, to the east, both Presov and Kosice offer examples of regions with high unemployment, low-skilled labor and stagnant economic growth (Demmou, Halus, Machlica, & Menkyna, 2015). According to Eurostat, in 2013 Bratislava kraj (region) had a GDP per capita of €43,000, while Vychodne Slovensko (i.e. eastern Slovakia) had a GDP per capita of €12,100 (Demmou, Halus, Machlica, & Menkyna, 2015).
Figure 1 shows how regional economic disparities, as measured through GDP per capita, emerged over the period from 1995 to 2010 (Matlovicova, K., Gavalova, A., & Kolesarova, J., 2014). Economic conditions in eastern and central Slovakia seem to have remained stagnant, built primarily on an industrial and agricultural foundation (Habánik, Kordoš, & Hošták, 2016). Regions in the east suffer from the lack of a modern transport infrastructure and limited investment in local industry. A recent European report assessed the number of firms per 1,000 inhabitants and found that Východné Slovensko (including Kosice and Presov in the east) contained 25 firms per 1,000 inhabitants; the average for Slovakia is 39 (European Commission, 2018). Additionally,
Východné Slovensko is only attracting 7.4 percent of the total foreign direct investment in Slovakia (European Commission, 2018).

The economy in Western Slovakia, however, has largely benefited from the entry in the European market, which started shortly after the communist revolution in 1989 and intensified after the EU accession (Korec & Ondoš, 2009). Specifically, the region of Západné Slovensko (in which the capital of Bratislava is located) has attracted considerable direct foreign investment with the development of high-tech manufacturing. From 1990 to 2012, the region consistently attracted approximately 14 percent of Slovakia's total foreign investment, stemming primarily from the manufacture of automobiles (e.g. Peugeot, Volkswagen) and consumer electronics (European Commission, 2018). Metropolitan regions (e.g. Bratislava, Trencin) are also benefitting significantly more than rural localities in the west, in terms of wages, infrastructure, and housing development (European Commission, 2018). Many citizens from rural localities in the west, as well as regions in the east, will attempt to find seasonal manufacturing work in the major metropolitan regions, especially Bratislava (Korec & Ondoš, 2009).

Economic disparities between the economically modernized Bratislava and lagging regions to the east is evidenced through an analysis of Slovakia's GINI coefficient, and how this changed in relation to EU accession. In 1992, during the initial transition from a centrally planned Soviet-style economy, to a liberalized economic market, Slovakia's GINI coefficient was at its lowest, at 19.5 points (OECD, 2018). Directly prior, and during accession to the European Union, Slovakia's GINI coefficient was relatively stable at approximately 27 points (OECD, 2018). This increase can be contributed to processes associated to economic liberalization. By 2005, and directly after EU accession, Slovakia saw a sharp spike in GINI, to 29.3 points (OECD, 2018). GINI would continue to fluctuate after 2005.
The Attraction of Populist Sovereignism

In line with the theoretical literature on ethnic competition, as well as the effect exerted by economic precarity, populist political movements should be more appealing to those residing in eastern Slovakia, where more people live in precarious economic conditions. The 2016 parliamentary elections, which saw a marked shift to the right, is enlightening to that effect. Many new (primarily populist) parties emerged, contributing to the most diverse parliament since the communist revolution (Hlavac, 2016).

Bratislava, Slovakia's most prosperous region in the west, has benefitted considerably from the open European market. Parties that received their highest vote percentages in Bratislava (e.g. SaS, OLaNO) seemed to have directed their campaign at university-educated individuals and high-skilled professionals (Hlavac, 2016). Slovakia's Freedom and Solidarity (SaS) party received their highest vote percentage from Bratislava. SaS was founded, and is still led, by the businessman and economist Peter Sulik, who served as the minister of finance for multiple Slovak governments and has been credited with helping Slovakia to attract considerable foreign investments (Jancarikova, 2016). The party has been described as libertarian. It has announced in its 2012 manifesto that individual freedom and responsibility were among their core principles (Hlavac, 2016, Institute for European Policy, 2016). In their 2012 manifesto, the party also acknowledged that the current condition of Roma minorities is a social problem in need of a solution, and that relations between Slovaks and the Hungarian (Magyar) minority should be strengthened (Institute for European Policy, 2016). SaS has also detailed the importance of European integration but has stressed that even deeper supranational influence could threaten national sovereignty (Institute for European Policy, 2016). SaS faired especially poorly in low-income, high unemployment regions such as Nitra and Presov (Hlavac, 2016).
The case for L'SNS (Marian Kotleba's radical, right-wing populist movement), in the 2016 parliamentary election, is quite different from that of SaS. Considering their radical discourse against immigration, minorities, and free-trade, it could be expected that L'SNS would not fare especially well with highly educated, economically prosperous populations, as would be predicted through ethnic competition theory (e.g. Banton, 1983; Olzak, 1996; Banting & Kymlicka, 2006). L'SNS saw its lowest level of support in Bratislava, garnering only 4.72 percent of the vote. In Banska Bystrica, the district in which Marian Kotleba, the party's leader, is currently mayor, the party managed to win 10.46 percent of the vote. In Presov and Zilina, districts that have lagged economically and do not have a significant Hungarian minority, L'SNS saw comparable levels of support (Hlavac, 2016).

Hlavac (2016) performed a regression analysis on regional-level data from the Statistical Office of the Slovak Republic, to determine which demographic features (e.g. age, ethnicity, employment, educational level) influenced each party’s ability to garner vote percentage in the 2016 parliamentary election. Education level was a significant determinant for almost all the parties assessed. A negative association with education level (i.e. p < 0.01 level) can be observed for parties that appealed to populist sovereignty, including L'SNS (at -0.159) and SNS (at -0.222). In the case of SaS, which espoused free-market libertarian ideals and supported the European Union, there was a robust positive association (i.e. p < 0.01 level) of 0.758 (Hlavac, 2016).

Unemployment has a similar effect to education level on voting behavior. Right-wing populist parties had a strong appeal in regions with a high unemployment rate. We find a positive association at the p < 0.01 level between unemployment rate and voting for L'SNS, at 0.195 (Hlavac, 2016). The nationalist political party SNS also experienced significant support in high unemployment regions, with a positive association of 0.128 at the p < 0.01 level. SaS saw its
lowest levels of support in regions with a high unemployment rate with a strong negative correlation of -0.241 at the p < 0.01 level (Hlavac, 2016).

Hlavac (2016) also incorporated regional percentages of both Roma and Hungarian minorities in the regression model. Support (i.e. vote share percentage) for populist parties exhibiting nationalistic tendencies (e.g. SNS, L'SNS) yielded statistically significant results in regions with large Roma and Hungarian populations. However, the relationship is negative in both cases. The possibility that populist parties may do well by exploiting regional tensions between ethnic Slovaks and minorities is not borne out in the regression results. Hlavac (2016) explains that self-report survey data, where Hungarians and Roma can freely check off "Slovak", is notoriously unreliable. L'SNS, whose leader (i.e. Marian Kotleba) has organized neo-Nazi marches through Roma villages (detailed in Chapter 3), showed a moderate (at the p < 0.1 level) negative association of -0.255 (Hlavac, 2016). In regions with a considerable ethnic Hungarian population, L'SNS also fared poorly, with a robust (at the p < 0.01 level) negative association of – 0.122.

Regions with high Roma and Magyar populations seemed to vote for the Ordinary People and Independent Personalities party (henceforth OL'aNO). OL'aNO was formed in 2011 and, founded on similar pro-EU ideals with Christian, social conservative leanings, has worked in a cooperative alliance with SaS since its inception (Rybar & Spac, 2017). Like SaS, OL'aNO also appears to have appealed to those highly skilled, highly educated citizens inhabiting the Bratislava region (Hlavac, 2016).

Unlike the Roma, the ethnic Hungarians have significant political representation in the Slovak parliament (Gurcsik & Satterwhite, 1996). Ethnic Hungarians primarily inhabit towns along the southern border between Slovakia and Hungary and compose approximately 9 percent of the total Slovak population. The ethnic Hungarian (Magyar) population has repeatedly been
singled-out by nationalistic populist movements (discussed in Chapter 3) that frame them as a threat to Slovak national identity because of a perceived inability to assimilate (Gurcsik & Satterwhite, 1996).

In the 2016 parliamentary election, Most-Hid secured 11 seats in parliament and, with center to center-right political leanings, was included in the coalition government with Smer-SD and SNS. In the regression analyses performed by Hlavac (2016), Most-Hid did especially well in regions with a high ethnic Hungarian (Magyar) population, with a robust (i.e. p < 0.001 level) positive association of 0.444. Most-Hid also fared well in highly educated regions, like those in western Slovakia, with a robust (i.e. p < 0.001 level) positive association of 0.272 (Hlavac, 2016).

The analysis of the framing and highlighting of chosen issues by sovereignist populist parties' sheds light on their attraction for certain categories of voters. Kluknavska (2014) conducted her analysis by focusing on various collective action frames, where the blame for perceived social problems (e.g. unemployment, perceived disintegration of national culture, perceived unfettered immigration) is attributed to individuals (e.g. mainstream politicians) and groups (e.g. minorities, elitist technocrats) (pp. 3-4). Specific focus was placed on how L'SNS systematically describes the categories of individuals it considers its enemies, including Roma, Immigrants, Political Elite, Media, Mainstream Parties, Affirmative Action Programs, over the course of 2010 to 2013 (Kluknavska, 2014).

To quantify the framing methods implemented by L'SNS, Kluknavska (2014) identified in a pilot study the diagnostic frames frequently drawn upon in their political rhetoric as well as the solutions to those perceived problems. The set of features associated to each prognostic frame were also defined. Kluknavska (2014) ran a final content analysis using information on the
People Party our Slovakia’s website, and of their numerous published manifestos and articles (contributing to a sample of 543 total diagnostic frames). Information that fit the typical set of features associated to a specific diagnostic frame, as well as prognosis, were coded as such.

When attributing blame for the hardships (e.g. unemployment, low income, debt) faced by their constituents (a "diagnostic"), L'SNS most commonly identifies the political elite, involved in mainstream parties and engaging with the EU, as responsible. This strategy comprised 54.4 percent of the total rhetoric coded, from 2010 to 2013 (Klunavska, 2014). The Roma, Roma-specific government programs (e.g. child subsidies, housing), and Roma criminality, were criticized in 28.4 percent of the total rhetoric coded (Klunavska, 2014). To a much lesser extent, L'SNS’ messaging also incorporated criticisms of the economic and cultural elite (e.g. financial firms, academics), as well as foreigners, including immigrants, the EU, NATO, and supranational financial groups (Klunavska, 2014).

Klunavska (2014) further analyzed how the diagnostic frames implemented by L'SNS shifted temporally, including before and after the 2012 parliamentary elections. While campaigning for the 2012 parliamentary election, it appears that L'SNS intensified its rhetoric against the Roma, who they regularly described as "drunken, asocial Gypsy parasites" (Klunavska, 2014). L'SNS also intensified its criticism of positive discrimination programs. Rom-specific programs (e.g. specialized education, job placement) were adopted around 2011 to comply with the European Union’s National Roma Integration Strategy (NRIS) framework (European Commission, COM (2011) 173 final). Previously, in 2005, however, the Slovak Constitutional Court had already ruled against such positive discrimination programs that would be based on ethnicity and not socioeconomic status, claiming that any such programs were unconstitutional (Goldirova, 2005).
L'SNS fared especially poorly in the 2012 Slovak parliamentary elections, failing to secure any parliamentary seats. Judging by the diagnostic frame analysis performed by Kluknavska (2014), it appears that L'SNS changed its strategy after the loss, focusing less on criticizing Roma assistance programs and shifting its focus on national sovereignty, in an anti-globalization vein. Specifically, rhetorical frames that insisted on a perceived loss of independence to the benefit of supranational institutions and the abuse of power by a globalist political elite, appear to have been intensified. According to Kluknavska (2014), the perceived globalist political elite (i.e. primarily EU politicians and mainstream political parties), was often criticized as "thieves, liars, and crooks" who "have plundered the state's assets", "destroyed Slovakia" and "live in luxury" (Kluknavska, 2014, p. 12).

III. Poland

Prior to 2001, parties exhibiting tendencies associated to populist sovereignism (e.g. emphasis on common history, criticism of a parasitic political elite, complaints over a loss of autonomy at the hand of supranational institutions) were not central in Polish politics (Pankowski, 2010; Jasiewicz, 2008). According to Pankowski (2010, pp. 95-97), political entrepreneurs first began to gain traction by drawing upon cultural resources around the early 2000's, most notably through the popular Catholic broadcasting channel Radio Maryja. Various small, extreme-right movements used the media outlet to rally support and disseminate information related to conservative issues (e.g. abortion, gay rights) that were being debated in association with navigating accession to the European Union (Pankowski, 2010). In 2001, Radio Maryja sponsored its own populist, conservative electoral bloc known as the League of Polish Families (henceforth referred to as LPR), which has remained active, with varying levels of parliamentary seat share, up to 2018 (Markowski & Tucker, 2010).
Talks of European Union accession, which followed shortly after Poland formed its democracy following the communist revolution, appears to have reinvigorated a push for "Polishness", by nationalistic populist movements, including LPR (De Lange & Guerra, 2009). De Lange & Guerra (2009) quote Bucker (2007, p. 123), who noted that "The EU is one external factor that fosters the proliferation of protective nationalism among certain segments of its member states’ populations, and this development might indeed be more salient in the new, Eastern European member states than in the old ones, simply because the EU has been much more visible in the new member states since the breakdown of socialism". After first applying for membership in 1994, Poland completed accession negotiations with the European Union in 2002, in which the proper transposition of laws compliant with the EU acquis was negotiated. In May of 2004, Poland was included in the 2004 EU expansion, which also included Slovakia and Hungary (among others). It appears that popular discontent over the EU negotiations, and subsequent accession, may have provided populist parties, like LPR, with sufficient support to see an increase in popularity for the 2001 Sejm (Poland's lower house of their bicameral government) and 2004 European Parliament elections (Markowski & Tucker, 2010).

By 2001, imminent accession into the European provided LPR with a sufficient base to see its first electoral success in Poland's Sjem. As De Lange & Guerra (2009) note, LPR framed themselves as the only true protectors of Polish values, which seems to have resonated with a Catholic-nationalist constituency averse to Europeanization. This framing strategy was credible because other right-leaning parties, representing rural, conservative interests (e.g. Polish Peasnat Party, Law and Justice), were bound to a coalition agreement with the Euro-positive, center-left Democratic Left Alliance-Labor Union (henceforth referred to as SLD-UP), thus unable to fight against integration. By the 2004 European Parliamantary elections, held in June of 2004 (directly
after Poland's accession was accepted in the May 2004 expansion), LPR succeeded in sending 10 representatives to the European Parliament, at almost 16 percent of the vote (De Lange & Guerra, 2009). The SLD-UP, which held a majority in the government at the time and guided Poland into the EU, secured less than 10 percent of the vote, inciting fears among EU lawmakers of a potential eurosceptic, populist backlash in Poland (De Lange & Guerra, 2009; Gaisbauer, 2007).

Since accessions negotiations started, it appears that euroscepticism has increased among a considerable proportion of Polish citizens, allowing populist parties (e.g. League of Polish Families, Self Defense for the Republic of Poland), claiming to fight for national sovereignism, to gain considerable vote share. As Markowski & Tucker (2010) argue, the Polish party system in the early 2000's was comprised of many new parties, all proposing different methods for fighting unemployment. Given the economic niche occupied by many Poles, which may be threatened by competition from open market forces, parties that proposed the potential of fixing the economy by protecting Poland from a corrupt, supranational political elite, gained traction.

By the 2005 parliamentary elections, LPR was unable to maintain strong support, as other, more centrist parties, adopted a eurosceptic ideological position to maintain a competitive edge (Gaisbauer, 2007). Gaisbauer (2007) depicts Polish party positions, in the ideological space associated to European integration, and how they changed in response to party competition, from 2001 to 2005. For their sustained insistence to reject EU accession, Gaisbauer (2007) placed LPR solely in the position of an unchanging eureject party. The Civic Platform, a mainstream liberal-conservative, Christian Democrat party, appears to have started as strongly Euro-positive around the time of the EU negotiations, only to shift to a moderate Eurosceptic position, by 2005, in response to the growing popularity of populist movements. To distance themselves from the Civic Platform, right-wing populist parties, representing rural, conservative interests (e.g. Polish Peasant
Party, Law and Justice), shifted from an ideological stance only moderately Eurosceptic, to extreme Euroscepeticism (Gaisbauer, 2007). Mainstream parties common throughout Europe (e.g. Social Democrats) maintained their ideological position in full support of European integration.

During campaigning for the 2005 presidential and parliamentary election, the far-right, populist Law and Justice (PiS) party unleashed a brutal attack against the governing Civic Platform party and then president Donald Tusk (Pienkos, 2006). Among the issues highlighted was a virulent criticism of the Civic Platform's leading role in the EU negotiations. Like with the rise of LPR in the early 2000's, the influential Radio Maryja appears to have played a critical role in helping the PiS party succeed over the Civic Platform. Presidential candidate, and the founder and chairman of the Law and Justice Party, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, beat Donald Tusk by approximately 10 percent, winning 54.47 percent of the vote.

It appears that Law and Justice's message, which included an economic stance closely associated to the Labor movement (policies detailed in depth below), conservative-christian ideals, and staunch euroscepticism, resonated with citizens in low income, rural regions, with agrarian interests (Pienkos, 2006; Jasiewicz, 2008). Kaczynsi did especially well in Poland's southeastern regions, among which several rank as the poorest regions in the country with alarming unemployment rates (detailed further below) (Pienkos, 2006). The Civic Platform, a Christian-Democrat party with conservative-liberal economic leanings, thus pushing for the opening of Poland to the greater European free market, fared differently (Pankowski, 2010; Bakke & Sitter, 2005). Donald Tusk did well in more economically prosperous regions located in the western and northern half of the country (Pienkos, 2006).

Prior to the massive refugee wave, from Syria and other parts of the middle east and north Africa in 2015, immigration, in any form, was never a central issue in Polish politics
(Krzyznowski, 2018). However, since the latter half of 2015, it appears that contention over accepting refugees, as mandated by the European Union, has shifted the landscape of Polish politics. Recent changes have allowed for far-right populist parties (e.g. Law and Justice, League of Polish Families, National Movement) to levy for more power, whilst forcing mainstream parties (e.g. Polish Christian Democratic Party, Civic Platform) to shift further towards right-wing populism to retain votes (Pedziwiatr, 2016). When the European Union first enacted the migrant quota scheme, to handle the massive 2015 influx that disproportionately burdened Italy and Greece, Poland refused to accept their refugee allocation. The current Polish Prime Minister (as of 2018) and leader of the Law and Justice Party (henceforth referred to as PiS), Mateusz Morawiecki, stated publicly that “proposals by the European Union that impose quotas on us hit the very foundations of national sovereignty”, and that "here in Poland, it’s we (emphasis added) who decide who will come to Poland and who will not" (Gavin, 2018). Commenting on the government's intentions regarding the crisis, prime minister Morawiecki also told Radio Poland that "We are invariably of the opinion, formulated by Law and Justice ahead of the elections of 2015, that we will not be receiving migrants from the Middle East and Northern Africa in Poland" (Euronews, 2018).

After Poland failed to respond to multiple written warnings from the European Commission, in 2017 the commission decided to proceed with infringement litigation with the European Court of Justice, effectively suing Poland for failing to comply with the migrant quota scheme. Representatives from the European Commission told reporters that they were moving forward with the litigation against Poland for "non-compliance with their legal obligations on relocation" (BBC, 2017).
According to Krzyzanowski (2018), the PiS party was one of the leading far-right populist parties behind an increase in radicalized rhetoric following the 2015 refugee crisis, which appears to have been done to garner votes in the 2015 parliamentary election. PiS's rhetoric followed the template of typical features associated to populist sovereignism (e.g. Euroscepticism, criticism of supranational institutions, emphasis on a "common history"), while also veering quite radical, including anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and talks of dismantling laws associated to liberal governments of the past (e.g. abortion). PiS has used multiple media outlets to disseminate such populist rhetoric, including Facebook, Twitter, manifestos published on their party website, and public speeches. Krzyznowski (2018) quantified Twitter rhetoric at the macro-level of frame analysis, where any rhetoric (e.g. anti-immigration, Islamic threat, racist or discriminatory remarks), which departed from the traditional political discourse in Poland. From Krzyznowski's (2018) analysis, it can be concluded that framing tactics were changed (e.g. loss of autonomy because of the EU - to - threat from radical Islam) in response to changing campaign dynamics (e.g. media coverage, attacks by opponents).

In Poland, it appears that political discontent with the European Union and the refugee quota, coupled with economic factors (e.g. unemployment, low income, inability of small businesses to compete with the global market), has provided fertile ground not only for PiS, but other, even more radical nationalistic parties to gain traction (e.g. Kukiz'15, Jobbik). In a country with unconsolidated system of political parties, where new parties are continuously sprouting and finding enough support to win considerable seat share, the prospect of an extremist party gaining majority control is a very real possibility (Kolarska-Bobinska, 2003). Even more troubling is the revolving nature of Poland's institutions, where, in 2001 alone, out of the 150 measures approved by parliament, 80 of which were constitutional amendments (Kolarska-Bobinska, 2003).
Although much of these 2001 amendments can be attributed to EU compliance and accession, the relative ease at which new constitutional amendments are introduced can potentially be weaponized by extremist political parties (detailed in Chapter 3).

Economic Trajectory

During the early 90's, after removing themselves from Soviet rule in the communist revolution of 1989, Poland's economy (e.g. unemployment, inequality, GDP per capita) dipped below pre-transition levels (Keane & Prasad, 2002). Transitioning from a centrally planned economy, to establishing the institutional apparatus necessary for a functioning market economy, did not come without instability and uncertainty (Sachs, 1992). At the beginning of the transition, Poland's economy was among the worst in Europe, with an overly developed, inefficient industrial sector that was entirely sheltered from the competitive open market forces beyond its borders (Sachs, 1992). Opening the market, to allow for the economy to modernize and relevant sectors (e.g. technology) to flourish, did not come without a considerable spike in unemployment, from approximately 1% in 1990, to 11% at the end of 1991 (Sachs, 1992). To mitigate economic hardship as outdated industries (e.g. labor-intensive farming, industrial manufacturing) were transformed, certain social safety nets (e.g. housing subsidies, healthcare) were retained, and subsequently fought over by competing parties representing divergent regional interests (Ordover, 1991; Domanski, 2003; Sachs, 1992).

In the mid-90s, once a sufficient institutional framework was established, the manufacture of more sophisticated products increased, and firms learned how to sell in a rapidly changing market (e.g. loss of the soviet market and competition from more advanced countries), economic development (e.g. exports, GDP per capita) started to take shape (Domanski, 2003). However, unemployment and income inequality remained as substantial problems into the early 2000’s, as
lagging regions failed to develop enough new industry to employ those that had been displaced from changing market conditions. Eurosceptic, populist parties (e.g. League of Polish Families, Polish Peasants Party, Law and Justice, Polish People's Party), claiming to represent agrarian interests and fight for national autonomy, specifically targeted such voters (Markowski & Tucker, 2010).

The temporal trajectory in the GINI coefficient for Poland, directly after the transition and into the early 2000's, also reveals why political discontent, in lagging regions, may have emerged (Keane & Prasad, 2002). According to statistical analysis performed by the Office for Economic Coordination and Development (OECD), the GINI coefficient in Poland, just prior to the transition in 1989, was 0.25, then fell to 0.23 during the initial transition in 1990 (OECD, 1997, p. 86; Keane & Prasad, 2002). However, by 1991, as the unemployment rate climbed, so did the GINI coefficient, increasing substantially to 0.26 and then stabilizing in the 0.29 to 0.30 range from 1993 to 1996 (OECD, 1997, p. 86; Keane & Prasad, 2002). Between 2002 to 2004, just prior to joining the EU, Poland's GINI coefficient would again skyrocket to 34.5 points (World Bank Group, 2018). These GINI increases reflect regional economic disparities, as those regions relying on labor-intensive agriculture remained stagnant while regions adopting new technological industry flourished.

During the economic transition, in 1993, the unemployment rate jumped to staggering 16.4 percent, of the total population, while employment in manufacturing dropped to its lowest point since the communist revolution. In response to faltering economic conditions, and a dissatisfied populous, then President Walsea, founder of the soviet Solidarity movement and former labor activist, dissolved the Polish parliament in 1993, necessitating the need for a premature election. Presidential parliamentary dissolution was made possible through the construction of the 1992
constitution, which allowed for the president to take initiative if there wasn't a constructive vote of no confidence (Millard, 1994). During the campaign for the September 1993 parliamentary election, talks of restoring Social Democrat egalitarianism (e.g. virulent critiques of capitalism), and a protective welfare state, were introduced in the public discourse (Millard, 1994). Ultimately, the Democratic-Left Alliance (SLD), which campaigned on a restoration of welfare programs, and the Polish People's Party (PSL), representing conservative ideals and agrarian interests, together won two-thirds of the vote and formed a majority coalition (Millard, 1994).

Regional Economic Analyses

Encompassing 16 economic regions in total, Poland's economy has traditionally been split into two areas; the economically prosperous western and northern regions, and the economically lagging, largely agrarian, regions in the southeast (Bronisz, Heijman, & Miszczuk, 2008). During the economic transition in the 90's, regions in the southeast of the country, whose economies were largely based on labor intensive farming and the industrial manufacture of raw materials, were those that were hardest hit by the push for modernization. According to the Office of Economic Coordination and Development (OECD), for all years leading from the communist revolution in 1989 (except 2001 - 2003), inequality, in GDP per capita, has increased among Poland's 16 designated economic regions (OECD, 2013). This disparity can largely be contributed to the country's most prosperous region, Mazowieckie (where the capital of Warsaw is located), gaining considerably, while other regions in the east (e.g. Podkarpackie, Lubelskie, Warminsko-Mazurskie) continue to falter.

Because Mazowieckie modernized its economy, by incorporating skilled labor and a technology sector, it has developed rapidly, with GDP per capita growing at an average rate of 6.6% from 1995 to 2005 (OECD, 2013). Meanwhile, because Podkarpackie continues to struggle
in their transition away from labor-intensive agriculture and the manufacture of raw materials, it was only capable of maintaining an average GDP per capita growth rate of 2.9% from 1995 to 2005 (OECD, 2013). Even more staggering are disparities in household income among the TL2 regions. According to the OECD, in 2010, the household income per capita (USD PPP Per Capita), for the Mazowieckie region, was 12,268 (OECD, 2013). The household income per capita (USD PPP Per Capita), for Podkarpackie in 2010, was approximately half that of Mazowieckie, at 6,927.

**Attraction of Populist Sovereignism**

At the point of the 2015 Polish parliamentary elections, Poland's economy had stabilized and advanced considerably relative to the 90's. According to the World Bank, the Polish economy saw healthy growth leading to 2015, with a 3.3% increase in GDP per capita in 2014, and a 3.8% increase, in GDP per capita, in 2015. By 2015, the unemployment rate also fell to 9.7%, the first time it saw single-digits since the transition in 1990 (World Bank Group, 2018). However, it appears that, despite recent economic successes, popular discontent over what was perceived as a corrupt European Union has allowed the opportunity for parties, claiming to fight for national sovereignty (e.g. Law and Justice), to gain considerable success (Markowski, 2016).

Since 2005, Poland has generally supported a party duopoly, between the liberal-conservative, Social Democrat Civic Platform (PO) and the right-wing populist Law and Justice (PiS) party, with many new, less impactful parties emerging (Sobkowicz, 2016). During the campaign for the 2015 election, Law and Justice (PiS) coached itself as a representative of rural, agrarian interests, which they proclaimed were threatened by a European Union elite that supposedly favored western and central europe. It appears that PiS lured rural farmers in the east by claiming they would demand that the European Union increase subsidies to rival those given to farmers in Western Europe (Marcinkiewicz & Stegmaier, 2016). Meanwhile, PO appears to have
attempted to appeal to moderate voters, in high skilled positions and with foreign interests, that have benefitted from European integration (Sobkowicz, 2016). The party has appealed especially to those in the capital city of Warsaw, as well as to those economically prosperous regions in the northwest. As an example of Warsaw's liberal political leanings, in 2017 thousands of citizens protested in Warsaw against the governing PiS and new, radical policies, including a judiciary overhaul that has enabled them to take control of the constitutional court, as well as many key media platforms; a move that has prompted EU lawmakers to investigate PiS for allegedly undermining the rule of law (Livingstone, 2017). When asked about the legitimacy of the protests, leader of the PiS, Jarosław Kaczyński, told reporters that "only a total failure to see reality could lead someone to the conclusion that there is a threat to freedom" (Livingstone, 2017).

PiS secured a resounding victory with 37.6% of the vote, while the incumbent PO only secured 24.1% of the vote. Because PiS was capable in winning 235 of the 460 in the Sjem, and 61 of the 100 seats in the Senate, while other small parties were unable to pass the 5% threshold, PiS also secured an absolute majority. In the 2015 presidential election, held in May, PiS had already been successful in sending its representative, Andrzej Duda, to a victory with 51.5% of the vote. This set of victories, where PiS holds both the presidential seat and an absolute majority in parliament, makes them especially dangerous as a party, capable of governing autonomously and passing legislation without contestation from rival parties.

The regional polarization in support for PO and PiS is clearly demarcated and was especially evident during the 2015 parliamentary elections (Sobkowicz, 2016; Markowski, 2016). Figure 2 (below) depicts the 2015 Sjem election by voting district. Both the Sjem (lower house) and Senate (upper house) elections were held on October 25th, 2015, and regional maps of the results between the two elections look nearly identical in the way parties are distributed. The
campaign strategy adopted by Law and Justice (PiS), both presidential and parliamentary, appears to be very much indicative of a far-right populist party, intent on representing rural, working-class interests. PiS promised to increase welfare programs directed to those in rural localities in the east, stop the European Union from forcing the refugee quota upon Poland, and tax supranational banking institutions (Marcinkiewicz & Stegmaier, 2016). An example of their committing to such campaign promises is the Banking Tax Act, which was passed shortly after PiS obtained power in

---

**Figure 2:** Results from the 2015 parliamentary Sjem election, divided by electoral region and vote percentage. Law and Justice (far-right) (Prawo i Sprawiedliwość) is depicted in blue, while the Civic Platform (center-right) (Platforma Obywatelska) is depicted in orange. Retrieved from: Wikimedia commons on August 22nd, 2018.
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Polish_Sejm_election_results_2015.svg
PiS maintained that it would fight against foreign lending institutions and insurers operating in Poland, which they claimed did not care about the interests of the working class. The Banking Tax Act of 2016 imposes a tax on the assets of foreign banks, cooperative savings funds and credit institutions that exceed 4 billion PLN total, while also imposing a tax on both domestic and foreign insurers, for assets that exceed 2 billion PLN total (Matusik, 2016). Revenue collected from the tax is intended to fund another campaign promise, the implementation of a generous welfare package for families, which included a guaranteed €120 for every additional child after the first born (Marcinkiewicz & Stegmaier, 2016; Matusik, 2016, Markowski, 2016). In another campaign promise, PiS pledged to redact PO's unpopular, yet necessary legislation which raised the retirement age (the point at which an individual can obtain retirement benefits from the state) to 67 (Markowski, 2016).

For the 2015 election, it appears that PO attempted to take advantage of Poland's political polarization by pushing further to the left and adopting progressive identity politics. Leading up to the election, by coordinating with other left-of-center parties in parliament at the time, PO passed legislation on transgender rights and in-vitro fertilization (Marcinkiewicz & Stegmaier, 2016). Previously, while allied with PO, Donald Tusk strongly cautioned against the implementation of identity politics. However, it appears that the prime minister at the time, Ewa Kopacz (PO), felt it necessary to move further to the left to attract voters (Marcinkiewicz & Stegmaier, 2016). The strategy may have had the unintended consequence of inflaming an already dissatisfied conservative portion of the population, feeding into the hands of the new, far-right nationalist party Kukiz'15 (detailed below).

As already mentioned above, when the refugee crisis hit its peak in September of 2015, directly before the October election, PiS (and other, more radical parties like Kukiz'15) was
provided with more material to fuel their Eurosceptic rhetoric. As Krzyznowski (2018) argued (Figure 2.14, above), the EU's handling of the migrant crisis provoked a substantial, quantifiable shift in the political discourse in Poland, quickly becoming a central issue. After the election, it appears that PiS has continued a steady stream of anti-immigration, Eurosceptic rhetoric to keep ahead of their political opponents for the next general election, which is scheduled for no later than November of 2019. At a PiS press conference, held in Przysuch (60 miles south of Warsaw, known for agriculture and a clay mine) in 2017, leader Jaroslaw Kaczynski told a televised crowd “We have not exploited the countries from which these refugees are coming to Europe these days, we have not used their labor force and finally we have not invited them to Europe. We have a full moral right to say ‘no’” (Reuters Staff, 2017). Kaczynski also addressed the fact that, to continue receiving regional development funds (which Poland's agrarian regions are heavily reliant upon), Poland must comply with all EU mandates. Kaczynski acknowledged that the PiS backed the EU in the 2004 expansion and appreciated the addition of EU development funds, but also stated that “the fact that we appreciate them (the funds), does not mean that we have lost the right to various assessments, including those regarding the historical context”, arguing that Poland never received compensation for damages sustained during WWII and should thus be held to a different set of standards (Reuters Staff, 2017).

More recently (i.e. post 2015 elections), it appears that PiS' rhetoric regarding the refugee crisis has been extended not only to refugees and asylum seekers but projected to any group perceived and categorized as outsiders (e.g. Roma, Ukrainians, Muslims), including an increase in anti-Semitic communications (Pankowski, 2018; Krzyznowski, 2018; Pedziwiatr, 2016). (I discuss this phenomenon more in Chapter 3, but it is relevant for introducing the recent rise of the Kukiz'15 party and their performance in the 2015 election) In May of 2015, punk rock front man Pawel
Kukiz organized a political movement (Kukiz'15) and announced he would be running in the presidential election, with the backing of the ultranationalist, far-right National Movement (RN). Kukiz appealed to young Poles, including young males associated to football hooliganry and Neo-Nazi skinhead movements, through strategic social media campaigns (Marcinkiewicz & Stegmaier, 2016). Kukiz'15 positioned itself as a staunch anti-establishment party, set on an agenda of introducing a full overhaul of the electoral system and increasing Polish sovereignty and national identity. In the campaign for the 2015 election, Kukiz proposed abolishing Poland's 1997 constitution and "replacing the country's parliamentary system with a presidential one" (Marcinkiewicz & Stegmaier, 2016). Kukiz'15 did surprisingly well in the 2015 parliamentary election, capable of securing 29 of the 460 seats in the Sjem (lower house). Furthermore, Kukiz himself can secure third place in the presidential elections, securing 21% of the total vote and receiving 42% from voters between the ages 18 to 29 (Moskwa, 2015). Kukiz's strong stance against immigration and the EU (detailed further in Chapter 3), as well as strong support in regions with many unemployed youths, appears to have motivated PiS to adopt an even more radicalized ideological position (detailed further in Chapter 3) to maintain voters for the November 2019 election. As public opinion polling shows (Figure 2.18, below), Kukiz'15 appears to be holding steady around the 10% support mark, while PiS (top) saw a substantial increase in 2017, around the same time that it started to engage in a more radicalized political agenda (detailed in Chapter 3).

IV. Hungary

On March 31, 1994, the Hungarian government filed its application to join the European Union and, in 1998, the began formal accession negotiations with the EU. During the period where the Hungarian government prepared for membership, from 1994, 1998, and 2002, four legislative
terms transpired with some interruptions in the accession process (i.e. directive transposition, compliance with ECJ rulings) (Batory, 2002). From 1994 to 1998, the Hungarian Socialist Party, a legal successor to the former communist party, under the direction of Gyula Horn, reviewed the bulk of Hungarian legislation to ensure that it came into compliance with EU norms (Batory, 2002). Among the most sensitive issues at the time were agricultural and financial provisions, which could directly affect those in economically precarious, agrarian, northern and southern plains regions (Batory, 2002). By 1998, with accession negotiations underway, the threat of European marketization, which could adversely affect those in rural, agricultural regions, appears to have provided fertile ground for Fidesz, a national-conservative and right-wing populist party lead by prominent politician Viktor Orban (Batory, 2002).

In the 1998 parliamentary election, the ruling coalition that ushered in the EU negotiations, consisting of The Hungarian Socialist party (MSZP) and the Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ), was ousted by a right-wing coalition led by Fidesz - Hungarian Civic Alliance (Fidesz-MPP) (Benoit, 2002). The actual seat share won in the election shows a radical shift relative to the 1994 election. In 1994, Fidesz published in its party manifesto that it was a staunch supporter of adopting the quickest method possible for joining the EU (Batory, 2002). However, by 1998, and amid poor economic conditions (discussed further below), Fidesz shifted towards a more eurosceptic position, advertising itself as a vigilant and aggressive defender against the possibility of supranational interest superseding national autonomy (Batory, 2002). Fidesz, led by Viktor Orban, can secure 148 seats in Hungary's unicameral parliament, a gain of 128 seats over the last election, while MSZP won 134 seats, 75 less than the previous election (Benoit, 2002). Fidesz formed a coalition with the Independent Smallholders, Agrarian Workers and Civic Party, which won 48 parliamentary seats.
As Popescu & Toka (2002) note, media coverages, and popular opinion, regarding the economy (detailed further below) were heavily negative at the time, which may have hurt the incumbent MSZP in the 1998 election. Fidesz utilized private media channels to campaign on a platform promoting their fight against alleged government corruption, law and order, and calls for higher welfare spending and the protection of economic interests in rural, agrarian regions (Popescu & Toka, 2002). By July 2002, under the Fidesz lead government, Hungary succeeded in completing negotiations with the European Union on 26 of the 31 chapters of the Acquis Communautaire (Batory, 2002). Of the chapters which remained in question were those primarily involving agricultural interests. Among the most contentious issues at the time, in which Fidesz asserted itself as a protector of national interests, was legalizing the ability for foreign (EU) nationals to purchase Hungarian farmland; a point of legislation where Fidesz pushed back against the EU (Batory, 2002). Viktor Orban's cabinet seemingly circumvented this issue by reaching an agreement in the accession negotiations, where Hungary would legalize the acquisition of farmland only three to seven years after accession (Batory, 2002). Fidesz also promoted an emphasis on national sovereignism, by passing nationalistic legislations such as the 'status law', which secured rights in employment, education, and social services to foreign nationals that could prove Hungarian descent (e.g. Magyar minority in Slovakia) (Batory, 2002). Fidesz generally regarded the "Hungarian nation" as encompassing both ethnic Hungarians residing within Hungarian borders, as well as neighboring countries, while the Hungarian Socialist Party (Fidesz's primary opposition) only acknowledged those residing within Hungarian borders. The status law strained diplomatic relations with Slovakia and Romania, who claimed that the act motivated the discrimination of Romanian and Slovakian nationals attempting to enter the Hungarian labor market (Batory, 2002).
During the campaign for the 2002 parliamentary elections, Viktor Orban and Fidesz continued promoting itself as a protector of national interests and the agrarian working class (Racz, 2003; Batory, 2002). Fidesz ran on the slogan of "Hungary at the heart of Europe", and continued to emphasize, in its party manifesto and in campaign speeches, that it had "succeeded in protecting Hungarian land, which foreign persons or corporations cannot buy" (Batory, 2002). Meanwhile, the Hungarian Socialist Party (henceforth referred to as MSZP) also positioned itself as a protector of national interests, by negotiating deals, on issues related to economic reform and agriculture, with Brussels that would benefit the country (Batory, 2002). The party criticized the antagonistic approach taken by Viktor Orban and Fidesz, who they claimed handled negotiations with "an aggressive tone, unnecessary conflicts with, and patronizing of, the negotiation partners" (Batory, 2002; Kovacs, 2002). The party also promised to attempt to reinstate the social welfare programs that it had trouble implementing during the economic transition (i.e. 1994-1998) and associated economic strife (detailed below). Ultimately, MSZP secured a slim, surprise victory by winning 178 seats and forming a coalition with the Alliance of Free Democrats party (SZDSZ), which won 20 seats. The incumbent Fidesz came close to winning a majority again, securing 164 seats. Figure 2.19 (below) depicts the change in parliamentary seats, among dominant parties in Hungary, from 1990 to 2002.

In the 2002 election, regional patterns in voting behavior were somewhat consistent with the economic disparities that existed at the time (Racz, 2002). Hungary's economic regions (discussed in further detail below) are typically divided along a south-west/north-east axis, where western regions, spanning from Budapest to the Austrian border (i.e. Transdanubia), are more economically advanced. Regions in central Hungary, and to the north-east (especially along the border with eastern Slovakia), which rely on labor-intensive agriculture and crude manufacturing,
have lagged economically (Racz, 2002). It appears that MSZP's message, which focused heavily on increasing social welfare programs (e.g. pensions, unemployment subsidies) directed towards those that had been displaced during the economic transition, resonated in predominantly agricultural in the eastern regions (Racz, 2002). Except for Budapest, the majority of MSZP's votes were won in rural, agricultural regions in the east (Racz, 2003). According to Racz (2003), during the final weeks of the campaign, Fidesz intensified its campaign in Hungary's agricultural regions, spreading fear of a potential restoration of communism if the socialist MSZP was voted in. Although Fidesz positioned itself as a fierce defender of agrarian interests and nationalism, it's possible that their (at the time) liberal-conservative platform (e.g. advocating for a free market) did not appeal enough to those in economically lagging, agricultural regions (Racz, 2003). Additionally, Fidesz's nationalistic tendencies may have not been appealing to those residing in the cosmopolitan metropolis surrounding Budapest (Palonen, 2009). Fidesz generally performed well in the Transdanubia regions in the west, as well as more rural regions in the southeast. Ultimately, the left won by a very slim margin, garnering 2,675,081 popular votes, compared to the right, which won 2,306,763. For MSZP, the distribution of the popular vote, among Hungary's single member districts, translated to 178 parliamentary seats, while Fidesz secured 168 (Figure 2.19, above). Although MSZP formed a coalition with AFD, which secured 20 parliamentary seats, it failed to secure the two-thirds majority necessary to pass legislation seamlessly, leaving Fidesz with the ability to obstruct policies inconsistent with its agenda.

While the MSZP - AFD coalition governed, from 2002 to 2006, it was capable of transposing the legislation necessary to comply with the remaining 5 chapters of the EU acquis, addressing agricultural and economic policies, which were left unfinished by Fidesz. This allowed Hungary to be included in the 2004 EU expansion, along with Hungary and Poland (among others).
Despite the accession, Hungary continued to experience poor economic conditions (discussed further below) under the MSZP-AFD government, with an extensive debate (from both sides) on the extent to which the welfare state should be implemented, as well as if the "shock therapy" associated to rapid liberal marketization was best for the country (Korkut, 2012, pp. 151 - 155). Laszlo Bekeski, who served as Minister of Finance for MSZP, admitted publicly that "the Hungarian economy resembles a feeble organism with a weak immune system" (Korkut, 2012, p. 152). MSZP adopted the policy that the only method for improving economic conditions downstream would be to continue to engage in economic liberalization and reform the agricultural sector to make it competitive with the rest of Europe. Laszlo Bekeski argued that "Hungary can only trigger recovery with reform steps geared towards improving its competitiveness" (Korkut, 2012, p. 152).

Prior to, and directly after the 2006 parliamentary election, Hungarian politics was composed of intense polarization, primarily surrounding issues related to the economy and the EU negotiations. Polarization existed between Fidesz and the incumbent MSZP, in a manner that resembled two rival forms of populism (Palonen, 2009). MSZP focused on a large, redistributive welfare state, to include all those residing within Hungary's borders, while Fidesz focused on building a sovereign nation state, with a common "Hungarian" ethnic identity that would include Magyars in neighboring countries (Palonen, 2009; Korkut, 2012). Polarization would lead to political scandal and large-scale political protests. The primary issue surrounding the polarization was the lagging nature of the economy (discussed in greater depth below), which was expected to improve after EU accession (Palonen, 2009). MSZP was capable of securing 198 parliamentary seats, under the leadership of the new prime minister Ferenc Gyurcsany, defeating Fidesz, which
secured 164. MSZP formed a coalition with the Alliance of Free Democrats, which secured 3 seats to barely pass the 5% threshold mandated for faction representation.

Directly after the election, political turmoil emerged as new reports were released indicating that the state of the economy was significantly worse than what prime minister Gyurcsany and MSZP stated during the campaign. Prime minister Gyurcsany gave his famous Oszod speech at a private MSZP party congressional convention, in which he admitted that the party had lied during the campaign to maintain the status quo (Palonen, 2009). During the speech, Gyurcsany is quoted as having stated that "we lied, morning, noon, and night", while also calling for a massive series of economic reforms to correct the mistakes made in the past (Palonen, 2009). In an excerpt of the speech, Gyurcsany stated that "There is not much choice. There is not, because we screwed up. Not a little, a lot. No European country has done something as boneheaded as we have. Evidently, we lied throughout the last year-and-a-half, two years. It was totally clear that what we are saying is not true. You cannot quote any significant government measure we can be proud of, other than at the end we managed to bring the government back from the brink. Nothing. If we have to give account to the country about what we did for four years, then what do we say" (BBC News, 2006). When the speech was leaked, first on the public Magyar Radio then spreading to other media channels, civil unrest emerged, and anti-government protests were staged (Palonen, 2009; BBC News, 2006). Violent riots, which injured over 150 people and involved the deployment of military tanks, were initiated primarily in Budapest, but in other cities throughout Hungary, as well as among the Magyar minority in Romania (BBC News, 2006). Protesters, which congregated outside of the ministerial mansion, called for the resignation of Gyurcsany. The Movement for a Better Hungary (Jobbik) party, a right-wing populist party, which formed three years prior in 2003, also appears to have played a role in organizing the protests.
In seeing an opportunity to capitalize on the political discontent that emerged from the Oszod speech, Viktor Orban and Fidesz, which composed the parliamentary opposition at the time, petitioned for a formal vote of no confidence, while simultaneously drafting new revisions to the constitution. Shortly after, Hungarian president Laszlo Solyom ordered the prime minister to initiate a parliamentary vote of no confidence, and, after apologizing publicly, Gyurcsany and MSZP remained in power with 207 MP's voting for, and 167 MP's (all members of Fidesz-MPP) voting against the government (Palonen, 2009). After the vote, Viktor Orban organized a nationalist protest of over 50,000 citizens, who convened at the parliamentary headquarters in Budapest waving Hungarian flags and calling for the removal of MSZP (Palonen, 2009).

The political turmoil that emerged under the leadership of MSZP seems to have fueled a conservative, populist backlash in the country, which came to a head during the 2010 parliamentary campaign with effects (e.g. the emerging popularity of the radical-right Jobbik party) that have lasted well into 2018 (Korkut, 2012, p. 161-165; Agh, 2016). Fidesz, along with its alliance partner, the Christian Democrat People's Party (KDNP), secured a landslide victory, winning 263 of the 368 parliamentary seats. The victory of the Fidesz-KDNP alliance, securing a two-thirds parliamentary majority, firmly entrenched Viktor Orban as a prime minister with significant legislative power. The radical, right-wing populist Jobbik party also saw its first electoral success since its inception in 2003, securing 47 parliamentary seats. MSZP, while under new leadership with Attila Mesterhazy, severely plummeted from popularity, only securing 59 seats (a loss of 133 over the previous election). After seizing control of the government with an over two-thirds supermajority, Fidesz and Viktor Orban (who began to transform himself into a political "strongman") saw the opportunity to enact sweeping institutional reforms in a bid to centralize and consolidate their power in government (specific legislation discussed in Chapter 3).
Economic Trajectory

In 1989, when Hungary left the centrally-planned economy organized by the Soviet regime, it embarked on an effort to engage in economic marketization, by establishing a sound institutional framework and reducing its reliance on underperforming industries (e.g. agriculture, manufacturing) by developing knowledge-based sectors (Lengyal & Leydesdorff, 2011). The initial "shock therapy" associated to economic liberalization, which took place in the early 90's, left Hungary with a set of serious economic imbalances by 1994 (The World Bank Group, 2003). Except for Budapest, Hungary had difficulty absorbing new knowledge-based industries, a problem that persisted even after EU accession (Lengyal & Leydesdorff, 2011). The government deficit skyrocketed to 8.4% of GDP while the public debt reached 88% of GDP (Zidek, 2014). Around the same period, inflation increased 18.8% from what it was in 1990 (Zidek, 2014). The unemployment rate also increased to 11% as labor-intensive agriculture and crude manufacturing sectors attempted to modernize (Zidek, 2014). Zidek (2014) states that, in 1994, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) ranked Hungary as the third most vulnerable economy in the world. Not surprisingly, the state of the economy during the mid-90's motivated the political discontent discussed above.

During the 1995 parliamentary election, the Social Democrats (MSZP) campaigned, and won the election, on a platform that promised a significant stimulus package and sweeping economic reforms (Zidek, 2014). Shortly after the election, the MSZP lead government, with the assistance of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), developed an economic reform plan known as the Bokros package, named after the then Minister of Finance Lajos Bokros (Zidek, 2014). To ensure proper economic development, the IMF also provided the government with a 300 million (USD) loan. The Bokros package imposed surcharges on imports (other than investments in the
country), tightened benefit packages to citizens (e.g. childcare, unemployment), and privatized the banking sector, which allowed foreign financial institutions to seize Hungarian banks (Zidek, 2014). Between 1995 and 1998, the government also implemented a set of sweeping structural reforms and a fiscal stabilization package (The World Bank, 2003). As a result, the economy began to recover in the latter half of the 90's, seeing an average GDP per capita growth of 4.4% between 1997 to 2001 (The World Bank Group, 2003). As the economy stabilized, and new knowledge-based sectors flourished (primarily in Budapest), the unemployment rate (Figure 2.21, below), which peaked in 1993 at approximately 12.5% of the total labor force, also started to decline into the early 2000's, with some increase associated to the marketization that would come with EU accession (The World Bank Group, 2003; Zidek, 2014).

Regional Analyses

During its initial transition to a market economy, economic disparities began to emerge between the generally cosmopolitan Budapest region, which embraced knowledge-based sectors, and the Hungarian countryside, which was predominantly comprised by agricultural industries (Nagy, 1994). As Nagy (1994) argues, Hungary is comprised of a single urban center, with considerable intellectual, cultural, and political significance (as well as 20% of the total population), which has attracted considerable foreign direct investment and joint ventures, while the rest of the country is mere periphery. For comparison, in 1993 the unemployment rate in Budapest was 7%, while Szabolcs-Szatmar-Bereg, located in the agricultural-based northern plains region that straddles Slovakia and the Ukraine, experienced an unemployment rate of 26.8% (Nagy, 1994). Northern Transdanubia, which borders Austria, also saw considerable entrepreneurial activity after an initial economic dip, while central and southern Transdanubia exhibited significant instability for their reliance on an outdated mining industry and having a
demography comprised of many dwarf villages (Nagy, 1994). MSZP, and other left-leaning parties (e.g. Alliance of Free Democrats), have traditionally done well in the regions surrounding Budapest, while Fidesz and Jobbik have seen their primary support base stemming from the plains regions.

Lengyel & Leydesdorff (2011) claim that after EU accession, Hungary continued to experience considerable regional economic disparities, and innovation systems in each part of the country have not contributed to an integrated national economic system. Economic disparities are exemplified by Hungary's GINI coefficient. After the initial economic transition in the 90's, the GINI coefficient remained stable at approximately 28 points, but saw a spike after EU accession in 2004, rising to 34.7 points by 2005 (The World Bank Group, 2018). It is presumed that this spike reflects the success of the Budapest region after streamlining economic coordination with a broader European market, which likely also contributed to discontent in lagging regions.

Lengyel & Leydesdorff (2011) argue that Hungary is now comprised of three separate economic innovation systems, including "(1) the capital Budapest (which) can be characterized as a metropolitan innovation system, and operates increasingly on a par with Vienna, Prague, and Munich as centers for knowledge-intensive services and knowledge based manufacturing; (2) the north-western parts of the country have been absorbed into the Western-European innovation systems surrounding it; and (3) the eastern and southern parts of the country are still predominantly integrated within old systems dynamics" (p. 4). The "old system dynamics" refer to labor-intensive agricultural sectors, which were sheltered from open market forces during the soviet regime, that are organized with a heavy reliance on national subsidies and EU regional development funds (Lengyel & Leydesdorff, 2011). These regions seem to be especially prone to adopting the populist messages of both the Fidesz and Jobbik party.
According to the European Roma Rights Center (ERRC), public opinion surveys, conducted during the refugee crisis, indicate that over 72 percent of Hungarians hold an unfavorable disposition towards Muslims, a feature that has provided radical-right parties with a constituency willing to lend an ear to their position (Rorke, 2018). The 2015 refugee crisis, and the EU's relocation scheme to alleviate the burden on Italy and Greece, seems to have been taken as an opportunity, by Viktor Orban, as well as the Jobbik party, to reject EU policy and signal their willingness to defend Hungarian sovereignty against an alleged supranational political elite (Fekete, 2016). Regarding the refugees and asylum seekers, Viktor Orban has stated in public interviews that "we don't see these people as Muslim refugees, we see them as Muslim invaders" and "for us migration is not a solution but a problem ... not medicine but a poison, we don’t need it and won’t swallow it" (Rorke, 2018).

Unlike Poland and Slovakia, who's governments also responded negatively towards the EU's handling of the crisis, Hungary did serve as a major transitory route for over 350,000 refugees, which reached its peak in September of 2015 (Kallius, Monterescu, & Rajaram, 2016). The refugees, primarily from Syria and Afghanistan, entered Europe through Greece and traveled northward, entering Hungary through its southern borders with Serbia and Croatia, to eventually reach Germany (Kallius, Monterescu, & Rajaram, 2016). In total, Hungary received approximately 8.5% of the total asylum-seekers in Europe, between 2015 and 2016, at a total of 202,321 persons (Zaun, 2018). When the total Hungarian population is taken into consideration, Hungary received 20.55 asylum seekers per thousand capita, the highest ratio out of all the EU countries (Zaun, 2018). For comparative purposes, Germany housed 48.8% of the European total, between 2015
and 2016, at 1,163,677 persons total (Zaun, 2018). When their total population is taken into consideration, Germany held 14.29 per thousand capita (Zaun, 2018).

To signal their stance to protect Hungary, one of the first measures adopted by Fidesz was the erection of billboards throughout Hungary, written in Hungarian, cautioning refugees not to take jobs away from Hungarians, as well as to respect Hungarian laws (Agh, 2016). On October 15, 2015, the Hungarian government announced that it was in a "state of migration emergency" along Hungary's southern border (Fekete, 2016). Rather than framing the refugee crisis as a humanitarian emergency, rhetoric perpetuated by the Orban government framed the situation as a "Muslim invasion" and a threat to national sovereignty (Fekete, 2016; Agh, 2016).

According to Kallius, Monterescu, & Rajaram (2016), the Fidesz-KDNP government maintained a steady rhetorical discourse, which framed the refugees as potential criminals and threats to national security, by highlighting terrorist attacks that have occurred in other EU countries (e.g. France). The government has also expressed that the predominantly Muslim immigrants do not belong in the allegedly homogenous, Christian society in Hungary, stating that they are culturally incompatible (Baczynska, 2017). Viktor Orban has also blamed the refugee crisis on the alleged dealings of a parasitic, globalist deep state linked to the EU, which, as he claims, has planned to destroy a homogenous Hungarian society through multiculturalism and liberalism (Haraszti, 2015). Orban also publicly accused MEP's in the European Parliament of conspiring to change the demographic composition of Europe, announcing on Hungarian public radio that "Europeans will not become a minority in our own Continent" (Mischke, 2018; Fekete, 2016).

Despite warnings from the EU, the Hungarian government adopted the policy of immobilization, initiating a military build-up along its border with Serbia and Croatia, which
involved the erection of barbed wire fencing, detention camps, and a significant presence of military personnel (Fekete, 2016; Kallius, Monterescu, & Rajaram, 2016). In 2017, the European Union announced that it would be launching litigation proceedings against Hungary for failing to meet the quota allocation set by the EU. When the disciplinary litigation was put to a vote in the European Parliament, more than the necessary two-thirds majority voted in favor of proceeding with the case, signaling that it found Hungary liable for breaching the fundamental human rights values detailed in Article 2 of the Treaty of Nice, thus necessitating the need to trigger Article 7 proceedings (Mischke, 2018). If the European Court finds that the Hungarian Government did breach the treaty, it can impose heavy fines and restrict funding (Mischke, 2018).

The announcement that the EU was going to proceed with litigation against Hungary did not come without a considerable backlash from Viktor Orban and Fidesz. In his State of the Union address, for 2018, European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker announced that the EU was planning to substantially bolster border security, with the aspiration of hiring over 10,000 more border security officials by 2020 (Mischke, 2018). Viktor Orban spun this plan as an aggression on Hungary, stating publicly that the EU wanted to "send mercenaries" to its country to prevent "Hungarian sons" from protecting their border (Mishke, 2018).

The refugee situation, and subsequent responses by the EU, appears to have motivated Hungary's populist parties to refocus their rhetoric towards defending Hungary against the perceived threats (e.g. national security, welfare allocations, crime) posed by those ascribed as categorical outsiders, including the Roma minority in the region (discussed in greater depth in Chapter 3) (Fekete, 2016; Haraszti, 2015). The Hungarian Roma minority is estimated to be approximately 7.49 percent of the total population (as of 2012), at 750,000 persons, and has faced considerable integration challenges, existing primarily in segregated, destitute ghettos (European
Rhetoric, which broadly frames all of those perceived as outsiders as threats and burdens to a homogenous Hungarian state, appears to have been used strategically in the 2018 parliamentary elections. In the lead up to the election, Viktor Orban's chief of staff claimed that Roma relations in the region, which have been highly counterproductive, should be taken as evidence that asylum-seekers will not be able to integrate with the majority population successfully (Bayer, 2018; European Commission, 2014). During a campaign speech held in the village of Martely (located in the economically lagging Southern Great Plains region), Viktor Orban told a crowd of supporters "we have been living with the Gypsies for 600 years and to this day we still haven’t been able to integrate them" (Bayer, 2018) In the same speech, Orban addressed the refugee problem by claiming “it’s a fairytale that we can integrate them" (Bayer, 2018).

Just prior to the election, Viktor Orban published an anti-immigration video, on his official Facebook page, that was filmed in the northern town of Miskolc, which is known for having authorities conduct pogrom-like evictions of Roma villages in the past (Orban, 2018; Walker, 2018; Bayer, 2018). In the video, Orban is seen greeting locals (e.g. police officers, construction workers) in a friendly manner, while he orates on both the refugee and Roma problem. Regarding Hungary's handling of the situation, Orban states "There are two paths ahead of Hungary to choose from: we will either have a national government, in which case we will not become an immigrant country, or the people of a George Soros form of government, in which case Hungary will become an immigrant country" (Walker, 2018). After, he states "now, just imagine when people with a different culture, habits and view of life come here from outside our borders" (Walker, 2018). In addressing integration concerns, Orban explains that newcomers (referencing the Roma and Muslim migrations from North Africa) typically gravitate to cities, like Miskolc and Budapest, while arguing that "they are places where ghettos are established, its where no-go zones, parallel
societies, the difficulties of coexistence and the deterioration of public security occur" (Walker, 2018). In an interview on Hungarian public radio, conducted just after the 2018 parliamentary election, Orban stated that "the main task of the new government will be to preserve Hungary's security and Christian culture" (Wrobel, 2018). In the same interview, Orban addressed his stance on the European Union by explaining "we believe in the importance of the nation, and in Hungary, we do not want to yield ground to any supranational business or political empire" (Wrobel, 2018).

Public opinion polling shows that Fidesz, and the radical right Jobbik party (addressed in Chapter 3), have held a dominant lead in Polish politics since the downfall of MSZP in 2010, indicating that Fidesz experienced an increase in popularity around October of 2015, the point of time when the refugee crisis had hit its peak (Kallius, Monterescu, & Rajaram, 2016).

Based on the overwhelming support Fidesz had leading up to the 2018 parliamentary election, as reflected in all the public opinion polling that had been done in the region, it is perhaps no surprise that Fidesz would dominate the election. Fidesz was able to secure 133 seats in parliament, well past the 100-member threshold for a majority. Additionally, the Jobbik party was capable of securing 26 seats, an increase of 3 seats over the election in 2014. In its first attempt to reenter politics since the political scandal that emerged in 2010, MSZP, under new leadership from Gergely Karacsony, secured 20 parliamentary seats. A regional analyses of voting behavior is revealing of the economic disparities that exist between the cosmopolitan region surrounding Budapest, in comparison to the more agricultural, conservative plains regions. The left of center MSZP garnered most of its votes solely from Budapest and the voting districts surrounding it. Fidesz, on the other hand, won almost all other electoral districts in the country.
Chapter 3

The Resurgence of Radicalism

I. Features of Radicalism

In situations where lagging economic conditions are coupled with supranational policy directives, which are perceived as unfair and a threat to national sovereignty, a disaffected population may be willing to lend an ear to populist political entrepreneurs pushing a nationalistic agenda. In such instances, where populist movements secure significant representation, if not total outright government control, there seems to be a natural progression to an increasingly radicalized agenda. Several factors can contribute to the phenomena, including party competition and critical issues, such as the refugee crisis and subsequent responses by the EU and populist movements. In the case studies detailed in Chapter 2, it was observed that populist movements used the refugee crisis to crystallize their support. Competition from other smaller, even more radical parties (e.g. Jobbik), also seems to have pushed populist movements further towards radicalization to retain votes. In instances where populist movements secure parliamentary majorities (e.g. Poland, Hungary), a radicalized agenda can take the form of dismantling the various institutions (e.g. impartial judiciaries, electoral laws) which secure a proper set of checks and balances, as well as engaging in an extreme and, often, conspiratorial rhetoric against threats to their power.

In most cases, populism does not pose an existential threat to democracy (Mudde, 2004, p. 279). As Taggart (2004) has stated, populist parties will "usually fade fast" (p. 270). However, there are cases in which populist sovereignist have become radicalized while in power, eventually attacking the various policies and institutions associated with liberal democracy and
fueling dramatic social strife. One such instance of the latter is the HDZ single party government, under the rule of Franjo Tudjman, in the Croatian government of the 1990's (Mudde, 2004, p. 280; Lindstrom, 2003).

In 1990, amid the breakup of the former Yugoslavia, the Croatian Democratic Union (henceforth referred to as HDZ), campaigned to win seats in the newly formed multi-party, unicameral parliamentary system in Croatia. Riding on a wave of political dissidence, HDZ, led by Franjo Tudjman, campaigned on a strong nativist platform pushing for hostile irredentism (Uzelak, 1997; Mudde, 2004, p. 279). Tudjman's radicalized, nationalistic rhetoric often exemplified that of an authoritarian "strong man", in which he asserted total control over decision making, as well as displaying a general unwillingness to respect national institutions.

Tudjman is quoted as having stated publicly "Those who are raising the question about the building of the Presidential Palace, yacht, or buying the presidential airplane, are belonging to those Yugo-unitarists, in other words, to remnants of the Yugo-communist ideology, who cannot accept the fact that Croatia has become a sovereign state which has its own Head of State...." (Uzelak, 1997). A feature of Tudjman's authoritarian "strong man" nature was his critical, and somewhat patronizing stance towards the press, often directing journalists on what and how to write on specific issues. Tudjman would often urge the press to emphasize the common history of Croats, especially in their reporting on diplomatic issues (Uzelak, 1997).

While in power in the early 90's, Tudjman not only pushed a strong nativist discourse by reminding the country of a common history among Croats, but consistently reminded the country of threats from neighboring countries (e.g. Italy, Serbia, Bosnia - Herzegovina ), which, as he stressed, held hostile irredentist dispositions (Razsa & Lindstrom, 2004, Uzelak, 1997). Stressing the common language binding Croats, and threats to solidarity from the country's Italian
minority, Tudjman stated in an interview that "bilingualism cannot be allowed in the whole Country [Istria], nor in general and public life, because it would mean that the sovereignty of the Croatian people as a majority in the whole Country's territory, would be compromised for an incomparably small Italian national minority" (Uzelak, 1997). Tudjman clearly outlined the enemies of the Croatian nation state while stressing that the land had always belonged to the Croatian people, who, again, shared a common history. Targeting Serbians that were residing within Croatian borders (and seeking their own autonomy), Tudjman stated in a political speech that "Serbs are a national minority who live on a territory that never belonged to them" (Uzelak, 1997). Amid an already tense relationship with neighboring Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, Tudjman's nativist rhetoric appears to have partially fueled the war, and genocide, that would soon follow.

Radicalized political movements attempt to build national solidarity and gain power by defining the ethnic markers (e.g. common language, customs) that bind citizens, emphasize a common history tied to a specific region, and clearly outline threats (e.g. categorical outsiders including minorities and immigrants, supranational political entities like the EU and NATO) to the sovereignty of the nation state. In the case of HDZ, which held a dominant majority in Croatia's unicameral government, no sufficient checks (e.g. viable competing parties, rejection by the public) existed to prevent the cascade of nativist rhetoric that would later fuel war and genocide between Croats, Serbs, and Bosnians. Although not quite as extreme, the same rudimentary features that constitute radical political extremism can be observed among movements in Slovakia, Poland and Hungary.
II. Slovakia

Slovakia has experienced various forms of political extremism tracing its roots to the revolution of 1989 (Nociar, 2012). At its most severe, far-right extremism has taken the form of hostile racism directed towards Roma and Hungarian minorities (Mudde, 2005). Do specific factors (e.g. economic conditions, supranational and national policies) provide a fertile ground for the development of such extreme political expressions?

In the early 90's, directly after the communist revolution, Slovakia saw the emergence of numerous political movements adopting extremist, racist (e.g. anti-Semitic, anti-Roma, neo-Nazi "White Power") ideologies, in a backlash against Soviet rule (Milo, 2005). White supremacist and skinhead movements (e.g. Slovakia Hammerskins, Blood & Honour Division Slovakia, White Power Party) exerted a strong attraction for youngsters between the ages of 14 to 26 in regions with high unemployment (Milo, 2005). These initial extremist movements where relatively uncoordinated, thus unable to challenge mainstream political parties in regional and national governments (Milo, 2005). Important leaders of populist sovereigntist political parties learned their trade in such movements. For instance, the leader of the L-SNS party, Marian Kotleba, started his political career in such a movement, the Slovak Togetherness, a far-right, white supremacist civic association that eventually was legally dissolved by the Slovak supreme court (Spac & Voda, 2014; Kluknavska, 2014; Kluknavska, 2015). While acting as the leader of Slovak Togetherness, Kotleba organized skinhead marches through Roma villages, while adorning uniforms from the fascist Hlinka Guard, a movement that collaborated with the German Third Reich from 1938 to 1945 (Spac & Voda, 2014).

While acting as the mayor of the Banska Bystrica region of central Slovakia (economically lagging, as discussed in Ch. 2), from 2013 to 2017, Marian Kotleba controlled
local newspaper *Bystrica Kraj*. On a recurring basis, *Bystrica Kraj* has published a range of political satire, both anti-Semitic and anti-Roma in its messaging. (United States Department of State, 2015). In a section critical of bankers and the substantial debt crisis among citizens in the region, the paper published an anti-Semitic cartoon depicting a banker with a long nose and curly hair, which was a direct copy of an anti-Semitic, Nazi-era propaganda poster (United States Department of State, 2015). After continually propagating anti-Semitic and anti-Roma rhetoric, citizens began to file complaints and government subsidies were removed from the taxpayer funded *Bystrica Kraj*.

The Slovak government revised its constitution in 1992 by including specific human rights clauses, with the aspiration of eventually joining the European Union. Article 12 of the 1992 constitution grants inalienable, equal rights to all citizens of the Slovak Republic, regardless of race, ethnicity or nationality, religion, and sex (Mihalik, 2014). However, because the People's Party - Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (henceforth referred to as L'S-HZDS), led by Vladamir Meclar, was nativistic in its orientation, opportunities were created to legally discriminate against the Roma and Hungarian (Magyar) minorities. In particular, in 1995 an amendment "language law" was added to the 1992 constitution, which mandated that, in regions with over a 20% minority population, the national language (i.e. Slovak) must be used in all official communications, including those in health, education, and employment systems (Mihalik, 2014). By adding this amendment, L'S-HZDS replaced the previously policy held by Czechoslovakia, which allowed districts, with over a 20% minority composition, to retain the language most closely associated with their ethnicity (Gonzalez, 2001, p. 303). The language law had the effect of severely inhibiting non-Slovak speakers (e.g. Roma, Magyars) from easily
accessing governmental services, such as the education and the healthcare systems (Mihalik, 2014).

In 2009, while a parliamentary coalition existed between SMER-SD, SNS, and L'S-HZDS (then led by Vladamir Meclar), the Slovak government revised the language law amendment, making illegal to conduct business, print books or journals, and use sign language in public in any language other than Slovak (BBC News, 2009). After receiving a written warning for a first violation, fines for further violations were set to up to 5,000 euro (BBC News, 2009). The move incited outrage among Slovakia's ethnic Magyars concentrated in the southern districts, as well as strained diplomatic relations with Hungary (BBC News, 2009). Shortly after the law was enacted, in September of 2009, more than 10,000 ethnic Hungarians congregated and protested in a soccer stadium in Dunajska Streda, a majority Hungarian town of approximately 22,000 in southern Slovakia (BBC News, 2009). The protest was conducted to persuade lawmakers to remove the law. Regarding the language law, Peter Pazmany, of the Hungarian Coalition Party (a party fighting for Hungarian minority representation in the Slovak parliament), told BBC reporters that the law made no sense and only created social tension (BBC news, 2009).

The political debate surrounding the revision to the language law in 2009 incited a flurry of radicalized rhetoric that emphasized the "common history" of both Slovakia and Hungary (Pytlas, 2013). Specifically, instances in which the ethnic Slovak population in Hungary experienced marginalization, stemming back to a forced migration when the catholic Habsburg empire overran protestant rule in the region (Örkény & Sik, 2011). SMER, SNS, and L'S-HZDS, members of a right-leaning, nationalistic parliamentary coalition, played what Pytlas (2013) referred to as the 'Hungarian card'. Here, rhetoric focused on the 'cultural domination' of ethnic
Slovaks in the former Kingdom of Hungary (Orkney & Sik, 2011; Pytlas, 2013). The SNS has adopted a strong nativist nationalist political platform. On its party website, in 2005, it declared that "Nation is an ethnic togetherness, the constant ethnic space, and the only way of entering it is to be born into it. Nation is defined by what is given forever and is unchangeable: lineage, origin, and the blood of forefathers, national mythology, and language. Nation and national membership are the real heritage, formed by history, which is given to everyone by his/her birth" (Milos, 2005, p. 213).

In Slovakia, radicalized political rhetoric, which seeks to build support by highlighting ethnic tensions, has been significantly more extreme in the case the country's ethnic Roma minority. According to the European Commission census, as of 2012 approximately 490,000 Roma were living in Slovakia, contributing to 9.02 percent of the total population (European Commission, 2014). Since Slovakia underwent revolutions in 1989, various nationalist movements have targeted the Roma, and the various government assistances afforded to the marginalized group, in what others (e.g. Dollard et al., 1939) have referred to as scapegoating.

According to Milo (2015, p. 227), in 2001, the largest number of racially motivated crimes occurred in the Terencin region, in north-central Slovakia, which has had a history of violent incidents incited by white nationalist, skinhead groups. Among racially motivated crimes in Slovakia, the most common offense is the "support and propagation of movements which tend toward the suppressing of human rights and liberties, in accordance with articles 260 and 261 of the Penal Code" (Milo, 2015, p. 227).

Common especially in the 90's, attacks on Roma are often incited by local political leaders seeking to demonstrate discontent over government services (e.g. housing, education), specifically directed towards helping the Roma (Milo, 2005; Spac, 2014; Kluknavska & Smolik,
Jan Slota, leader of the Real Slovak National Party (henceforth referred to as PSNS), a more radicalized offshoot of SNS, as well as mayor of the town of Zilina, has frequently engaged in publicly scorning the various assistance programs (e.g. subsidies for children, government jobs programs) offered to the Roma. In 2002, he stated in a public speech that the Roma "produce children not for loving them, but because they view the kids as a money-making possibility" (Milo, 2005, p. 215). In 1999, at a political rally in central Slovakia, Slota "accused all Roma of being criminals who rob and steal" (Milo, 2005, p. 233). During the campaign for the parliamentary campaign in 2012, Jan Slota erected billboards, in towns with a significant Roma population, which showed images depicting destitute Roma ghettos and included one of his campaign catch phrases "How long will we pay for Gypsies" (Mihalik, 2014). During the same campaign, SNS purchased a series of billboards, showing the faces of SNS frontrunners (including Jan Slota), which contained the catchphrase "Stop supporting the parasites" (Mihalik, 2014). Similar anti-Roma rhetoric was also implemented by SNS in the 2010 parliamentary campaign, where SNS revealed a controversial billboard, which showed a heavily tattooed, obese Roma man along with the catchphrase "Stop feeding those who do not want to work" (Mihalik, 2014).

Mihalik (2015) analyzed data, collected via ethnographic field surveys conducted by the European Commission funded MYPLACE (Memory, Youth, Political Legacy and Civic Engagement) project, in two different locations in Slovakia, Rimavska Sobota and Trnava, to determine which percentage of the youth population held negative dispositions toward the Roma and Hungarian (Magyar) minorities. Rimavska Sobota is a small, economically lagging town in the southern portion of the Banska Bystrica region, where radical far-right leader Marian Kotleba serves as mayor. Trnava, located in the Kraj region approximately 47 kilometers north-east of
Bratislava, is slightly more developed economically. Data from the MYPLACE project was gathered through the deployment of both quantitative (n = 1,200) and qualitative (n = 60) methods among youth, ages 15 to 25, in both regions (Mihalik, 2015). Mihalik (2015) notes that similar past studies conducted in Slovakia (e.g. Public opinion related to right-wing extremism (n=1005) have found that support for radical right-wing ideologies (e.g. attacks on minority welfare packages, overt racism, ant-establishment) is most common among males, with limited education, residing in small towns. Such individuals seem to gravitate to the SMER, SNS, and L'S-HZDS parties (Mihalik, 2015).

According to his processing of qualitative data from the MYPLACE project, Mihalik (2015) notes that it is especially common for non-Roma youth, when asked about their support for the actions of various skinhead movements in the region, to endorse the response "I agree with them, but I think it is not correct". Participants also usually stated that they believed the police should be much stricter in controlling the Roma population (Mihalik, 2015). One participant claimed in an open-ended question that "in Slovakia, it is normal that people have issues against Roma. Young people are easy to influence and if they group around older who share negative attitude against Roma they automatically consider it as true and valid" (Mihalik, 2015). Mihalik (2015) also processed the quantitative data from the MYPLACE project, which was collected by surveying respondents on various anti-Hungarian and anti-Roma positions. Results indicate that over 63 percent of participants, in the Rimavska Sobota region, endorsed responses indicating an anti-Roma position. An ample youth population, experiencing economic strife and harboring negative dispositions toward the Roma population, likely provided Marian Kotleba and L'SNS with the fertile ground it needed to gain power utilizing rhetoric that attacked the various economic assistance programs directed at the Roma. In the Trnava region, which
continues to experience problems with political radicalization as new skinhead movements gain traction, the percentage of youth holding anti-Roma dispositions is even higher at 79 percent (Mihalik, 2015).

III. Poland

In recent years (Since 2015) it appears that active far-right populist parties in Poland (e.g. PiS, Kukiz’15, PSL) are exhibiting the typical features associated to political radicalism. These features include a political leader exhibiting authoritarian "strong man" tendencies, support to override government institutions, rhetoric involving a rigid conception of national identity with exclusive membership, and the justification of racism. Radicalized political parties often attempt to remove the various government institutions (e.g. judicial systems, electoral laws) intended to act as a system of checks and balances. Given the relative weakness of Poland's institutional structure, where a party can easily obtain an absolute majority in its unicameral parliament, while simultaneously securing the presidential seat (e.g. PiS in the 2015 elections), the possibility of a radicalized party obtaining total control of the Polish government is very much plausible. If political discontent were extreme among the population, for various reasons including economic strife and a disdain for top-down policy implementation by the EU, a party could curry the support for abolishing the country's constitution (e.g. Kukiz'15 during the 2015 campaign), and radically change the institutional structure to consolidate power.

Typical of radicalized populist parties is an emphasis on a collective national identity, with a common history. While in power, it appears that PiS is starting to abuse its power (as of 2018) to reconstruct a national identity and a common, 'heroic' history. On February 1st, 2018, the PiS controlled Senate (with a presidential signature from PiS' Adrzej Duda) pushed through a controversial new law that attaches a three year jail sentence to any individual found guilty of
communicating any information suggesting that Poland was complicit in the Holocaust, or any other war crime during the 20th century (e.g. Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968) (Pankowski, 2018; Wielinski & Wyborcza, 2017). It appears that nationalist movements, which received minimal support in the elections, may have played a role in coercing the legislation through via threat (Pankowski, 2018). After the Senate passed the legislation, a presidential signature was still needed. On February 5th, after some apparent presidential hesitation, the radical far-right movements National Movement (RN) and National Radical Camp (ONR) held demonstrations outside of the presidential palace, in view of Andrzej Duda (Pankowski, 2018). After demonstrators repeatedly yelled several anti-Semitic remarks, a banner was exposed, addressed directly at president Duda, which read "Take off your yarmulke: sign the bill!" (Pankowski, 2018). The next day, president Duda signed the bill, bringing the legislation into law (Pankowski, 2018).

The law incited a firestorm of diplomatic backlash, both from the United States and Israel. After Israeli ambassador to Poland Anna Azari publicly scorned the law, a popular TV personality and political commentator on Polish state TV, Rafal Ziemkiewicz, announced on his Twitter account "For many years I have convinced people that we must support Israel. Today, because of a few stupid and greedy scabs (emphasis added), I feel like an idiot" (Pankowski, 2018). The word *parchy* [scab] has traditionally been used as a derogatory term in radical Polish anti-Semitic discourse and appears to be regaining popularity (Pankowski, 2018). After refusing to apologize and delete the Tweet, it appears that Ziemkiewicz career has blossomed, and after being implicated in a Tel Aviv University report on anti-Semitism, Ziemkiewicz announced that his being labeled an anti-Semite was a mark of "professional success" (Pankowski, 2018).
To correct the diplomatic blunder, in June of 2018, Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki (also of PiS) urged parliament to amend the law to remove the possibility of a jail term, while still retaining the infraction as a civil offense capable of being fined through the court system (Ingber, 2018). According to Reuters, regarding the amendment, Morawiecki told lawmakers that "those who say that Poland may be responsible for the crimes of World War Two deserve jail terms", while also conceding "but we operate in an international context and we take that into account" (Ingber, 2018). Later, in June of 2018, the Polish lower and upper house both voted to amend the law and remove jail terms. A parliamentary member reportedly told Reuters staff that the law was amended to help improve diplomatic relations with the United States "as a deterrence policy against Russia" (Ingber, 2018).

Since securing a full parliamentary majority, along with the presidential seat, in 2015, the far-right populist PiS has developed a track record of passing legislation to push a radicalized agenda and remove those from office that disagree. In July of 2018, the PiS controlled parliament passed legislation reducing the mandatory retirement age, for the supreme court, from 70 to 65 (Sobczak & Baczyska, 2018). The move appears to be a direct aggression against the First President (i.e. leader) of the Supreme Court, Malgorzata Gersdof, who opposed the PiS government and would be forced to retire under the new legislation. Moreover, the law also required the immediate removal of 27 of the 73 supreme court justices, while simultaneously expanding the supreme court to 120 members (Sobczak & Baczyska, 2018). Given that the government would be allowed to appoint new justices, the law effectively grants PiS the ability to reconfigure two thirds of the supreme court and stack the judiciary with members more partial to PiS' agenda (Romo, 2018). President Andrzej Duda has stated publicly that the 'judicial reform' legislation is intended to weed out corruption among Supreme Court justices, which has
allegedly existed since the communist era (Romo, 2018). Shortly after PiS passed the judicial 'reform' legislation, the European Commission announced that it will undertake legal action against the Polish government, stating that the new law "undermines the principle of judicial independence, including the irremovability of judges" (Romo, 2018).

The European Commission has opened several separate litigation cases against the Polish government related to violations of the rule of law, claiming that Poland has failed to maintain their obligation to adhere to the EU Charter of Fundamental Human Rights. On July 2, 2018, the European Commission sent a letter of formal notice to the Polish government, warning of impending litigation if a proper response was not received within a month (European Commission, 2018). After receiving a response from the Polish government, the European Commission determined that "The response of the Polish authorities does not alleviate the Commission's legal concerns" (European Commission, 2018). In August of 2018, the European Commission maintained that "the Polish law on the Supreme Court is incompatible with EU law as it undermines the principle of judicial independence, including the irremovability of judges, and thereby Poland fails to fulfil its obligations under Article 19(1) of the Treaty on European Union read in connection with Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union" (European Commission, 2018). The European Commission has given the Polish government one month to reverse their supreme court legislation and bring their laws back into compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Human Rights. After resisting the European Commission and failing to reverse the supreme court litigation, on September 24, 2018 the European Commission announced in a press release that it would be referring Poland to the European Court of Justice for egregious violations of the principle of judicial independence (European Commission, 2018). PiS' behavior has also incited outrage among citizens residing in
the generally economically prosperous regions in the west, where the Civic Platform has seen considerable support. In response to the 'judicial reform' legislation, in July of 2018 thousands of protesters congregated on the city of Krakow (bordering the Czech Republic), carrying copies of the Polish constitution and chanting "Solidarnosc" (i.e. solidarity), as was once done during protests against the communist regime (New York Times Editorial Board, 2018).

The popularity of radicalized populist parties in Poland, which discredit government institutions to consolidate their power, is not only limited to the PiS party, but appears to be even more extreme with the Kukiz'15 movement. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Kukiz'15, led by former punk rock star Pawel Kukiz, rose to prominence just prior to the 2015 elections and secured an impressive 42 seats in parliament, while Kukiz himself came in third place in the presidential election (Marcinkiewicz & Stegmaier, 2016). Pawel Kukiz positioned himself as an anti-establishment, anti-system candidate with a radical vision of removing the constitution and replacing the parliamentary system with a presidential system (Marcinkiewicz & Stegmaier, 2016).

Kukiz appears to have maintained contacts with Law and Justice (PiS) leader Jaroslaw Kaczynski and may be playing an influential role in the recent anti-establishment policies (e.g. supreme court overhaul) adopted by PiS (Szczerbiak, 2018). Kukiz'15 came out publicly as strongly opposed to the European Commission's handling of the PiS governments recent judicial overhaul and the impending ECJ litigation prompted by Article 7 "rule of law" concerns (Szczerbiak, 2018). Playing on fears of Islamic terrorism in the region, Kukiz'15 has also publicly supported the PiS government in their vehement opposition to the European Union's refugee quota scheme. In June of 2016, Kukiz'15, along with the right-wing opposition National Movement (RN), organized anti-immigration protests in several Polish cities (Radio Poland,
2016). The previous month, Kukiz'15 had already started a petition on a referendum to prevent the Polish government from accepting any individuals from the Middle East and North Africa (Radio Poland, 2016). Pawel Kukiz told reporters that individuals coming from these regions were too "culturally foreign", thus a threat to national sovereignty (Radio Poland, 2016). As Szczerbiak (2018) notes, Kukiz' impulsive and emotional public persona, which departs drastically from typical mainstream politicians, seems to be attracting voters as he is perceived as authentically anti-establishment. If PiS fails to secure enough seats for an absolute majority in the November 2019 parliamentary election, it appears that Kukiz'15 could realistically join them as a coalition partner in a radicalized nationalistic government (Szczerbiak, 2018).

Along with the popularity of Kukiz'15, and other radical nationalist movements in Poland, has come an increase in anti-Semitism, which is rather blatant in the public discourse and appears to have increased dramatically around January of 2018 (Pankowski, 2018). Pawel Kukiz, leader of Kukiz'15, has repeatedly made public remarks linking Jews with Communism, while also blaming Jews for allegedly accusing Poles for being complicit in the Holocaust. Kukiz told local reporters that "making Poles co-responsible for the holocaust is a moral and ethical holocaust against the Poles" (Pankowski, 2018). Parliamentary member Marek Jakubiak, a representative from Kukiz'15, has repeatedly made the case that Poles and Jews should be treated as morally equivalent victims during the Holocaust, and that the international community has failed to properly acknowledge Polish suffering during the Holocaust.

Even more extreme is the anti-Semitic rhetoric exhibited by president Andrzej Duda's advisor and media representative Andrzej Zybertowic, who has previously made a career as a sociologist, publishing articles on security issues in prominent Polish media (Pankowski, 2018). Recently (as of 2018), Zybertowic publicly expressed arguments accusing an alleged globalist
Jewish elite of planning the holocaust for the benefit of creating the state of Israel and bargaining for Jewish superiority (Pankowski, 2018). In addressing reporters on the passage of the 2018 language law, which attaches a prison sentence to any individual accused of suggesting that Poles were complicit in the holocaust, Zybertowic stated that "in this dispute one can see clearly that Israel is fighting to keep a monopoly on the Holocaust. The 'religion' of the Holocaust has become a symbolic shield for that country, which is used by Israel to create for itself a special position in many places in the world - a shield meant to protect Israel against any criticism. And now, Israel is afraid that Poland's IPN law will break its monopoly on the holocaust" (Pankowski, 2018). Anti-Semitic comments like these have become quite common in the public discourse in Poland. On the Twitter account for Polish state radio, political commentator Piotr Nisztor stated that "if somebody acts as a spokesman for Israeli interests, maybe they should think about giving up their Polish citizenship and accepting Israeli citizenship" (Pankowski, 2018).

IV. Hungary

After winning the 2010 election, Viktor Orban and Fidesz committed to a more radicalized, populist agenda set on restoring and preserving national sovereignty. In the rhetoric perpetuated by Fidesz, the left-liberal coalitions that previously led Hungary were accused of corruption, as well as holding a parasitic, elitist position that placed supranational interests ahead of the nation (Korkut, 2012, p. 166). Shortly after, Orban stated in a parliamentary speech that "A new social contract evolved in the polling booths when Hungarians showed an unprecedented agreement in overthrowing the old system and decided to build a new system of national cooperation" (Korkut, 2012, p. 161). Orban repeatedly called for a "renewal" of the nation.
In 2011, the Fidesz led government seized the opportunity that had been presented, with their securing a two-thirds supermajority (i.e. 68% of the parliament exactly) and festering political discontent following the 2006 protests and commenced formal procedures to pass a new constitution that had been drafted. When placed to a vote, the parliament voted along party lines, and the conservative Fidesz-KDNP coalition passed the new constitution, also known as the "Fundamental Law" with relative ease. The "Fidesz" constitution came into effect on January 1st, 2012 (Brodsky, 2013). The new constitution included a potentially dangerous set of new laws that aided its ability to consolidate centralized power, as well as construct and rigidify a common national identity (Brodsky, 2013). Published on the official website of the Hungarian government is a detailed description of the "Fundamental Law", where it is stated that a new constitution was direly needed to "closed the door on the past in a symbolical sense, since our country was the last one among the states of the former communist bloc to replace its Soviet model-based constitution. The new Constitution opened a new chapter in the history of the country. The former fundamental law, issued in 1949, has now been replaced by a Constitution written by Hungary itself, committed to both national and European values" (The Official Website of the Hungarian Government, 2018).

The new Hungarian "Fundamental Law" constitution also includes clauses that appear to rigidify a common national identity, including an emphasis on a national language and a common history. Written in the preamble of the constitution is the proclamation that "we are proud that our king Saint Stephen built the Hungarian State on solid ground and made our country a part of Christian Europe one thousand years ago", that "we recognize the role of Christianity in preserving nationhood", and that "we commit to promoting and safeguarding our heritage, our unique language, Hungarian culture" (The Official Website of the Hungarian
Government, 2018). Article H, of the Foundation of the constitution, also states that "in Hungary the official language shall be Hungarian" and "Hungary shall protect the Hungarian language" (The Official Website of the Hungarian Government, 2018).

The new constitution also contains clauses which entirely annul any rulings made by the Constitutional Court, prior to 2012, allowing the Fidesz government to operate on a 'clean slate' (Brodsky, 2013). The fourth amendment made to the constitution radically changed the nature of future campaigning, by making it illegal to advertise a political party through platforms other than public media broadcasts. Broadcasts on public media channels are also screened by a government media board, which originally had an equal representation of political parties, but was taken over and controlled entirely by Fidesz when the constitution was passed (Brodsky, 2013). Previous laws incorporating the policy, in which one political party could gain sole control over the government media board, were deemed unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court prior to 2012; a ruling rendered obsolete by the new constitution (Brodsky, 2013; Scheppelle, 2013; The Political Capital Institute, 2018).

In December of 2011, Fidesz also utilized its supermajority to pass legislation to reshape electoral districts (from 176 individual constituencies to 106) and shrink the National Assembly (i.e. parliament) from 386 seats, to 199 (The Political Capital Institute, 2018). The restructuring reduced the number of seats necessary for a supermajority to 100 (The Political Capital Institute, 2018). The move incited suspicions, from opposition parties and onlooking EU officials, of gerrymandering on the part of Fidesz (The Political Capital Institute, 2018). With new laws to consolidate power and skew the electoral system in their favor, the Fidesz-KDNP alliance was able to seize control of parliament again in the 2014 parliamentary election, securing 133 of the
(now) 199 seats in parliament, while the rival MSZP disbanded. Additionally, the radical, far-right Jobbik party saw increased success, securing a 25.57% share of the parliamentary seats.

Viktor Orban has utilized conspiratorial rhetoric that targets an alleged Jewish-controlled globalist political elite (a deep state behind the EU), which he, and other radical populists have suggested, is attempting to change the demography of Europe and destroy national sovereignty by integrating Muslim and Roma minorities. The leader (as it is perceived), behind this alleged globalist deep state, is George Soros, a Jewish-Hungarian businessman and philanthropist that has funded several human rights NGO's (e.g. The Open Society Foundations, The European Roma Rights Center) and academic institutions (e.g. Central European University). The Open Society Foundations (named after Karl Popper's book, The Open Society), do promote liberal democratic values and equal opportunity to minority groups, as well as serving as watchdogs against authoritarianism, perhaps why they may be perceived as a threat by populist political entrepreneurs (Lyman, 2017).

István Németh, who campaigned on the regional electoral list in Budapest, for Fidesz, between 2004 and 2006, and on the national list for Fidesz since 2014, has helped Viktor Orban in constructing a campaign against George Soros, calling for a "de-Sorosization" of society (Lyman, 2017). Referencing the American election of Donald Trump, Nemeth stated in an interview that "I think they must be swept out, and now I believe the international conditions are right for this with the election of a new president" (Lyman, 2017). In discussing with reporters the nature in which populist movement in eastern Europe have scapegoated George Soros, Jan Orlovsky, the director for the Open Society Foundations in Slovakia claimed "you couldn’t come up with a better enemy figure today", "George Soros brings up all of the stereotypes we have
lived with all our lives — about Jews, bankers and, in Slovakia, also about Hungarians" (Lyman, 2017).

Among the more recent legislative reforms introduced by the Fidesz government was an anti-immigration legislative package, which has been termed the "Stop Soros" bill. The "Stop Soros" bill attempts to impede NGO's from helping recent asylum seekers from the middle east, by including vague language to criminalize the act of facilitating "illegal immigration" and placing a steep 25% tax on human rights NGO's found to be "organizing immigration" (The Political Capital Institute, 2018). The bill includes a "assisting illegal immigration" provision to the Criminal Code, which attaches the possibility of imprisonment to "individuals or groups who help migrants arriving to the country illegally or not entitled to international protection in Hungary gain a legal status permitting the individual to stay in the country" (The Political Capital Institute, 2018).

Among those effected by the "Stop Soros" bill is Hungary's Central European University, a private, graduate-level liberal arts college that was founded, in 1991, through financial contributions from George Soros. One of the central tenets behind the university's mission statement is the promotion of values that support a free and open society, contributing to it being perceived as a "bastion of liberalism" by the Fidesz lead government (BBC News, 2017; The Official Website of Central European University, 2018). In April of 2017, the Hungarian parliament, with a commanding vote of 123 to 38, passed legislation which stipulates that foreign universities cannot operate in Hungary without being based in their home country, and with the government's approval of the arrangement (BBC News, 2017). Because Central European University (CEU) is funded by George Soros, who's operations are headquartered in New York, CEO is considered by the government to be a foreign university (BBC News, 2017). To comply
with the legislation, CEU opened academic courses at Bard College in New York (Walker, 2018). However, because the Fidesz government has failed to endorse paperwork to acknowledge the agreement, CEU is currently (as of 2018) operating in a state of limbo and will likely be forced to shut down (Walker, 2018). A CEU academic program, which offered free college courses to asylum seekers, has already been forced to close because of the 25% tax imposed by the "Stop Soros" bill (BBC News, 2017).

The Fidesz government is also passing legislation in an apparent attempt to remove the judicial checks and balances, which previously existed in Hungary's institutional framework, by restructuring the judiciary (The Political Capital Institute, 2018). In June of 2018, Minister of Justice László Trócsányi submitted to parliament a legislative proposal, amendment 7 of the constitution, which was introduced to establish the existence of an Administrative High Court, will take over all competencies previously undertaken by the Hungarian Supreme Court (The Political Capital Institute, 2018). Cases heard by the Administrative High Court will be those involving appeals against state authorities, including cases regarding asylum, civil liberties, complaints against police officers, public procurement, and tax decisions (The Political Capital Institute, 2018). Researchers at the Political Capital Institute argue that the amendment "undermines the separation of power", by mandating that judges interpret each case in line with relevent legislation (The Political Capital Institute, 2018). The president of the Administrative High Court will be appointed by the Fidesz controlled National Assembly, thus it is likely that the appointee will be partial to Fidesz' agenda (Reuters Staff, 2018, The Political Capital Institute, 2018). Viktor Orban had already tried to establish the court in 2016, which was blocked by the Constitutional Court, necessitating the need for Fidesz to add amendment 7 (Reuters Staff, 2018). Justice Minister Laszlo Trocsanyi has denied allegations made by the opposition, which
allege that Fidesz is attempting to stack the administrative high court with politically biased Justices, by claiming that "for me the independence of judges is a fixed star of democracy" in a hearing with Parliaments justice committee (Reuters Staff, 2018).

Attempts at undermining Hungary's judicial system stem back to the initial drafting of the "Fidesz" constitution in 2011, where, like Poland, the retirement age for Hungarian judges was lowered from 70 to 62 years of age (Halmai, 2017). When the new "Fundamental Law" constitution came into effect on January 1st, 2012, 274 judges were forced into early retirement, including 20 Supreme Court Justices (out of the 74 total) (Halmai, 2017). This allowed the Hungarian parliament, controlled by Fidesz by a two-thirds supermajority, to appoint justices that may be more partial to their nationalistic agenda.

In November of 2017, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) announced that it was proceeding with litigation, Commission vs. Hungary (C-286/12), for violating Articles 2 and 6(1) of Council Directive 2000/78/EC, which establish a "general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation" to "combat discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, disability, age [emphasis added] or sexual orientation as regards employment and occupation" (Halmai, 2017; Official Journal of European Communities, 2000). On November 6th, 2012, the European Court of Justice announced that it found the Hungarian government guilty of violating directive 2000/78/EC. Despite the ruling, the Hungarian government did not reinstate the judges that were forced to retire and continued to pass legislation that would undermine the institutional checks and balances supported by an impartial judiciary (Halmai, 2017).

In addition to the radicalization observed among the Fidesz party, Hungary has also seen the rise in popularity of the Jobbik party, a more radicalized right-wing populist party fighting for a Hungarian nationalism centered on conservative-Christian values (Varga, 2014; Karacsony
Among the political issues most hotly contested by the Jobbik party is the Roma minority in the country, including how to handle the problems (e.g. high crime rate, the abuse of welfare packages) posed by their segregation and a virulent criticism of the numerous integration and assistance programs (e.g. NRIS) offered by NGO's (e.g. George Soros' European Roma Rights Center) and mandated by the European Union (Korkut, 2012. pp. 185-188; Szabados, 2015; Karacsony & Rona, 2011). The Jobbik party has seen considerable support in recent parliamentary elections, winning 16.67% of the seats in 2010, 20.22% of the seats in 2014, and 19.06% of the seats in 2018 (Szabados, 2015). By 2010, after the political turmoil and protests in 2006, Jobbik was able to double its support base, relative to 2006 (Szabados, 2015). Public opinion polls indicate that, as of 2015, the Jobbik party consistently ranks as the second largest party (in terms of support base) behind Fidesz (Szabados, 2015, p. 50).

Before the rise of the Jobbik party, Hungary's Roma problem was considered a taboo subject. After the communist regime fell in 1989, thousands of Roma, which had been employed through government jobs, were left unemployed and resigned themselves to destitute, segregated villages that still remain heavily reliant on government welfare packages (Szabados, 2015). Parties on the left (e.g. MSZP) would campaign on increasing government spending for assistance programs (e.g. child subsidies, job market training, education centers) and parties on the right (e.g. Fidesz) would be accused of being racist if they attempted to criticize the assistance programs (Szabados, 2015). This discourse was not highly visible, and evidence points towards both parties engaging in corrupt practices to bribe Roma community leaders for votes (Szabados, 2015). When Gabor Vona took control of the Jobbik party in 2006, he positioned the Jobbik as a party that would break the silence on the Roma issue (Szabados, 2015; Korkut, 2012. pp. 185-188). Gábor Vona, along with assistance from Fidesz officials, organized
the Hungarian Guard, a radical conservative political movement that began to adorn outfits, worn by Hungarian Nazis during WWII, and march through towns with a high percentage of Roma inhabitants (Korkut, 2012. pp. 185-188; Szabados, 2015). Gabor Vona and the Hungarian Guard continued to claim that they would fight against "Gypsy crime", as well as virulently criticize the Hungarian political elite, and the EU, for avoiding the problem and lying to the public (Szabados, 2015). Szabados (2015) also claims that Fidesz, in a bid to retain voters, adopted the "Gypsy crime" phrase developed by the Jobbik party and radicalized its rhetoric towards Roma assistance programs.

To compete with Fidesz, the Jobbik party has radicalized its rhetoric by accusing all of those they ascribed as categorical outsiders (e.g. Roma, Jews, asylum-seekers) as being threats to Hungarian sovereignty and security. This includes perpetuating a blatantly anti-Semitic and conspiratorial discourse, which links Hungary's Jewish community to an alleged globalist political elite and their use of the Roma as "biological weapons" (Human Rights First, 2015). Eniko Hegedus, a member of parliament representing the Jobbik party, told reporters in 2011 that “Now is the time to finally say: Israeli occupation is ongoing in our homeland. This is a fact, for evidence we need only to think about the overwhelming dominance of Israeli capital investments, property developments in Hungary. And the Gypsy people are a biological weapon of this [Israeli occupation]. They use them as tools against the Hungarian people.” (Human Rights First, 2015). Marton Gyongyosi, leader of Jobbik's Foreign Policy Cabinet and parliamentary member, told reporters in 2012 that “I think now is the time to assess…how many people of Jewish origin there are here, and especially in the Hungarian parliament and the Hungarian government, who pose a national security risk to Hungary” (Human Rights First, 2015). Referencing bankers in the financial industry, Gabor Vona, the leader of the Jobbik party,
told reporters in 2013 that “The Israeli conquerors, these investors, should look for another country in the world for themselves, because Hungary is not for sale” (Human Rights First, 2015).

Interestingly, before the refugee crisis in 2015, the Jobbik party had adopted a peculiar pro-Muslim stance, claiming Muslim nations as allies for (as they suggest) holding rigid conservative values (Szabados, 2015). The party claimed that, like them, Muslims were against the alleged liberal, globalist political elite, with the party leader Gabor Vona claiming publicly that ‘Islam is the last hope for humanity in the darkness of globalization and liberalism’ (Szabados, 2015, p. 55). After the refugee crisis in 2015, to maintain its competitiveness against the highly negative anti-immigration stance of Fidesz, the Jobbik party was forced to make an immediate about face (Szabados, 2015). When the Fidesz government militarized the border during the height of the refugee crisis, in September of 2015 (detailed in Chapter 2), the Jobbik part engaged in inflammatory rhetoric. Gabor Vona told reporters, in September of 2015, that "Hungary has to be able to turn back everyone who arrives at the Hungarian borders as an illegal migrant — everyone without distinction. There is a real humanitarian catastrophe taking place here, but the humanitarian catastrophe is not about what will happen to the poor immigrants. The humanitarian catastrophe is what will happen to poor Hungary" (Human Rights First, 2015). Exacerbating the perceived security threat and broadly referencing the middle east, parliamentary member Marton Gyongyosi stated publicly that “even a child there knows how to assemble and disassemble an AK-47, and I would not feel comfortable standing close to a person with such skill" (Human Rights First, 2015).

The Political Capital Institute, a policy research and consulting firm in Budapest, which is partially funded by George Soros' Open Society Foundation, has done research on which
segments of the Hungarian population are most susceptible to adopting radicalized political views (e.g. racism, extreme nationalism, anti-establishment). Researchers note that far-right, anti-establishment sentiments have risen significantly in recent years (The Political Capital Institute, 2018). As researchers for the firm argue, "attitude radicals" are dissaafected members of the populous that are easily "seduced" by radical political movements claiming to fight for national sovereignty and sweeping institutional change (The Political Capital Institute, 2012). It is claimed that public confidence in Hungarian institutions has fluctuated significantly since the transition. This has provided political entrepreneurs with a population willing to lend an ear to their radical policies (e.g. constitutional overhauls, closing of borders), as well as pushing more mainstream parties to the move their ideological positions, to the far ends of the political spectrum, in a bid to maintain relevance (The Political Capital Institute, 2012).

The Political Capital Institute analyzed Hungary's susceptibility to radical right-wing ideologies (in 2012, prior to the refugee crisis), by implementing a model known as the DREX (Demand for Right Wing Extremism) index. Researchers at the Political Capital Institute developed the DREX model by modifying multiple intercorrelated scales used in the European Social Survey (ESS). A given country's DREX ranking is determined by the number of respondents in a country who express holding at least three of the following political dispositions, including prejudices, anti-establishment attitudes, right-wing value orientation and fear, distrust and pessimism (The Political Capital Institute, 2012). The Political Capital Institute conducted a series of surveys with Hungarian citizens, in Autumn of 2010 (around the same time of the 2010 parliamentary election).

By surveying Hungarian citizens using their DREX index, researchers at The Political Capital Institute (2012) found that, of those surveyed, 11% could be placed on the DREX index,
making them easily susceptible to being "seduced" by extreme expression of right-wing radicalism. Researchers involved in the project claim that the highest ratio of "attitude radicals" can be found among Jobbik supporters, at approximately 30% of those surveyed (The Political Capital Institute, 2012). Jobbik supporters also ranked the highest in terms of holding prejudicial sentiments (e.g. negative attitudes towards those perceived as outsiders, including minorities and immigrants) and anti-establishment values, while Fidesz supporters seem to rank the highest in terms of holding a radical right-wing value orientation. Researchers also found that "48% of the population over 16 is extremely prejudiced in Hungary, 20% can be described as anti-establishment, 32% expresses strong right-wing values and 19% are characterized by fear, distrust and pessimism" (The Political Capital Institute, 2012). The significant proportion of the Hungarian population, already holding such radical views in 2013 and thus willing to lend an ear to radicalized political rhetoric, provided populist political entrepreneurs with the fertile ground they needed to push a radicalized agenda when the refugee crisis hit its peak in 2015. Evidence suggests that such political dispositions seem to be most prominent among those inhabiting small, economically lagging (i.e. high unemployment, low wealth) villages in Hungary, which is addressed in depth in chapter 4 (Kracsony & Rona, 2011).
Chapter 4

Conclusion: Converging Evidence

The case studies addressed in previous chapters are intended to build a body of evidence which supports an explanatory template for the emergence of radical populist expressions in Europe. The foundation of this template is formed through economically driven political discontent, which emerges in situations where outdated industries are forced, through economic liberalization, to compete with open market forces, while knowledge-based sectors simultaneously thrive in an open, global market. This dynamic was evidenced especially in the case of Slovakia, where the economically modernized Bratislava region prospered significantly after entering the European Union, while outdated industries in eastern Slovakia were slow to modernize, contributing to political disaffection among citizens in underdeveloped regions. Economic strife on its own, however, is not sufficient enough to provide the fertile ground necessary for populist political entrepreneurs to rise to the forefront of the national political scenes in their respective countries.

As Judis (2016) explains, the European Union was developed with good intentions, set on enhancing the prosperity of all its member states. However, "many Europeans have not seen their benefits, particularly those who live in less prosperous nations within the Eurozone" (Judis, 2016, p. 162). Although, overall, the general economic standing of these countries (GDP) has increased, people seem to have reshaped their expectations and see that their economic standing has not improved Judis (2016), quoting the economist Wynne Godley, includes in his text the statement: "What happens in a whole country-a potential 'region' in a fully integrated community-suffers a structural setback? So long as it is a sovereign state, it can devalue its currency. It can then trade
successfully at full employment provided its people accept the necessary cut in their real incomes. With an economic and monetary union, this recourse is obviously barred, and its prospect is grave indeed unless federal budgeting arrangements are made that fulfill a redistributive role. As Judis (2016) argues, a heavily centralized monetary union associated with the EU could potentially ease economic distress through large-scale wealth distribution. However, other economic drivers in the EU, like Germany and the northern European countries, are left at a disadvantage (i.e. providing more to the EU than they get back) and are thus left with an argument which accuses underdeveloped countries of free-riding. This dynamic motivates a proverbial tug of war during times of economic global distress, which was seen especially during the Eurozone crisis, and invariably contributed to frustrations with the EU and subsequent increases in Euroscepticism (Clements, Nanou, & Verney, 2014).

Clements, Nanou, & Verney (2014) assessed attitudes towards the European Union, among Greek citizens just prior to, and after the Eurozone crisis, by assessing responses to the Eurobarometer survey. Prior to the Eurozone crisis, Greece was generally considered to be a Euro-positive country, evidenced through the resounding agreement with Eurobarometer responses which indicate that Greece's membership in the EU has been a "good thing" and that the country has benefitted since joining (Clements, Nanou, & Verney, 2014). Clements, Nanou, & Verney (2014), in analyzing post-recession Eurobarometer data note that, after the Eurozone collapsed in 2008, during the subsequent period of economic stagnation (where Greece would receive multiple EU/IMF bailouts) between November 2009 and November 2012, negative sentiments towards the EU almost tripled, from 14% to 49%. Greece has also experienced the rapid rise of right-wing populist parties (e.g. Golden Dawn) since the Euro crisis, which perpetuate a rhetoric that attacks
the EU and, in extreme cases, has called for a referendum "Grexit" on leaving the EU (Georgiadou, 2013).

In the case of the EU, certain underdeveloped regions (e.g. eastern Slovakia, Hungary's plains regions) remained heavily reliant on EU funding to prevent total economic collapse, especially during the Eurozone crisis in 2008 (e.g. Greece). This same funding, usually involving regional development packages, is also used as a lever to persuade countries to adopt minority assistance policies (e.g. NRIS, refugee relocation). Resentment over the apparent loss in national autonomy, due to reliance on compliance-contingent funding after exposure to the global market forces associated economic liberalization, is central to a template for explaining the popularity of populism. This dynamic leaves political entrepreneurs with a fertile ground to spread messages involving national sovereignty. In the case studies discussed in previous chapters, where regions experienced lagging economic conditions (e.g. unemployment, income inequality) because they relied on outdated industries (e.g. labor-intensive agriculture, crude manufacturing), the rhetoric of populist political entrepreneurs attempts to tap into resentment by blaming supranational entities, like global financial institutions and the European Union. Rhetoric usually involves criticizing such entities by claiming that they are operated by a corrupt, parasitic political elite that does not care about the interests of the 'common man'. In extreme expressions of populist radicalization, which was observed in both Hungary and Poland, political entrepreneurs resort to claiming that a (primarily Jewish) globalist political and financial elite is in an antagonistic relationship with the sovereignty and homogeneity of their respective countries.

The top-down policy implementation associated to supranational directives, involving compliance with EU policies that mandate the adoption of assistance programs directed at specific minority populations (e.g. refugee relocation obligations, NRIS programs) to maintain legal
compliance, seems to be the final step in a general template that allowed radical populism to enter the mainstream in European politics. As was seen in Slovakia, the National Roma Integration Strategies framework, which mandated the development of assistance programs (e.g. child subsidies, job training and placement, education funding) directed specifically towards the Roma minority in the region, provided populist movements (e.g. SNS, L'SNS) with material to fuel their rhetoric. Such rhetoric attacked the EU for undermining national sovereignty, as well as perpetuated a disdain for the Roma minority. SNS campaign billboards reading "Stop supporting the parasites" would soon follow (Mihalik, 2014).

In the case of European Council decisions 2015/1523 and 2015/1601, which mandated that EU member states adopt an emergency relocation scheme during height of the refugee crisis in 2015, member states were obligated to take in an EU allocated quantity of refugees. The mandate was intended to relieve the burden on Greece in Italy, who received most of the refugees from the Mediterranean, by relocating 40,000 (in decision 2015/1523) and 120,000 (in decision 2015/1601) persons respectively (European Commission, 2015). Member states were legally mandated by the EU to accept these refugees "according to Article 78(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), in the event of one or more Member States being confronted by an emergency situation characterized by a sudden inflow of nationals of third countries, the Council, on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament, may adopt provisional measures for the benefit of the Member State(s) concerned" (European Commission, 2015). In all the cases addressed in this research, the European Union's refugee relocation mandate provided populist movements with the final push they needed to rally considerable support among a population that was already dissatisfied by their economic standing and policy directives favoring those perceived as outsiders (i.e. Roma). Populist political entrepreneurs would proceed to frame
the refugee crisis as a threat to national sovereignty and security, drawing upon incidents like the Paris attacks in November of 2015 and the New Year's Eve sexual assault case in Cologne, to fuel their rhetoric. When the European Commission announced that it was suing the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary, for failing to accept any refugees and thus violating Article 78(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, populist political entrepreneurs spun the impending litigation as an afront to national autonomy. The European Union's top-down handling of the refugee crisis, and other minority issues like those observed with the Roma, forms the final component in a template which explains why populist movements have seen such support in recent years.

To highlight which segments of the population tend to favor the ideologies associated to radical populism (e.g. anti-establishment, nationalistic, anti-minority), I return to the case study on Hungary. Kracsony & Rona (2011) investigated the extent to which certain variables (e.g. gender, age, wealth, unemployment, anti-Roma attitudes, anti-Semitism) best predicted Hungarians willingness to vote for Jobbik, as well Fidesz and MSZP. Researchers conducted an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression, on such demographic, contextual, and attitudinal variables, obtained from the 2009 Hungarian Election Study database, to determine which factors were most strongly associated with a Hungarian citizens decision to support either party.

To obtain values for the dependent variable in their study, Kracsony & Rona (2011) included responses regarding preferences, along a 7-point scale (1 = antipathy, 7 = sympathy), to each party (Fidesz, MSZP, Fidesz), from the 2009 Hungarian Election Study (Note: this was done prior to the immigration crisis and more recent expressions of radicalization). In the case of the Jobbik, and to a slightly lesser extent Fidesz, results from the regression analysis seem to support general arguments in the theoretical literature on ethnic competition, which claim that
those inhabiting economically precarious positions in society (e.g. low skilled labor, unemployed, uneducated, from small underdeveloped villages) would be more inclined, because of pre-existing levels of political discontent associated to economic liberalization, to accept radical populist movements exhibiting anti-minority tendencies (e.g. Banton, 1983; Olzak, 1992; Kymlicka & Banting, 2006). For the variable, intended to be an indicator for general wealth, Kracsony & Rona (2011) included a dichotomous variable, where a value of 0 would indicate the lower quarter in their quantification of wealth, while a 1 would indicate the upper quarter in wealth. For the Jobbik dependent variable, the wealth indicator shows a robust association of -0.096, at the p < 0.001 level of significance. Unemployment rate, treated similarly as a dichotomous variable, also shows a moderately strong association of -0.113, at the p < 0.05 level of significance (Kracsony & Rona, 2011). These results indicate that those that are unemployed, or inhabiting the lower socioeconomic rung in Hungary, are more likely to support the Jobbik party. Among the sociodemographic variables was an indicator for the population size of the respondent's respective town or village. Kracsony & Rona (2011) captured this by including a dichotomous variable indicating if the respondent was from a small village (1), or a mid-sized town (0). Results show a moderately strong coefficient, of -0.086 at the p < 0.05 level, indicating that those inhabiting small villages are significantly more likely to support the Jobbik party. These results support the argument that those inhabiting a position of economic precarity will be more willing to lend an ear to the radicalized rhetoric perpetuated by recent expressions of populism throughout Europe.

Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012), as part of a research team for the Demos political think-tank in the United Kingdom (partially funded by George Soros' Open Society Foundation), conducted research on open access Facebook data to assess the online
behavior of Jobbik's Facebook followers. As they claim, "the rise of populism in Europe can be traced through online behavior" Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012). Researchers gathered socioeconomic, age, and gender data from Hungarian citizens on Facebook that were active fans of the Jobbik group page by utilizing publicly available advertising information Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012). Researchers note that the majority (i.e. 71 %) of Jobbik's Facebook fans (n = 27, 140) are young males under 30, who engage in an active dialogue "critical of globalization and the effects of international capitalism on workers’ rights" and expressing concern for preserving national culture (Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori, 2012). Of Jobbik's male Facebook fans, 73% completed elementary or secondary school only, while 20% were college educated (Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori, 2012). Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012) also found that approximately 12% of Jobbik's followers were unemployed, with unemployment more likely among Jobbik's followers that were over 30 years of age.

In the Karacsony & Rona (2011) regression, it was observed that those in small villages, with limited education, and potentially facing unemployment, where significantly more likely to support the Jobbik party. From the preliminary Facebook data obtained by Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012), it also appears that Jobbik's supporters are typically males with limited education. From this, it can be inferred that the Jobbik's target demographic is largely composed of young males, from economically precarious regions, that may be attempting to enter the labor positions that were affected by economic liberalization. A population of low-skilled and unemployed citizens, adversely affected by the open market forces associated to economic liberalization and EU accession, would provide populist parties in Hungary with a dissafected population primed to accept their radicalized platform. These results would seem to support
research questions 1a (i.e. does political discontent seem to emerge in regions that have experienced a negative economic impact (e.g. unemployment) after undertaking the economic transformation associated to marketization and joining the European Union?) and 1b (i.e. are the increases in the popularity of populist movements, distrust of mainstream political parties and the European Union, and increases in the resentment of minority groups, more prevalent in regions that are underdeveloped economically?). In all the case studies addressed in previous chapters, populist political were indeed capable of securing greater vote share in regions that were lagging economically. Presumably, the same regions whos economies relied on industries (e.g. labor-intensive agriculture, crude manufacturing) that could not be sustained after the marketization that occurred after EU accession.

To further investigate the issues that Jobbik supporters find most pressing, as well as their attitudes towards the European Union, Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012) sampled a subset (n = 2,263) of Jobbik's Facebook followers and had them participate in an online survey. In their survey, Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012) presented participants with 19 possible socio-political concerns and asked them to rank them. Among the potential concerns, participants ranked the integration of Roma (28%) and crime (26%) as the top two most pressing problems in their country (Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori, 2012). Economic issues, including Hungary's general economic standing (24%), unemployment (21% ), and rising prices (19%), were also frequently ranked as most pressing (Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori, 2012).

Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012) also assessed attitudes towards the European Union among the same sample taken from the Jobbik party's Facebook fans (n = 2,263), which seem to be predominantly negative. Researchers asked participants "what the EU means to
them personally", with over 67% of males under 30, and 69% of females under 30, responding with "loss of cultural and national identity" as their primary response (Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori, 2012). Although participants did acknowledge the travel and work advantages that come from open borders, the issues of government waste (53% total), bureaucracy (48% total), unemployment (48% total), and increases in crime (43% total), are also frequent responses (Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori, 2012).

Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012) also investigated generalized trust, and institutional trust, among their Jobbik Facebook sample (n = 2,263), while also comparing their results to national Hungarian figures obtained from Eurobarometer survey data collected during the same period. Approximately 42% of Jobbik's Facebook supporters agreed with the statement "in general, most people cannot be trusted", which is remarkably low compared to the broader Hungarian society, which was surveyed at 79% by the Eurobarometer (Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori, 2012). This can potentially be explained by taking into consideration the social world in which most Jobbik supporters occupy. As Kracsony & Rona (2011) showed, a significant likelihood exists that Jobbik supporters will come from small villages, which typically incorporate the types of tight-knit social networks that facilitate trust (i.e. social information is easily circulated in small villages, allowing for efficient monitoring against free-riding) (Olson, 2009). When Jobbik's Facebook supporters (n=2,263) were asked about their trust in government, the EU, trade unions, traditional political parties, and the media, an entirely different effect emerged.

Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori's (2012) assessment of Jobbik's Facebook fans shows that a resoundingly high level of institutional distrust existed among Jobbik supporters in 2012. Approximately 91% of the Jobbik supporters surveyed indicated that they did not trust the government, compared to the 45% obtained from the general Hungarian public (Bartlett, Birdwell,
Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori's, 2012). When asked whether they trusted the Hungarian judiciary system, over 82% of Jobbik supporters responded that they distrusted the judiciary, while 43% of the Hungarian general public, surveyed by the Eurobarometer, expressed a similar disposition (Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori's, 2012). With a high level of institutional trust already present among the Hungarian public, especially towards the government and judiciary system, the Fidesz party was able to reach a significant subset of the population willing to lend an ear to their new policies regarding constitutional and judicial overhauls. The same could be said for media outlets. Among the Jobbik supporters surveyed by Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012), approximately 92% of those surveyed expressed that they did not trust the press, while 52% of the Hungarian general public expressed a similar disposition. Fidesz policy regarding electoral campaigning and the government's media advisory board (detailed in Ch. 3) likely found a receptive audience. Finally, approximately 88% of the Jobbik supporters surveyed indicated that they distrusted the European Union, compared to 30% of the Hungarian general public Bartlett, Birdwell, Kreko, Benfield, & Gyori (2012). These results indicate that, prior to the refugee crisis in 2015, a significant portion of the Hungarian public, primarily those in economically underdeveloped regions, was already primed to accept a radicalized rhetoric that would attack the European Union and the mainstream political establishment. When the refugee crisis hit in 2015, and the EU subsequently enacted its refugee relocation scheme, populist political parties in Hungary (e.g. Jobbik, Fidesz), and throughout the EU (below), were handed the perfect issue to crystalize political discontent and rise to the forefront of European politics.

All research seems to point towards the refugee crisis as the central issue that provided populist movements with the fertile ground they needed to rise to prominence. This effect is not just isolated to the study cases addressed in previous chapters (Slovakia, Poland, Hungary), but
appears to have influenced politics in all EU member states that have experienced immigration problems in some form. Podnobik, Jusup, Kovac, and Stanley (2017) have investigated extensively the relationship between immigration and the associated increase in the popularity of far-right populist parties. Researchers assessed voting data from EU countries most affected by the refugee crisis (e.g. Greece, Italy, Norway, Sweden, France) that peaked in September of 2015 (detailed further in Chapter 2), which placed a burden on Greece and Italy, who received a disproportionately large number of refugees, thus prompting the EU to implement an obligatory refugee relocation program. Podnobik, Jusup, Kovac, and Stanley (2017) quantified the number of immigrants in each country, from September 2013 to September 2016, by assessing the number of visa applications and, by fitting a cumulative exponential function to the data, showed how this relates with the vote share percentage obtained by parties that could be classified as right-wing populist. In their analyses of the results (Figure 3, below), Podnobik, Jusup, Kovac, and Stanley (2017) conclude that "among the EU countries involved in the recent migrant crisis, support for RW (i.e. right-wing) populism is generally higher in those countries that accepted a larger number of immigrants relative to the country’s population size" (p. 3). The isolation of Austria, by Podnobik, Jusup, Kovac, and Stanley (2017), is especially relevant for the discussion considering that it experienced a significant increase in immigration (i.e. primarily refugees) after the refugee crisis hit its peak in September of 2015. The crisis seems to have prompted a political dialogue that fueled the rhetoric of the right-wing populist Freedom Party of Austria (FPO), which framed the situation as a threat to national security and sovereignty in its rhetoric leading to the 2017 election (Rheindorf & Wodak, 2017; BBC 2017). When the refugee crisis was underway, and the EU initiated its obligatory relocation scheme, the FPO called for an increase in border security and urged the government to implement a "maximum limit" in the number of asylum applications it
would accept (Rheindorf & Wodak, 2017). The FPO also suggested, in its party manifesto, that benefit allocations to refugees be capped at a marginal level and to bar any new immigrants from receiving state welfare benefits until they have lived in Austria for five years (BBC, 2017). In a nod to the campaign run by American President Donald Trump, FPO featured the slogan "Austria First" prominently on the front page of its party website leading up to the election (Bleiker, 2018).

![Figure 3: The relationship between the percentage of right-wing populist vote share (y axis) and percentage of new immigration visas in relation to the total population (x), among EU countries that have experienced significant immigration from September 2013 to September 2016. Both the linear fit, and cumulative exponential curve (solid) is shown. All countries are combined in (a), while the effect is isolated to Austria (local elections as data points) in (b). From: Podnobik, Jusup, Kovac, and Stanley (2017)]](image)

Rheindorf and Wodak (2018) analyzed the rhetoric implemented by key political figures in Austrian media, regarding the refugee crisis and subsequent immigration waves. Specifically, the occurrence of semantic fields (i.e. framing methods) in Austrian media, associated to the two discourse strands, the building of a border fence and implementing a national limit on the number
of asylum applications accepted. Rheindorf and Wodak (2018) quantified how often dialogue regarding both policy considerations occurred in Austrian newspapers during a period, from April 2015 to February 2016, where the refugee crisis was hotly contested by politicians in Austrian media. As Rheindorf and Wodak (2018) state in their analysis, the FPO seems to have been the most prolific perpetuator of such rhetoric, while the incumbent OVP contributed to a lesser extent. In their analysis on framing strategies, Rheindorf and Wodak (2018) note that the emphasis on the threat posed by immigration, most commonly the threat of terrorism, is used most frequently in the anti-immigrant discourse. It appears that both parties (i.e. OVP and FPO) draw reference to incidents, like the November 2015 Paris attack and the New Year's Eve sexual assault in Cologne, to incite fear and curry support for their anti-immigration platform.

The FPO party did especially well in the 2017 parliamentary election, winning 51 seats in a 5.5% upward swing from the 2013 election, the closest a third party has come to defeating the dominant OVP (Austrian People's Party) and SPO (Social Democrat Party of Austria) parties since WWII. After the election, FPO joined, as a junior partner, in a coalition with the conservative OVP, which won 62 seats in Austria's 182 unicameral parliament. Public opinion polling in Austria (Figure 4.2, below) shows that the FPO party experienced a relatively substantial increase in popularity around the time that the refugee crisis hit its peak in September of 2015, with a momentum that seems to have led directly into the 2017 election.

More recently (as of 2018), it appears that the FPO has radicalized its rhetoric regarding the refugee situation, of which Austria is still attempting to negotiate. Vice Chancellor Heinz-Christian Strache (of FPO) publicly suggested a policy where asylum seekers, still waiting for application acceptance from the crisis in 2015, should be detained in Army barracks until their applications for asylum have been processed (Bleiker, 2018). Regarding the policy suggestion,
Strache stated in an interview on Austrian public television that "We need order as long as there is an open asylum application process" (Bleiker, 2018). The OVP-FPO coalition has voiced even more contentious policy recommendations, all aligning with the rhetoric voiced by FPO, which frames asylum seekers as a serious security threat. In their published government program, the coalition has expressed intentions to pass legislation to relinquish assets from asylum applicants and use it to fund basic services for those waiting for approval (Bleiker, 2018). The coalition also intends to pass legislation mandating that asylum applicants turn their phones over to authorities to gather data for intelligence purposes, as well as require doctors to forgo client-patient confidentiality and share medical records with authorities (Bleiker, 2018).

In addressing research question 2 (i.e. has there been a marked change in how populist movements express themselves politically (e.g. emphasis on specific issues, rhetorical framing strategies) in Poland, Hungary, and Slovakia since the refugee crisis in 2015?), to date, no research exists that has quantified the rhetoric of populist political entrepreneurs, in Slovakia, Poland, or Hungary, and investigated the extent to which their addressing of minorities has changed (i.e. less emphasis on Roma, more emphasis on immigration) prior to, and after the refugee crisis. Based on the rhetoric that was pulled from reports on public dialogue, it appears that, in all the case studies addressed, the immigration issue has been prioritized over rhetoric that directly criticizes the Roma and welfare assistance packages (e.g. child subsidies, jobs programs). When the Roma are addressed, post refugee crisis, it appears that integration and assistance programs are criticized for their link to George Soros' Open Society Foundations (seen especially in Hungary) and an alleged globalist political elite. The Roma now appear to be treated as belonging to a broader category of outsider, considered as foreign invaders, and used as a tool by this alleged globalist elite to destroy the homogeneity and sovereignty of their respective countries. Thus, after the refugee crisis it
appears that anti-Roma rhetoric hasn't necessarily increased but is now used to contribute to a broader rhetorical argument, which accuses an alleged EU elite of using those that are "culturally foreign" to undermine the homogeneity and sovereignty of their respective countries.

In summary, as Slovakia, Poland, and Hungary transitioned from communism, the initial "shock therapy" associated to economic liberalization would cause an initial economic recession, with significant lulls in the unemployment rates of the respective case studies. Those regions most affected were those incorporating outdated industries (e.g. labor-intensive agriculture, steel manufacture) that had been sheltered from open market forces by the communist regime. Lagging economic conditions among these regions would subtly improve into the early 2000's, and with EU accession, as regional development and social funds could be used for assistance. Meanwhile, modernized regions (e.g. Bratislava, Warsaw, Budapest), that had incorporated knowledge-based sectors, would experience a significant economic increase from the streamlined economic coordination that would come from EU accession and opening to a broader European market. This economic increase, by and large, was not experienced in underdeveloped regions, contributing to an element of political disaffection by those that had not benefitted from EU accession and opening to the broader European market. Regional economic disparities were evidenced especially in the cases of Slovakia and Hungary, who would experience an increase in GINI directly after entering the EU.

After the Eurozone crisis in 2008, disaffection would be compounded, providing populist political entrepreneurs with a significant subset of the population, primarily residing in regions with underdeveloped industries (e.g. agriculture, mining, crude manufacturing), willing to lend an ear to their platform. When the European Union started to mandate that its members adopt assistance programs (e.g. NRIS), specifically targeting minorities that have posed a significant
integration problem, populist politicians would incorporate in their rhetoric a virulent criticism of those assistance programs, claiming that the resources should be redirected to the 'native' population; a discourse that would be especially appealing to those in positions of economic precarity. This dynamic was indeed evidenced in the case of SNS and L'SNS in Slovakia, Fidesz and Jobbik in Hungary, and PiS in Poland.

Finally, when the refugee crisis, incorporating approximately 1.2 million individuals fleeing the war-torn Middle East and North Africa, hit its peak in September of 2015, the European Union implemented an obligatory refugee relocation scheme to relocate 120,000 individuals and relieve the burden on Italy and Greece (Zaun, 2018). This program would provide populist political entrepreneurs, who were already capable of tapping into various forms of regional discontent, with the perfect issue to signal their firm stance against a supposed parasitic political elite in the EU and crystallize their support to rise to the forefront of the political scenes in their respective country. In the case of Poland and Hungary, who's institutional systems were especially weak (e.g. unicameral parliaments), populist movements that obtained parliamentary supermajorities would proceed to overhaul the political systems in their countries, by attacking their constitution, electoral laws, and judicial systems, to centralize and consolidate their power. When the EU attempted to intervene with litigation, to discipline against legislation that attacked the impartiality of judiciaries, as well as policies that refused to accept refugees, populist political entrepreneurs would manipulate these situations to again fuel their rhetoric. This rhetoric, which would become increasingly radicalized up to 2018, would attack the EU elite by claiming that their policies are specifically engineered to steadily chip away at national sovereignty.

The approach taken by this research did not take a rigorous scientific approach to confirm hypotheses associated to the research questions above, but rather, offer evidence for evaluating the
plausibility of a situational template that explains why populist movements have been capable of rising to the forefront of European politics. Currently, parties that have obtained centralized government control (e.g. PiS, Fidesz), are in a proverbial tug of war with the European Union, whose limited sanctioning mechanisms include pulling funding, imposing fines and limiting voting in the European Parliament. As populist governments continue to violate the institutional pillars of liberal democracy, including the impartiality and irremovability of judges, as well as sound electoral laws, the European Union is limited to imposing such sanctioning mechanisms to curb the behavior. Populist governments are then able to manipulate such sanctions to fuel their rhetoric against an alleged supranational political elite. It appears that the "top-down" manner in which the EU implements policies has not worked especially well in certain underdeveloped regions, which would seem to necessitate the need for research on alternative approaches to handling pressing problems such as the integration of immigrant and minority groups. The approach of applying supranational policies uniformly across countries and regions with varying economic, social, and institutional dynamics may need to be curtailed in favor of a "ground-up" approach to governance. With such a "ground-up" approach, policies are tailored at the local-level by considering specific regional circumstances and, depending on their success, are adopted at the national and supranational level. Of course, a considerable amount of research is needed to more definitively determine the extent to which the EU has contributed to the current "populist backlash" and how best to correct the problem it poses for the future of liberal democracy.
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