

Miranda Lupion

NATIONAL MEMORY AND DIVISIVE NARRATIVE BUILDING IN POLAND'S 2010 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

DOI: 10.1515/ppsr-2015-0039

Author

Miranda Lupion is a graduate student at Harvard and recently graduated from the University of Pennsylvania. She is particularly interested in memory politics and narrative building in former Soviet and Soviet satellite states

e-mail: lupion@sas.upenn.edu

Abstract

This paper employs the 2010 Polish presidential election as a case study to explore the implications of memory politics, examining the Law and Justice party's (PiS) use of national memory ahead of the June election. Through process tracing, this paper finds that the Smolensk Air Crash became the central theme of this race, which pitted Civic Platform (PO) candidate Bronisław Komorowski against the late President Lech Kaczyński's twin brother, PiS's Jarosław Kaczyński. Amplified by the media, PiS selectively drew on easily recognisable events and figures from Polish history to construct an "Us versus Them" conflict of "true Polish patriots" – those who supported the party and its anti-Russian stance – and "Others" – those who, although sympathetic to the crash victims, favoured Tusk and his push for renewed Polish-Russian relations. The primary goal of this paper is to demonstrate how a historical memory approach can inform the study of contemporary politics – a subject which is too often left solely to social scientists.

Keywords: memory politics, narrative building, Law and Justice, Civic Platform

Introduction

Located about 870 kilometres to the east of the Polish capital Warsaw, Russia's Katyn forest holds a tragic dual significance for Poles. In 1940, Soviet forces turned the forest into a mass grave for 22,000 Polish intellectuals and military officers executed by the NKVD on the orders of secret police chief Lavrentiy Beria (Hinsey 2011, 145). Although German soldiers uncovered the bodies in 1943, Poles were not permitted to grieve openly; mentioning the Massacre in communist Poland could have led to imprisonment, and the Soviet Union denied the incident until 1990 (ibid. 147).

Seventy years after the Massacre, the forest became the site of a second tragedy. On April 10, 2010, Polish President Lech Kaczyński, on a flight *en route* to a commemoration ceremony honouring the victims of the Katyn Massacre, was killed along with 95 other Polish politicians, historians, and activists when poor visibility caused the plane to crash in the vicinity of the nearby city of Smolensk (Rosset 2011, 242). However, unlike the tragedy in 1940, this time the Polish public could openly mourn the victims.

And mourn they did. Following the accident, acting President Bronisław Komorowski scheduled fresh presidential elections for June. The crash became the central theme of the race, which pitted Civic Platform (PO) candidate Bronisław Komorowski against the

late President Lech Kaczyński's twin brother, Law and Justice's (PiS) Jarosław Kaczyński. However, the results of the election defied the prevailing belief that, in the wake of national trauma, voters tend to increase support for their leaders (Cohen and Solomon 2011, 319). Failing to unite in the face of tragedy, Poles did not overwhelmingly back the party and twin brother of the late President. On the contrary, Komorowski decisively defeated Kaczyński. Furthermore, an empirical study of voter data and opinions regarding the crash shows that the incident did not cause voters to significantly alter their political preferences. If anything, it "petrified," or strengthened, existing preferences, an outcome that left political scientists surprised (Czeński 2014, 537).

This paper employs the 2010 Polish presidential campaign as a case study to explore the implications of memory politics, examining the Law and Justice party's (PiS) use of national memory ahead of the June election. The primary goal of this piece is to demonstrate how a historical memory approach can inform the study of contemporary politics – a subject which is too often left solely to social scientists. Through process tracing, this paper finds that the crash and its significance in Polish history, and not policy, became the central theme of this race. Amplified by the media, PiS selectively drew on easily recognisable events and figures from Polish history to construct an "Us versus Them" conflict of "true Polish patriots" – those who supported the party and its anti-Russian stance – and "Others" – those who, although sympathetic to the crash victims, favoured Tusk and his push for renewed Polish-Russian relations.

This paper begins with a survey of existing theoretical approaches to memory politics. This is followed by a thematic analysis of PiS's narratives and their divisive outcomes. I conclude by briefly discussing the significance of integrating national memory approaches in political science scholarship.

Theoretical approaches to the politics of national memory and identity formation

An overused yet under-theorised concept, "memory" is too vague to adequately capture the nuances of its role in narrative building (Bell 2003, 71). From a historical and political perspective, authors tend to identify two types of "memory". The first is concentrated on personal memories of events that individuals have actually lived through and can recall. Historian Duncan Bell calls this *collective memory* (2003, 65). Emphasizing its limited temporal state, Bell argues that this type of memory is formed only through experience and cannot be transmitted (ibid. 73). Applying memory studies to the realm of international relations, political scientist Jan-Werner Müller gives this concept a more specific name – *mass individual memory* (2002, 3). Other authors refer to it as *passive memory* (Winter and Sivan 1999, 6) or *souvenir memory* (Snyder 2002, 39), highlighting the personal nature of recollection.

Unimpeded by personal and temporal restrictions, the second breed of "memory" casts a much wider net. Typically referred to as national memory, it consists of the "shared understandings, conceptualizations, or representations of past events" crucial to the creation of national identity, and is often reinforced through education and actively invoked in public discourse (Bell 2003, 65). Such discourse is facilitated by the spread of communications technology and the media (ibid. 79). Bell calls this *mythology*. Using largely the same definition, Müller adheres to the more conventional terminology, calling the phe-

nomenon *national memory*, contending that Bell's use of the term *mythology* is flawed because it implies that events are fictional (2002, 3). Müller adds that national memory is never unified, but rather is embroiled in ongoing politically charged negotiations between interested parties (ibid. 21).

Other authors call this *collective remembrance* (Winter and Sivan 1999, 6), *memoire* (Snyder 2002, 39) (Neumann 2002, 121), *public memory* (Feuchtwang 2006, 178), and *commemoration* (Bernhard and Kubik 2014, 8). This paper adopts Müller's terminology, using *national memory* to describe the easily recognisable events, figures, and themes, such as the Solidarity movement or Pope John Paul II, referenced by politicians and the media in constructing national narratives. The events, figures, and themes along with the public's conceptions of these entities are drawn from a bank of what Bernhard and Kubik call *cultural memory*. The way in which the state and political actors selectively use this material is part of *official memory*. In summary, national memory stems from the interaction between cultural and official memory and forms the basis for building national narratives (ibid. 8).

A final semantic distinction must be made between national memory and history. As Bell explains, in its pure form, history is too full of qualifications to make for an easily digestible, compelling national narrative. In building narratives, actors simplify history, omitting unsuitable perspectives and details while accentuating and even exaggerating other aspects that are more relevant to their case (2003, 77).

However, national memory is more than just a distilled history. Impassioned, national memory operates in an extended temporal domain (Bell 2003, 66). While history resonates with the present and provides lessons for policymakers, the charged, oversimplified nature of the narrative encourages an emotional engagement that links the past and the present. In this sense, the national memory transcends history's rigid temporal boundaries. Contrast an IMF economist studying Poland's path to a market-based economy with a Polish politician drawing parallels between pro-EU elites and what he characterises as the elite-driven transition from Soviet socialism to capitalism. Although both the politician and the economist focus on the Polish economy in the 1990s, the politician's rhetoric is emotionally charged, connecting anti-elite sentiments from the 1990s with current anti-EU attitudes. He has drawn on national memory, while the economist's work falls into the domain of applied history.

Politicians and other actors use national memory to generate support for specific policies and to legitimise their claim to authority (Edkins 2006, 101–102). This is especially relevant to policies that rely on specific visions of the past, such as PiS's anti-Russian foreign policy. In justifying their stance toward Moscow, party members and right-wing media spoke of Soviet history, making references to the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact and the Katyn Massacre. National memory's ability to legitimise ideology and policy renders it a powerful form of political capital.

In democracies, actors compete with one another for control over national memory (Müller 2002, 22); their speeches and statements are amplified by the media and new communications technologies (Ray 2006, 140). Taking a page out of Poland's book, this mnemonic contest is exemplified in PiS and PO's distinct responses to Russia's role in the crash investigation. PO and centre-left media hoped Poles would see Russians as co-sympathisers and the Kremlin as a cooperative partner in the investigation. PiS and right-wing media concentrated on the potential for a botched investigation, citing past Soviet

cover-ups in an effort to make Russia appear untrustworthy (Guillette 2013, 26). This battle for sovereignty over national memory is fought within the confines of what Bernhard and Kubik call *structural constraints* or systematic restrictions, such as a party's relative power and access to institutions and media outlets, which curb the influence that actors have over memory (2014, 19).

In a democracy, appeals to national memory are also limited by *cultural constraints*. These are existing narratives transmitted through personal networks, textbooks, films, and schools, and informed by individual memories. If an appeal to national memory completely contradicts dominant narratives, the actor risks eroding his or her political legitimacy (Bernhard and Kubik 2014, 22–24). In this actor-centred model, politicians propagate narratives for public consumption; individuals respond by rejecting, accepting, or modifying the narrative in conversation with one another and with elites (through the ballot box, etc.). Therefore, although individuals play a role in contributing to and judging national discourse, elites are the architects of the narratives and, thus, carry greater weight in the conversation (Winter and Sivan 1999, 28–29).

To study the relationship between national memory and politics, this paper combines historian Thomas Berger's method with Bernhard and Kubik's framework. In dissecting narratives built on national memory, Berger's process advocates identifying key references and studying their historical context from the national perspective. Drawing on that background, as well as other rhetorical uses of the reference, it is possible to establish a thematic, rhetorical and/or emotional link between the narrative and its political purpose (Müller 2002, 29). An integral part of this process is the linking or *layering* of different historical references, such as the plane crash and the Massacre (Bernhard and Kubik 2014, 28).

Bernhard and Kubik's volume on collective memory and politics in Soviet states and satellite states provides a framework for characterizing the different ways politicians conceive of national memory. The authors classify elites or *mnemonic actors* based on how they relate to the existence of multiple historical narratives. *Mnemonic warriors* see only one correct version of the past, which is promoted by their policies and ideology. Any other conceptions are simply wrong. Because they are usually focused on returning to a paradise lost, warriors tend to believe the country cannot move forward without a reorientation toward the right mnemonic foundation. In contrast to the warriors, *mnemonic pluralists* recognise and support the presence of multiple conflicting narratives. As a rule, *mnemonic abnegators* avoid memory politics and the accompanying rhetoric wars. They are typically pragmatic and policy-driven technocrats (ibid. 12–14). While these characterizations are by no means exhaustive, they provide useful descriptions of memory politics strategies.

With support from the media, PiS acted as a mnemonic warrior in its unsuccessful 2010 presidential campaign. Their "Us versus Them" rhetoric aimed to separate those who supported their "correct" history from those who refused to buy into the party's narrative. However, in PiS's successful 2015 presidential and parliamentary campaign, the party altered its strategy to focus on policy issues. Avoiding memory politics, PiS acted more like a mnemonic abnegator.

The Law and Justice party and the Civic Platform: A brief history

Although founded by the Kaczynski twins only in 2001, PiS became a major national player in the 2005 presidential and parliamentary elections. Lech Kaczynski was elected president, and, in the Sejm, PiS formed a ruling coalition with the League of Polish Families (LPR) and Self-defence (SO) (Rosset 2011, 242). Headed by Prime Minister Jarosław Kaczynski, the coalition focused on religious, moral, and social issues rather than economic concerns (Koczanowicz 2012, 814). However, marred by a corruption scandal and internal conflict, PiS lost its majority status in the 2007 parliamentary elections. Low voter turnout among elderly and poor Poles ultimately doomed PiS to defeat (Harper 2010, 24). After a close contest, PO emerged victorious, forming a coalition with Polish People's Party (PSL), and Donald Tusk replaced Jarosław Kaczynski as the Prime Minister. The Polish government began to operate in nearly perpetual tension, as the Law and Justice President frequently used his veto to block PO initiatives and PO experienced rising popularity (Rosset 2011, 242).

The 2007 collapse can be seen as a referendum on PiS's Fourth Republic project (Harper 2010, 22). The idea of a Fourth Republic stems from what the party sees as a cure to the usurped revolution of 1989. In this view, during the Roundtable discussions and post-communist transition to a market-based economy and a pluralistic political system, both liberal and formerly communist elites have dominated government (Harper 2010, 30). According to PiS, elite collusion has prevented Poland from becoming a truly participatory democracy, and the country will not be able to move forward without facing its history (Koczanowicz 2012, 813). To come to terms with the Soviet past, the party has advocated a program of de-communization or lustration. Founded on the idea of cleansing, the 2006 policy required those running for public office to disclose whether they had ever acted as a Soviet informer. It also provided access to Soviet-era records for victims. An amendment to the law on local governments went as far as to strip recently elected mayors of their position for failing to submit their lustration paperwork on time (Stanley 2016, 271). Although this section was eventually ruled unconstitutional, PiS had planned to expand these efforts (Harper 2010, 30). Through these initiatives, it is only fitting PiS earned the nickname the "party of the past" (Hinsey 2011, 148). These policies were within the context of a bigger goal: the revival of officially sanctioned debate on the preservation of national identity and history (Stańczyk 2013, 289).

National identity is, in part, about being distinct from an "Other." For PiS, this lends support to their traditionally anti-Germany and anti-Russia narrative (Harper 2010, 31), which manifested itself in a foreign policy driven "by a sense of historical grievance" (Stanley 2016, 273). In 2007, the party publicly attacked PO for being "too soft" on German claims to property in the formerly German region of western Poland, while also vocally opposing the creation of a museum to commemorate Germans expelled after World War II. In these discussions, PiS frequently cited Nazi crimes and what they saw as Germany's responsibility for starting this war (ibid. 28). Playing on Poland's "hero and victim status" and role as a "Christ of Nations" (Etkind et al. 2012, 133), the party used the media to reinforce these views (Stańczyk 2013, 315), with right-wing *Wprost* even comparing Russia President Vladimir Putin to Adolf Hitler (ibid. 310).

According to PiS, an additional essential element of "Polishness" is adherence to Catholic values, which the party actively promoted through the public education system (Harper 2010, 20) (Hinsey 2011, 148). In the early to mid-2000s, PiS and the far-right Self De-

fence party reinvented the “Us” to signify the devout, hardworking and Catholic Pole, and the “Them” to denote the so-called “liberal atheists” (Stanley 2008, 106). This new divide was perhaps best captured in a line from Jarosław Kaczyński’s speech at a 2006 rally in the shipyards of Gdansk. Appropriating the Solidarity myth, Kaczyński proclaimed that “We [PiS and supporters] stand where we stood back then,” implying continuity between rally attendees and the ‘90s Solidarity activists. “They [our opponents] stand where the militia stood,” linking those who are against the Fourth Republic project with the Polish Soviet forces who cracked down on the labour union (Stanley 2016, 269).

These policies speak to the party’s use of national memory and a milder “Us” versus “Them” dichotomy prior to the 2010 presidential election campaign. Secular Poles or Poles practicing a faith other than Catholicism did not fit within the PiS’s narrow definition of “Polishness.” The public faced frequent reminders of Nazi and Soviet transgressions; patriotism and support for closer ties with Russia and Germany were made to seem mutually exclusive. Without explicitly naming names, the lustration movement implied there was “dirt” – i.e., Soviet-sympathizers and those who oppose PiS’s vision of history – within Polish politics that must be removed (Harper 2010, 30). This “Othering” rhetoric only intensified in the wake of the crash.

Although also a post-Solidarity, centre-right party, PO has ridiculed PiS’s obsession with a “correct” Polish history; before he became Prime Minister, Donald Tusk called the Polish “romantic-imperial-messianic” tradition a “pathetic-grim-grotesque theatre of unfulfilled dreams and ungrounded longings” (Etkind et al. 2012, 134). At the time, despite having similar social policies to those of PiS, PO sought closer economic ties with Germany and saw Poland as a potential mediator between the European Union and Russia (ibid. 134). The party largely avoided engaging in memory politics and consistently demonstrated a commitment to the pluralist account of memory, as exemplified by Tusk’s lofty proposal for a Museum of War in Gdansk slated to present “the universal experience of war... equally acceptable to Poles, Germans, and Russians” (Stańczyk 2013, 290).

Even so, PO should not have been mistaken for a liberal “Western” party. On social issues, the party was in tune with Catholic values and historically opposed abortion, gay marriage, and euthanasia. Formerly a proponent of state funding for in-vitro fertilization, Tusk retracted his support in the face of popular opposition. He has also refused to sign the European Union Charter of Fundamental Rights, which, for some, symbolized his rejection of “universal” and liberal values in favour of Polish traditionalism (Harper 2010, 24).

PiS and PO’s similar stance on social issues turned the 2010 election and, to a lesser extent, the 2005 and 2007 elections into contests based on rhetoric and narrative-building rather than concrete policy. As Harper observes, the “legitimacy of the parties is largely determined by how they position themselves in relation to space, to each other, and to wider discursive and other... forces” (2010, 17). Policy issues took a backseat to overarching discursive and ideological ideas (ibid. 32).

National memory in the 2010 presidential campaign: Katyn 1, Katyn 2, and the war over Wawel

Tension between the PiS president and PO Prime Minister meant that there were two separate ceremonies to commemorate the anniversary of the Massacre. Prime Minister Tusk flew to the site on April 7, for a joint Russian-Polish ceremony, during which he publicly

met with Russian President Putin (Hinsey 2011, 149–150). President Lech Kaczyński was scheduled to arrive three days later, travelling with more than 80 other attendees. For both parties, the Katyn memorial presented an opportunity to begin campaigning for their parties in the autumn presidential elections. Tusk would have billed the ceremony as a chance to promote reconciliation and closer ties with Russia (Tusk, instead, capitalised on Russian cooperation in the wake of the crash to the same ends). For Kaczyński, it presented another opportunity to play on memory politics, connecting Soviet crimes with modern Russia (ibid. 150).

On April 10, 2010, Lech Kaczyński and 95 others were killed 20 kilometres from the Katyn forest. Thick fog caused the flight crew to misjudge distance in the landing approach, and the plane crashed near to the Smolensk North Airport (Hinsey 2011, 142). As per the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation, Russia's Interstate Aviation Committee was tasked with the initial investigation. The Polish government later contested this decision, claiming that the flight was under military, rather than civilian, regulation, and thus the Chicago Convention did not apply (Koczanowicz 2012, 824). The final Russian report notes a political pressure to land the plane at all costs (ibid. 825). A separate Polish report commissioned by the Minister of Internal Affairs blames miscommunications between Russian air traffic controllers and Polish pilots. The crash also prompted a wave of conspiracy theories, many of which implicated Tusk and Putin in foul play (ibid. 824).

In the months following the crash, the candidates did little explicit campaigning for the June presidential elections. Out of respect for the dead, opposition candidates avoided directly criticizing Lech Kaczyński (Rosset 2011, 243), and his grief-stricken brother, Jarosław Kaczyński, toned down his usually fiery rhetoric, even failing to define his political platform (Niżyńska 2010, 467). As such, the parties and the national media took the lead in campaigning (ibid. 475). As an election of discourse rather than policy, the impact of ideologically aligned media outlets became that much more important in propagating national narratives. Since the 2005 rise of PiS and their anti-elite rhetoric, the media has functioned not as an “independent actor, but rather [as] an arena in which populism [is] played out” (Stanley 2016, 272).

Immediately after the accident, the narrative-building role that party-aligned media would play in the 2010 presidential campaign was foreshadowed in the way outlets connected or failed to connect the crash to the 1940 massacre. With public figures, like Lech Walesa, calling the incident “Katyn number two,” it was impossible not to recognize the tragic parallel (Niżyńska 2010, 471). Nevertheless, led by *Gazeta Wyborcza*, the centrist and left-aligned media quickly adopted a forward-looking approach, focusing on the future implications for the crash investigation and possibilities for further Russian-Polish reconciliation (Guillette 2013, 18). In contrast, right-aligned media used the crash as an opportunity to reflect on the Katyn Massacre and, more generally, on Soviet crimes at Poland's expense, adopting romantic overtones to emphasize that the crash took place on already “accursed lands” (Koczanowicz 2012, 817–818).

Known as layering, this memory politics technique is key to narrative construction (Bernhard and Kubik 2014, 28). To Poles, the Katyn Massacre symbolises all Polish suffering and can be connected to violent, anti-imperial uprisings in the nineteenth century, the double Soviet-German invasion of 1939, the Warsaw Uprising, and the Siberian deportations. The Massacre reference conjures up these images, allowing the media to establish

a precedent for mistrusting Russia in the wake of the crash and legitimising anti-Russian sentiment (Niżyńska 2010, 470). The Katyn Massacre provided excellent material for layering. Conservative papers recognized this insofar as they referred to crash victims as the “flower of the Polish nation,” language typically reserved to describe the loss of the young intelligentsia in World War II (ibid. 469) as well as the high-ranking Polish officers and professionals deported to Soviet camps (Hinsey 2011, 144). *Gość Niedzielny* went further, asserting that the crash returned Poles to a state of collective victimhood similar to those who witnessed World War II (Szeligowska 2014, 497). Following the crash, *Nasz Dziennik* gave renewed attention to the “Russian” murder of Polish officers and priests in World War II and post-War Poland; the choice to use the word “Russian” rather than “Soviet” was a deliberate attempt to blame Soviet-era crimes on today’s regime. *Gazeta Wyborcza* repudiated *Nasz Dziennik*’s link between the current Russian government and the Soviet system (Guillette 2013, 26).

In the days immediately after the accident, the PiS-backed media began drawing on national memory to contextualize the crash. This narrative building later matured into more clearly promoting an “Us” versus “Them” divide. The controversial burial at Wawel Royal Castle in Krakow shattered any veneer of unity in mourning and catalysed this explicit “Othering” rhetoric (Szeligowska 2014, 488). On April 13, Cardinal Dziwisz announced that Lech Kaczynski and his wife would be buried at Wawel, the former residence of the Polish Monarchy and twentieth-century home of the Polish president. “...He [Lech Kaczynski] will rest there together with those who contributed to the good of our fatherland: from kings, to heroes, leaders...” (Szeligowska 2014, 492). Today, in addition to housing a popular museum and cathedral, the Royal Castle functions as a national necropolis reserved for Polish kings, such as Jan III Sobieski and Zygmunt III Waza, and national icons, such as Tadeusz Kosciuszko, Marshall Józef Piłsudski, and Adam Mickiewicz (ibid. 492). The burial should have served to further unify the country in both mourning and patriotism, muting party politics, at least temporarily (Koczanowicz 2012, 818). Instead, it fiercely divided Poland into two camps and paved the way for three months of divisive rhetoric in the run-up to the presidential election.

In the first camp were mostly conservative PiS supporters who considered the ex-President a hero and endorsed the Wawel burial. The Cardinal summarised their position, explaining that because Lech Kaczynski “died as a hero, then he deserve(d) to be buried among heroes,” (Szeligowska 2014, 493). *Nasz Dziennik* followed suit, publishing articles that linked Lech Kaczynski with kings from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the country’s golden age (Guillette 2013, 23–24).

Centrist and left-wing media and Poles opposed to the burial formed the second camp (Szeligowska 2014, 492–493). PO-aligned *Gazeta Wyborcza* supported the protestors, arguing that to be qualified for royal burial, the candidate needs more than just a title; he or she ought to have performed some sort of heroic deed (like Piłsudski) or contributed to the country in another long-lasting and meaningful way (as the work of Mickiewicz did) (Guillette 2013, 30–31). Much of the leftist press had the same message: Kaczynski’s death was tragic but not necessarily heroic (Szeligowska 2014, 493).

Calling opponents of the burial “unrighteous Poles,” the first camp tried to exclude the second from what they saw as a patriotic community of mourners (Szeligowska 2014, 494). Supporters, or the “Us,” stood on Krakowskie Przedmieście in Warsaw waiting to pay respects to the ex-President and his wife. The opponents, or the “Them,” loudly pro-

tested the Wawel burial in Krakow and unpatriotically criticised Lech Kaczynski and his romanticism (ibid. 498). The burial at Wawel provoked the first outward display of divide and “Othering” rhetoric (Hinsey 2011, 143) (Etkind et al. 2012, 139) (Niżyńska 2010, 474). In the coming months, parties would intensify this divide through narratives amplified by the media.

“Othering” enemies in the 2010 campaign

PiS did not invent “Othering.” Dividing the nation into allies and enemies has been a feature of Polish politics for centuries (Stanley 2016, 264). After the eighteenth century partition of Poland by Prussia, Russia, and Austria, these imperial rulers fulfilled the role of the elite “Them.” Communal suffering at the hands of foreigners formed the basis of Polish romantic identity and the “Us” (Niżyńska 2010, 471). Under Soviet socialism, the Polish Communist Party ensured that the capitalist “West” represented the official “Them.” Unofficially, Polish resentment of the Soviet Union created an underground dichotomy of Polish freedom fighters (“Us”) and Party members (“Them”) (Koczanowicz 2012, 817).

Aided by the party’s and media’s layering of historical references to construct narratives out of national memory, PiS’s “Othering” reached new heights in the campaign for the 2010 presidential election. The “Othering” rhetoric took two distinct, yet interrelated, forms. Wawel was the first example of “internal Othering”, which drew on events and figures from Polish history to paint Kaczynski and his supporters as Polish patriots. The second flavour, “external Othering,” should be seen as a logical extension of internal Othering and focused on historical antagonism between Poland and Russia to condemn ordinary Russians, the Russian government, and Poles in favour of Tusk’s bid to improve Polish-Russian relations.

At its core, internal “Othering” was based on the notion that Lech Kaczynski ought to be recognized as a patriot and a martyr. Alternative opinions were not simply unwelcome but also unpatriotic. An article in the Russian newspaper *Pravda* captured both the essence and the irony of this idea, recalling that “Lech Kaczynski lived in the captivity of historical myths, built his whole politics in accordance with historical myths and endlessly speculated on the problems of the past. And now his death has been transformed into a new Polish myth” (Etkind et al. 2012, 147). On April 19, well-known Polish author Jarosław Marek Rymkiewicz publicly bolstered this transformation, publishing a poem in *Rzeczpospolita* that urged Jarosław Kaczynski to carry on the efforts of his brother by running for president. The piece called on Jarosław to protect Poland from “...the hands of her thieves...who want to steal it and sell it to the world.” Although Rymkiewicz failed to identify the thieves by name, the poem implied they favoured a more outward-looking Poland. This position contrasted with Rymkiewicz and PiS’s fear that an “open” Poland would accelerate the erosion of traditional Polish values. In this context, it is logical to conclude that the “thieves” in question were the pro-EU PO supporters (Niżyńska, 2010, 476–477).

Rymkiewicz’s poem is an example of two memory politics techniques used to develop the “Us” versus “Them” narrative in Poland. The first, “polarizing without specifying,” refers to a mnemonic warrior’s aversion to explicitly naming the “Them,” instead preferring to make thinly veiled allusions to his or her opponents. Speaking vaguely affords the party plausible deniability in the face of accusations regarding polarization or scapegoating

(Niżyńska 2010, 477). This façade of ambiguity was accompanied by an additional strategy: the return of romantic language. Marked by frequent references to sacrifice, exaltation, tragedy, victimhood, honour, and suffering, such language sought to create a binary situation (Szeligowska 2014, 497). Poles could either mourn the ex-President as a patriot and a martyr or they were excluded from mourning altogether. Striving to establish exclusive ownership over all mourning, the party left no legitimate space for grief without romanticism. In this way, romantic language served to further the divide between the “Us” – the patriots responding to these dramatic calls – and the “Them” – those excluded by PiS’s monopoly on mourning (Niżyńska 2010, 468).

The making of martyrs and heroes: Internal “Othering”, foundational myths and religious authority in the campaign

Combining the use of romantic language and the unspecified enemy with national memory, conservative politicians and the right-aligned media promoted a variety of “Othering” narratives. One such idea particularly popular in the run-up to the election saw the Smolensk crash as a “blood sacrifice” that could serve as the foundational myth that post-communist Poland so desperately lacked. For conservative historians, the relatively peaceful progression from socialism to free-market capitalism and accompanying political changes robbed Poles of an adequately romantic historical basis for the Third Republic (Etkind et al. 2012, 142–143). While some citizens did look to the victory of Solidarity in the first partially free elections as a pivotal moment, for others, these events fell short of the characteristically Polish notions of victimhood, heroism, and martyrdom (Niżyńska 2010, 468).

PiS politician Ludwik Dorn went further, asserting that bloodshed is crucial for national rebirth (Etkind et al. 2012, 143). For the party, the Smolensk tragedy fulfilled this role and could act as the foundational myth for both their party and the Fourth Republic. The victims of the Smolensk crash were seen as martyrs; they “sacrificed” their lives to attract global attention to the Katyn Massacre and Soviet crimes in general. In his homily, Bishop of Świdnica, Ignacy Dec, supported this narrative, asserting that “...this sacrifice of the life of our best sons and daughters will help to show the world the truth” (ibid. 142). In another eulogy, Father Marian Putyra used the theme of victimhood to layer the Massacre and the crash, asking, “Has that Katyn earth demanded still more Polish blood? How much more of that blood needs to be spilled in order that the truth about that drama be finally made clear?” (ibid. 142).

Because the PiS narrative considered all crash victims to be martyrs, it needed to elevate the ex-President to a state above run-of-the-mill martyrdom – national hero. This was accomplished through the selective appropriation of easily recognizable figures and events from Polish national memory. In one *Nasz Dziennik* article, former PiS Secretary of State Antoni Macierewicz called Kaczynski the “greatest Polish statesman since Józef Piłsudski [head of the Second Polish Republic] and Roman Dmowski [leader of the post-World War I Polish independence movement]” (Guillette 2013, 19). Other outlets focused on the late Polish President-in-exile Ryszard Kaczorowski, who was also a crash victim. Accentuating his unwavering commitment to Poland’s independence, articles indirectly compared the two leaders (ibid. 21). Written by friends and supporters, these pieces likened Kaczynski to iconic figures from Polish history and are typical of post-crash conservative media coverage.

Such parallels of character were complemented by selective historical contextualisation. In addition to the Katyn Massacre, the Solidarity movement became one of the most commonly appropriated historical events in the run-up to the election. As a post-Solidarity party, PiS had previously claimed the exclusive right to represent the movement's supporters (Harper 2010, 31). In a *Nasz Dziennik* article, Macierewicz again highlighted PiS and the ex-President's link to the movement, remarking that "...one can say with certainty that free trade unions would have never arisen without Lech Kaczyński. Surely this is why he became chief adviser to the striking shipyard workers during the great August strike" (Guillette 2013, 20). In reminding Poles of Lech Kaczyński's contribution to the downfall of the Polish Communist Party, Macierewicz relied on the public's favourable view of the 1990s Solidarity movement. He drew on Polish national memory – Solidarity unionists as freedom fighters – to construct a narrative emphasizing Kaczyński's influence above that of others, like Lech Wałęsa.

Macierewicz's article then used this narrative to further the "Us" versus "Them" divide. He went on to state that "...little is said about this and many other names are remembered in this connection, but Lech Kaczyński, who passed on basic labour law information to the unionists and who helped shape 'Solidarity' as it was being born during the strike, is forgotten" (Guillette 2013, 19). Using passive construction ("is forgotten"), the author accused an unspecified subject of undervaluing Kaczyński's role in Solidarity. PiS's narrative implied that some Poles – the "Them" – ignored the ex-President's fundamental contributions to the movement. This group was, by extension, ignorant of Polish history and unpatriotic. In contrast, the author and readers – the "Us" – gave credit where credit was due. In reality, the publication may have exaggerated the ex-President's role in the shipyard protests (ibid. 22). Taking a different angle, the *Gość Niedzielny* article provides an additional example of the appropriation of Solidarity for "Othering" rhetoric. Focused on the public rather than the President, the piece compared the energy of the crowd of mourners (the "Us") to the Solidarity protestors (Szeligowska 2014, 491). Because the right-aligned media promoted PiS's monopoly on mourning, it follows that only "genuine patriots" or party supporters could be on par with the legendary Solidarity activists.

In the conservative media, even the more "secular" aspects of Polish history, like the Solidarity Movement, were shrouded in religious overtones. In Poland, politics and religion are inextricably linked. Under first imperial and then communist rule, nationalists acted as crusaders in the fight against the suppression of the Catholic Church and Polish culture. In this way, the notion of the leader as a saviour or messiah became deeply ingrained in national politics, especially in times of oppression or trauma (Koczanowicz 2012, 817). PiS has actively encouraged this link. From 2005 to 2007, the party advocated for legislation that would make patriotic and moral education a separate and obligatory school subject. In an effort to boost the status of these and similar subjects, the party also pushed schools to count religious studies in students' grade point averages (Stanley 2016, 269–270).

In the run-up to the election, PiS directly appropriated both religious authority and religion-infused historical events in narrative building. This furthered the "Us" versus "Them" divide that would alienate more moderate, secular voters. In terms of jurisdiction, the party and conservative media outlets called on the Church, rather than the state, to lead the nation in mourning and to arrange this, including the burial at Wawel. An editorial in *Rzeczpospolita* justified the logic behind the delegation of the authority, explaining

that the state does not have the emotional tools (stories, symbols, morals) to help citizens cope with the trauma (Szeligowska 2014, 495–496). In a devout country, such as Poland, empowering the Church to guide citizens through a national tragedy is understandable. However, by co-opting the Church in the party's monopoly on mourning, PiS eliminated the opportunity for secular mourners to grieve. According to the party's framework, only mourning overseen by the Church could be legitimate and, thus, patriotic.

Aside from appropriating authority, the conservative media drew on national memory to connect the ex-President's death with the loss of Pope John Paul II. *Nasz Dziennik* compared mourning after the crash with national grief after the Pope's death in 2005 (Guillette 2013, 8). Other conservative outlets echoed these sentiments, relating memories of Poles coming together to mourn the Pope with communal mourning for crash victims (Niżyńska 2010, 471). In this narrative, there is a double parallel; the President is likened to the Pope, a well-respected national figure and the pinnacle of piety and moral authority. Those publicly mourning the death of the President are not just grieving but also coming together in the name of national unity just as they had five years earlier. Such analogies elevated the status of Kaczynski supporters and affirmed Catholicism as fundamental to Polish identity. Supported by the conservative media, the PiS used religion in its "Othering" narrative to deprive secular Poles of Polish identity and exclude them from mourning.

Meanwhile, PO itself avoided directly engaging in memory politics, instead focusing on policy while quietly encouraging a diversity of historical narratives. This choice garnered support from the left-aligned media, which took up the party's cause, openly attacking PiS's monopoly on mourning and Polish identity. Acting as a mnemonic pluralist, *Gazeta Wyborcza* assailed PiS for what they termed "mourning patriotism," arguing that the party's monopoly on mourning had no constructive value and served only to divide the country (Szeligowska 2014, 500). In an article for this outlet, Jesuit priest Wacław Osza-jca went further, specifically condemning PiS's attempt to profit from parallels between the deaths of the ex-President and ex-Pope (Guillette 2013, 15). Echoing Polish historian Marcin Król's attitudes toward patriotism, liberal outlets asserted the existence of multiple patriotisms. To Król, "real Poles" do not exist. Individuals conceive of their national identity and corresponding civic duties in different ways. In modern society, the failure to recognize the multiplicity of narratives and efforts to promote a single patriotic narrative would ultimately backfire (Szeligowska 2014, 500).

External "Othering" in national memory: Poland as the "victim-hero" and Russia as the "aggressor"

The second strand of "Othering" rhetoric repurposes the deeply rooted animosity between Poland and Russia for political gain. A new interpretation of an old technique, juxtaposition of Russia and Eastern Europe has historically served as a defining characteristic of Polish identity. In the run-up to the 2010 presidential election, the conservative media and PiS drew on national memory to play into conspiracy theories implicating Russian President Putin and Polish Prime Minister Tusk in the crash. For PiS, a distrust of Russia again became a non-negotiable part of "Polishness". In this same vein, moderate Poles supporting Tusk's push to improve relations between the two countries were cast as the "Them." The party portrayed this group as ignorant of history and in collusion with the "Other" (Russia), meaning that they, by extension, were also an "Other."

The “Othering” of Russia can be traced at least as far back as the eighteenth century partition of Poland. Having wiped Poland off of the map, imperial Russia, as well as Prussia and Austria, continued to resist the country’s existence not just as an independent state, but also as a national identity. The 1917 revolution in Russia strengthened Poland’s resolve to be regarded as “civilized” and “Western,” as opposed to “barbaric” and “Eastern,” and lent support to the messianic elements of Polish national identity. Acting as a bulwark against the spread of communism, pre-World War II Poland saw itself as the last outpost of the West (Stańczyk 2013, 291). The 1939 Molotov-Ribbentrop pact marked the first act of aggression in a new era of old hostilities. However, this time the General Secretary of the Communist Party, rather than the Tsar, would lead the occupation (Levintova 2010, 1343).

Institutionalised through textbooks and the conservative media, this negative representation of Russia is familiar to nearly all Poles (Zarycki 2004, 55). The formerly far-right publication *Wprost* was particularly fond of imposing anti-Russian historical references on Putin’s government. Comparing a proposed Russo-German gas pipeline, Nordstream, to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, the magazine revived the idea of a Russian-German alliance intended to undermine Poland’s sovereignty, though this time vis-à-vis natural resource control (Stańczyk 2013, 307–308). During the 2008 Russian-Georgian war, the magazine’s cover referred to the Russian President as “Adolf Putin,” a reference to his regime’s supposed inclination toward invading and occupying neighbours, as Hitler did in Czechoslovakian Sudetenland (ibid. 310).

Wprost’s tactics are representative of a larger “Othering” trend in Polish right-wing media that intensified after the crash (Stańczyk 2013, 305). In the run-up to the election, the conservative media supported PiS’s narrative, which consistently depicted Poland as a victim and a hero. The term victim implies suffering at the hands of, or mistreatment by, some entity. Similarly, a hero needs to triumph over some opposing force. For the party and the right-aligned media, Russia could furnish the necessary foil to Poland’s victim and hero status. The historical basis for these “opposition-hero” and “aggressor-victim” relationships is deeply ingrained in Polish national memory. Lech Kaczyński promoted the idea, frequently referencing Poland’s “special role” as a prophet sent to warn the world of Russia’s expansionist ambitions (Koczanowicz 2012, 816). The speech prepared by Lech Kaczyński for the commemoration summed up his party’s take on the geopolitical “Us” (Westernised Poland) versus “Them” (Asiatic Russia) divide. Calling Poland the “Gotha of the East” and Katyn “the most tragic station of the cross,” the nation is likened to a Christ figure while Russia is implied to be a sort of Pontius Pilate (Etkind et al. 2012, 135).

Building on a growing distrust of Russians, especially among elderly Poles, PiS and the conservative media propagated conspiracy theories blaming Russian-PO collaboration for the crash (Hinsey 2011, 150). Their partnership represented a logical next stage in Russia’s long series of attempts to destroy Poland. Poles who rejected PiS’s suspicion of Russia were grouped with the Russians as “Others,” further alienating moderate voters in the June election.

In the 2010 campaign, Jarosław Kaczyński’s word choice signalled his belief that Russia should be faulted for the disaster at Smolensk. Kaczyński consistently used the term “crime” to refer to the crash, which is of dual significance. First, in using the word crime as opposed to “accident” or “tragedy,” Kaczyński implied the existence of a culprit (Russia) and an intent to harm. Second, “crime” is typically used to refer to the original Katyn

Massacre. In choosing to label the crash as a crime, Kaczynski drew on national memory to connect the Massacre to the 2010 tragedy. PiS followed his linguistic lead, calling the event the “Smolensk assassination” and the “Smolensk lie.” This represented another deliberate attempt to layer the crash and the Massacre, which is often referred to as the “Katyn lie” (Etkinds et al. 2012, 141).

The conservative media emulated the party, accusing Russia of toying with super magnets and artificial fog to disrupt the flight’s landing (Koczanowicz 2012, 834). Right-wing outlets *Nasz Dziennik* and *Gazeta Polska* compared what they viewed as a faulty crash investigation with the Soviet cover-up of the Katyn Massacre in 1940. Other articles connected Tusk with Putin’s NKVD work in Soviet-occupied East Germany. A piece on the crash published on the *Nasz Dziennik* and *Gazeta Polska*-supported *Crash News Digest Website*, and supposedly written by a former CIA intelligence analyst, references the “Soviet genocide in the 1920s when they [the USSR] starved 20 million Ukrainians to death.” The analogy was intended to demonstrate Russia’s historic disregard for the lives of civilians. In these comparisons, PiS used national memory to legitimise conspiracy theories and “Other” Russia. Through this rhetoric, the party alienated Poles who rejected this anti-Russian rhetoric in favour of the PO’s approach.

The Civic Platform’s response: an opportunity for Polish-Russian reconciliation

Prime Minister Tusk intended his visit to Katyn to function as a springboard for improving Polish-Russian relations. Instead, his party capitalized on the crash to try to achieve the same ends, striving to undermine the PiS narrative in the process. The Russian response aided Tusk in this endeavour; both Russian and Polish media reported widespread grief among young Russia urbanites. This was accompanied by the idea of a second chance for Katyn – that this time the tragedy would be handled properly and the victims would be treated with respect. Russian authorities declared April 12 a day of national mourning and, for the first time, broadcast Andrzej Wajda’s documentary about the Katyn Massacre on Russian state television (Etkind et al. 2012, 137). These efforts were made permanent by a November 2010 Duma resolution affirming Russia’s new official policy toward the history of Katyn and more generally the Stalin era (ibid.145).

The Polish liberal media followed suit, using inclusive rhetoric to promote the idea of a joint mourning. From a high politics perspective, outlets emphasized Tusk-Putin reconciliation and cooperation. In headlines like “Putin pays Tribute to the Victims,” liberal outlets underscored the Kremlin’s respect for the tragedy. Adam Michnik published a piece in both Russian and Polish complete with a photograph of Putin and Tusk embracing (Guillette 2013, 27). Outlets also stressed the unity of Polish and Russian citizens. Under headings such as “We, the Russians, Cry Together with the Poles,” *Gazeta Wyborcza* republished sympathetic comments from Russians originally run by the Russian outlet *RIA Novosti* (ibid. 13). Michnik remarked that “The Smolensk catastrophe broke something in our Polish and Russian hearts. In the hearts of the leaders and of regular people. It was as if a gigantic dam opened...” (Etkind et al. 2012, 136). In discussing the Katyn Massacre, the PO and liberal media were careful to blame the Soviet regime and Stalin, rather than Russia. For the undecided centrist voter, The PO’s conciliatory rhetoric may have offered a welcome change from PiS’s nationalist “Othering” narrative.

Conclusion

At 55 percent participation, the 2010 presidential election saw, for Poland, a higher-than-average voter turnout. The first round left PO candidate Bronisław Komorowski with 40 percent of the vote, a 5 percent lead over Jarosław Kaczyński. The second round led to a narrow victory for PO, as Komorowski took home 53 percent of the vote (Rosset 2011, 244).

Contrary to the expectations of electoral outcomes after a national tragedy, the incumbent party lost to the opposition. Comparing aggregate and individual electoral data with opinion polls, Czeński found that the Smolensk crash strengthened existing voter preferences, which he called the “petrifying effect.” Czeński hypothesized that the crash mobilized the PiS’s traditional base, which is comprised of mostly older and poorer Poles from eastern and southeastern Poland (Rosset 2011, 244). This group, which largely failed to vote in the 2007 parliamentary elections, partially explained the high turnout (Czeński 2014, 537–538). However, Czeński’s analysis does not account for the similarly high turnout rates of moderate voters, which proved crucial to Komorowski’s win.

At first glance, these results may suggest that undecided voters rejected rhetoric in favour of reconciliation, leading to Komorowski’s success and demonstrating that “Othering” was not a viable political strategy. However, the 2010 election was too close to proclaim a decisive victory for pluralism. Furthermore, after winning the 2015 presidential election, PiS has shifted back to the far-right, strengthening government control over the media and courts and reintroducing “Othering” narratives (e.g. debate over abortion law has revived values-laden rhetoric asserting that Catholicism is an essential component of “Polishness”) (Marcinkiewicz and Stegmaier 2016, 224). At the same time, hyper nationalism has resurged in Poland, drawing fascist and neo-Nazis to Warsaw’s March of Independence. While political scientists once predicted that increasing internationalization and freer, faster media would eventually lead to the demise of “Othering,” the rise of the far right in some EU member states and the 2016 U.S. presidential election calls Fukuyama’s “end of history” argument into question (Davies 2017). Likewise, Bernhard and Kubik’s observation that, over time, politicians in democracies tend to move away from polarizing memory politics, seems deterministic (2014, 28–29). Recent electoral patterns suggest that mnemonic warriors, who feed on divisive rhetoric, have increasing appeal to those who feel economically insecure or otherwise threatened by demographic changes.

As the paper demonstrates, further interdisciplinary study is needed to fully understand the long-term viability of mnemonic warriors in liberal democracies, which are by definition pluralistic. As “Othering” rhetoric flares in democratic countries across the Atlantic (and on Twitter), a purely political science approach both failed to predict, and limits future understanding of, the global lapse in pluralism. In Poland, the next round of parliamentary elections, which must be held by November 2019, and the 2020 presidential elections will again test the viability PiS’s divisive narratives. Greater consideration for the electoral impact of memory politics and narrative building will enhance political science scholarship, promote more accurate forecasting, and a more pluralistic world.

References:

- Bell, D (2003). 'Mythscape: Memory, Mythology, and National Identity.' *British Journal of Sociology* 54, no. 1, 63–81.
- Bernhard, M and Kubik, J eds. (2014). *Twenty Years After Communism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bleiker, R and Hoang, Y (2006). 'Remembering and Forgetting the Korean War: From Trauma to Reconciliation.' In *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship between Past and Present*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 195–212.
- Cohen, F and Solomon, S (2011). 'The Politics of Mortal Terror.' *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 20, no. 5, 316–20.
- Czeżnik, M (2014). 'In the Shadow of the Smolensk Catastrophe – The 2010 Presidential Election in Poland.' *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* 28, no. 3, 518–39.
- Davies, C (2017). 'More girls, fewer skinheads': Poland's far right wrestles with changing image.' *The Guardian*.
- Edkins, J (2006). 'Remembering Relationality: Trauma Time and Politics.' In *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship between Past and Present*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 99–115.
- Etkind A, Finnin R, Blacker U, Fedor J, Lewis S, Mäklsoo M, and Mroz M (2012). *Remembering Katyn*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Feuchtwang, S (2006). 'Memorials to Injustice.' In *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship between Past and Present*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 176–94.
- Guillette, D (2013). 'Media Manipulation of the Tragedy at Smolensk: Nasz Dziennik's and Gazeta Wyborcza's Coverage of the 2010 Crash.' Master of Arts Thesis, Department of Slavic and Eurasian Studies, Duke University.
- Harper, J (2010). 'Negating Negation.' *Problems of Post-Communism* 57, no. 4, 16–36.
- Hinsey, E (2011). 'Death in the Forest.' *New England Review* 32, no. 1, 142–53.
- Koczanowicz, L (2012). 'The Politics of Catastrophe: Poland's Presidential Crash and the Ideology of Post-Postcommunism.' *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* 26, no. 4, 811–28.
- Levintova, E (2010). 'Good Neighbours? Dominant Narratives about the 'Other' in Contemporary Polish and Russian Newspapers.' *Europe-Asia Studies* 62, no. 8, 1339–61.
- Marcinkiewicz, K, and Stegmaier, M (2016). 'The Parliamentary Election in Poland, October 2015.' *Electoral Studies* 41, 221–24.
- Müller, J ed. (2002). *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neumann, I (2002). 'Europe's Post-Cold War Memory of Russia: Cui Bono?' In *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 121–36.
- Niżyńska, J (2010). 'The Politics of Mourning and the Crisis of Poland's Symbolic Language after April 10.' *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* 24, no. 4, 467–79.
- 'Poland: Country Outlook.' EIU ViewsWire, The Economist Intelligence Unit, April 13, 2016.
- 'Poland: Duda Will Raise Stakes for Autumn Poll.' Oxford Analytica Daily Brief Service, May 27, 2015.

- Ray, L (2006). 'Mourning, Melancholia and Violence.' In *Memory, Trauma, and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship between Past and Present*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 135–56.
- Rosset, J (2011). 'The 2010 Presidential Election in Poland.' *Electoral Studies* 30, 241–44.
- Snyder, T (2002). 'Memory of Sovereignty and Sovereignty over Memory: Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine, 1939–1999.' In *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 39–58.
- Stańczyk, E (2013). 'Caught between German and Russia: Memory and National Identity in Poland's Right-Wing Media Post-2004.' *The Slavonic and East European Review* 91, no. 2, 289–316.
- Stanley, B (2016). 'Confrontation by Default and Confrontation by Design: Strategic and Institutional Responses to Poland's Populist Coalition Government.' *Democratization* 23, no. 2, 263–82.
- Stanley, B (2008). 'The Thin Ideology of Populism.' *Journal of Political Ideologies* 13, no. 1, 95–110.
- Szeligowska, D (2014). 'Patriotism in Mourning.' *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* 28, no. 3, 487–517.
- 'The Harbinger; Poland's Presidential Election.' *The Economist*, May 9, 2015. "Ukraine/ Poland Politics: Policy on Ukraine-Russia after October." *The Economist Intelligence Unit N.A., Incorporated*, July 16, 2015.
- Winter, J, and Sivan, E eds. (1999). *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*. Studies in the Social and Cultural History of Modern Warfare 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zarycki, T (2004). 'Uses of Russia: The Role of Russia in the Modern Polish Identity.' *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* 18, no. 4, 595–627.