Dominika Kasprowicz, Agnieszka Hess

Uniwersytet Jagielloński

Populism in Poland
– between demagoguery and demophilia[1]

Abstract: The goal of this paper is to present the evolution of populism in Poland using the examples of two political parties: the "Samoobrona" ("Self-Defense") political party of Andrzej Lepper (a populist party which garnered most support in the first decade of the 21st century) and the "Kukiz '15" movement – the dark horse of the last Polish parliamentary elections. Both of these groups superbly illustrate the demagogy characteristic of populism, linked with an affirmation of the people (nation) which in turn would not be possible without the anti-establishment stance of the political leaders and the electorate. A comparison of these two examples allows us to monitor the transformations occurring in populist groups over the last few years, especially in the age where the Internet is employed as a vital means of communication. The paper presents the alternative conceptualizations of the idea of populism, and moves on to employ the N. Baar scheme (2009) and secondary and primary data (data obtained from the "Barometr Wyborczy" voting advisory application), and press releases to draft various types of correspondence between these two cases, which makes it possible to identify new, interesting characteristics of populism.

Key words: populism, party politics in Poland, Poland

Introduction

The last decade, which was initiated with the economic crisis of 2008, was a successive period in the history of post-war Europe, when populists were riding a wave of popular support and interest from the media. This question was full of expectations from numerous researchers for many years, including those who concentrate on the democratic political systems of Western Europe, as well as those of formerly authoritarian states. At the same time, in relation to these two groups, there remains the

---

constatation of the American researcher Casa Mudde, who affirmed that an attempt to delineate populism is nothing more than trying to shoot and hit a moving target in a thick fog (Mudde, 2006). This is an apt observation, in as much as populism is still waiting for a universally accepted and employed real definition, which manifests its essential (that is, without which populism could not be what it is) and unambiguous characteristic.

In academic and media milieus, the term "populism" is often employed to describe an organization and political leaders whose words are too eclectic to be subordinate to a political doctrine, or whose statements concentrate on the citizen/voting masses, and which possess a simplified and demagogic character, where such a specific target group is nothing more than an essential condition for a "catch-all" party strategy. To paraphrase Jerzy Szacki – if we were to draw up a list of thinkers who could be awarded the moniker of populist, the list itself would be rather odd. Herder and Owen, Rousseau and Proudhon, Lev Tolstoy and Juan Peron, Gandhi and Senator Joseph McCarthy, Hannah Arendt and General DeGaulle, Sun Yat Sen and Pooujade, chairman Mao and the Tanzanian leader Nyerere, as well as scores of other names of people who had little in common, would all be found on this list (Szacki, 2003).

Of course this doesn't mean that "populism" has yet to receive an operative definition. Quite the contrary, the academic debate centered on this phenomenon is exceptionally rich in content and conceptual propositions. Many authors have made an attempt to sum it all up by saying that populism is "operationalized" as a more narrow phenomenon – a political style of acting or in a wider sense, as an elaborate vision of a new political order. (Canovan 1981, 1999; Mudde, 2000, 2004; Taggart, 2000; Meny, Surrel 2002).

In the first view, populism (seen as a political style or strategy) means demagoguery employed with the goal of acquiring and maintaining political power. This is manifested in the use of socio-techniques, direct communication with the electorate, which often leads to "clientelistic" links (in extreme instances, the buying of votes or the selling of political appointments). In this perspective, populism is an essential element of electoral democracy, and is an imminent characteristic of the political class.

According to another viewpoint, shared by Margaret Canovan or Donald MacRae – populism is understood to be a political doctrine, that is a compilation of assessments of a more universal character, which manifest the foibles of democratic procedures, and the weak quality of those

elites attempting to gain political capital (Canovan, 1981, 1999; Mac-
Rae 1969). According to this concept, populism and populists, in a wider
meaning of the term, utilize demagogic tools of communication, while at
the same time propose more or less coherent solutions for remodeling the
democratic order, all of this with the goal of exchanging the elites and/or
augmenting the level of representation of the sovereign, or mythical "peo-
ple". The role models here are examples from history, such as the Russian
nationalists (*narodniks*) or American populists from the end of the XIX
century. Such an understanding of populism, though also controversial,
is so intriguing, that it takes into consideration populist actors of various
types of character – and political parties, but also other political actors
such as protest or social movements, operating in the name of the masses,
and which have their own political goals.

Both of these formulations, although employed in the political analy-
ses of these phenomena, have aroused a doubt, as to their methodological
nature (Szacki, 2003). At the same time however, they have several ele-
ments in common. It's exactly this *demophilia* – the so-called love of the
people, and faith in their inerrancy – which is a characteristic which binds
doctrinal populists and political opportunists (demagogues) together. This
is due to the fact that both of these groups desire to be perceived as "the
voice of society" (of the nation, people, or the electorate), which is effec-
tive in the struggle against the corrupt and ineffective elites. Opposition to
the establishment, constitutes the second essential element of populism.
A consequence, populism fits the role of a current of the opposition ex-
ceptionally well, as it is directed at being a negation and criticism of the
present social reality, as a protest group, an emanation of anti-system ori-
ented social groups, dissatisfied with the direction of social change. That
is exactly why populists have awarded themselves the role of "authentic
representatives of the will of the people" (Derlich, 2010). The result of
this leadership strategy – based on a direct link between the leader or
leaders with the masses, is also founded on the logic of the plebiscite and/
or clientelism. The third important aspect is the self-limiting character of
populism. As a phenomenon which is the portable power of the opposition
in a system of representative democracy, after crossing a certain barrier to
obtain parliamentary representation (MPs), and all the more so if some of
its adherents make it into the cabinet (of a government), populism losses
credibility, and therefore, support. As researchers of the political system
have noted, that characteristic of populist parties is gradually loosing sig-
nificance, and in respect to specific political systems, it has even become

an imminent part of that system, as for instance in Bulgaria (Cholova, Kasprowicz, 2010).

These characteristics were detected and employed to carry out a systematic analysis of various political parties by Nicholas Baar (Baar, 2009). His work was a starting point for the authors of this paper, to distinguish and to later analyze Polish (political) populism. His proposed scheme not only allows us to distinguish populist political parties from protest parties, it also, in a precise manner, "operationalizes" this phenomenon, allowing a more precise selection of samples. The definition selected by the author defines populism as: a mass movement directed from outside the party system by a new entity, or one that has arisen as a result of a separation from a previously existing political entity, which attempts to acquire and maintain power via the use of anti-establishment rhetoric, as well as having direct (through plebiscites) links with its adherents (Baar, 2009, p. 44). On the basis of this statement, the author delineates three levels of analysis, namely, the localization of the party in the party system (*locus*), the type of bonds which unite the politician with his adherents (*linkage*), as well as the type of transmission of information (*message*).

Many instances of populism have been described in Poland after 1989. When employing various examples of typology, reference was made to the manner in which politics were conducted, or it was included as a doctrinal element of specific political propositions. One kind of populism, was called entrepreneurial populism, as represented by Stan Tymiński, whereas the "Samoobrona" ("Self-Defense") party was called agrarian populism, the far right, as represented by the "Liga Polskich Rodzin" ("League of Polish Families") and "Prawo i Sprawiedliwość" ("Law and Justice") were called political populism (political parties), and in addition there were grass roots movements, represented by non-party political organizations, such as trade unions (Wysocka, 2008; Derlich, 2010; Kasprowicz, 2013; Kasprowicz, 2015; Stępińska et al., 2016; Markowski, 2016). The messages of all relevant political parties contained some populist elements of the political discourse (Przyłęcki, 2012). As mentioned above however, this research was based on several operational definitions of populism, hence the difficulty in generalizing the results of this research. In addition, none of the aforementioned works, deals with a relatively new political entity, "Kukiz '15", a party which arose thanks to a relatively successful presidential campaign, and later an election committee. It is the opinion of the authors of this paper, that the "Kukiz '15" party is not just another example of populism in Polish politics; this party

is undertaking a series of intriguing political maneuvers, which may have a permanent effect on the specifics and degree of institutionalization of populism in the Polish political system.

In order to obtain the research results indicated at the start of this paper, which is to establish those transformations which are taking place in populist groups, the authors have decided to employ a comparative method, where two cases are compared – the past "Samoobrona" union and party organization of Andrzej Lepper, and the "Kukiz '15" (which to the date refuse to turn into the political party, making use of a possibility given the Polish electoral code, that enables non-party actors to run in local and general elections). The sampling was made according to the strategy of the highest probability, that is an analysis subject to the three levels indicated by Baar, as constituting political populism. Each of these categories will be complemented by specific information for the Polish context, and in the authors' opinion, having a universal character.

Position in the Party System (*Locus*)

The first characteristic enabling a distinguishing of a populist organization, is its position (localization) in the party system. In accordance with Baar's supposition, we can divide parties between those which operate inside and outside of the party system, as well as those which take a position in the middle – political outlaws, who became outlaws on their own accord (*mavericks*). Only outsiders may be recognized as being populists, that is those who are politically independent regarding mainstream political parties (which in turn creates and maintains the specifics of a given party system), and those who create new parties, and produce so-called "political independents", that is those who are unaffiliated with any particular political party. The second group of political populists are those who are political outlaws of their own accord. That is those politicians who decided to break away from a mainstream party, and based on their political capital, initiate a new organization. Both of these groups attain political significance not through or in union with, deep-rooted party structures, but rather by operating on the margins of party politics.

When analyzing these two political groups – both "Samoobrona" and "Kukiz '15" are perceived as being an example of outsiders based on those protest movements, which arose in Poland in the early 1990s and at the beginning of the 2000s. In other words, both these groups, as a result

of grass roots movements are not affiliated with a political party, yet they garnered significant support among voters. The roots of "Samoobrona" are found in the protest actions undertaken by farmers, and trade union activity under the same name, which led to the party's being registered as "Samoobrona" ("Self-Defense") in 1993. With regards to "Kukiz '15", it was the "Platforma Oburzonych" ("Platform of the Outraged") – an agreement which brought together more than one hundred organizations in 2011 – formal and informal interest groups, associations, trade unions, including an initiative known as "zmieleni.pl" (zmieleni – those who are ground down) whose leader was Paweł Kukiz. Although the "Platforma" did not achieve political relevance in 2011, it was able to accumulate some political capital. It was directed against the political establishment, and represented voters who were disappointed with the ruling class, and obtained a significant amount of attention in the mass media (Kasprowicz, 2013).

It is noteworthy that both these instances, the entrance of populist outsiders into the political mainstream, were the result of the political crises of 2000 and 2015, and more exactly, were a side effect of them. It was precisely this reconstruction of the party system, which occurred in these years, which paved the way for a political relevance of a new object – outsiders in the form of Andrzej Lepper and Paweł Kukiz.

The political crisis of 2000, which enabled the institutionalization of „Samoobrona" in the party system, could be summed up in the following points:

– A change in the model of electoral behavior (the end of the post-communist division);
– A final defeat of the model of a broad cooperation between right-wing and liberal milieus and the beginning of a new socio-political division on the right;
– Key changes in the electoral system (with a preference for smaller entities);
– Changes in the system of financing political parties (in the direction of parties-cartels, that is more independence for political parties from the electorate and party members);
– A high level of disappointment among voters in politics and the elites (CBOS – Center for Public Opinion Research).

When placed against this background, the circumstances of the political crisis of 2015, which led to a new opening of the political party system to outsiders, including "Kukiz '15", are not so dramatic. One may how-

ever, delineate several common elements of the crisis of the party system in 2000 and 2015. Above all there was a change in the electoral behavioral model – the heretofore relatively stable electorate decomposed, which was manifested in the evident victory of the "Prawo i Sprawiedliwość" party, as well as the high support for outsiders by all groups of society (divided by age, geography, profession, etc. IPSOS 2015). This was accompanied by a mobilization of younger voters, who until this time had remained relatively passive. A decisive victory won by one party, terminated a stable coalition which had lasted two electoral terms, that is of the agrarian party ("PSL") and the centrist "Platforma Obywatelska", which after ruling for 8 years also noted a significant increase in disappointment amongst voters. A new opening in the party scene was also accompanied by a change in the electoral system, in which it was gradually (as opposed to the radical changes in how votes were counted, which took place before the 2001 elections) modified from a proportional system, to a mixed universal system. The linking of the uninominal component of voting precincts (first in the Senate election of 2011, later, partially, in local government elections in 2014), on the one hand provided an opportunity for new, local, popular politicians and groups, and on the other hand was along the lines of their political program, in which the introduction of direct democratic tools and an increase in voter supervision of the electoral process were postulated.

The Message Generated in the Public Sphere (*Message*)

As Baar writes, some political actors take advantage of the those trends which use an anti-establishment rhetoric in the context of the general decline in interest concerning, and confidence in, political institutions. Baar, based on existing definitions of this concept, amongst others, those provided by Margaret Canova, Ernesto Laclau, Cassa Mudde or Andreas Scheller, recognizes them as being a set of rhetorical measures, whose goal is the acquiring of support, and that this is in essence, a conviction of a Manichean vision of the world, divided amongst the "ruled" and the "rulers", which assumes that the rulers don't represent (that is they either can't or won't) the interest of the voters. At the same time a criticism of the political system and its political and/or economic demiurges, goes hand in hand with an indication of the criteria of their evaluation, and what ensues, it directly offers its adherents a kind of anti-establishment

rhetoric, which promises to fix the *status quo* (Baar, 2009, pp. 30–31 and following). The author also points out several conditions essential for the success of such a rhetoric, the most important of which is to cover the content of the message on the subject of the political elites-traitors, or incompetents, with a conviction that already is present in society, that such people really exist amongst the elites. An anti-establishment rhetoric is not reserved solely for populists of course, but in the author's opinion they constitute yet another condition, which is essential and necessary, for a given entity to be recognized as being populist.

Four immanent characteristics of the populist message generated in the public sphere, which are employed by political actors, could be enumerated here. They are: 1) a simplification, which becomes an affirmation, that the world isn't complicated, and social relations are a dichotomous agreement based on the premise, that an opinion may be right or wrong, but society is divided according to an "us" against "them" scheme, and the basis for any activity is the principle "whoever is not with us, is against us", 2) utopianism, that is the supposition that it is possible to bring about an ideal world (society), and that this utopia may be realized, 3) the acquiring of support through a specific manner of communicating with society, which is characterized by "shortening the distance" with the receivers (public) and employing a "we" narration as well as 4) creating a climate of social mobilization, through, for example, the idealization of the community or denigrating the ruling class, or creating a climate of fear in the face of a given threat (Dutkiewicz, 2013).

As has already been mentioned, existing analyses confirm the existence of the populist discourse amongst Poland's leading political parties. Where "Samoobrona" is concerned, a confirmation may be found in official party documents and campaign manifestos, where it is affirmed that the party is "the only party in Poland which is the voice speaking in the name of all citizens" (referred to in: Wysocka, 2008). The party's leader in his appearances, skillfully based his arguments on historic resentments from pre-World War II times, when there was an evident social division along the lines of the poor and manipulated masses, and the capitalists (elites). "Samoobrona", which critically evaluated the effects of the political-social transformation already at the beginning of the 1990s, called particular attention to the widening range of social exclusion, including the ever increasing number of societal groups which were composed of the so-called "losers in the transformation". The party announced that only a change of the elites and the realization of a complex program of

socio-economic transformations could solve this problem. Andrzej Lepper (the chairman of "Samoobrona") appealed to the poorest people and the uneducated, those who were residents of state-owned housing, and small farmers. In addition, one may read in party documents about the "necessity of defending the poor and unemployed, the honest and the hardworking, who have been harmed by the economic system" ("Samoobrona" Election Program). The party's anti-establishment rhetoric was also employed after the party entered parliament in 2001. It's worthwhile here to cite the results of an analysis by Paweł Przyłęcki.

This author, like Baar, leaves the boundaries of the phenomenological framework, and concentrates on an analysis of the populist system of political communication. The results of his research regarding "Samoobrona" show that it fits in the framework described by Baar. In Przyłęcki's opinion, "Samoobrona" represents populism of a plebian character, although it has taken on: "[...] a rather primitive form and doesn't have a chance of lasting" (Baar, 2009, p. 135). Members of parliament of the "Samoobrona" party, often quoted conspiracy theories and provided examples of anti-Polish activity. Their speeches were often directed to that which a Polish society, which had grown weary of politics, wanted to hear. The linguistic tools used by the party leaders served, amongst others, to make of the elite an enemy of the nation, dependent upon the employing of a strategy of fear against the rulers of society, and a direct discreditation of political opponents.

In the instance of "Kukiz '15", with regards to the statements of the party's leader, as well as the official material of the election committee (2015), what is immediately evident is the anti-political party theme. In addition, this political entity ("Kukiz '15") wishes to be perceived as a "non-ideological representative of the nation" ("Kukiz '15" webpage). The political goals of "Kukiz '15" were presented in the "Strategy for Change" – a campaign manifesto published prior to the parliamentary elections of 2015 where, in exact accordance with Baar's formula, there was a combination of opposition to the ruling parties, with an offer of how to fix the political *status quo*. The leitmotiv of the whole campaign and the manifesto was a "change of the system" as well as "transferring the state to the citizens, and away from the hands of the (political) party clans" (Kukiz, 2015). This group often used the postulate during the campaign, of introducing a single-member constituency system, which was presented as a means of healing the politician-voter relationship in Poland. This solution, would supposedly guarantee the personal respon-

sibility of a member of parliament regarding his electorate, and thereby enable a change of the elite, and end a system where the same people always maintained political power. Thanks to a single-member constituency, the "party-ocracy" was also to have ended – that is the loyalty of the "mediocre, passive, but faithful" members of parliament, first of all to their own party bosses (and not their electorate). The leader of "Kukiz '15" also attacked the mainstream media, which he accused of bias and politicizing. He treated the media as an essential component of the system, which needed to be changed. He declared war against the "foreign mass media" declaring that it was necessary to fight against monopolies and foreign capital on the media market. The critical coverage given by the mass media to him and his party were later deemed by Kukiz to be "good indications". Public appearances by members of the "Kukiz '15" party, were dominated by a rhetoric of outrage against the system, the party elites, and the mass media. The narrative of "we the citizens" was also employed. After the elections the leader of "Kukiz '15" declared that his party had achieved success despite the opposition of the political elites and the mainstream media – the citizens won, not the state/institutions.

Types of Links Between Parties and Voters (*Linkage*)

The third condition necessary and essential when speaking about political populism, is according to Baar, a specific manner of relationship between political parties and the voters/citizens. Baar stresses this fact, with regards to the means though which this (bilateral) contact is established and maintained between these two entities. This relationship is characterized by an extensive authority which the voters have in giving instructions and seeing that they are carried out. Hence, the description of these links as being plebiscitary. On the other hand, it is the individual person who has been elected (not the party) and it is he who bears the responsibility of realizing the sovereign will (of the people). In this system, where these electoral links dominate, one may detect a return to Rousseau's view, where any kind of blurring of responsibility or institutionalized mediation leads to inefficiency in politics. The tools of direct democracy as a means, thanks to which, this relationship is to be established, are to be a panacea for the lack of efficacy of the policies conducted by political parties, and other powerful interest groups (Baar, 2009, pp. 35–36).

In this light, the example of "Samoobrona" could be treated as border-line. This is because in relations with its electorate, this party maintained an equilibrium between establishing direct contact and responsibility of its political leaders with its electorate, and clientelism (also described by Baar as being an alternative form of linkage). Not having any representation in parliament (before 2001 and after 2007), Lepper intensified his direct links with the electorate. He organized and took active part in agrarian protests, including instances of mob rule and confrontations with the police. He realized a strategy of "being close to the people" especially during election campaigns, which were marked with frequent meetings with farmers during local holidays in public places. On the other hand, at the height of its popularity, "Samoobrona" rarely organized electoral meetings (Kasprowicz, Cholova, 2008). Although Lepper criticized the political class, he never proposed a distinct strengthening of voters in relation to political institutions. "Samoobrona" supported state interventionism and opted for a reinforcement of public institutions with the goal of protecting civil rights and guaranteeing a subsistence level income. The means to establish this party-voter relationship took on a dysfunctional form, had a clientelistic attribute (patron-client), and eventually transgressed the law. The party leaders were accused and convicted of such practices as literally buying votes, or selling sinecures (the affair of being on the candidate list to the European Parliament, or the real estate affair which led to the "PiS", "LPR", "Samoobrona" coalition's fall in 2006).

The "Kukiz '15" movement in turn, takes advantage of, or postulates the use of, the plebiscite model of solutions. A superb example of this, was the drawing up of the electoral register (list of candidates) for the 2015 parliamentary elections, where anyone interested could apply, or register as a committee of voters (not as a party or party coalition). This strategy was continued after an electoral success (in the 2015 parliamentary election, "Kukiz '15" won third place with 8.81% of the votes, which resulted in its being awarded 42 members of parliament). The leader (Kukiz) consistently refused to register the group as a political party – rather it is organized as a parliamentary club or a network of associations ("The Association for a New Constitution „Kukiz '15", the "Endecja" ("National Democracy") Association"). As far as solutions for the political system, the standard slogans of "Kukiz '15" were the introduction of a single-member constituency for parliamentary elections, increasing the powers of the presidency, as well as

doing away with any minimal voter turnout, to ensure the validity of referendums.

An important tool in the politician-voter relationship is taking advantage of the means of communication. As was mentioned, "Samoobrona" a decade ago, was based on the mobilization of an electorate with the help of direct communication, organizing protest actions and marches, which illustrated and lent credibility to a war being waged by an outsider, against the political system. In the instance of "Kukiz '15", this mobilization of the electorate took place above all with the assistance of quasi-direct communication. In 2014 and 2015 a turning point was reached in Poland, regarding the direction in which political campaigns were to be conducted, thanks to such tools as the Internet and social media. Facebook, Youtube, and Twitter were employed for the first time on a massive scale, in electoral communications.

Facebook was Paweł Kukiz's trump card in the presidential campaign, and the principal means by which this musician communicated with his electorate. This was initially imposed by a small campaign budget, but it passed the test and helped increase his popularity. His official account on Twitter during the presidential campaign, which was quite successful, was "@prezydentKukiz". For the parliamentary campaign, the Twitter account was coordinated with two official pages of the movement on Facebook: "Kukiz '15" and "Posłowie Kukiz '15" ("Members of Parliament Kukiz '15"). These profiles became exceedingly popular due to the language of communication used on them, employed by representatives of the organization (entries and comments – which often didn't fit the standard political rhetoric, due to their incisive style and manner of expression) as well as the "interaction" with the electorate – an "open" profile for internauts, which became popular above all, thanks to changes in the commentary among Internet users themselves. Internauts became radicalized by the anti-system postulates of the movement, and by the style and language employed by the "Kukiz '15" campaign. This course of events only fortified the slogan, "put matters back in the citizens' hands" and evoked a type of plebiscite in Internet communication. There was content on the "Kukiz '15" profile, for which the group did not take any responsibility (the concept of opportunistic witnesses – L. Hagen) but at the same time this content could be used in the campaign. Such a solution provides enormous possibilities for manipulating content, radicalizing opinion, and characterizing the message.

Conclusions

Baar's analytic framework (the linking of three elements), permits the distinguishing of populist groups against the background of other groups (demagogic, protest) and their analysis. At the same time, the Polish example indicates an evolution of populism, especially in the direction of plebiscite-postulates, and proving that several changes should be introduced. Above all, populism should not be viewed as a political party, but rather as a hybrid, linking various organizational forms for obtaining political goals. It is also relevant, to distinguish a fourth analytical element, the means of communication, which literally changed from being direct to becoming quasi-direct (Internet) which expands plebiscite possibilities, and at the same time enables a greater manipulation of the message.

Bibliography

Barr R. (2009), *Populists, Outsiders and Anti-Establishment Politics*, "Party Politics", vol. 15 (1), pp. 29–48.

Canovan M. (1981), *Populism*, Harcourt Brace Javonovich, New York.

Canovan M. (1999), *Trust the People! Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy*, "Political Studies", vol. 47, pp. 2–16, doi: 10.1111/1467-9248.00184.

Cholova B., Kasprowicz D. (2010), *Fertile Ground for Populism? Populist Parties in Poland and Bulgaria: Tentative Framework*, Paper for the ECPR Graduate Conference, 31 August, Dublin.

Derlich S. (2010), *Populistów ethos zmanipulowany*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, Toruń.

Dutkiewicz M. (2013), *Populiści dobroczynności. Medialne informowanie o pomaganiu*, Instytut Spraw Publicznych, Warszawa.

Kasprowicz D. (2013), *Dwa oblicza populizmu*, Instytut Obywatelski, www.instytut-obywatelski.pl/14366.

MacRae D. (1969), *Populism as an ideology*, in: *Populism – its meaning and national characteristics*, eds. G. Lonescu, E. Gellner, Macmillan, London.

Markowski R. (ed.) (2004), *Populizm a demokracja*, Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN, Warszawa.

Mény Y., Surel Y. (eds.) (2002), *Democracies and the Populist Challenge*, Palgrave, New York.

Mudde C. (2004), *The Populist Zeitgeist*, "Government and Opposition", vol. 39 (4), pp. 541–563, doi: 10.1111/j.1477-7053.2004.00135.

Przyłęcki P. (2012), *Populizm w polskiej polityce. Analiza dyskursu polityki*, Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, Warszawa.

Stępińska A., Lipiński A., Hess A., Piontek D. (2017), *Poland. A Fourth Wave of Populism?*, in: *Populist Political Communication in Europe*, eds. T. Aalberg et al., Routledge, New York.

Szacki J. (2003), *Pytania o populizm*, “Krytyka polityczna”, vol. 4, pp. 28–34.

Taggart P. (2000), *Populism*, Open University Press, Buckingham PA.

Wysocka O. (2009), *Populism in Poland: In/visible exclusion*, in: *In/visibility: Perspectives on Inclusion and Exclusion*, ed. L. Freeman, Vienna: IWM Junior Visiting Fellows’ Conferences, vol. 26, Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen, Austria, http://www.iwm.at/publications/5-junior-visiting-fellows-conferences/vol-xxvi/populism-in-poland.

Wysocka O. (2008), *Populizm i Radio Maryja*, “Znak”, vol. 640 (9), pp. 61–69.

Populizm w Polsce – między demagogią i demofilią

Streszczenie

Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie ewolucji populizmu w Polsce przy użyciu dwóch przykładów partii politycznych: „Samoobrony” Andrzeja Leppera (była to partia populistyczna, która uzyskała największe poparcie w pierwszej dekadzie XXI wieku) oraz ruchu „Kukiz’15” – czarnego konia ostatnich wyborów parlamentarnych. Oba te ugrupowania znakomicie ilustrują demagogię charakterystyczną dla populizmu, związaną z afirmacją narodu, która z kolei nie byłaby możliwa bez anti-establishmentowej postawy przywódców politycznych i elektoratu. Porównanie tych dwóch przykładów umożliwiło nam monitorowanie przemian zachodzących w ugrupowaniach populistycznych w ciągu ostatnich kilku lat, zwłaszcza w czasach gdy Internet służy jako podstawowy środek komunikacji. W artykule zaprezentowano kolejno alternatywne konceptualizacje idei populizmu, a później – korzystając ze schematu N. Baara (2009) i danych drugorzędnych i podstawowych (dane uzyskane w internetowym poradniku wyborczym „Barometr Wyborczy”), oraz publikacji prasowych – zarysowano różnorodne powiązania występujące między obydwoma ugrupowaniami, co pozwoliło w rezultacie określić nowe, ciekawe cechy populizmu.

Słowa kluczowe: populizm, partie polityczne w Polsce, Polska