

YASUKO SHIBATA  
Graduate School for Social Research

## The Fantasmatic Stranger in Polish Nationalism: Critical Discourse Analysis of LPR's Homophobic Discourse

*Abstract:* The article presents how the discursive discrimination of homosexuals serves nationalism in the contemporary Polish society. Following a brief conceptual location of homophobia within the ideological movement of nationalism, the exemplar homophobic discourse of the Polish nationalists, i.e. that of the League of Polish Families (LPR), is examined through the interdisciplinary method of critical discourse analysis (CDA). In the theoretical part, the sexual minority is applied the status of the “stranger” discussed in cultural sociology; the nationalist is in turn conceptualized as a social-phenomenological actor, who perceives and categorizes the sexual “stranger” by using the knowledge circulating at the Schützean lifeworld. The CDA of the discriminatory discourse of LPR politicians, who represent such homophobic nationalists, attests that homosexuals are mobilized as the “fantasmatic” stranger in today's Poland.

*Keywords:* homophobia; stranger; nationalism; LPR; critical discourse analysis (CDA); the critique of fantasy.

### Introduction

Recent observations on hate-speech in Poland notably point out the “Jewish” status of sexual minorities<sup>1</sup> in the society. The public discussions on homosexuality, especially those which followed the billboard campaign of “Let Them See Us” in spring 2003 and the Kraków incident on May 7, 2004,<sup>2</sup> draws a consensus of gender studies/queer studies scholars (e.g. Warkocki 2004; Umińska-Keff 2006; Graff 2006, 2008) that in contrast with anti-Semitism, which is presently regarded as politically incorrect by Polish citizens, discrimination toward homosexuals is limited to a loose censure, and gays and lesbians are taking over the “Jewish” status in today's Polish society. Among studies on the discourse<sup>3</sup> of discrimination, Adam Ostolski, a sociologist and a politician of the Greens 2004 (Zieloni 2004), shows a similarity between the

---

<sup>1</sup> A sexual minority is a group of people having such sexual identities/orientations/practices that differ from the majority in society. It primarily refers to lesbians, gays, bisexual and transgender people, who are also grouped under the term LGBT.

<sup>2</sup> The 2003 campaign (“Niech nas zobaczą”), presenting Polish homosexual couples hand in hand on billboards, and the 2004 March of Tolerance (Marsz Tolerancji), a peaceful demonstration calling for understanding for LGBT people, were organized by the association of the Campaign Against Homophobia (KPH) and the participants were attacked with stones, eggs, bottles, and paint.

<sup>3</sup> Discourse is a language use incorporated in the social structure of the dominance/inequality of meaning (van Dijk 1998).

structure of the Polish anti-Semitic discourse in the 1930s and that of today's anti-gay and lesbian discourse.<sup>4</sup> By conducting a comparative analysis of the rhetoric utilized in today's national-Catholic daily *Nasz Dziennik* with such a pre-war daily as *Maty Dziennik*, the researcher validly endorses the observation on the threatened status of homosexuals in Polish society (Ostolski 2005a; also cf. 2005b).

The "Judaization" of sexual minorities in Polish society leads us to the following question: how do the figures of homosexuals, peculiarly allotted a "quasi-ethnic" position in society, currently function in Polish nationalism? This article suggests an answer by formulating a conceptual framework for homophobic nationalism and by providing an introductory analysis of typical discriminatory discourse based on Polish homophobic nationalism.

The concrete object of the analysis is the radical rightist League of Polish Families (LPR),<sup>5</sup> which has actively presented discriminatory utterances on sexual minorities since its establishment. During the Fifth Term Sejm (2005–2007), the party entered the coalition government with Law and Justice (PiS) and Samoobrona; LPR leader Roman Giertych<sup>6</sup> acquired the positions of Vice Premier and the Minister of National Education from May 2006 to August 2007. The interdisciplinary method of critical discourse analysis (CDA), especially the "discourse-historical approach" which is capable of catching social/historical contexts, serves the textual analysis of the political party's discourse discriminating against the nation's "other," i.e. the sociological "stranger."

The studies of CDA aim to politically unmask the unequal structure embedded in society and realized by its discourse. To achieve this purpose in the case of the Polish nationalist-homophobic discourse, it is necessary for the researcher to determine and disclose the foundation of the idea of the Polish nation, into which the negative image of the "stranger" is powerfully screwed. Ireneusz Krzemiński, in his research on Polish-Jewish relations and anti-Semitism, shows that the model of "Polishness," consisting of such Romantic-Messianic concepts as "suffering" and "honor," considerably applies to respondents and shows the widespread rootedness of Romanticism in relation to the "other/stranger" (Krzemiński 2002, 2004). The analysis of the discourse of LPR politicians thus requires not only the knowledge of its direct ideological father, i.e. the pre-war National Democracy, but also of the archetypal "other" created vis-à-vis the image of the Polish nation in the literary works of the nineteenth century. To

---

<sup>4</sup> The sociologist, avoiding the imprecision of the word homophobia (see fn. 7), uses the word "anti-gay and lesbian discourse" to concretize the target of discriminatory utterances (Ostolski 2005a, p. 156). Yet considering the practicality of the word, this article roughly adopts the term "homophobic discourse" to refer to such language.

<sup>5</sup> The League of Polish Families (*Liga Polskich Rodzin*; LPR) was established in April 2001 out of the agreement among, for example, the National Party (SN), the National Democratic Party (SND), the League of Family (*Liga Rodzin*) and the Warsaw Family (*Rodzina Warszawska*). The party regarded Roman Dmowski as the ideological father and was tied with the All-Polish Youth (MW; also see fn. 18), founded in 1922, which is known for anti-Semitism and re-emerged in 1989. Since its entrance into the coalition government in 2006, LPR declared a distance from Dmowski's anti-Semitism and cut its ties with MW.

<sup>6</sup> Roman Giertych is a son of MEP Maciej Giertych and a grandson of Jędrzej Giertych (1903–1992), who was a dedicated ally of Dmowski. Having reactivated MW in 1989, R. Giertych served as its chairman until 1993 (honorary chairman since 1994).

incorporate such mandated cultural contexts, I will further adopt the literary method of the “critique of fantasy” established by a distinguished historian of literature, Maria Janion. The analysis of the discursive process of the LPR will show that in today’s Polish nationalism, homosexuals are vulnerably mobilized as eternal “fantasmatic” strangers that “nationally” arrest the minds of the Polish citizens.

### **The “Stranger” for the Nation: A Theoretical Sketch of Homophobic Nationalism**

Homophobia basically signifies an irrational fear, aversion or discriminatory action directed toward sexual minorities.<sup>7</sup> The term was first publicly used by clinical psychologist George Weinberg in 1965 and popularized through his book *Society and the Healthy Homosexual* published in 1971. The American Psychiatric Association voted to remove the entry of homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders in 1973, which later led to a similar decision by the World Health Organization in 1990. Homophobia, reflecting the disapproval of homosexuality, in turn has become the object of psychoanalysis though being not specially regarded as a disorder.<sup>8</sup> Scientific and institutional approval of homosexuality has not persuaded people to rationalize the falsely diffused common knowledge about different sexual orientations; a peculiar psychological symptom of homophobia outwardly or tacitly lingers in many societies. Sociological and psychological empirical studies on the identities of sexual minorities show that homosexuals themselves are not free from the homophobic state of mind.<sup>9</sup> The self-denial of the people who have different sexual orientations than the social majority’s attests to the entrapping work of the societal norm on sexualities.

Curiously resonating with the latest tendencies of the “Judaization” of LGBT people in Polish society, homosexuals had long been together categorized with Jewish people as the “other” in European societies (cf. Boswell 1981; Mosse 1985; Mayer 1975/2005). The notion of the “other” is discussed in sociology as the “stranger” and has been primarily treated as the “non-member” of a community. The archetypal stranger for Georg Simmel (1908/1964) is the medieval European Jewry, who were occupied with intermediary finance and trade and were being both “near and remote” from the community. Though widely engaging in communication with inhabitants and closely involved with their daily lives, Jews as the strangers could not formulate organic and kinship relationships within the community. This distance of the stranger from the community is explained by Alfred Schütz from the perspective of knowledge. The ready-made standardized “cultural pattern” of the community firstly offers an

---

<sup>7</sup> Due to the etymology of the term singularly coming from “fear” (phobia), researchers suggest such alternative words as heterosexism (the uniform assumption that all individuals are heterosexuals), heteronegativity (the disapproval of homosexuality not simply because of fear), heteronormativity (the presence of Lacanian “law” stipulating heterosexuality), or broadly sexual prejudice (negative attitudes based on sexual orientation). Confer, for example, Adam 2002; Herek 2004.

<sup>8</sup> The progress of the psychoanalysis on homophobia is introduced by, for example, E. Young-Bruehl 1996; J. Ryan 2001.

<sup>9</sup> For the Polish case, see such works as Kochanowski, 2004; Bojarska-Nowaczyk 2006.

individual a sufficient coherence of knowledge for life; this inner-circulating knowledge is the necessary “recipe” for interpreting the social world (Schütz 1944/1976a, p. 95). The stranger is the one, who does not belong to this “community of knowledge.” By not sharing the knowledge/worldview of a closed hermeneutic community, the stranger experiences exclusion when attempting to enter the community.

Let us locate this sociological stranger in the ideological movement of nationalism. Nationalism, which aims at establishing and maintaining the unity, identity and authenticity of a particular human population called a nation (Smith 2003, pp. 24–25), is a daily enterprise of social actors of imposing fixed illusions about a nation on a certain population. Nationalists represent such actors. A nation, being an “imagined and bounded political entity” (Anderson 1991, p. 6), itself persists through a series of direct and indirect communications. The term “imagined” does not imply the falsity of the nation but instead it emphasizes such an aspect that different nations present different ways of people’s imagination (*ibid.*, p. 20); thus it signifies the creative character of the imagining process and of the style of its development and maintenance (Janion 2006b, pp. 261–262). The people who are supposed to belong to the same nation primarily recognize that they commonly hold a set of beliefs, loyalty and a sense of solidarity for the nation (Gellner 1983, p. 12). Every nation is a specific “community of communication,” which is based on people’s multiple kinds of cultural experiences in everyday life (Kłoskowska 2001, p. 77).

Crucially, such nations and national cultures are not monolithic; the nation exists and changes as people differently keep engaging in acts of imagination and communication. However, nationalists, desiring authenticity and unity of their vision about a nation, occupy themselves with a peculiar type of communication. Let us give the nationalists, whose inhuman status is often taken for granted in nation/nationalism studies, the status of social-phenomenological individuals, who perceive the world and engage in communication with other people. Upon encountering people in society, nationalists unquestioningly sort the people into “general types” (cf. Schütz 1944/1976a, p. 96). To make sense of the situation, they resort to a “schema,” which consists of insights, beliefs and instructions and shows an effective way of digesting experiences (cf. Schütz 1955/1976b, p. 237). The schema is socially transmitted to the individuals “for the attainment of typical results by the typical application of typical means” (Schütz 1975, p. 120). In other words, the nationalists’ communication is a process of solving “problems” through the circular application of the schema lying in the Schützean lifeworld.

The “stranger” encountered by nationalists remains to be a “non-member” as well as a necessary antagonistic element of their singularly envisioned community of the nation. The classical theorists on the concept of the stranger, Simmel and Schütz, are currently regarded by many sociologists as irrelevant; the stranger is discussed rather as a contingent “event” that has no past or future (Bauman 2000; Rundell 2004) or as the “indifferent ones,” i.e. the persons being neither friend nor enemy to society (Stichweh, 1997, pp. 5–8). It is we who are strangers and who are noticed for our “otherness” upon encountering the “other” (Kristeva 1988/1991; Waldenfels 1997/2002). Yet according to the cognitive capacity of nationalists, the stranger is an

“unknown” person and a “problem” to be categorized. The stranger for nationalists is entrapped in the social-phenomenological lifeworld, which differs from the richer and rational-dialogic lifeworld stipulated by Jürgen Habermas.<sup>10</sup> The Schützean parochial stranger that should be avoided as a sociological framework for the “other” (Ålund 1995) ironically best applies to nationalists. When facing such a figure, the nationalists conclusively exercise the fixed schema and try to “solve” the other/stranger, which in turn serves the masking of the ideological faultiness (cf. Žižek 1989/1999, pp. 126–127) of nationalism.

Nationalists’ homophobia signifies the monolithic application of the societal schema of the stranger to sexual minorities. Homosexuals, who have different sexual identities, orientations and practices from that of heterosexuals, are the “type” for the unquestioning societal exclusion; they are incorporated into the nationalists’ vision of the nation needing to cover up the incoherence of their desired national unity. Thus, in nationalism, homosexuals gain the status of a quasi-ethnic group and are applied ethnic/racial terminology having been used as the Schützean schema in society.<sup>11</sup> Nationalists’ social-phenomenological experience of the stranger is crystallized as homophobic nationalism, which deprives homosexuals of their due rights and denies their existence as the nation’s constituents.

### **Social and Cultural-Historical Contexts of the Nationalist-Homophobic Discourse in Poland**

Critical discourse analysis (CDA), which consists of interdisciplinary linguistic studies on the relationships among language, power and society, is one of the growing academic initiatives that deal with discrimination against sexual minorities. By sharing the ideal with critical theorists, the purpose of the CDA researchers is to examine injustice and inequality in society and to “change” the established social structure of dominance by means of the production of language that unmasks such a structure. CDA’s primary field of interest lies in racist discourse (e.g. van Dijk 1987, 1993; Wodak & van Dijk 2000; Reisigl & Wodak 2001), while homophobic discourse has fewer entries than the studies on race/nation/ethnicity-based discrimination. When observing this tendency within CDA studies, Donna Lillian, a linguist specializing in the analysis of Canadian radical rightist discourse, draws on Barbara Smith’s remark that homophobia is a type of discrimination that is last tackled by social movements and that the physical and verbal attacks on homosexuals are often left to the critical moment (Smith, 1993, p. 99; cited in Lillian 2005, p. 138). Homophobic discourse is thus given lower priority than racist and sexist discourse, yet CDA researchers have

<sup>10</sup> Habermas regards the lifeworld of Schütz as ineptly limited to the cultural sphere. According to the critical theorist, Schütz’s emphasis on the lifeworld’s pervasiveness forces the individual to stay idle in the circle of cultural meanings. Yet people communicate with each other not simply to be “tested” on their knowledge of culture stocked in the lifeworld (Habermas 1981/1987, pp. 138–139). The “questioning” of the lifeworld is the basis of rational communicative action.

<sup>11</sup> The abusive use of the concept of race/nation/ethnicity in the context of gender is discussed by, for example, Yuval-Davis 1997; Brubaker 2004.

started to examine one of the most obstinate kinds of discriminatory discourse widely spread in societies (e.g. Gouveia 2005; Lillian 2001, 2005).

The analysis of the discourse based on homophobic nationalism, which was clarified in the former section, requires substantial insight into the social-historical and cultural contexts of the discourse. Among CDA studies, the discourse-historical approach of Ruth Wodak, as shown in her in-depth research on contemporary Austrian anti-Semitic discourse, efficiently incorporates necessary social-historical contexts for understanding the discriminatory discourse and serves the analysis of homophobic discourse.<sup>12</sup> When further considering the idea of Anthony D. Smith that nationalism utilizes the “sacred resources” of the nation lying in the deeper strata of a community (Smith 2003, p. 31), it is reasonable to say that the homophobic discourse of nationalists especially requires an examination of the cultural contexts being such a sacred legacy. Following Wodak’s approach and implementing it with a method of literary analysis, the “critique of fantasy” (Janion 2001, 2006a), social contexts as well as cultural and historical contexts of the Polish homophobic-nationalistic discourse will be introduced below.

Today most Polish citizens are affected by the homophobic state of mind. The pathological image of sexual minorities prevails in the society; their orientation is treated as a sickness, deviation and handicap. The causes driving one to homosexuality are critically and unfavorably studied by psychologists and sexologists, joined by the mighty Roman Catholic hierarchy, which denies the orientation as a disorder. Compared with the standard of the European Union, homosexuals are completely marginalized in Poland and mostly live under considerable societal pressure. In contrast to the data that on average 41 percent of EU citizens accept same-sex marriage, a recent representative survey shows that merely 18 percent of the Polish respondents give positive answers regarding this issue; as much as 66 percent of the respondents do not believe that homosexuals have the right to public demonstration, not mentioning the right to adopt children, of which 90 percent of the Poles disapprove.<sup>13</sup> Other non-representative surveys conducted in recent years show that about 10 to 20 percent of the LGBT respondents each year experience physical violence, while from around 30 to 50 percent of them have been psychologically attacked in many spheres of their life—at work, school, at their place of residence and in public spaces including city transport and administrative offices.<sup>14</sup> The spreading homophobia of Polish society

---

<sup>12</sup> I refer to Wodak 2001; Reisigl & Wodak 2001. The application of Wodak’s approach to the LPR discourse has been successfully conducted by Kurczewska et al. 2005. For another possibility of CDA for analyzing homophobic discourse, confer, for example, Balejko, 2007. The scholar of queer studies introduces the method of Siegfried Jäger to the analysis of the discourse; Wodak acknowledges the contribution of Jäger in incorporating social/political/historical contexts for the discriminatory discourse analysis (Reisigl & Wodak 2001, p. 31).

<sup>13</sup> The data of EU citizens are taken from Eurobarometer 2006/2007; the survey on Poland was conducted by CBOS May 10–12, 2008, both cited from P. Pacewicz, “Polacy—dzieci Giertycha” [“Poles—the Children of Giertych”], *Gazeta Wyborcza*, June 7, 2008. The article’s author, the deputy editor-in-chief of the daily *Gazeta Wyborcza*, received such LGBT awards as Tolerance 2007 and Hyacinth (in 2008) for his works criticizing the Polish authority’s homophobia.

<sup>14</sup> See the surveys carried out by the initiative of Lambda Warsaw and KPH (e.g. Kliszczyński & Dudała, 2002; Kliszczyński & Kasiorek 2003; Abramowicz 2007). Due to the necessity of anonymity, the surveys

could be an interesting object of psychoanalysis; the phenomenon encroaching human rights and dignity calls for further effective initiatives for social change.

The development of the LGBT movement in Poland parallels with the politicization of intolerance toward sexual minorities since 1989. Joanna Mizielińska, a scholar of gender studies, draws on the notion of “moral panic” introduced by Gayle Rubin (1993) as well as a similar term of “sexual panic” suggested by Denis Altman (2001) to explain the outburst of Poles’ homophobia following the changes in the value system. During the period of social transformation, the fall of morality has appeared to be the object of political discourse to cover up the actual reason for the unrest; sexuality becomes the target of politicization to cause sexual panic among citizens. The sexual panic in Poland appeared in such a form that outrightly denied sexual minorities their right to self-definition; in the aim of “defending” the traditional values, the possibility of legalizing homosexual couples was ousted during the parliamentary debates on the 18<sup>th</sup> article of the constitution imposing heterosexual marriage (Mizielińska 2004, pp. 117–118). Alongside the social transformation and the panic, different activities supporting sexual minorities developed in post-communist Poland.<sup>15</sup> Various initiatives of LGBT organizations after the turn of the century, e.g. the Days for Equality and Warsaw Equality Parade that have taken place since 2001, the “Let Them See Us” campaign in different cities in 2003,<sup>16</sup> the Culture for Tolerance Festival in Kraków as well as the Days for Equality and Tolerance in Poznań, with their final marches through the city streets since 2004, came to challenge the Poles to make contact with the crucial “strangers” in society. When observing the tumultuous March of Tolerance in Kraków in May 2004, Anna Gruszczyńska, a philologist and activist of KPH since the association’s formation, stated that the initiative offered the Poles chance for a “double coming-out,” i.e. it allowed not only homosexuals but also homophobes to disclose themselves (Gruszczyńska 2004, p. 140). The activities of the LGBT organizations, paralleled with the country’s unrest accompanying EU accession, thus gave the society a momentum for facing the “otherness” of sexual minorities as well as of themselves.

Among political parties which had mandated seats in the Sejm/local governments and exhibited aversion to sexual minorities, the actions taken by the politicians of the ultra national-Catholic LPR stood out from 2001 to 2007. For LPR, which aims at building a strong community based on the “system of arbitrary political and social

---

are not representative; most respondents live in major cities. For the latest available *Raport 2005–2006*, besides the face-to-face method, the questionnaire was posted on gay portals; about three-fourths of the data was collected electronically.

<sup>15</sup> The threshold goes back to the underground meeting of Warsaw homosexuals in the latter half of the 1980s; the formation of the Lambda group in 1990 and its collapse in the following years, the refreshed registration of Lambda Warsaw in 1997 as well as the establishment of KPH in 2000 deserve minimum note as the movement’s development. Generally speaking, while Lambda Warsaw has an inner-supportive character, KPH tries to reach the social audience. Confer Krzemiński 2006.

<sup>16</sup> The billboards were publicly presented in Warsaw and Kraków each for a week; while the exhibition of 30 photographs of gay and lesbian couples also traveled to Wrocław, Gdańsk and Sosnowiec. See: [www.niechnaszobacza.queers.pl](http://www.niechnaszobacza.queers.pl).

exclusions” (Kurczewska 2005, p. 343),<sup>17</sup> homosexuals have been the principal target of such exclusion. Against the LGBT social initiatives mentioned above, the party’s MPs and city councilors constantly showed images of protests in the public media. They obstructed the billboard campaign, marches and parades through political pressure (e.g. on the Kraków mayor, advertising agent and the minister of internal affairs) and by the decisions made at local governments; and they vigorously organized counter-manifestations with their youth-appendage, the All-Polish Youth (MW).<sup>18</sup> Since 1994, when the European Parliament accepted a Recommendation that Member States and candidate countries acknowledge the rights of homosexual persons and couples, the European Union has been encouraging Poland to adopt its standard. The LPR’s worldview countering against such a push by the EU would be here visually provided by the apt description of Paweł Leszkowicz, an art historian and critic.<sup>19</sup> On the verge of Poland’s accession, the devoted EU antagonist LPR generated an illustration which juxtaposes a tidy gay couple ruling a boy, i.e. the European norm, with a humble family supportively consisting of men-women-boy, i.e. the Polish norm (Leszkowicz 2004, p. 92). The homosexuals are the strangers belonging to the “other world”; the crucial presence of homosexuals as the other/stranger for the party thus testifies its exemplarity as the actor of the homophobic nationalism conceptualized earlier. Cooperating with Law and Justice (PiS) and ultimately entering the eccentric coalition government of the “Fourth Republic” in May 2006, LPR became a principal cause for drawing a warning resolution of the Council of Europe, which called for the country’s resignation from racism and homophobia.

The analysis of the cultural-historical contexts of the Polish discourse on the “stranger” primarily requires consultation with the deeper resources of the Polish nation. The ideological legacy of National Democracy in LPR is undoubted; the knowledge on the pre-war anti-Semitic *Endecja* would at first sight seem to serve as the sufficient context of the nationalist party’s homophobic discourse. Yet one would start to ponder the suggestion of Stefan Zgliczyński, the director of the Polish edition of *Le Monde diplomatique*, regarding the continuity of an aspect of Polish Romanticism in the ideology of National Democracy. The publicist draws a paragraph from Roman Dmowski’s *Thoughts of a Modern Pole* (1903) and asserts that the ideologist’s aspiration for leading other nations is the legacy of the Romantic Messianism (Zgliczyński 2008, pp. 96–97). An observation of Brian A. Porter at the University of Michigan clarifies this point in another way. The historian of political thought, though acknowledging a great difference, articulates the similarity of National Democracy and Polish Romanticists. As the nineteenth-century poets created various kinds of

---

<sup>17</sup> For the validation of “sacred” Polishness through the exclusion of “Jews” conducted by marginal radical nationalist groupings in 1990s, see the studies of Kurczewska 1999, 2002.

<sup>18</sup> The All-Polish Youth (*Młodzież Wszechpolska*; MW), a social-educational organization consisting of young Poles, dates back to the pre-war youth circles under the same name discriminating against Jewish students and citizens in the 1920s–30s. MW was reactivated by Roman Giertych on December 2, 1989 at Collegium Novum of Poznań University.

<sup>19</sup> Also confer his study with that of Tomek Kitliński, a philosopher and a historian of culture, on the “heterocracy” imbued in Polish culture and its interrelation with contemporary art and politics (Leszkowicz & Kitliński 2005).



imageries of the Polish nation, the ideologists of *Endecja* simply “imagined” the body of the Polish “nation,” not concretizing the exact feature of the state (Porter, 1992, pp. 648–649). The nation was the entity that was subject to the unclear work of “imagining,” which the ideologists of *Endecja* theoretically disliked (cf. Porter 2002). The National-Democratic imagining of the nation was notoriously based on the hatred towards and exclusion of the ethnic “stranger,” i.e. the Jews. It can be the ironic continuation of the imagining politics of the Messianic Romanticists; the ideology of *Endecja* justifies its obscure notion of the nation by galvanizing the hateful version of the stranger, which was quasi-mythically embedded in the works of Polish Romanticism. In other words, the imagined “fantasy” about the Polish nation and its stranger, appearing in National Democracy, and moreover in its contemporary heir, could be likened to the Romanticist period.

“Fantasy,” which was originally applied in psychoanalysis, is loosely defined as various kinds of imaginations, pictures, emotional themes, mystification, hallucinations, dreams and illusions. It draws features from both myths and stereotypes and haunts our consciousness (Janion 1996/2006a, p. 6). One of the crucial features of fantasy is that although it does not exist in real society, it traps our perceptions in a closed shell. Fantasy turns out to be a kitsch stereotype (Janion 2001, p. 180); it functions to schematically categorize real people into the images of heroes, heroines, or “Jews.” Such a character of fantasy notably serves ideology to fill the “empty space of fundamental impossibility,” i.e. as a necessary element which accounts for the ideology’s failure to achieve a harmonic/organic society free from antagonistic divisions (Žižek 1989/1999, pp. 126–127). The ideological fantasy, usually taking the form of the “other” or the “stranger,” thus works to evoke the categorized “us” and “them” in the receivers of the ideology.

The Romanticism in Poland saw the flowering of the imageries of the Polish nation. At the same time, the Polish Romanticism was the occasion of the “great discovering of otherness”; differing sorts of “uncanny” (*unheimlich*) imageries, i.e. the fantasies of the “other,” had been explored (Janion, 2004, pp. 10–19). The ethnically eccentric (e.g. Jews), the sexually or mentally different (e.g. women, the insane), or both of these, were vividly depicted by poets and writers. Juxtaposed with the imageries of the nation often represented by heroes, the fantasies of the uncanny “other/stranger” vis-à-vis the Polish nation were launched as the reflecting mirrors of the Polishness and national cultures. These fantasies are the deep cultural resources of the Polish nation, which need to be taken into account when analyzing the contemporary discriminatory discourse on the “stranger.” There are multiple entries of the “strangers” in Romanticism;<sup>20</sup> yet the characteristic set of ideological (i.e. negative) fantasy primarily appears in *The Un-Divine Comedy* (1835) of Zygmunt Krasiński.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> The most famous positive image is the figure of Jankiel in Adam Mickiewicz’s (1798–1855) *Pan Tadeusz* (1834) reflecting the poet’s political idea that Jews are the Messianic co-operators for changing the nation’s deadlocked situation. For Polish Messianic thoughts, confer Walicki 1994, 2006; for the figure of Jews, see Janion, 2000, 2009; Segel, 1996.

<sup>21</sup> Zygmunt Krasiński (1812–1859) represents a conservative current of the Polish Romanticists; *The Un-Divine Comedy*, which is worthy of being called a European masterpiece, offers a specific imagery of the

The main fantasies used in this “contaminated” masterpiece are: (1) the Converts being masked as Christians; (2) the Talmud as the Jews’ manual of hatred toward Christians; (3) deicide; (4) blood desired by Jews; and (5) the conspiracy of the Converts (Janion, 2009).<sup>22</sup> By melding the fantasmatic pictures of Jews embedded in Polish and European culture, Krasieński presented the suffering of the honorable and homogenous Polish nation of the nobility and the destruction of the Polish nation intended by the Converts being the insidious “other/stranger.” Some of these fantasies are incorporated in LPR politicians’ discriminatory utterances towards sexual minorities.

### Basic Procedure for Textual Analysis

Before moving on to the analysis of LPR’s discourse, the materials and analytical procedure should be briefly clarified. This article aims at an exemplary demonstration of textual analyses rather than a hasty skimming of available data; the criterion for choosing the empirical materials was the “typicality” of the texts as agreed in CDA studies (Meyer 2001, p. 18). The main texts selected to be presented here are as follows: (1) Wojciech Wierzejski,<sup>23</sup> “Going to War for the Polish Family (*Idziemy na wojnę o polską rodzinę*)” (*Mysł Polska*, August 28, 2005); (2) W. Wierzejski, “One Must Not Be a Liberal (*Nie można być liberałem*)” (*Racja Polska*, September 2006); and (3) The speech of Roman Giertych at the European education ministers’ gathering in Heidelberg (March 1, 2007). Other texts comprising the stock of data are also referred to (mainly as footnotes) whenever it is necessary. The analytical results of the texts will be presented in this order and will satisfactorily convey certain dynamics of the LPR discourse from the electoral campaign in 2005 to the party’s acquisition of power after 2006.

The analysis of these materials is based on the following methods of Ruth Wodak: (1) discourse topics/subtopics and (2) self- and other-presentation analyses, the latter of which further consists of a) reference/nomination analysis, and b) the argumentation analysis, i.e. the use of *topoi*.<sup>24</sup> The analysis of a certain text firstly begins with the clarification of discourse topics/subtopics that summarize ideas underlining the meanings of each portion of sentences. Discourse topics are the most “important” or “summarizing” ideas that present the meaning of sequences of sentences/passages (van Dijk 1984, p. 56). As it is also called an “investigation of thematic areas,” discourse

---

Polish nation, based on the sovereign nobility who protect the old values/virtues from the revolutionaries steered by Jewry and ultimately die to gain God’s Providence.

<sup>22</sup> For the foundation of the drama’s anti-Semitic concepts, also see Burdziej 2001.

<sup>23</sup> Wojciech Wierzejski, the former MEP, MP and the right hand of Roman Giertych, has belonged to MW since 1993 and was its chairman in 1999–2000. He has been an avid participant of the consecutive protests against LGBT marches/parades and known for harsh discriminatory remarks against homosexuals. Wierzejski resigned from LPR after the party’s loss in October 2007. He is currently the editor-in chief of the monthly *Narodowa Polityka* [*National Politics*].

<sup>24</sup> Confer Wodak 2001 as well as Reisigl & Wodak 2001, pp. 46–54. For the reference/nomination analysis, Wodak develops her method on that elaborated by Theo van Leeuwen, 1995, 1996.

topic analysis serves the examination of covered themes as well as of the text's structure and comprises a good entry into the texts of discourse. After discourse topics are defined, the analysis of self- and other-presentation strategies follows; the representation of social actors in discourse is examined here. Referential/nomination tactics, i.e. linguistic reference/labeling as well as activation/passivization of persons and social groups, and the foregrounding/backgrounding strategy, i.e. the highlighting method of inclusion or exclusion of persons/groups in the text,<sup>25</sup> comprise the primary objects of the analysis. Such strategies as personalization, pathologization, impersonalization and criminalization, the use of biological/naturalizing metaphors and metonymies are examples of referential/nomination methods that represent social actors.

The self- and other-presentation analysis of Wodak can be fortified by the analysis of ideological fantasies. At the referential/nomination stages of textual analysis, the above introduced literary method of the critique of fantasy can be incorporated. When examining the linguistic description of stereotypical and evaluative traits/qualities/features of social actors in texts, the application of the positive (national) images and negative (strange) images, appearing in the works of Polish Romanticism, can be effectively discerned. By adopting the method of literary studies, the analysis attains fuller reflection of cultural contexts in the construction of in-groups and out-groups.

The following step examining the self/other presentation is the analysis of argumentation strategies. The aim of this step is to examine how the positive and negative attributions of persons/social groups, i.e. the inclusion/exclusion and discrimination/preference of the persons and groups, are being justified in the analyzed texts. The usage of *topoi*, i.e. "rules of conclusions," is especially examined. *Topoi* function to connect arguments with claims/conclusions; each *topos* justifies the transition from arguments to conclusion (cf. Reisigl & Wodak 2001, p. 74). The analysis of *topoi* thus unfolds the core mechanism of legitimating the discrimination of the "fantasmaticized," or if not, categorized persons/groups. By examining how the positive evaluation of the in-groups and the negative depreciation of the out-groups are justified and by exposing them to the public in the form of language, the deceiving and irrational discrimination of the "other/stranger" can be politically countered to change the discourse.

### **The Defense from the Destroyer of the Polish Nation = Polish Family**

The interview with the then European MP Wojciech Wierzejski, which was held during the 2005 electoral campaign and appeared in the party-affiliated weekly *Mysł Polska* under the title of "Going to War for the Polish Family," is a good entrance to LPR's homophobic discourse.<sup>26</sup> The discourse topic analysis shows the following core elements of the text: the need for a "war" promoting families, the rising power of homosexuals in Europe, the need for "positive discrimination" of homosexuals in Poland, and

<sup>25</sup> For the strategy of foregrounding and backgrounding, see especially van Leeuwen, 1996.

<sup>26</sup> This and other texts of Wierzejski are translated from Polish into English by the author.

LPR's pro-family/pro-natalist policies. Such a configuration of the text indicates that the speaker presents homosexuals as an imminent threat to the family and that he juxtaposes the sexual minority with the party's pro-family tax/housing/education policies that should contribute to reversing the declining birthrate in Poland. The contrasting structure emphasizes the "toxicity" of the sexual minority and the effectiveness of LPR's pro-natalist policies, which are based on the discrimination of the social group.

The self- and other-presentation analysis then shows the referential strategy dominating in the text: the pathologization of sexual minorities. The in-group nominations, i.e. "family," "Poles," "Catholics" and the "national grouping" (i.e. LPR), were altogether put on equal levels and activated throughout the text, showing the offensive posture of LPR's "Poles." In reference to the sexual minority, the pathologonym "deviants (*dewianci*)" or "perverts (*zбочeńcy*)" is constantly used. Homosexuality is clearly defined as a pathology harming Poles = family, while the person of each homosexual is reduced to none. It is primarily suggested that homosexuals are the cause of the allegedly worsened status of the Polish family.<sup>27</sup> The metaphor of "war" expands the "family" to a nationalized unit and makes homosexuals the "enemies" of the Polish nation. A crucial point in this text is that not only homosexuals, but also people of liberal political orientation were "fantasmatically" categorized as a social group, i.e. the "stranger," who secretly *intends* to destroy the "family" = the Polish nation. For instance, referring to Spain, where the homosexual relationship has been legalized, Wierzejski says: "We cannot leave it so that it would be similar in Poland, and this is why as a national grouping, already earlier, we have warned you of the possibility of legalizing this pathology by specific liberal circles." In other words, the "liberal circles" will realize (or have realized) their plan of legalizing the "pathology" that destroys the Polish nation. It is insinuated that people of liberal orientation are like the fantasmatic "masked" Converts, who are *secretly but deliberately* plotting the sexual anti-Polish/anti-family conspiracy, and that they are therefore the anti-Pole strangers.

For the justification of the exclusion of the "fantasmaticized" homosexuals and liberals, the *topoi* of definition, of danger and threat as well as of responsibility are used in the text. The exclusion of homosexuals defined as pathologic "deviants" is firstly justified by the *topos* of definition, or just because they are deviants. The *topos* of danger is then used: the "deviants," together with "liberal circles," are plotting the dissemination of pathology and anti-family legalization of homosexual relationships. To further the argumentation, let us examine the following fragment of the text:

Severe public opinion is the foundation of a healthy state and enables us to keep all pathologies still in the bud. Our duty as Poles and Catholics is the realization of the social teaching of the Church in every field. Let's not draw aside from the obligation, let's talk straight: war against the deviants, peace to the family!

<sup>27</sup> In an appeal to local governments for the prohibition of rallies of homosexuals, Wierzejski similarly describes that there are "forces that attack our State, constitutional order, being in force in the Republic, the rights of the family to healthy development and the right of the young generation to the life without permanent public offense." Homosexuals and their supporters are the offenders of the Polish family; thus the "public authority must respect" the 18<sup>th</sup> article of the Polish Constitution stipulating heterosexual marriage, and "ceaselessly guard society's rights to life free from homosexual manifestations, giving offense and hurting family" ("Apel w sprawie wieców homoseksualistów" November 25, 2005).

When it comes to the deviants, the best way to counteract them is, besides societal pressure, the positive pro-family program, which the state should realize. I here have in mind the pro-family politics, which is still lacking in Poland. LPR after the acquisition of power will make such a program come into force. Some circles regard it as the discrimination of “those who love differently” and they are not really wrong, since our program is positive discrimination. We want to promote pro-family attitudes, and where possible, to combat what is opposed to the norm.

Wierzejski suggests that the “pathologies,” i.e. homosexual relationships, need to be nipped while they are “still in the bud.” The LPR politician, in a National-Democratic way, calls for “severe public opinion” punishing the homosexual relationships for changing the sickening Polish society.<sup>28</sup> Thus, the summarizing slogan arises: “war against the deviants, peace to the family!” Reflecting on his own attitudes toward “those who love differently,” the politician directly justifies the party’s pro-family policies by defining them as the “positive discrimination” of homosexuals.<sup>29</sup> Such discrimination is the “duty of Poles and Catholics,” being the honorable sovereign of the nation. The then member of the European Parliament thus legitimates the exclusion of the sexual minority by the *topos* of Poles’ responsibility.

The analyzed text thus applies the Polish ideological fantasy of the *intentional* destruction of the Polish nation by homosexuals and liberal political groupings. LPR hostilely categorizes people having these orientations and justifies its exclusion; such a discursive presentation of the “stranger” as the anti-Polish/anti-family enemies functions to legitimize the just “war,” i.e. the pro-family policies of LPR.

### The Need for Killing the Murderer of the Polish Children

The interview held during the last local electoral campaigns appeared in several party-affiliated monthlies in September 2006 (e.g. *Racja Polska*, 9 (54); *Goniec Warszawski*, 4; *Goniec Lubelski*, 4). For the analysis, the text of *Racja Polska* was adopted. The text’s core structure clarified in the discourse topic analysis consists of the following elements: the attack on the pathologic anti-Christian Europe denying the “rights to life,” the presentation/justification of the LPR’s proposition of capital punishment on the “pedophiles-murderers,” and an optimistic view on the proposal’s prospect in the European Union.

The text firstly uses derogatory ideologonyms, i.e. “the European extreme leftism (*skrajne lewactwo europejskie*)” and “the international leftism (*międzynarodowe lewactwo*),” to attack the supposed general ethical consensus in Western European countries.<sup>30</sup> The reference of the “international leftism” evokes the image of a tri-

<sup>28</sup> Formerly, Wierzejski wrote a small text on this “severe public opinion,” attempting to draw on Dmowski’s *Polityka polska i odbudowanie państwa* [*The Polish Politics and the Restoration of the State*]. According to Dmowski, intolerance in society is necessary for changing the “sick situation of the political life” of Poland (Wierzejski 2001, p. 18, 2004b, p. 14).

<sup>29</sup> Commenting on article II-81 of the EU Constitution on the ban on discrimination, Wierzejski repeatedly and with irony brackets/highlights the word “discrimination” and shows his disgust toward the ban, which stipulates the “right of public declaration of the perversion, and forces us to adapt to it” (Wierzejski 2004a, p. 6).

<sup>30</sup> In a fragment subtitled “Pedophilic-Fag Alliance” [“Sojusz pedofilsko-pedalski”] in a press article, Wierzejski points out the alleged co-operation of the European leftists with homosexuals and pedophiles.

umphant social revolution and the Jewish conspiracy; such pathologizing adjectives as “sick” and “degenerated” applied to leftism further strengthen the fantasmatic imagery. On the other hand, it is the conceived “human entities” (embryos) and children that are the “smallest, most vulnerable” before the sick leftists’ influence. By thus activating the leftism, the text linguistically presents the fantasmatic attack on embryos/children constantly coming from Western countries. “We,” LPR, i.e. the “supporters of traditional values, Christian, conservative and national,” are then counteractively activated; LPR postulating the honorable “protection” and “defense” of life were thus presented against the degeneration approaching from the West.

In the criminalization strategy used in this text, one of the older ideological fantasies is noticeably applied. After commenting on the necessity of defending embryos’ life, Wierzejski remarks:

What is more, it is the right moment also from this perspective: we keep observing consecutive cases of the murder of children by pedophiles in a sexual setting. Each day brings about another case, sad sensations. If society permits the possibility of murdering and raping its own children and does not protect them from these cruel criminals, it will bear collective responsibility. Each subsequent case burdens us morally. It is an inadmissible issue. I think that reflecting on the protection and defense of life, especially that of the smallest, of the least protected, Europe matured enough to put the problem of capital punishment for the particularly disgusting murder of children in the forefront.

The criminonym, “murderer” is above all predicatively imposed on pedophiles who sexually abuse children. Here, it should be remembered that Wierzejski regards that pedophiles are mostly homosexuals, and that there is intensive cooperation, if not identification, of homosexuals with pedophiles. For instance, on May 12, 2006, the LPR politician sent the then Minister of Internal Affairs and Administration Ludwik Dorn and Minister of Justice Zbigniew Ziobro a parliamentary question [*zapytanie poselskie*], which demanded that the ministers investigate the connection of “homosexual circles” with pedophilic circles and the mafia world.<sup>31</sup> In this sense, in the assertive reference of “pedophiles-murderers,” the fantasy of the “Jews-murderers” desiring the blood of Christians for their ritual is operating. The image of pedophiles seducing children to fill their desire evokes one of the most lasting anti-Semitic fantasies originating in medieval Europe.<sup>32</sup> Fantasmatically given a status of the stranger, pedophiles-murderers being the anti-Poles are to be ousted from society, i.e. they should be killed.

As in the previous text, the *topoi* of danger/threat and of responsibility stand out in the text, in this case together justifying the introduction of capital punishment. Let

---

On the legalization of homosexual relationship in the Netherlands, the LPR politician remarks: “The World also remembers the great **pedophile scandals** at the very top of the Dutch authorities. Today the state offers a bow to the perverts and gives them privileges. [...] It is widely known that such and not the other legal resolutions were caused by the lobbying of not just queer circles [...], but of all the **porno-businesses**, which make the biggest *Geschäfte* [*gzeszefy*] with the perversions. It possesses enormous financial resources, and above all it influences the majority of media. *Leftist-liberal journalism*, it is a social group perhaps of the highest percentage of sexual deviants, not only that of homosexual” (Wierzejski, 2002, p. 42; emphasis his).

<sup>31</sup> Wierzejski clarifies his opinion in a press interview: “Each policeman certifies that homosexuals, it is a circle almost 100 percent agreeing with pedophilic circles. It is a fact, which requires no research.” *Gazeta Wyborcza*, May 16, 2006.

<sup>32</sup> Confer Langmuir 1990; for ethnographic studies, see e.g. Tokarska-Bakir 2004a, 2004b.

us firstly concentrate on the fragment cited above. The present-day society has established such a condition that children are exposed to the danger of murder and rape without having the guarantee of protection; whereby the “collective responsibility” toward such a situation arises. Moreover, by using the danger/threat and responsibility *topoi*, the concluding part of the fragment directly calls for the introduction of capital punishment in all of Europe, which is suggested as heretofore controlled by the extreme leftism. Then in the following and ending fragment of the text, Wierzejski states that the consensus on the abolition of the death penalty in Europe favors the “murderers” and “degenerates” as well as other different types of “perverts.” The sexual strangers endanger the most vulnerable group, children, who need societal protection. It is high time that Europe reinstate capital punishment against these threatening “pedophiles-murderers.”

Thus the text attributes the causes of criminal pedophiles to the “international extreme leftism,” syncretizing the fantasies of murders-Jews desiring Christian blood and of their conspiracy of world domination. The rhetoric legitimates the LPR’s programmatic proposition of introducing the death penalty on the anti-national “pedophiles-murderers” and its necessity in the whole European society.

### **The Creation of an Ideal Europe**

The Heidelberg speech to be analyzed below was delivered by the then Vice-Premier and Minister of National Education Roman Giertych during an informal meeting of Education Ministers of European countries on March 1, 2007 with the aim of proposing the initiative of forming the Great Charter of Nations’ Rights (*Wielka Karta Praw Narodów*). The short yet highly ideological speech consists of the following elements: the crisis of European values; homosexual “propaganda” harming the youth; the murder of unborn European children; the need for a standard manual for teaching the youth; Europe’s need for the restriction of homosexual “propaganda”; Europe’s need for traditional, human and family values; and the necessity of the Great Charter of Nations’ Rights. Similar to the previous texts, the configuration of the topics indicates that the propaganda of homosexuals, which is defined by the LPR leader as a European crisis, is structured as an object of due attack, in this case for protecting the education of the youth.

The referential analysis of the text peculiarly shows that there is no specific nomination of sexual minorities. The following are the paragraphs of the speech referring to homosexuality in Europe:

Europe needs a sincere and honest debate on values. First of all, we need to discuss the right of European nations to their identity and liberty. Today, liberty is curtailed by an attempt to impose onus opinions of small ideological groups. This is especially evident in education.

Today, we can see that several actions are taken in order to promote youth education in a spirit of permissiveness and belief that no standard of values should be met. It is time to change this attitude in Europe. Europe was strong when it was based on natural law and when youth education drew on this law. Recently, I have learned that eleven-year old boys would participate in a gay parade and that local authorities had already given their consent for such propaganda in one of the European countries. I am aware that in some countries this topic is taboo. Fortunately in my country, we can talk about that frankly.

Homosexual propaganda is reaching younger and younger children. In some countries, children at hospitals are forbidden to talk or read about mummy and daddy because this may allegedly infringe minority rights. Let us abandon this unconsidered political correctness. If we do not work hard to strengthen the family, there will be no future for our continent. [...] <sup>33</sup>

Homosexuals as subjects are absent and thus outright backgrounded; yet a dominating feature in the text is the “attempt to impose onus opinions of small ideological groups” and thus the “homosexual propaganda.” <sup>34</sup> This extreme impersonalization, or the absence of a concrete reference to persons, shows the text’s postulates that sexual minorities have *already* attained power and thus control the opinion of European society from the behind. The fantasy of a partially “completed” conspiracy assumingly developed from a modern construct of Jewish world domination <sup>35</sup> is incorporated in this text.

“Europe” is also activated as the actor that urgently needs change and initiative. While freedom of speech is restricted in some European countries, there is “liberty” in presenting “frank” opinions on sexual minorities in the speaker’s country. This usage of the word “liberty” would evoke the renowned right of the Polish sovereign nobility, which the suffering hero retains against the revolutionaries and the conspiracy of the Convert. At the same time, it functions as a differentiation strategy: Poland, under the criticism of homophobia, is actually the bastion/savior of European values, where the liberty for bringing out the initiative remains. It is the other countries that are suffering from the dominance of homosexuality. Led by heroic Poland, “we,” Europe, need to limit homosexual propaganda and go back to the traditional values of human life, family and natural law; “we” need to create the document that guarantees the “liberty” and identity of European nations in the idea of such values. Thus the text outwardly uses the *topos* of responsibility to justify the discrimination of sexual minorities. Homosexuals, who are fantasmatically (i.e. conspiratorially) ruling Europe, are to be expelled on the basis of the commonly agreed document on European nations under the leadership of Poland.

A unique point of the text’s rhetoric is that it is an original amalgamation of the legacy of the National Democracy as well as of Romanticism. One should firstly note that for Roman Dmowski, the nation should consider only its own interests; no nation can boast that it is morally superior to others. The pre-war statesman notably insisted that Poles needed to do away with the naïveté of appealing to the other countries’ consciences, which did not exist at all. <sup>36</sup> If asked for comments, Dmowski would evaluate the Heidelberg speech of Roman Giertych as the effeminate “Messianization” of the Polish *raison d’État* among the fiercely egoistic nation-states

<sup>33</sup> The English text is available from the Internet archive of the Ministry of National Education (last accessed July 27, 2008): <http://www.men.gov.pl/oswiata/archiwum/heidelberg.php>.

<sup>34</sup> It should be remembered that in June 2006, Minister Giertych dismissed Mirosław Sielatycki, the Director of National In-Service Teacher Training Center (CODN), for the adoption of “Compass,” a teachers’ manual for human rights education created by the Council of Europe. The manual allegedly served the “promotion of homosexuality” at school.

<sup>35</sup> The image was most notably forged out by the fictitious *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* of N. Sergius.

<sup>36</sup> Confer Walicki 1991, pp. 67–68.



comprising the European Union. To such a remark, Roman Giertych could probably only defend in the following way: to achieve the interest of the Polish nation, i.e. the educational discrimination of sexual minorities and their expulsion from the territory, an appeal to the Member States' opinion was the most rational measure. Dmowski would further rebuke the credulous hope and the compromising acceptance of the European Union, which impermissibly opposes the sober ideological foundation of the National Democracy.

### Conclusion

On October 6, 2001, after gaining his first mandated seat at the elections for the Fourth Term Sejm held on September 23<sup>rd</sup> of the same year, Roman Giertych talked to the interviewer from the daily *Rzeczpospolita*:

But please do not think that our goal is the simple entry into the Sejm. We want to take power and protect the nation from all of those, which it cannot cope with by itself. The nation, in the period of occupation and Stalinist years, became in a sense deprived of the head, with the Polish intelligentsia destroyed. Consequently, this nation is deprived of leadership. Different political swindlers direct society to nowhere. [...] There is nobody, who protects this nation, for there are no people, who could serve this.

The purpose of the LPR was thus the ultimate acquisition of power, i.e. the formation of its own government, to “protect” the Polish nation deprived of strong leadership. One of the targets, with which the political party had stipulated to tackle for protecting the nation, was the “danger” of tolerating homosexuality.

The analysis of LPR's nationalist-homophobic discourse has shown the utilization of the “sacred resources” of the Polish nation, i.e. the image of the stranger as the enemy of the nation, which has been embedded and mobilized in Polish culture since the time of Romanticism. The three texts appearing in 2005–2007 sufficiently indicate the LPR's ambitious ideological move during the short period, i.e. the shift from the “defense” of Polish society, struggling against the West's “sick” influence, to the quasi-Messianic “creation” of the charter of the European nation, suggesting the liquidation of homosexuals. “Europe” is primarily presented as the society under the despotism of the “international leftism,” where the ideology of homosexuality prevails. The “pedophiles-murderers,” fantasmatically killing Polish Christian children, are just the extension of European homosexual propaganda; to change Europe, Poland, which is not yet wholly dominated by the “deviants,” has the responsibility to break the imposed taboo and to take the initiative to lead the European nations to oust homosexuals that are harmful strangers to Europe.

Thus, LPR, in its discourse, incorporated the fantasy of the conspiracy of homosexuals' dominance, which is allegedly near completion in Europe and also affects the Polish nation. The question posed at the outset, i.e. “how do the figures of homosexuals function in today's Polish nationalism?,” could be now reformulated as the following: “what does this mobilization of the peculiar fantasy of homosexuals in Polish nationalism signify today?” Abiding by the political correctness regarding anti-Semitism, the nationalist party applied the fantasmatic scheme of the conspiracy

of homosexuals to their new European “other,” giving a status of the eternal stranger to this sexual minority. It is a spontaneous attack on the “stranger” by an eccentric radical rightist party, yet is also a reproduction of the image of the stranger facing the Polish nation that is allowed as a species of Polishness. In other words, it is the re-projection of the imagined Polish nation, which “suffers” from the conspiracy of the invisible/hiding “strangers.” The imagined is the Polish hero, who “defends” the nation’s “honor” by hating the immoral strangers, further “creating” an ideal world that is free from homosexuality. The homophobic discourse of LPR, unwittingly driving the “stranger” into the defensive version of the Messianic-Romanticist Polishness, works to offer a clue for the justification of society’s acceptance of homophobia.

In their utterances, the radical rightist politicians mobilized the imagery of homosexuals = strangers to crystallize the party’s ideal of the nation based on moral unity under natural law, covering up its inevitable falsity and running counter to today’s Europe. The LPR’s nationalist-homophobic discourse is an alarming piece of Polish nationalism, which warns Polish citizens not to indulge in the closed Schützean lifeworld. It shows the imminent necessity of the constant questioning of knowledge as well as the rational communication with the present-day other/stranger, to whom they themselves belong.

## References

- Abramowicz, M. (ed.). 2007. *Sytuacja społeczna osób biseksualnych i homoseksualnych w Polsce. Raport za lata 2005 i 2006* [Social Situation of Bisexual and Homosexual Persons: 2005 and 2006 Report in Poland]. Warszawa: Kampania Przeciw Homofobii & Stowarzyszenie Lambda.
- Adam, B. D. 2002. “Theorizing Homophobia,” in: K. Plummer (ed.), *Sexualities: Critical Concepts in Sociology*. London: Routledge, vol. 2, pp. 170–187.
- Altman, D. 2001. *Global Sex*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Ålund, A. 1995. “Alterity in Modernity,” *Acta Sociologica* 38: 11–22.
- Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Balejko, D. K. 2007. “Krytyczna analiza dyskursu. Homofobia w szponach nauki” [Critical Discourse Analysis: Homophobia in the Grip of Science], in: M. Baer & M. Lizurej (eds.), *Z odmiennej perspektywy* [From a Different Perspective]. Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza Arboretum, pp. 79–91.
- Bauman, Z. 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Oxford: Polity.
- Bojarska-Nowaczyk, K. 2006. ““Przejęte ciotki niemile widziane”—o homofobii gejów i lesbijek” [Bent Queers Unwelcome: On Homophobia of Gays and Lesbians], in: T. Basiuk, D. Ferens, & T. Sikora (eds.), *Parametry pożądania. Kultura odmienców wobec homofobii* [Parameters of Desire: Queer Culture against Homophobia]. Kraków: Universitas, pp. 61–72.
- Brubaker, R. 2004. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Burdziej, B. 2001. “Izrael i krzyż. U podstaw ideowych Nie-Boskiej komedii Zygmunta Krasińskiego” [Israel and the Cross. The Ideological Bases of Zygmunt Krasiński’s Un-Divine Comedy], in: G. Halkiewicz-Sojak & B. Burdziej (eds.), *Zygmunt Krasiński—nowe spojrzenia* [Zygmunt Krasiński—New Perspectives]. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, pp. 201–249.
- Dmowski, R. 1988 (1925). *Polityka polska i odbudowanie państwa* [The Polish Politics and the Restoration of the State]. Warszawa: PAX.
- Dmowski, R. 1989 (1903). *Mysli nowoczesnego Polaka* [Thoughts of a Modern Pole]. Warszawa: Grunwald.
- Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Gouveia, C. A. M. 2005. "Assumptions about Gender, Power and Opportunity: Gays and Lesbians as Discursive Subjects in a Portuguese Newspaper," in: M. M. Lazar (ed.), *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power and Ideology in Discourse*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 229–250.
- Graff, A. 2006. "We Are Not (All) Homophobes: A Report from Poland," *Feminist Studies*, 32 (2): 434–449.
- Graff, A. 2008. *Rykoszetem. Rzecz o płci, seksualności i narodzie* [Stray Bullets: Essays on Gender, Sexuality and Nation]. Warszawa: W.A.B.
- Gruszczynska, A. 2004. "Wściekłość i wrzask" [Fury and Scream], in: Z. Sypniewski & B. Warkocki (eds.), *Homofobia po polsku* [Homophobia in the Polish Way]. Warszawa: Sic!, pp. 139–149.
- Habermas, J. 1987 (1981). *The Theory of Communicative Action: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Oxford: Polity Press (T. McCarthy, Trans.).
- Herek, G. M. 2004. "Beyond Homophobia: Thinking about Sexual Prejudice and Stigma in the Twenty-first century," *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 1 (2): 6–24.
- Janion, M. 2000. *Do Europy: tak, ale razem z naszymi umarłymi* [To Europe: Yes, but Together with Our Dead]. Warszawa: Sic!
- Janion, M. 2001. *Zło i fantazmaty. Prace wybrane* [Evil and Fantasies]. Kraków: Universitas, vol. 3.
- Janion, M. 2004. "Słowiańszczyzna, szaleństwo i śmierć" [The Slavdom, Madness and Death], in: M. Janion, C. Snochowska-Gonzalez, & K. Szczuka (eds.), *Inny, inna, inne. O inności w kulturze* [On the Otherness in Culture]. Warszawa: IBL PAN, pp. 10–19.
- Janion, M. 2006a (1996). *Kobieta i duch inności* [Woman and the Spirit of Otherness]. Warszawa: Sic!
- Janion, M. 2006b. *Niesamowita Słowiańszczyzna* [The Uncanny Slavdom]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Janion, M. 2009. *Bohater, spisek, śmierć. Wykłady żydowskie* [The Hero, Conspiracy, Death: Jewish Lectures]. Warszawa: W.A.B.
- Jäger, S. 2001. "Discourse and Knowledge: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of a Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis," in: R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 32–62.
- Kliszczyński, K., & Dudała, M. (eds.). 2002. *Raport 2001. Raport o dyskryminacji i nietolerancji ze względu na orientację seksualną w Polsce* [Report 2001: On Discrimination and Intolerance due to Sexual Orientation in Poland]. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Lambda Warszawa & Kampania Przeciw Homofobii.
- Kliszczyński, K. & Kasiorek, T. (eds.). 2003. *Raport 2002. Raport o dyskryminacji i nietolerancji ze względu na orientację seksualną w Polsce* [Report 2002: On Discrimination and Intolerance due to Sexual Orientation in Poland]. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Lambda Warszawa & Kampania Przeciw Homofobii.
- Kłoskowska, A. 2001. *National Cultures at the Grass-Root Level*. Warsaw: CEU Press.
- Kochanowski, J. 2004. *Fantazmat różNICowany. Socjologiczne studium przemian tożsamości gejów* [Diversified Fantasy: A Social Study on the Transformations of the Identities of Gays]. Kraków: Universitas.
- Krasiński, Z. 1966. *Nie-Boska komedia* [The Un-Divine Comedy]. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy Ośrodków Naukowych.
- Kristeva, J. 1991. *Strangers to Ourselves*. New York: Columbia University Press (L. Roudiez, Trans.).
- Krzemiński, I. 2002. "Polish-Jewish Relations, Anti-Semitism and National Identity," *Polish Sociological Review*, 1 (137): 25–51.
- Krzemiński, I. 2004. *Antysemityzm w Polsce i na Ukrainie* [Anti-Semitism in Poland and in Ukraine]. Warszawa: Scholar.
- Krzemiński, I. (ed.). 2006. *Wolność, równość, odmiennosc. Nowe ruchy społeczne w Polsce początku XXI wieku* [Freedom, Equality and Otherness: New Social Movements in Poland at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa akademickie i profesjonalne.
- Kurczewska, J. 1999. "Świętość narodu polskiego i jej wróg—'Żyd,' czyli nacjonalistyczna strategia wyłączenia" [The Sacredness of the Polish Nation and Its Enemy—"a Jew," or the Nationalist Strategy of Exclusion], in: D. Gawin (ed.), *Homo Eligens*. Warszawa: IFiS PAN, pp. 143–153.
- Kurczewska, J. 2002. *Patriotyzm(y) polskich polityków. Z badań nad świadomością liderów partyjnych lat dziewięćdziesiątych* [Patriotism(s) of Polish Politicians]. Warszawa: IFiS PAN.
- Kurczewska, J. 2005. "National Identities vis-à-vis Democracy and Catholicism," *Polish Sociological Review*, 4 (152): 329–347.

- Kurczewska, J., Horolets, A. & Trojanowska-Strzęboszewska, M. 2005. "The European dilemma, institutional patterns and politics of 'racial' discrimination. Discourse analysis of politics: LPR's rhetorics." Warszawa: Institute of Public Affairs Report.
- Langmuir, G. 1990. *History, Religion, and Antisemitism*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Lazar, M. M. (ed.). 2005. *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power and Ideology in Discourse*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leszkowicz, P. 2004. "Przełamując hetero-matrix. Wojna seksualna w Polsce i kryzys prawa człowieka" [Breaking Hetero-Matrix. Sexual War in Poland and the Crisis of Human Rights], in: Z. Sypniewski & B. Warkocki (eds.), *Homofobia po polsku* [Homophobia in the Polish Way] Warsaw: Sic!, pp. 85–112.
- Leszkowicz, P. & Kitliński, T. 2005. *Miłość i demokracja. Rozważania kwestii homoseksualnej w Polsce* [Love and Democracy: Reflections on the Homosexual Question in Poland]. Kraków: Aureus.
- Lillian, D. L. 2001. "Canadian Neo-Conservative Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, York University, Toronto.
- Lillian, D. L. 2005. "Homophobic Discourse: A 'Popular Canadian Example'" [Electronic version]. *SKY Journal of Linguistics*, 18: 119–144.
- Mayer, H. 2005. *Odmienicy* [The Misfits]. Warszawa: MUZA SA (A. Kryczyńska, Trans.).
- Meyer, M. 2001. "Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to CDA," in: R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 14–31.
- Mizelińska, J. 2004. "Nasze życie, nasze rodziny, nasze wartości, czyli jak walczyć z moralną paniką w ponowoczesnych czasach?" [Our Lives, Our Families, Our Values, or How to Fight with Moral Panic in Post-Modern Times], in: Z. Sypniewski & B. Warkocki (eds.), *Homofobia po polsku* [Homophobia in the Polish Way]. Warszawa: Sic!, pp. 113–134.
- Mosse, G. 1985. *Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ostolski, A. 2005a. "Spiskowcy i gorszyście. Judaizowanie gejów w polskim dyskursie prawicowym" [Conspirators and Demoralizers: The Judaization of Gays in the Polish Rightist Discourse], in: M. Głowacka & E. Nowicka (eds.), *Jak się dzielimy i co nas łączy? Przemiany wartości i więzi we współczesnym społeczeństwie polskim*. Kraków: NOMOS, pp. 156–178.
- Ostolski, A. 2005b. "Żydzi, geje i wojna cywilizacji" [Jews, Gays and the War of Civilizations], *op. cit.*, 23 (2). Retrieved March 5, 2008, from [http://www.opcit.art.pl/cms/index.php?p=text23\\_01](http://www.opcit.art.pl/cms/index.php?p=text23_01)
- Porter, B. A. 1992. "Who is a Pole and Where is Poland? Territory and Nation in the Rhetoric of Polish National Democracy before 1905," *Slavic Review*, 51: 639–653.
- Porter, B. A. 2002. *When Nationalism Began to Hate: Imagining Modern Politics in Nineteenth-Century Poland*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. 2001. *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. London: Routledge.
- Rubin, G. 1993. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality," in: H. Ablove, M. A. Barale, & F. M. Halperin (eds.), *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 3–44.
- Rundell, J. 2004. "Strangers, Citizens and Outsiders: Otherness, Multiculturalism and the Cosmopolitan Imaginary in Mobile Societies," *Thesis Eleven*, 78: 85–101.
- Ryan, J. 2001. "Can Psychoanalysis Understand Homophobia? Resistance in the Clinic," in: T. Dean & C. Lane (eds.), *Homosexuality and Psychoanalysis*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp. 307–32.
- Schütz, A. 1975. "Some Structures of the Life-World," in: I. Schütz, (ed.), *Collected Papers III: Studies in Phenomenological Philosophy*. The Hague: Nijhoff, pp. 116–132.
- Schütz, A. 1976a. "The Stranger: An Essay in Social Psychology," in: A. Broderson (ed.), *Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory*. The Hague: Nijhoff, pp. 91–106.
- Schütz, A. 1976b. "Equality and the Meaning Structure of the Social World," in: A. Broderson (ed.), *Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory*. The Hague: Nijhoff, pp. 226–273.
- Segel, H. B. 1996. *Stranger in our Midst: Images of the Jew in Polish Literature*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- Sergius, N. 2003. *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. (V. E. Marsden, Trans.). Barcelona & Singapore: Athena University Press.
- Simmel, G. 1964 1908. "The Stranger," in: K. H. Wolff (ed. & Trans.), *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 402–409.
- Smith, A. D. 2003. *Chosen Peoples*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Smith, B. 1993. "Homophobia: Why Bring It Up?," in: H. Abelove, M. A. Barale, & F. M. Halperin (eds.), *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 99–102.
- Stichweh, R. 1997. "The Stranger—On the Sociology of Indifference," *Thesis Eleven*, 51: 1–16.
- Stichweh, R. 2005. "Stranger," in: A. Harrington, B. L. Marshall, & H.-P. Müller (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*. London: Routledge. Retrieved May 18, 2006, from the University of Lucerne, Switzerland, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Web site: <http://www.unilu.ch/files/14stwstranger.pdf>.
- Tokarska-Bakir, J. 2004a. "Ganz andere? Żyd jako czarownica i czarownica jako Żyd w polskich i obcych źródłach etnograficznych, czyli jak czytać protokoły przesłuchań" [Ganz andere? A Jew as a Witch, and a Witch as a Jew in Polish and Foreign Ethnographic Sources, or How to Read Protocols of Investigations], in: M. Janion, C. Snochowska-Gonzalez, & K. Szczuka (eds.), *Inny, inna, inne. O inności w kulturze* [On the Otherness in Culture]. Warszawa: IBL PAN, pp. 110–147.
- Tokarska-Bakir, J. 2004b. *Rzeczy mgliste. Eseje i studia* [Foggy Matters: Essays and Studies]. Sejny: Pogranicze.
- Umiańska-Keff, B. 2006. *Barykady. Kroniki obsesyjne* [The Barricades: Obsessive Chronicles]. Kraków: eFKa.
- van Dijk, T. A. 1984. *Prejudice in Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- van Dijk, T. A. 1987. *Communicating Racism*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. 1993. *Elite Discourse and Racism*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. 1998. *Ideology*. London: Sage.
- van Leeuwen, T. 1995. "Representing Social Action," *Discourse & Society*, 6 (1): 81–106.
- van Leeuwen, T. 1996. "The Representation of Social Actors," in: C. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (eds.), *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, pp. 32–70.
- Waldenfels, B. 2002. *Topografia obcego. Studia z fenomenologii obcego* [Topography of Otherness: Studies from the Phenomenology of Otherness] (J. Sidorek, Trans.). Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.
- Walicki, A. 1994. *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The Case of Poland*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Walicki, A. 2006. *Mesjanizm Adama Mickiewicza w perspektywie porównawczej* [Adam Mickiewicz's Messianism in Comparative Perspective]. Warszawa: IBL & IFiS PAN.
- Warkocki, B. 2004. "Biedni Polacy patrzą na homoseksualistów" [The Poor Poles Look at Homosexuals], in: Z. Sypniewski & B. Warkocki (eds.), *Homofobia po polsku* [Homophobia in the Polish Way]. Warszawa: Sic!, pp. 151–169.
- Wierzejski, W. 2001. "Surowa opinia publiczna," in: *Naród, młodzież, idea. Zbiór narodowej publicystyki z lat 1997–2000* [Nation, Youth, Idea]. Krzeszowice: Ostoja, pp. 18–19.
- Wierzejski, W. 2002. "Euro-pedały w ofensywie," in: *Zamach na Cywilizację. Szkice etyczne z lat 2000–2001* [The Attack on Civilization]. Krzeszowice: Ostoja, pp. 41–44.
- Wierzejski, W. 2004a. "Wartość, cele i prawa podstawowe Unii Europejskiej w Traktacie Konstytucyjnym UE," in: W. Wierzejski, P. Sulowski, S. Pawłowski, P. Farfał, R. Parda, P. Ślusarczyk, & B. Rzeźniczak, *Odrzućmy unijną konstytucję!* [Let's Reject the EU Constitution]. Warszawa: Ars Politica, pp. 5–7.
- Wierzejski, W. 2004b. *My wybieramy Polskę!* [We Choose Poland]. Warszawa: Ars Politica.
- Wodak, R. 2001. "The discourse-historical approach," in: R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 63–94.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (eds.). 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wodak, R., & van Dijk, T. A. (eds.). 2000. *Racism at the Top*. Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.
- Young-Bruehl, E. 1996. *The Anatomy of Prejudice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, N. 1997. *Gender & Nation*. London: Sage.
- Zgliczyński, S. 2008. *Antysemityzm po polsku* [Antisemitism in the Polish Way]. Warszawa: Książka i Prasa.
- Žižek, S. 1999. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London & New York: Verso.

*Biographical Note:* Yasuko Shibata, LL.B. from Keio University, Tokyo, studied political science at Bryn Mawr College, PA, U.S., and holds an MA degree from the Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland. She is currently a Ph.D. candidate in sociology at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences.

*Address:* E-mail: [yshibata@sns.waw.pl](mailto:yshibata@sns.waw.pl)