Marcin Pielużek (Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland)

IDEOLOGY, LANGUAGE AND VALUES OF THE CONTEMPORARY EXTREME RIGHT. Proposal of the Research Process

ABSTRACT

The main aim of this article is to explore ideology, language and values of the Polish extreme right. The key to the success of the contemporary extreme right seems to be on the one hand a common European front of the nationalist groups and political parties, and on the other hand the contemporary language of the extreme right groups. In the past, radical nationalist movements in their communication employed radial slogans and rhetoric. Today they adopted the language of the mainstream but its semantics has changed.

The article is a proposal for the research of the systems of values using corpus linguistics tools and methods. Analyzing communication and language of the Polish extreme right the author tries to answer the following questions: what are the core ideological concepts of the Polish nationalist movements; and what are their values. The author referenced to the constructivist and system theories, and conceptions of the linguistic worldviews.

1. Introduction

Everyday communication is strongly correlated with particular values ascribed to individual utterances. These values are negotiated during cognitive processes and they determine not only the perception of "reality", but also translate to our communicational behaviours. You cannot speak without valuating. This stems from the fact – as Michał Głowiński (1986: 180) states – that words, idioms, collocations etc. which are employed in communication are saturated with values, and with all certainty, they do not remain neutral.

The main aim of this article is to present the possibility of examination of the value systems from a communicational perspective. Therefore two substantial questions need to be answered: What are values from the perspective of the communication theory? How to examine the values of larger social groups? From the communicational perspective, when we try to examine the values, like in the case of this research, which concentrated on the communication of the Polish contemporary extreme right, we are not dealing with values of single individuals, or with the sum of values of all participants of these groups. This notion is, in fact, relevant to all social groups. For example, politicians during election campaign always refer to the particular sets of values, which are declared as significant to them. Yet when they are elected, their actions, especially in the case of voting under the pressure of party discipline, often contradict their previously declared system of values. Their actions result from the logic of the political party system, i.e., the actions of each politician should serve the realization of party goals. These actions are, therefore, directed at preserving interests and/or the internal stability of the party. This is how we reach the starting point, which is a claim proposed by Talcott Parsons, that values are goals, which the systems want to achieve (Fleischer 2010: 19-20). The author believes, that in the case of communication research processes, values should be investigated from the systems theory perspective.

The area of research should be therefore transferred from the matter of the individual's values, located to a great extent in the tradition of philosophy, towards the process of identifying elements which are responsible for controlling the particular system, which are, in this perspective, the constituents of values of a certain system. As Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1972:39-40) wrote, one of the elements of the philosophy of systems is the relation between the human and his world. This, in the philosophical discourse is called value. In our case we will have tackle the problem from the perspective of the relation between the

system and its environment, in the Niklas Luhmann's (1995) sense. The system here is to be understood as a group of elements conjugated to each other in such a fashion, that they form a certain entity which can be distinguished in a given environment (Siciński 1978: 13).

2. Systems, Communication and Language

The starting point of the systems theory is the assumption that "the whole is more than the sum of parts", i.e., "constitutive characteristics are not explainable from the characteristics of isolated parts. The characteristics of the complex, therefore, compared to those of the elements, appear as 'new' or 'emergent'. If, however, we know the total of parts contained in a system and the relations between them, the behaviour of the system may be derived from the behaviour of the parts" (Bertalanffy 1968: 55). An important feature of the systems is their stability. While functioning, the system creates its own peculiar structure, which is based on relations of its elements. This creates a "personality" of the system, which guarantees system's preservation. The exchange of particular elements does not result in change in system's "personality" (Laszlo 1978).

Adopted here Niklas Luhmann's (1995) communicational perspective, assumes that social systems are operationally closed (they reproduce their own elements) but informationally open (they can scan the environment and process information) and they function as a communicational systems. The core of Luhmann's concept is the distinction between the system and the environment, and thus the distinction of self-reference and other-reference. The concept of autopoiesis, invented by biologists (see Maturana, Varela, Uribe 1974), was adopted by Luhmann for the benefit of his own theory, according to which the social system is autopoietic and self-referential - "communications refer to past communications and anticipate future ones" (Matuszek 2014: 18, my translation).

Luhmann's social systems are functional systems, which emerge as a result of actions aimed at reducing the complexity of the world. As Henk de Berg (1997: 143) vividly describes: „Metaphorically speaking, complexity is reduced by being sliced up, cut into manageable pieces, but then pops up in a new shape in the different pieces. Science, for example, differentiates into disciplines, which in turn are faced with complexity they must put in a manageable form, and so on." Although the structure of data is important, it remains in the shadow

of relations, which are the basis of establishing, stabilizing and reproduction of individual systems.

In result, as Luhmann suggests, we have to do with various communicational systems: political, economic, legal etc. Each of them creates their own communications via appropriate structuring of communication with using the specific binary code (see Luhmann 1995), which is responsible for the process of reduction of complexity. „Everything that appears on the 'screen' of a system necessarily appears in terms of the system-specific code" (Berg 1997: 145-146). The operational closeness of the systems causes their inability to influence one another, however their informational openness makes it possible to scan the environment and process the information (within theirs distinctive binary codes). „Political system may prohibit the use of nuclear energy but how, and whether the economic system then continues to operates depends exclusively on the economic system" (Berg 1997: 146).

Luhmann's system theory – as Berg assumes – is a theory of contingency, which assumes „that every social action or event is always a selection from range of possibilities and that, therefore, reality could have been, and can be, different" […] „A system maintains a boundary between its own reduced complexity and the overcomplexity of the environment. From this perspective, structures do not count as given but are seen as contingent, that is, basically variable, contributions to the ongoing process of reduction of complexity" (Berg 1997: 141).

As we could see, although the structure of systems is still important, it remains in the shadow of relations, which are the basis of establishing, stabilizing and reproduction of individual systems. The problem of structure occurs in reference to „the problem of double contingency", pointed out by Talcott Parsons, and which stems from the open character of social systems. The structure is understood here as „generalized expectations" or, as Siegfried J. Schmidt put it, „expectation of expectations" (Schmidt 2008: 67). The following Berg's quote will be helpful to explain this issue (1997: 143): "When a person uses a tool or a piece of machinery she will have a certain expectations regarding this thing which can guide her behaviour. But when the same person interacts with another person she is dealing not with a thing but with someone who in turn has expectations. In this situation, what is needed is not simply expectations but expectations of expectations".

By assuming therefore, that each social system produces its own codes and its characteristic semantics, the meaning of the particular words and phrases

is dependent on their meaning within particular systems. Adopted here the constructivist perspective states that communication is a process of creating meanings. As it is pointed out by Schmidt (2004: 2-3), the specified "models of reality" have been constructed by given communities and societies in the course of history, through the processes of interaction and communication of the particular systems. Models of reality are created on the basis of the "collective knowledge" of members of the specific communities. "System of distinctions, constructing the categorical frames of reality model, must be permanently connected with social semantics and with socially sanctioned emotions and standards" (Schmidt 2004: 2, my translation). It should be stressed out that it is not important to what extent the "models of reality" correspond to actual "reality". What is important is that they must fit (in Glasersfeld's sense 1995) to the world created by given system (community, society, etc.). In the functionally oriented societies coherent domains of themes and knowledge plus pertinent forms and modes of communication are elements which are responsible for reduction of complexity and at the same time constitute the identity of the given system (Schmidt 1992: 305). In consequence the function of the language is not to transmit information, but it serves as the coordination of behaviours, i.e., it is responsible for production of the consensual sphere of interactions between linguistically interacting systems during the development of a cooperative area of interaction (Schmidt 2006: 206). The language regulates behaviours through creating distinctions that allow the system to function.

Taking into account the abovementioned, values are understood here as elements which control the behaviours of a system. As Ervin Laszlo pointed out – "each action oriented on achieving a goal, is an action oriented on values" (Laszlo, 124, my translation). The valuation is therefore, a product of inner-systemic operation of the system. The sphere of values is, in consequence, strongly correlated with the action or the effect of actions. The system undertakes various (re)actions in response to the "valuating" information derived from the environment. Therefore, values are a strictly subjective sphere, which translates to the fact that the values/axiological sphere can in no way be considered as constant and unchanging, but rather a process of constantly adjusting systems of meanings.

Therefore the following definition is proposed: X is a value = X is an item, which controls the system's behaviour, provides hierarchy and stabilises the social system as well as allows the system to realize determined goals.

3. Methodological Assumptions

How, on such described foundations, the process of reconstruction of system values can be processed? In order to identify the values of a given social (sub)system, it is necessary not only to investigate the internal network of relations between particular elements and establish their hierarchy, but also to define the functions, which the key elements fulfil in its communication. Systems, as Bertalanffy (1972: 36-37) suggested, are composed of an internal and external description. The former encompasses the structural description, i.e., the description of the behaviour of the system using the variables which determine the states of the system and their relationships. The external description is, in turn, a functional description – "the behaviour of the system is described by its interaction with the environment".

In order to understand a given group, we should reconstruct the components of their ideological worldview, what is possible through the discourse analysis. Discourse – after Michael Fleischer (2002: 12) – shall be understood as a systemic repertoire of signs, which organize and interpret the rules, norms and values of a specific group, which are correlated with socialisation and culture of these environments. Discourses are, therefore, necessary and involuntary habits of expression.

Discourse analysis from this perspective should help find the answer to the question: What controls the manifestations of the particular systems? The discourse analysis consists in searching for discursive nuances of given statements, i.e., typical and repeatable features, which differentiate the elements of the given discourse. It is irrelevant though, what stands behind particular style, manner of utterance, point of view of person's statement, but what is important is what in specific, single manifested utterance indicate at general features typical for given subculture (Fleischer 2002: 17).

The process of reconstruction of the values of the contemporary extreme right combines: 1) corpus linguistic methods and Anna Wierzbicka's (1997) key-word concept to reconstruct the 'internal description'; 2) Sinclair's (2003, 2004) theory of collocation to reconstruct the 'external description' – i.e, to identify functions the respective key-words perform and to reconstruct theirs semantics and meanings.

Although the concept of universal semantic units (cf. Wierzbicka 1996) is not entirely convergent with the systems theory adopted here, nevertheless, proposed by Wierzbicka concept of the key-words seems to be a significant tool

for identifying values in the communication of various social and cultural groups. "'Key words' – as Wierzbicka (1997: 15-16) claims – „are words which are particularly important and revealing in given culture", however, "there is no finite set of such words in a language, and there is no 'objective discovery procedure' for identifying them" (Ibid.: 16).

How we can therefore identify key-words. After Wierzbicka (cf. 1997: 16-17) the following process was adapted: 1) establishing, on the basis of the frequency list, whether the word in question is a common or marginal; 2) establishing whether the word in question is a the centre of the whole phraseological cluster; 3) checking if the given word is very frequently used in some specific domain; 4) Verifying whether the word in question occurs frequently in titles, in saying etc. As Wierzbicka emphasizes, in some way the concept of the 'key words' can be perceived as an 'atomistic' approach, however, "'key words' need not be undertaken in old-fashioned atomistic spirit. On the contrary, some words can be studied as focal points around which entire cultural domains are organized. By exploring these focal points in depth we may be able to show the general organizing principles which lend structure and coherence to a cultural domain as a whole, and which often have an explanatory power extending across a number of domains" (Wierzbicka 1997: 16-17).

At the next step, John Sinclair's theory of the 'unit of meaning' was employed in order to establish the meaning of the key-words. As Sinclair shows (2004: 25-43), the meaning of the particular word is not and cannot be limited to the vocabulary definition. The meaning and valuation of the word in communication of the particular groups is strictly correlated with co-occurring words. "Even words or phrases that on the surface seem to have a rather neutral or positive meaning can, in some discourse contexts and in occurrence with certain words, express negative value judgements and specific ideological stances" (Jaworska 2012: 405). According to Van Dijk, Jaworska states (2012: 406) that "lexical choices (…) are not only evaluative judgements, but also reflect the ideological stance of the user, or the group that she or he represents". Therefore, collocations cannot be perceived as ordinary lexical units but as structures which can determine meanings and a system's communication.

Resuming, key-words which control the process of communication are being defined here as a particular value or as a component of the particular value. Semantics of the key-words, reconstructed on the basis of its collocations, establishes functions the particular values fulfil in nationalists' communication.

4. Contemporary Extreme-Right

How can we define a contemporary extreme-right? Michael Minkenberg (cf. 2000: 170) states that the contemporary radical right has three dimensions. Firstly, it is an international phenomenon. Secondly, the contemporary right-wing radicalism is a modern phenomenon. "It has undergone a phase of renewal, as a result of social and cultural modernization shifts in post-war Europe" (Ibid.: 170). The third factor is that contemporary right-wing radicalism is a complex phenomenon.

Adopted here the concept of the 'extreme right' was proposed by Piero Ignazi (cf. 2006). As he points out, in this day and age we can list a plenty of right-wing and far right movements, organizations and parties, but not each of them can be called radical or, using Ignazi's term, "extreme". The word "extreme" doesn't suggest however, that we deal with some kind of illegal or terrorist groups. The word "extreme" refers here to the parties and organizations which occupy the right-most position of the political spectrum.

As Ignazi indicates, despite the fact that in the ideological programs and manifests we can find references to the fascist and neo-fascist ideas or thinkers, the present-day extreme right is a completely new and modern type of far right. Until the 80s of the XXth century, the term "extreme right" was a synonym for neo-fascism, mainly due to a fact, that the only organization being defined with this name was MSI – Movimento Sociale Italiano (Italian Social Movement), openly referring to the pre-war fascism. New political movements and radicalisation of some parties in the 80s caused, that the contemporary radical right-wing was born (cf. Ignazi 2006: 2-3).

Basically, "these parties are anti-system as they undermine the (democratic) system's legitimacy through their discourse and actions. They are fiercely opposed to the idea of parliamentary representation and partisan conflicts, and hence they argue for corporatist or, mainly, direct and personalistic mechanisms of representation; they are against the idea of pluralism because it endangers (the ideal of) societal harmony; they are against the universal idea of equality as rights should be allotted on the basis such elements (race, language, ethnicity); and finally they are somewhat authoritarian because they conceive supra-individual and collective authority (State, nation, community) as more important than the individual one" (Ignazi 2006: 2).

But what is the most important is that nationalist organizations from different countries are linked, cooperate with each other and influence each

other, despite the historical resentments. Therefore the British researcher Les Back defines the ideology of the contemporary extreme-right as "liquid ideologies", which "are capable of assimilating elements that on the face of it seem incompatible" (Back 2002).

5. Research Process and Results

The process of reconstruction of the nationalist values was designed in the following way. The first step was to generate four text corpora, three of which were created on the basis of texts published in zines[1] (printed and distributed in the independent circulation) which were the key communication tool of Polish subcultures in Poland in the 90s. The first corpus included texts published by the neo-fascist movements[2]. The second one encompassed publications of the right-wing skinheads.[3] Finally, the third corpus is a collection of texts published by radical nationalists. The last, fourth corpus, was constructed on the basis of the Internet publications of the radical nationalists, published in the years 2007-2011. In order to enable comparison of results, each corpus consisted of 50 thousand words.

In another step, the frequency lists were generated[4], which enabled to identify the most frequent words occurring in the communication of the particular group. The frequency list can also be treated as a visualization of the hierarchy of the various elements. Subsequently, the process of identification of the key-words (in Anna Wierzbicka's sense) was conducted, and an analysis of the dominant contexts of the key-words[5] and their collocations was performed[6]. In

---

[1] Stephen Duncombe defines zines in the following way (1997: 11-12): "Zines are noncomercial, nonprofessional, small-circulation magazines which their creator produce, publish, and distribute by themselves" (About zines and their taxonomy see Duncombe 1997).

[2] As a neo-fascist movements I understand groups which call themselves fascists, or more commonly, national socialists.

[3] About the origins of the skinhead subculture, its transformations and types see Brake (1974).

[4] Word frequency lists were generated using WordSmith Tools. In the process of analysis of collocations and words in context (KWIC) the Provalis Research Tools were used.

[5] In this paper the analysis was limited to the nouns. However, not all nouns will serve as a value (or constitute elements of values). For instance, the word *year*, while serving an important informational role in a particular sentence, does not contain any valuating meaning. From the final list of nouns, on the basis of the context analysis, one needs to eliminate these elements which, with all certainty, do not possess value or valuating qualities.

[6] The outcomes presented here include the most commons nouns. Only lexemes which occurred at least 15 times in corpora were taken into account and lemmatized.

the following table the 15 most frequently occurred lexemes in each corpus were listed.

Table 1. The first 15 most frequent words in the examined corpora

LP.	NEO-FASCIST CORPUS		SKINHEAD CORPUS		NATIONALIST CORPUS 1990s.		NATIONALIST CORPUS 2007-2011	
	Word	f	Word	f	Word	f	Word	F
1	White	153	Skinhead	310	Poland	277	Poland	319
2	People	150	Poland	234	Nation	176	Action	246
3	Poland	140	People	166	People	175	March	121
4	Jude	133	Movement	160	Life	133	Movement	120
5	Skinhead	110	Country	119	Youth	116	Youth	118
6	Race	106	White	100	Pole	100	Activist	102
7	World	83	Concert	89	Organization	92	People	81
8	Life	78	Group	87	Power	85	Nationlist (nacjonalista)	80
9	Nation	78	Nation	82	Group	80	Independence	71
10	Fight	75	Music	77	Movement	78	Organization	67
11	Europe	58	Organization	76	State	61	Manifestation	62
12	Movement	57	Life	72	Generation	57	Nationalist (narodowiec)	58
13	Country	55	Band	71	(Eur.) Union	51	Group	53
14	Germany	48	World	66	Fight	49	Police	52
15	Holocaust	41	Beer	52	Law	49	Pole	45

Source: Own research.

Table 1 portrays two groups of values. First group encompasses items which seem to be common to the entire nationalist movement: *Poland*, *nation*, *people* (however in this case the meaning is often reliant on co-occurring words) and *Pole*. Second group depicts the characteristics of the given circles. The frequency lists are, therefore, helpful in the process of identification of the ideological elements and/or conceptual frames, and subsequently to recognize the values (or components of values). They are also useful in revealing the convergence/divergence between particular corpora. For example, the neo-fascist and skinhead corpuses possess many common elements. The nationalist and radical nationalist corpora are expressly different from the two mentioned above. It is

also evident that there are substantial differences between the dominant elements in the nationalist corpus from the 90s and the one from the first decade of the XXIth century[7].

When we divide the dominants lexemes into particular categories, a clearer image emerge (see Table 2). Five categories can be distinguished here. The first one consists of ideological components, which include elements directly related to the ideological concepts declared by each of the group. The sphere of identity is to be understood as elements, which are not the carriers of ideology, but are related to it, and constitute an integral part of the identity of a given group. The third category relates to the elements connected with the organizational structure. The fourth sphere includes the elements which relate to the actions of the studied groups. Finally, in the fifth category the remaining elements were gathered.

Table. 2. Dominating distinguished categories common to all corpora

NEOFASCIST CORPUS		SKINHEAD CORPUS	
IDEOLOGY	FREQ.	IDEOLOGY	FREQ.
WHITE	153	POLAND	234
PEOPLE	150	PEOPLE	166
POLAND	140	COUNTRY	119
JUDE	133	WHITE	100
RACE	106	NATION	82
NATION	78		
COUNTRY	55		
HOLOCAUST	41		
IDENTITY	FREQ.	IDENTITY	FREQ.
SKINHEAD	110	SKINHEAD	310
		CONCERT	89
		MUSIC	77
		BAND	71
		BEER	52
STRUCTURE	FREQ.	STRUCTURE	FREQ.
MOVEMENT	57	MOVEMENT	160

---

[7] One needs to remember, that this state can be a result of the text selection process, performed at the point of creating the corpora. Nevertheless, in the case of distinct differences we can speak about changes in accentuating particular elements in the communication of a given group.

		GROUP	87
		ORGANIZATION	76
ACTION	FREQ.	ACTION	FREQ.
FIGHT	75		
OTHER CONCEPTUAL FRAMES	FREQ.	OTHER CONCEPTUAL FRAMES	FREQ.
WORLD	83	LIFE	72
LIFE	78	WORLD	66
EUROPE	58		
GERMANY	48		
NATIONALIST CORPUS 1990s		NATIONAIST CORPUS 2007-2011	
IDEOLOGY	FREQ.	IDEOLOGY	FREQ.
POLAND	277	POLAND	319
NATION	176	INDEPENDENCE	71
PEOPLE	175	POLE	45
POLE	100		
STATE	61		
IDENTITY	FREQ.	IDENTITY	FREQ.
YOUTH	116	YOUTH	118
POWER	85	NATIONALIST (nacjonalista)	80
		NATIONALIST (narodowiec)	58
STRUCTURE	FREQ.	STRUCTURE	FREQ.
ORGANIZATION	92	MOVEMENT	120
GROUP	80	ACTIVIST	102
MOVEMENT	78	PEOPLE	81
		ORGANIZATION	67
		GROUP	53
ACTION	FREQ.	ACTION	FREQ.
FIGHT	49	ACTION	246
		MARCH	121
		MANIFESTATION	62
OTHER CONCEPTUAL FRAMES	FREQ.	OTHER CONCEPTUAL FRAMES	FREQ.
(EUROPEAN) UNION	51	POLICE	52
LAW	49		
LIFE	133		
GENERATION	57		

Source: Own research.

From this perspective it is quite visible, that the neo-fascist communication is based on ideological elements and it is supplemented by contexts with the lexeme *skinhead*, which plays important role in creating the movement identity. In the skinhead corpus the ideological issues are also of great importance, however, they are to a much greater extent correlated with the subculture identity and organizational structure, than in the case of neo-fascists. Interesting results were noticed in the case of the nationalist corpus. It is quite evident that the nationalist communication in the 90s of the XXth century was more oriented on the ideological issues, compared to the contemporary communication, which focuses heavily on informing about the actions undertaken by the movement and organizational affairs.

The main assumption is that the dominant lexemes in these corpora are responsible for directing communication of the particular group. Another issue, is their verification as the key-words. According to Wierzbicka's claim, in order to recognise the frequently recurring words as the key-words, it is necessary to examine their meanings and the functions they fulfil in the communication of a given system. This process is best to be shown on the basis of the lexemes *Poland* (which occurs in every corpus) and *white* (very important in the neo-fascist and skinhead communication).

With all certainty the lexeme *Poland* is a defined value for the Polish extreme right, however, it has minor role in transferring/creating particular ideological content. Among all contexts only single collocations, which can be considered as axiological, emerged (for example *to betray Poland* etc.). Most often this lexeme co-occurred with prepositions *to*, *in*, *by* etc., and thereby the main function of the word *Poland* was placing particular contexts in a geopolitical environment. The lexeme therefore fulfil mainly a pragmatic function. The most frequent are references to the ultra-nationalist concept of "Great Poland"[8]. The second most common group of collocations referred to the nationalist organizations, mostly to the National Rebirth of Poland (especially in the nationalist corpora).

Although marginal ideological semantization of this lexeme is no surprise when discussing the communication of neo-fascists and skinheads, since other values are more important for these circles, almost completely lack of the ideological meanings can be intriguing in the case of nationalist communication.

---

[8] The phrase "Great Poland" refers to Roman Dmowski's idea of nationalism – an ultra-conservative, intolerant and anti-Semitic concept (see more Porter 2000).

One could suppose that *Poland* should be considered a synonym for nation. However, in this case the lexeme *Poland* also serves a pragmatic function. It is worth noticing, how the hierarchy of elements changes with time. In the 90s corpus, references to the concept of "Great Poland" were most frequent, and the two following collocations were references to the political system – to the polish nationalist organization called National Rebirth of Poland and to the political party – Movement for the Reconstruction of Poland. In the current communication the emphasis is transferred to the communication about the movement's environment itself.

The case is slightly different when analysing the lexeme *white* which is an important element of both the neo-fascists and skinheads identity. Not only the higher number and frequency of collocations can be noticed, but also the fact that all of them perform the same function – they are responsible for creating the racist construct of "white supremacy".

When we take into consideration the dominant collocations and their contexts we can distinguish the following groups of values (constructs).

The neo-fascist and skinhead circles are linked by a number of values. In both instances the construct of "racism" prevails. Two words are directly responsible for creating this construct: *white* (153)[9][100]' and *race* (106)[72][10], and the communication is controlled by the following collocations:

WHITE: *white man* (35)[6], *white people* (5)[8], *white race* (14)[20], *white nationalists* (5), *white world* (3), *white pride* (3), *white brothers* (3), *white power* (3)[3], *white nations* (3), *white army* [9], *white children* [4], *white revolution*.

RACE: *our race* (8)[10], *own race* (5), *one's race* (6), *Aryan race* (10), *Aryan nation*' (3), *black race* [5], *other race* [4];

Yet another strong construct is "anti-Semitism", and the controlling lexemes are *Jew*[11] (104)[71] and *Holocaust* (44). This construct, which constitute the anti-value

---

[9] Given that four corpora are comparable, the frequencies of occurrence of words in the particular corpus was given in the following way. The notations go as follows - (..) frequency in the neo-fascist corpus, […] skinhead corpus, /…/ 90s nationalist corpus., <...> XXI century nationalist corpus.

[10] In the following analysis, for comparative purposes, the frequency of the lexemes which failed to reach the predefined threshold of 15 most frequent words was also listed.

[11] Although the lexeme *Jew* is also present in the skinhead corpus, however, it is emphasized to a much lesser degree. It should also be pointed out that the adjective *Jewish* is equally important in the communication of these groups. The construct of the "Jew" constitute an important anti-value for

for both groups, realizes an important role in creating the opposition "us-them", and helps to develop the construct of "the other". Another construct is "skinhead"[12] (compound lexemes *skinhead* (110)[310], *movement* (57)[160]), which is responsible for creating an identity and unity of the groups. This is most clearly visible within the skinhead corpus, in which a large number of subculture elements exists. The following elements help to establish the group's "life style": *concert* [89], *group* [87], *music* [77], *organization* [76], *band* [71], *beer* [52]. Finally, we have the universal nationalist values – *Poland* (140) [234], *nation* (78)[82], *country* (55)[119].

While the neo-fascist corpus was characterized with a strictly ideological communication and the skinhead corpus underlined the subculture sphere of the movement, the nationalist circles emphasize their affiliations to the political system. This is best shown on the basis of numerous elements which relate to political structure: *organization* /92/<67>, *group* /80/<53>, *movement* /78/<120>, *youth* /116/<118>, *activist* <102>, *nationalist*[13] (nacjonalista)' <80>, *nationalist* (narodowiec)<58> and manners of operation, although these elements are dominant in corpus from the XXI century: *action* <246>, *march* <121>, *manifestation* <62>. Politics and the coinciding actions on the political arena constitute a real value for the nationalists.

As it was mentioned previously, the nationalist corpora differ extensively, when considering the dominant lexemes. One can assume that this alteration stems from the change of tools used for communicational purposes. In the pre-Internet era, when the zines or papers printed in low circulation where the main communication tool of the nationalist circles, the information concerning the current events were published in marginal amounts, and the ideological

---

these circles, and it is constructed on the basis of a series of negative connotations. The adjective *Jewish* functions as a tool for transferring this negative meaning onto other lexemes, which are not correlated with Jews or the Judaism.

[12] It should be stressed out that while majority of neo-fascists is skinheads not all skinheads identify themselves with the neo-fascist ideology.

[13] Two important remarks should be presented here. The first one regards the term "nationalism" which is used differently by Polish end English speakers. According to Oxford Dictionary the meaning of the word 'nationalism' can be both neutral, when it refers to general patriotic feeling, and negative when it refers to some extreme form of patriotism. In the Polish language the meaning is explicitly negative and it encompasses such notions as: chauvinism, xenophobia and the aggressive ideology of the extreme right is embedded into it. Secondly, in the English language the word 'nationalist' refers both to the moderate nationalists and to the members of the far-right parties, however, the terms far-right or extreme right are more preferable in the second case. In the Polish language there are two terms. The first one is the word "narodowiec" which refers to moderate nationalists and the word 'nacjonalista' (nationalist) which refers to the members of the far-right groups and organization.

texts dominated. Currently, the lack of the economic barriers in creating media, made it possible to develop a large number of nationalist websites. Each organization, promotes its own actions through its own channels. In consequence, the number of references to the activity of individual organizations in contemporary communication translates to different hierarchization of values.

The corpus from the 90s shows, that the central elements responsible for controlling communication were ideological components like *nation*, *Poland*, *Pole*, *state*. Previously it has been shown, that in the case of the lexeme *Poland* only the collocation "Great Poland" was a recurring ideological concept. A much more valuing word is the lexeme *nation*, which is responsible for the creation of the "imagined community" (a reference to Benedict Anderson's concept, cf. 1991). In order to achieve this goal nationalists use not only the collocations which are responsible for emphasizing the attachment to Poland such as *Polish nation* (27), but also such phrases as *our nation* (8) or *wellbeing of the nation*. Interestingly, among the dominant collocations, the lexeme *motherland* did not occur, even though it is mentioned as an important element of the patriotic values (see Bartmiński 2006, Fleischer 2003, Pisarek 2003).

Conclusions

The example of the last corpus shows, that the change in the communicational behaviours of the contemporary extreme right, hinders the identification of values. The strictly ideological lexemes, although certainly relevant, mostly for the purpose of maintaining the stability and coherence of the system, are not used as commonly as in the past. It is quite evident that the current communication is based on self-referential codes – nationalists communicate mostly about themselves. Another issue is, as Chris Atton (2006) observed, that the contemporary far-right has changed its communicational strategy. The language, which in the past was distinctive and significantly more radicalized, has currently adjusted to the mainstream political discourse, however, new meanings are being ascribed to the particular words/concepts.

In consequence the process of identification of values has become more complicated. The meanings and values are hidden within less obvious (than in the case of *race* or *Holocaust*) words and collocations. They need to be looked for in the various communicational spheres. For example, the "axiology of space" (cf. Bartmiński 2003) helps to reveal the valuating meanings which are

hidden in the contexts referring to the particular geographic areas or parties/organizations. Through such collocations as *Greek nationalists*, *Hungarian nationalists* one can attempt to decode ideological elements, however, it requires additional analysis. Another example is the *European Union*, which in the communication of nationalists is an anti-value. Examining collocations related to the UE one can find numerous information, which enable reconstructing certain values, e.g. anti-values as immigration, Islam, anti-clericalism etc.

Simultaneously it is visible that the analytical process in further research should be expanded to adjectives (these which can be assumed as values or those which when interact with other words create valuating meanings). An excellent example here is the previously mentioned lexeme *Jewish*, which only marginal referred to the Jewish population. Its main function in the extreme right communication is to establish a clear-cut division between them and us, and to define the enemy – e.g. *Jewish European Union*, *Jewish finance*. This lexeme is also used as a "discursive weapon" in the ideological battle with "the enemy".

With utmost certainty, the procedure described above does not end the process of reconstruction of values in the communication of Polish nationalists. Another step will be the attempt to categorize the identified elements and an attempt to create an axiological ideological matrix.

Acknowledgements

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, B. (1991), *Imagined Ccommunities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London-New York: Verso.

Back, L. (2002), *When Hate Speaks the Language of Love*, paper presented at the Social Movement Studies Conference, London.

Bartmiński, J. (eds.) (2003), „Miejsce wartości w językowym obrazie świata", In Jerzy Bartmiński (Eds.) *Język w kręgu wartości*, pp. 59-86, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Bartmiński, J. (eds.) (2006), *Język, wartości, polityka*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Berg, H. De. (1997), „Communication as Challenge to Systems Theory", Canadian Review of Comparative Literature 1997, CRCL, March, pp. 141-151.

Bertalanffy, L. von, (1968), *General System Theory*, New York: George Brazillier.

Bertalanffy, L. von, (1972), „The history and status of general systems theory". In. George J. Klir (Eds.), *Trends in General Systems Theory,* pp. 21-41, New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Brake, M. (1974), „The Skinheads: An English Working Class Subculture", Youth Society 1974, vol. 6, no.2, pp. 179-200.

Duncombe, S. (1997), *Notes From Underground. Zines and the Politics of Alternative Culture*, Bloomington: Verso.

Fleischer, M. (2002), *Konstrukcja rzeczywistości*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Fleischer, M. (2003), „Stabilność polskiej symboliki kolektywnej" In Jerzy Bartmiński (Eds.) *Język w kręgu wartości*, pp. 107-144, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Fleischer, M. (2010). *Wartości w wymiarze komunikacyjnym*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Primum Verbum.

Glasersfeld, E. von, (1995). *Radical Constructivism. A Way of Knowing and Learning.* London-Washington D.C.

Głowiński, M. (1986), "Wartościowanie w badaniach literackich a język potoczny". In Stefan Sawicki and Władysław Panas (Eds), *O wartościowaniu w badaniach literackich*, pp. 179-195, Lublin: RW KUL.

Ignazi, P. (2006), *Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe*, New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jaworska, S. (2012), "On the F word: A corpus-based analysis of the media representation of feminism in British and German press discourse, 1990–2009", Discourse and Society, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 401-431.

Laszlo, E. (1978), *Systemowy obraz świata*, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Luhmann, N. (1995), *Social Systems*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Maturana H.R., F.G. Varela, R. Uribe (1974), "Autopoiesis: the organization of living systems, its characterization and a model", Currents in modern biology 1995, May 5 (4), pp. 187-196.

Matuszek K. C. (2014), "System polityki w perspektywie teorii Luhmanna", Horyzonty Polityki, Vol. 5, N. 12, pp.14-29.

Minkenberg, M. (2000), "The Renewal of the Radical Right: Between Modernity and Antimodernity", Government and Opposition, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 170-188.

Pisarek, W. (2003), "Wybory słów sztandarowych jako kryterium stratyfikacji społeczeństwa", In Jerzy Bartmiński (Eds.) *Język w kręgu wartości*, pp. 87-106, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Porter, B. (2000), *When Nationalism Began to Hate*, New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt S. J. (1992), "The Logic of Observation: An Introduction to Constructivism", Canadian Review of Comparative Literature 1992, CRCL, September, pp. 295-311.

Schmidt S. J. (2004), "Kultura a kontyngencja: nauki obserwatora", 2K: Kultura I Komunikacja 2004, no. 1, pp. 2-5.

Schmidt, S. J. (2006), "Od tekstu do systemu. Zarys konstruktywistycznego (empirycznego) modelu nauki". In Erazm Kuźma & Andrzej Skrendo &Jerzy Madejski (Eds.) *Konstruktywizm w badaniach literackich*, pp. 199-220, Kraków: Univestitas.

Schmidt S.J. (2008), "Operative Fictions, or How to Talk About Society", Constructivism Foundations 2008, vol.3, no. 2, pp. 67-68.

Siciński, A. (1978), "Przedmowa". In. Ervin Laszlo *Systemowy obraz świata*, pp.5-19, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Sinclair, J. (2003), *Reading Concordances. An Introduction*, London: Pearson Education Limited.

Sinclair, J. (2004), *Trust the Text. Language, corpus and discourse*: London, Routledge.

Wierzbicka, A. (1996), *Semantics. Primes and Universals*, New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (1997), *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.