The aim of this paper is to contribute to the deconstruction of the migration discourse of the Law and Justice Party (Prawo i Sprawiedliwość, PiS), looking for mythical structures in it and trying to decode them using discourse analysis. When it comes to migration politics, Poland is one of the most curious and ambiguous contemporary cases. Previously predominantly a sending country, as its economy grows Poland is becoming a receiving country, faced with millions of incoming labour migrants. The Polish government lets them in, despite being anti-migrant in its rhetoric, especially when it comes to relocation of refugees within the European Union (EU). Some surveys reveal that countrywide anti-migrant sentiment is a rather new development: Polish attitudes towards immigrants have worsened since mid-2015, that is since the so-called European migration crisis was utilized by Law and Justice in their campaign at the 2015 Polish parliamentary election in order to gain fear-induced support. Therefore, Law and Justice’s migration discourse is fundamental to the study of contemporary Polish migration politics. I have analysed the news, interviews and other publications from the official website of the Law and Justice party (pis.org.pl) over a period between June 2015 and July 2018. Based upon E. Cassirer’s, M. Eliade’s and H. Tudor’s understanding of political myth, I have identified a number of repetitive mythical structures and characteristics of political myths in the Law and Justice’s discourse on migration that can help to better understand Law and Justice’s political and ideological stances.
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We should carefully study the origin, the structure, the methods, and the technique of the political myths. We should see the adversary face to face in order to know how to combat him.

Ernst Cassirer, *The myth of the state*

INTRODUCTION

When it comes to migration politics, Poland is one of the most curious and ambiguous contemporary cases. Previously predominantly a sending country, as its economy grows Poland is becoming a receiving country, faced with millions of incoming labour migrants, whom the Polish government lets in despite being anti-migrant in its rhetoric especially when it comes to relocation of refugees within the European Union (EU). The *Independent* has listed Poland among the most anti-migrant countries in Europe, and surveys show that Poles would leave the EU if this were necessary to ensure that Muslim refugees do not settle in Poland. At the same time, millions of Poles work in other EU countries, benefitting from the free movement of people. Moreover, during WWII Poles themselves were asylum seekers escaping, among others, to the Middle East, and Poland has been home to Muslim minorities for centuries (the Tatar Poles). Indeed, surveys show that countrywide anti-migrant sentiment is a rather new development: Polish attitudes towards immigrants have worsened since mid-2015, since the

---


so-called European migration crisis was utilized by the Law and Justice party (Prawo I Sprawiedliwość, PiS) in their 2015 Polish parliamentary election campaign in order to gain fear-induced support. Therefore, PiS migration discourse is fundamental to the study of contemporary Polish migration politics. According to one of the founders of research into political myths, Ernst Cassirer, instability as a state of mind, a crisis, can be crafted. This state of mind is a fertile ground for acceptance of myth, which can be a very effective tool of social manipulation. The European migration crisis is an example of such a moment of instability.

One of the central features of myth is its appeal to emotions, and appeal to emotions is a tool widely used in populist politics. According to José Pedro Zúquete, populists, which include PiS, also often resort to missionary politics. This is a cluster concept that he defines as a political religion, characterized by the dynamic interaction among charismatic leadership, a narrative of salvation, outsiderhood and ritualization, and the creation of a moral community invested with a collective mission of combating conspiratorial enemies and redeeming the nation from its putative crisis. For this, mythologies of the strong state, the home of a blameless, pure nation are often invoked. Therefore, myth is a useful analytical lens for the study of populist politics. The aim of this paper is to contribute to the deconstruction of the migration discourse of PiS, looking for mythical structures in it and trying to decode them using basic discourse analysis.

THEORY

The word “myth” comes from the Greek mythos which originally meant “word, speech”. It then gained secondary meanings, such as “public speech”, “dialogue, conversation” or “tale, narration”.

Scientific conceptualisation of myth as a political tool started in the 20th century, first by Mircea Eliade, then by Ernst Cassirer and Leszek Kolakowski. Afterwards, Henry Tudor defined the concept of political myth.

---

Cassirer focused on the philosophy of cognition, the way of understanding and interpreting reality. He viewed human culture as a world of “symbolic forms”: language, history, art, science and myth. Those five symbolic forms are our lenses for interpretation of reality. Looking for structures in those human activities, he studied myth as a form of consciousness, a form of cognition (a way of thinking), which is different from scientific cognition, but not necessarily wrong or false, as positivists have argued.\(^{20}\) If something is not empirically verifiable, however, it is a myth. The mythical way of thinking can be either spontaneous or crafted. Cassirer noted that in the 20th century, with the help of new technical tools, old ideas have been changed into the strong and powerful political weapons that myths are.\(^{21}\) He found myth made according to plan. The new political myths do not grow up freely; they are not wild fruits of an exuberant imagination. They are artificial things fabricated by very skilful and cunning artisans.\(^{22}\) He states that the technological age has enabled a new technique of mythmaking, thanks to which myths can be manufactured in the same sense and according to the same methods as any other modern weapon... That is a new thing and a thing of crucial importance. It has changed the whole form of our social life... The first step that had to be taken was a change in the function of language. If we study the development of human speech we find that in the history of civilization the word fulfils two entirely different functions. To put it briefly we may term these functions the semantic and the magical use of the word... the magic word has a predominant and overwhelming influence. It does not describe things or relations of things; it tries to produce effects and to change the course of nature.\(^{23}\) Cassirer said that language, along with ritual, is a tool of creating mythological thinking. As for language, he said new, performative language, rather than descriptive, is created, or old words are given new meaning. This language allows one to create labels, and thereby control people’s reality through controlling their emotions. Hence, while studying myth we need to first and foremost look at the language.

Cassirer also said that the mythological mode of thinking usually appears in moments of instability, in crises. Therefore, it only makes sense that the so-called European refugee crisis has spurred multiple mythologies concerning migrants. Moreover, Cassirer notes that instability as a state of mind can be crafted, artificially created, and consequently myth can be a very effective tool of social manipulation.

Eliade understood myth as a sacred story. While he was also interested in the concept of homo symbolicus, he focused more on homo religiosus. Thus, he studied concrete religious myths in order to understand the structures of mythical thinking. He believed that myths can transform, but it is structure that allows myth to survive. These structures are derived from the religious, but exist in our world on their own, detached from religion, but omnipresent in literature, cinema and politics. For Eliade, myth was
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\(^{20}\) C. Bottici, *A Philosophy...*


\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 282.

\(^{23}\) Ibid.
a way of transcending objective human existence through introducing the concept of “sacrum” to it.\textsuperscript{24,25}

Leszek Kolakowski was close to Eliade in his understanding of myth, as he treated it as a way of transcending empirical human experience by giving it a meaning that went beyond empirical reality through relativization.\textsuperscript{26} He saw myth as a type of religious belief, and as a conviction and a philosophical theory, which saw the fulfillment of transhistorical values in the reality of human culture.\textsuperscript{27} He saw understanding of empirical realities as meaningful to a mythical organisation of the world, which is permanently present in cultures. His view of a myth can be briefly summarised as the meaning-giving interpretation of reality. Importantly, he noted that the predicates “true” and “false” are inapplicable here, similar to Cassirer’s understanding. What he viewed important is not matching a judgement with a situation it describes but matching a need with an area which satisfies it.\textsuperscript{28}

Henry Tudor defined political myths as ideological narratives, believed by social groups to be true even when they may be false, devices with dramatic constructions that are used to “come to grips with reality”. Political myth for him is a kind of myth that deals with political topics. Its major characteristic is that it is always uses a certain group of people as the hero or protagonist.\textsuperscript{29}

For this paper, since I analyze discourse of a political party on a concrete politicised topic, I adopt Tudor’s definition of a political myth, informed by Cassirer’s and Eliade’s understandings of myth, and to a lesser extent by Kolakowski’s. This is because both Cassirer and Eliade, in spite of differences in what they focus on, see myth as a special form of thinking and as an expression of collective emotions, and both were interested in myth in political thinking.\textsuperscript{30-32}

I leave aside scholars who understand myth as a story produced by primitive societies, such as Levi-Strauss, or myth as a false notion of reality, such as Barthes, and others, as they do not fully fit the chosen research focus.

Therefore, I see political myths as (ideologically infused) convictions, visions and beliefs constructed in the consciousness and cognition of a community in reply to a strong emotional need, and which appeal to layers of consciousness beyond rationality, and the purpose of which is to provide a meaningful interpretation of empirical reality.

Cassirer identified five attributes of a myth: 1) mythical identity (no difference between the real and the ideal, the object and its representation, between the thought and

\textsuperscript{24} C. Bottici, \textit{A Philosophy...}
\textsuperscript{26} L. Kolakowski, A. Czerniawski, \textit{The Presence of Myth}, Chicago 1989, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., p. 3.
\textsuperscript{30} E. Cassirer, \textit{The Myth of...}
the being); 2) lack of distinction between the part and the whole (an attribute is identical to the whole); 3) causality fallacy (anything that happened before will happen again, allowing the building of prophecies); 4) organisation of time and space is different than in science (*in illo tempore*); 5) numbers have more than empirical values.  

Barbara Törnquist Plewa has identified the following distinctive features of a myth, bringing together the understanding of the major authors, Eliade, Cassirer and Kołakowski: emotional bias, transhistoricity, the capacity to transcend human empirical experience, and the two-value division of the world into sacrum and profanum.  

Among those features, the most fundamental is emotional bias, the emotional need which creates a myth. *If a myth reflects a truth, it is primarily a truth of emotions. A real myth can never be a pure intellectual creation, a living myth must be expressed emotionally.* At the same time, a myth is not a bare emotion, it is an expression of collective emotion. To become a myth, an emotion must find its expression in either a visual or a verbal form through symbolic manifestations. Expression is as important as emotion. For this paper, I will focus on verbal manifestations of myths, on the language used to create them. I am, however, aware that language can never render the totality of emotions that generate a myth, which creates a limitation for such research.  

Thanks to its transhistoricity, a myth legitimises contemporary action through linking it with the past.  

The two-value division of the world into sacrum and profanum is also particularly important to characterise a myth. This can apply to time, space, numbers, objects, values, etc.  

All these features are intertwined in the structure of a myth, however most important is that as long as there are irrational or emotional elements, there are traces of myth. After Kołakowski, as long as something in reality has a sense, a higher purpose, meaning, is ascribed values, it has traces of myth. Myth can explain anything. An overall function of myth can be summarised after Cassirer as to control people’s reality, or after Kołakowski, to give meaning to it.  

**ANALYSIS**

I have analysed the news, interviews and other publications from the official website of the Law and Justice Party (pis.org.pl). The research sample was selected by search of the
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33 E. Cassirer, *The Myth of...*  
35 C. Bottici, *A Philosophy...*  
36 Ibid.  
38 H. Buczyńska, Cassirer, Warszawa 1963, pp. 91-94.  
The result was curious because nowhere in the analysed material was there a mention of Chechen refugees, which are the biggest group among the refugees accepted in Poland, and the biggest group among applicants for asylum.41 Neither were Ukrainian migrants mentioned, even though in talks with the EU the Polish government sometimes uses them as an excuse of having already accepted a large number of refugees.42 Neither is there a mention of new plans to welcome economic migrants from Vietnam and the Philippines.43

The analysis has revealed an overwhelming appeal to emotion, and very little appeal to rationality throughout the discourse. There are no arguments given against accepting refugees, such as potential negative economic effects, integration difficulties due to lack of proficiency in Polish or cultural and religious otherness. The only argument overwhelmingly used is that of security, which proves that migration in Poland is a largely securitised issue, meaning a manufactured perceived existential threat.44 Regarding the refusal to accept EU refugee relocation quotas, it is repeated many times that what is most important is the security of Poland and Poles.45

As explanation for this reasoning, terror attacks in Western European countries are cited. For example: After recent events related to acts of terror, we will not accept refugees, because there is no mechanism which would ensure security.46

Here we can notice the fallacy of causality, identified by Cassirer as one of the characteristics of myth. The terror attacks to which Jarosław Kaczyński refers in this statement, (quote from a Q&A session with Kaczyński in May, 2016), are presumably the bombings in Brussels which had happened two months earlier. Naturally, there is no way to empirically prove that an attack in Belgium by Belgian nationals (and one

40 Since the website is in Polish, so was the search, accounting for all possible grammatical forms of the nouns. All original text is in Polish, all translation is own.
Swedish national) loyal to the Islamic state could in any way cause attacks in Poland by Syrian refugees.47 48

However, the dominant myth in the discourse is an “us vs them” way of thinking, where “us” or “self” is the PiS government, by extension Poland, and the extended self49 50 is the four Visegrad countries (V4), sometimes the wider Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) or new EU Member States who struggle against the older Member States, Western European countries, and the “Brussels elites” who are perceived as protecting their interests at the cost of the new members. The reference to V4 and the CEE suggests the hierarchy of PiS self-identification, which fits into a model of nested identities – a hierarchal form where national identification is nested in a regional one.51 However, further research is needed to definitely prove this thesis, and establish which identification comes first, V4 or the CEE. The V4 has formed a strong bond over its opposition to the EU relocation quotas. They present themselves as an alternative alliance against the old Member States.

Coherence of the positions of the Visegrad Group is noticeable.52

The EU is demonised. Its “old” Member States are portrayed as dangerous, its “Brussels elites” as illegitimate, its leaders as authoritarian, its policies as bad and ineffective (the underlined words are those that were coded):

[About accepting and relocating refugees] Attempts to force joint responsibility for the decision on the opening of borders, which Angela Merkel has taken in an authoritarian manner and in violation of all EU procedures, is a complete mistake of Brussels. The European Union, if it is to be an organization embedded in the values of European culture, must first require of itself the rule of law.53

This propaganda about success [of relocation programs] from the European Commission... for many people it was a wakeup call showing the hypocrisy of the Brussels elites.54

Jarosław Kaczyński on meeting with Merkel, discussing problems of Brexit and refugees, in document titled “Each state has a sovereign right to defend its interest”:

50 According to Prelinger, who tested James’s concept of extended self, other people, such as the people in one’s hometown, are considered as an extension of the self.
Germany must decide. We do not accept such a policy that on the one hand, all is well at the international level, and on the other at the level of media and society, there is a constant nonsensical attack on Poland and supporting the opposition, which is not a normal opposition, but a total opposition. This is unacceptable...The claim that the German government does not have any influence over the media is a claim, to put it mildly, detached from reality.\(^{55}\)

We can notice Kaczynski blaming Germany for being hypocritical, as “Brussels elites” in the quote above, and victimizing Poland as being nonsensically attacked. In another statement, Kaczynski takes this even further:

[On Poland’s strong anti-migrant stance against the EU] The arguments are raised that the European Union pays us. But what is it paying for? For the fact that we give away to the strongest states of the European Union (because it is them, and not us, who decides in Brussels) a very large part of the decision-making opportunities on our matters. They gain great regulatory power, also towards Poland. It has great economic and political value. We do not get it for free, we can say that they buy it from us very cheaply... We have no reasons for pangs of conscience. Instead, we have the right to defend our sovereignty to oppose the unheard-of statements of European politicians, headed by Mr Schulz, to defend against this defamation campaign carried out by the mortal enemies of Poland, people mad from hatred to our country. And not doing this is not only a disgrace, shame and scandal but also a great political mistake.\(^{56}\)

This statement is especially harsh, with European politicians being called “mortal enemies of Poland”, “mad from hatred”. It stems from September 2015, when a parliamentary campaign was still ongoing. Later communications are more diplomatic.

The EU is perceived as polarized between the West and the East, with Poland as a “whipping boy”:

The basic problem of Poland is the fact that in recent months it has become a comfortable “whipping boy”. The decision makers of the “old EU”, irritated by Poland’s strong opposition to the forced relocation of refugees in our country, imposed on us unfavourable rhetoric in their national media, which in turn has a clear impact on sentiments in the society. As a consequence, in the societies of the “old EU” the antipathy to our country persists or is even growing, as to the alleged “egoists” who “forgot what solidarity is” and who “only take money and do not want to give anything themselves”. In this climate, populist simplifications and unfair generalizations fall on fertile ground... At the same time, the Polish government should repeat the signals of support for European integration while respecting the scope of political and economic freedoms guaranteed by the treaties. A strong EU is Poland’s interest – but not the EU polarized between the “poor relatives from the East” and the “old elite”\(^{57}\).


At the same time, they contradistinguish Western Europe from Central and Eastern Europe, and not in a flattering manner:

Please look around Europe, look at Sweden, where Sharia is in force and the state has no control. (…) What is happening in Italy? Occupied churches, sometimes treated as toilets. What is going on in France? A constant wrangle and patrols that enforce sharia. The same happens in London, also in Germany, the toughest in this respect, such phenomena take place.58

…by [not] accepting the forced relocation of migrants, we win the security of our own citizens. People in Poland, in public places, feel safe. At least a lot safer than in Western Europe. They do not live in fear that every night out on the beach or an evening walk can end in a tragedy.60

Many curious observations can be made about those paragraphs. First, as normally in their discourse, PiS presents EU relocation quotas (as many other EU decisions) as forced on Poland.

In general, we can notice how this paragraph’s aim is to incite fear by means of highly dramatic language (“living in fear”, “can end in tragedy”) and a comparison with a Western Europe which has accepted refugees and is therefore implicitly suffering from terror.

We show that you can pursue a different policy and live without fear of terrorist attacks. This is an example for the leaders of some countries that are so dangerous, that regardless of the invocation of reality, the frustration of societies affected by these misfortunes is growing. They look at the map and see where it is different. And they ask – how come can they live there normally? In the name of what do we give away our security, the shape of European civilization? I often hear such voices… I hear admiration for Poland that was able to say “no” to bad projects, that we are today a beautiful, safe, attractive country.61

This paragraph is an excellent example of myth. The mere refusal to accept a few thousand refugees only two years before the publication of this material, is interpreted with so much meaning that it is basically portrayed as the cause of the country’s prosperity. On the other hand, other [implicitly Western] European countries are portrayed as dangerous and self-destructive. Poland is yet again shown as the hero, the Messiah, who will show others the way to salvation. Empirical reality is explicitly denied.

Besides, in many cases, the word ‘migrants’ is used when clearly ‘refugees’ or ‘asylum seekers’ is meant. I believe this is intentional and not just an accidental confusion of definitions. That is because ‘migrant’ unlike ‘refugee’ or ‘asylum seeker’ frees them from implied responsibility to help. At the same time, while talking about Ukrainians in Poland, they often use the term ‘refugee’, even though the vast majority of them are
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58 Retrieved from: “Mamy prawo bronić…”

59 I assume there was a typo, as the interviewee talks about Poland refusing to accept refugees and the benefits of such a decision.


61 Retrieved from: ibid.
economic migrants. Moreover, it is often said that refugees in Europe are not real refugees, that they are liars seeking economic profit – this logic also frees one from sympathy and responsibility to help:

We see that refugees come not only from Syria or Iraq. They are people there from northern Africa or even from Europe. What is very important is that these people want to go to Germany.

Another example of emphasizing security – in a document titled “Security of Poles is our priority” the first sentence reads:

Prime Minister Beata Szydło has firmly stated today that in the matter of refugees, Poland will not allow itself to be intimidated by the European Commission. The security of the region, Poles and the Visegrad Group is our priority and we will never agree to blackmail and dictating such conditions.

A lot is being said on the EU’s intention to fine Member States who refuse to relocate refugees:

The fee would amount to 250,000 euro for each person who will not be accepted [...] This is a form of extortion on EU states that are not ready to receive.

We can notice here the emotional appeal to a Polish messianic complex and distrust for authority. The latter is manifested in the language of oppression used to describe the actions of the European commission: intimidation, blackmail, dictating, distortion. The former is reminiscent of the structure of the myth of Poland as “Christ of nations” (a notion first introduced by Adam Mickiewicz) where not only Poland is oppressed by a foreign power, it stands firmly against it, and their sacrifice is supposed to save the entire region from suffering.

Another example of Poland under PiS represented as a hero in the good fight:

As Poland, from the very beginning we have consistently and with great courage raised it and we were not afraid to start discussions on this subject [the relocation mechanism]. The entire Visegrad is of such opinion at the moment.

As long as I am Prime Minister, there will be no Polish consent to this [refugee relocation]. They [the EU] will not break us.

Across all the publications, sovereignty is mentioned or alluded to multiple times in regard to migration policy. It seems to be that this is the real issue for PiS, not refugees

62 “Poland Refuses...”
63 Retrieved from: “Najważniejsze jest bezpieczeństwo”.
65 Retrieved from: ibid.
69 Retrieved from: “Nie będzie zgody...”
per se, but rather their monopoly on decision-making in Poland being jeopardized by the EU. Since Poland’s history of occupations has led it, along with other countries in the region, to perceive its sovereignty as sacrosanct\(^{70}\), this issue is easy to manipulate in order to mobilize opposition against the foreign power that is claimed to be a threat to nation’s sovereignty:

Such a decision would abolish the sovereignty of the weaker Member States of the European Union. We cannot agree to this. We must oppose, because we are and will be masters in our own land.\(^{71}\)

Sovereign states must have the ability to decide who they accept.\(^{72}\)

We have the right to defend our sovereignty.\(^{73}\)

We take the position that all EU countries have a duty to guarantee full sovereignty of borders and that we, the Republic of Poland, decide who we want to accept, whom we want to accept temporarily, and whom we do not want to accept.\(^{74}\)

The talk of “weaker” Member States seems to be an instrumental victimization, in other contexts it is often talked about how strong the Polish economy is. When asked whether she thinks that “the European Establishment” will accept the changes in Poland [refusal to relocate refugees] former Prime Minister Beata Szydło replied:

I’m convinced of that. It is impossible to leave Poland, a large country, one of the leaders, when it comes to economic growth in Europe, out of decision-making. Neither we, nor other Member States will allow this. It does not change the fact that we will be attacked. We must remind them that it is about our example, our path, how to build economic growth, security of citizens, an attractive place to invest, that it does not infect others with the thought that things can be done differently than before.\(^{75}\)

The growing political influence of the V4 is also mentioned in other articles:

V4 is becoming an increasingly serious European entity that can create a positive and constructive European policy, can indicate positive solutions. [...] The Polish Presidency in the V4 will coincide with the Presidency of Slovakia in the EU Council – it is a good time to talk about Central Europe, to show our projects and build a good climate for them in the European Union.\(^{76}\)

From an article titled Poland defends its own interests today:

For us the most important is the security of Poles. We will not agree to the forced relocation of refugees. Nobody can impose a migration policy on us, it is an individual matter of


\(^{71}\) Retrieved from: “Q&A z Prezesem PiS...”


\(^{73}\) Retrieved from: “Mamy prawo bronić...”


\(^{75}\) Retrieved from: “Nie będzie zgody...”

each of the EU member states...Currently, the policy of pressure from the European Union is being applied. We cannot give in to it.77

The narrative of saving Poland from a security threat and protecting it from a foreign bully demonstrates that PiS has resorted to messianic politics.78 The perceived salvation of the nation from all evil foreign threats, PiS fully accredits to itself:

*If it were not for the Government of Law and Justice and a tough policy in this matter, the Poles would not feel safe today.*79

Here we can also notice again the language of emotions in “feeling safe”, but not necessarily being safe, as empirical reality is secondary when it comes to myth. Moreover, this example clearly shows the construction of a mythical hero or protagonist (a major characteristic of political myth after Tudor) out of the PiS government. This is constructed in opposition not only to the EU, as the antagonist, but also towards Civic Platform (Platforma Obywatelska, PO), the opposition party. Hence, we see the manifestation of another myth being created about PO, that of ‘the enemy of the people’. The above quote comes from an article titled *Civic Platform has no direction for Poland*,80 referring to their decision to accept EU relocation quotas when they were in government *Against the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, against the V4 countries*.81 PO is shown as unable to defend the Polish interest against the EU:

*PO is not a party that would be able to conduct a sovereign migration policy and a sovereign policy towards the EU, to present Polish arguments in Brussels.*82

Often ‘the enemy of the people’ is personalised in the face of Donald Tusk, the leader of PO and President of the European Council. One document was even titled: “Donald Tusk is convenient for Western European countries”83, which implies that there is a conflict of interest between Western and Eastern Member States and not a common European interest. A zero-sum game, not a positive-sum game. Therefore, Tusk is seen as a traitor. The first sentence of that article mentions refugees:

*Donald Tusk already in September 2015 spoke very clearly in favour of forced refugee quotas for the EU Member States, including Poland. ...the candidacy of Donald Tusk is convenient from the point of view of Western countries that want to get rid of immigrants... He behaved as if he was a very loyal functionary of the European Union, who pursues German interests. Chancellor Merkel is now pushing Donald's candidacy...*84
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78 J.P. Zúquete, “Missionary Politics...”


80 Ibid.

81 Ibid.

82 Retrieved from: “Nasze działania ws. imigrantów...”
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Kaczyński went as far as to call Tusk’s actions “high treason”:

High treason is a legal concept that refers to the most serious crime that can be committed. But, gentlemen, it is necessary to recall what Donald Tusk has done with the idea of punishing countries opposing the admission of refugees with the fine of 250,000 euros per person. 85

His actions are seen as singling out the Polish and Hungarian governments: as the head of this body [the European Council], he does not focus on solving the migration problem, but on the fighting the Polish government and the Hungarian government. 86

Moreover, everybody who is not with us, is against us, against Poland. They do not just have different values and political beliefs, they have evil intentions. In matters of existential security, there is no room for tolerance, and every harsh decision is justified as necessary for the survival of the nation. This is where the danger of securitized issues lies:

That’s those who march today [in support of welcoming refugees], who want the Polish life to be disturbed. 87

Importantly, in later publications, we can see that the good fight that PiS has been carrying on has started to bear fruit. The European institutions have started listening to what Poland has to say and accepting it. The need for acceptance has been fulfilled, and Poland has managed to convert other countries to its side in the argument, saving both them and us:

The fact that the decision to relocate immigrants has not been extended, but is dying a natural death, is for Poland above all a sign that the European Commission is not deaf to the arguments of the Visegrad Group. Patiently repeated arguments brought the expected results. 88

A publication titled “Together, we can influence the fate of Europe”, mentions that Poland contributes to easing migration tensions visibly. 89

I am glad that the President of the European Council is starting to speak like Poland in the context of refugees. We want to help people affected by the war on the spot, there the help is more effective. 90

PiS’s need for acceptance by the EU is manifested strongly, it can also be concluded from this as well as frequent mentions of sovereignty that PiS opposes deeper European integration:

For the future of the EU the most important is another foundation of European integration, which is not much talked about lately – the motto of the EU is the slogan “united in diversity”. It would be very good if the Brussels elites realized that the Member States are


86 Retrieved from: “Nasze działania ws. imigrantów...”

87 Retrieved from: “Q&A z Prezesem PiS...”

88 Retrieved from: “KE nie jest głucha na argument...”

89 Retrieved from: “Wspólnie możemy wpływać...”

different, and this in turn implies different options for action in emergency situations, such as the current migration crisis. The EU should unambiguously accept the diverse efforts of various Member States to stop a humanitarian catastrophe.\textsuperscript{91}

As for helping people on the spot, this seems to be the alternative vision of the concept of solidarity that PiS conveys everywhere in its discourse as proof of its good intentions:

\begin{quote}
We want to help, but there on the spot.\textsuperscript{92}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
We owe the truth to those who died in Auschwitz...Referring to the situation in the Middle East, she reminded that people in a war-torn country need to be helped but on the spot...You have to create a decent living environment for them. The current European Union policy towards refugees is not effective...We wonder if this is the way that will really help refugees, if it is not better – as Poland is doing right now – to help there on the spot, like when we get involved providing medical help ...our country is involved, among others in the construction of hospitals.\textsuperscript{93}
\end{quote}

Invoking Auschwitz, when it has nothing to do with the matter discussed, is a clear manipulation, aimed at revoking historical memory and strong emotions.

\section*{CONCLUSION}

The analysis has shown an overwhelming appeal to emotion, and very little appeal to rationality throughout the discourse.

The basic mythical structure identified in the texts analysed is the ‘us vs. them’ myth. ‘Us’ represents PiS and Poland, which are constructed as heroes, and sometimes the V4 or the CEE in general. Heroization of a particular group is central to political myth (after Tudor). ‘Them’ is more diverse. First, on a vertical axis, it refers to the EU, “the old EU” Member States, especially Germany and the so-called “Brussels elites”, who are demonized and constructed into an antagonist, a usurper, a hater. On a horizontal axis there is the ‘other’, a foreign enemy, refugees, which are constructed into an existential security threat. This triad of people-elite-enemy is distinctive of right-wing populism.\textsuperscript{94}

Another enemy constructed in PiS’s discourse is the PO, and Donald Tusk in particular. Their portrayal resembles the ‘enemy of the people’ myth, as in their stances on migration policy they have allegedly betrayed the Polish interest. Overall, we can see that PiS views migration policy as a zero-sum game, where Western EU Member States benefit from relocating refugees, putting the burden on the Eastern Member States, who are unable to handle it. By refusing refugee relocation quotas, PiS promises salvation.

\textsuperscript{91} Retrieved from: “UE od samej siebie...”

\textsuperscript{92} Retrieved from: “Q&A z Prezesem PiS...”


from this threat, from all the enemies – resorting to missionary politics. It also conveys an alternative way of helping refugees and showing solidarity – through providing aid at home, in their sending countries. All of this, coupled with occasional references to European civilization and values, suggests that the PiS vision of European identity is rather inward-looking, meaning that it is culture and value-based, and not universalist and open-ended. However, this thesis would need to be further researched.

Overall, this paper is based on a relatively small research sample. PiS discourse, beyond what is available on its website and beyond only text, needs to be further researched in order to definitively prove the indicative conclusions drawn above. However, this paper could serve as an illustration and as a point of departure for deeper investigations into how PiS uses mythological structures, and how their visions of Europe and of European identity manifest themselves in migration discourse.
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