

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

**THERE'S A THIN LINE BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND TOTALITY: A
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF A TWO OPPOSING MANIFESTOS**

February 2017

Tomáš Badin

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

**THERE'S A THIN LINE BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND TOTALITY: A
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF A TWO OPPOSING MANIFESTOS**

BACHELOR'S THESIS

Study Program: Liberal Arts
Field of Study: 3.1.6. Political Science
Thesis Supervisor: James Griffith, PhD.
Qualification: Bachelor of Arts (abbr. 'Bc.')Submission Date: 15 February 2016
Date of Defence: June 9, 2017

Bratislava, 2017

Tomáš Badin

Declaration of Originality

I declare that this bachelor thesis is my own work and has not been published in part or in whole elsewhere. All used academic and other sources of literature are referenced and listed in Bibliography.

Bratislava, February 15, 2016

Tomáš Badin

Signed:

There's a Thin Line Between Democracy and Totality: A Comparative Analysis Of a Two Opposing Manifestos

Author: Tomáš Badin

Thesis Title: There's a Thin Line Between Democracy and Totality: A Comparative Analysis of a Two Opposing Manifestos

University: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts

Thesis Advisor: James Griffith, PhD.

Head of the Defense Committee: Samuel Abrahám, PhD

Members of the Defense Committee: Samuel Abrahám, PhD, prof. František Novosád, Mgr. Dagmar Kusá, PhD

Place and date: Bratislava, February 2016

Page and word count: 45 pages, 11 800 words

Qualification: Bachelor of Arts (abbr. 'Bc.')

Keywords:, Arendt, Foucault, Agamben, modernity, totalitarianism

Driven by the contemporary influx of non-democratic solutions in the Western world, this work is meant to discover the foundations of modernity as the point of departure for both regimes that emerged out of it, namely, democracy and totality. Both regimes having a common parent in the original character of modernity, suggests that there may not be as striking disproportions as would we think.

Working predominantly with works of three political philosophers, Hannah Arendt, Michel Foucault, and Giorgio Agamben, this work describes the modernity as being characterized by an inclusion of the biological part of human into the center of political power. These accounts are to be discovered mainly in Michel Foucault's *The History of Sexuality* and Giorgio Agamben's magnum opus, *Homo Sacer*.

Accepting their thesis, this work moves on to describe the nature of totalitarianism as found in Hannah Arendt's *On the Nature of Totalitarianism*. The necessary conditions for totalitarianism are to be found in an atomized society characterized by disinterested individuals lost in a complete loneliness which is the result of the modern mass society. Complemented by totalitarian ideology and the rule of terror, the transition to totality is complete.

Conjoining together the accounts of modernity and totalitarianism, this work is meant to provide a comparative analysis of the *Manifesto of Slovak Government* and the *Manifesto of People's Party Our Slovakia*, while trying to prove the hypothesis, that the former represents the democratic outcome of modernity, while the latter epitomizes the totalitarian result.

Medzi Demokraciou a Totalitou je Tenký Ľad: Komparatívna analýza dvoch opozitných manifestov

Autor bakalárskej práce: Tomáš Badin

Názov práce: Medzi Demokraciou a Totalitou je Tenký Ľad: Komparatívna analýza dvoch opozitných manifestov

Názov vysokej školy: Bratislavská medzinárodná škola liberálnych štúdií

Vedúci bakalárskej práce: James Griffith, PhD.

Predseda komisie pre obhajoby bakalárskych prác: Samuel Abrahám, PhD

Členovia komisie pre obhajoby bakalárskych prác: Samuel Abrahám, PhD, prof. František Novosád, Mgr.

Dagmar Kusá, PhD

Dátum a miesto: Bratislava, február 2016

Rozsah práce: 45 strán, 11 800 slov

Stupeň kvalifikácie: Bakalár (Bc)

Kľúčové slová: Arendt, Foucault, Agamben, modernita, totalita

Inšpirovaná súčasným svetovým dianím ktoré poukazuje na stále častejšiu tendenciu siahať po nedemokratických krokoch, táto práca opisuje modernu ako bod z ktorého vzišli oba režimy, demokracia, aj totalita. Oba režimy majú v moderne spoločné korene, čo naznačuje že medzi nimi, nakoniec nemusí byť až taký priepastný rozdiel.

Táto práca využíva primárne zdroje troch autorov z oblasti politickej filozofie, Hanu Arendt, Michela Foucault, a Giorgia Agambena a z nich vyskladáva mozaiku moderny ktorá je charakterizovaná najmä inklúziou biologickej osoby človeka do centra dopadu politickej moci. Tieto idey čerpá v prvom rade z dvoch kníh, prvého vydania *Histórie Sexuality* od Michela Foucault a *Homo Sacer* od Giorgia Agambena.

Prijatím ich téz sa práca posúva ďalej k opisu totality ktorej charakteristiku hľadá v eseji Hanny Arendt opisujúcej základ totalitarizmu. Nevyhnutným predpokladom ku vzniku totalitarizmu je atomizovaná, indiferentná spoločnosť ktorej jednotlivci sú existenciálne osamelí, čoho dôvodom je vznik novej, masovej, spoločnosti. V spojitosti s totalitnou ideológiou a vlády teroru a strachu je tranzícia k totalite dokončená.

Spojením poznatkov ako moderne, tak o totalite, táto práca prezentuje komparatívnu analýzu *Programového Vyhlásenia Vlády SR 2016-2020* s manifestom Ľudovej Strany Naše Slovensko v snahe potvrdenia hypotézy, že Programové Vyhlásenie prezentuje demokratický vývin moderny, zatiaľ čo Manifest ĽSNS prezentuje vývin totalitný

Table of Contents

Declaration of Originality	iii
Abstract	iv
Abstrakt	v
Introduction	7
Chapter 1: The System of Modernity 1.1 Who Counts as Human?	9
1.2 Individual and Citizen	9
1.3.1 Foucault's Power-Knowledge Relationships and the Birth of Bio-power	11
1.3.2 Dealing With the Uncertain	14
1.4 Arendt's Emergence of Homo Laboreans	17
1.5 Agamben's Camp as the Epitome of Modernity	18
1.6 Summary	20
Chapter 2: The Outcomes of Modernity - Democracy or Totality 2.1 Fear, Anxiety, and Loneliness	22
2.2 Principle of Logicity and Ideology	25
2.3 Lust for Power	26
2.4 Summary	27
Chapter3: Two Manifestos as Two Distinct Possibilities of Modernity 3.1 Methodology and Hypothesis	28
3.2 Analysis	28
3.2.1 Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic, ch.1: Strengthening Social and Political Stability	28
3.2.2 Manifesto of the People's Party Our Slovakia	29
3.3 Sub conclusion	30
Conclusion	32
Resumé	34
Bibliography	37
Attachments	39

Introduction

It's 71 years since the end of the World War II and world has changed dramatically. We're globalized, our informational technologies were unimaginable 20 – 25 years ago, we can search for sources of information from wherever and whenever we want with just one click on the past-days super-computers which we call smartphones. Sitting here in Bratislava, Slovakia, I can book a flight ticket to Burma for today's night in 5 minutes.

Almost every high-school in Slovakia have scheduled journeys to Auschwitz for their students to have first-hand experiences of the crimes of the past. There are tons of books, films, poems, songs, album, paintings that are concerned with the problematique of holocaust. And yet, the democratic world is shaking and screaming for help.

The whole social-sphere is filled with racism. There are new Nazi-skinhead movements emerging; hate is an every-day phenomenon of both on- and off-line life; there are media that are not even trying anymore to be politically correct and are openly referring to Roma as "parasites". Even more, there are political parties that resemble the well-known Fascist ideas too well for it to be a coincidence. Rallies, waving flags, black and red uniforms, swastika's logotypes and screaming leaders.

In Slovakian parliamentary elections of 2016 there has been openly fascist parties winning in regions where there are villages that has been burned and their populations eradicated by the German Nazi Forced in 1940's.

So my question is – how is this even possible? Aren't school-trips to Auschwitz, state holidays, annual remembrances of holocaust, monuments of any kind, necessary history lessons, unspeakable efforts of non-governmental human-rights organizations striving for the exact opposite? To never make the horrors of past come to life again?

The title of this work suggests that there is a thin line between democracy and totality. What is crucial is to understand it not as a border or a demarcation line where democracy ends, and totality starts. We're unable to draw such a line since there are

simply too many givens to count into the equation. On the other side, we can pinpoint extremes to which we can stick these terms. It will be hard to find a person that will say that by a standardized, generalized understanding of given terms, Nazi Germany was the epitome of liberal democracy and that the socially and economically prosperous states of current Scandinavia are shining examples of totalitarian regimes. Therefore, we must understand the line maybe not as vertical break where one side is a democracy and the other totality, but rather as a horizontal line, i.e., a line depicting a linear, temporal development. This developmental analysis gets us to another crucial point, that is, that these two regimes have common starting place – modernity and its mass society. Hence, shown on the x axis it would look as follows: totality --- modernity --- democracy.

But drawing the temporal line like this would suggest that the move to modernity would've been a backward motion resurrecting some pre-modern realities. And I would argue that that is false. Rather, we should consider modernity as the starting point of both regimes, therefore, from the possible outcome of modernity is either democracy or totality and their ways are often intertwined. It is this delineation that shows as our perspectives. The system of modernity begets the fundamentals of both regimes, whether the democratic or the totalitarian. And it is precisely the point where we shall start our analysis. Hence, what follows will be a chapter that will describe the characteristics of modernity, or the common parent of both of those offsprings based mainly on a reading of Hannah Arendt, Michel Foucault, and Giorgio Agamben.

Chapter 1: The System of Modernity

1.1 Who Counts as Human?

“The question the preoccupies me in the light of recent global violence is, who counts as human?” (Butler, 2004, p. 20)

This is a pivot point considering the politico-philosophical nature of this work. The vital question indeed is – who counts as human? What types of people there are? Is there a difference between a natural, biological life of a person and a societal, political part? If yes, are these parts standalone or do they overlap? On which parts of these characters is the political power applied, i.e., how to draw power relations between objects and subjects? These are all questions that have been very much alive perhaps since the start of human thinking. For millennia, since Aristotle's division of human soul in *Politics*, they have stood virtually intact. Even though Arendt, Foucault or Agamben may not have been the first crusaders to wander this open road, they are certainly one of the most crucial ones. Despite the fact, that these may not have been the primary concerns of Foucault's and Arendt's thinking, as opposed to Giorgio Agamben's *Homo Sacer*, they compose the core of their theories. Therefore, since those are mostly the 20th-century political philosopher and theorists that shook the foundations of these elements of society, we can assume something of fundamental importance was happening to societies. Or else, it was the societo-scientifico-political model of modernity that brought these questions to life, and the academics mentioned above were the pioneers of its scientific analysis. In the next section, I will write on how did these relationships of the natural/political parts developed, starting with Aristotle, moving through Arendt and Foucault, and ending with Agamben.

1.2 Individual and Citizen

“The trouble, obviously, with this discrepancy between public and personal life, between man as citizen and man as individual, is not only that laws can never be used to

guide and judge actions in personal life, but also that the very standards of right and wrong in the two spheres are not the same and are often even in conflict” (Arendt, *On the Nature of Totalitarianism*, 1994, p. 334) writes Arendt in her 1954 essay called *On the Nature of Totalitarianism*. Well, the question appears – why bother oneself with questions on the difference between personal and private life in an attempt to characterize the nature of totalitarian regimes of the 20th century? The answer to this issue is, that without the elimination of this duality of humans the Holocaust wouldn't be possible. In societies before modernity, this duality was the standard. Evidently, modernity brought with itself this profound shift. Michel Foucault writes in the first volume of *History of Sexuality* that “for millennia, the man remained what he was for Aristotle: a living animal with the additional capacity for a political existence...” (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: Volume I*, 1978, p. 143).

At the very start of Aristotle's *Politics*, what is being described is the evolution or creation of a city-state. From the pair of woman and man to a household, then to a village from an association of households and eventually from association of villages to a state. Whenever any stage reaches self-sufficiency, it moves on, and in the end, it reaches its goal that is described as a self-sufficient state. Aristotle follows by a famous passage, "self-sufficiency has been reached, and while the state came about as a means of securing *life itself*, it continues in being to secure the *good life*" (Aristotle, 1992, 1252b27, emphasis added). As we know, for Aristotle, the end of things was that of fulfilling their purpose, which meets its highest point in acquiring the level of self-sufficiency. Therefore, the allegory of a state is at the same time a description of humans alone. It follows then, that while people are born for the mere end of living, in the natural, animalistic sense of securing life, there is a second end, i.e., to lead a good life.

Aristotle follows by stating that “man is by nature a political animal” (Aristotle, 1992, p1253a1), a phrase that became canonical considering the human ability to speak. Even though there are animals that can communicate, it's never by language. Language, as the means of the political, societal life then is the end of humans. It is by language that

cities and states are born. Hence, we see, that in the traditional understanding of things, there were two ends for humans. First, the animalistic part which when fulfilled meets its end in survival, in procreation. Second, the political part, which is developed and progresses through societal involvement and its end is a good life. This duality is to dissolve with the coming age of what Michel Foucault called bio-power or the age of security.

Foucault continues his famous phrase in the introduction of bio-power as follows "...modern man is an animal whose politics places his existence as a living being in question" (Foucault, 1978, p. 143). To clarify this seemingly complex sentence, we shall dive right into Foucauldian thinking and explain its basis shortly.

1.3.1 Foucault's Power-Knowledge Relationships and the Birth of Bio-power

Probably the essential concept for Foucault is power. Foucault opposes the centuries-old Western concept of power that understood it as an object that some do, and others do not possess. Only if we know that "power is not a substance, fluid, or something that derives from a particular source" (Foucault, 2009, p. 2) we can move to explain power-relations. For Foucault, power is a set of mechanisms and procedures (Foucault, 2009, p. 2) or a set of "events and or relations" (McWhorther, 2004, p. 41). Power is everywhere, and no-one can ever eliminate oneself from it. Imagine it as a constant power struggle where every particle is opposing and reinforcing the other particles. McWhorther describes three key features of this concept. First, "resistance is an integral part of any event of power" (Foucault, 1997, pp. 298-99 as in McWhorther, 2004, p. 42). Second is that people within the power relations always act upon bodies. "Power is always action upon action and the anchor points for exercises of power are always bodies" (Foucault, 2000, p. 340 as in McWhorther, 2004, p.42). Third, that "power is not merely a negative limit to human action" (McWhorther, 2004, p. 42). As McWhorther states, these power struggles are creative; they produce reality. When the opposing forces find a steady balance, they create "social forms, institutions, routines, and even beliefs, theories, and

self-images" (McWhorther, 2004, p. 43). "Power produces selves. Power makes us who we are" (McWhorther, 2004, p. 43). And as the configurations of the system of power forces changes, so change our bodies, our senses of self, our identities.

Bio-power is a "great technology of power" (Foucault, 1978, p. 140) that was, we could say, developing from the early 17th century, but thoroughly conducted only in the 19th century. We can understand it as a political organization of the power-knowledge relations that was invested in creating a particular type of bodies which could be observed at its best in institutions such as schools, military barracks, hospitals or mental asylums.

Before 17th century we have had a legal system that was invested in setting up laws and if there happened to be a transgression of given law, to punish the offender and make a spectacle out of it. From the 17th century on, the punishment as a show is starting to vanish. Why? Because the whole socio-political spectrum changed and politics needed to form a different type of bodies fit the modern realities. There was a great demographical boom, great technological advancement; urbanization starts to have a high impact, economic foundations needed to be rethought, etc. Politics were in fact pushed by reality to create a different kind of bodies - so called "docile bodies." Docile in the very sense that in economic terms, the utilitarian forces of such bodies are increased, while in a political sense, their force diminishes and the inherent obedience is maximized (Foucault, 1975, p. 182).

This power over bodies evolved in two strains that are to be conjoined in the one overarching phenomenon - bio-power. First is the "anatomo-political" (Foucault, 1978, p.139) model characterized by disciplines which were sets of tidy mechanisms regarding disciplining, optimization of capabilities, tidiness, punctuality and so on. They were built on the idea of the body as a machine that could be just rearranged and put to a different kind of work and achieve better results. The second are the "regulatory controls: a bio-politics of the population" (Foucault, 1978, p.139) that developed a little later with an emergence of biology as a science. These regulatory techniques were

interested in population and their birth rates, mortalities, life expectancies. The concept of the human body started to change from the older idea of the body as a machine to a newer, developmental one.

No longer were bodies understood in spatial relations of differently organized parts but in a primarily *temporal* manner as *developing* through the influences of environment and of certain developmental stages. That was one of the reasons for an emergence of certain normative power relations. This developmental notion of the human body made it possible to set what is the norm and what is a deviation from the norm. Interestingly enough, the deviation was the first to be coined. And mathematico-statistical and biological innovations combined to create these normative notions on huge parts of the populace. Humans started to be understood as, and maybe more importantly, analyzed through a grid of species, opposed to individuals. These two strains and ideas conjoined into one in the 19th century that may be finally characterized by a political system which was not marked by death, but by a management of life - bio-power.

This was as a very short introduction for the purpose of understanding of the term bio-power, the great technology of power. To comprehend its complexity and importance, we shall continue in putting it into contrast with previous prevailing regimes, or, in a more Foucauldian fashion, prevailing power-knowledge relations. The justification for this step lies with an understanding of why "...modern man is an animal whose politics places his existence as a living being in question" (Foucault, 1978, p. 143) As opposed to previous regimes. To do so, I choose to work with Foucault's second lecture in *Security, Territory, Population* where he described how systems of different ages – juridico-legal, disciplinary and the age of security (the age of bio-power virtually) dealt with the problem of scarcity.

1.3.2 Dealing With the Uncertain

The second lecture describes the “governing and treatment of the uncertain” (Foucault, 2009, p. 29). Foucault takes up an example of scarcity (as the uncertain event) and the different approaches to dealing with the problem. This time it wasn't divided into three sections that were main for the vital governing principle, i.e., the juridical, disciplinary and security models. In this case, we have two models. In the first model are conjoined the juridical and disciplinary aspects, in the second, the aspects natural to security.

Scarcity is not precisely a famine; it is the "present insufficiency of the amount of grain necessary for a nation's subsistence" (Foucault, 2009, p. 30). The biggest problem that comes with scarcity is that it primarily affects the urban milieu which does not have the means of producing food per se. They depend on the rural areas to provide the means of subsistence. The urban milieu has to most political power (derived from their number, economic means, position, and density) and scarcity is destined to lead to an urban revolt almost immediately. “So it is the scourge of the population on one side, and, on the other, catastrophe, crisis if you like, for the government” (Foucault, 2009, p. 30).

There were two classical explanations for the emergence of scarcity. First, a model of scarcity as vitally a misfortune. Second, as a man's evil nature because the events of scarcity were connected with an influx of prices as results of egoism and hoarding of grain.

The first, juridico-disciplinary model is own to the mercantilist economic period. It functioned within a system of price control, rights of storage, limits on exports, etc. In short, the objective was, of grain, to be sold at the lowest possible prices. Then, peasants made the smallest possible profit; the urban population was fed at the lowest cost and eventually needed to be paid the most minor possible wages (Foucault, 2009, p. 32). It is an anti-scarcity system based on prevention. The problem with this model is, that it, in fact leads to constant shortages. In short, by keeping the prices of grain at the

lowest possible level, it is not profitable for the agriculture to produce much. Therefore, the levels of production, quality of storage and the whole energy put into the process is minimized, and the whole system falls apart with a minimal natural "misfortune," e.g., too hot, too dry, too wet year.

So, a new model of dealing with the uncertain, that is scarcity, must have been adopted. It was a physiocratic model passed in the half of 18th century. This model understood, but mainly made, scarcity a *chimera* (Foucault, 2009, p. 38). As something that does not exist and cannot exist; that it wasn't a natural phenomenon caused by events of natural misfortune but as an artificial event made by unfortunate governing. In short, it operated on a principle of the invisible hand. When the state stopped enforcing the lowest-possible-wages-policies and restrictions on storage, they found out, that scarcity solves itself out. When the levels of grain fell behind the norm, producers understood that the prices would rise. Moreover, in a nutshell, everyone wanted to be the first to sell for the highest prices. That, again, led to falling of the prices. Hence, this new model is not a model that tries to prevent scarcity; Oppositely, it tries to modulate it in its reality and inevitable coming. Scarcity is understood as a constant phenomenon within the overall economic system. However, since the real event of scarcity is unreal within this new model, it only stays as a chimera.

However, the question is now divided. Even though scarcity disappears as a population-wide phenomenon, it is still very real to an individual or a multiplicity-of-individuals level. The reality that one or more persons will die of hunger must stay real for the chimera to stay true. We see that this change of the model, from the juridico-disciplinary to the security does not only deal with scarcity per se. There has been a profound shift in objects of the power-knowledge relations we call politics. The object of the politics of security is population (bio-power), and the multiplicities of individuals may and will only serve as an instrument.

Finally, the differences between these three regimes may be characterized as follows.

Firstly, that discipline is centripetal, and security is centrifugal (Foucault, 2009, p. 45). That discipline goes from outside to the core; it needs perfect alignment and tight regulations. It tends to omit everything that it does not need for its subsistence. Security, on the other hand, is centrifugal. It needs precisely as much as is possible for it to be real. Connected to the first, but different in certain aspects is the second difference.

Discipline regulates everything while security “lets things happen” (Foucault, 2009, p. 45). In this aspect, so to say, discipline is a rigid system (in all the broadness of the word). Security, on the other hand, operates with a milieu, with ever-changing organics. Security, even though it gets a hold on to something (bodies), moderates biological, inherent, and we can say unconscious features. It makes the seemingly "impertinent" characteristics "pertinent" (Foucault, 2009, p. 45).

The third difference is that the legal and disciplinary models operate on a tight scheme of "dos" and "don'ts" (Foucault, 2009, p. 46). Of what is and what is not permitted. Not a single particle of indifference is allowed for existence within that model, while security grasps this at the level of their “effective reality” (Foucault, 2009, p. 47). It stays back so that the object can understand what is desirable and what is not.

The fourth and final difference is, that discipline works within an imaginary realm. It imagines all the harmful elements that could happen and prescribes what is and what is not allowed. Security, on the other hand, works within a space "complementary to reality" (Foucault, 2009, p. 47).

To conclude, it is perhaps visible now, that what is the main trait of societal life from 19th century on for Foucault is this mode of bio-power. The system of power relations that includes man's biology into his political existence. Evidently, there's no duality of individual and citizen. Both parts are conjoined within the player in the new era. However pleasing it may sound, bio-power developed thoroughly from the previous disciplinary regime, that may be characterized beautifully by the drill instructor of Stanley Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*, by adding to it a second strain of scientific inquiry,

namely biology and statistics, in the fulfillment of the quest of the creation of docile bodies. That being stated, we shall now move on to consider Arendt's and Agamben's stances on this issue.

1.4 Arendt's Emergence of Homo Laboreans

Giorgio Agamben writes in an introduction to his opus magnum, *Homo Sacer*, that “almost twenty years before *The History of Sexuality*, Hannah Arendt had already analyzed the process that brings *homo laborans* – and, with it, biological life as such – gradually to occupy the very center of the political scene of modernity” (Agamben, 1998, p. 3). In Arendt's *The Human Condition*, a work which for the delimited scope of this paper will be used only marginally, but in itself provides a magnificent insight into political theorist's understanding of human nature in a new, technologically advanced world, what is described are three “fundamental human activities: labor, work, and action” (Arendt, 1998, p. 7), each one with its particular corresponding human condition. Labor maintains the biological processes in humans. It supports the biological life of an individual as procreation and fertility sustain the human species. It encompasses growth, nourishment and its corresponding human condition is the natural life of the person itself. Secondly, work transcends the physical realm of things; it's the activity that is connected to a creation of artificial things that outlast the bittersweet reality of the life cycle of growth and decay. The corresponding condition of work is “worldliness” (Arendt, 1998, p. 7) and I find it easy to imagine work's product as a culture in a broad sense of the word. Action, finally, is the ultimate political activity of humans because it transcends biology, naturalness, or the world of things, fully. The action is invested in the intra-human enterprise, and its analogous condition is plurality because “we are all the same, that is, human, in such a way that nobody is ever the same as anyone else who ever lived, lives, or will live” (Arendt, 1998, p. 8). The following quote is meant to demonstrate, first, the saturation of the political sphere with biological traits; and second, how this triangle of vital human activities is connected to an overarching human

phenomenon, which will be crucial in describing the totalitarian solutions to the question of modernity, natality in connection to plurality.

"All three activities and their corresponding conditions are intimately connected with the most general condition of human existence: birth and death, natality and mortality. Labor assures not only individual survival but the life of the species. Work and its product, the human artifact, bestow a measure of permanence and durability upon the futility of mortal life and the fleeting character of human time. Action, insofar as it engages in founding and preserving political bodies, creates the condition for remembrance, that is, for history" (Arendt, 1998, pp. 8-9)

1.5 Agamben's Camp as the Epitome of Modernity

"The birth of the camp in our time appears as an event that decisively signals the political space of modernity itself. It is produced at the point at which the political system of the modern nation-state, which was founded on the functional nexus between a determinate localization (land) and a determinate order (the State) and mediated by automatic rules for the inscription of life (birth or the nation), enters into a lasting crisis, and the State decides to assume directly the care of the nation's biological life as one of its proper tasks ...[the camp] is the fourth, inseparable element that has now added itself to - and so broken - the old trinity composed of the state, the nation (birth), and land"
(Agamben, 1998, pp. 175-176)

First things first, Agamben's *Homo Sacer*, is an immensely huge and dense work, in which meanings and insights are richly multi-layered. Working within something of a metaphysical-philosophical context, Agamben's chapters revolutionized and influenced thinking in vast spheres of thought. However charming and beneficial is the book in its wholeness, for the sake of clarity and tidiness and within considerations of the scope and mostly purpose, I choose to work with it very marginally, utilizing primarily the

notion of camp quoted and the novelty of its character in delineating the characteristics of modernity. So then, what is camp?

The camp is the par excellence of place of non-distinction on the axis of inside and outside. Using the Arendtian language perhaps, the camp is the condition, the epitome and the corresponding place for “naked life” or the place where “homo sacer” dwells. The camp, place formerly known for marginalized individuals and groups has become the “hidden matrix and *nomos* of the political space in which we are still living” (Agamben, 1998, p. 166).

The vital premise of *Homo Sacer* dwells on a continuation of Arendt's notions on homo laborans, i.e., the biopolitical understanding of modern politics predating Foucault's account, and then an extension of Foucault's concept of bio-politics; while both situating in within debates on modern sovereignty. Hence, adopting the biopolitical stance, Agamben rethought the concept of sovereignty.

Homo sacer is an obscure figure of Roman law depicting a person that was both at the same time, both outside and inside of the reach of the law. It describes a person who was abandoned, hence could be killed (but not murdered), yet, at the same time, couldn't be sacrificed in a religious ritual (Agamben, 1998, pp. 8-9). This figure is brought forward by Agamben in an attempt to coin down new premises of modernity from a politico-philosophical perspective. Perhaps the main argument is that in a modernity characterized by camp, it is not anymore, the majority, but the camp, the margins, that are the pillars of society. “We live in an increasingly fragmented, ‘splintering’ society in which distinctions between culture and nature, biology, and politics, law and transgression, mobility and immobility, reality and representation, immanence and transcendence, inside and outside . . . tend to disappear in a ‘zone of indistinction’. The camp, the prototypical zone of indistinction, is the hidden logic beneath this process” (Diken & Laustsen, 2005, p. 4) writes Diken and Laustsen in an attempt to compose a contemporary sociological basis of modern society by proceeding through the lenses of camp. Moreover, as long as it is the figure of homo sacer, the representation of naked

life, that is the embodiment of modernity, the appalling option of totalitarianism will always be too much alive.

1.6 Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to delineate characteristic traits of modernity from the perspective of political philosophy by combining the thought of predominantly three authors, i.e., Michel Foucault, Hannah Arendt, and Giorgio Agamben. Similar as they may sound, every author used was producing their works in different circumstances and times and with different ends in their minds. This heterogeneity of approaches is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it enriches the outcome by presenting different, at times opposed ideas, on the other, these different takes may differ in certain angles and shapes. For example, Agamben's theory of homo sacer, even though building on accords of both, Arendt and Foucault, disregards the notion of bio-power being predominantly new, modern phenomenon. He does that in an attempt to recreate the understanding of the social-political fabric entirely anew and with a somewhat different purpose in mind than Foucault. Still, even though are they not agreeing at specific points, Agamben's account should be taken as more of a complementary regard than an attempt for refutation, since what is considered as the epitome of modernity, is, simply speaking an advanced theory of biopower or biopolitics – the notion of humans as potentially homines sacri. Also, mysterious as it may be, neither Arendt nor Foucault commented on their texts considering the birth of biopolitics.

Taking into account the above-mentioned shortcomings, we should now be confident in stating, that modernity is characterized by a radical shift in what constitutes the object and subject of sovereignty be it called either bio-politics or the re-emergence of the figure of homo sacer. While the former being an entirely new form of power-knowledge relations that was developing slowly from the 17th century and came to full power in the half of the 19th by conjoining the disciplining faculties and techniques of the previous disciplinary regime with new modes of analysis, namely biology and statistics. This shift

made possible for political power to be applied not only to individuals or groups but from then on species. Or else, that the biological part of person, let's say the most hidden, the most private, became the epicenter of an application of political power. The latter, homo sacre, a figure that can be killed, but not sacrificed, developed through double-bind, the inclusive exclusion of modern sovereign power. What is new with Agamben's theory, is that within the new understanding of sovereignty, we're all potentially homines sacri and that the camp, once posited in the margins, is the new core of society.

Chapter 2: The Outcomes of Modernity - Democracy or Totality

2.1 Fear, Anxiety, and Loneliness

"...the ever-increasing political and physical homelessness and spiritual and social rootlessness-is the one gigantic mass destiny of our time in which we all participate..."

(Arendt, 1994, p. 357)

In *On the Nature of Totalitarianism* Arendt tries to delineate the basis structure of how the mentioned regimes either corrupted or completed modernity. What Arendt does is not to try to characterize in details the realities of neither Germany nor Russia. What is proposed is a general theory of the creation or an arrival of totalitarian regimes; a global theory of totalitarianism unbound by neither time (age), nor space (geography). Or else, as in *The Human Condition* was described the nature of people and society, in *On the Nature of Totalitarianism* it is the nature of totality that is being illustrated. The starting point for Arendt lies in the very foundations of the human psyche, on how people are influenced by their surroundings, institutions, and discourse. The "homelessness" and "spiritual and social rootlessness" (Arendt, 1994, p. 357) constitute the ground from which the totalitarian regimes sprung.

In *The Human Condition* Arendt wrote, that it is "natality" and "plurality" which are the fundamental conditions of humans (Arendt, 1998, pp. 8-9). Considering *plurality* as the human condition of *action*, the par excellence activity of intra-human, societal correspondence and cooperation, then the *loneliness* that Arendt describes already points to a certain corruption of the societal fabric. The modernity and the emergence of traits of mass society were for Arendt characterized by the downfall and a rupture in the traditional forms of authority and morality. In a society characterized by labor, with the omnipresent touch of political power even in the most intimate spheres of human life and an arrival of neoliberal economic forms, known by their never-ending rendering of mathematical pros and cons, i.e., the cost-benefit analysis, Arendt sees a potential for

the emergence of a specifically 20th century phenomena – the totalitarian regimes of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.

Terror, the virtue corresponding to totality “has the power to bind together completely isolated individuals and that by doing so it isolates these individuals even further” (Arendt, 1994, p. 356). It follows that societal *action* (as described previously) is the archetypal *nemesis* of totality, insofar as it binds people together and is, primarily, creative, as the notion of power for Foucault. Therefore, we could understand the process of totalitarian corruption as an already atomized society created by utterly disinterested and socially impotent individuals that are once again bound together by fear and terror, in the pursuit and in the name of reality-deprived ideological nonsense disguised as the ultimate developmental trajectory of *laws of Nature or History* (Arendt, 1994, p. 340).

Adopting Arendt's premises and taking into consideration writings of Foucault and Agamben, we shall, and we, in fact, can locate this process of atomization within works of all. In the Foucauldian understanding of time flow and the fundamental changes of regimes throughout the classical period (17th to 19th century), the modern biopolitics and the corresponding figure, the docile body, is, in an Arendtian perspective, the point of the society atomized, but not yet reunified by totality. The paradoxically atomized end-point figure of totality in Arendt's analysis, that which is first atomized and then its atomization furthered by "unreal" unification of fear and terror is a *post-biopolitical* figure.

At the end of the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* Foucault spends a paragraph describing racism and its "most cunning and the most naïve form... Nazism" (Foucault, 1978, p. 149) as a byproduct of when the biopolitical age with its corresponding symbol of sex adopted the symbol of *blood* correlated to the age of discipline (Foucault, 1978, p. 147). Leaving the details aside, for now, this justifies the notion that the totalitarian society is of a post-biopolitical origin insofar as the development of the regime types goes from the juridical (sovereign) age to a disciplinary and eventually to a biopolitical

one. Nazism, as brought to life in Nazi Germany is the product of yet another step in that chain, when biopolitics became once again influenced by certain disciplinary traits. Therefore, the political power, through its disciplinarian machinery dissolves the milieu, the organic, for Arendt, *active fabric*, so to construct it again in a particular manner suitable to demands of the new world. Society and population existed before, sure. But not in the modernity's sense. There, the population is dissolved and atomized through the disciplinary techniques and then the atomized, indifferent parts are reconstructed in the what was described as the society in the age of bio-power.

For Agamben, the issue of loneliness and atomization as a mark of the period of modernity is somewhat easier to make, since it is the camp and its corresponding figure, the homo sacer, that constitutes the truly new modern features. Homo sacer is a naked life in being, a person that is literally inside and outside of the sovereign power at the same time; a person that can be killed, yet not murdered but is also devoid of the possibility of religious sacrifice. And it is precisely homo sacer, whose biological life occupies the center of his political power that is the embodiment of modernity. Now, imagine a society, where everyone, everywhere, is in a constant danger of life and that is the norm. Agamben presents a somewhat darker image of the modern society. The camp, the materialized concept of homo sacre is the pillar of social stratification. A place of non-distinction, where the homines sacri are placed. A place whose logical conclusion in being, in the real world is the concentration camp. Hence, considering Agamben's writing, his ideas are, so to say, one step beyond of those of Arendt and Foucault, because it is precisely the camp, the concentration camp that is the end-point of modernity. Therefore, without creating a fully different metaphysical basis for modern sovereignty, the basis for the concentration camp, the *camp*, will be still alive (Agamben, 1998, p. 10).

2.2 Principle of Logicality and Ideology

“...ideologies are systems of explanation of life and world that claim to explain everything, past and future, without further concurrence with actual experience”

(Arendt, 1994, pp. 349-350)

The existence of ideologies and their presence in the political sphere of mankind sure pre-dated the totalitarian regimes of the 20th century by a long shot. The novelty of the totalitarian ideologies has two roots. Firstly, totalitarian ideologies, are different from opinions or prejudices insofar as they tend to explain everything, the whole course of history. The second difference is connected to the already discussed issue of loneliness and solitude which is the breeding ground for pure, reality-deprived logical overthinking.

It follows from the first difference, that since democratic, republican tradition and the whole western tradition of thinking is based in the premise that reality equals truth, and that totalitarian ideologies are in their core absolutely detached from reality, these ideologies can fabricate any kind of information and sell it as truth (Arendt, 1994, p. 344). We may, then, even go as far, as to state, that totalitarian regimes lack the ability to regard the truthfulness or falseness of any information. The true or false scale is altogether missing. “It is the underlying conviction of any totalitarian transformation of ideology into reality that it will become true whether it is true or not” (Arendt, 1994, p. 344). There is also a second conclusion emerging from this premise; one that would logically work against the will of the tyrant.

The second difference, “logicality” is “...what appeals to isolated human beings, for man in complete solitude, without any contact with his fellow - men and therefore without any real possibility of experience - has nothing else he can fall back on but the most abstract rules of reasoning” (Arendt, 1994, p. 358). Yet loneliness and solitude are not the same. In solitude, we are alone only physically, yet we are still connected to the

outside world, to other human beings. Solitude is, in fact, a time well spent, because only in that stance we can truly reach into the depths of our minds. “In solitude we are always two- in-one...” (Arendt, 1994, p. 358) whereas loneliness comes as we lose the grip of the world outside. When we become truly alone. It is in loneliness, in an atomized society, when the far-reaching, absurd consequences of reasoning unbounded by intra-human touch start to dwell in totalitarian thoughts.

2.3 Lust for Power

It is a “lust for power ... the political and social sin par excellence” (Arendt, 1994, p. 353) that is rooted deep within the machinery of totalitarian regimes. Inter-connected to an atomized society driven insane by some fantastical, yet nonsensical ideology, lust for power can be one way to interpret the totalitarian interest. Lust for power, as well as ideologies, defies the rules of reality, of rationality. In a fully developed totalitarian states, policies are not anymore guided by a utilitarian principle; everything has gone mad. The one thing to bear in mind with lust and power, is, that it is an insatiable craving. This insatiability illustrates also the desire for domination of the totalitarian states that can never reach and fulfill its end. “It eliminates individuals for the sake of the species; it sacrifices men for the sake of mankind...” (Arendt, 1994, p. 342).

“The ideologies of racism and dialectical materialism that transformed Nature and History from the firm soil supporting human life and action into supra-gigantic forces whose movements race through humanity, dragging every individual willy-nilly with them-either riding atop their triumphant car or crushed under its wheel” (Arendt, 1994, p. 341)

2.4 Summary

The basis, the original environment from which totalitarianism emerges is found in a completely atomized society. Society whose once rich social matrix based, not even on institutions or discourse, but a matrix based on elementary human contact is eliminated. For Arendt, this is the epitome of modernity which made totalitarianism possible. In Foucauldian thinking, I argue, that this uprootedness can be found in a biopolitical society. A society whose inner workings were rearranged by disciplinarian scrutiny, so that they could be all later put together in a seemingly organic way. Whereas it was the disciplinarian society that dissolved and put everything into a precise order, everyone, so to say, in his special cell, biopower, adopting the language and lenses of biology and species reconstructed the society. Arguably, it covered the atomization by layer of organic fabric so that the internal function can operate undetected. Agamben more gloomy analysis suggests that homo sacer is the figure of modernity, while camp is the space corresponding to that figure. And concentration camp is the idea of camp extended to its consequential end. But, insofar as is the atomized society a necessary condition, it is not a sufficient one. It is only when such a society is being driven by a totalitarian ideology that tries to explain and justify any, however insane, deed by as according to a particular *necessity*, a sum of some artificial laws.

That is when terror starts to reign and even fear is rendered void, because there are no rules of rationality within terror, which, in itself, defies the realm of reality. It is the vicious circle of deepening the rupture between people that totalitarian regimes need for its survival, since any human action in concord is its fatal enemy. It is perhaps this level of a complete social inability that definitely marks the totalitarianism. Yet, there is a glimmer of hope which is rooted deep, too deep for totalitarianism to grasp. That is both, the idea of birth as well as physical birth (Arendt, 1994, p. 342). Human dissimilitude, the ability act anew is what marks humans. In the end, it is the natality, that is the condition of *action*.

Chapter3: Two Manifestos as Two Distinct Possibilities of Modernity

3.1 Methodology and Hypothesis

In this chapter, I will provide a comparative analysis of two manifestos, *Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic* (due to the scope of this work, only an analysis of its first chapter, "Strengthening Social and Political Stability" will be provided) and *Manifesto of the People's Party Our Slovakia*. By working with findings of the second chapter, of how a totalitarian regime can come to life from the matrix of modern society delineated in the first chapter I will attempt to prove my hypothesis. That is, that the former manifesto, a legally binding document of the Slovak coalition for years 2016-2020 is representing the positive possible outcome of modernity, i.e., liberal democracy, while the latter, represents a totalitarian perspective.

3.2 Analysis

3.2.1 Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic, ch.1: Strengthening Social and Political Stability

Insofar as is the manifesto of Slovak coalition is a binding document and Slovakia a member of European Union, there is no surprise hidden in its agenda. The text mentions the strengthening of human fabric, social cohesion or fight against extremism, the core principles of a free democratic regime, multiple times.

1. "This Manifesto openly avows the European democratic traditions of freedom, human dignity and tolerance in combating fascism and rightist extremism" (ÚVSR, 2016).

2. "On the basis of this democratic conviction, the Government is prepared to strengthen the policy of understanding and reconciliation of all Slovak citizens regardless of their ethnicity and use this unique opportunity to launch a new phase of support to national minorities" (ÚVSR, 2016).

3. “The Manifesto of the Government strives to anchor the domestic and international stability of the country by fostering the overall economic and social cohesion with the objective of curbing the rise of extremism in society in general, and in parliamentary benches in particular” (ÚVSR, 2016).

4. “By supporting social dialogue and the tripartite, the Government will strive to provide social certainties for all citizens of the Slovak Republic irrespective of their regional and social backgrounds or standing” (ÚVSR, 2016).

5. “The Government will use all legal and political means to stave off extremism and stop any further anti-systemic erosion of parliamentary democracy” (ÚVSR, 2016).

3.2.2 Manifesto of the People’s Party Our Slovakia

The Manifesto of the People’s Party Our Slovakia points on multiple (in its entire length really) directly back to the Slovak State of 1939-1945, which was a client state of Nazi Germany:

1. “People’s Party Our Slovakia continues in the legacy of our national heroes – Ludovit Stur, Dr. Andrej Hlinka and Dr. Jozef Tiso” (ĽSNS, 2016)

2. “*Leader* of the people’s Party Our Slovakia is Ing. Mgr. Marian Kotleba” (ĽSNS, 2016, emphasis added)

3. “[The People’s Party Our Slovakia aims to reshape Slovak Republic with the goal to become...] safe for all *decent* citizens so they are not terrorized by *gypsy* or other extremists and corrupted politicians” (ĽSNS, 2016, emphasis added)

4. “christian and morally preserved so that traditional Christian values are applied instead of

western liberalism which encourages atheism, materialism, consumerism, dangerous sects and sexual deviations” (ĽSNS, 2016)

5. “national so that the Slovaks are in control of Slovakia and not in the service of foreigners, immigrants and ethnic minorities” (LSNS, 2016)

6. “Uncompromising program, open and striking rhetoric and the fight against *parasites*” (LSNS, 2016, emphasis added)

7. “Nevertheless, we are determined to sacrifice ourselves for Slovakia – *For God and For the nation!*” (LSNS, 2016, emphasis added)

3.3 Sub conclusion

Our primary hypothesis has two parts. First, that the first chapter, Strengthening Social and Political Stability of the *Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic 2016-2020*, is representing the positive possible outcome of modernity, that is, liberal, parliamentary democracy by strengthening the social fabric by policies that strengthen social cohesion, reduce regional differences and combat extremism. This part was *proved to stand*.

Strengthening of social cohesion, together with the reduction of regional differences constitutes the per excellence figures of modern democracy for Arendt. Since modernity was for all three authors, Arendt, Foucault, and Agamben characterized by an atomized society. And the atomized society as the necessary condition for the rise of totalitarianism, the agenda strictly opposes this notion. Secondly, considering natality and plurality as conditions of human *action* (Arendt, 1998, p. 7), which nothing else but the characteristic of a free society, social cohesion and flattening of regional differences creates opportunities for *action* to take place from an institutionalist perspective. The third main agenda, to combat extremism, I believe, doesn't need any further explanation.

The second part of our primary hypothesis stated, that the *Manifesto of the People's Party Our Slovakia* represents the less fortunate possible outcome of modernity, that is, agenda's leading correspondent to totalitarianism. This part of our hypothesis, in this

primary form was *disproved*. Neither of the manifesto's propositions were showing *clear* and *direct* link to the traits of modernity characterized as a reconstruction of an atomized society in the name of an over-arching ideology based on a divine law of History or Nature, in the presence of constant fear-defying terror.

Yet, the manifesto has shown strong resemblance of the ideals of Slovak State a client state of Nazi Germany in the period of 1939 to 1945, appraisal of unconventional figures responsible for the Slovak part on the Holocaust, strong racist tone, rigidness of ideas, misogyny, homophobia or xenophobic traits.

Conclusion

The approval ratings of People's Party Our Slovakia are, from their election, on a steady rise, and slightly over 10 percent now. After Donald Trump's inauguration, there has been a whole plethora of things happening, where there is nothing else left for us than to shake our heads in disbelief. "Alternative facts" and disbelief in for facts in general is terrifying news. IT were precisely information as listed above that made me first consider working with this theme. The title of this work says, that there is a thin line between democracy and totality. This work, trying to stay true to its title tried to present first and foremost the account of three political philosophers – Hannah Arendt, Michel Foucault and Giorgio Agamben on issues on totalitarianism in modernity. Cause of their texts to be of different nature, it was inevitable for us to construct a unified theory from the start, that is, from the particularly new notions of modernity. Our first chapter revealed that the what came with modernity is a shift in traditional object/subject classification in politics stemming from the inclusion of biological life into the pertinent characteristics of modern political power. The second chapter moved consider what are the particularities of totalitarianism and in what way does they penetrate the specific environment of modern, mass society characterized by disinterest and towing of social bonds. The third chapter applied the sum of knowledge presented in both, first and second chapter and with it provided a comparative analysis of two manifestos. First was the manifesto of Slovak Government, the second being the Manifesto of People's Party Our Slovakia. These two were meant two represent the different possible outcomes of modernity, namely democracy and totality which was also our hypothesis. First part of hypothesis was proved, rendering the official manifesto of Slovak coalition as being representing parliamentary democracy, while the second was disproved, freeing the People's Party Our Slovakia's manifesto of being accused of totalitarian tendencies. Yet, a strong adherence to Slovak State, a client state of Nazi Germany was found, as well as elements strongly opposing the conditions of a free, democratic government characterized mostly by social cohesion and cooperation.

Therefore, if we would change the formulation of the second part of our hypothesis, from representing the possible outcome of modernity, that is totalitarianism, for “exploiting the social fabric insomuch as creating a fertile ground for totalitarianism”, I believe that we would succeed. Of course, the problem appears with vaguely defined terms. But words in written form sometimes hide the reality of what is truly happening. Also, considering this work as to be primarily concerned with political theory, then, perhaps, a fine amount of openness, and a space for interpretation isn’t that off-putting.

Resumé

Inšpirovaná súčasným svetovým dianím ktoré poukazuje na stále častejšiu tendenciu siahať po nedemokratických krokoch, táto práca opisuje modernu ako bod z ktorého vzišli oba režimy, demokracia, aj totalita. Oba režimy majú v moderne spoločné korene, čo naznačuje že medzi nimi, nakoniec nemusí byť až taký priepastný rozdiel. A možno práve, že je medzi nimi tenký ľad. K tomu aby sme mohli prijať túto tézu si je treba ale predstaviť vývoj nie segmentovo, ale vývojovo ako organický pohyb.

Táto práca využíva primárne zdroje troch autorov z oblasti politickej filozofie, Hanu Arendt, Michela Foucault, a Giorgia Agambena a z nich vyskladáva mozaiku moderny ktorá je charakterizovaná najmä inklúziou biologickej osoby človeka do centra dopadu politickej moci. Tieto idey čerpá v prvom rade z dvoch kníh, prvého vydania *Histórie Sexuality* od Michela Foucault a *Homo Sacer* od Giorgia Agambena. Táto inklúzia biologickej stránky a jej prienik do centra politickej moci prezentuje odklon od antického „dualitného“ vnímania človeka ktorý bol charakterizovaný týmto rozkolom. Jeho biologická časť, ktorej vyústenie sa charakterizovalo v managemente domácnosti bola jasne odlišná od politickej časti ktorej herným pódium bola agora ako centrum mesta.

Avšak tento rozkol sa zmenil nástupom modernity, ktorú Michel Foucault charakterizoval ako dobu bio-politiky. Biopolitika sa odlišovala od dvoch dominantných predošlých režimov tým, že nástupom biológie a štatistiky ako vedy, analyzovala spoločnosť cez sitko druhu a nie jednotlivca.

Na druhú stranu, pre Giorgia Agambena to nebol biopolitický záver ktorý určoval modernitu, no práve figúra „homo sacer“ ktorou poukazoval na zmenu v tradičnom systéme suverenity. Inými slovami, homo sacer predstavuje osobu ktorá je pod dvojitým nátlakom inkluzívnej exklúzie. Teda, osoba, ktorá je zároveň objektom suverénnej moci,

no iba do tej miery, že je od nej exkluzívna, ňou opustená. Táto osoba, homo sacer, a jej prisľichajúce miesto na zemi, „kemp“, je to, čo symbolizovalo modernitu.

Pre Arendt bola charakteristikou modernity masová spoločnosť ktorá produkovala indiferentných, osamelých jednotlivcov ktorých sociálny matrix bol oslabený. Arendt opisovala človeka ako primárne sociálneho jednotlivca. A bolo to práve v sociálnej spolupráci a vzťahoch v čom Arendt našla jadro ľudskej existencie tomu odpovedajúcu natalitu ako kondíciu, možnosť začať odznova.

Táto kondícia spoločenského bytia je ale, bohužiaľ, alebo chvalabohu, presným opozitom totalitného režimu. Totalitný režim, za pomoci špeciálnej totalitnej ideológie, ktorá vo svojom, od reality odtrhnutom svete, je schopná vysvetliť všetko, no zároveň nič. Táto ideológia môže zafungovať jedine v prípade aplikácie na atomizovanú spoločnosť ľudí, ktorí, aj napriek tomu, že sú fyzicky v kontakte, nemajú medzi sebou žiadne sociálne vzťahy. Vládou teroru a všadeprítomným strachom sa potom tranzícia k totalite úspešne ukončí.

V Záverečnej kapitole tejto práce je prezentovaná komparatívna analýza *Programového Vyhlásenia Vlády SR 2016-2020* s manifestom Ľudovej Strany Naše Slovensko v snahe potvrdenia hypotézy, že Programové Vyhlásenie prezentuje demokratický vývin moderny, zatiaľ čo Manifest ĽSNS prezentuje vývin totalitný.

Ako vidíme, naša hypotéza ma dva závery. Prvý z nich, že *Programové Vyhlásenie Vlády SR*, forma manifestu, prezentuje vývin moderny v demokraciu, bol potvrdený na základe niekoľko násobného použitia výrazov ktoré predkladali sociálnu kohéziu, zmenšovanie regionálny rozdielov a boj proti extrémizmu za prvoradé.

Na druhej strane, druhý záver našej hypotézy bol vyvrátený. To znamená, že na základe takého výskumu a takej metodológie, aká bolo použitá, sme nebolo schopní dokázať, že na základe ich manifestu, je Ľudová Strana Naše Slovensko prezentujúca agendy totality. Zároveň však vieme z istotou tvrdiť, že ĽSNS zastáva mentalitu Slovenského Štátu v tom najširšom chápaní slova. Príklady do očí bijúceho rasizmu, xenofóbie, či rozvratu

spoločenského vlákna vieme by sme boli schopní tvrdiť, že ĽSNS síce nie je totalitná strana vo svojej rétorike manifestu, no jasne využíva nástroje ktoré v konečnom dôsledku presne k totalitnej spoločnosti, a žiadnej inej nespejú.

Bibliography

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. (D. Heller-Roazen, Trans.) Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Arendt, H. (1973). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Arendt, H. (1994). On the Nature of Totalitarianism. In H. Arendt, *Essays in Understanding: 1930-1954* (pp. 663-728). New York: Schocken Books.
- Arendt, H. (1994). On the Nature of Totalitarianism. In H. Arendt, & J. Kohn (Ed.), *Essays in Understanding: 1930-1954* (pp. 328-361). New York: Schocken Books.
- Arendt, H. (1998). *The Human Condition* (2nd Edition ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle. (1992). *The Politics*. (T. A. Sinclair, Trans.) England: Penguin Books.
- Aristotle. (2007). *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (2nd Edition ed.). (G. A. Kennedy, Trans.) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso.
- Danoff, B. (2000). Arendt, Kafka, and the Nature of Totalitarianism. *Perspectives on Political Science*, 29(4), 211-218.
- Diken, B., & Laustsen, C. B. (2005). *The Culture of Exception: Sociology Facing the Camp*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Ek, R. (2006). Giorgio Agamben and the Spatialities of the Camp: An Introduction. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 88(4), 363-386.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline & Punish* (2nd ed.). (A. Sheridan, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: Volume I*. (R. Hurley, Trans.) New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-78*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Govier, T. (2010). *A Practical Study of Argument* (7th Edition ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- ĽSNS. (2016). *Manifesto of People's Party Our Slovakia*. ĽSNS.
- McWhorther, L. (2004, August). Sex, Race, and Biopower: A Foucauldian Genealogy. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 19(3), 38-62.

- McWorther, L. (2004, August). Sex, Race, and Biopower: A Foucauldian Genealogy. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 19(3), 38-62.
- Rasmussen, K. S. (2001). Foucault's Genealogy of Racism. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 28(5), 34-51.
- ÚVSR. (2016). *Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic*. Úrad vlády Slovenskej Republiky.

Attachments

Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic

In the parliamentary elections to the National Council of the Slovak Republic, held on 5 March 2016, citizens expressed their support for a programme of social and political stability, social dialogue, structural reforms and systemic changes in the relevant areas of society. Based on the mandate given by citizens, a coalition government has been formed and appointed in compliance with the constitutional procedures of the Slovak Republic.

The Government of the Slovak Republic will place its activities in a framework which ensures the stable development of Slovak society and provides sufficient flexibility for reaction to the opportunities and threats of the external environment in order to secure the economic, social and environmental development of Slovakia, foster social cohesion, reduce regional disparities, strengthen the active role played by the state in combating corruption and enhancing the quality of public services for citizens.

Pursuant to Article 113 of the Constitution of the Slovak Republic, the Government of the Slovak Republic ("Government") presents itself to the National Council of the Slovak Republic and, along with the request for a vote of confidence, submits this Manifesto.

The Manifesto is structured along the following areas of the Government's executive activities, which are hereby submitted to the National Council of the Slovak Republic as a basis for vote of confidence:

1. Strengthening social and political stability;
2. Reacting flexibly to the opportunities and threats of the external environment;

3. Supporting, on a continuous basis, the economic, social and environmental development of the country;
 4. Fostering the economic, social and territorial cohesion of Slovakia;
 5. Strengthening the role of the state and the protection of public interest;
1. STRENGTHENING SOCIAL AND POLITICAL STABILITY

The incoming government is a government of continuity and progress, a government with a historic chance to overcome the dividing lines from the 1990s and focus on the real challenges of our times which, nowadays, include a new majority accord on a democratic functioning of the Slovak Republic and on strengthening the role of credible politics in the country.

This Manifesto is based on the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the Slovak Republic which guarantees implementation of the democratic form of government, life in freedom, and development of spiritual culture and economic prosperity. This Manifesto openly avows the European democratic traditions of freedom, human dignity and tolerance in combating fascism and rightist extremism. On the basis of this democratic conviction, the Government is prepared to strengthen the policy of understanding and reconciliation of all Slovak citizens regardless of their ethnicity and use this unique opportunity to launch a new phase of support to national minorities. The Government, formed on the basis of a broad consensus and political accord, will support the national, economic and political interests of all Slovak citizens in our common Europe.

We are living in a period marked by major tremors which jeopardise European unity, European values and established political practices. Slovakia stands ready to face these threats. In breakthrough times, when our society was swayed by storms and passions, be it during the historic moments of the Slovak National Uprising or, most recently, at the end of the 20th century when the country refused to accept an authoritarian policy,

Slovakia showed ability to form a broad social and political consensus across party lines. The government of today continues to uphold this idea, which is based on the premise of the necessity for standard political parties to make historic compromises in the interest of the country.

The Manifesto of the Government strives to anchor the domestic and international stability of the country by fostering the overall economic and social cohesion with the objective of curbing the rise of extremism in society in general, and in parliamentary benches in particular. The Government will pursue a pro-growth economic policy in order to create an additional 100,000 new jobs and bring unemployment below 10%. The Government is committed to attaining a balanced budget by 2020 and strengthening the overall fiscal discipline. By supporting social dialogue and the tripartite, the Government will strive to provide social certainties for all citizens of the Slovak Republic irrespective of their regional and social backgrounds or standing.

Bearing in mind that the European Union constitutes the main framework which influences everyday life and events in Slovakia, the Government will do its utmost to ensure the successful and safe Presidency of the Slovak Republic in the Council of the European Union in the second half of 2016, including support for Slovakia's national priority, i.e., completing the Eurozone architecture by adopting common fiscal instruments designed to absorb economic shocks.

The Government will support policies aimed at reducing social and regional disparities. It will pursue a public policy aimed at creating new jobs in the various regions and developing local road infrastructure. The Government will achieve its objectives in this area through implementing regional development programmes for the least developed districts, including through the support of social economy by a combination of grants and financial instruments. The Government will make better use of the inherent strengths of individual regions, strengthen food security and increase the share of Slovak food products on the consumer market. The Government will also see to assisting

the thousands of citizens who suffer as a consequence of execution proceedings and will help them pay their debts.

By incorporating the principles of open governance into this Manifesto, we are declaring our determination to institutionalise and intensify the fight against corruption. Although Slovakia managed to sail through the stormy waters of the global economic crisis largely unscathed thanks to its pro-growth economic policy, it was not possible to eliminate all the repercussions which the globally intertwined economic system has had on our citizens. This is what makes people much more susceptible to any conduct which breaches the law or compromises ethical standards. The Government perceives corruption as the enemy of democracy which opens doors to false and extremist solutions. This is why a vigorous anti-corruption programme aimed at strengthening the rule of law is one of our priorities.

The incoming Government is aware of the need to advocate the strategic role of the state in individual sectors. The Government will continue to modernise and revitalise the system of public administration so that all taxpayers get value for their money in the form of high-quality and easily accessible public services. Unlike the simplified concept based on which the state should rid itself of and/or privatise as many of its functions as possible, the Government advocates the idea of a well-managed and properly functioning welfare state – a state which respects solidarity and efficiency. The rigorous application of the value-for-money principle and the adoption of a new law on shell companies and tax havens will be a step in the right direction in that it will create new jobs, ensure equal access to public services and improve the quality of life both in urban and rural areas.

The Manifesto of the Government is based on the shared will of all coalition partners to go down the route of fostering political stability and building citizens' trust in democratic institutions. The Government will use all legal and political means to stave off extremism and stop any further anti-systemic erosion of parliamentary democracy.

The success of this ruling coalition will determine the future development of standard parliamentary and party politics in Slovakia. This is a challenge for all responsible citizens of the state and, at the same time, a political commitment and the reason for the formation of this coalition government - the government of state-forming concordance.

-

Manifesto of People's Party Our Slovakia

People's Party Our Slovakia (Ľudová strana Naše Slovensko) was established as a political party in 2011. It is based on three core principles – national, christian and social.

Leader of the people's Party Our Slovakia is Ing. Mgr. Marian Kotleba, regional president of the Banská Bystrica county.

The People's Party Our Slovakia is the only real alternative and opposition to the corrupted and criminal "democratic" system and the current parliamentary parties, which all have been more or less participating in stealing the treasures of our country and in betraying and selling out our nation.

The People's Party Our Slovakia continues in the legacy of our national heroes – Ludovit Stur, Dr. Andrej Hlinka and Dr. Jozef Tiso.

The People's Party Our Slovakia aims to reshape Slovak Republic with the goal to become:

- politically independent and economically self-sufficient so that we are not controlled by the European Union, international financiers and multinational corporations. We want to protect our own people and national interests.
- neutral, so that we do not have to participate in criminal policies of NATO, USA and Israel.
- safe for all decent citizens so they are not terrorized by gypsy or other extremists and corrupted politicians.
- socially equitable so that every decent citizen has work, fair wage, enough food and a healthy home.
- economically prosperous so that we do not live in debt slavery and in the world of fictional money, but rather with a balanced national budget and our own currency, covered by real values.

- economically developed, so that the domestic entrepreneurs and their products are the basis of the Slovak economy, rather than foreign investors who are often distorting Slovak market with cheap imports of low-quality products from abroad.
- christian and morally preserved so that traditional Christian values are applied instead of western liberalism which encourages atheism, materialism, consumerism, dangerous sects and sexual deviations.
- national so that the Slovaks are in control of Slovakia and not in the service of foreigners, immigrants and ethnic minorities.
- educated and cultural as a proud country in the heart of Europe should be.
- healthy so that our citizens have access to free health care, high-quality food products without unnecessary chemicals and well preserved environment.

The People's Party Our Slovakia has no rich sponsors among greedy speculators or financial groups, but is paid solely from the resources of their own people, committed to our program and our values.

Our members take politics as their personal mission in life, as a service to the nation and homeland. Unlike others we really want to achieve what we preach. Therefore, we are perceived as a major threat to the material and selfish interests of the current government and political system.

Uncompromising program, open and striking rhetoric and the fight against parasites and thieves in parliament and among people is the reason why we are being continuously attacked by foreign media and persecuted by the government and its police machinery.

Nevertheless, we are determined to sacrifice ourselves for Slovakia – For God and For the nation!