

**Between Czechoslovakia and 'mečiarism': Political
situation in the Slovak Republic in 1992-1994**

Krzysztof Żarna

University of Rzeszów, Poland

Political Preferences

2018, vol. 21: 71-83.

DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.7533161

journals.us.edu.pl/index.php/PP

Submitted: 02/10/2018

Accepted: 04/12/2018



Abstract:

The article concerns the analysis of the political situation in the Slovak Republic and the formation of the party system. In the analysed period, the process of decomposition of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic took place, or actually, the culmination of this process. The study is based on the assumption that in the analysed period there were many divisions observed on the political scene, which were the result of the lack of a stable political structure. In the article author uses the method of historical and institutional analysis.

Key words:

Slovakia, Czechoslovakia, Vladimír Mečiar, HZDS

Introduction

After the events described in Central and Eastern Europe as an autumn of nations, the political systems that functioned in the countries of the region that had been under the influence of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics underwent decomposition. In the case of Czechoslovakia, in contrast to, for example, Romania, the "velvet revolution" did not result in bloodshed in the event of the fall of the existing system. The Czechs and the Slovaks followed the double way. In the years 1990-1992 not only the process of political transformation commenced, but also the decomposition of the Czech and the Slovak Federal Republic (CSRF) occurred.

Also in this case, in contrast to, for example, Yugoslavia, the disintegration of the federation was of a peaceful nature. This article concerns the analysis of the political situation that took place in Slovakia in the period from 1992, when the fate of the federation was already decided, until the 1994, when the coalition of the Movement for Democratic Slovakia (HZDS), the Slovakian National Party (SNS) and the Slovak Workers' Association (ZRS) took power.

Then, as a result of Vladimír Mečiar's policy, there were many instances of violations of human rights and freedoms, which had their consequences in marginalisation of Slovakia in the international arena. The analysed period has not yet received a detailed study, there have been mostly publications concerning either the process of Czechoslovakia's disintegration or the post-1994 period. This article is based on the assumption that in the analysed period there were many divisions on the political scene which resulted from the lack of a stable political structure. In the article author uses the method of historical and institutional analysis.

Elections to the Slovak National Council

As Marian Szczepaniak (1995: 51) noted, the electoral campaign for the Slovak National Council in 1992 was dominated by three main problems:

- the direction of economic reforms; it was accepted in the Czech Republic, while in the Slovaks' opinion it had the character of explicitly pro-Czech. It was connected with the recession, which to a large extent affected Slovakia, where the heavy and defense industries producing intermediate products had been prevalent. In the new reality, the demand for their products decreased. The reforms undertaken in 1991 deepened the difficult economic situation in Slovakia,
- implementation of the Decommunisation Act of 9 October 1991; Vaclav Havel's motion seeking to alleviate it, was rejected by the Federal Assembly. In contrast to the Czech Republic, where the law was implemented, in Slovakia it was received with indifference, and the authorities nominated after the 1992 June elections immediately announced its cancellation,
- unresolved Czech-Slovak dispute over the constitutional shape of the state: its result was the failure of the Federal Assembly to adopt the new constitution of the CSRF.

On June 5 and 6, 1992 general elections to the Slovak National Council were held. They fundamentally changed the political situation. HZDS won, obtaining 37.3% of votes and almost half of the seats. Such a high result was achieved mainly due to the fact that a large number of political parties did not get to the parliament, being unable to exceed the required threshold of 5% support. The Democratic Left Party (SDL) was also successful. The Christian Democratic Movement (KDH) received 13 seats fewer than in the previous election, SNS seven seats fewer, support for the Community coalition (ESWS)/Hungarian Christian Democratic Movement (MKDH) (Červený & Kmet' 2008: 254) remained at a similar level. The Social Democratic Party

of Slovakia (SDSS) suffered a failure, as it did not exceed the required electoral threshold. It considered itself an heir of the parties that had been active within Austro-Hungary and in Czechoslovakia. It was the legal successor of Czechoslovak Social Democracy (ČSD) operating in 1947-1948. The name SDSS has been formally in force since 1993. Alexander Dubček became the chairman of this party for a short period, and its other activists were: Ivan Paulička, Jaroslav Volf, Boris Zala. Politicians presented their group as an alternative to the Communist Party of Slovakia (KSS), however, the most votes of the left-wing electorate were collected by SĎĽ. Representatives of this party were in favour of the federation, they stressed the idea of self-government and social state (Zenderowski 2007: 303).

Table 1. Results of parliamentary elections in 1992

Party	Result (in%)	Number of seats
Movement for Democratic Slovakia	37.26	74
Democratic Left Party	14.70	29
Christian Democratic Movement	8.89	18
Slovak National Party	7.93	15
Community / Hungarian Christian Democratic Movement	7.42	14
Other	23.80	-
Total	100.00	150

Source: *Parlamentné voľby 1992 na Slovensku.*

Soňa Szomolanyi (2004: 152) believes that the elections in 1992 should be considered as those that „ended” the existence of the Czechoslovak state.

Appointment of the government of Vladimír Mečiar and the breakup of the Federation

After the parliamentary elections leading Czech and Slovak politicians came to the conclusion that politics at the republican level would be crucial, while the role of the federal level would be decreasing. So Václav Klaus became the Prime Minister of the Czech Republic and Vladimír Mečiar of the Slovak Republic. On the other hand, the politicians of the second plan were included in the federal government (Bankowicz 2003: 110). V. Mečiar then declared: *Enough. The state in its current form cannot and will not exist. We want a sovereign Slovakia, which is a subject of international law, which would form a kind of "defense and economic community" with the Czech Republic. Armed forces would be "coordinated centrally"* (Pleszaty 1992: 11).

The government set up by HZDS with Vladimír Mečiar as a leader could count in the beginning for the support of two independent deputies. He also had the support of the SNS, whose leader Ľudovít Černák was a member of the government, as well as of some of the politicians of SDL. It should be added that the newly formed coalition had 83 deputies in the 150-seat parliament. HZDS gained the status of hegemon due to the fact that it controlled over 49% of seats in the parliament and over 80% of ministerial positions. The composition of this coalition was surprising. HZDS originated from the Anti-Violence Society (VPN), which could suggest anti-communist and pro-reform orientation, while the SNS had the status of an extreme nationalist party (Herbut 1998: 164). When applying for a vote of confidence, Mr. Mečiar presented on 15 July 1992 a government program declaration. In the context of foreign policy, he stressed that one of the main goals was to promote objective information about Slovakia which would strive to improve the pluralistic political system and respect the principles of European and democratic political culture. The Slovak authorities declared taking action to cooperate with Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Romania and other southern European countries. In addition, they recognized as leading the association agreement of CSRF with the European Communities (EC) and guaranteed compliance with the provisions of all agreements concluded by the federal authorities. V. Mečiar in the program declaration assured that, recognizing the role of the United Nations (UN) and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), Slovakia would be keen to participate in the forums of these organisations and all the other bodies acting for international agreement and cooperation. Parallel to the activities carried out by the federal authorities, the Slovak government announced efforts to develop its own international relations, among others in order to attract foreign investors and increase own exports (*Programove vyhlásenie...*).

The program declaration was presented at the moment when the future of CSRF had already been foredoomed – on February 14, 1992, the Presidium of the Slovak National Council did not accept the content of the Czech-Slovak agreement. The consequence of this decision was the proclamation of the sovereignty of the Slovak Republic on 17 July 1992. 113 deputies voted in favor of the declaration, 24 were against and 10 abstained (*Deklarácia Slovenskej...*). The Declaration recognized the supreme right of the Slovak nation to self-determination, it also ensured respect for the rights of every citizen, as well as of all representatives of national and ethnic minorities.

The dissolution of the Federation was also determined by the negative position of the HZDS regarding Václav Havel's candidacy for the post of president. As a result, on 3 July 1992 he did not obtain the required majority of votes in the Federal Assembly. In the Slovak part of the House of Nations, only 18 out of 75 MPs voted for him in the second round. This fact and perhaps first of all, as Bugusław Pytlik notes, the declaration of sovereignty of Slovakia caused that V. Havel withdrew his candidacy and resigned from the office on July 20. He stated that his continued duties as the head of state could become an obstacle to the systemic changes and independence efforts of the Slovaks initiated after the June 1992 elections (Pytlik 2013: 31). Subsequent attempts to find a person who would take over the president's seat failed until the end of the existence of Czechoslovakia. As a result, the function of the head of state was performed by the presidium of the Federal Assembly (Bankowicz 2003: 111).

Ewa Orlof (2003) pointed out that the role of the two parties, Václav Klaus's Civic Democratic Party (ODS) and Vladimír Mečiar's Movement for Democratic Slovakia, actually increased in this period. In fact, the decision to split the state was made by the two politicians who did not appeal to the citizens to express their opinion on the subject in a referendum. Michal Kováč presented his stance on the idea of calling a referendum. He stated that the Slovaks did not mind, but the Czechs would also have to agree to it. However, in his opinion, ODS did not want a referendum, because it was not interested in the dissolution of Czechoslovakia. He added, however, that such a referendum was not needed for the division of the state. The only thing that was important was that the decision would be voted by the Federal Assembly, not just the parliaments of both republics. And so it happened, although it was not obvious, because V. Klaus and V. Mečiar thought that since they got along and their parties had a majority in the parliaments of both republics, the matter was settled. The future Slovakian president had to convince V. Mečiar for a long time that voting in the Federal Assembly was necessary and eventually succeeded. Thanks to this, the division of the state took place in a way that the international community was forced to accept (Kováč 1998: 24). It should be remembered how, more or less in the same period, other multinational states: Yugoslavia and the USSR collapsed.

The Slovak Republic is a new state on the political map of Europe

On 22-23 July 1992 in Bratislava, Václav Klaus and Vladimír Mečiar signed an agreement on the disappearance of the federation. Ewa Orlof quoted the phrase that appeared at

that time in the media and that illustrated V. Klaus's philosophy: *Without the Slovaks to Europe or with them to the Balkans* (Orlof 2003: 256). A month later, on 26 August 1992, a meeting was held in Brno, where V. Klaus and V. Mečiar agreed that the CSRF would cease to exist at midnight on December 31, 1992. The Slovakian parliament adopted with a large majority a constitution of the Slovak Republic on September 1. On November 13, the Federal Assembly passed a law on the division of the Republic's property in a 2:1 ratio in favor of the Czech Republic (Pytlik 2013: 31). According to Rudolf Schuster, *the Czech Republic and Slovakia were like a tired marriage, expostulating each other about every penny. I only regretted that there was no referendum on this matter. Anyway, I'm not sure if the majority would like to divide the federation. If things were to be treated less emotionally, in a long-term perspective, economic and social analyses could take place, for example, the form of a confederation, without a definite separation of the Czech Republic and Slovakia, would have been better for both sides. Meanwhile, two prime ministers, Vladimir Mečiar and Vaclav Klaus, took part in the separation of the state, with no opinion from the nations.* (Schuster 1999: 36).

The head of the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry, Jíří Dienstbier, stated that he himself was against the division, not because the Slovaks could not have their own state, but because he was aware of high esteem and authority enjoyed by Czechoslovakia in the world. In the West, the country was believed to be a stabilising factor, because it was the only multi-ethnic state that managed to move from communism to democracy (Čarnogursky & Dienstbier 2002: 9).

On January 1, 1993, two new states were created: the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. They took over the rights and obligations resulting from international agreements by which the CSRF had been bound. Already in the first week after the creation of the Slovak Republic, the authorities began a crackdown on journalists sympathising with the opposition. The management of the most popular daily *Smena* was dismissed. After the June 1992 elections, the daily was transformed into a sole proprietorship with a 100% share of the state treasury. The Supervisory Board consisted entirely of persons favorably disposed to HZDS. On January 4, the Council members denounced the editor-in-chief Karol Ježík and executive manager Jozef Weiss. The official reason for the dismissal was the difficult financial situation of the newspaper, but it seems that this was just an excuse, because their successors Gabriela Baranovičová and Ján Lukáčik had previously run the daily *Denní Telegraph* which brought losses of 3 million Slovak crowns. Meanwhile, *Smena* recorded profits of around 6 million. Former Prime Minister Ján

Čarnogurský said that this was the beginning of a new "normalisation", referring in this way to the Prague Spring. The Syndicate of Slovak Journalists, on the other hand, considered this decision an attempt to intimidate the entire professional environment (Jagodzinski 1993: 5).

The first presidential election in the post-war history of Slovakia was an important event. The MPs of the National Council of the Slovak Republic¹ during the 13th meeting on January 26, 1993, attempted to elect a presidential candidate from among Milan Ftáčnik (SDL), Roman Kováč (HZDS), Anton Neuwirth (KDH) and Jozef Prokeš (SNS). None of the candidates received the required 90 votes. A similar situation took place a day later, on 27 January. In the end, the vice-chairman of the HZDS Michal Kováč was elected the head of state. In the election on 15 February 1993 he was supported by 106 deputies (*Stenografická správa...* 1993).

After the election, Michal Kováč resigned as a deputy chairman of the HZDS and suspended his membership in the party, declaring that he wanted to be a cross-party president (Henderson 2002: 44). It was a defeat of V. Mečiar whose close collaborator Roman Kováč lost. During the inaugural speech on the day of the oath, on March 2, 1993, Michal Kováč also referred to the foreign policy of the Slovak Republic. He stressed that the priorities stem from the geopolitical location of Slovakia in the Central Europe and the fact that since the beginning of its history this country had belonged to the West European culture and had been an organic part of the Euro-Atlantic area. With regard to the immediate international environment, the President considered it appropriate to continue cooperation with the Czech Republic and the Republic of Hungary and expressed support for established forms of cooperation between the Visegrad Group countries, which could have a positive impact on Slovakia's accession to Euro-Atlantic structures. M. Kováč stressed that relations with the United States of America should be of key importance for foreign policy. He stated that his duties included creating the impression that Slovakia was a democratic state with a stable government and an open market awaiting foreign investors (Bajda 2010a: 257-258).

In the years 1993-1994, the actions taken by V. Mečiar had the greatest influence on the formation of the Slovak political system and foreign policy. It should be emphasised that the personality traits of this politician had a very strong impact on his decisions. The prime minister consistently sought to create the state according to his own vision. As Piotr Bajda points out,

¹ It was decided to change the name of the parliament from the Slovak National Council to the National Council of the Slovak Republic. One of the reasons was the fact that the first name was associated with the Slovak state dependent in the years 1939-1945 on the Third Reich).

V. Mečiar did not tolerate those who did not share his convictions, and any manifestations of protest against the practices used by the head of the government led to the escalation of conflicts and intensification of repression. For his purposes he used not very precisely formulated provisions of the Constitution in the area of demarcation of the powers of the supreme authorities and the lack of relevant jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court of the Slovak Republic or of adopted and respected principles of practicing politics (Bajda 2009: 34-46). In this situation, the outbreak of conflict at the highest levels of power was only a matter of time.

Already at the beginning of 1993 there were some disagreements between HZDS and SNS and SDL² which in exchange for their support in the parliament demanded their representation in government. As V. Mečiar did not agree to this request, they withdrew their support for the government. In March 1993, L. Černák resigned. During this period there was also a split within HZDS. It was caused by the conflict between V. Mečiar and vice-chairman Milan Kňažko, who was unable to accept the form of leadership in the party. The conflict had already broken out at the time of the presidential election. M. Kňažko, who was also the deputy prime minister and vice-president of HZDS, publicly stated that the first Slovak president should be a cross-party president and must not have a communist past. V. Mečiar accused him of the activities supporting the party split. At the beginning of February 1993, the government did not allow M. Kňažko to visit the Brussels seat of NATO as well as to participate at the Brussels meeting of foreign ministers of the Visegrad Group and the EC, and the Geneva conference devoted to human rights issues in March (Jagodziński 1993b: 5).

V. Mečiar accused his former associate of failing to manage the ministry entrusted to him and of conducting foreign policy in a way that would harm the state and the party. It should be added that neither the President nor the parliamentary foreign affairs committee disagreed with this opinion. In order to resolve the doubts, Mr. Kováč asked the Constitutional Court of the Slovak Republic if he could refuse to sign the motion submitted by the chairman of the Council of Ministers. However, before the verdict was issued, Mr. Mečiar demanded that the head of state signs the resignation, threatening that he would otherwise resign from his position himself. In this situation, on March 19, 1993, the President dismissed M. Kňažka from his positions. The new minister of foreign affairs was another HZDS politician, Jozef Moravčík (Bajda 2010b: 38). The quoted events were not only a foretaste of the style in which V. Mečiar intended to carry out his position in the future. They also showed that credibility of Slovakia on the international stage

did not have to be the basic task of the foreign policy of this government. In September 1993, one of the CSCE committees prepared a document: *Human rights and democratisation in Slovakia*. The document explicitly stated that V. Mečiar's government did not allow materials unfavorable for HZDS to be published. In addition, it was found that the state subsidy system served press titles that were loyal to the government (Madeira 2001: 179).

In November 1993, SNS entered the government, but it did not solve V. Mečiar's problems. In this situation, the government lost its political base in the parliament. The lack of stability on the Slovak political scene was manifested by the progressive polarisation and disintegration of political parties. First of all, the style in which the HZDS ruled, and especially of its leader V. Mečiar, became the reason for further splits of this political group. As a result of the conflicts, a group of eight MPs with Milan Kňažko left HZDS and formed the Alliance of Democrats (AD) (Bajda 2010b: 72). In February 1994, another group of politicians, gathered around J. Moravčík and R. Kováč, left the HZDS establishing the Alternative Political Realism (APR). By joining AD and Ľudovít Černák's² National Democratic Party, in April 1994 the Democratic Union of Slovakia (DÚ), a liberal-democratic party was founded. The leading activists of this party declared that their goal was to realise the objectives of HZDS while rejecting nationalist rhetoric and authoritarian way of practicing politics. It declared its support for Slovakia's aspirations to join the EU and NATO. As a result of the presented changes, V. Mečiar's government lost the parliamentary majority (Zenderowski 2007: 313).

The weakening of the political position of the collective executive body became a good opportunity for Michal Kováč to make a critical assessment of the political activities of the government and its chairman. On March 9, 1994, the President presented a State Status Report to the National Council of the Slovak Republic. In the part devoted to the internal political situation, M. Kováč described V. Mečiar's policy as confrontational and leading to social divisions. The President also supported the creation of a broad coalition that would not have to seek support in the parliament and fight for survival as a minority government. As a result of a three-day discussion on the report, MP Ladislav Pittner put forward a motion to pass a vote of no confidence in V. Mečiar's government. On March 11, 1994, the government was

² In March 1994, there was a division in the Slovak National Party, which decided to leave the government coalition. The chairman of SNS Ľudovít Černák resigned from the function of deputy prime minister. One of the reasons for the break-up of the coalition was the appointment of Imrich Andrejčák as defense minister by Vladimír Mečiar. The national Democratic Party – New Alternative (Narodno-demokraticka strana- Nova alternative NDS-NA) emerged, headed by the aforementioned L. Černák.

deprived of the confidence of the National Council of the Slovak Republic and thus forced to resign, which took place three days later (Jančura 2014).

The rule of Josef Moravčík's cabinet

On the same day the President, having dismissed V. Mečiar, appointed former Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. Moravčík, as the head of government. The new cabinet was very politically diverse, it was composed of SĎP, KDH and the groups formed as a result of leaving HZDS and SNS, which, as already mentioned, merged into the liberal DÚ. The government of J. Moravčík was supported by the Hungarian minority parties remaining formally in opposition (Cichosz 2010: 138).

On April 12, 1994, at the meeting of the National Council of the Slovak Republic J. Moravčík presented the program declaration of the new government. He criticised the activity of the previous cabinet, accused it of not being prepared to perform its tasks and of using authoritarian methods, which provoked tensions and political disputes. When assessing Slovak foreign policy, the Prime Minister pointed out that just after the creation of the state, its goals were appropriate and widely accepted by political parties. J. Moravčík announced that he would return to the activities leading to membership in the European Union (EU), the North Atlantic Alliance (NATO) as well as the active participation of the Slovak army as part of the United Nations (UN) peace-keeping forces. In addition, the Prime Minister emphasised the need to solve the problems of national minorities and ethnic groups in the Slovak Republic, developing cooperation with the Council of Europe and with the Slovaks in other countries, as well as coordinating foreign policy activities with the president, stating that the smaller the state, the more profitable it is to carry out serious and consistent foreign policy (*Stenografická správa...* 1994). The post of the Minister of Foreign Affairs was taken by Eduard Kukan, a politician of DÚ (Žarna 2015: 107). Despite the loss of power, HZDS had a relatively strong position. V. Mečiar started to become one of the architects of the creation of the Slovak Republic, which was met with dissatisfaction on the part of SNS politicians.

The activities of the coalition government formed by DÚ, KDH, and SĎP were temporarily limited by early parliamentary elections scheduled for September 30 and October 1, 1994. This fact meant that the second half of the activity of J. Moravčík's government came during the election campaign to the parliament. The largest opposition party, HZDS, criticised

the government enjoying the trust of the president. Paradoxically, the government's activities in the international arena were negatively evaluated as being limited to the implementation of foreign policy assumptions already postulated by V. Mečiar and contained in his government's program declaration. The criticism of the prime minister's cooperation with the president (Žarna 2015: 108) was not without significance for the future events.

The elections of 30 September and 1 October 1994 for almost four years shaped the political scene of Slovakia which was clearly polarised into a government coalition and a completely marginalised opposition. Again HZDS won, obtaining similar support as two years earlier (35%). The anti- Mečiar coalition proved too weak to compromise the position of HZDS. First of all, the animosities between KDĽ and SĽĽ politicians contributed to the results (*Parlamentné voľby 1994...*).

Table 2. Results of parliamentary elections in 1994

Party	Result (in%)	Number of seats
Movement for Democratic Slovakia	35.0	61
Common Choice	10.4	18
Hungarian Coalition	10.2	17
Christian Democratic Movement	10.1	17
Democratic Union of Slovakia	8.6	15
Association of Slovak Workers	7.3	13
Slovak National Party	5.4	9
Democratic Party	3.4	-
Communist Party of Slovakia	2.7	-
Christian Social Union	2.1	-
Other	4.8	-
Total	100.0	150

Source: *Parlamentné voľby 1994 on Slovensko*.

HZDS this time took part in a coalition with the Slovak Agricultural Union (RSS) which was not very significant on the Slovak political scene. The second place was taken by the Common choice (SV) formed by SĽĽ, SDSS and the Workers' Movement (HPRS). The electoral results obtained by KDĽ, the Hungarian Coalition created by the Hungarian Citizens' Party (ISO), MKĽĽ and ESWS and DÚ – can be seen as confirmation of the stabilising position of these movements and political parties. The results of the elections confirmed the dominant position of HZDS (Bajda 2010b: 78-83).

Conclusion

The 1992-1994 were a period in which the common state of the Czechs and Slovaks decomposed. In the analyzed period, the fate of the Federation was already decided, therefore the author's purpose was not to discuss this process. This article presents the internal situation and the formation of the party system in the Slovak Republic. The analysis of this process allows us to clearly state that in the case of the Slovaks, the lack of a stable political structure is undoubtedly the result of the ongoing divisions on the political scene.

This is also the period in which the Slovak Democratic Movement with its charismatic leader Vladimír Mečiar dominated the Slovakian political scene. Vladimír Mečiar was considered to be one of the architects of the Federation's dissolution alongside Vacláv Klaus. The results of parliamentary elections show that the support for HZDS in elections in 1992 and 1994 remained more or less at the same level (37.26% and 35%). One can come to the conclusion that, as already mentioned, despite the more or less constant support from the electorate, there were many cases of departure of leading politicians from this party, the reason for which was primarily the style of exercising power by V. Mečiar. Politicians who did not share his opinion were marginalized, which resulted in the escalation of numerous conflicts.

The period 1992-1994 was a prelude to what took place after the elections to the National Council of the Slovak Republic, when after a short break he again took over the government becoming the head of the coalition of the Slovak Democratic Movement - the Slovak National Party - the Slovak Workers' Association.

References:

- Bajda, P. (2009). *Spór o władzę na Słowacji w latach 1993-1998*. In: J. Błuszkowski, & J. Zaleśny (eds.), *Wielowymiarowość systemów politycznych. Teoretyczne założenia i praktyczne uwarunkowania* (pp. 36–46). Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa
- Bajda, P. (2010a). *Elity polityczne na Słowacji w latach 1989-2010. Kręta droga do nowoczesnego państwa*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- Bajda, P. (2010b). *Polityka zagraniczna Słowacji*. In: E. Pałka (ed.), *Współczesna Słowacja. Sytuacja wewnętrzna i pozycja międzynarodowa* (pp. 255–78). Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza Arboretum.
- Bankowicz, M. (2003). *Zlikwidowane państwo. Ze studiów nad polityką Czechosłowacji*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego
- Čarnogurský, J., & Dienstbier, J. (2002). *Osobno lepiej niż razem*. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 17.09.
- Červený, O., & Kmeť, N. (2008). *Slovenská národná rada a jej snahy o riešenie štátoprávných otok*. In: M. Pekník (ed.), *Slovenské národné rady a cestak parlamentarizmu* (pp. 221–50). Bratislava: VEDA.

- Cichosz, M. (2010). *Gabinety na Słowacji po 1990 roku*. In: E. Pałka (ed.), *Współczesna Słowacja. Sytuacja wewnętrzna i pozycja międzynarodowa* (pp. 133–50). Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza Arboretum.
- Deklarácia Slovenskej národnej rady o zvrchovanosti Slovenskej republiky*. Z.z. 1992, č. 84.
- Henderson, K. (2002), Slovakia. The escape from invisibility, London-New York: Routledge.
- Herbut, R. (1998), *Systemy partyjne krajów Europy Centralnej i Wschodniej oraz wzorce rywalizacji politycznej*. In: A. Antoszewski & R. Herbut (ed.), *Demokracje Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej w perspektywie porównawczej* (pp. 129–67). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Jagodziński, A. (1993). Etyczna regulacja prasy. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 9-10.01
- Jagodziński, A. (1993). Minister bez paszportu. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 8.03
- Jančura, V. (2014). Prezident sa postavil premiérovi a - povalil ho. *Pravda*, 25.03.
- Kováč, M. (1998). Wszystko się może zdarzyć. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 25.09.
- Madera, A.J. (2001). *Na drodze do niepodległości. Słowacki system polityczny w okresie transformacji*. Rzeszów: SAS Wanda Tarnawska.
- Orlof, E. (2003), *Transformacja polityczna w Słowacji w ostatniej dekadzie XX wieku*. In: I. Stawowy-Kawka & W. Rojek (eds.), *Państwa europejskie na drodze do niepodległości (w drugiej połowie XIX i XX wieku)*. *Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Marianowi Zgórniakowi* (pp. 253–63). Kraków: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze Historica Jagiellonica.
- Parlamentné voľby 1992 na Slovensku*. www.vysledkyvolieb.sk/parlamentne-volby/1994/vysledky (29/07/2018).
- Parlamentné voľby 1994 na Slovensku*. www.vysledkyvolieb.sk/parlamentne-volby/1994/vysledky (29/08/2018).
- Pleszaty, K. (1992). Przed rozwodem. *Wprost*, 21.06.
- Programové vyhlásenie Slovenskej republiky*, Stenografická správa z 2. schôdzi Slovenskej národnej rady konanej 14. a 15. júla 1992, <https://www.nrsr.sk/dl/Browser/Document?documentId=71564> (28/08/2018).
- Pytlik, B. (2010). *Polityka zagraniczna Republiki Słowackiej w latach 1993-1998*. In: J. Osiński (ed.), *Administracja publiczna. Między polityką, prawem a ekonomią. Jubileusz 10-lecia Katedry Akademii Publicznej Kolegium Ekonomiczno-Społecznego SGH* (pp. 221–67). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Szkoły Głównej Handlowej.
- Schuster R. (1999) [interview], Bez czerwonej kartki. *Polityka*, 11.12.
- Stenografická správa o 15. schôdzi Národnej rady Slovenskej republiky* konanej 15. februára a 2. marca 1993, <https://www.nrsr.sk/dl/Browser/Document?documentId=75649> (06/08/2018).
- Stenografická správa o 29. schôdzi Národnej rady Slovenskej republiky* konanej 12. a 13. apríla 1994, <http://www.nrsr.sk/dl/Browser/Document?documentId=71577> (30/08/2018).
- Szczepaniak, M. (1995). Czechosłowacja w latach 1989-1992. Od „aksamitnej rewolucji” do „aksamitnego” rozpadu federacji. *Prace Politologiczne*, 226, 38–58.
- Szomolanyi, S (2004). *Slovakia: From a Difficult Case of Transition to a Consolidated Central European Democracy*. In: T. Hayashi (ed.), *Democracy and market economics in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 149–88). Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University.
- Zenderowski, R. (2007). *Nad Tatrami błyska się... Słowacka tożsamość narodowa w dyskursie politycznym w Republice Słowackiej (1989-2004)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie.
- Žarna, K. (2015). *Od Mečiara do Dzurindy. Główne kierunki polityki zagranicznej Republiki Słowackiej w latach 1993-2002*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.
-