

ANTI-SEMITIC  
DISCOURSE  
IN HUNGARY  
IN 2001

ANTI-SEMITIC DISCOURSE IN HUNGARY IN 2001  
REPORT AND DOCUMENTATION

**ANTI-SEMITIC DISCOURSE  
IN HUNGARY IN 2001  
Report and Documentation**

Editors:

ANDRÁS GERŐ, LÁSZLÓ VARGA, MÁTYÁS VINCE

Published by B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge



Budapest, Hungary 2002

Papers published in this book are based on documents collected by the  
Jewish Documentation Center of B'nai B'rith. H - 1065 Budapest,  
Révay u. 16., e-mail: zsdk@freemail.hu

This publication was made possible by a grant of the Soros Foundation

Copyright ©2002 by B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge and the Authors

ISBN 963 204 620 X

ISSN 1589-0619

Published by B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge

Printed by HTSART Printing House, Budapest, Hungary

## CONTENTS

---

Publisher's Foreword . . . . .	185
LÁSZLÓ VARGA: There is No Anti-Semitism in Hungary, or is There? . . . . .	189
LÁSZLÓ KARSAI: The School Holocaust Memorial Day . . . . .	201
JÁNOS DÉSI: In League With the Romas Against the Hungarians. . . . .	209
TIBOR SZESZLÉR: The Fradi-Fotex Affair . . . . .	217
GÁBOR SCHWEITZER: "Exclude Them, or if You Don't...!" . . . . .	227
ZSÓFIA MIHANCSEK: Revealing Quotations . . . . .	237
ÁRON MONORI: Radio Without Muzzle. . . . .	251
MÁRIA VÁSÁRHELYI: Jew-Bashing on Public Television . . . . .	265
MIHÁLY SZILÁGYI-GÁL: Through the Eyes of Csurka . . . . .	275
BALÁZS SIPOS: Understanding Globalization. . . . .	283
ÁRON MONORI: Old-New Prejudices. . . . .	295
Appendix . . . . .	307
ENIKŐ FUKK: Focal Points in Mass Communication . . . . .	307
ORTT RESOLUTION: Pannon Rádió Violates the Law. . . . .	321
STATEMENT BY MIÉP: Fradi-Fotex – a Transaction Against the Nation . . . . .	325
A Formal Complaint in the Fradi-Fotex Case. . . . .	327

## PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

---

*"I have been planning to write this review for one and a half years. I wanted to wait until anti-Semitism in Hungary – this national malaria, scurvy, epilepsy, anthrax – subsides for a little while", philosopher Miklós Tamás Gáspár began his article published in the daily Népszabadság on November 17, 2001, under the title Új zsidó nacionalizmus (New Jewish Nationalism). The article, a review of a book on Israel by fellow philosopher György Tatár, goes on to say: "After all, it is not fair to criticize people, whatever faults I think they have, who are being threatened, who are visibly in danger. Many accounts show that the number of (anti-Semitic) incidents in the street, at work, at restaurants has suddenly increased. I have also witnessed such incidents myself. Not to mention the incitement of the right wing and far-right media, now tolerated, now supported by the government. But I'm waiting in vain. The anti-Jewish instigation does not seem to subside so soon, its fervor won't diminish."*

We are also still waiting in vain. The operation of the Zsidó Dokumentációs Központ/Jewish Documentation Center (ZsiDok), founded by the Budapest Lodge of B'nai B'rith to document manifestations of anti-Semitism in Hungary, has been sadly successful. While all copies of our first report, prepared in 2001 in the year of the millennium, have been sold out, anti-Semitic discourse has not ceased to exist.

ZsiDok, organized in Budapest at the end of 1999, set as one of its main goals the collection and documentation of news items and reflections relating to the life of the Hungarian Jewish community as reported in the Hungarian mass media. Its media monitoring activity has resulted in a continuously expanding computerized database, which accurately documents the discourse relating to Hungarian Jews, including anti-Semitic discourse. This second volume of the book – just like last year's report – is primarily based on this collection.

B'nai B'rith published the first volume of the book on anti-Semitic discourse last year with the intention to hold a mirror to all those concerned by or interested in public discourse in Hungary; to those concerned by or interested in who, where, how and why anti-Semitic discourse is being used openly and implicitly. This remains our chief ambition this year: to hold a mirror, to record, to reflect, sometimes to analyze, and to argue only in exceptional cases. We wish to offer our readers a report on the state of affairs, not a polemical writing.

The essays in this year's report review and document articles from Hungary's printed press in the year 2001, and a small number of programs broadcast by Pannon Rádió, as well as one program from the public Magyar Televízió. Although the program entitled, Sajtóklub, aired on the television channel ATV would also have provided plenty of material for the book, we did not manage to record the program in time, therefore we did not commission an analysis of the foregoing program. Sadly enough, this year's volume still turned out thicker than the first one.

Our previous volume, the one reporting on the year 2000, was received with considerable interest and fairness by a large part of the Hungarian press: the Hungarian news agency MTI and all of the major daily newspapers reported on its publishing. The book was reviewed by the weekly 168 óra, The Budapest Sun, Szombat, Új Élet, and the human rights journal Fundamentum, and the editors were interviewed by Magyar Rádió (Gondolatjel) and Civil Rádió. Let us hereby thank them for appreciating our initiative. There were different reactions as well: e.g. Magyar Fórum argued with us in a threatening tone ...

We sent out many complimentary copies of our publication with the clear purpose of disseminating as widely as possible. Copies of our report were sent to Hungarian public figures, politicians, diplomats and journalists, many people who, we thought, play a part in shaping public discourse. We also thought of the wider reading public: through the Országos Könyvtárellátó Közhasznú Társaság (National Library Non-Profit Distribution Service) we provided free copies to every Hungarian library that requested. Copies of the bilingual volume were also sent to foreign institutions, such as the library of the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, the Jewish National and University Library of Jerusalem, the Yad Vashem Library, Columbia University, the City University of New York, the Hochschule für Jüdische Studien in Heidelberg, and, of course, the American and European organizations of B'nai B'rith.

Thus, we wanted to secure the widest publicity possible for our report, all the more so as many far-right journalists in Hungary are denying the presence of anti-Semitic discourse in the Hungarian mass media. This book – both last year's edition and the present one – is meant to contravene this denial. We are not trying to record that “*public discourse is anti-Semitic in Hungary*”, as one of our critics not familiar with the basic rules of the Hungarian language put it, but that *there is anti-Semitic discourse in Hungary*. This is what we intend to record, and our commitment was strengthened by the numerous positive

responses received in connection with last year's book, encouraging us to carry on with our initiative. Let us quote from one letter.

*"I am writing with reference to ... the book (Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary in 2000) that the B'nai B'rith of Budapest published this year. ... This bilingual work is both well done and of the greatest significance. It is an invaluable record of the state of civil rights and liberties in Hungary in general and of the status of the Jews in particular. It is a must reading for everyone interested in the evolution of post-Communist Hungary toward a genuine democracy. Hopefully, it will not only make an impact on the fair-minded political and governmental leaders of Hungary, but – through its English version – also enlighten those identified with NATO and the European Union."* Randolph L. Braham, Distinguished Professor, The City University of New York.

Thus, we will carry on documenting the manifestations of anti-Semitic discourse in 2002 and will continue providing access to the database of ZsiDok for the purpose of well-intentioned scholarly research at our Budapest office. Just like last year, our report remains bilingual. The English section contains some complete, and some partly abridged versions of the Hungarian essays. (The abridgement is always indicated in the title.) The book concludes with an appendix containing some important documents and a bibliographical list of the "focal points" in the mass media.

Our sponsors this year are the Hungarian Soros Foundation, the Association of Jewish Communities in Hungary (Mazsihisz), the B'nai B'rith First Lodge of England, Mr. Iván Halász (Budapest) and Dr. John P. Reeves (London). Thank you for allowing us to carry on with our work.

*Dr. Tibor Szeszlér  
On Behalf of The Executive Board of the B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge  
Budapest, August 2002*

LÁSZLÓ VARGA

THERE IS NO ANTI-SEMITISM IN HUNGARY,  
OR IS THERE?

---

*What the US Ambassador Allegedly Said  
(abridged)*

*“Csurka claims he is no anti-Semite, yet he alleges that certain ‘men in high positions’ have amassed fortunes in dishonest ways. He claims he is no enemy of Europe, yet he demands that the EU admit its intention of ‘colonizing’ Hungary. He claims he is no revisionist, yet he rejects the idea that Hungarians renounce their ‘historical rights’.”* The quote is from a correspondent of the German daily Die Welt who summed up his interview with the chairman of MIÉP (Party of Hungarian Justice and Life) with those words.<sup>1</sup>

In their internal communications, members of the extreme right (who prefer to refer to themselves as national radicals) never admit their anti-Semitism and even show hostility to those who do. *“Almost every day,”* said Kornél Döbrentei in a radio commentary, *“somebody stands up, as if according to a timetable, and begins complaining about anti-Semitism. But no group is allowed to impose itself on a nation unpunished. Sooner or later that nation will say ‘no’ to being held hostage and being unscrupulously blackmailed because of its clear conscience.”*<sup>2</sup>

A commentator of Magyar Nemzet daily writes that the extreme right is anti-Semitic in word *“only.”* *“Ethnic riots have recently flared in England but not here, guest workers are repeatedly attacked in Germany but not here, and I could mention many other examples. Do not get me wrong: it would be foolish to claim that xenophobia and anti-Semitism are absent in Hungary. But, fortunately, they are only verbal. Consequently, no one has the right to criticize this*

---

<sup>1</sup> *“Nein, ein Antisemit sei er nicht, aber es gäbe da ‘hohe Herren’, die Reichtümer auf dunklen Wegen aufgetürmt hätten. Ein Antieuropäer? Keineswegs, nur sollte die Europäische Union offen sagen, dass sie Ungarn zur ‘Kolonie’ herabdrücken wolle. Ein Revisionist? Nicht im Geringsten, doch dürfe man nicht auf seine ‘historischen Rechte’ verzichten.”* Raphael Krüger: Feind, Verräter, Gauner, Jude – Ungarn stürzt in den Wahlkampf (Enemy, Traitor, Rogue, Jew – Hungary Plunges into the Election Campaign). Die Welt, March 2, 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Commentary by Kornél Döbrentei, in Vasárnapi újság, June 24, 2001.

country for that. And it is nonsense to claim that the center right gives financial or material support to the extremists.”<sup>3</sup>

That article came in response to a speech by Nancy Goodman Brinker, Ambassador of the United States to Hungary, which she delivered to the Harvard Club in Budapest on November 19 2001, in which she extolled at length on the history of American-Hungarian relations. She referred to the warm welcome Lajos Kossuth received when he visited the United States in 1851. She added that a bust of his – a symbol of Hungarians’ love of liberty – was put on display in the Capitol; and that Americans watched with compassion Hungary’s renewed drive for liberty in 1956. She spoke in detail about the friendly cooperation of the two countries. Almost at the end of her talk, when discussing democracy, she said:

*“I am disturbed to hear of blatantly anti-Semitic and anti-foreigner sentiments in Hungary, particularly among certain political elite. We in the United States believe that no political speech should be censored, even the most reprehensible. But the fact that certain ideas should not be censored does not make them acceptable in polite company, and it is the duty of the leaders of all political parties to ensure that hate speech be labeled for what it is, and that it be clearly rejected. There can be no hesitation on this issue. It is simply too important for Hungary’s international image, and its future as a democracy.”*<sup>4</sup>

Two statements can be deduced from that quote:

1. There are anti-Semitic (and xenophobic) sentiments and views in certain circles of the Hungarian political elite.

2. In “*polite company*” they are unacceptable. The leaders of political parties (in democratic countries) are obliged to reject them.

Only the daily Népszabadság newspaper reported the speech from a first-hand account. In addition to what can be read above, the paper wrote: *“In the opinion of the Ambassador the anti-Semitic and anti-foreign statements were for her the only dissonant experience during her two-month stay in Budapest. She added that nowhere else in the world did she see such phenomena.”*<sup>5</sup>

The latter sentence – as can be seen from the wording – is a personal addition, which is not carried as a quotation by Népszabadság. The next day however the (right wing) daily newspaper Magyar Nemzet quoted that latter sen-

<sup>3</sup> Szabolcs Szerető: Az egyetlen gond (The Only Problem). Magyar Nemzet, November 21, 2001.

<sup>4</sup> U.S.–Hungary Relations: A Partnership of Security, Commerce, and Democracy. Remarks at the Harvard Club.

<sup>5</sup> Népszabadság, November 20, 2001.

tence, and it added: “that is at least how *Népszabadság* reports on the Ambassador’s presentation to the Harvard Club.”<sup>6</sup> After that nearly all commentaries in the Hungarian press referred to that personal addition instead of the passage that *Népszabadság* had carried in verbatim translation.

In diplomatic practice one can separate rather exactly a country’s official position from the subjective addition to it by the diplomat who conveys it.<sup>7</sup> At first sight, it could be concluded that the Hungarian press misunderstood the situation. Actually that was not the case. The Hungarian responses, including the official ones, attempted to interpret – making use of the subjective addition – the whole train of thought as if it were the subjective opinion of the Ambassador, and they rejected it in that form. If the Hungarian commentators had checked out the official website of the Budapest Embassy of the United States, they could have seen exactly what is and what is not in the text of the speech. Both the Hungarian press and the Hungarian officials who spoke about it in public mixed up the two: they treated the official US message to the Hungarian political elite as if it were Ambassador Brinker’s subjective opinion.

That is why the critical remarks (and especially the subjective addition) instead of the words of praise to Hungary attracted attention. (As for Ambassador Brinker’s words of praise for Hungary, only *Népszabadság*, Index, an internet portal and, in part, the MTI Hungarian News Agency reported on them.) In fact, politicians who spoke on behalf of the government parties went so far as to question the competence of the Ambassador. Miklós Csapody, a vice-president of the Hungarian Democratic Forum (MDF), made it a point to speak in a diplomatic manner:

*“I was astonished to hear that the Ambassador formed such a definitive opinion after spending just one and a half months in Hungary... We, Europeans know better than those living in more fortunate regions of the world that anti-Semitism and other forms of racism have caused horrendous consequences. We also know, and I hope more and more people are aware of what politicians may politely say in public and what they may not. In diplomacy, as elsewhere, it is imperative to seek solutions rather than to stir animosity or lament over it.”*<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Magyar Nemzet, November 21, 2001.

<sup>7</sup> When a diplomat reads a text, that is the official position. When he/she raises his/her eyes from the paper (and perhaps removes his/her spectacles or makes some other similar gesture), then he/she is adding his/her personal commentary. *Népszabadság* made clear that distinction.

<sup>8</sup> *Népszabadság*, November 21, 2001.

Whether the Ambassador spent one and a half months in Hungary or two is a question of minor importance.<sup>9</sup> More important is that she conveyed the official position of the United States rather than her own opinion. Actually the Ambassador did not form such a “definitive opinion” as suggested by Csapody. All she did was to voice the concerns of her government, in line with the rules of diplomacy.

Mihály Balla, head of the foreign affairs cabinet of the Hungarian Civic Party (Fidesz) said that the Ambassador exaggerated. Although in Balla’s view there are anti-Semitic phenomena in Hungary, there is no official anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism as such is not typical of Hungarian political life. Balla disagrees with Nancy Goodman Brinker’s way of formulating her opinion because in the Hungarian political elite there are no anti-Semitic statements or decisions. When Népszabadság asked whether or not MIÉP had made anti-Semitic statements, Balla said that, as far as he knew, MIÉP had not made specifically anti-Semitic statements either. He added that it would be difficult to rule out that anti-Semitic statements occurred during certain meetings organized by MIÉP or in press articles of some of MIÉP’s politicians. In Balla’s view it is the shared responsibility of the political parties to stand up against anti-Semitic and anti-foreign phenomena. Balla expressed the hope that with time the opinion of the Ambassador, who has only been in Hungary for two months, will change.<sup>10</sup>

Maybe it is surprising how unfamiliar Balla was with Hungarian domestic affairs. He did not seem to be aware of the anti-Semitic statements of MIÉP, and he did not sense that part of Hungarian society was concerned about anti-Semitism. Balla did not comprehend that the anti-Semitic phenomena provoked the resentment of the US government. To him, the only problem was the way she formulated her opinion.

Note that Balla denied anti-Semitism in Hungary. He said there was no official anti-Semitism. Actually, neither any serious Hungarian press publications, nor the Ambassador stated that there was. Balla thought that, because “*there was no official anti-Semitism,*” it did not even exist among the Hungarian political elite.

---

<sup>9</sup> As the profile issued by the US Embassy in Budapest says, President Bush nominated Ms. Brinker to be Ambassador in Hungary on May 23, 2001. On 1 August the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved the nomination, and on 3 August the Senate confirmed the decision. Ms. Brinker handed over her credentials to Hungarian President Ferenc Mádl on September 26, 2001.

<sup>10</sup> Népszabadság, November 21, 2001.

Whenever Hungarian or foreign politicians voiced concern, Fidesz, the senior government party between 1998 and 2002, and press organs close to it, responded with the following arguments: anti-Semitism was not a Hungarian phenomenon, it did not even exist in Hungary, and even if it existed, it was just like the one customary in Western Europe; in Hungary anti-Semitism never received official recognition, and it was “only verbal”.

Actually, anti-Semitism has become part of public speech in Hungary (just as the US Ambassador stated in her presentation): occasionally politicians resort to hate speech of that sort, which means it has found its way to the political elite.<sup>11</sup>

Although it is not a peculiar Hungarian phenomenon, there is a factor that differentiates it from the Western democracies. Certain major political forces – in fact the majority of those in government in 2001 – refused clearly to dissociate themselves from all forms of anti-Semitism, including hate speech. Briefly put, that is a prime cause why political anti-Semitism could take root in Hungary in recent years.

Let us now return to the debate in the Hungarian press about the US Ambassador’s presentation. Speaking in an interview with *Népszabadság*, Béla Györi, spokesman for MIÉP, seemed to have better understood the Ambassador’s words than Csapody or Balla. “*It is difficult to assess an opinion that we only know from hearsay*”, he said. He added that the Ambassador should have told exactly whom she was talking about. “*If she names anti-Semites and those stirring hatred, we can distance ourselves from ‘a certain political elite’.*” Asked by *Népszabadság* whether the remark was targeted toward MIÉP, he strongly denied it.<sup>12</sup>

Only Béla Béres, a vice-president of the Smallholders’ Party dissociated his party from the phenomenon rather than from the Ambassador. (Note that in late 2001 his party was in the governing coalition in formal terms only.) He said it was very regrettable that the Ambassador had such an experience during so short a time. “*Xenophobia is alien to the soul of Hungarian people. Ever since King Saint Stephen [who reigned in the early 11th century], Hungary has welcomed immigrants... There is a political force that uses mean measures in its campaign effort. The Smallholders resolutely denounce all forms of xenophobia.*”<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Last year’s edition of *Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary* addressed that problem, and so does this year’s.

<sup>12</sup> *Népszabadság*, November 21, 2001.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

Writing for *Magyar Nemzet*, Szabolcs Szeretô (see footnote <sup>3</sup>) denied the US Ambassador's statement and suggested that she had fallen victim to some sort of a conspiracy. "*We have no reason to suppose that Nancy Goodman Brinker hates the Hungarian people and its government, and it is unlikely that she personally saw manifestations of extreme anti-foreign sentiments. I venture to say certain people have convinced her that there is anti-Semitism. ... I put the question without waiting for an answer: who is trying to mislead the Ambassador of the United States? Journalists have told me that when the press attaché of the US Embassy first met Hungarian newsmen, two staffers of a Hungarian business weekly gave him a copy of Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary. What they did was detrimental to the image of Hungary.*"<sup>14</sup>

In that article Szeretô discussed anti-Semitism in Hungary and Ms. Brinker's related presentation in a different (though not new) political dimension, that of political anti-Semitism. There is political anti-Semitism in a country when major political forces, for instance, parliamentary parties, use anti-Semitic arguments in their daily practice, and when it is alleged that the political opponents use the "*Jewish question*" for their own ends.<sup>15</sup> That is not anti-Semitism as such; instead, it is the use of it for a specific purpose. Consider, for instance, the following wording. The Alliance of Free Democrats (SzDSz) is not named; instead, reference to it is coded as a "*liberal' auxiliary force of the post-Communist left.*"

As *Magyar Nemzet* and *Népszabadság* have different target audiences, Ambassador Brinker's presentation was viewed in a different light in each publication. When interviewed by *Népszabadság*, Csapody described the speech as astonishing, while Balla denied that anti-Semitic statements occur in Hungarian political life, and he refuted a statement (that was never uttered). He said there was no official anti-Semitism in Hungary. By contrast, *Magyar Nemzet* spoke of people who deliberately tarnished the international image of Hungary, and it went as far as imputing a fictitious statement to the US Ambassador: "*repulsive manifestations of rampant xenophobia.*"

In accordance with international practice, the next day *Magyar Nemzet* carried an interview with Ambassador Brinker about her presentation to the Harvard Club as well as an article by László Tökéczi, a historian.

---

<sup>14</sup> *Magyar Nemzet*, November 21, 2001.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Ágnes Hankiss, *Magyar Nemzet*, June 18, 1999. László Varga: Fordulat a közbeszédben (A Change in the Course of Discourse) in: *Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary in 2000*.

Tökéczki posed as an “unbiased scholar”, who attempted to synthesize the disparate responses of politicians and journalists. He imputed statements to unnamed “left-wingers” that were never uttered. He alleged that left-wingers had said in public that today in Hungary there was official discrimination according to origin, nationality and religion.<sup>16</sup>

Tökéczki denies discrimination according to origin. Such discrimination does not exist, he claims, even if the ombudsman for national and ethnic minorities claims that (with reference to alleged surveys) 80% of college students are racist. Referring to Jenő Kaltenbach, Tökéczki rejects a statement that Kaltenbach never made and denies that there is racism in Hungary.<sup>17</sup> Even if racism existed, he wrote, it was due to “*problems of coexistence*”.

For Tökéczki the key question is not whether or not there is anti-Semitism and whether the survey mentioned by the ombudsman is reliable. What he is interested in is the response. “*Nowadays in Hungary many people are attempting to make the impression that there was anti-Semitism in this country. Only a minority is taken in by those recurrent provocations. What they do is nothing more than Jew-bashing as a response to those provocations.*”<sup>18</sup>

The far right press publications also wrote about “left wing” informants.<sup>19</sup> But they struck a different tone. “*I really do not like it when the US Ambassador,*

<sup>16</sup> László Tökéczki: A sehol sincs megkülönböztetés. Miféle belpolitikai előnyöket remélnék az antiszemizmussal vádolók? (Discrimination that does not Exist. What Benefits do People Complaining about Purported Anti-Semitism Expect?), Magyar Nemzet, November 22, 2001.

<sup>17</sup> The survey that Jenő Kaltenbach made public did not examine college students in general, only those in teacher training colleges. The document described 14% (and not 80%!) of the respondents as racist. The political state secretary of the Ministry of Education said of that survey that he did not consider it representative, even if its findings were not unexpected. See: Zoltán Simon: Minden hetedik tanárképzős rasszista (Every Seventh Teacher Training College Student is a Racist). Népszava, November 28, 2001.

<sup>18</sup> See footnote 16.

<sup>19</sup> “*I doubt that Ms. Brinker has ever heard anti-Semitic and anti-foreigner statements from members of the political elite, unless she met representatives of the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP). Note that a survey made during the 1990s showed that anti-Semitism was the strongest in the ranks of the MSZP. Perhaps the Ambassador often reads certain daily papers that discuss in detail how to vote down the right wing parties and how to exclude them from Parliament. Or perhaps she has had a talk with the only media sociologist whose name one can read and hear in all media, who would like to ban the political right altogether. I wish I knew who provides this Ambassador with information. If it is the same persons who advised her predecessor, it is high time she relied on other people’s advice. If she has inadequate advisors, she will mistake the tolerant and righteous Hungarians for racist boors of the Balkans.*”

*who looks like a Hollywood film star; who's not a diplomat, but a business-woman, when speaking to members of the Harvard Club at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, says that, since she arrived here two months ago, she has heard racist and anti-Semitic statements from within certain circles of the local political elite never heard before anywhere else in the world."*

*It has become the rule rather than the exception that the US Ambassadors to Hungary are not diplomats but people of various other sorts, lawyers or photographer husbands. But what I cannot stomach is that each of them behaves in a very undiplomatic manner by interfering in Hungarian internal affairs soon after their arrival... Apparently Ambassador Brinker rarely meets Israeli investors, and rarely ever those who gladly live in the residential parks because Hungary is inexpensive and beautiful and its people are extremely friendly to foreigners."*<sup>20</sup>

The style and the concrete examples (residential park) aside, the Magyar Demokrata employed the same two arguments that the governing party politicians and journalists standing close to them did: the Ambassador is not competent and there is no anti-Semitism in Hungary.

The radio program Vasárnapi újság also broached the motif of portraying the MSzP as an anti-Semitic party.<sup>21</sup> The same program said of SzDSz that it was a Jewish party. (*"The German liberal Süddeutsche Zeitung referred to it as the par excellence party of the Budapest Jewish intelligentsia."*) Stating, *"The US diplomats maintain no relationship whatsoever with MIÉP and do not even shake hands with its leaders,"* it draws the following conclusion: *"for them the political elite means the parties in the ruling coalition. However, the leaders of the governing coalition have never made any anti-Semitic or anti-foreigner statements."*

The formula is simple: the MSzP is anti-Semitic, the SzDSz is Jewish and MIÉP – which is indeed anti-Semitic – is ignored. Hence it follows that the US Ambassador labeled the governing parties as anti-Semitic. The question here is not whether or not she made such a statement but that the statement imputed to her is unfounded.

---

<sup>20</sup> Ágnes Seszták: Az egyedülállóan rasszista Magyarország. A nagykövet narrációja (Uniquely Racist Hungary. Address by the Ambassador). Magyar Demokrata, November 29, 2001.

<sup>21</sup> *"As shown by a survey conducted a few years ago, no other party has so many anti-Semites among its members."*

Vasárnapi újság employed political insinuation, just as did Tôkéczki: *“The newspapers that immediately sided with an Ambassador who had criticized a political elite that had been elected by the Hungarian people acted in the same manner years ago when, during the single-party regime, leaders of the Kremlin frowned on certain Hungarian politicians who veered away from the Party line. The Hungarian people are not naïve: they know the balance of power. They know who has the power in any controversy between Washington and Budapest. To illustrate the balance of power, suffice it to refer to a picture shown on Thursday by BBC Television: a Palestinian kid of eight faced a giant Israeli tank. In the corresponding power formula in Hungary, the left-liberal press is not the kid.”*

Here anti-Americanism is added to denial of anti-Semitism. The arguments deployed by Vasárnapi újság are similar to those used by Magyar Demokrata. *“In ten years’ time the US chose new friends in Hungary, and that was not the mistake of the Hungarians. Before 1990, the United States was popular among those yearning for freedom and opposing Communist hegemony, while the advocates of the single-party system hated it. By now the unreserved advocates of the Soviet Union have become the unreserved advocates of post-Reagan America, while the advocates of freedom and independence look at Washington almost as their archenemy. Nancy Goodmann Brinker should know that force, or tanks for that matter, cannot overcome the heart of the people. Soft as the heart is, it resists the force of even the biggest bomb. The bosses of the US Ambassador should realize that just as we could never be forced to like the Soviet Union, that will not go in the case of Washington either. It is high time she and her diplomat colleagues kept clear of Hungarian internal affairs – especially if she is applying double standards to rap us. She will certainly fail. As an American she should know that when someone repeatedly fails, that would have its consequences. The blame should be placed squarely on herself.”<sup>22</sup>*

As if the machinery could not be halted, the far right press returned to the topic a month later. Magyar Fórum adjusted its criticism of the US Ambassador to the observation of (the nonexistent) Moslem Christmas. *“Dear Nancy. As long as the Christmas display in front of the Capitol in Washington, DC fails to include the religious symbols of some residents of the United States, including the crescent moon of the Moslems (which is also the symbol of the Islamic coun-*

---

<sup>22</sup> István Lovas: Csomó a kákán (Fault Finding). Vasárnapi újság, December 16, 2001.

tries), then when you wish to offend us, instead of the adjective 'anti-Semite', hurl at us the names of the animals that surrounded the baby Jesus in the manger. We deserve being referred to that way."<sup>23</sup>

András Bencsik found an explanation for the Ambassador's statement in a well-known manner, which however is not customary in these circles. "*It is easy to guess the origin of the new American Ambassador, Nancy Goodman Brinker, when it was unambiguously revealed by The Washington Post that, before leaving, she bid farewell to her friends, including her rabbi. Thus, she is concerned by the issue, and, as we have seen, biased as well.*"<sup>24</sup>

Bencsik – and we do not say so to flatter him, but simply to state a fact – is part of the Hungarian political elite, even when he attaches the Jewish label to the US Ambassador. He simply meant it as factual information. The problem is it is rather impolite to find fault with the origin of the Ambassador of a country that is so proud of the fact that all of its citizens are Americans.

Bencsik is apparently the only commentator who admits that there is political anti-Semitism within the Hungarian political elite. "*When the US Ambassador declared that she had experienced intolerable anti-Semitism in Hungary (sic!), a statement that she made without any foundation, rashly and in a manner unworthy of a diplomat, then she referred to a statement by Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. without mentioning his name.*" "*And it would be rather impolite to exclude from the political elite a deputy president of a party that is in Parliament [between 1998 and 2002].*"

As it turned out, the responses to her speech have justified what she said. Indeed the most outspoken critics were not the neo-Fascists (euphemistically referred to as "*national radicals*") but representatives of public institutions. It was Katalin Kondor, president of Hungary's Magyar Rádió (public-service radio), who put the seal of acceptability on political anti-Semitism in Hungary.

It would be beyond the scope of this essay to discuss what the president of a public-service radio station may or may not do and whether it was legally acceptable that she spoke at a party meeting. On December 4 Katalin Kondor was among the speakers at a meeting of the 11th district chapter of the

---

<sup>23</sup> Zsuzsa Bunyevác: Mennyből a Nancy... (Nancy from Heaven...). Magyar Fórum, December 27, 2001.

<sup>24</sup> Bencsik could have saved himself from the trouble of perusing the American press for that information as the Ambassador spoke in detail about her religious affiliation in the interview with Magyar Nemzet mentioned above.

Hungarian Democratic Forum (MDF). I do not question her right to criticize Hungary's Act on Radio and Television Services, but she went further than that. She described it as shameful, which raises the question whether she is ready to submit herself to the constitutional order of the Republic of Hungary.

The president of that radio station may cherish political views of her choice. If however she talks about them in public, that is proof of her incompetence. And if she does that while citing her impartiality, that is an open attack on democracy in Hungary. She said: *"Ever since 1998, I have been shocked by the way that issue has been abused. I am saying that not as a person in a senior position but as a private person. Someone comes to Hungary and just after a stay of two months, dares to croak about anti-Semitism."*<sup>25</sup>

The government of the Republic of Hungary never responded to the words of the president of the public-service radio, not at least in public. However, a question was put concerning the whole matter to the Prime Minister during a radio interview in Vasárnapi újság:

*"Moderator: Have you or the Foreign Minister summoned the US Ambassador for a clarifying conversation over her grossly insulting statement about alleged anti-Semitism in Hungary? Has anything happened regarding that matter, or it is cloaked in silence, just as during the Soviet occupation? The question came from one of our listeners.*

*Viktor Orbán: We are not obliged to remain silent about it. In fact, it is the duty of the Hungarian Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister to voice their opinion about it in the right place and in an appropriate form, whether or not their opinion is identical with what has been said or their opinion is entirely different. In fact, I regularly do so. I am proud that Hungary is an independent country, not one under occupation. Hungary is on an equal footing with all other countries even if they may be bigger or stronger militarily. We expect the same respect and appreciation that we give to other states. The Hungarian government and we Hungarians never unjustly criticize any other state. Therefore, we expect the same from our allies, friends and the neutral states."*<sup>26</sup>

It is not clear from the Prime Minister's answer (even though that was the question) whether he put the US Ambassador's words under the heading of *"unjust criticism"*.

<sup>25</sup> Kivel beszélek? (Who I am Speaking to?), Katalin Kondor among the speakers at MDF events. In: Népszabadság, December 11, 2001.

<sup>26</sup> Gábor Stifner's interview with Viktor Orbán. Vasárnapi újság, January 27, 2002.

LÁSZLÓ KARSAI

## THE SCHOOL HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL DAY

---

*(abridged)*

Education Minister Zoltán Pokorni (Fiatal Demokraták Szövetsége – Magyar Polgári Párt/Alliance of Young Democrats – Hungarian Civic Party – Fidesz) attended the traditional commemoration of the Budapest ghetto on January 18, 2000 at the synagogue in Dohány utca (street). After the commemoration, he announced at a press conference that he intended to include April 16 as a Holocaust Memorial Day in the school curriculum. Mr. Pokorni said he had the idea while preparing for the “*Living History*” conference, held in Stockholm on January 26-27, 2000, as he reviewed the history textbooks with his colleagues. The education minister, himself a history teacher, said at a press conference:<sup>1</sup> “*All in all, it can be said that the [history textbooks] publish correct data and provide an appropriate view of not just the Holocaust, but also a major part of the political processes leading to it.*”<sup>2</sup>

As the mass deportation of the Hungarian Jews began on May 15, 1944, it seemed logical to choose this date for a Hungarian Holocaust Memorial Day. However, Mr. Pokorni said that since graduating students are busy preparing for their final exams in the middle of May, this is not a suitable date.<sup>3</sup>

Leaders of the Jewish religious community, who claimed that the idea of the Holocaust Memorial Day was actually theirs, welcomed Mr. Pokorni’s announcement.<sup>4</sup> Béla Horváth, an MP of the Független Kisgazda és Polgári Párt/Independent Smallholders’ and Civic Party (FKGP) spoke in Parliament on February 4, 2000, suggesting that, if a school memorial day is consecrated to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Szabolcs Szunyogh: Interview with Zoltán Pokorni. Köznevelés, February 11, 2000.

<sup>2</sup> As a practicing teacher and a person familiar with the Hungarian secondary-school and university textbooks, I refuted the minister’s statement in a recently published study, see: László Karsai: Új magyar egyetemi és középiskolai tankönyvek a holokausztról. (New Hungarian university and secondary-school textbooks on the Holocaust) In: Tanulmányok a holokausztról, (Studies on the Holocaust), I. Ed.: Randolph L. Braham: Budapest, Balassi Kiadó., 2001, pp. 123-158.

<sup>3</sup> Köznevelés, *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Statement by Gusztáv Zoltai, managing director of Magyar Zsidó Hitközségek Szövetsége – Association of Jewish Religious Communities in Hungary (Mazsihisz) to the author of this writing. Tape recording, November 30, 2001.

victims of the Holocaust, a memorial day should also be given to the victims of Communism.<sup>5</sup> After Béla Horváth submitted his idea as a proposal on February 15 (*“On a memorial day for the victims of Communism”*), Parliament’s Committee for Human Rights, Minorities and Religious Affairs put the issue on its agenda on March 14, with a speed almost unprecedented in the current practice of the Hungarian Parliament. The committee finally voted for the submission of the proposal to Parliament with 9 ‘yes’ votes and 8 ‘no’ votes.

Parliament’s Committee for Education and Science debated the proposal on March 16. József Csige (MSZP) said: there is no need for memorial days at all, because of both their content and atmosphere. *“When pedagogical illusionism and unscrupulous political ambition merge to become school practice, children’s interests will be ignored and pedagogy will disappear,”* Mr. Csige said. Gábor Horn (Szabad Demokraták Szövetsége/Alliance of Free Democrats – SZDSZ) agreed that it was pedagogically entirely wrong to sort out an issue with memorial days, and the Holocaust Memorial Day is no exception. The committee finally approved the proposal with 13 ‘yes’ votes and 6 ‘no’ votes.

On April 14, 2000, Parliament’s plenary session debated the proposal on the school Memorial Day for the Victims of Communism for three and a half hours. Mr. Horváth repeatedly pointed out that he agreed with the proposal on the Holocaust Memorial Day, but no single victim should be forgotten. Mr. Donáth pointed out that Germany commemorates the Holocaust with a national day of mourning, not with memorial lessons at schools. Tamás Bauer (SZDSZ) said his party generally disapproves of memorial days, including the introduction of the Holocaust Day. Anyone who has ever stood through school ceremonies knows this is not the right way to remember or commemorate the victims, the oppressive regimes and the mass murders.

Finally, Parliament passed legislation declaring February 25 as the Memorial Day for the Victims of Communist Dictatorships on May 5, 2000, after a debate of a mere three-quarters of an hour. The final vote was held on June 13, when Mr. Horváth’s amended proposal was approved with an overwhelming majority.

The decree of Education Minister Zoltán Pokorni on the 2000/2001 school year was published on August 18, 2000, and Point 8 of the decree stipulated for *“commemorations held as part of school lessons.”* It listed a total of three such days: October 6, (the day when 13 Hungarian generals were executed by the Austrian authorities in Arad after the suppression of the 1848-1849 revolution

---

<sup>5</sup> Parliamentary records, see [www.mkogy.hu](http://www.mkogy.hu).

and freedom fight), February 25, the Memorial Day for the Victims of Communist Dictatorships, and April 16, the Holocaust Memorial Day.<sup>6</sup>

On February 25, 2001, when the Memorial Day for the Victims of Communism was held in Parliament and President Ferenc Mádl also mentioned the Holocaust victims in his speech, there were rude interruptions. One young man from among the invited guests, for example, shouted: *“He’s lying! He’s got the wrong number!”*<sup>7</sup> In Magyar Fórum, the weekly of the Magyar Igazság és Élet Pártja/Hungarian Truth and Life Party (MIÉP), István Gazdag attacked the President in a personal tone. Mr. Gazdag was primarily upset by Mr. Mádl’s statement that said, *“The genocide committed against the Jews is unprecedented in history.”* The statement, generally accepted in Holocaust research, was termed *“an unacceptable and intolerable order of rank”* by Mr. Gazdag. He said *“the most scandalous thing”* about Mr. Mádl’s statement was that he mentioned the Holocaust in a speech on the victims of Communism, while the *“chief engineers”* of the Communist revolutions were actually Jews. (Among these *“chief engineers”*, Mr. Gazdag listed Marx, Trotsky and Béla Kun as well as Lenin and Engels, even though the latter two cannot be classified as Jews even according to the racist Nuremberg laws.<sup>8</sup>)

In early 2001 the journalists of Magyar Fórum (MIÉP’s weekly news magazine) launched a concerted attack against the Education Minister and the Holocaust Memorial Day. At a February press conference,<sup>9</sup> MIÉP spoke of *“regrettable events that happened to the Hungarian Jews”*, explaining that these *“regrettable events”* only took place after Hungary’s German occupation, after March 19, 1944.<sup>10</sup> The writers of the far right are rather uninformed as regards the

---

<sup>6</sup> Decree of the Minister of Education no. 9/2000 (May 31) on the 2000-2001 school year, 2 (8.)

<sup>7</sup> Köznevelés, March 9, 2001.

<sup>8</sup> István Gazdag: Emléknapi diszsonancia (Memorial Day Discord). Magyar Fórum, March 8, 2001.

<sup>9</sup> MIÉP press conference, February 22, 2001. - MTI

<sup>10</sup> This press conference did not discuss what these *“regrettable events”* – the plundering of 437,000 Hungarian Jews, driving them into reception camps and ghettos and deporting most of them to Auschwitz – were all about. Nor did they mention the fact that *“regrettable events”* actually happened to the Hungarian Jews before the German occupation as well. A series of anti-Jewish laws expelled them from civil rights, tens of thousands were deprived of their livelihood, approximately 16,000 Hungarian Jews were massacred at Kameniec-Podolsky in August 1941, and close to 800 Hungarian Jews were massacred in Novi Sad in January 1942, in addition to 2000 Serbian Jews. The humiliating unarmed forced-labor service also claimed the lives of tens of thousands of Jews before the German occupation.

history of the Hungarian Holocaust. Kornél Döbrentei claims that the anti-Jewish laws passed after 1938 were created in order to save the Jews, who were “*in league with*” the then leaders of the Jewish community, as it were. According to Mr. Döbrentei, a Jewish “deputation” was sent to Governor Horthy, urging him to dispatch the 2nd Hungarian Army to the front, intimating that they were war profiteers: “*Somebody must have been manufacturing those paper-soled boots.*”<sup>11</sup>

In the same spirit, Alajos Chrudinák described political Zionism as a “*racist, Nazi collaborator movement*”, making the most absurd accusations against Zionist leader Rezső Kasztner. For example, although the story of how Manfréd Weiss’ property went to German ownership is well known to historians,<sup>12</sup> Mr. Chrudinák still tried to make Magyar Fórum readers believe that Kasztner “*is also guilty of*” letting this huge arms factory go into German hands.<sup>13</sup> With reference to Mr. Chrudinák’s article, one reader wrote to the paper that Kasztner reported “*suspicious elements*” to the Gestapo, and it was also he who betrayed Hanna Szenes, the Jewish partisan girl, to the authorities.<sup>14</sup>

Zoltán Szöcs,<sup>15</sup> a permanent contributor to Magyar Fórum, who is proud of his anti-Semitism, expressed his hope in connection with the Holocaust Memorial Day that students born in the late eighties will not, “*if they are normal*”, examine their consciences or feel responsible.<sup>16</sup> Describing Communism and Nazism as having the same genetic make-up, Mr. Szöcs says: “*Hitler and Nazism were the products of the Left ... leftist internal strife and domestic quar-*

<sup>11</sup> Notes by Kornél Döbrentei. Vasárnapi újság, June 24, 2001. This is another unfounded statement: the authorities kept a very sharp eye on army contractors during World War II, particularly if they were Jews.

<sup>12</sup> For more details, see: Karsai, Elek – Szinai, Miklós: A Weiss Manfréd vagyon német kézbe kerülésének története (The story of how the property of Manfréd Weiss went into German ownership), Századok, 1961, year 95, issues 4-5. pp. 680-719.) From the latest literature, see: Kádár, Gábor – Vági, Zoltán: Aranyvonat (Golden train), Osiris Kiadó, Budapest, 2001, pp.155–168.

<sup>13</sup> Alajos Chrudinák: Izraeli apartheid és hazai védelmezői (Apartheid in Israel and its Protectors in Hungary), Magyar Fórum, September 6, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> Andor Dobó: Chrudinák írásához (Commenting on Mr Chrudinák’s Writing). Magyar Fórum, September 27, 2001.

<sup>15</sup> Zoltán Szöcs was mentioned in the 2000 issue of “Antiszemita közbeszéd...” as a writer “*of articles carrying openly and assertively undertaken anti-Semitic content and message.*” In response to this, Mr. Szöcs wrote: “*It was meant as abuse /the allegation that he is an anti-Semite /, but one day it will be praise.*” Zoltán Szöcs: Elegem van! (I’ve had Enough!). Magyar Fórum, October 11, 2001.

<sup>16</sup> Zoltán Szöcs: A Kollonich-projekt (The Kollonich Project). Magyar Fórum, April 5, 2001.

*rels drew mankind into World War II.*"<sup>17</sup> Mr. Csurka also speaks about "Two horrific and equally destructive, evil, infamous" regimes, but while Nazism, according to him, only led to "deranged barbarity and mass murders" over time, Lenin and Stalin's Bolshevism was "destructive from the outset".<sup>18</sup> Mr. Csurka says the Endlösung was the final solution, which "unpardonably ended in the gas chambers."<sup>19</sup>

Mr. Szócs calls Hanna Szenes, who fell victim to members of the Arrow Cross (the Hungarian Nazis), a "simple traitor", who – and Mr. Szócs considers these as aggravating circumstances – "as a young woman", a Zionist, "member of an armed terrorist group" tried to fight against constitutional order in 1944 in Hungary.<sup>20</sup>

MIÉP-president István Csurka termed the school Holocaust Day "brain-washing" and an "anti-national ceremony" in Magyar Fórum. Mr. Csurka said the methodological booklet distributed by the Ministry of Education to history teachers could have been published in the Kádár regime. "This booklet aims at making children feel guilty, and at maiming their Christian and national feelings, because of the Holocaust committed a long time ago, carried out by their grandfathers and great-grandfathers."<sup>21</sup>

In an article related to the subject, published in April 2001,<sup>22</sup> Gyula Fekete Jr. first and foremost attacked the date set for the Holocaust Memorial Day,

<sup>17</sup> Zoltán Szócs: Alain de Benoi/s/t. Magyar Fórum, January 11, 2001.

<sup>18</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, June 7, 2001.

<sup>19</sup> Quoting: Bozóki, András-Kriza, Borbála: Az ellenzék ellenzéke (The Opposition of the Opposition). Népszabadság, December 1, 2001.

<sup>20</sup> Zoltán Szócs: Szabó Zoltán, a szocialista Mikulás (Sz. Z., the Socialists' Santa Claus). Magyar Fórum, May 17, 2001. Mr. Szócs was revolted by the fact that a park was named after the heroic partisan girl in Budapest's District VII. Mr. Szócs said it is "morally disgusting to live with the memory of an anti-Hungarian subverter". In his article, Mr. Szócs does not waste any words on the fact that the country of the "law and order" of the Sztójay-Szálasi-regime had hundreds of thousands of Hungarian Jews deported.

<sup>21</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, April 12, 2001. Mr. Csurka does not deny the responsibility of the generation of the "grandfathers and great-grandfathers" for the Hungarian Holocaust, but he considers it unnecessary, dangerous and harmful that the pupils should be taught about it.

<sup>22</sup> On the history of the Holocaust, see: Hilberg, Raul: The Destruction of the European Jews (Holmes and Meier, New York-London, 1985.) In Hungarian: Karsai, László: Holokauszt (Pannonika Kiadó, Budapest, 2001.) On the Lovas-debate, see: Révész, Sándor: Egy plagizátor (A plagiarist); Karsai, László: Holokauszt: egyediség, tények, hazugságok (Holocaust: individuality, facts, lies). Élet és Irodalom, April 10, 2001.

April 16. He said that April 22, a date “*also recognized by the UN*”, would have been better, but would not have suited the Communists, as it would not coincide with Easter.<sup>23</sup> Gyula Fekete Jr. has been informed that the setting up of the ghettos in Hungary started in the autumn (!) of 1944, by order of the German invaders.<sup>24</sup> He accuses Communist historians of keeping quiet about the fact that the Jews of France, the Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark had been forced to live in ghettos for years, while in Hungary this only happened after the country’s German invasion.<sup>25</sup> His ignorance must also be the explanation for another statement of his, which often appears in articles by writers flirting with Holocaust denial, which says that, according to the Yad Vashem Holocaust Memorial Center in Jerusalem, the number of Hungarian Holocaust victims was not approximately 600,000, but much fewer.<sup>26</sup>

Fidesz’ experts did not consider April 2 as an appropriate date for the Holocaust Memorial Day, because it would have coincided too often with the Easter holidays. In 2001, April 16 fell on Easter Monday. Mr. Csurka took advantage of this to accuse Mr. Pokorni of trying to maintain a sense of guilt in the people in order to “*culturally maim the Hungarian middle-class*”, and of aiming to replace “*the joint Christian experience and consciousness with a collective sense of guilt over the Holocaust*” with the Holocaust Memorial Days.<sup>27</sup>

The Holocaust Memorial Day was held on April 17, 2001 (the day following Easter Monday) in Parliament. The session-room of the former Upper House was jam-packed; the invited guests included the Israeli Ambassador, Mazsihisz

<sup>23</sup> For the sake of accuracy: there is no Holocaust Memorial Day recognized by the UN. The Warsaw ghetto rebelled on April 19, 1943.

<sup>24</sup> Another point where Mr. Fekete Jr is wrong: the ghettos were set up in April-May 1944 nationwide in Hungary.

<sup>25</sup> There is a simple reason why the Communist and – let us add – non-Communist historians “have kept quiet” about this: in Western Europe, in the countries from which Jews were deported, (the Danish Jews managed to escape to Sweden in the autumn of 1943 with help from the Danish population) no ghettos were set up either by the occupying German authorities or the local authorities collaborating with them. The Jews were deported from their homes or – mainly the foreign, homeless Jews – from internment camps.

<sup>26</sup> The explanation is as follows: certain experts from Yad Vashem, following Raul Hilberg, only count the Jews killed and deported from the country’s current (smaller) “Trianon” territory as Hungarian Holocaust victims, while counting those deported from Northern Transylvania, Upper Hungary and the southern borderland (once belonging to Hungary) as Romanian, Slovak and Yugoslav Holocaust victims.

<sup>27</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, April 12, 2001.

leaders, historians and journalists. The MIÉP MPs did not attend the event, claiming later on that their parliamentary group was preparing for that day's parliamentary session.<sup>28</sup> Eyewitnesses say Mr. Csurka was walking in the corridor during the memorial session. Somewhat later, on the radio program *Vasárnapi újság*,<sup>29</sup> Mr. Csurka mentioned another argument as to why his party's parliamentary group did not attend the Holocaust Memorial Day. "*... there is no rule in the Constitution stipulating that we must attend the Holocaust memorial session*", he said.<sup>30</sup>

In an official statement,<sup>31</sup> MIÉP accused Mazsihisz of trying to maintain the nation's sense of guilt with the Holocaust Memorial Day. Csurka condemns the Holocaust like any other genocide, but only "*... along with the vengeance which followed and which still lasts today... They have been forcing us to celebrate our occupation as our liberation*<sup>32</sup> for over fifty years while blaming generation after generation for the Holocaust, and taking everything away from us while sprawling on everything at the same time."<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> The MIÉP statement was published in: *Magyar Fórum*, April 26, 2001.

<sup>29</sup> *Vasárnapi újság*, April 22, 2001.

<sup>30</sup> The Mazsihisz leaders decided that if the MIÉP deputies turn up at the memorial session, they will leave the room. (Statement by Gusztáv Zoltai to the author of this writing. Tape recording, November 30, 2001.)

<sup>31</sup> *Magyar Fórum*, April 26, 2001.

<sup>32</sup> A reference to the phrase: "liberation of Hungary by the Soviet army in 1945". It was the beginning of Hungary's occupation by the Soviet army.

<sup>33</sup> István Csurka: *Magyar szemmel* (Through Hungarian Eyes). *Magyar Fórum*, October 4, 2001.

JÁNOS DÉSI  
IN LEAGUE WITH THE ROMAS AGAINST  
THE HUNGARIANS

---

The controversial exodus of the Romas of Zámoly made many people realize that it is not necessarily easy to be Roma today in rural Hungary. While we will not describe the details of this story, we will attempt to show how some public figures and their supporters in the far-right press have simplified the issue by suggesting that there is no problem with the Romas. It is only the “*Jews*”, the “*Israelis*”, the “*Mossad agents*” or “*foreign agents*”<sup>1</sup> who are trying to pit the Romas against the Hungarians in order to promote their own base political interests.

Before reviewing the statements published on this issue in 2001 that support this point of view, we need to have a quick look at some articles published in 2000, since the story came to the fore in that year.

After enduring hardships for many years, the Romas of Zámoly decided in the summer of 2000 to emigrate from Hungary and ask for asylum somewhere abroad. Government officials and a majority of the right-wing press regarded this as a serious offense.<sup>2</sup> And the search for scapegoats soon began. We shall see that following criticism from the West related to the living conditions of the Romas of Hungary, those members of the press who served as the cheering section for the government tried to shift the blame onto the Romas of Zámoly rather than to address the problems of their conditions. Those “*uninterested in Hungary’s success*” were also blamed for taking advantage of the situation. Here are two quotes reflecting this view.

*“The actual non-existent grievances of the Roma families of Zámoly have been exaggerated and were presented previously to international authorities by two MSZP (Socialist) politicians of Jewish origin, with the clear intention of discrediting Hungary, or rather the Hungarian nation.”*<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The quotation marks mean that, of course, we shall not be dealing with Jews, Israelis, and Mossad-agents here, but rather with the way the Evil is presented in the shape of “Jews” “Israelis” “Mossad-agents”.

<sup>2</sup> The story is complicated by the fact that a young man from Csákvár was killed under as yet unclear conditions near the homes of the Zámoly Romas. Therefore, it seemed to many people at the time that it was enough to suggest that the Romas were fleeing from justice. Later on it became clear that this would not be a sufficient explanation.

<sup>3</sup> Jeruzsálemből jön a pénz a cigányoknak (Romas Receive Money from Jerusalem). Magyar Fórum, August 17, 2000.

*“Only those who have practiced it before can perform such coordinated, accurate work. During the taxi drivers’ blockade, for example. Those who are experienced in discrediting the country abroad. Those who fill the Western press with reports on the ‘evil’ conditions here. Those who call the Hungarians anti-Semites and try to keep frightening Europe with Csurka.”<sup>4</sup>*

My research shows that it was first suggested on an internet forum that a specific Israeli person helped the emigration of the Romas. Later on, József Krasznai, the leader or spokesperson of the Zámoly group also confirmed to the Roma Press Center: *“Katalin Katz, a history lecturer from a Jerusalem university contributed USD 4000 to the Zámoly Romas’ trip to Strasbourg”*. He said, *“Katalin Katz is a well-known researcher of the Roma Holocaust, who, through her research, became acquainted with my mother, Mrs. Rudolf Krasznai. This is where the connection came from.”<sup>5</sup>*

It did not take more than a few days for the writer of the article quoted above from Magyar Fórum to draw the conclusion: *“It is no accident either that the organizers and chief media promoters of the scandalous Roma abuses in Rádió Street in Székesfehérvár, which preceded the current colorful show artificially created around the Romas of Zámoly, and which now has international aspects as well, were also well-known Jewish public figures.”<sup>6</sup>*

The writer of the Magyar Fórum article, József Hering<sup>7</sup> suggests that the story is not just about Katalin Katz, but there must be a larger, mysterious action hidden in the background. *“The most repulsive element of the story is that even Hungarian-born Israeli citizens are actively involved in what clearly is a concerted propaganda campaign. A certain Katalin Katz, lecturer at the Hebrew*

<sup>4</sup> György Pihál: Cigányút (Double meaning: its literal translation is ‘the Romas’ road’, but the word is generally used to mean ‘the wrong way’). Magyar Nemzet, July 28, 2000. Note: István Csurka is head of the Hungarian Truth and Life Party (MIÉP).

<sup>5</sup> Béla Berkes: Jeruzsálemi tanár támogatta a zámolyiakat (Jerusalem Lecturer Supports the Zámoly Romas). Magyar Hírlap, August 5, 2000.

<sup>6</sup> Jeruzsálemből jön a pénz a cigányoknak (Romas Receive Money from Jerusalem), Magyar Fórum, August 17, 2000.

<sup>7</sup> Katalin Katz said of Mr. Hering: *“I do not regularly read the Hungarian press. I know that Magyar Fórum published an ugly article about me by a writer called József Hering. It is interesting to note that – as far as I know – he converted to the Jewish faith, settled in Israel, received Israeli citizenship and lived there for nine years. And, having returned from Israel, he is now saying that I, as an Israeli, do not have the right to help whomever I wish here in Hungary.”* János Gadó: Úgy éreztem, közös a sorsunk, azért segítettem nekik (I felt our fate was common, that’s why I helped them). Szombat, November 2000.

*University of Jerusalem gave a speech on the common fate of Romas and Jews at a Roma Holocaust event organized by MAZSIKE, a Jewish organization in Budapest, and her words were followed by action when she presented a considerable amount of money – clearly not from her own pocket – to fund the merry-making of the Zámoly Romas in Strasbourg.”<sup>8</sup>*

It would also be interesting to analyze the wording of the article – and of similar articles (“*the most repulsive, concerted propaganda campaign*”, “*a certain Katalin Katz,*” etc.). However, what is important here from the point of view of content and, and which will later establish the entire Jewish conspiracy theory, is the remark saying “*clearly not from her own pocket*”. That is, if Katalin Katz contributed the money from her own pocket, it can hardly be more than an act of one single person. If others are involved as well, then it is a conscious, pre-meditated political action, and if these “*others*” happen to be Jews, you have everything you need for a decent conspiracy.

Perhaps it is not a particularly interesting conclusion by József Hering that Katalin Katz had better look around at home because Israel is definitely a racist country – this is used in Magyar Fórum as a recurring theme.

The publicity campaign was continued by the newspaper Magyar Demokrata, which suggested with some malice that, of course, the Romas would not be able to immigrate to Israel. Then why should an Israeli intervene, the unnamed writer points out, adding: “*The other possible destination, the Holy Land, was suggested because of the – not entirely clear part played by Katalin Katz. As it was earlier reported, the lecturer from the University of Jerusalem contributed thousands of dollars to support the Roma ‘exodus’ highlighted by József Krasznai’s name.*”<sup>9</sup>

Thus, the article suggests that the part played by Katalin Katz is not clear,<sup>10</sup> and the wording “*thousands of dollars*” – no matter how much this might mean – certainly sounds stronger than the specific amount, by then well-known from the press (USD 4,000).

<sup>8</sup> Jeruzsálemből jön a pénz a cigányoknak (Romas Receive Money from Jerusalem). Magyar Fórum, August 17, 2000.

<sup>9</sup> Kanada, Kuba vagy Izrael? Hova mennek a zámolyi romák? (Canada, Cuba or Israel? Where are the Romas of Zámoly Going?). Magyar Demokrata, August 31, 2000.

<sup>10</sup> Katalin Katz explained quite a few times why and how she supported her Roma friends; how her sympathy and willingness to help them was awakened. See for example: an interview of Péter Kertész (The Holocaust is about humans). Élet és Irodalom, October 13, 2000.; János Gadó’s interview in Szombat, November 2000., an interview by Zoltán Háberman-Ágnes Kende in Amaro Drom.

On March 2, 2001, the Romas of Zámoly and their supporters held a press conference in the French National Assembly building, through the initiative of a Green and a Communist member of the French Parliament. The following day, the daily Magyar Nemzet responded, as it were, with an article suggesting that the secret services might be pulling the strings from the background.<sup>11</sup> The headline itself left no doubt as to the idea that Israel (the Jews) are involved in the great discrediting campaign. (*“Discrediting secret service action? Israeli money, far-left support to the emigrating Romas of Zámoly.”*) That is, through the groundwork laid by Magyar Fórum and Demokrata, a philanthropic act by a private Israeli citizen is transformed in a perfectly natural way in Magyar Nemzet into a joint discrediting action by Israelis and the far-left.

Quoting Jane’s Intelligence Digest, the article said the strings are pulled by the Russian secret services in order to create difficulties for Hungary on its path to EU accession. *“Magyar Nemzet has been informed that the statements of Jane’s Intelligence Digest are well-founded. This is supported by the use of a method typical of secret services under which such discrediting operations are usually carried out with the involvement of a third country. As it was earlier reported, the travel costs of the Zámoly Romas were financed from Israel. Considering the one million Russians settled in Israel, many ex-agents of the former Soviet secret services might be living there. It is also significant that, in France, far-left Hungarian émigrés acted as supporters of the Zámoly Romas.”*<sup>12</sup>

The idea of a network of Israel and the Israeli secret services influencing the entire world is a well-known motif of the anti-Semitic parlance. Of course, the connections have never been proven. Although it is certainly true that one million Russians have settled in Israel, and there might well have been agents among them, but to suggest that the strings are pulled by secret services, does not allow for the fact that one specific person was offering her own money. The main point is that Israel and the far-left can be entangled, along with the Russian secret services – and there you have a perfect conspiracy theory.

The idea of the Israeli connection does not come from Jane’s, which soon becomes clear as the same issue of Magyar Nemzet quotes from the article in

---

<sup>11</sup> Zsuzsanna Tar – Matild Torkos: Lejárató titkosszolgálati akció? Izraeli pénz, szélsőbalos támogatás a kivándorolt zámolyi romáknak (Discrediting Secret Service Action? Israeli Money, Far-left Support to the Emigrating Romas of Zámoly). Magyar Nemzet, March 3, 2001.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

detail, in István Lovas' Tallózó.<sup>13</sup> The Israeli connection, as evidenced from the Russian line, is all the invention of Magyar Nemzet ...

This version spread and changed rapidly over the following days. Soon it "became clear" that the strings were pulled by the Israeli secret service – although even Magyar Nemzet did not say this, but it was undoubtedly the source of this assumption. István Lovas, a journalist for Vasárnapi újság, a radio program broadcast on the following day, recalls the story, adding: "*Perhaps this will also make one or two other mysteries clearer. However, we would not dare to assume that an Israeli university lecturer, Katalin Katz, might have been led by something other than her nature to grant USD 4000 to the Romas of Zámoly.*"<sup>14</sup> May everyone understand it as he wishes.

And the already familiar authors are enthusiastically spinning the plot along. "*A certain Katalin Katz came to Budapest straight from Jerusalem, to a Roma Holocaust conference organized by the Jewish organization Mazsike, where she put a nice little amount into the pocket of József Krasznai, the man organizing the trip of the Zámoly Romas to Strasbourg.*

*It would be unjust to draw the conclusion from this that everyone in Israel – or even among the Jews in Hungary – shares the clearly anti-Hungarian views of Katalin Katz and her employers. However, the opposing views are not reported by the Hungarian press, which is dominated by Jews.*"<sup>15</sup> József Hering says, introducing one of his writings in which he quotes an Israeli author, suggesting that in his book the Romas are irreparable criminals. Thus, Katalin Katz came to Budapest at the invitation of Mazsike and gave a countless amount of money to the Romas.

Despite Hungary's far-right press doing all they could to prevent the Romas from achieving their goal, finally, the first members of the group recently received asylum in France, in line with the Geneva Convention.

István Lovas commented on this in Vasárnapi újság as follows: "*The Strasbourg decision – backed by the successor of the KGB as well as French Socialists and Communists, local Greens, an Israeli university lecturer teaching social work and members of the local Jewish community – will obviously have serious consequences.*"<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> István Lovas: Tallózó, Jane's Intelligence Digest. Magyar Nemzet, March 3, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> István Lovas' editorial, Magyar Rádió, Vasárnapi újság, March 4, 2001.

<sup>15</sup> József Hering: Israeli View on the Romas, Magyar Fórum, March 8, 2001.

<sup>16</sup> István Lovas' editorial, Magyar Rádió, Vasárnapi újság, March 11, 2001.

Thus, here we have the outline of the “great conspiracy”, in which secret services, Israelis, French Jews and Communists are involved. This and the anti-Roma statements not quoted here, but abundant in these texts, are all designed to prove that everything is basically all right with the Romas in Hungary, and that the story of the Zámoly Romas is just the result of vicious scheming.

After the French decision was made, a group of Hungarian intellectuals wrote a letter of thanks to the French prime minister. Knowing the style of Magyar Fórum, it is, of course, not surprising that they are described in an editorial as those who have now plunged another dagger into Hungary’s back. The author of the article concludes: “*if, led by their tormented state of mind, some of them decided to leave Hungary, because here, just like the Romas of Zámoly, they are persecuted, I will immediately write a letter of thanks to Prime Minister Ariel Sharon for providing them with shelter.*”<sup>17</sup> Thus, those plunging the dagger into their country’s back are Jews – the reader of Magyar Fórum now realizes, if he was naive enough not to have known it for a long time. Those referred to in “italics” are pursuing these activities, the article in Magyar Fórum reveals.<sup>18</sup>

And thereby, it marked out, as it were, the direction of the offensive for MIÉP, the party so close to the weekly newspaper. MIÉP MP Lóránt Hegedűs attacked the forty “*ultraliberal, so-called intellectuals*” in Parliament. “*It is only impossible to call them traitors to their country because they have never identified with the Hungarian people, its fate, history, culture, or life, not even to one quiver of their souls. We have to declare that they represent a tiny minority trying to hold the country’s biggest, stigmatized minority as hostages in order to gratify their basest anti-Hungarian instincts, using their Israeli comrades and violating the constitution of the Republic of Hungary to arouse ethnic and racist incitement.*”<sup>19</sup>

Hegedűs, otherwise a Calvinist minister by profession, continues: “*The dangerous nature of their efforts is shown by the expert background apparatus organizing the travels of the Zámoly Romas in Strasbourg, including Katalin*

---

<sup>17</sup> Zoltán Szócs: Romas and Gypsies, Magyar Fórum, March 22, 2001.

<sup>18</sup> In a later article, Magyar Fórum declares this expressis verbis: “*except for one or two ... goys, who are the forty Hungarian intellectuals who sent a letter of thanks to the French president for giving shelter to the Romas?*” – József Hering asks the rhetorical question, Magyar Fórum, October 18, 2001.

<sup>19</sup> Lóránt Hegedűs’ speech in Parliament, Parlamenti napló (Parliamentary records), March 27, 2001.

*Katz, a lecturer in the Department of Sociology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, who – just like her compatriots – is unlikely to ever think of supporting, with as little as one dollar, the families of the Palestinian children massacred by the Israeli army. The issue of the background raises the question of whether it is possible that Mossad, widely considered the world's best-organized secret service, was unaware of the fact that Israel's newly settled citizens were carrying out a discrediting campaign against a third country through the secret service of their former state in the territory of a fourth one. I believe, if this were the case, Mossad would be the world's worst-organized secret service, but this is an affirmation that even someone with the strongest racist prejudice could not make.*"<sup>20</sup>

Here, Pastor Hegedűs combines the never-confirmed allegations of Magyar Nemzet with the usual anti-Semitic motifs, building on a world suggested by the pictures of the Middle East broadcast everyday, but rarely explained in the news programs.<sup>21</sup> He does not neglect, of course, Mossad, which is used here as a symbol, and is not just a secret service, but a secret apparatus governing the entire world from behind the scenes.

On behalf of the government, secretary of state of the Ministry of Justice, Csaba Hende, responded to Hegedűs' speech, not wasting any words on the MIÉP deputy's anti-Semitic remarks, but criticizing the Hungarians writing the letter to the French prime minister instead, emphasizing how much good the Hungarian authorities did for the Romas.

In the following issue of Magyar Fórum – after the groundwork had been laid, István Csurka, leader of the Hungarian Truth and Life Party (MIÉP) himself comments on the issue. First, he briefly explains that the Trianon Treaty itself can also be blamed on the Jews, who were constantly speaking evil of Hungary, and therefore it is no wonder that the country was divested of two-thirds of its territory.<sup>22</sup> Then he goes on to draw a parallel between the stories of Zámoly and Tiszaeszlár: both cases involving a murder. In the latter case, which occurred in 1882, Móricz Scharf, who was the star witness fled to Amsterdam,

---

<sup>20</sup> Lóránt Hegedűs' speech in Parliament, Parlamenti napló (Parliamentary records), March 27, 2001.

<sup>21</sup> It only shows Hegedűs' complete indifference to facts that Katz repeatedly said that, when she needed help with the Romas, she contacted a charity organization that she had previously worked with to help Palestinians.

<sup>22</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes), Magyar Fórum, April 5, 2001.

while in the recent case, the Romas fled to Strasbourg – he says. The Tiszaeszlár story, like so many other old anti-Semitic stories, is rather just a symbol here, a hint not requiring any explanation, and the search for historic truth is out of the question. Tiszaeszlár is no longer an issue of facts here, but rather one of faith. It is a frequently recurring point of comparison in the paper, illustrating the cruelty and wickedness of the Jews to regular readers, without having to consider reality at all. *“As the Jews, who come in, occupy positions, and exercise financial and media control, do not have an ethnic minority”*<sup>23</sup> so they are using the Romas. Finally, he draws the conclusion: *“This cannot be done without stirring up the Romas, a new, defiant minority within the country. Decreasing emigration and fierce propaganda – this is the vision of Katz, the Mossad and the KGB.”*<sup>24</sup>

All the pieces have been put together now. The picture is complete.

---

<sup>23</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes), Magyar Fórum, April 5, 2001.

<sup>24</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes), Magyar Fórum, April 5, 2001.

TIBOR SZESZLÉR  
THE FRADI-FOTEX AFFAIR

---

*(abridged)*

The Jewish Documentation Center's – albeit incomplete – database contains 89 items on this case, which came into the limelight as the Fradi-Fotex affair. It all began with a press conference by MIÉP on July 25, 2001, where the statement of MIÉP's Presidium (see the Appendix) was set forth by the party's vice-president, MP László Bognár. This time, the party's presidium decided that a seemingly business news item required public comment. The news item, which was only partly an economic one, reported on a Hungarian shareholding company, Fotex Rt's purchase of 80% stake in Ferencváros Labdarúgó Sport Kft, the company operating the football team of Ferencvárosi Torna Club (FTC).

MIÉP's press published the document entitled "*Statement on Fradi*" unabridged, and the Hungarian news agency MTI reported on the press conference on the same day. The statement of the MIÉP Presidium was distributed to journalists on the spot as printed material under the title *Fradi-Fotex – nemzetellenes tranzakció (Fradi-Fotex – transaction against the nation)*. The Hungarian press covered the story in detail on the following day. The main point of MIÉP's statement is that the party condemns it as an act against the nation that Fradi's football team will be owned by Fotex Rt.

Taking a closer look at the text, it claims that Fradi has been acquired by a "*greedy, unscrupulous business group*", which has nothing to do with "*either Ferencváros or the Hungarians*". The text criticizes the fact that Fradi's new owner is the company, which also owns another Hungarian football club, MTK.<sup>1</sup> According to the Presidium of MIÉP, a national government should not have let this happen, this is a "*dark, transaction against the nation*", the destruction of Fradi; a fatal mistake by the government.

The text is cloudy and clear at the same time; its barely concealed message is easily understood by any Hungarians, whether they are Jewish, anti-Semite, or neither. The fact that the message got through can be measured by the storm of indignation in the press on the following day. Here are a few quotations from the following day's press:

---

<sup>1</sup> MTK is generally considered as a Jewish football team, due to its historic ties to the Jewish bourgeoisie.

*“Socialist MP Magda Kósa Kovács, chair of Parliament’s Human Rights Committee, said she was shocked by the statements made at the MIÉP-press conference. She was reminded by the phrases used there of the era when the Nazis tried to persuade the man-in-the-street that our Jewish fellow countrymen are our enemies.”<sup>2</sup>*

*“The Hungarian Jewish organizations expressed their deep shock on behalf of Hungarian Jews over the Nazi, anti-national and provocative behavior which has now been raised to the level of parliamentary politics.”<sup>3</sup>*

*“On July 25, 2001, the Hungarian Truth and Life Party produced some plain, explicit anti-Semitic utterances unprecedented in the history of modern Hungarian democracy at their press conference. The pretext was the news that, as it is commonly known, Fotex Rt, which also owns part of MTK, has purchased FTC – to the sincere joy of the team’s management which has been struggling with financial problems. ...MIÉP vice-president Bognár also explained that the purchase of Fradi is not primarily a sports-related matter. We fully agree with that one. This is not about Fradi or sports at all. What this is all about is nothing but plain anti-Semitism. The only question is whether the Chief Prosecutor of the Hungarian Republic will excuse open racist incitement that violates the constitution and the penal code.”<sup>4</sup>*

The statement of the MIÉP Presidium and the words of vice-president Bognár, which were then repeated several times in the printed and electronic media, ultimately suggested the sequence of thought that Fradi, perceived as a national symbol, has been purchased by Fotex Rt which is associated with the Jews through the president of the shareholding company. Consequently, Fradi has been purchased by “the Jews”; thereby, Fradi has been acquired by a greedy, unscrupulous business group which has nothing to do with the Hungarians, therefore, the transaction is anti-national.

Speaking on the program *Aktuális*, broadcast by Magyar Televízió on July 27, László Bognár repeated with obstinate stubbornness that MIÉP’s presidium was only protesting because the privatization resulted in selling Fradi off to a “foreign”-owned business, in which the owner is a foreign company. Answering

---

<sup>2</sup> MIÉP Onslaught Against the Contract between the Club and Fotex. *Népszabadság*, July 26, 2001.

<sup>3</sup> From a joint statement by eight Jewish organizations. *Magyar Hírlap*, July 26, 2001.

<sup>4</sup> Article by István Szász. *Népszava*, July 26, 2001.

repeated<sup>5</sup> questions as to whether he or the text were anti-Semitic, he denied any such suggestions: “...where is the anti-Semitism here? MIÉP was *only* trying to prevent a bad privatization deal. This is not about religious or racist discrimination at all”.

The right-wing press wasted no time in answering: “This is an old tradition: whenever MIÉP speaks up for a national cause, it will be called anti-Semitic and Nazi by left-wing liberal circles – said László Bognár, who, setting forth the position of the presidium of MIÉP, called the purchase of Fradi a transaction against the nation on Wednesday.”<sup>6</sup> The manifestations of shock that followed, as well as the moves initiating criminal procedure, were triggered by the unmistakable message indicating that a parliamentary party, MIÉP, has now raised its own conscious, tendentious anti-Semitism, represented by its party leaders, but never publicly admitted, to the level of national politics in Hungary.

The Association of Hungarian Jewish Communities (Mazsihisz) protested in a press statement on July 26 in concert with seven other Jewish organizations. “We want to express our deep shock on behalf of the Hungarian Jews” over what they perceived as Nazi, anti-national and provocative behavior now raised to the level of parliamentary politics. They emphatically requested that the “organs of the state should ensure law and order and social peace”. The Budapest lodge of the international Jewish organization B’nai B’rith announced in a television news program on July 27 that it intended to turn to the Chief Prosecutor in order to start a criminal procedure in the matter.

Following the initial press reactions, the public awaited with suspense and anticipation the Fradi-Újpest football game that was set for the following Saturday, July 28. It was not for nothing: supporters in the stands displayed arrow-cross flags, (a symbol of the Hungarian Nazi Party in the Thirties and Forties of the last century), cartoons depicting a crooked-nosed Jew and blue banners unmistakably calling abuse upon the Jews, which could be clearly seen on the television broadcast as well. It was undoubtedly shocking to hear the fans howling “The train is leaving for Auschwitz” and the people leaving the stadium chanting “dirty Jews”. After what happened in the stands and after the

---

<sup>5</sup> Interviewer: *Do you consider yourself an anti-Semite?* Bognár: *God forbid!* Interviewer later: *How do you know who is a Jew and who is not?* Bognár: *Where are the anti-Semitic statements here? What is anti-Semitic in this? This is only something made up by journalists! As soon as somebody utters the word “Jew”, he is immediately an anti-Semite.*

<sup>6</sup> Magyar Nemzet, July 28, 2001.

game, Mazsihisz, along with six other Jewish organizations, decided to make a formal complaint.<sup>7</sup> Two private individuals also took legal action.

Those initiating legal action based it on the paragraph of the Hungarian criminal law stipulating punishment for “*incitement of hatred in public against the Hungarian nation, any national, ethnic, racial, religious group or certain groups of the population.*” The legal definition of instigation against a community has been one of the most debated pieces of legislation of the era following the change of political system, which was amended by the Hungarian Parliament and the Constitutional Court three times within a decade.

Following the scandalous football game, as leading politicians of the government coalition parties remained silent,<sup>8</sup> the political writings published in the Hungarian press began to deal with this issue – namely the silence. Here are a few quotations to illustrate this.

*“It was in vain to expect that sentence of the Prime Minister. We didn’t expect him to politically distance himself, although that would also have been meaningful, but to give us a sentence expressing his moral responsibility for the country. A gesture to a society under attack. Instead, Viktor Orbán gave reassuring words to MIÉP, the attacker. I’m talking about a society under attack, and not ‘just’ anti-Semitic instigation. MIÉP’s vice-president, László Bognár called the purchase of a majority stake in FTC Futball Kft by Fotex a transaction against the nation, ergo expelling the rich Jewish middle class from the nation. The particular cruelty and horrible historical atmosphere of the idea conceals an important trait of its aggressiveness that is typical of MIÉP...”*<sup>9</sup>

*“The official statement concerning the acquisition of Ferencváros . . . has created a radically different situation. The difference is that MIÉP decided that the time has now come for open incitement, to raise Nazi ideas into the publicity of the democratic Hungarian society. . . The way MIÉP contrasts*

<sup>7</sup> In addition to Mazsihisz, the statement initiating criminal investigation was signed by leaders of the Budapest Jewish Community, the Committee of the Persecutes of Nazism, the Raoul Wallenberg Association, the National Association of Forced Laborers, and the Füst Milán Spiritual Lodge. The solicitor of Mazsihisz indicated that B’nai B’rith had already filed its separate statement initiating criminal proceedings in the matter.

<sup>8</sup> The Minister of Justice eluded a question concerning the MIÉP statement by a television journalist by saying she does not know much about football. In his Wednesday radio interview, the Prime Minister only expressed his surprise over the fact that two rival football clubs are owned by one and the same owner.

<sup>9</sup> Péter Nagy N.: Egy mondat. (One Sentence). Népszabadság, August 3, 2001.

*belonging to the Jewish community with belonging to the Hungarians, and belonging to one means exclusion from the other; well, this way of thinking is nothing but the racist idea which came from a reign of terror in Nazi Germany, the open propagation of the fundamental ideas of the Hungarian Nazis who nearly ruined our country. The fact that MIÉP again undertakes to openly propagate racial discrimination is not just the internal affair of this small party and the masses of people protesting against its ideas. MIÉP has now attacked constitutional democracy itself.”<sup>10</sup>*

*“In connection with the sell-off of FTC, it became clear that ... it does not carry any political risks to make openly anti-Semitic utterances, while calling for social solidarity and rescuing the nation. There’s no need to worry that Hungary’s governing party might perceive the dangers of this. The leader who would be the most liable to speak up in such cases expresses his ‘surprise’. However, it would be better if he had nothing to do with what surprises him. Particularly the head of a government, which announced the idea of a service provider state in its program three years ago. As a leader responsible for the government, he should at least have known what he was supposed to find surprising as a politician. He could have said that this is the limit that no one should be allowed to cross, for the sake of the country. Since he did not say this, the provokers of this sad situation can feel victorious.”<sup>11</sup>*

The far-(?)-right press could not leave this unanswered.

*“The clattering of the Jews has started again, this old, well-known, loud and indignant chorus about that terrible Hungarian anti-Semitism, which dared to go as far as calling a Jew a Jew in its unrestrained exclusion. Seemingly, it was triggered by MIÉP’s disapproving statement concerning Fradi’s sell-off – because those giving instructions for this nationwide rattling make sure there is always some specific case serving as the pretext for the uproar. In reality, they are set off by the particular Jewish mental need to cry out about their alleged state of being threatened, attacked and defenseless again and again to the world. They have such a strong drive for this periodically recurring lamentation that they don’t even need a wailing wall. A sports-related MIÉP-statement is perfectly enough...*

*How to recognize a Jew – this is the classical evergreen, not Symphony No. IX. It is a huge problem to see a Jew in a Jew: that is cast-iron anti-Semitism.*

---

<sup>10</sup> Péter György: A fordulat. (The Turning Point). Népszabadság, August 4, 2001.

<sup>11</sup> László Kéri: Friditől Fradiig. (From Fridi to Fradi). Népszava, August 8, 2001.

*It is an ever larger problem, however; not to appreciate, respect and support the free development and blossoming of Jewishness in a Jew. Anyone with an average intelligence might say that, to meet the above expectation, it is obviously necessary to recognize who is a Jew and who is not, since without such a distinction it would be impossible to make any meaningful contact with the Jews. Still, they take offense, in fact, they resent being regarded as Jews by a non-Jew...*

*This time, they are under a death threat in the FTC-affair, and the ethnic group concerned – as well as their supporters – are moaning about unprecedented ‘instigation’, historic ‘turning-point’, ‘anti-Semitism’ calling for vengeance...*

*– How do you know that Mr. Várszegi is a Jew?*

*– This is the question of questions. Now you try to answer, Hungarian, if you dare! I warn anyone against casually answering: I can see it. You could hardly make a bigger mistake, you could bear the stamp “racist” until the end of your days! Neo-liberal thinking has gained such an overwhelming victory over reason that soon there won’t be a white man in the USA who would dare to notice that his next-door neighbor is black. It is no longer allowed to see such striking obviousness. It is socially forbidden. Let us avoid the trap and – I suggest – we should give the following answer to the interrogators of Cross-fire (a popular political TV-program). Certain signs suggest that Mr. Várszegi is a Jew: his contacts, friends, business partners, political affiliation, the values he represents, his life and career all suggest so. Of course, we cannot know whether Mr. Várszegi is a Jew or possibly a Székely Unitarian – he could be either – but analyzing whatever we can find out about him, we assume he is probably a Jew.*

*Thus, this is how far we have come: Mr. Várszegi, who is probably a Jew, has purchased Fradi, which undoubtedly symbolizes Hungarian national feelings.”<sup>12</sup>*

The carefully reasoned and documented statement making a formal complaint,<sup>13</sup> filed by B’nai B’rith to the Chief Prosecutor, as well as the statement filed by Mazsihisz with the Budapest Chief Prosecutor’s Office, and the statements filed by the mayor of Budaörs as well as two private individuals also to the prosecutor’s department were merged into one case by the authorities. Then they refused to order an investigation ... The prosecutor’s department gave the following reasons:

<sup>12</sup> Zoltán Szöcs: Zsidózakata. (Jewish Rattling) Magyar Fórum, August 9, 2001.

<sup>13</sup> For the unabridged text of the formal complaint, see the Appendix.

*“As regards the prejudicial statements, it can be established that they are suitable for negatively influencing public opinion, but not for inciting hatred. The simplified, stereotyped and entirely unfounded discrimination between social groups approaches the limits of freedom of speech, but does not reach the extent that would require criminal intervention.”<sup>14</sup>*

The complainants did not accept this outcome, they all lodged a complaint to the superior authority. (The prosecutor’s department would not even take this case to the court, so they decided to judge it themselves.)<sup>15</sup> In its request urging for a review of the decision, B’nai B’rith made the following points: *“Contrary to the prosecutor’s opinion stated in the resolution, the events that took place at the Újpest–Fradi football game following the MIÉP press conference are closely related to the criminal offense we stated. What happened there is the immediate and obvious ‘result’ of the instigation. The subject protected by law is public peace, law and order. Public peace has now been broken. While the authorities remained silent and indifferent, the Hungarian public witnessed through the broadcasting of television channels a series of seriously upsetting events the likes of which have not taken place in this country since 1944: the masses of people chanting the words ‘dirty Jews’ in a rhythmic chorus, the texts displayed on the banners and the unmistakable cartoon are direct and obvious consequences of the racial instigation. If the prosecutor’s department does not take action against this, that indeed means the death of the rule of law!”<sup>16</sup>*

It is important to note that the legal debate actually concerns the interpretation of the notion of *“instigation”*, a slightly unclear sentence, an archaic term of the Hungarian criminal law.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Point V. of the resolution No. 101/2001 (August 17, 2001) of the Central Prosecutor’s Investigation Office.

<sup>15</sup> The Hungarian criminal procedure does not currently allow for the legal institution known as private prosecution. For lack of this institution, the complainant – or the person considering himself as the offended party – cannot take his own case to criminal court himself.

<sup>16</sup> B’nai B’rith complaint to the Chief Prosecutor, August 27, 2001.

<sup>17</sup> The point of the legal debate is the question of what the subject of the instigating talk is, what the term ‘instigating hatred’ itself means. Hungarian lawyers have been occupied by the task of accurately defining the legal content of the expression since 1878 when it first appeared in the penal code of the time, the Csemegi Codex. This term was used throughout the twentieth century, with the highest judicial forums always trying to exploit the uncertainty of the expression amid the changes of various political systems in compliance with the given regime.

In any case, the legal debate on hate-talk – on the clash between the constitutional freedom of speech and the right to human dignity, also protected by the constitution – has been revived by this case and still remains on the agenda in Hungary. But let us return to the flow of events: the complaints lodged because of the refusal to order a criminal investigation by the authorities was first rejected by the Budapest Chief Prosecutor's Office on August 17, 2001, and by the Central Chief Prosecutor first on September 3, and then on October 9. In early September, however, another serious atrocity took place. This (the article by Lóránt Hegedűs Jr.) prompted the Executive Board of B'nai B'rith to turn to the Chief Prosecutor again:

*"... the reason given for refusing to order a criminal investigation was that the prejudicial statements are suitable for negatively influencing public opinion, but not instigating hatred; since the quoted statements do not incite for active violent acts against another social group. Since then, that has also taken place! Therefore, we add a new statement to the previous one, requesting the institution of separate criminal proceedings for behavior breaching Paragraph 269 of the Penal Code.*

*We enclose No.2001(III) /3 of the newspaper called Ébresztő of the District XVI organization of MIÉP, in order to present it to the Chief Prosecutor in an original copy. The paper was distributed in thousands of copies by mailbox delivery in Budapest's District XVI. On page one of this newspaper, the following text was published with the signature of MIÉP vice-president Lóránt Hegedűs Jr; in word for word quotation:*

*'So hear, Hungarians, the message of the 1000th year of the Christian Hungarian state, based on 1000 ancient rights and legal continuity, the only one leading you to life: EXCLUDE THEM! BECAUSE IF YOU DON'T, THEY WILL DO IT TO YOU!'*

*The author instigates against the Jews in several circumscribed, but unmistakable ways. The call for exclusion talks about 'an army of Galician vagabonds' using hardly encoded hate-talk. ... The article does not require any commentary. The text now meets the criteria specified by the prosecutor's department; it is hardly possible to claim that these words do not incite for active violent acts against another social group."<sup>18</sup>*

---

<sup>18</sup> B'nai B'rith letter to the Chief Prosecutor, September 12, 2001.

In a letter to the president of B'nai B'rith, the Chief Prosecutor's Office said on October 9 that the prosecutor's department ordered a criminal investigation concerning the above-quoted article.<sup>19</sup> (The investigation regarding the content of the article distributed with the signature of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr was pursued by the prosecutor's department against an unknown offender for several months...) The Chief Prosecutor did not initiate the suspension of the immunity of MIÉP vice-president and MP Lóránt Hegedűs Jr until early December 2001. Charges were brought in the summer of 2002, but up to the time this volume was published there has been no court hearing. (The case of the article written by Mr. Hegedűs Jr is discussed in detail by the following essay of this volume.)

---

<sup>19</sup> The Jewish Documentation Centre preserves the unabridged text of the legal documents and provides access to them to anyone interested. A summary of the legal documents can be found in the September 7 and September 14, 2001 issues of *Élet és Irodalom*: "They do not incite or instigate" – the prosecution documents of the MIÉP-Fradi case.

GÁBOR SCHWEITZER

“EXCLUDE THEM, OR IF YOU DON’T...”

---

(abridged)

On August 16, 2001 MIÉP vice-president Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. published an article entitled “*Keresztyén magyar állam!*” (Christian Hungarian State!)<sup>1</sup> in *Ébresztő* (Awakening), the paper of a local chapter of the Hungarian Truth and Life Party (MIÉP) in Budapest’s District XVI. The article deserves attention not just because the author is one of this party’s vice-presidents and MP’s,<sup>2</sup> as well as a practicing Calvinist minister in Budapest, but also because, after his right of immunity was suspended, Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. was questioned as a suspect on December 18, 2001, in an investigation by the prosecution for suspicion of incitement against a community. During the time between the publishing of the article and the court hearing, the media followed the developments with special attention, all the more so as the matter closely concerned not just MIÉP, well-known for its radical nationalism, but Hungary’s Reformed Church as well. This summary aims to provide a chronological list of the most important facts, opinions and positions published in the Hungarian press concerning the article written by Lóránt Hegedűs Jr.

The article written by the MIÉP vice-president focuses on the idea that the 1000-year-old Christian Hungarian state had to suffer a series of major historical calamities over the course of its existence. He names the Tatars (Mongols), the Turks and the Russians as the destructive representatives of a “*devastating hysterical anger*,” while considering the Habsburgs, “*the least talented and most narrow-minded dynasty in Europe, in fact, the whole world*” as representing a “*cold-blooded base hatred*”.

The following quotation, which omits certain sections irrelevant to this topic, essentially covers the second part of the article, and reflects the main points of the author’s message. “*The Christian Hungarian state would have warded off (the ill effects) of the Compromise of 1867, had not an army of Galician vagabonds*

---

<sup>1</sup> Lóránt Hegedűs Jr.: *Keresztyén magyar állam*. (Christian Hungarian State). *Ébresztő*, 2001. (III. year), no. 3.

<sup>2</sup> As the Hungarian Truth and Life Party did not reach the threshold required to become a parliamentary party in the elections of April 2002, and its individual candidates did not perform successfully either, Lóránt Hegedűs Jr.’s electoral mandate expired with the formation of the new Parliament.

*arrived, who had been gnawing away at the country, which, despite everything, again and again, had always been able to resurrect from its ruins, the bones of the heroes. If their Zion of the Old Testament was lost due to their sins and rebellions against God, let the most promising height of the New Testament way of life, the Hungarian Zion be lost as well. ... Since it is impossible to smoke out every Palestinian from the banks of the Jordan using Fascist methods that often imitate the Nazis themselves, they are returning to the banks of the Danube, now in the shape of internationalists, now in a jingoistic form, now as cosmopolitans, in order to give the Hungarians another kick just because they feel like doing so. ...*

*So hear, Hungarians, the message of the 1000th year of the Christian Hungarian state, based on 1000 ancient rights and legal continuity, the only one leading you to life: EXCLUDE THEM! BECAUSE IF YOU DON'T, THEY WILL DO IT TO YOU!*

*To this we are warned by the suffering of 1000 years, the heritage of our robbed and 1000-times plundered country, (but which is) still there at that 'height' and last but not least by the stone-throwing sons of Ramallah."*

One of the first press reflections was made approximately three weeks after the article was published. Answering a question by the national daily Magyar Hírlap as to how the sentences regarding exclusion should be interpreted, all Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. had to say was *"this should be understood as it is written"*. He would not provide any further explanation.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, Gábor Fodor, a leading official of the Alliance of Free Democrats called the article a *"shameful Nazi writing"*. The chairwoman of the Parliament's Human Rights Committee, Magda Kósa Kovács (Hungarian Socialist Party – MSZP), expressed her view that this manifestation of hate-talk must not be left unpunished. (Other members of the committee included Mr. Fodor as well as Mr. Hegedűs Jr.) She also suggested that the Chief Prosecutor be asked whether or not MIÉP is a party operating in line with the constitution.<sup>4</sup>

The editors of Magyar Hírlap decided to publicize Hegedűs' article in the following issue of the daily in order to bring wider attention to it, because the message of the article is *"more hideous than ever – because it is openly inciting –, and because it was written by a vice-president of a parliamentary party"*.<sup>5</sup> They

<sup>3</sup> Magdaléna Dzindisz: Kirekesztés egy kerületi lapban. (Exclusion in a District Newspaper) Magyar Hírlap, September 7, 2001.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> The Priest of Anger (MH-position). Magyar Hírlap, September 8, 2001.

believe that the article, aimed at excluding citizens of Jewish origin/religion from the Republic of Hungary, is first and foremost a shame on its author, the Calvinist minister. However, unless they “*raise their voices*” – it will be a shame on the Reformed Church, MIÉP and the Hungarian Parliament alike, and finally on the Hungarian government as well, because if the government, “*responsible for the country’s mental health and its law and order*” does not raise its voice in protest against what was said in this article, what happened can also be regarded as a “*shame on the country*”. Magyar Hírlap believes that this time it is no longer sufficient to distance themselves from this act and politically condemn it, but “*a criminal investigation of the minister-MP must follow*”<sup>6</sup> with regard to what was said in the article.

The author of an article published in the weekly *Heti Világgazdaság* (HVG) one week later<sup>7</sup> pointed out that, unlike an earlier statement by another vice-president of MIÉP, László Bognár, regarding the sale of the football team FTC, the article by Mr. Hegedűs Jr. could have criminal consequences. As it was reported by the press, the prosecution rejected the statement of suspicion of incitement against a community in the case of Mr. Bognár arguing that, although what was said is based on prejudice and constitutes an insult against the Jews, however, to quote the position taken by the prosecution, “*it cannot be regarded as a call for hatred and active behavior*”. Thus, what Mr. Bognár said does not count as an offense, however, Mr. Hegedűs Jr.’s statements calling for exclusion “*at least approach punishability considering the explanations of the court sentences passed so far regarding incitement against a community*”,<sup>8</sup> according to the article in HVG.

On September 17, Népszabadság reported that several individuals made formal complaints because of the article by Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. The paper said that Socialist MP Ildikó Lendvai turned to Chief Prosecutor Péter Polt with the question of whether the investigating authority intended ex officio to initiate a procedure in the matter?<sup>9</sup> Two days later, Zoltán Borbély, spokesman for the Budapest Chief Prosecutor’s Office told the press that the investigating

---

<sup>6</sup> The Priest of Anger (MH-position). Magyar Hírlap, September 8, 2001.

<sup>7</sup> István Riba: Üzenet a múltból. (Message from the Past). *Heti Világgazdaság*, September 15, 2001.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Feljelentették ifj. Hegedűs Lórántot. (Formal Complaint against Lóránt Hegedűs Jr.). *Népszabadság*, September 17, 2001.

authority has taken the position that what was said in the article fulfills the criteria of incitement against a community. However, the procedure has no “*suspect at the moment*;<sup>10</sup> *the investigating office is conducting an investigation concerning an offense*”.<sup>11</sup> MIÉP’s spokesman said the party does not wish to deal with the statements. Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. and party president István Csurka refused to comment on the matter.<sup>12</sup>

As regards the disputed article, however, Mr. Hegedűs Jr. told the daily Magyar Nemzet that “*Exclusion can also be constitutional and remain within the bounds of legality*”. Nevertheless, “*everyone can interpret the article as they want*”. He said his sentences were misinterpreted as he “*does not have anything against the Hungarian Jews, but against Israel’s policy and Israeli economic expansion in Hungary as well as Zionism*”. Mr. Hegedűs Jr. would not comment on the procedure itself until the investigation is closed.<sup>13</sup>

The comments by representatives of the Hungarian Reformed Church opened a new chapter in the matter and obviously led to the emergence of further considerations (as well as conflicts). The Hungarian news agency MTI reported on September 20, 2001 that, in a letter dated September 5 and signed by Bishop Gusztáv Bölcsei and General Superintendent Attila Kálmán, the Presidium of the Synod of the Hungarian Reformed Church declared the article of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. as “*contrary to the Word, unworthy of the Reformed Church and incompatible with its confession*”. The letter, addressed to the local ecclesiastical authority, the Dunamellék Reformed Diocese, asked the leaders of the diocese to investigate whether the article was indeed written by Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. and whether there had been a retraction published regarding the article?<sup>14</sup>

Speaking to MTI, the Hungarian News Agency, the Bishop of the Dunamellék Reformed Diocese, Loránd Hegedűs – father and ecclesiastical superior of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. – emphasized that the article by Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. can

<sup>10</sup> This means that the investigation is conducted against unknown offender(s).

<sup>11</sup> T. B.: Nyomozás a MIÉP-alelnök cikke kapcsán. (Investigation Concerning a MIÉP-vice-president’s Article). Népszabadság, September 19, 2001.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Gábor Pál: Csurka István bírálja a kormányt. (István Csurka Criticizes the Government) Magyar Nemzet, September 20, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> A református egyház igeellenesnek ítélte ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt írását. (Reformed Church Considers Writing by L.H. Jr. as Contrary to the Word). MTI, September 20, 2001.

be regarded as a response to an article published earlier in Magyar Hírlap under the title “*A kirekesztés módszertanához*” (To the Methodology of Exclusion). The author of the disputed article did not mention this fact, Bishop Hegedűs added.<sup>15</sup> He also noted that “*certain forces*” have been threatening his family with bomb alerts, death threats, two bullets shot into their door and an ongoing smear campaign – among other things. The Dunamellék Reformed Diocese also called upon Mr. Hegedűs Jr. to show a “*refinement of content*” when making statements in a capacity other than ecclesiastical.<sup>16</sup>

At the same time, the faculty of the Debrecen University for Calvinist Theology published its view regarding the article of Mr. Hegedűs Jr. According to the fifteen university lecturers signing the statement, Mr. Hegedűs Jr.’s article “*contains theologically incorrect, exclusionary and misleading ideas; in fact, it amounts to incitement, instigation and dishonor*”.<sup>17</sup>

Speaking to Magyar Nemzet, Lóránt Hegedűs Sr., Bishop of the Dunamellék Reformed Diocese, said that the diocese has investigated the matter and informed the Presidium of the Synod of the outcome. He said they told Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. that he should “*take his ecclesiastical service into consideration when making statements in a capacity other than ecclesiastical*”.<sup>18</sup> However, Bishop Hegedűs also emphasized – which leads us to another ramification of the matter – that “*I will only accept the new proposal regulating the congregational service of minister-MPs – which would not allow ministers to take public office – if the Synod screens out former Communist spies from the highest decision-making body of the Reformed Church*”.<sup>19</sup>

Pannon Rádió, a radio station close to MIÉP, also became involved in the story. In a September radio program, following the investigation ordered by the Central Prosecuting Investigation Office, they read aloud the disputed article.

---

<sup>15</sup> This argument defending L. H. Jr., saying that his article is nothing but a response to a series of articles aiming to exclude the Hungarians, will become a recurring motif.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Ákos Jezsó: Feszültségek a reformátusoknál. (Tensions in the Reformed Church). Magyar Nemzet, September 21, 2001.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* The intensification of the conflicts within the Reformed Church is reflected by a statement signed by Bishop Loránd Hegedűs and published by the National Press Service on October 29, in which he criticized those convening the pastors’ meeting of October 15 in Debrecen for dealing with the article of L.H.Jr. without inviting the author to state his position. See the statement of the Episcopal Office of the Dunamellék Reformed Diocese. October 29, 2001.

A special investigation was initiated by a member of the National Radio and Television Board (ORTT) to clear up the background of the matter.<sup>20</sup>

In an article published in Magyar Fórum in early October, MIÉP president István Csurka launched a broad offensive protecting Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. and MIÉP – which he perceived as driven to the periphery.<sup>21</sup> What the MIÉP vice-president published in one of the party's local small-circulation<sup>22</sup> quarterly publications did not contain *“impermissible things”*, he said, still, the article attracted *“enormously undue attention”*. All Mr. Hegedűs Jr. did was to try to defend himself. Mr. Csurka said, *“What excluding means in contemporary Hungarian public jargon is nothing else, but the fact is that he violated the interests of a circle with immeasurable wealth and enormous contacts, which happens to consider itself as Jewish at the moment, and he dared to restrict these interests out of self-defense”*. Mr. Hegedűs Jr. only made a proposal for restriction because he has no powers to enforce any *“real restriction”*. According to Csurka, the MIÉP vice-president *“did not hurt one single Hungarian or one single Jew who confesses himself a Hungarian as well as being a Jew, only naming those using their power for evil, and calling for their exclusion, out of self-defense. He has the right to do so because, unfortunately, he is justified by the social conditions.”* However, it is not only the *“liberal terrorists”* who want to take Mr. Hegedűs Jr. to account – just like the United States of America which has attacked Afghanistan and Osama bin Laden – but part of the Reformed Church as well. Mr. Csurka believes that Mr. Hegedűs Jr. and his party are now under attack from the media which *“do nothing but discriminate, exclude and conceal through all their operation”*, and are now indignantly *“offended”* by the article written by the minister-MP. Mr. Csurka said that, in his article that has come under cross-fire, Mr. Hegedűs Jr. *“was not inciting, but reacting to an incitement, and establishing a fact. He noted the exclusion of the Hungarians*

<sup>20</sup> H. Z.: A médiahatóság vizsgálja a Pannon Rádiót. (Pannon Rádió under Investigation by Media Authority) Népszabadság, September 29, 2001.

<sup>21</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel. (Through Hungarian Eyes) Magyar Fórum, October 4, 2001. With regard to this article – on the basis of a report by a private individual – an investigation was also started against István Csurka for incitement against a community, which the investigating authority eventually declared unjustified. See also István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, October 18, 2001.

<sup>22</sup> Népszabadság has been informed that the newspaper called Ébresztő had a circulation of twelve thousand. In, Eljárás indul Csurka ellen is? (Will there be a Procedure against Csurka as well?) Népszabadság, October 10, 2001.

*and found a remedy for it, a political one: he says you should prevent your own final exclusion, Hungarians, exclude them, because if you don't, they will do it to you. He is defending himself. Just like, unfortunately, we are all defending ourselves.”*

As reported above, the ORTT investigated the broadcast of Mr. Hegedűs, Jr.'s article on Pannon Rádió, as well as other programs aired on the station. According to the report prepared by the ORTT's office, the text was capable of inciting hatred.<sup>23</sup> As a result, the ORTT imposed a fine of 1 million forints on Pannon Rádió at the end of October 2001.<sup>24</sup> The board member designated by MIÉP was the only one not voting for the ORTT resolution.

At the end of October, an open letter was published in the press by a group of religious intellectuals addressed to the leaders of the Catholic, Reformed and Evangelical churches calling for action against racism. They accused some ministers of the Christian churches of hatred toward the Romas and foreigners as well as the Jews. However, they expressed satisfaction over the fact that the leaders of the Reformed church condemned Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. with regard to his disputed article.<sup>25</sup>

In early November 2001 in Magyar Fórum, István Csurka repeatedly defended his vice-president as well as Pannon Rádió. According to Mr. Csurka, who sharply rejected the accusation of anti-Semitism, the article of Mr. Hegedűs Jr. is to be regarded as a response to the “*life-threatening attacks*” that happened to him. However, Mr. Csurka believes that what the MIÉP vice-president has written cannot be offensive to “*the entire Hungarian Jewish*

<sup>23</sup> Ügyészségen a kirekesztők ügyei. (Cases of Excluders under Prosecution). Népszava, October 12, 2001.

<sup>24</sup> ORTT imposes fine of HUF 1m on Pannon Rádió. The Budapest radio station must pay because of the Hegedűs-article. Index, October 26, 2001. See also Gabriella Tábori: Pannon Rádió Fined by ORTT. Magyar Nemzet, October 27, 2001. The article emphasized that, according to the ORTT resolution, the writing of L.H.Jr. “*does not meet the requirements of the media act because the law bans incitement of hatred against sexes, peoples, nations, national, ethnic, linguistic and other minorities, ecclesiastical or religious groups*”.

<sup>25</sup> Gábor Czene: Hívô értelmiségiek a rasszizmus ellen. (Religious Intellectuals against Racism). Népszabadság, October 29, 2001. The open letter was published by Népszabadság on the following day, October 30 (Közös lelkiismeretvizsgálatra van szükség. Értelmiségiek egy csoportjának levele egyházi vezetôkhöz. – We Need a Joint Self-examination. Letter by a Group of Intellectuals to Church Leaders). See also Beliczai, Bea – Zoltán Simon: Levél a püspököknek a gyûlölet ellen. (Letter to the Bishops against Racism). Népszava, October 30, 2001.

*community*". All the remarks made by Mr. Hegedűs Jr. in the disputed article must be regarded as self-evident in a democracy guaranteeing freedom of speech, according to Mr. Csurka. He believes that Hungarians should be liberated from the "terror" of the "financial and press caste", namely – we read towards the end of the article – by excluding them from economic and political power, "or from the over possession of it because if we don't do it, they will exclude us – from life".<sup>26</sup>

In the meantime, Péter Feldmájer, a lawyer representing one of the individuals who started legal action in connection with the article by Lőránt Hegedűs Jr. amended his proposal to include damages of 1 Ft in compensation for non-financial harm since "his client's health significantly deteriorated due to the anti-Semitic statements".<sup>27</sup> The legislator, Mr. Feldmájer added, "should answer the question as to whether it is possible to cause non-financial damage by incitement committed in the public domain or only by physical abuse".<sup>28</sup>

At the end of November, the Synod of the Hungarian Reformed Church reviewed the Hegedűs Jr. matter, and a great majority concurred with the earlier view expressed by the Presidium in which they condemned the article as contrary to the Word and incompatible with the Calvinist confession. Of the 90 participants – according to secular president Attila Kálmán – only fifteen voted against the proposal with 5-6 abstentions.<sup>29</sup> The Synod also requested the general meeting of the local diocese to distance itself from the ideas of Lőránt Hegedűs Jr.

According to Mihály Takaró, General Superintendent of the local Dunamellék Reformed Diocese, the request of the Synod cannot be regarded as binding, and added that the Synod is a legislative body, not a jurisdictional one.

<sup>26</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, November 1, 2001.

<sup>27</sup> Egy forintra perlik ifjabb Hegedűst. (Hegedűs Jr. Sued for HUF 1 for Damages) Népszabadság, November 21, 2001.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid. The court sentence, although still appealable, favors Mr. Hegedűs Jr.

<sup>29</sup> The meeting of the Synod of the Reformed Church declared the article of L.H.Jr. as contrary to the Word. Source: MTI, November 28, 2001. István Csurka stated his view on the resolution of the Synod in a "Statement" signed as president of MIÉP, saying that "the majority of the Reformed Synod joined the anti-Christian, Liberal, Cosmopolitan and globalist forces". He said the Synod should have noticed that "the attack against Hegedűs Jr. did not originate from sincere Jewish concern because of the return of the Holocaust, the terrible Hungarian tragedy always condemned by us as well, it was a political attack by a small group against a party and a truth." István Csurka: Nyilatkozat (Statement). Magyar Fórum, December 6, 2001.

The general meeting of the diocese will decide whether or not to place the matter of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. on its agenda.<sup>30</sup>

In early December 2001, the Chief Prosecutor’s Office established that the article written by Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. constituted an offence of incitement against a community considering the fact that it called for excluding a well-defined target group, the “*Galician vagabonds*.” Consequently, it proposed the suspension of Mr Hegedűs Jr’s right of immunity to Parliament because an MP can only be questioned as a defendant after such a proposal is approved.<sup>31</sup>

After hearing Lóránt Hegedűs Jr., the Parliament’s Committee for Immunity and Privileges unanimously proposed that the MP’s right of immunity should be suspended by Parliament. Mr. Hegedűs Jr. handed over to MTI his statement made before the parliamentary committee, in which he also asked for suspension of his right of immunity. Trusting in the resolutions of the Supreme Court and the Constitutional Court, Mr. Hegedűs Jr. said that, in exercising his constitutional right to freedom of speech, he did not commit any offense when writing his article.<sup>32</sup>

In the middle of December 2001, the plenary session of Parliament suspended Hegedűs Jr.’s right of immunity by a great majority – including the backing of MIÉP as well.<sup>33</sup>

In June 2002 the prosecution brought formal criminal charges against Lóránt Hegedűs Jr., who is expected to stand trial. Of course, it remains to be seen what sentence will be given by the court, but it can be predicted that the sentence will certainly become a precedent, and mark the beginning of a new era in Hungarian political discourse.

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. Bishop Loránd Hegedűs commented on the procedure and the resolution of the Synod to the radio program called *Vasárnapi újság* on December 2, 2001, answering questions by Éva Terebesi.

<sup>31</sup> *Kiadja-e Hegedűst a parlament? (Will Parliament Deliver Hegedűs?) Népszabadság*, December 5, 2001.

<sup>32</sup> *Ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt megismételte vádjait (Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. Repeats his Accusations) (MTI-report). Népszabadság*, December 15, 2001.

<sup>33</sup> 275 MP’s voted for the proposal to suspend the right of immunity, with 8 ‘no’ votes and 12 abstentions. *Önként vállalt kiadatás. (Voluntary Extradition). Magyar Fórum*, December 27, 2001.

ZSÓFIA MIHANCSIK  
REVEALING QUOTATIONS

---

*(abridged)*

The following is a collection of quotations from the radio program Vasárnapi újság (Magyar Rádió, Kossuth radio station, Sunday mornings from 6.00.–8.30.), broadcast in 2001, and from two Hungarian radical right-wing weeklies – Magyar Demokrata and Magyar Fórum – from articles published in 2001. We selected items related to the Jews or to Israel, adding explanatory subheadings or texts only when absolutely necessary.

—— VASÁRNAPI ÚJSÁG ——

The Jewish-controlled media against the Hungarians<sup>1</sup>

MIÉP president István Csurka said his party insists on maintaining the current composition of the boards of the public media because “...*what the commercial television and radio stations are pursuing is not just a commercial activity but a socialist-liberal, liberal policy, and they are fully against the national interest... The problem is that ... they have let these commercial channels in, which are owned by the Bronfman family, as far as tv2 is concerned, or rather by the leaders of the World Jewish Federation, and these are serving as a tool for propaganda, which is simply against Hungarian national interests*”.

About the Durban conference<sup>2</sup>

“*Finally, there is no more taboo-racism, no racism that cannot be talked about, and there is no single type of racism that could be claimed to be exclusive... The United States and Israel have quit the Durban conference because, according to various reports, between three and four thousand non-governmental organizations represented at the conference decided to call a spade a spade, ... (accusing*

---

<sup>1</sup> Lakatos Pál interjúja Csurka Istvánnal (Interview with I. Csurka by P. Lakatos). Vasárnapi újság, March 11, 2001.

<sup>2</sup> A durbani öskaján – avagy: ki nevet a végén? (The Ancient Malice of Durban – or: Who will Laugh Last?). Vasárnapi újság, September 2, 2001. and Sok mindennek vége. (So Many Things are Over) by István Lovas, Vasárnapi újság, September 9, 2001.

*Israel of) ... apartheid, colonialism and genocide ... What could cause greater physical or mental harm than keeping a people – the Palestinians – behind electric fences and barbed wire, depriving them of their statehood, their right to vote, in fact, even their right to move...”*

A “genuine” Israeli view<sup>3</sup>

*Question: “UN Secretary General Kofi Annan said at the Durban Conference Against Racism that the Holocaust cannot serve as eternal justification for the oppression of the Palestinians. A few days later, Israel quit the conference, condemning it as anti-Semitic.”*

*Answer: “Using the term anti-Semitic is ... an ideological tool nowadays, it means that if somebody does not agree with our ideas on how to organize society, he/she is anti-Semitic. This has nothing to do with historical anti-Semitism – which has effectively ceased to exist, it’s a simple political propaganda tool...”*

*Question: “Do you think there is any rational interest behind the United States supporting Israel with military equipment and huge amounts of money?”*

*Answer: “In the United States, the organized Jewish community is a leading force, holding major positions in the banking sector, the media, and the entertainment industry. This entertainment industry is also their main propaganda institution ... There is almost no day that passes without the New York Times or the Washington Post devoting an article to Israel or the Holocaust, in order to maintain the awareness of the Jews as the chosen people. Since they are in possession of the necessary financial power, they are also able to support Israel...”*

*Question: “Another usual argument in favor of Israel is the one saying that all states have the right to fight terrorism using all possible means, and that even the most severe oppression does not give the Palestinians the right to carry out bombing attacks against civilians.”*

*Answer: “As you know, when the Nazis occupied Russia, the Russian partisans could not choose their methods, but carried out innumerable attacks, including railway explosions against the occupiers. I don’t think any nation will tolerate occupation or attempts at destroying their people or expelling them from their land. Self-defense is a basic right. Then again, what can be termed as terrorism is also a big question. It is well known, for example, that the Israeli*

---

<sup>3</sup> Izrael Shamir Budapest. Molnár Balázs interjúja Izrael Shamir orosz-izraeli íróval (I.Shamir in Budapest. Interview with Russian-Israeli writer I.Shamir by B.Molnár). Vasárnapi újság, September 9, 2001.

*secret service has greatly infiltrated the Palestinian organization Hamas; they are aware of every move of almost every leader, which is why they have been able to liquidate so many of them. Therefore, it is often impossible to tell the difference between real terrorist attacks and Israeli provocations, since (the Israeli secret services) announce the suppression of a plot almost every day ...”*

On a statement by the US Ambassador<sup>4</sup>

*István Lovas’ argumentation: “Although the question was repeated three times, the press attaché of the US Ambassador would not reveal to journalists what specific anti-Semitic statements the Ambassador meant and who made them. Which ... undermines our belief that the Ambassador representing the United States respects the value of straightforwardness – so well respected in America – in Hungary as well. It also reflects a kind of cowardice and maliciousness. Her counterparts, including the Canadian, Swiss, Italian, and Austrian Ambassadors to Hungary, would never, under any circumstances, interfere in the internal affairs of a supposedly sovereign country, just as Géza Jeszenszky (Hungary’s Ambassador to the United States) would never criticize Washington for the sad and terrible reality of America’s black ghettos based on racial discrimination and poverty. Thus, if Nancy Goodman Brinker interferes in Hungary’s internal affairs, at least she should not conceal it in a mist that obscures everything...”*

— MAGYAR DEMOKRATA —

Concerted attack on Jesus<sup>5</sup>

*On the cover of the April 14 issue of the weekly Heti Világgazdaság, “half of the face from the well-known Shroud of Turin is fitted together with half of a face reconstructed from the skull of a Jewish man from the first century. The result is horrifying and revolting ... the message of the picture is unmistakable: there’s no way of knowing what Jesus looked like, whether he was longhaired or short-haired. Nothing is certain about him, you cannot even be sure whether he lived at all, and if he did, the most we can assume is that he was a curly-haired Jew with a trimmed beard and thick lips.”*

---

<sup>4</sup> Lovas István írása (Article by I. Lovas). Vasárnapi újság, December 16, 2001.

<sup>5</sup> Bencsik, András: Támadás Jézus ellen. (Attack on Jesus). Magyar Demokrata, April 19, 2001.

*“This is too much ... in fact, it is intolerable. It is impossible to know what the editors who threw this in the face of Christianity must have meant. Perhaps they just wanted to have some fun, have a good laugh behind the backs of those stupid people, the way they managed to make fools of us again and assume we would not even notice anything. It is impossible to know from where Mr. Friderikusz takes the liberty to contest the moral foundations of an entire civilization...”* But *“...those making fun of the most sacred of universal human values are playing with fire. They are forgetting that history has hit back with terrible force not once, but several times, and will hit back again. To every action there is a reaction. Aren't they afraid?”*

#### The characteristics of the Jews<sup>6</sup>

*“In Jewish communities over the centuries, the brightest Yeshiva-Talmud student has traditionally married the richest girl. This is how the combination of intellectual skills (cleverness) and creativity (wealthiness, money-making) has been refined. As much as 35% of all Nobel-prize winners are Jews ... In addition to creativity and intellectual skills, the winning, successful type refined for the Diaspora has also passed on certain severely anti-social traits such as high-strung quarrelsomeness, aggressiveness, a wish to show off and a general resistance to socialization. This type, which was refined to sustain his people for the future until the end of time by serving his religion with infinite devotion, increasing his wealth and turning inwards, towards his God-fearing community, successfully performed this task in the Diaspora. When Mendelssohn secularized, or Germanized the Jews, releasing them from the ghettos into Europe, he removed them from the community where they were useful to themselves and harmless to others. The Israelis ... caution against this type.”*

*“These ‘purebred’ Jews refined for the Diaspora do not receive support there, they are almost castrated through isolation and left to their own resources. As many as 90% of the Hungarian Jews who emigrated there in recent years have returned from Israel.”*

*“These Jews are used for experiments like rats in the dissecting room. There has been an extensive series of experiments in Hungary recently, by which they have tried to work out scientifically how the Jews could be forced to live in one*

---

<sup>6</sup> Gábor Ács: Izraeli fajtavédelem, zsidó és magyar fajtaközösség. (Israeli Race-protection, Jewish and Hungarian Race-community). Magyar Demokrata, July 7, 2001.

*block and then prompted to emigrate. They want to use the resulting experience in America, in order to cause the Jews who have mixed with the local German and Anglo-Saxon-Celtic types to emigrate (these Western types are more sober-minded than the Hungarians) ... In America's big cities, the majority of the population are blacks, and surveys show that the Jews are also concentrated in cities. In New York, for example, the population includes a Jewish community of two million people. They are planning to use the blacks and other colored people to force the Jews to emigrate to Israel ... Of course, the anti-Semitism stirred up and aroused across America could easily become dangerous, even dragging the world's entire Jewish community into extreme peril."*

Double standard in common talk<sup>7</sup>

There is a double standard ruling the common talk in Hungary: "some people are allowed to make fun of the Jews, while others will be persecuted for it. In theory, anyone is allowed to make fun of the Hungarians, but it only happens from one side."

*"Let us stop forever blackmailing each other with the stigma of anti-Semitism or treason. It might be too late now, as so many wounds have been inflicted on both sides. We believe it was they who started it when, after the change of system, they (wrongly) imagined that anti-Semitism was behind every national idea, goal and thought. Everyone should show a little more moderation ... Both the Jews and the Hungarians suffered severe calamities in the twentieth century. Both should tolerate each other's sensibilities to a certain extent instead of always trying to determine whose grievances are the worst. The uniqueness and the horror of the Holocaust is not a convincing argument in Hungary after our own twentieth-century history; after Trianon, the Hungarian Soviet Republic, the Paris Peace Treaty ..."*

*"Even the terrorist attack on the US and the war on terrorism cannot suppress the hatred of those keeping alive the accusation of anti-Semitism in Hungary. Every day these spiritual terrorists repeat in the left-wing-liberal media – (which is supported from abroad or owned by foreign investors, and which offers publicity to the insulters) – that anti-Semitism, exclusion and racism are raging in Hungary."<sup>8</sup>*

---

<sup>7</sup> Zsolt Ungváry: Más-más mérce. (Different Standards). Magyar Demokrata, August 23, 2001.

<sup>8</sup> B. K.: Hegedűs Lóránt vétke. (The Offence of L. Hegedűs). Magyar Demokrata, October 18, 2001.

Exchange of letters on MIÉP's anti-Semitism<sup>9</sup>

*"I was also shocked by the sharp words of the MIÉP vice president, which evoked associations to repugnant historical concepts, but I was even more upset and frightened by the subhuman hatred reflected by the reactions (to the statements)... It is easy to guess the origin of the new American Ambassador, Nancy Goodman Brinker, when it was unambiguously revealed by The Washington Post that, before leaving, she bid farewell to her friends, including her rabbi. Thus, she is concerned by the issue, and, as we have seen, biased as well, although without mentioning any names, she was unmistakably reacting to the statements of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. when she said – without any foundation whatsoever and with impetuosity unworthy of a diplomat – that she experienced intolerable anti-Semitism in Hungary. Thus, she took part in the revenge campaign, the counter-attack, but not by striking back at the attacker, but at those who are innocent in the matter, the Nation, since she experienced anti-Semitism in general. The method is weirdly the same."*

*"The shameful ones, the hostile haters, are detrimental because they are constantly trying to desecrate the beautiful process of the nation's becoming conscious of itself with their filthy delirium, unfounded frightening, malicious mud-slinging. It is difficult to defend ourselves against them because it is impossible to call them by their name. First of all because, although they hide behind the mask of the 'Jew,' this is not necessarily their typical identity: they are either Jews, or they aren't. What is common to them is their cold, calculating meanness. That calculated hatred ... So who are these enemies of ours? Ádám Éliás is right. Let us not follow their logic; let us not try to identify them on racial grounds. Let us just use a word that perfectly expresses their essence: rogues..."*

Criticizing the US Ambassador<sup>10</sup>

*"I really do not like it when the US Ambassador, who looks like a Hollywood film star, who's not a diplomat, but a businesswoman, when speaking to members of the Harvard Club at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, says that, since she arrived here two months ago, she has heard racist and anti-Semitic*

<sup>9</sup> Ádám Éliás: Egy galíciai jöttment vallomása. (Confession of a Galician Vagabond). Magyar Demokrata, December 20, 2001. András Bencsik: Válasz Éliás Ádámnak. (Reply to Á. Éliás). Magyar Demokrata, December 20, 2001.

<sup>10</sup> Ágnes Seszták: Az egyedülállóan rasszista Magyarország (Uniquely Racist Hungary). Magyar Demokrata, November 29, 2001.

*statements from within certain circles of the local political elite never heard before anywhere else in the world ... I wonder where Ms. Brinker might have heard anti-Semitic and racist statements from the political elite? Is she perhaps meeting MSZP deputies? One survey prepared in the nineties showed that they are the most anti-Semitic party."*

*"Apparently Ambassador Brinker rarely meets Israeli investors, and rarely ever those who gladly live in the residential parks because Hungary is inexpensive and beautiful and its people are extremely friendly to foreigners."*

*"In America, the Ku Klux Klan still exists in the Southern states, the term 'liberal' is still used as an insult, and Southern radio stations still cannot play certain songs because of racist letters and death threats from the public ...there, racism and intolerance are still thriving. But – as far as I know – even Mrs. Clinton made some rude remarks to the Jews of New York, which she very soon came to regret after they enlightened her about political correctness. So Ms. Brinker had better take a look around America before saying she has experienced racism and anti-Semitism in Hungary never seen before 'anywhere else in the world'."*

— MAGYAR FÓRUM —

The weekly Magyar Fórum (and its monthly edition Havi Magyar Fórum) published almost 90 articles dealing with Jewish topics in 2001. Of these, I only selected a few, in order to demonstrate their logic, according to which all the phenomena of the world can be strung on one and the same thread – Jewish world domination, and the deprivation of Hungarians of their national identity, which serves as an exclusive framework for interpreting the developments of Hungary's domestic politics and economic and social processes.

Rejecting the punishability of the denial of the Holocaust, denying the Holocaust<sup>11</sup>

The news item that the article in question was responding to is as follows: *"Socialist MPs have proposed that Parliament request that the government review the possibility of regulating the punishability of the denial of the*

<sup>11</sup> József Király: Holokausztállítás, holokauszttagadás. (Affirming the Holocaust, Denying the Holocaust). Havi Magyar Fórum, September 2001.

*Holocaust... MSZP deputies Magda Kósa Kovács, Zoltán Szabó and Tamás Suchman said in their proposal that the denial of the Holocaust is a current phenomenon."*

At the beginning of the article, the writer points out that "we would by no means like to depreciate the responsibility of the Nazis, and the SS in particular, in the fate of the Jews during World War II or belittle the immense suffering of this people." Then he goes on to depreciate and belittle. "What kind of Holocaust is it whose truth needs to be proven and protected by the power of the law? Aren't the arguments convincing enough?" ... "We cannot accept ... the argument of those submitting the bill saying that the denial of the Holocaust must be punished by law because of the possibility of the revival of such monstrous ideas." The justification of this statement is as follows: "First of all, many of those denying the Holocaust have always dissociated themselves from national socialism." "Secondly, if we follow this logic, we should also ban the affirmation of the Holocaust since those who believe in dispossessing and murdering the Palestinians and making their existence impossible (monstrous idea!) generally affirm the Holocaust."...

"There is no other historical event in the world for which we have such inconsistent data as that of the Holocaust." The different accounts of the number of victims make one unsure from the outset (quotations from "official statements, all publishing different figures"). At the end of the enumeration, the author asks the following question: "Can it be qualified as denying the Holocaust to say that most of the Auschwitz victims died of diseases and not because they were killed in the gas chambers?"

The soap-theory is not true: "Can it be qualified as denying the Holocaust to say that the Nazis did not make soap from the fat of the Jews?" Because "... the Yad Vashem Holocaust Memorial Center in Israel has said that the soap story is not true".

There was no plan by Hitler to systematically exterminate the Jews: "Although more than – literally – 400 tons of documents, personal notes by Nazi leaders, secret diaries, etc. were examined after the war, no piece of writing relating to a plan, order or program to exterminate the Jews was found."

The author quotes from studies contesting the existence of the gas chambers as a whole or in certain details (for example, no feeding holes were found). The credibility of the statements regarding the gas chambers is questionable: "They often cite the statement made by the former Auschwitz commandant, Rudolph Höss as a confession of the culprits." This, however, was made after "...Höss

*was tortured and beaten nearly to death". "...The figures admitted by Höss – 2.5m people were killed and 1.5m died of diseases under his command between 1941 and 1943 – are not taken seriously by any historian today."*

Why is the denial of the Holocaust sanctioned in the world? Financial restitution, on the one hand: *"Any restitution is based on the number of victims. If it is credibly proven that the number of victims is only a fragment of the originally accepted figure, and if the victims did not die in the way we believe today, any further claims to financial restitution will collapse."* Moral restitution, on the other hand: *"The peoples of Europe are now burdened with a collective pan-European sense of guilt."*

This is how the Holocaust religion can be substituted for Christianity: *"This religion already has all the necessary attributes (dogma, sanctuary, articles of faith, pontiffs)." "Knowing the representatives of the Holocaust religion and seeing the current trends, it seems logical that they have already marked out the place of Christianity in the new world order. Its existence will be on the periphery, for the sole purpose of preaching a sense of guilt to the non-Jewish masses."*

#### How and why the Jews are invading Hungary?<sup>12</sup>

The problem: *"The costs of sustaining Israel have begun to exceed a reasonable and historically justifiable and tolerable amount."* Even though: *"There is nothing threatening the existence of Israel. From the military point of view, the country could totally defeat each of its neighbors both one by one and simultaneously. It can launch military offensives at will; it can kill and take revenge. It can starve Iraq, which puts up the fiercest resistance against it, to surrender; it can weaken them in order to keep them under control. It can exclude their oil from the world market. The anti-Semite oil is excluded from the free movement of ideas and goods. And it can still declare Iraq, destroyed to the very last, as dangerous."* Thus: *"Israel's leaders, who are the best-informed people in the world, know very well that it is impossible to sustain their country in its current state and quality even in the medium term, and particularly in this state of perpetual endangerment and constant fighting because of its historical impossibilities. The high costs will consume it sooner or later."*

---

<sup>12</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel. (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 26, 2001. and August 2, 2001.

It is a warning that the USA could cease to be a supporter at any time: *“In the last elections, Israel did not succeed in helping the Democrats, who usually provide them with greater security and more attentive service, return to power. In twenty-five to thirty years’ time, colored people will reach a majority in the USA. They will elect the government. A government they vote into power could make a different decision (regarding Israel).”*

Hungary’s key role in Israeli politics: *“Why do the institutions leading the Jewish community of the world and Israel itself need dismembered Hungary as an area. Why do we dare to call the Hungarian business partners of the plaza-builders vanguards? Why do we believe that the financial centers controlling the world and the Jewish community have a large-scale strategic goal of supporting the construction of plazas and residential parks in Hungary and why are they offensively spreading Jewish and Israeli mass culture here? What do they employ vanguards for and why do they want Hungarian land? The answer is simple: because of the high costs of sustaining Israel.”*

Because *“Mankind is facing the question of whether, instead of the nature-exploiting system of globalization, it should universally switch over to the non-profiterring system of sustainable development or else die. If, however, it does switch over, if rationality and the instinct for life prevail, there won’t be anyone left to cover the costs of the symbolic state of globalization. Then they will need a new, cheaper place. This is how the people of Dismembered Hungary become involved in the picture.”*

*“What makes Dismembered Hungary suitable for this role? It is exactly its dismembered nature. In 1920, its people underwent a dismemberment, which nearly cost them their lives. With Trianon, the Hungarian nation lost its historical right to its fatherland, the same right that justified the foundation of Israel. The Hungarians still do not have their historical rights, and they are slowly losing even their rights to their remaining country: they cannot be nationalists, not even out of self-defense.”*

*“The other reason why the choice fell on the former Kádár–Aczél country, or, otherwise, the leading country of the emerging states of Central and Eastern Europe, is the existence of the base.” “Even during the Antall government”... the annual report of the US State Department “...could only establish that ‘the Jews are well represented in the cultural, political and economic sectors’.”*

In order to invade Hungary *“Even the thought of any historical rights must be eradicated from the Hungarians. Greater Hungary? Holy Crown? Readjustment of frontiers? A shout down with Europe, a slap in the face and*

*punishment for everyone who dares to suggest something like this. Because the premises can only be Dismembered Hungary, with the cowardly, timid Hungarian semi-proletariat with no self-respect, tottering in the plazas and forever waiting for charity. Even a small addition to the country's territory would give an enormous boost to the self-esteem of the Hungarians, giving them a real sense of achievement. That would mean happiness and baby-making. And an increase in the population."*

But the invasion will probably not take place as openly as in Palestine: *"After all, this is a 1000-year-old European country, where, even in fifty years' time, there will still be six to seven million poor Hungarians left, who will always remind Europe by tooth and nail that this used to be the land of the Huns. The silence and patience regarding Hungary's current morbid status quo- will only last until the poor devils realize what has been happening to them. In order to prevent such a Hungarian defensive uprising, they are probably not planning more than a country and a society that is Hungarian in name only, but mixed regarding its leadership and domination as well as its culture, which is characterized by a 'religious-genealogical' duality. The differences in property and income are already striking. If the country keeps its status quo, these differences will automatically increase. However, decisions on livelihood, social mobility, and education will be made by the bankers and plaza-owners, who have long been living here or more recently arrived, namely the homogeneous or mixed half- Russian Jews."*

This is not anti-Semitism!<sup>13</sup>

*"It is in order to culturally maim the national middle class, they need to maintain the sense of guilt, to hold Holocaust Memorial Days, and substitute a collective sense of guilt over the Holocaust for the shared Christian consciousness and experiences. In Budapest, the Ministry of Education has published a brochure of methodological guidelines, introduced by the education minister, on the organization and contents of the school Holocaust Memorial Day scheduled for April 17... This booklet aims at making children feel guilty and at maiming their Christian and national feelings because of the Holocaust committed a long time ago, and carried out by their grandfathers and great-grandfathers. At the same time, it keeps quiet about the entire global process, concealing, denying,*

<sup>13</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel. (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, March 1, 2001. and István Csurka: Magyar szemmel. (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, April 12, 2001.

*and covering over with lies the war; the wrestling and blood sacrifice of the people, and misrepresenting the social processes which led to this bloody series of events ... In order to raise a sense of guilt over the Jews today, they must deny the fact that the leaders of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, who introduced the Leninist class terror in Hungary, were all Jews with just one exception."*

#### Helping the MSZP into power<sup>14</sup>

*"The MSZP is the only favorite (political party) of the Israeli political leadership in Hungary. Advantageous investments require heavy political support. Israel is interested in the Socialists' getting into power, providing a lot of cheap land for plazas and residential parks and letting Hungarian culture dissolve. Let them make room for those crossing the Verecke pass again or arriving at Ferihegy airport without any passport control in countless numbers. They don't want any parties or forces not providing them with special preferences in government. Therefore, the forces that can be expected to give fair and equal treatment to everyone must be put aside as extremists. Or as forces fraternizing with extremists. Even fraternizing counts as anti-Semitism."*

#### Why did Medgyessy become MSZP's Prime Minister-designate?<sup>15</sup>

*"Medgyessy is needed by the Israeli capitalists, who already have a major influence in Hungary, by the circles of globalization most interested in Hungary, or rather, they need him to be able to enforce their will in some way."*

*"This Investor Holding Rt. is an interesting company, but the two owners are even more interesting. One is Medgyessy, and the other is János Fekete. The famous old man with two passports. The former vice president of the National Bank, who has double – Israeli-Hungarian – citizenship, and who also helped with advice when Medgyessy was head of the Investment Bank. He was also founder of the Hungarian Leumi Bank, which only operated for a few years in Hungary, funded by the Credit Bank, distributing a few billions and then leaving ... The Leumi is the bank of the Mossad and it's back again in the form of Investor Holding Rt. ... It is through this company, through Fekete and his companions, that Israeli commanding will be introduced ... This is a pact to serve Israeli interests. The Socialist Party has suddenly sprung to attention ... EU-expansion might be delayed, or possibly even cancelled, European capital might*

<sup>14</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel. (Through Hungarian Eyes.) Magyar Fórum, September 6, 2001.

<sup>15</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel. (Through Hungarian Eyes.) Magyar Fórum, June 14, 2001.

*come or leave, or move further to the East, whereas Israel has long-term goals. Making room for them cannot be stopped even if the EU-affair does not work out. This is the background of entering Medgyessy as a non-party stallion.”*

On the terrorist attack on New York<sup>16</sup>

*“The story is running on in the commentaries, it does not yet mean anything entirely different from what it was: an apocalypse, although it is getting very close to meaning something entirely different: a new world order. It hasn’t gotten as far as its predecessor; the Holocaust, the denial of which is considered a crime, but it’s already on its way to getting there. Because the story broadcast on the screen, just like the one organized after World War II, is designed to manipulate the international public, to set public thinking in one specific direction, and to slowly but surely censor everything else from it.”*

*“The suggestion made in Durban, which said that Zionism is racism and Israel–America are an oppressive-genocidal regime, amounted to a political Stalingrad for globalism. The poor decided to declare that Zionism is a racist ideology and that Israel and the USA, which supports and sustains it, are a genocidal power. The consciousness industry has recognized the great danger: a view realizing the true nature of the Middle East policy of the USA and Israel has begun spreading in its most important intellectual breeding ground, Europe. This disobedience could wrench the rolls of banknotes from the hand offering them to Israel ... it was impossible to keep quiet about what’s been happening in Palestine. Not just about the fact that every day they are killing innocent people, children, Palestinians, who are natives there, but also about the fact that the world is not angry enough with the suicide bombers who end their lives in cafés and bus-stops in order to take many of their enemies with them into death... After a suicide attack, often committed by youngsters, it was impossible until now to inflict collective punishment on the people of the suicide bomber. Now it is possible. They will begin with the Afghans, but will not finish there.”*

On a statement by the Hungarian President<sup>17</sup>

*On the Memorial Day for the Victims of Communism, “...the discordant note ruining the dignity and credibility of the commemoration ... came from the per-*

<sup>16</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel. (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, September 20, 2001.

<sup>17</sup> István Gazdag: Emléknapi disszonancia. (Memorial Day Discordance). Magyar Fórum, March 8, 2001.

*son holding the country's highest public office, from the President himself... The main message of Ferenc Mádl's speech was that 'the genocide committed against the Jews is unprecedented in history' .... This statement in itself sets up an unacceptable and intolerable order of rank among the various genocides, ab ovo allocating a privileged status to the Jewish genocide... What is even more scandalous, however, is the fact that this statement was made on the day dedicated to the victims of Communism, the regime which was designed and put into practice by ... Jews ranking as the 'chief engineers of the revolutions' from Marx, Engels and Trotsky right through to Lenin, Béla Kun and the ringleaders of the Hungarian Soviet Republic to Mátyás Rákosi and the Muscovite leaders of the MDP (the then Communist party of Hungary) ... [Mádl] thereby descended to something that even his predecessor, who otherwise fostered particularly intimate relations with 'the chosen people', would not have risked doing in a given case (and not just for fear of another possible hissing and booing)."*

Hanna Szenes, the traitor<sup>18</sup>

*"Hanna Szenes ... left the country at the age of 18 to live in an Israeli kibbutz, and then volunteered to serve in a secret British military organization called Special Operations Group, set up by Churchill ... Finally, after touching down in Egypt, Italy and Yugoslavia, she was dropped over the river Dráva with her group in 1944 'in order to try to save the Hungarian Jews'. Let me translate this: Hanna Szenes infiltrated into Hungary, a country at war, as part of an armed terrorist group in order to carry out armed operations on the home front against constitutional law and order. Of course, she was caught within a few days, and then tried by court martial and executed in November 1944. She died at the age of 23. Today she is 'hero of Israel' ... In my eyes, she's a simple traitor, who, as a young woman, attacked her fellow Hungarians with a weapon because she was not elected secretary of the school literary and debating society."*

---

<sup>18</sup> Zoltán Szócs: Szabó Zoltán, a szocialista Mikulás. (Z. Szabó, the Socialists' Santa Claus). Magyar Fórum, May 17, 2001.

ÁRON MONORI  
RADIO WITHOUT MUZZLE

---

*(abridged)*

While Pannon Rádió did not introduce anti-Semitic discourse in Hungary's electronic media,<sup>1</sup> it escalated it. It uses unveiled anti-Semitic language alongside euphemistic hints of earlier vintage. In addition to implying certain messages "between the lines," its broadcasters and listeners, who phone in, voice exclusionist views without any encryption. That is part of a trend during recent years in Hungary: hate speech that used to be unpresentable, in fact rejected, has increasingly become part of public speech. Pannon Rádió is not just swimming with the current; it is, in fact, its engine. What it does among Hungarian electronic media corresponds to the function of Magyar Fórum in the printed press.<sup>2</sup>

Jewish themes often came up in programs on Pannon Rádió during 2001. Topics related to the Jewry of Hungary, of other countries (as that of the US), and the State of Israel were almost always mentioned in negative contexts. Many of the commentaries and talk shows were critical of Jewry in general and of Israel, and served as springboards for contributions by listeners who phoned in. Topics that were raised by the moderators and their guests often provoked extremist and oversimplified anti-Semitic opinions that were, as a rule, voiced by the listeners (who ostensibly expressed the *vox populi*). The broadcasters of Pannon Rádió would express thanks for the extremist listener comments; and even sheer nonsense went unchallenged or was even confirmed. Practically all the topics that we know from the Hungarian and international anti-Semitic literature and press publications came up during the programs, ranging from religion-related anti-Judaism to general anti-Semitic stereotypes.

The editors, moderators and invited guests of Pannon Rádió openly propagate exclusionist, anti-Semitic views. What is more, they make it clear to their

---

<sup>1</sup> A regional radio station. Some 25% of the Hungarian population can tune in to it in Budapest and its surroundings.

<sup>2</sup> Both organs have close ties to MIÉP, the Hungarian Party of Life and Justice, and to one another. For more details on that issue, see an analysis by the Centre for Freedom of the Press: "Az érthető frekvencia" (The Understandable Frequency), *Élet és Irodalom*, September 28, 2001, or [www.sajtoszabadsag.hu](http://www.sajtoszabadsag.hu).

listeners: in that forum their example can be followed by everyone, by every listener; in fact, the editors expect their listeners to follow suit. Whoever strikes that note can become a member of the “Pannon family”.<sup>3</sup> Several methods are used to set the right tone. These include commentaries read aloud by the editors, and talk shows with invited guests, in which dialogues with listeners are steered. The broadcasters make it clear that in that forum things may be openly declared that are taboo elsewhere. (This is how Feró Nagy<sup>4</sup> explained it: “*Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Voice of Free Hungary, where you may freely talk about everything you only dared to think about or you did not even dare to think about.*”<sup>5</sup>) Encouraged by such editorial introductions, listeners freely voice their most extremist opinions, theories and biases. The result is a new quality both in content and language. Code words are increasingly supplanted by undisguised hate speech. Here is a collection of editorial introductions that are meant to invite the desired listener response.

Commentary by Tibor Franka

*“A country is celebrating, this time over the dead bodies of hundreds of Palestinians. The country is Israel, marking its 53rd birthday. ... How controversial is the history of a country where a holiday is observed by committing murders. The last time Jewish soldiers shot and killed a Palestinian was yesterday. It happened along the border of the Gaza Strip and Israel. Responding to that incident Arafat declared he condemned all forms of violence against innocent people, Palestinian or Israeli. Ayatollah Khamenei however has said Israel inflated the number of the victims of the Holocaust to justify its brutal treatment of the Palestinians. The Iranian leader is of the opinion that the problem can only be solved by the destruction of Israel.”<sup>6</sup>*

Tibor Franka's interview with Péter Szabó Szentmihályi

*Tibor Franka: “Nearly 700 people have been killed in Palestine, including over 500 Palestinians. The Jews have killed many Palestinian infants alongside their mothers. The Fotex Company has bought the football club Ferencváros, and*

---

<sup>3</sup> That is how the editors and listeners often refer to their virtual community.

<sup>4</sup> Feró Nagy left Pannon Rádió in autumn 2001.

<sup>5</sup> Pannon Rádió, 9.09 p.m., July 24, 2001.

<sup>6</sup> Pannon Rádió, 6.08 a.m., April 26, 2001.

*MIÉP has issued a statement about that move. Today's newspapers say László Bognár, vice-president of MIÉP [who made that statement], may be sued for incitement because he used the word 'Jewish.'... Here is a third development: there is a controversy over Hungarian farmers secretly selling their land to foreigners. And the fourth one: demonstrations are underway in Genoa. How would you comment on all that?"*

*Péter Szabó Szentmihályi: "No doubt, there is an interconnection between those things, even if indirect. They are part of globalization. ... Power centers and capital are standing behind what is happening to us, Hungarians, and the Palestinians ... I am no advocate of any grand conspiracy theory, yet in my view a group of bankers, who are keeping out of sight, is still pulling the strings ... throughout the world things are mercilessly ruled by money... in addition, in more and more countries elements unconnected to any nations have assumed power..."*

### Types of anti-Semitic content that feature in the programs

The broadcasters and listeners of Pannon Rádió have taken to the habit of competing to voice almost all types of theories and stereotypes that are known only too well from anti-Semitic literature. See a list of them below. I strove to arrange the quotations according to categories, which was far from easy since the same statement often includes anti-Semitic content of several types.

#### Traditional Christian anti-Judaism

Listener: *"You, Jews, are human beings, but the goys are not. It is not forbidden to steal unless from Christians? Fornication with a non-Jewish woman is not a sin. An oath made to a non-Jew – who is not a human being – is not binding. A booklet that I am holding in my hand says those quotations are from the Talmud."* (Actually, none of those statements can be found in the Talmud. They are well-known anti-Semitic fabrications<sup>7</sup> yet the moderator never cared to refute them or even confirm their validity.)

---

<sup>7</sup> It has been a long-standing anti-Semitic practice (often followed by Pannon Rádió) to present as Talmudic passages, ridiculous statements that ostensibly illustrate Jewish immorality. All those references are fabrications, and they depend on secondary sources. One of the books most often referred to is *Der Talmudjude* by August Rohling. First published in Münster in 1871, it gained wide currency in Hungary. In addition, Hungarian anti-Semites often quote from *A Talmud magyarul 15 füzetben* (Talmud in Hungary in 15 brochures) by Alfonz Luzsénszky, Budapest, 1919.

Zoltán Sipos: *"I regret to tell you that I have read that chapter. Perhaps, many of our listeners have not."*<sup>8</sup>

Listener: *"May I read a few sentences from the Talmud?"*

Tibor Franka: *"You may, but be brief because we have a full agenda and I have to leave at 12."*

Listener: *"This is what they think of the goys. When a Christian comes to the house of a Jew, this is what the Jew quietly says: 'May he be damned ... may his body wither, his tongue rot and his soul be torn off.' This is a prayer of theirs: ... 'bring devastating wars onto the Christians, cover them with clouds for six months, punish them with festers and plague, throw their heads to the ground in anger and bring salvation to your beloved.'"*

Tibor Franka: *"Although this is undoubtedly part of the Talmud, there are quite a few people in this country who think otherwise."*

Listener: *"... They committed the first genocide. During the reign of King Xerxes a mass murder occurred at the request of Esther, who was Jewish. They have been marking that occasion as a festival of joy down to this day."*<sup>9</sup>

Listener: *"Being a Christian, I totally disagree with the decision of the Council [Second Vatican Council] to acquit the people of Israel of murdering God. Such a deed can never be forgiven. ... No priest of sober mind could ever say so."*

Tibor Franka: *"But after all, that is what the Council declared."*

Listener: *"They will be branded with His blood to eternity. ... Certain things do not lapse. Just as they keep referring to the Holocaust, we should not let that be forgotten."*

Tibor Franka: *"That may have been one of the motivations behind the decision of Pope John Paul II."*<sup>10</sup>

Listener: *"That is probably the case."*<sup>11</sup>

Myth about a worldwide conspiracy as directed by Jewish Freemasonry

Péter Töke: *"... just like elsewhere, a power elite pulls the strings there [in the US]. [János Drábik] has named 13 such powerful families. Everyone knows the Rothschilds, Rockefellers and Astors of England. ... Strange as it may sound,*

<sup>8</sup> Pannon Rádió, 11.44 p.m., July 27, 2001.

<sup>9</sup> Pannon Rádió, 10.27 p.m., November 5, 2001.

<sup>10</sup> A few minutes before, Tibor Franka said Pope John Paul II declined to meet with Israeli Foreign Minister, Shimon Peres.

<sup>11</sup> Pannon Rádió, 4.42 p.m., December 13, 2001.

*... as early as the 1970s a secret society of Freemasons was formed in Hungary, who were then represented in the inner circles of the ruling Communist Party. ... Later on they chose sons and daughters of high-ranking party officials to be sent to universities in the UK and the US to acquire proper training. As early as that they knew that within ten years, Communism would be replaced by a multi-party system. In fact, they knew what kind of parties they should form later on to gain controlling influence over the fate of the country. ... Those youngsters then returned to Hungary with degrees from Oxford, Yale and Georgetown. Needless to say, that particular organization has about half a million members around the world ... leading capitalists and high-ranking politicians. ... One of them was György Aczél in Hungary. ... Those people decided who had the greatest chance of becoming Hungary's first Prime Minister. Ever since 1975, that man received special attention and training ... his career was secured."*

János Drábik: *"...what we are talking about is a power center that is hiding behind the scenes. Talk of that power center is branded as raving, yet it does exist..."*<sup>12</sup>

Listener: *"Jewish Zionist imperialism intends to build the new Zion in Hungary. It is meant to become the western bastion of its world hegemony. Communism was mere dabbling with that scheme. What the Jews are building at breakneck speed is a future for themselves and a burial vault for Hungarians.' The quotation is from Dezső Szabó, who wrote it on 5 May 1921, over 80 years ago. I think ... it is still valid."*

Listener: *"There is a mighty power center in hiding, which dominates world affairs."*

Zoltán Sipos: *"I find your logic correct."*<sup>13</sup>

#### Jewish robber capital and plutocracy

Listener: *"...the building that used to house the Hungarian Stock Exchange ... is now up for sale. ... No decision has been made whom to sell it to, but I have a hunch that it will be to some Israeli investor. If that were the case, the heart of Budapest would be stolen..."*

---

<sup>12</sup> Pannon Rádió, 2.43 p.m., December 21, 2001.

<sup>13</sup> Pannon Rádió, 11.45 p.m., July 27, 2001.

Tibor Franka: *“Thank you for speaking your mind.”*<sup>14</sup>

Listener: *“Since 1989 in 95% of the cases where money was misappropriated, the culprits have been Jews.”*

Tibor Franka: *“I have no information on that. I cannot reject or confirm that statement ... it is apparently the way you see it.”*

Listener: *“This not just my opinion, it is a fact. Just look at the names and you can be certain of their origin. ... If Hungary is in a crisis, they have caused it.”*<sup>15</sup>

#### Jewish control over the media

Béla Györi: *“At Mr. Soros’ order<sup>16</sup> the government of Prime Minister József Antall instructed Csaba Gombár to have me dismissed [from the state-owned Radio Budapest], and so it happened.”*<sup>17</sup>

Feró Nagy: *“I am not allowed to ask Mr. Bronfman<sup>18</sup> to instruct RTL Klub [television station] to air a play by István Csurka instead of Heti Hetes [humorous talk show that pokes fun at high-ranking officials]. ... Even if there is a follower of MIÉP on the staff at RTL Klub, he is carefully concealing his political conviction.”*<sup>19</sup>

#### Judeo-Bolshevism

Listener: *“Many of you have probably read the book I am holding in my hand: Zsidó terror Magyarországon (Jewish Terror in Hungary) ... It tells about horrendous murders, robbery, racketeering and lies. This book is a nightmare, and it must have been a nightmare for the victims of those deeds. That same hatemongering, robbery and parasitism is still going on. Why are we supposed to apologize, I do not understand? Have they every apologized for what they did to us in 1919? ... How dare they insult us day by day asking for our apology”?*<sup>20</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Pannon Rádió, 10.57 p.m., July 26, 2001.

<sup>15</sup> Pannon Rádió, 4.08 p.m., November 29, 2001.

<sup>16</sup> In Hungarian anti-Semitic publications George Soros is the archetypal Jewish plutocrat.

<sup>17</sup> Pannon Rádió, 8.48 p.m., July 23, 2001.

<sup>18</sup> Edgar Bronfman is president of the World Jewish Congress.

<sup>19</sup> Pannon Rádió, 4.23 p.m., July 24, 2001.

<sup>20</sup> Pannon Rádió, 11.28 p.m., April 24, 2001.

### Hungary's occupation and dominance

Listener: “[the industrial plants] are without exception owned by Westerners, chiefly Israelis. ... The Jews emigrated [from the former Soviet Union] to Israel via Hungary. Now that they are unhappy there, they are dreaming of resettling in Hungary. Sooner or later Hungary is bound to become a second homeland for Israelites...”<sup>21</sup>

Listener: “Do you remember how the Osman Turks took the Castle of Buda? ... The same trick is repeated these days: they enter Hungary in increasing numbers, and there will come a day when they will own everything here and we will become their slaves. ... Hungary is surely their best direction for escape. ... They have no inhibitions whatsoever. ... What we must do is to strike them and obstruct their deals wherever we can.”<sup>22</sup>

Listener: “...they have to leave the territory that was cultivated for them 50 years ago because they do not have enough water. In fact, water has become a strategic issue. Hungary is so rich in water, you drill a well anywhere, and you find medicinal or mineral water. ... Hungarian territory is what they would like to get but they do not even know how to bore a well. They could not get along without our assistance. They need us so that they could exploit us. Were they forced to live in isolation, they would starve...”

Zoltán Sipos: “Thank you for your valuable comment.”<sup>23</sup>

Listener: “...anti-Semitism has never struck roots in Hungary, how else could hundreds of thousands of them live here ... they have never confessed how many of them lived here ... what they seek is hegemony over Hungarians by a reliance on their money ... the only sinful nation in this country [the Hungarian nation] has the duty to shut up and work for them ... that is more than one can bear. A certain minority keeps ten million people under its control; that is outrageous!”<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Pannon Rádió, 11.39 p.m., July 27, 2001.

<sup>22</sup> Pannon Rádió, 8.52 a.m., July 26, 2001.

<sup>23</sup> Pannon Rádió, 11.25 p.m., July 27, 2001.

<sup>24</sup> Pannon Rádió, 11.24 p.m., July 27, 2001.

Jews are unable to integrate into the Hungarian nation

Listener: “... *in the final analysis all important decisions in this country are made by a hundred thousand or perhaps five hundred thousand Jews...*”<sup>25</sup>

Listener: “*I will not stand for Jews calling me an anti-Semite, a nationalist, an irredentist or racist. ... I will not stand for being branded in my own country by aliens.*”<sup>26</sup>

Anti-Zionism<sup>27</sup> and animosity to Israel

Listener: “*One can learn a lot [from Chrudinák] ... he has at last explained to me that ... even the Great Powers are directed by the Zionists ... What I really hate about globalization is ... that it is also under the control of the Zionists. ... For them globalization is a tool to achieve what Hitler could not: hegemony over the world. ... If they accomplish their aim, nations will disappear and the majority of the people will become slaves.*”<sup>28</sup>

Listener: “*...the final resolution apparently has been rewritten in Durban. ... Once again it shows that the Zionists can get the upper hand over the rest of the world. That is scandalous. We have to defend ourselves really strongly because they want to do the same here.*”<sup>29</sup>

## Focal points

Domestic and international events during 2001 often lent themselves to the broadcasters of Pannon Rádió to speak about the “harmful” activities of Jews at home and abroad. Given the note struck by the moderators, these themes as a rule provoked anti-Semitic comments from listeners. See below the way Pannon Rádió presented some of these “cases”.

<sup>25</sup> Pannon Rádió, 10.36 p.m., July 24, 2001.

<sup>26</sup> Pannon Rádió, 4.26 p.m., July 26, 2001.

<sup>27</sup> The international literature on anti-Semitism defines anti-Zionism as an attempt to sell anti-Semitic attitudes in an ostensibly presentable manner, which became taboo in the wake of the Holocaust. See for instance Helen Fein: “Contemporary Conflicts: How the Jewish Claims and Jewish Nationhood affect Anti-Semitism” In: Helen Fein (ed.): *The Persisting Question. Sociological Perspectives and Social Contexts of Modern Anti-Semitism*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York 1987, pp. 355–743.

<sup>28</sup> Pannon Rádió, 10.27 p.m., September 7, 2001.

<sup>29</sup> Pannon Rádió, 7.22 p.m., September 7, 2001.

### The case of Lóránt Hegedűs

The exclusionist article by Calvinist minister Lóránt Hegedűs, Jr., a vice-president of MIÉP, which was originally published in a local district publication, called *Ébresztő* (Signal to Arise), provoked widespread protests in Hungary.<sup>30</sup> Hegedűs read the aloud article on Pannon Rádió,<sup>31</sup> and Pannon Rádió devoted ample attention to the case. Both its broadcasters and listeners expressed solidarity and agreement with Hegedűs, and the case offered an opportunity for further anti-Semitic comments.

Listener: *“Lóránt Hegedűs, Jr. is absolutely right. There is silence on what his ostensibly exclusionist article is responding to. ... It is outrageous that the independent Constitutional Court has yielded to the pressure of synagogues.”*

Tibor Franka: *“Others brand us as exclusionists. Whom do we exclude and where to?”*

Listener: *“The young Calvinist minister who recommended that they should be excluded before they exclude us wrote his article too late because we have been excluded for a long time already. They are suing him, while the real exclusionists may carry on with their propaganda unhindered.”*

Tibor Franka: *“Do you mean that the majority of the people are excluded? Or at least is that the name of the game? To make the point clearer: the US Ambassador has made a statement in Hungary. That is a well-proven method .... The comrades wrote the abusive article in Hungary, then sent it to friends and coreligionists at French, English and American newspapers, who in turn published it as their own. Then the Hungarian journalist who sent that article abroad in Hungarian would inform Hungarian readers that the Washington Post or some other newspaper has written that we, Hungarians, have done this or that...”*

Listener: *“I am certain that they talked with the American Ambassador ahead of the Hungarian Foreign Minister...”*

Tibor Franka: *“Correct. More and more Hungarian people have realized what is really going on here.”<sup>32</sup>*

---

<sup>30</sup> See Gábor Halmi: Gyűlöletbeszéd és személyiségi jogok (Hate Speech and Individual Rights), *Fundamentum*, no. 4, 2001; Péter Molnár: Uszítás vagy gyalázkodás? (Hatemongering or Abusive Language?). *Fundamentum*, no. 4, 2001.

<sup>31</sup> See Hegedűs' article quoted on pps. 227–228 of this volume.

<sup>32</sup> Pannon Rádió, 11.24 p.m., December 20, 2001.

Listener: *“The reverend has our unrestrained sympathy. To defend Lóránt Hegedűs, Jr.: Telling the truth has always involved risks. Violating Pharisaic interests could incur crucifixion as early as 2000 years ago. Yet Jesus was adamant on that matter. He referred to the scribes and Pharisees, media moguls of the time, as offspring of vipers...”*<sup>33</sup>

#### 11 September

The terrorist attacks on the United States also provoked anti-Semitic comments on Pannon Rádió.

Listener: *“I find it annoying that the authorities claim to be certain about the identity of the perpetrators. I have read the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, which is relevant to current conditions almost word for word. What happened was self-explosion. Note that five thousand Jewish persons were not in the twin towers at the time of the explosion. That is a clear indication of who the culprits were.”*<sup>34</sup>

Listener: *“The Mossad rather than the Arabs were in action on September 11 ... it would have been impossible to carry out that operation so smoothly from a cave.”*

Tibor Franka: *“From a cave that has not even been found. ... Thanks for your call.”*<sup>35</sup>

#### Compensation for harm done to Jews

It will be recalled that the victims of the Holocaust and their heirs only received partial compensation in Hungary following the transition to multi-party democracy.<sup>36</sup> Still, moderators on Pannon Rádió repeatedly had conversations with listeners on how the compensation paid to Jews impoverishes Hungarian society. In fact, Pannon Rádió challenged the legal and moral justification of that compensation altogether. The way in which the moderators confirmed the statements of listeners was tantamount to hatemongering against the Jewish community of Hungary.

---

<sup>33</sup> Pannon Rádió, 10.42 a.m., December 19, 2001.

<sup>34</sup> Pannon Rádió, 4.56 p.m., December 4, 2001.

<sup>35</sup> Pannon Rádió, 4.47 p.m., December 13, 2001.

<sup>36</sup> For a timetable of the compensation of Jews, see A kárpótlás kronológiája (Chronology of Compensation). Népszava, November 29, 2001.

Listener: *“Once again they are asking for compensation on some questionable grounds ... Surely we will get poorer and poorer if we give them everything.”*

Listener: *“Their compensation should be halted or this country will go bankrupt. Ever since the so-called transition, dependants of the survivors had ample chance to steal from the wealth of Hungary. What they want is to take away everything from us and let us, Christians, die because we are unimportant ... I do not ask for their forgiveness because I did not commit any crime ... but I find their claims disgusting...”<sup>37</sup>*

#### The head of Mossad visits Hungary

In December 2001 the head of the Israeli secret service, the Mossad, paid an official visit to Hungary. Pannon Rádió repeatedly commented on the event. The responses included various anti-Semitic and anti-Israeli topics, including the scheme to resettle a large number of Israeli citizens to Hungary and promoting Jewish world hegemony.

Listener: *“Last time you mentioned the visit to Budapest of the commander-in-chief of Mossad.”*

Tibor Franka: *“We tried to find out on what mission he came: to issue instructions, to make requests or to persuade?”*

Listener: *“I wonder if things get tough in Israel, will not many Israelis attempt to emigrate? Do you not think they wish to prepare their resettlement to Hungary?”*

Tibor Franka: *“I do not know ... What I find remarkable is why does the commander of Mossad come to Hungary when there is so much to do at home. Arafat is under house arrest; they want the world to believe that Arafat is opposed to peace while I think it is Arafat, if anyone, who wants peace, unlike Israel, which does not. How is Hungary involved in all that? What is going on here?”*

Listener: *“They want to prepare the ground for their resettlement ... I would not be surprised to see a lot of refugees here from Israel.”*

Tibor Franka: *“First, why exactly in Hungary? Second, why the secrecy?”*

Listener: *“Apparently the general public need not know about it.”*

Tibor Franka: *“...what if a politician would also come from the Palestinians ... to talk about similar issues?”*

---

<sup>37</sup> Pannon Rádió, 4.25 p.m., November 29, 2001.

Listener: *“I do not think anyone would come here from the Palestinians ... they are surrounded and no one is allowed to leave.”*

Tibor Franka: *“Will they be confined to camps that are surrounded with barbed-wire?”*

Listener: *“Is not that the case already? ...”*

Tibor Franka: *“Do you mean that there will be concentration camps in Palestine?”*

Listener: *“A whole people can be confined to a concentration camp. That is what can be deduced from the news.”*

Tibor Franka: *“...what you are implying is an issue that the chief of Mossad should perhaps discuss in America and not in Hungary.”*

Listener: *“Hungary is apparently very attractive in their eyes.”*

Tibor Franka: *“Will Hungary fulfill their desire?”*

Listener: *“They already have half of this country, ranging from chain stores to banks, under their control. That is crystal clear to everyone.”*

Tibor Franka: *“That is amazing! Well I never! You must be joking.”<sup>38</sup>*

István Godina: *“On the topic of Mossad once again ... The Israelis cannot continue to live in the areas that they reconquered with reference to their being the chosen people of the Bible ... In Hungary there is a lot of arable land and sweet water plus peace. They want to turn Hungary into a Jewish country, a second Israel because its climate and other conditions are ideal for them. Hungary could feed the required number of people. I am not of course thinking of the Hungarians. Slowly but steadily they will exterminate us ... we have to face up to the dangers. First, the Jews wish to resettle in Hungary ... and apparently that is already underway. Second, a financial power center pulls the strings. In fact, the two factors are closely related and both punish us. ... Nothing can stop them. Take the case of America: it is still called America, yet the Jews evidently direct it.”<sup>39</sup>*

#### Observing Hanukkah in Hungary

The public celebration of Hanukkah was repeatedly commented upon on Pannon Rádió. Listeners who phoned in expressed indignation on how that could happen in Hungary in 2001. The event lent itself the opportunity for listeners to voice their animosity toward Jews while the moderators actively assisted.

<sup>38</sup> Pannon Rádió, 10.28 p.m., December 20, 2001.

<sup>39</sup> Pannon Rádió, 11.22 p.m., December 21, 2001.

Listener: *"I would like to say a few words on the lighting of the Hanukkah lamps. ... First those lights appeared near the Western Railway Station, ... then in Lujza Blaha Square and then in other parts of Budapest. Today they are also present in front of the Parliament building. The next thing, the Star of David will be put on top of Parliament. ... If we erected a crucifix at the entrance of Dohány Street, they would be really astonished ... I think we should do so."*

Tibor Franka: *"... We could do so because we are in our homeland ... I am also perplexed by their erecting the menorah in front of the Parliament building."*<sup>40</sup>

Listener: *"...Every Hungarian household should have a copy of Henry Ford's seminal work, The International Jew. It is available in Hungarian."*

Tibor Franka: *"It has been translated into Hungarian; I also have a copy."*<sup>41</sup>

Listener: *"I wonder why on earth the head of Mossad has visited Hungary ... and the raising of menorahs is another interesting question. I would not oppose the menorah if it were inside the synagogue, but to erect it in front of the Parliament building, that is provocation."*

Tibor Franka: *"... in what sense do you find it a provocation?"*

Listener: *"It is a provocation through and through. ... That is the ferment of anti-Semitism. They themselves provoke anti-Semitic sentiments."*

Tibor Franka: *"They would not have dared to erect that six-meter-tall menorah in front of the Parliament building, the tallest menorah in Europe (right in front of a memorial plaque commemorating the revolution of 1956), if they had not received permission from [the speaker of Parliament] János Áder and [the mayor of Budapest] Gábor Demszky."*

Listener: *"True."*<sup>42</sup>

## Conclusion

The above quotes are typical of the programs of Pannon Rádió. The content and language of those programs allow us to make the following conclusion: Pannon Rádió airs programs that propagate a worldview that is consistently ethno-centric, nationalistic, xenophobic and, most of all, anti-Semitic. The conclusion is borne out by a survey that has been conducted by the National Radio and Television Board (ORTT). (See the document in the Appendix to this volume.)

<sup>40</sup> Pannon Rádió, 10.28 p.m., December 11, 2001.

<sup>41</sup> Pannon Rádió, 11.48 p.m., December 11, 2001.

<sup>42</sup> Pannon Rádió, 5.01 p.m., December 18, 2001.

MÁRIA VÁSÁRHELYI

## JEW-BASHING ON PUBLIC TELEVISION

---

The following is a shortened version of an analysis<sup>1</sup> of press reviews broadcast every weekday morning just before 8.a.m. under the name Tallózó on the public television channel Magyar Televízió (MTV), in the period between February 15-April 3, 2001. During this six-week period, a total of 28 press reviews were broadcast, reviewing an average of 3-4 articles from foreign newspapers.<sup>2</sup>

This analysis aims to provide a picture of the criteria and the method of selection from foreign newspapers, as well as the topics covered, the way the original articles were interpreted and the topic structure resulting from the selection. In addition to an analysis of the contents of the press reviews, this also required a comparison of the contents with the original articles.<sup>3</sup> By comparing the contents appearing in the press reviews with that of the original articles we were able to create a picture of the method used by the editors in making their selection.

In the examined period, the editors mostly used the quick, easy and convenient method of simply translating the headlines and titles of the given articles as well as the leads (the summaries at the beginning of the articles), and presented this to the public as a press review. This theoretically averted the danger of misinterpreting the articles since the function of the headline and the lead is to allow

---

<sup>1</sup> The analysis was originally ordered by the Monitor group of Nyilvánosság Klub.

<sup>2</sup> The morning press review was repeated in the midday news block of the public television, and it was also available every day on MTV's Képűség (teletext service).

<sup>3</sup> Over the 28 days covered by the analysis, a total of 111 articles were selected from 27 different newspapers. The sample included 16 European (5 British, 3 Swiss, 2 German, 2 French, and 1 Austrian, 1 Swedish, 1 Finnish and 1 Estonian) 4 US, 2 Canadian, 2 Israeli and 1 Singaporean paper. The majority of the newspapers were daily papers. During the 28 days, the most frequently quoted paper was the British Daily Telegraph, with one out of five items presenting an article from this daily newspaper. The second most frequently quoted paper was another British paper, The Guardian. This, however, was only quoted half as many times as its pronouncedly Conservative sister newspaper. The third most often quoted daily paper was The Times, followed by The Independent. This shows that the sampling in the given period was primarily based on various leading papers from the United Kingdom, with Conservative newspapers making up the majority.

the original author to identify the essence of his/her own article. This method, however, does not meet the professional requirements of press reviews.<sup>4</sup>

According to the general consensus established and accepted in the international press, press reviews are aimed at presenting to the public those issues that are viewed as most relevant and that generated the greatest public interest during the given period as published in the international press, including the various political viewpoints expressed by commentators and writers of the leading foreign newspapers on those issues. Therefore, the press review is clearly and definitely not a news genre.

However, the press review offered by the editor of MTV is actually a news block edited with the use of very special and obviously subjective criteria. Most of these "pseudo news items" consist of one or two sentences, and do not reveal either who the people featured in the news are or where, when and what happened to them, and often none of these elements can be found out from the news item, itself. It is almost never explained why that particular event or statement is important or worth mentioning, and what the reasons or possible consequences of the events are, although, in most cases, the original news and reports upon which the press review is based clearly reveal all these circumstances and reasons.

Our analysis of these press reviews established that they were not designed to inform, but to exert emotional influence and to manipulate, and by transgressing the boundaries of the genre only served as a means to achieve this end. While the editors mainly tried to exert emotional impact on and manipulate the public through their selection and interpretation of the topics, they also used other means to increase the effect. Be it a professional press review or a genuine news block, it would be unimaginable to repeat the same "news item" three or four times in the same program without providing any significant addi-

---

<sup>4</sup> Taking a look at the papers covered by MTV's press review, it can be established that it is impossible to obtain the paper-based editions of this number of foreign newspapers with such regularity and punctuality in Hungary. Therefore, it is possible to conclude without any risk of error that the press reviews broadcast on television were based on the internet editions of the quoted newspapers. To prepare press reviews on the basis of the online versions of printed newspapers is now a method accepted worldwide as long as the editor informs the public that the press review is based on the internet edition, which sometimes differs from the printed version. This information was somewhat one-sided in the case of MTV, as they do not actually inform the public of this fact. However, the website of the quoted newspaper is shown on the screen during the press review, which indicates that the source was not the printed edition.

tional information. This method does not serve any purpose other than to hammer home a particular message. No day can pass without the press review mentioning at least once the cruelties of the Israeli occupiers against the Palestinian people.

Since one of the most important attributes of a press review is the selection of items from the international press published on a given day, we also attempted to compare the selection criteria of Magyar Televízió's Tallózó with similar press reviews of other media. As Magyar Nemzet is the only leading Hungarian newspaper publishing a daily selection from the world press similar to that of the public television, we decided to compare that newspaper's press review with the material of the six weeks covered by the this analysis. To our greatest amazement, it turned out that the press review published in Magyar Nemzet under the name of István Lovas is word for word the same as the selection broadcast one day earlier on MTV.

This would be unacceptable even if Magyar Nemzet indicated that it was publishing a selection broadcast one day earlier on MTV, as such a relationship cannot exist between a publicly funded television station and a privately-owned daily newspaper. However, the fact that Magyar Nemzet never let its readers know that it is using something verbatim in its "Lapszemle" (Press review) column that appeared earlier in another media is a serious infringement of basic professional standards made with a conscious decision to deceive the public.<sup>5</sup>

At first sight, the 111 items that we analyzed cover a wide range of topics, when one takes a closer look, certain topics clearly emerge that the editor of the press review focused on. (The table on the content structure of the press reviews appears on the next page.)

As seen from the table, the most frequently selected topic of the press reviews during the six weeks covered by the analysis was the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and that was covered using a rather specific approach. In the news items dealing with this topic, the state of Israel only gets mentioned in a negative context, as if the Jewish state was solely and exclusively responsible for the conflict. Almost two-thirds of the articles concerning the Israeli-Palestinian conflict report on killings by Israeli soldiers: "*Israel murders*

---

<sup>5</sup> Whether Mr. Lovas publishes a review prepared by others under his own name or he prepares MTV's press review as well as, his behavior is unacceptable in any case.

## The content structure of the press reviews

The topics covered by the press reviews	Number of occurrences <sup>6</sup>
Israeli aggression, cruelty against the Palestinians	23
Problems and failures of the European Union	21
Successes of the Right abroad	19
Suffering of the Palestinian people	12
Investigation against Clinton	9
Jewish crime, Jewish criminals	8
Failures of the Left	7
Homosexuality	6
Strengthening anti-Semitism	5
Problems and scandals in French domestic politics	5

*Palestinian officials and militants*”,<sup>7</sup> “*Israel locks up 200,000 Palestinians into a huge concentration camp*”,<sup>8</sup> “*Israeli soldiers destroy ten houses, burying one man alive*”,<sup>9</sup> “*Israel inflicts collective punishment on the Palestinians*”, “*Israel uses Nazi methods against the Palestinians*”.<sup>10</sup> The remaining one-third of the articles concerning this topic report on Israel’s growing international isolation and on the manifestations of the international public condemning Israel’s behavior. The majority of the news items focus on emphasizing Israeli cruelty and on the responsibility of the Jewish state and its unwillingness to compromise.

There were only three items in the analyzed period that at least mentioned the responsibility of the other party in a subordinate clause. This is particularly remarkable considering that the Palestinians only appear as the defenseless, weak and exposed victims of the conflict in the news items, giving the impression that the international public is uniformly convinced that the conflict is only causing the Palestinian people to suffer. While almost two-thirds of the items concerning the subject mention the suffering of the Palestinian people and the Palestinian victims, terrorist attacks against Israelis and Israeli victims are only

<sup>6</sup> The number of occurrences is higher than the number of the articles sampled because one article can cover several topics.

<sup>7</sup> February 21, 2001. Source: The Financial Times.

<sup>8</sup> March 13, 2001. Source: The Jerusalem Post.

<sup>9</sup> February 22, 2001. Source: The Guardian.

<sup>10</sup> March 13, 2001. Source: The Daily Telegraph.

mentioned once, and even then only while emphasizing the Palestinian losses, in a subordinate clause.

If you get your information on the international opinion of the Middle-East conflict from the press reviews of the public television, you cannot but think that this is clearly a fight between Good and Evil, and that this view is shared by the international public. *“Western capitals shocked by Israel’s behavior”*, *“Amnesty International condemns Israel”*,<sup>11</sup> *“US State Department launches severe attack on Israel”*,<sup>12</sup> *“Scared of violence, British tourists avoid Israel”*,<sup>13</sup> *“France proposes firm action against Israel to EU”*,<sup>14</sup> *“UN Secretary General Kofi Annan accuses Israel”*,<sup>15</sup> *“Danish Foreign Minister proposes sanctions against Israel”*, because *“an entire nation is being tortured”*, *“an entire nation is locked up in concentration camps”*, *“the Palestinians are in a far worse situation that the Blacks were under Apartheid in South Africa”*.<sup>16</sup>

Israel does not get better treatment in the items concerning topics other than the Middle-East conflict either. Israel is mentioned in three news items reporting that Bill Clinton *“gave amnesty to Jewish tax evaders yielding to pressure from leading Israeli politicians”*,<sup>17</sup> with one item saying that *“Israel takes first place worldwide in copyright infringement”*,<sup>18</sup> and another one reporting that a British paper *“aired the involvement of the Israeli secret service”*<sup>19</sup> regarding the emigration of the Romas of Zámoly.

The same one-sided and biased approach is behind the items focusing on the Jews and the Jewish people. However strange it might seem, the selection of the public television suggests to the uninformed viewer that one of the topics of the greatest interest to the international press today is related to the Jews. During the analyzed period, the public television’s press review covered a total of 12 articles focusing on Jews. Although this in itself is difficult to explain – with a superficial knowledge of the events of world politics and the issues covered by

---

<sup>11</sup> February 21, 2001. Source: The Financial Times.

<sup>12</sup> February 22, 2001. Source: Ha’aretz.

<sup>13</sup> February 27, 2001. Source: The Jerusalem Post.

<sup>14</sup> March 14, 2001. Source: The Guardian.

<sup>15</sup> March 28, 2001. Source: The Guardian.

<sup>16</sup> March 28, 2001. Source: The Jerusalem Post.

<sup>17</sup> February 19, 2001. Source: The Jerusalem Post.

<sup>18</sup> February 27, 2001. Source: Ha’aretz.

<sup>19</sup> March 22, 2001. Source: Liberation.

the international press, it is even more remarkable considering that the Jews – just like the state of Israel – only appear in a negative context in MTV’s press review, and two-thirds of the items concerning this topic mention Jews specifically in connection with crime.

Four of the above-mentioned items report that “*Bill Clinton has given amnesty to four Chassid Jews, who swindled millions of dollars out of the American government, and then the entire Chassid community voted for Hillary Clinton*”,<sup>20</sup> and another item says that an American writer, who “*called the Jews parasites who control the world economy and kill Christian babies*”,<sup>21</sup> was invited to a health care conference in Toronto, despite protests from sponsors and Jewish organizations. Browsing through the topics covered by the international press, the editors considered it particularly important to select an item reporting that the Jewish director of one of the leading art galleries in Warsaw was compelled to resign after exhibiting an art work representing the Pope being smashed by a meteorite and retouching the Nazi uniforms on pictures of leading actors, as well as another item saying that the leader of the Austrian Jewish community “*will only agree with the compensation amount offered to Holocaust survivors if the Jewish community receives compensation as well*”.<sup>22</sup> The press reviews also informed viewers that “*white-collar Jewish crime is now openly discussed in Germany*”,<sup>23</sup> and that the director of the Washington Holocaust Museum urged the US president using the museum’s official letterhead that he should give amnesty to Jewish tax evaders.

There is a total of five items discussing the strengthening of anti-Semitism, four of which explicitly suggest that the Jews, themselves, are to blame for the increase of anti-Semitism; “*whether the fact that Bill Clinton pardoned Jewish tax evaders will lead to rising anti-Semitism*”, “*the anti-Semitic attacks against the director of the Warsaw gallery began after he exhibited an art work representing the Pope being smashed by a meteorite*”,<sup>24</sup> the “*anti-Semitism debate raging in Austria started after Chancellor Schüssel refused the unacceptable tie-up of the local Jewish community leader regarding compensation*”,<sup>25</sup> and “*the*

---

<sup>20</sup> February 20, 2001. Source: Toronto Sun.

<sup>21</sup> February 23, 2001. Source: National Post.

<sup>22</sup> March 14, 2001. Source: Die Presse.

<sup>23</sup> March 7, 2001. Source: Ha’aretz.

<sup>24</sup> March 9, 2001. Source: The Daily Telegraph.

<sup>25</sup> March 14, 2001. Source: Die Presse.

*events in the Middle-East must be behind the dramatic increase in the number of anti-Semitic attacks in New York last year; and the rise in the number of racist attacks in France can presumably be explained by the same reason”.*<sup>26</sup>

Within this relatively short period, the editors of the press reviews found as many as three opportunities to give publicity to the issue of Holocaust-denial: “*The far-right Belgian–Flemish bloc dismissed its president, who expressed his doubts on a Dutch television program regarding the number of Jews killed in World War II in the gas chambers of the concentration camps*”,<sup>27</sup> “*the Holocaust-deniers are to hold a conference under the name ‘Revisionism and Zionism’ between March 31–April 3 in the capital of Lebanon*”,<sup>28</sup> a team of legal experts invited by the Swedish prime minister believes that “*it will only lead to legal complications if the Swedish government tries to legally prosecute Holocaust-denial*”.<sup>29</sup>

Of the total of 111 items broadcast over the period under examination, one out of three was in some way related to Israel or the Jewish people, and 9 out of 10 items discussed their involvement in the given issue in a negative context.

The editors of the press review found a way to present this issue in a negative context in the most absurd cases. This is best illustrated on February 23, when one of the four most important items selected from the world press reported that when “*Eminem, the homophobic white rapper, hugged Elton John, the singer fighting for gay rights, it seemed to one of the participants (sic!) of the scene as if Barbra Streisand was embracing Eva Braun*”.<sup>30</sup>

In the few cases where the selected articles did not have direct political relevance, the editors still found a way of presenting Israel and the Jews in a negative light.

Over the six weeks covered by the analysis, the names of George Soros and Steven Spielberg were mentioned twice each; as regarding Mr. Soros, Tallózó reported that “*the financial speculator’s Open Society Institute secretly funded an anti-government internet portal site, as a result of which the portal’s news editor resigned*”.<sup>31</sup> As regarding Steven Spielberg, the press review informed

---

<sup>26</sup> March 23, 2001. Source: Die Presse.

<sup>27</sup> March 2, 2001. Source: Neue Zürcher Zeitung.

<sup>28</sup> March 20, 2001. Source: Ha’aretz.

<sup>29</sup> February 22, 2001. Source: Svenska Dagbladet.

<sup>30</sup> February 23, 2001. Source: The Guardian.

<sup>31</sup> March 7, 2001. Source: The Straits Times.

viewers that “*he is going to attack the legendary US president Abraham Lincoln in his next film. The Hollywood film director presents the great abolitionist as a racist suffering from manic depression, who nearly lost the civil war.*”<sup>32</sup> After all this, it may not seem mischievous to assume that the editors of Tallózó must have informed viewers with malicious joy that “*the accounts of George Soros, Steven Spielberg and many other ultra-rich Americans have also been tapped by a crook from Brooklyn, who made forged credit cards*”,<sup>33</sup> which we can hardly assume was the event eliciting the greatest public concern worldwide on March 21, 2001...

In analyzing the press reviews, we also wanted to examine the authenticity and reliability of the translation and interpretation of the texts. This, however, was only possible in cases where we managed to obtain the newspapers used as the source for the original articles. Using the sources available to us, we managed to find two-thirds of the articles covered by Tallózó, and made a comparison of the original material and the resulting summary in these cases. What follows are two specific, but typical examples illustrating the misinterpretation of the original articles. These clearly show that the twisting of the meaning does not result from misunderstanding or from an insufficient command of the language, but from a deliberate distortion of the contents of the original text so that it will fit in with the one-sided and biased concept typical of the editing of the morning press reviews of the public Magyar Televízió.

Tallózó: (The following quotation is a translation of the Hungarian version of this article) February 21, 2001. Financial Times: “*Amnesty International, the London-based human rights organization is to issue a report today condemning Israel for murdering Palestinian officials and militants over the past three months. The report warns that the fact that the Israeli government accepts unlawful killing and does not investigate the cause of the death caused by the security forces can lead to a ‘culture of impunity’. In the report, Amnesty International emphasizes that unlawful killings cannot be accepted even in armed conflicts. The 350 Palestinian victims included 100 minors, according to the report.*”

The original article was a three-quarter-column report by the paper’s Jerusalem correspondent, published on page 7, among the major international

---

<sup>32</sup> March 19, 2001. Source: The Sunday Times.

<sup>33</sup> March 25, 2001. Source: The Daily Telegraph.

news. The content of the first sentence of the MTV summary is identical with that of the lead of the report. The second sentence is roughly identical to the first sentence of the third paragraph of the article, but it contains a translation mistake. As a result of this mistake, the meaning of the sentence is lost; the translated version of the original is a logical absurdity. (...does not investigate the cause of the death caused by the security forces ...) The phrase “*unlawful killing*” in the third sentence is an inaccurate translation. The original report used the term “*extra judicial execution*”. The last sentence of the summary comes from the ultimate paragraph of the article. The Amnesty International report primarily deals with the “*executions*” carried out by the Israeli security service, but also mentions the fact that Amnesty criticized the Palestinian militants, as well, for killing civilians.

Tallózó: March 28, 2001. The Guardian: “*UN Secretary General Kofi Annan yesterday accused Israel of inflicting ‘collective punishment’ on the Palestinian people by paralyzing their economy and spreading anger and despair across the occupied territories, the left-wing British paper said. The UN Secretary General, who was speaking to the Arab summit in the Jordanian capital, Amman, also reminded the summit that, ‘Israel has a right to exist in safety within internationally recognized borders’.*”

The original article was published on March 28 on the online edition of The Guardian. If the Tallózó editor had really intended to fully reflect the essence of the report, aiming at balanced reporting, it would have been appropriate to include another sentence from the original article. According to the original report, Mr. Annan also said “*Arab grievances would fare better if many Israelis did not believe that their existence was under threat.*”

MIHÁLY SZILÁGYI-GÁL

THROUGH THE EYES OF CSURKA

---

*(abridged)*

This brief essay is a reader's response to the series of articles "Magyar Szemmel" (Through Hungarian Eyes) that István Csurka published in Magyar Fórum between June 28 and September 19, 2001. I will confine myself to confronting those articles with what they, themselves, state.

This is how Csurka defines the purpose of the series in the first part: *"I will examine the ways and means and the purpose of Israeli capital investment in Hungary, especially in the field of real estate."*<sup>1</sup> Those investments, Csurka claims, have a purpose in addition to seeking profit. Csurka also defines the aim of his analysis. *"In publishing this study I wish to let society know what is happening to it. It should be aware of it. Because as long as it is undigested by the brain and by the soul, people are not in a position to make decisions. Decisions on saying 'no' or on carrying on with surrender. Not that I could say that Hungarians are fully in a position to make a decision yet. The whole thing began at the end of the 19th century, when Jews inundated Hungary from Galicia."*

This is how Csurka attempts to prove that the investments concerned serve implicit purposes in addition to profit. *"The culture conveyed by shopping malls is alien to this nation, but no one should think that it merely seeks business gains."*<sup>2</sup> *"Let me make it clear that no one before me has taken the trouble to reveal the possible hidden aims of the change of regime yet."*<sup>3</sup> *"Shopping malls and residential parks are built, new residential quarters are erected around glass-fronted bank towers and apartments are purchased, all with the purpose of altering the pattern of the city and spreading a new culture."*<sup>4</sup> *"The construction of shopping malls, as I have pointed out before, is meant to disseminate a new culture. Péter Székely, CEO and President of Transelektro Inc., made a telltale statement on that. As the head of one of the*

---

<sup>1</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, June 28, 2001.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., July 12, 2001.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., July 15, 2001.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., July 12, 2001.

*corporations building a shopping mall in Kiev – no kidding, Kiev! – he spoke at Hungary’s embassy in Kiev of the purpose and nature of constructing shopping malls on the occasion of laying the foundation stone of Libid’ Plaza. ‘The residents of the commercial center formed by that shopping and entertainment center are tenants. Their shops line the avenues of the mall. Neither doors, nor windows connect the shops with the outside world. Commercial and business policy considerations make it inevitable that the building should be blind to the outside world because its shops are focused onto the internal avenues of the mall.’”* The quote goes on a few lines further: *“In addition to the distributive functions, the mall has the purpose of entertaining its visitors. In fact, it is capable of ‘captivating’ each member of a family for the whole day.”* That, Csurka says, is *“plain talk”*. He draws the conclusion: *“captivating the visitors is a purpose not just in Kiev. The same applies to Budapest. That is the strategic objective.”*<sup>5</sup>

What Csurka says about the supposed strategic thinking of those firms fails to demonstrate what he promises to the readers before the quote: a cultural goal that is allegedly enshrined in the trading effort.

István Csurka keeps alleging an interconnection between the origin of the entrepreneurs and the assumed *“anti-national”* aims of those ventures. He does not prove that interconnection, yet he refers to it as a source of information. *“Market economy as transposed here by the West is better than Soviet-type socialism. However, everyone is too shy to ask the question as to whether or not the incoming capital has some other purpose as well: political or perhaps ethnic.”*<sup>6</sup> Furthermore: *“Israeli investments are meant for Jews. They are managed by Hungarian Jews, who are familiar with the field. The same applies to the other target area of investments: telecommunications.”*<sup>7</sup> Later on the reader is told that some people come off badly *because they are Hungarian*: *“It is more and more often noticed among those shoved aside that the victims are usually those who are merely Hungarian.”*<sup>8</sup>

With time the reader gets used to the fact that in Csurka’s articles the story and the origin of the dramatis personae are linked. Once that link is taken for granted, the reader will not even raise an eyebrow when told that the invest-

<sup>5</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, June 28, 2001.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., July 5, 2001.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., June 28, 2001.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., July 19, 2001.

ments of Jewish origin are harmful to Hungarian society. However, if the reader takes the trouble to unravel the two messages separately, then he can make the following conclusion: the real message is not that certain business ventures and other activities are harmful to the nation culturally or in any other way, but the real message is merely the origin of the investors.

Upon closer inspection, the reader can reveal what, in Csurka's view, is harmful. He dislikes both components: the effects of those activities and the origin of those persons. So the problem with shopping malls is not just that they alter the Hungarian cityscape and create some new cultural forms, which are "*alien to the Hungarian national cultural environment.*" It is also a problem that those shopping malls are business ventures of investors of a certain origin and/or citizenship. The question may be put this way: which aspect of shopping malls is set against culture – shopping malls as such or the nationality of their investors? If it is just the spread of shopping malls that is culturally harmful, then why start the diatribes with reference to the alleged or real origin of their investors?

*"A giant shopping mall is being built in Kiev, bigger than those in Budapest. The builder is a Hungarian firm. A remarkable fact, which prompts me to ask some questions."* Later on in the article he continues: *"The Hungarian firm has two business partners in Kiev. One of them is a company specializing in the construction of shopping malls, which is a metamorphosis of various firms belonging to the Brothers Ofer. Transelektro is the co-owner with that firm of the shopping mall along Váci Road..."* This is what Csurka writes about Transelektro: *"Transelektro carries out multifarious business activities indeed! It is engaged in tourism, transport, the manufacture and sale of electric appliances, construction and property development. It is present in, among other places, Africa, as well as Germany. We might as well be proud to have such a grand Hungarian enterprise. But that is exactly what we do not know: whether or not it is Hungarian, and who its real owner is. ... Presently they are in a slick cooperation with the Brothers Ofer and Gazprom."*<sup>9</sup>

The quote retells the story of an investment that does not fit the general message of the series of articles, namely, that there is an interconnection between cultural identities, the fact of an investment, and that it alters its environment. Csurka admits though that it is impossible to define whether the firm referred to

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., July 19, 2001.

is Hungarian or international in identity and cultural affiliation. As an investor, however, it behaves the same way as those firms that Csurka describes as Jewish in business background. Reference to the Ofers is a hint to some Jewish connection, yet Csurka is admittedly at a loss as to whether that company is Jewish or not. He does not even elaborate on that issue in the article. By closely inspecting Csurka's sentences the reader can see that Csurka could not manage to place Transelektro's story among the ventures with a clearly Jewish background. What if the owners of Transelektro take part in a project not as Hungarians, and the shareholders of the Ofer brothers not as Jews, but simply as everyday actors in the global economy? What if they only cooperate to make more money? Csurka's argumentation about the Jewish (or other) imperialist conspiracy disguised as global business operation is useless when it is confronted with such a banal economic phenomenon.

Another sentence in the series of articles also says that it is impossible to define in terms of nation and ethnicity the motivations of a global economy. Note that Csurka does not even attempt to confront that thought with his hypothesis about the hidden cultural intentions. *"It goes without saying that the managers of more than just those companies have retained their posts today by the Israeli owners. Let me add: it is impossible to tell who the real owner of any foreign-owned company is."*<sup>10</sup>

This is what the July 19, 2001, issue of Magyar Fórum says: *"Anti-Semitism is not fomented by us, by me or by these analyses but by injustice, exclusion and self-assertion."*<sup>11</sup> We can talk of injustice, exclusion and self-assertion if a person does something in violation of some rule. Should we construe from that statement that the people mentioned by Csurka do not have the right to take part in business just like anyone else? Self-assertion can be said of a person who is taking part in an activity uninvited. Those guilty of self-assertion should be stopped and asked to leave. Where they should go is told in the following sentence: *"Never before in history has it happened that a nation, citing possession of that land epochs before, should reconquer a territory and establish a state as if it were the legal successor to the old one."*<sup>12</sup> It follows from the above two quotations that in Csurka's opinion Jews have no justified claim to a homeland

---

<sup>10</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, June 28, 2001.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., July 19, 2001.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., July 26, 2001.

anywhere on earth. He says there would not be anti-Semitism if Jews had not acted in such a self-assertive manner around the world, especially in Hungary. Neither is their presence in Israel legitimate. Where, I dare to ask, should Jews live after all? Csurka fails to answer that question.

By contrast, we can read in Magyar Fórum that András Bárony (Member of Parliament, MSZP, Hungarian Socialist Party) *“attended a Jewish conference in Jerusalem as a ‘Jewish politician’. The same person represents the Republic of Hungary in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg.”* *“There he is not a Jewish but a Hungarian parliamentarian. This ‘now you see it, now you don’t’ conduct is typical of the tactic of the advance men [i.e. the investors].”*<sup>13</sup> *“Those honest Jews are all right who are Hungarian at heart, but who do not apply that tactic. They only rely on their talent when they carve out a career for themselves. They do not have a dual identity: even if they are Jewish by birth, they are Hungarian at heart.”*<sup>14</sup>

There is a contradiction in that train of thought. On the one hand, the author writes of Jews *“who are Hungarian at heart”*. On the other hand, he says of them that they *“do not have a dual identity”*. The two statements appear to be contradictory. It is clear on first sight that in Csurka’s eyes having dual identity is not honest. But that contradicts his statement that those Hungarians are honest who lay emphasis on their being Hungarian even though they were born Jewish. At a closer reading it becomes clear that for Csurka the Hungarian-Jewish duality is a one-way street. He excludes the possibility that the Hungarian-Jewish duality is of necessity a Jewish-Hungarian duality as well. If we deny the one, the other also becomes nonsensical. That leads us back to the first sentence, which claims that it is dishonest to be, on the one hand, a Hungarian politician and to attend an international conference arranged for politicians of Jewish origin, on the other. Csurka applies the same logic elsewhere, when he writes of Hungary. What he says would not be strange if his opinion on duality worked both ways. I would sum up the content of the two sentences as follows: the Hungarian-Jewish identity is only honest if the person concerned only manifests his Hungarianness. If he manifests the other one also, or both, he ceases to be honest.

---

<sup>13</sup> Megérett a folytatás. (Time to Carry On). Magyar Fórum, September 13, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar szemmel, Magyar Fórum, July 19, 2001.

*“We do not exactly know what planners are up to in the major Jewish ethnic and financial centers. We only see what is happening before our eyes, and we only expose what they make public in writing. The report that we have mentioned above supplies statistics about the educational attainments of the Jews surveyed and about the positions they hold in society, which corresponds to that of a high education.”* The article then carries a series of data, which tells nothing about any anti-Hungarian plan. Neither do Csurka’s introductory words tell anything about such a plan: *“we do not exactly know what planners are up to” ... “We only see what is happening before our eyes.”*<sup>15</sup> How does Csurka know what is happening if he says it is impossible to tell what planners are up to?

From this point of view, the following passages are noteworthy. *“Let us now draw circles and write in them what we know or think we know. Let us then connect the centers of those circles.”*<sup>16</sup> *“Can we suppose that they have any purpose with that real estate, property development, chain stores and shopping malls other than to sell them later on?”*<sup>17</sup> *“Daring a supposition as it may sound, we cannot entirely rule out that as early as 1990 and 1991, when assets that used to be in state ownership were secretly and illegally privatized, and when a pact was hammered out by Antall and Tölgyessy [József Antall was prime minister and Péter Tölgyessy was leader of the opposition in Parliament], certain people already foresaw the venues and price of the shopping malls yet to be built.”*<sup>18</sup>

As can be seen, hypotheses are treated as if they were proof. The same method can also be illustrated by the commentary of a later date in Magyar Fórum: *“István Csurka published his profound analyses in six straight weeks about the secrets of Hungary’s real estate market, on how assets have been illegally transferred with the pretext of ‘property development,’ and on the obscure yet easily decodable connection between the construction of shopping malls and residential parks and Israeli investors.”*<sup>19</sup> The reader is left with the paradox: how the same thing can be *“obscure yet easily decodable”*.

As we demonstrated above, Csurka smoothly shifts from suppositions to evidence. At the end of his series of articles, he “raises the alarm” and calls for self-

---

<sup>15</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, June 28, 2001.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., July 19, 2001.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., July 5, 2001.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., July 5, 2001.

<sup>19</sup> Tízből tíz (Ten out of Ten). Magyar Fórum, August 30, 2001.

defensive vigilance on behalf of the Hungarians: *“This writing is meant to be a candle in the dark. Its author would hate to see the further shrinkage of the territory of Dismembered Hungary and the further passivity of its residents. The time will certainly come when the nation should certainly wake up. Indifference equals death. My mission is to open the eyes of Hungarians. I have to act as a healer.” “We would be dishonest if we let others occupy our beautiful homeland, which we obtained through so many sacrifices.”*<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Magyar Fórum, August 2, 2001.

BALÁZS SIPOS

UNDERSTANDING GLOBALIZATION

---

*(abridged)*

The theoreticians of anti-Semitism have found a treasure trove of ideas in globalization, the momentous process that got underway during the second half of the 20th century. They use it as “evidence” for their antiquated allegations and scurry to dress their rhetoric in the cloak of modernity. The increased interdependence of nations has “opened their eyes” to the “secrets” of the operation of the international Jewish conspiracy. They can use globalization as proof of their teachings because today we live in a world of mutual dependencies where shifting a grain of sand might change the course of the universe.<sup>1</sup>

However, upon closer inspection we can discover impressive precedents. Even before the publication of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, far right movements bemoaned such dangers. Decades ago opinion leaders of the Hungarian extreme right “noticed” that unification of the world would end diversity and bring about the demise of nations, and that the motivating force behind all that is the “Jewish race”. Writing in the 1920s, Dezső Szabó claimed that the emergence of a world culture was at hand and the variety of human races was doomed to disappear. He depicted that scenario as no less horrible than when you are forced to eat the same hated and tasteless food for the rest of your life. It goes without saying that he blamed the Jewish race for such a bleak future.<sup>2</sup>

Globalization only modernized the outer crust of anti-Semitism, affecting chiefly the notions it uses. And the notions were in dire need of modernization, indeed, because they had frozen in their pre-1933 state (when Hitler came to power) since they had no adequate response to the Holocaust. An anti-Semite either (1) denies the Holocaust altogether, or (2) approves it and seeks explanations for it, or (3) attempts to avoid that topic. As for the first two options, they

---

<sup>1</sup> József Nagy: *A mai filozófia fő irányai (Principal Tendencies in Contemporary Philosophy)*. 1923, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Dezső Szabó: *Faj és világirodalom (Race and World Literature)* in: D. Sz.: *Panasz. Újabb tanulmányok (Complaint. Essays of Recent Vintage)*, Ferrum, 1923, pp. 95–96.

are no longer acceptable in civilized society. The third option, if used without employing the notion of globalization, is hardly tenable (because without mentioning the Holocaust, how can one explain the powerful influence of the tiny Jewish State?). When an anti-Semite uses the notion of globalization in commenting on recent world developments, he can stick to the centuries-old conspiracy theory that includes shibboleths such as “*Jews have an un-Hungarian mindset*”, they are “*traitors*”, “*Jewish interests wriggle their way into every field of life*”, “*Jews turn the entire popular culture Jewish*”, etc.

During 2001 opinion writers of the Hungarian far right used their theory of a global conspiracy to underpin their ideas, and they rarely denied the Holocaust. It is occasionally alleged, for instance, that the Holocaust was not a unique phenomenon; just one of several instances of genocide; or every genocide is a Holocaust (which, in effect, robs that word of its meaning). On January 9, 2001, Feró Nagy, a commentator on Pannon Rádió, a local radio station that can be received in Budapest and its surroundings, declared that the United States had no history. “*The only tangible fact in their history is the extermination of the Indians*”, which was “*the worst Holocaust in human history*”.

Let us consider the second case when an attempt is made to justify the Holocaust by blaming the Jews for their alleged misdeeds. Said István Csurka, chairman of the Party of Hungarian Justice and Life (MIÉP): “*Hitler needed no moderation for he saw his sacred frenzy [sic!] as the pinnacle of history.*”<sup>3</sup> Csurka discusses the Holocaust as part of the 20th-century history that includes the “*confrontation between Hungarians and Jews*”. A statement signed by Csurka as well as MIÉP’s Presidium and parliamentary faction claims: “*when assessing the Holocaust and other 20th-century events, we must take into consideration the affiliation and wickedness of those persons*<sup>4</sup> and it would be unjust to put the blame solely on certain groups of Hungarian society.”<sup>5</sup>

The tenet about the “confrontation of peoples” is also used when anti-Semites discuss the Holocaust in a global context. As Csurka put it: “*just as the Hungarians retaliated for Jewish terror in 1919*<sup>6</sup> by enacting the

<sup>3</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, April 26, 2001.

<sup>4</sup> “Jewish political criminals” such as Béla Kun, Tibor Szamuely, Ottó Korvin, Mátyás Rákosi, József Révai and the Zionist, liberal-Communist György Aczél.

<sup>5</sup> Nincs különbség áldozat és áldozat között (No Difference between the Victims), statement by MIÉP, *ibid.*, p. 1.

<sup>6</sup> During the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

*Numerus clausus*<sup>7</sup>, nowadays the Jews are mounting an offensive with the Holocaust industry”, which is meant to perpetuate Hungarians’ sense of guilt. “The sense of guilt is maintained to culturally paralyze the national middle class.”<sup>8</sup>

To put it in trendy international anti-Semitic lingo, Hungary’s national middle class is allegedly threatened by a “global Jewish conspiracy”. Let us put that claim into perspective.

To start with, Csurka reminds his readers that Jews and Hungarians are two distinct groups. It is his conviction that Jews are the heirs of Béla Kun,<sup>9</sup> while the great-grandfathers and grandfathers of the Hungarians carried out the Holocaust. (That is what Csurka calls the confrontation of peoples.) Csurka continues: Jews are the “only people deprived of their state and homeland who have retained their national consciousness in the form of their religion even though they had been submerged in the cultures of various other peoples and ...two thousand years on, they could put forth the demand for the re-establishment of their state and, indeed, they did establish their state.”<sup>10</sup> Zoltán Szöcs, who regularly contributes to *Magyar Fórum*, goes as far as saying: “my Hungarian ancestors were never in captivity in Egypt;” and “they whose ancestors were in exile in Egypt have realized the force, the enormous energy, that can be found in our belief. Until they fail to weaken the foundations of that belief, we<sup>11</sup> will not fall prey to them.”<sup>12</sup>

In addition to the Holocaust industry, the same purpose is served by defaming Hungary. As László Kövér, former chairman of the largest party in the pre-2002 government, put it: “people of that type have the habit of spreading false information in articles, which they circulate in countries abroad knowing that those articles do harm to Hungary and its government”<sup>13</sup> László Kövér spoke in general terms about intellectuals who write critical articles about the work of the Hungarian government. However, a listener phoning in to Pannon Rádió

<sup>7</sup> Restricting the entry of Jews to Hungarian universities from 1920.

<sup>8</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, April 12, 2001.

<sup>9</sup> Leader of the Hungarian Communist government of 1919.

<sup>10</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 26, 2001.

<sup>11</sup> Christian Hungarians.

<sup>12</sup> Zoltán Szöcs: Csoda és bizonyosság (Miracle and Certainty). Magyar Fórum, April 12, 2001.

<sup>13</sup> Ágnes Seszták’s interview with László Kövér: A véleményemet ritkán tartom magamban (I Usually Speak My Mind). Magyar Demokrata, no. 50, 2000.

spoke in concrete terms. He referred to an “*un-Hungarian pressure group*” that “*may do anything it wishes*”. The members of that group “*brand others as racist for their own pleasure, for their own benefit and to divert attention from their own activities*”.<sup>14</sup>

According to that tenet, the defamation of Hungary comes in handy for Israel because Israel wants Hungary to become a defenseless prey. People “*who are Hungarian in name only*” can regain their power only if they defame and overthrow the right-wing national government. Alajos Chrudinák put those thoughts forward in a commentary he read on Pannon Rádió:

*“...certain extremist left-liberal politicians, journalists and intellectuals spread unbridled xenophobic allegations. They yearn to regain power, so they spread slander. They brand as anti-Semite and Nazi anyone who opposes them or who exposes their political and financial manipulations... They have controlled the media ever since the pre-1990 era but time is running out for those persons of an un-Hungarian mindset. Hungarian society will no longer buy their hate speech, their defamation of the past and of Hungary’s holiest symbols...National consciousness, which they sought to undermine, is gradually regaining strength. During the election campaign, liberals and post-Communists, who hate Hungarians, allege at home and abroad that the Hungarian people are anti-Semitic, that there is exclusion and Nazi propaganda in Hungary. That is a lie. Such allegations are used in Romania and by some left-liberal newspapers to skew Hungary’s image.”*<sup>15</sup>

So, we are told, there are in Hungary people who are “*Hungarian in name only*”, “*henchmen*” who form an “*un-Hungarian pressure group*”<sup>16</sup> who “*serve alien interests*”. However, viewed from the Hungarian side, their job is getting ever more difficult because – as noticed by both Chrudinák and Csurka – at around the year 2000 “*Hungarian society has learned to recognize aliens. The Devil’s hooved foot in the disguised service of alien interests can be recognized under paramilitary khakis and workers’ militia uniforms just as well as under neatly tailored suits.*”<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Pannon Rádió, January 11, 2001.

<sup>15</sup> Miért antiszemita a zsidó Saron tábornok? Már nem a fark csóválja a kutyát! (Why is the Jewish General Sharon an Anti-Semite? The Tail Wagging the Dog? No more!) Commentary by Alajos Chrudinák on Pannon Rádió on November 18, Magyar Fórum, November 22, 2001.

<sup>16</sup> Pannon Rádió, January 9 and 11, 2001.

<sup>17</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, April 26, 2001.

One may put the question: what is the alien interest that is served by, among other things, the Holocaust industry, that is bent on obstructing “*our efforts to raise the misguided nation to its feet, to set it out along its own road, a road that will lead to its own home, prosperity and a Christian future?*”<sup>18</sup> What is it that explains that “*one of its principal workshops has been established in Europe and especially in Hungary out of so many places?*”<sup>19</sup> In Csurka’s opinion there is one answer to both questions: Israel, which is the prime mover behind all matters on earth, a state “*that is not perpetuated on the basis of historical right but a new state formed with the strength of money. It was born due to the internal contradictions of Europe, which had been weakened by two world wars. Israel is a European type of country, which is alien to its surroundings. Enormous capital accumulated and, since recently, the armed forces of the USA guarantee its continued existence.*”<sup>20</sup>

Israel “*is a mixture of numerous – only in part Jewish – cultural identities, including those of Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, Hungarian (partly Transylvanian Hungarian) components, as well as the cultural identities brought by the Sephardim from Spanish-speaking and Arabic countries, and other parts of Asia and Africa. The whole mixture is dissolved in Anglo-American and especially American globalization*”.<sup>21</sup>

At this point there seems to be some internal contradiction in the train of thought of the leader of MIÉP. For a moment it may seem that the unification of the world (globalization, that is) is an Anglo-American invention, not an Israeli one. However, Csurka – as well as others – makes it clear here and in other articles that in his view the world is governed by the international Jewish lobby, and the Jewish State is the center of a vast colonial power, which exploits the rest of the world. “*Israel may not be a member of the European Union owing to its geographical location, but it is treated as if it were one. Indeed, it takes part in many of its programs and initiatives. For the time being, however, the major source of its funding originates from the USA, which seems to consider it its 54th state.*”<sup>22</sup>

What is more, Europe and America are tools in Israel’s hand: they ensure that Israel should have global hegemony and, apparently, ensure its continued ex-

---

<sup>18</sup> Zoltán Szöcs: Csoda és bizonyosság, *ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, April 12, 2001.

<sup>20</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 26, 2001.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

istence. As is typical of Hungary's far right writers, who occasionally lose heart, elsewhere Csurka attempts to give this issue a more straightforward wording but cannot help refuting his own statement. (We will return to theoretical aspects of this question below.)

*"...The State of Israel is increasing its power in expanding circles: it isolates and deprives from all rights a small people right in its territory; it dominates over, bombs or arranges the bombing of its neighboring Arab states and, with the assistance of the same world power, it extends its sway even to Rome. This statement is of course symbolical. It does not mean that this small state has tangible political or military sway over Rome, Berlin or for that matter Moscow... What it means is that via the strength of the United States and in alliance with the Americans, and on the strength of the power of money, the ultimate exclusion of Christian culture is underway. By putting pressure on the nations and nation-states, a new popular culture is being propagated, and 'the world hegemony of capitalist corporations is being established.' The mass production of 'mass humans,' who are the most malleable, is underway."*<sup>23</sup>

What does the Jewish State need that for? The only purpose of Israel's world hegemony is to perpetuate its existence. For that it needs plenty of money or, to be more precise, it needs the financial assistance and exploitation of America and Europe (and the assistance of the US armed forces). But a nation that consists of sovereign individuals could in theory decide not to continue to pay those costs. *"The USA can only sell to its own people the need to pay the exorbitant costs of maintaining Israel if it can refer to what Europe pays; in other words, if American citizens are informed that Europe has also been ripped off... That gives some consolation to American society, which is so sensitive to financial matters... After all, Europe – that elder, impoverished and helpless brother – is still some sort of standard when it comes to coughing up money. The pressure brought to bear by American Jewish capital and the American Jewish media are no longer sufficient to make the USA run two armies: its own and that of Israel. There is also a need for approval by the European democracies and for the financial contribution of European banks and major corporations."*<sup>24</sup>

It goes without saying that in Csurka's view the costs of the war on Iraq were also part of the upkeep of Israel. He wrote that the American and European

<sup>23</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, April 12, 2001.

<sup>24</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 26, 2001.

troops did not take Baghdad because Jerusalem needed Saddam Hussein. Through him Israel could prove to the world that it lives under a constant threat. *“It is through the permanent situation of being under a threat that Israel’s survival is posited as a moral question for Europe and the rest of the Christian world.”*<sup>25</sup>

Israel has formed such a community of interests with the USA, the European Union and NATO that poses an armed threat to regions even beyond the Middle East. Those “conspirator” states and their international organizations have divided the entire world among themselves, and they categorize the countries that are “nationalistic” and “non-friendly to Jews” as hostile.

The above-mentioned Zoltán Szócs has commented in a statement on Hungary’s Foreign Ministry as follows: *“Taking a closer look at recent events, in my assessment, the premier rogue state is Israel, whose trickery can be evidenced by the neighboring Arab states at any time. In a similar manner, I consider as rogue states the United States and Canada for bombing Yugoslavia in 1999, the United Kingdom for what it did to Iraq and for its scheming in starting numerous wars over the past two hundred years”*.<sup>26</sup>

During 2001 Magyar Fórum carried further articles that alleged global interpenetration between the Jewish State, the United States and the European Union. For instance, it was stated that America and Europe pay the costs of the global propaganda activity that is essential for the survival of Israel.

*“They need a liberal world order. They need commercial television stations and liberal newspapers, liberal dominance at universities, a news network that covers the whole world, and popular culture. The costs of running all those is borne by the individual nations. As a rule those ventures are profitable. The problem is they also wish to possess the public-service [media]. They wish to have control over everything; they want to fill every gap, not allowing the light in anywhere. It took decades to build and win approval for that media monopoly, and it still costs billions of dollars.”*<sup>27</sup>

Expenditure on the military, the media and other things, in sum, *“the costs of sustaining Israel have begun to exceed a reasonable and historically justifiable and tolerable amount... When calculating the costs of running Israel, the expen-*

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Zoltán Szócs: Moslék és haramiaállam (Swill and Rogue State). Magyar Fórum, June 28, 2001.

<sup>27</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 26, 2001.

*diture on wars is not all. Add to that the cost of peacekeeping and the cost of the technique of generating that much money. The name of that technique is globalization. I am far from stating that the Jews invented globalization, and that it only serves Israel's interests. I claim, however, that of all the major capitalist countries, it is the Israeli and other Jewish capital that can best use globalization for its own purposes. Israel is the emblematic state of globalization.*"<sup>28</sup>

It is impossible to understand Israel's global power merely by examining the work of NATO, the European Union and other international organizations. Knowledge of the activities of the World Jewish Congress is indispensable.

*"For several decades now the World Jewish Congress has had the job of securing various needs for Israel by employing the most diverse methods, as well as rallying the world's Jews and keeping records of them, along with helping and manipulating them. Its most important task is to use any means it finds fit for convincing the politicians, journalists, international organizations and the Jews, themselves, to support and assist Israel in the spirit of extremist Jewish nationalism. Therefore in several countries Jewish lobbies are at work at commanding the heights of power. The lobbyists are united by shared political and economic interests: they pursue and protect the interests of Israel and all the Jews."*<sup>29</sup>

An important issue has not been covered yet. Without it, it is impossible to understand the global sway of Israel and international Jewry. We should be informed of their purpose. We should know what "they" want of "us".

*"Why do the institutions leading the Jewish community of the world and Israel itself need dismembered Hungary as an area?<sup>30</sup> Why do we dare to call the Hungarian business partners of the plaza-builders vanguards? Why do we believe that the financial centers controlling the world and the Jewish community have a large-scale strategic goal of supporting the construction of plazas and residential parks in Hungary and why are they offensively spreading Jewish and Israeli mass culture here? What do they employ vanguards for and why do they want Hungarian land? The answer is simple: because of the high costs of sustaining Israel."*

*"Israel's leaders, who are the best-informed people in the world, know very well that it is impossible to sustain their country in its current state and quality*

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Alajos Chrudinák: Miért antiszemita a zsidó Saron tábornok? (Why is the Jewish General Sharon an Anti-Semite?) Idem.

<sup>30</sup> The term refers to the territorial verdict of the Versailles Peace Treaty.

*even in the medium term, and particularly in this state of perpetual endangerment and constant fighting because of its historical impossibilities. The USA might at any time decide to discontinue supporting it... In twenty-five to thirty years' time, colored people will reach a majority in the USA. They will elect the government. A government they vote into power could make a different decision (regarding Israel). At stake is whether or not they manage to keep those Black, Spanish, South American, Vietnamese and Chinese people in shopping-mall impassiveness so that they could continue sponsoring Israel. And there are even more important things at stake. Now not just the costs of maintaining that small state are running sky high, even higher are the costs of maintaining the present global status quo. And the existence of Israel rests on the present state of the world, on suppressed opposition, on the present status quo."*

*"Mankind is facing the question of whether, instead of the nature-exploiting system of globalization, it should universally switch over to the non-profiteering system of sustainable development or else die. If, however, it does switch over, if rationality and the instinct for life prevail, there won't be anyone left to cover the costs of the symbolic state of globalization."<sup>31</sup>*

The end of globalization would not automatically herald the collapse of the international Jewish conspiracy. Israel, *"whose inhabitants derive a moral boost from the Holocaust, is bracing for the repartition of the world. It is taking security measures wherever it feels fit, however it feels fit. That is the end of Zionism. A new Mount Zion is needed. It may as well be as secularized as Svábhegy [a hill in Budapest]."*<sup>32</sup>

Thereafter Csurka goes on to explain why the future Elders of Svábhegy have selected Hungary of all countries. *"What makes Dismembered Hungary suitable for this role? It is exactly its dismembered nature. In 1920, its people underwent a dismemberment, which nearly cost them their lives. With Trianon, the Hungarian nation lost its historical right to its fatherland, the same right that justified the foundation of Israel."*<sup>33</sup> His train of thought is an unprecedented attempt at linking the Hungarian-Jewish opposition to the peace treaty that left Hungary with a far smaller territory and population after World War I. *"Ever since 1920 Hungarians have been without their historical rights. If all goes on*

---

<sup>31</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 26, 2001.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

*the way it has done so far, it will even lose its right to its present territory. Hungarians are not allowed to be nationalistic, not even in self-defense. During the twentieth century Hungarians lost both world wars partly because of their own mistake and partly because of the irresponsible conduct of their ruling elite. Their revolution of 1956 was violently repressed by the Soviet army partly because the Americans did not lift a finger. Between the end of 1956 and 1989 the anachronistic Hungarian political regime was perpetuated by yes-men, who did harm to the national consciousness. Small wonder, today demographically the nation is on the decline.*"<sup>34</sup>

The decrease of population affects the white population, but it does not the "fertile Roma".

I call the reader's attention to those statements because they clearly show the racism of the Hungarian far right. For instance, their authors speak of "moral superiority." *"Unless population policies are radically changed by the state, in thirty or fifty years this country will have three million fewer white Hungarians, who are indigenous here, who are the pillars of this state and are heirs to this country's historical rights. The remainder will be devoid of power and possessions... The fact that the true heirs of historical rights are already in a subordinate position renders Dismembered Hungary a pleasant and safe haven. However, care must be taken so that Hungarians from the neighboring countries or anyone else should not be able to occupy the empty areas. Hungary should be left half empty, that is, fillable. As for the Hungarians outside the borders, who are prevented from resettling in Hungary ... they will be taken care of by the neighboring countries, even without encouragement. Suffice it to maintain the status quo. Even the thought of any historical rights must be eradicated from the Hungarians. Greater Hungary? Holy Crown? Readjustment of frontiers? A shout down with Europe, a slap in the face and punishment for everyone who dares to suggest something like this. Because the premises can only be Dismembered Hungary, with the cowardly, timid Hungarian semi-proletariat with no self-respect, tottering in the plazas and forever waiting for charity.*"<sup>35</sup>

The summation below will help the reader understand the anti-Semitic theory of globalization. Let us have a look at the argument of Hungary's far right commentators:

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

Jews/Israel + USA = globalization/internationalism → putting pressure on nation  
 → internal enemy/ “advance men”

During 2001 the theorists of anti-Semitism juggled with those notions at random depending on what they sought to prove.

Both at the starting point and at the end point of that “series” we can find stereotypes that are well known from the anti-Semitic lexicon. It is enough to mention just one element and the reader will instantly remember the rest. A penetrating analysis of the film *Top Gun* has proven that the best way of understanding the message of the media is to take the vantage point of the audience.<sup>36</sup> How a member of the audience interprets the message depends on his/her way of decoding – which in turn depends on that person’s cultural experiences. Regular readers of *Magyar Fórum* are bound to become part of an anti-Semitic tradition. Consequently, we have good reason to suppose that the regular readers of that journal approve of its editorial line. What the listeners of Pannon Rádió say during phone-in programs proves that.

For instance, one of those listeners complained that a liberal minister had set up an expert panel that consists of “*cosmopolitan*” scholars, a panel that allegedly recommended that Hungary should compensate for the decline in its population by inviting settlers from abroad. The listener said: “*I have had enough of such recommendations, which are formulated at foreign orders.*”<sup>37</sup> He then mentioned the Jews, the issues of globalization and nationhood. Finally, he put the question: “*I have had enough of the immigrant Russian Jews, who are walking around in downtown Budapest in expensive fur coats. Let me put the question: Why do we let Brussels, New York, the World Bank or UNESCO issue us orders?*”<sup>38</sup> Two days later, speaking on Pannon Rádió, a female listener expressed her indignation because, as she put it, the international financial world constrains Viktor Orbán’s room to maneuver.

Why is that important? Because expressions like “*debt slavery*” and “*people of an un-Hungarian mindset*” evoke associations in the readers of *Magyar Fórum* (and listeners of the above-mentioned Pannon Rádió) that are different from those of the rest of the public.<sup>39</sup> Consequently, we should not overlook a

<sup>36</sup> Andy Ruddock: *Understanding Audiences. Theory and Method*, Sage, 2001, pp. 123–126.

<sup>37</sup> Pannon Rádió, January 9, 2001.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> In the year 2000 Viktor Orbán also used those terms in public speeches.

remark by László Kövér (formerly president, since spring 2001, executive vice-president of Fidesz, the majority party in the previous government) in which he denies the view that MIÉP is a racist party. After a group of Roma people from the village of Zámoly sought asylum in Strasbourg, Kövér claimed that the incident had been prearranged with the purpose of tarnishing Hungary's image, and that Israel was among the chief organizers. He alleged that the Zámoly affair had been "*concocted*" by Hungarian left-liberal intellectuals. Without their "*wickedness*" it could never have happened. It was meant to make the "*majority society*" (i.e. the Hungarian society) have a bad conscience and feel ashamed. The same arguments were used during 2001 by contributors to the weekly Magyar Fórum and Magyar Demokrata and parliamentary speeches by Lóránt Hegedűs Jr., MP of MIÉP. Those arguments neatly fit the doctrine about the Jews seeking global hegemony...<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> See: A rendszerváltás még nem zárult le (Parts of the Pre-1990 Regime are still Hanging On), interview with László Kövér by László Seres and Szilvia Varró, Beszélő, May 2001.

ÁRON MONORI

## OLD-NEW PREJUDICES

---

### *A Comparison of the Phraseology of Magyar Fórum and 12 röpirat*

In this essay<sup>1</sup> I compare hate speech that appeared in the weekly Magyar Fórum in 2001 with the content of 12 röpirat (12 Pamphlets), an anti-Semitic monthly of the 1880s. However widely apart the two journals are in time, and however different their social and political environment is, there is a stunning similarity between the worldview and ideas of their authors.

Magyar Fórum, which was established at the end of the 20th century by István Csurka, the anti-Semitic<sup>2</sup> founder of a party, writer and political commentator, could hardly add anything in content to what could be read in the monthly that was published a century before that and was edited by Gyôzô Istóczy, another anti-Semitic founder of a party and political commentator. The two journals have a common denominator: they look for and find the same thing (“The Jew”) behind every phenomenon and event. Whether “*the Jew*” is labeled as “*cosmopolite*”, “*Judeo-Bolshevik*”, “*assimilated*”, “*Zionist*”, “*capitalist*” or “*Communist*” is of secondary importance. The point is that he serves alien interests, is a parasite sucking the blood of the nation, and is the cause of all our problems. As can be seen below, Hungarian anti-Semitic journalism has hardly changed over the past one hundred years.

### Briefly About the Founders and the Monthlies

Gyôzô Istóczy, an infamous anti-Semitic politician of the final decades of the 19th century, founded the monthly 12 röpirat in 1880. In the 1870s he was a Member of the Hungarian Parliament belonging to the Liberal Party, then a

---

<sup>1</sup> This study is the revised version of an article first published in the media theory journal Médiakutató: Egy antiszemita lap és szellemi előfutára (An Anti-Semitic Monthly and Its Intellectual Precursor). Médiakutató, spring 2002.

<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to give a terse definition of anti-Semitism. In this essay I will use David Berger’s definition, which says that anti-Semitism means “(1) *hostility to Jews as a group, hostility that either has no justifiable cause or overreacts to it in a morally unacceptable way; or (2) contempt for the physical or moral traits that mark Jews, which contempt is the result of entirely unfounded or irrational generalizations and exaggerations.*” In: András Kovács, ed.: Modern antiszemitizmus (Modern Anti-Semitism), Új Mandátum, Budapest, 1999, p. 89.

party in government. In 1883 he left the party and founded a new one, the National Anti-Semitic Party.<sup>3</sup> After that the Anti-Semitic Party issued 12 röpirat for twelve years. The “*Jewish question*” was practically its only theme.

István Csurka, the leading politician of the far right in Hungary, founded Magyar Fórum in 1989. From 1990, Csurka was a Member of Parliament belonging to the Hungarian Democratic Forum (MDF), which was then a government party. He left MDF in 1993 and founded the radical right-wing Party of Hungarian Justice and Life (MIÉP). After that Magyar Fórum essentially became the organ of MIÉP.<sup>4</sup> Articles related to Jews and Israel abound in it.

Although there is a century between the two monthlies and their historical contexts are different, the way they address issues that are related to Jews is often identical. Both journals carry topics, theories and general anti-Semitic stereotypes that are well known in the history of anti-Semitic ideology and opinion writing. Below I survey some recurrent topics in the two publications.

### Conspiracy Theory

Allegations about conspiracies are among the most often repeated charges against Jews. Both publications carry articles that reveal efforts of Jews to seize economic, financial and political power around the world.

#### 12 röpirat

*“...an alien race is nowadays threatening the culture, civilization, well-being and future of the European Christian peoples. That alien race is the Jewish race. ...Modern liberalism, which increasingly identifies itself with the interests of the strengthening Jews, has become sham liberalism. It is now a handy tool for Jews*

<sup>3</sup> The parliamentary career of the Anti-Semitic Party was brief. (By 1892 it had become so insignificant that it did not enter the elections.) The political elite of the time spared no effort to push to the margin the anti-Semitic movement. Prime Minister István Tisza repeatedly dissociated himself conspicuously from Istóczy and his party. For more details, see Mór Szatmári: *Húsz esztendő parlamenti viharai* (Parliamentary Battles of Twenty Years). Amicus, Budapest, 1928, p. 58. Responsible politicians, who disagreed on scores of other issues, concurred on that one. Lajos Kossuth sent this message from exile in 1883: “... as for anti-Semitic propaganda, I am ashamed of it as a man of the 19th century, I regret it as a Hungarian, and I condemn it as a patriot.” In: Ferenc Kossuth, ed.: *Kossuth Lajos iratai* (Documents of Lajos Kossuth), vol. 10, Athenaeum, Budapest, 1904, p. 117.

<sup>4</sup> István Csurka, President of MIÉP, is head of its board of editors.

*to realize their plans of world hegemony and enslaving the European Christian peoples. ... Jewish financiers keep increasing the national debts, which heavily burden the peoples. Because of those debts, the governments of indebted states degenerate into debt collecting agencies of the Jews.”<sup>5</sup>*

*“Jews – not just those living in Europe – form a huge army that is seeking world hegemony with the guidance of Alliance Israélite Universelle. That activity is anything but noble. ... The results of the Berlin congress have shown that the »Alliance Israélite Universelle« is already a great power.”<sup>6</sup>*

*“Jewish power derives from the lodges of Freemasons. ... Freemasonry is a handy tool in the hands of the leaders of Alliance Israélite Universelle.. ... As far as religion is concerned, Jews are atheists, Freemasons and nihilists, as for principles, they are rational. They are not 'sons of Moses' any more. ... However, they have remained Jewish in heart and blood ... for they still cherish the dream of world hegemony. Whatever their nationality or title, they serve the interests of their people and promote the plan of the leaders of Israel.”<sup>7</sup>*

#### Magyar Fórum

*“In 1973 the chairman of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright, decided to summon leading Zionist lobbyists before a committee hearing to throw some light on their pro-Israel lobbying. He summed up the results of his enquiry in a »Face the Nation« interview on CBS television: 'The Israelis control policy in ... the Senate'. He added: 'Our colleagues in the Senate, about 70% of them, make up their minds more under the pressure of a lobby than from their own conviction.' In the next elections Fulbright lost his seat as senator.”<sup>8</sup>*

<sup>5</sup> A drezdai első nemzetközi antiszemita kongresszus manifesztuma. A zsidóság által veszélyeztetett keresztény államok kormányaihoz és népeihez! (Manifesto of the first international anti-Semitic congress, held in Dresden. Addressed to the governments and peoples of the Christian states that are endangered by Jews), 12 röpirat, September 15, 1882.

<sup>6</sup> Károly Kovács: A zsidóság, mint uralomra vágó kaszt (Jews Form a Caste that Seeks World Hegemony). 12 röpirat, December 15, 1880.

<sup>7</sup> Szabadkőművéség és zsidóság (Freemasonry and Jews). 12 röpirat, August 15, 1883.

<sup>8</sup> Alajos Chrudinák: Izraeli apartheid és hazai védelmezői (Apartheid in Israel and its Hungarian Defenders). Magyar Fórum, September 6, 2001.

*“...of all the big capitalist groups that have ties to countries and nations, the Israeli and other Jewish capitalists can make the best use of globalism. Israel is the paragon state of globalism. ...Ever since Theodor Herzl’s early vision, the fathers of Israel have been acting with determination and in cooperation with each other. With foresight and in the possession of all necessary information, and with the Holocaust behind them, they have prepared to repartition the world and ensure secure livelihood for their brethren.”<sup>9</sup>*

## Immigration, New Settlers and their Henchmen

Calling attention to Jewish immigration has been a recurrent theme in Hungarian anti-Semitic literature.<sup>10</sup> Readers are always warned of the grave dangers to Hungarian society. Both journals discuss that issue profusely. 12 röpirat calls for government action to halt a process that is detrimental to Hungarians. Csurka’s weekly falls short of that, yet its self-styled diagnoses imply the need for some action.

### 12 röpirat

*“The number of Jews is growing fast due to large-scale immigration. Newspapers of various political affiliations have repeatedly complained about this Jewish influx, which is also heavily on the mind of the public. ...I ask the honorable ministry: previous governments have promised to introduce a bill in Parliament to limit the settlement of Jews but they never followed through. Is this government going to do so to prevent foreign Jews from inundating Hungary?”<sup>11</sup>*

*“Jews are surreptitiously conquering the lands that our ancestors handed down to us. Unless we reconquer them, we will become strangers in our homeland.”<sup>12</sup>*

<sup>9</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 6, 2001.

<sup>10</sup> The widely held view that during the age of Austria-Hungary (1867-1918) immigration swelled the ranks of Jews on Hungarian soil is unfounded. Between 1870 and 1910 emigrating Jews outnumbered immigrant ones by 113,800. Among emigrants in general Jews had a higher ratio than Christians. See also Walter Pietsch: A zsidók bevándorlása Galiciából és a magyarországi zsidóság (Immigration of Jews from Galicia and the Jews of Hungary). Valóság, no. 11, 1988.

<sup>11</sup> Istóczy Győző képviselőnek a képviselőház 1875. évi ápril 8-kán tartott ülésén a zsidókérdésben az össz-minisztériumhoz intézett interpellációja s ennek indoklása. Question of Győző Istóczy, MP, to the Government about the Jewish Question, Delivered in the Upper House on 8 April 1875). 12 röpirat, April 15, 1885.

<sup>12</sup> Győző Istóczy: Programunk. (Our Manifesto). 12 röpirat, September 15, 1881.

Magyar Fórum

*“The shopping mall culture is alien to our nation, yet no one should think it only serves business purposes. Once Budapest has turned truly international, shopping malls will become the most important public spaces of the city. ... The city is international, and everything is in the hands of the Jews, who live in guarded residential parks. For the rest of us there is nothing else to do other than to loiter in the mall for half a day. What an excellent country is left to us! By the way, what was it called in the past?”<sup>13</sup>*

*“Why do the institutions leading the Jewish community of the world and Israel itself need dismembered Hungary as an area. Why do we dare to call the Hungarian business partners of the plaza-builders vanguards? Why do we believe that the financial centers controlling the world and the Jewish community have a large-scale strategic goal of supporting the construction of plazas and residential parks in Hungary and why are they offensively spreading Jewish and Israeli mass culture here? What do they employ vanguards for and why do they want Hungarian land? The answer is simple: because of the high costs of sustaining Israel. ... they need another, less expensive territory. That is why our truncated country has been put on their map. It is impossible to reduce the exorbitant maintenance costs of Israel. ... They expect a solution to their problem by choosing truncated Hungary, where the population is tolerant and decreasing and where natural assets are ideal... Jewish leaders are looking for a new European base. Founding a state through infiltration and purchases is not new to them at all for that is how they did it in Palestine.”<sup>14</sup>*

### “Jewish Rule” in Hungary

These journals often allege that the elected leaders of Hungary do not hold the reins of economic and political power because they are under the influence of Jewish circles that play a dominant role in international finance. The articles warn about the limitations of Hungary’s sovereignty and competence.

---

<sup>13</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 12, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 26, 2001.

## 12 röpirat

*“The fetters on the hands and feet of the nation have been made of iron that was bought from a loan granted by Rothschild. That cosmopolitan billionaire and his legion of usurers order Hungary about and even direct Hungary’s home affairs. ... when Hungarian workers guided by Hungarian enterprising spirit utilize Hungary’s ample resources, then alien hands are not allowed to exploit domestic resources to serve alien interests. ’[Quoted from his own earlier speech] Here is the essence of my anti-Semitism: in Hungary alien hands divert a considerable part of the domestic resources to alien destinations.”<sup>15</sup>*

*“As Europe’s wise governments have steered themselves and their peoples to the pockets of Jewish bankers... we should expect our government (which is sitting meekly in Rothschild’s pocket) and the majority of Members of Parliament who blindly support it to solve the Jewish question in the foreseeable future ... Rothschild has plenty of money and he is a Jew. Even if our civilized government has revenue of 300 million forints, it is a beggar and will always depend on Jews. ... See for yourself that real power is not wielded by Kálmán Tisza or Szapáry but by Jews, who corrupt the governments in the same way as petty usurers corrupt and enslave the men-in-the-street.”<sup>16</sup>*

## Magyar Fórum

*“Although Hungary is not even a member of the European Union and is far from introducing the euro, control over its finances is already in the hands of the same forces that rule in the euro zone. In the forthcoming analysis I am going to tell you how Israeli investors have penetrated the Hungarian state, which has been weakened. Israeli investors are about to assume real control here both over economic life and other everyday aspects of life. In this liberal state the power field is divided into two parts. A weak government and an incapacitated state occupy the one part. The other, continuously growing part, is filled by international capital, Israeli companies and their henchmen.”<sup>17</sup>*

<sup>15</sup> Istóczy Győző képviselői beszámolója az 1881–84-ki országgyűlésről (Győző Istóczy Gives an Account of the Sessions of Parliament between 1881 and 1884). 12 röpirat, May 15, 1884.

<sup>16</sup> Sámuel Gáborjáni Szentmiklósi: Kiáltó szó a magyar keresztény néphez (Warning to the Hungarian Christian People). 12 röpirat, April 15, 1884.

<sup>17</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, July 12, 2001.

## Jewish Control over the Printed and Electronic Media

The anti-Semitic articles keep stressing that the Jews have occupied all key positions. An eminent place is assigned here to the printed and electronic media. Both publications devote attention to that topic.

### 12 röpirat

*“In addition to business, Jews have gained ground especially in the press. In fact, in Austria-Hungary the majority of papers is either owned by Jews or a delegate of that caste is on guard. In constitutional countries the press is second in importance only to finance ... The press is a vehicle for Jewish interests.”<sup>18</sup>*

*“Jews have become unrestrained manipulators of public opinion. They suppress whatever justified complaint is made against them and misinterpret all articles that even faintly endanger Jewish rule ... The consequences are intellectual slavery and moral cowardice towards Jews.”<sup>19</sup>*

*“Alas, Jews dominate nearly every newspaper. Jewish publishers, editors and journalists work hand in hand to bring down Hungarian journalism from the heights where enthusiasts had once elevated it.”<sup>20</sup>*

*“The Jewish press throws sand into open eyes. ... The Jewish press cynically ridicules both quixotic dreams and hallowed national endeavors. In Hungary it is not the national sentiment that creates journalism but the daily press creates the general opinion. And the daily press is a mercenary of the Jews.”<sup>21</sup>*

### Magyar Fórum

*“The Bronfman family owns both commercial television channels, especially TV2, and their direction is arranged accordingly. Note that Edgar Bronfman is*

<sup>18</sup> Istóczy Győző képviselőnek a képviselőház 1875. évi ápril 8-kán tartott ülésén a zsidókérdésben az össz-minisztériumhoz intézett interpellációjá s ennek indoklása (Question – and its reasoning – Győző Istóczy addressed to the government about the Jewish question in Parliament on 8 April 1875). 12 röpirat, April 15, 1885.

<sup>19</sup> See footnote <sup>5</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> Társadalmunk elzsidósodása (Growing Jewish Dominance over our Society) 12 röpirat, September 15, 1885.

<sup>21</sup> Zalai: Theoria és praxis (Theory and Practice), 12 röpirat, March 15, 1883.

*chairman of the World Jewish Congress. ...Israeli investments are meant for Jews. They are managed by Hungarian Jews, who are familiar with the field. The same applies to the other target area of investments: telecommunications. Where they cannot have full control, as at the State Radio and Television, they maintain a barrage of criticism.”<sup>22</sup>*

*“Today, just as during the Kádár-Aczél era [1957 – mid 1980s] persons belonging to a certain race decide what facts, truths and lies should be served to the people.”<sup>23</sup>*

*“A meeting is organized with Endre Marinovich.<sup>24</sup> The organizers are reporters, moderators, editors, György Bolgár and others of his type – persons who have control over the news programs of Radio Budapest. They used to be in senior positions before 1989, and their political past has not been scrutinized. They are neo-liberal or Communist in conviction but they pose as being aloof of party politics. The principal organizer is Gábor István Benedek. The papers report that he is acting on behalf of the Federation of Hungarian Jewish Congregations (Mazsihisz). That is not by accident. ... Mazsihisz is the Hungarian extension of the World Jewish Congress. The former cabinet chief should know exactly what the persons surrounding him represent. They put forward requests and proposals and they issue threats. ...They want Radio Budapest to remain under their control. Just like similar guys at Népszabadság, they wish to continue directing the Hungarian press, radio and television stations. They wish to help the commercial television channels to destroy our values.”<sup>25</sup>*

### Immunity and Double Standards

Both journals broach the charge that, relying on their positions of power, Jews demand special treatment for themselves; they introduce double standards that are favorable to them (and detrimental to Hungarians and other peoples), and they do not tolerate criticism of any sort either in Hungary or elsewhere.

---

<sup>22</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, June 28, 2001.

<sup>23</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, October 4, 2001.

<sup>24</sup> Who at a certain time was the only candidate to the post of president of the public-service Hungarian Radio.

<sup>25</sup> István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes), Magyar Fórum, March 8, 2001.

12 röpirat

*“Are Jews alone aloof from all criticism? It is tolerable to criticize more or less harshly the Jesuits, aristocrats, the armed forces, prim members of the middle class and even the crown. It is possible and allowed to sharply ridicule and even stir hatred against 60 million Germans and 100 million Slavs. Then why on earth could we not ponder the goings-on of the 8 to 10 million Jews, especially since those goings-on provoke such strong criticism? Each nation, state and social institution should tolerate criticism. Why is it especially the Jews who claim full exemption from criticism?”<sup>26</sup>*

*“...the Jews have made criticism of the Jewish race a crime comparable to high treason ... only the Jews – unrelenting enemies of mankind – enjoy immunity.”<sup>27</sup>*

*“...often a non-Jew may not assert his simplest right against a Jew. What is more, the bureaucrats who have been bribed by the Jews may persecute such a man for the rest of his life ... Non-Jews cannot enjoy equality before the law if they come into conflict with Jews.”<sup>28</sup>*

Magyar Fórum

*“Since World War II it has been a strict requirement that in films, as elsewhere, the portrayal of Yahweh’s ‘chosen people’, ‘the salt of the earth’, ‘our elder brethren’ (Pope John Paul II dixit) must express the highest respect. They merit hosanna by birthright and due gratitude for the good deeds they have done to the world. Objective rendering, which would be labeled as anti-Semitic, cannot occur because at least 90% of American filmmaking is in Jewish hands...”<sup>29</sup>*

*“Now that Parliament’s committee of immunity has unanimously voted to suspend the immunity of Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., the time has come for the Grand Trial and the pledge of allegiance to Brussels and Washington: Hungary is not an anti-Semitic country and it punishes ‘hate speech’ in all forms. During the trial*

---

<sup>26</sup> Beköszöntő (Greeting the Reader). 12 röpirat, October 15, 1880.

<sup>27</sup> See footnote <sup>6</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> See footnote <sup>5</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> István Gazdag: Filmszemle – politikailag inkorrekt szemmel (Film Review – with a Politically Incorrect Approach). Magyar Fórum, September 20, 2001.

*no one will dare open his mouth because all those in positions of power know that it is a time when mouths have to be kept shut and everyone is expected to agree with the persecution of the defendant.”<sup>30</sup>*

## Conclusion

A comparison of articles in the two journals shows their shared attitude of explaining all phenomena along anti-Semitic lines. They see domestic Jews as standing for an alien power. That alien power, they allege, has a center. According to 12 röpirat, it is the Paris-based Alliance Israélite Universelle, according to Magyar Fórum, it is the World Jewish Congress.

Both journals say there is a “Jewish question”, which is not religious but related to business, society and politics. 12 röpirat refers to the Jews as a separate caste, whose members belong to the same race and cannot assimilate. Magyar Fórum avoids formulating views so bluntly. It pinpoints certain Jewish groups and organizations that it considers especially noxious, as the Mazsihisz (“*the extended arm of the World Jewish Congress*”), Jewish financiers (“*caste of bankers*”), and Jewish journalists who dominate the press (“*Aczél-hussars who belong to a close-knit race*”), etc. Furthermore, Magyar Fórum condemns the “Tribe”, which it defines as “*a few million cantankerous blusterers*” “*who are posing as if they were the majority*”.

The editors and authors of 12 röpirat pioneered in formulating the phrasology of modern Hungarian anti-Semitism. They coined phrases such as “*Jewish question*”, “*new land conquerors*”, and “*caste spirit*”. To portray Jews, they translated certain German expressions like “*destructive elements*”, “*aliens*”, “*unpatriotic*”, etc. which were avidly picked up by anti-Semitic opinion writers of the 20th century.<sup>31</sup> István Csurka’s weekly uses a part of those phrases and has added new ones. In Hungary Magyar Fórum was the first to use expressions like “*Palestinization*” or “*caste of bankers*”.

These journals consider as proven that the Jews control business, the press and the political processes. Money and money-handling Shylock Jews allegedly

<sup>30</sup> Zoltán Szócs: Hegedüs kontra kirekesztők (Hegedüs Versus the Exclusionists). Magyar Fórum, December 20, 2001.

<sup>31</sup> For more detail, see Judit Kubinszky: Politikai antiszemitizmus Magyarországon 1875–1890 (Political Anti-Semitism in Hungary 1875–1890), Kossuth, Budapest, 1976. pp. 82–83.

play a key role there. Financial control is then employed in the realm of politics because indebted governments “*who are in the pockets of Jewish bankers and Jewish usurers*” cannot represent their voters’ interests, and the mercenary media distort facts at the behest of their owners. In 12 röpirat the archetype of the Shylock Jew is Rothschild and the Rothschilds, in Magyar Fórum György Soros, Edgar Bronfman and true to the century-old tradition, Rothschild.<sup>32</sup>

Both journals carry anti-liberal and, to some extent, anti-capitalist phrases. In 12 röpirat they are confined to condemning Jewish monopoly capital. In Magyar Fórum that takes the form of anti-globalism. Magyar Fórum claims that the Jewish-led investor groups and the State of Israel are the main beneficiaries of globalism, while globalism is detrimental to Hungary. That, according to Magyar Fórum, is one source of the alleged conflict of interest between Hungarians and Jews.

Apart from the differences that are related to the two different historical periods, there is an unmistakable ideological kinship between the two journals. As if to confirm that, Magyar Fórum repeatedly refers to Gyôzô Istóczy. All those references are affirmative. In fact, Zoltán Szôcs describes Istóczy as a great Hungarian.<sup>33</sup> Note the phrase: “*Gyôzô Istóczy, may his memory be blessed*”<sup>34</sup> Writing about the damage caused by Jewish immigration, Magyar Fórum goes as far as expressing its full identity of views with its ideological precursor: “*The tragedy whose early symptoms were revealed in Parliament by Istóczy in 1878 has escalated into an irreversible murder of a nation under our very eyes.*”<sup>35</sup>

Ascertaining this professed ideological kinship we can safely conclude that the roots of today’s anti-Semitic journalism are to be found in the 19th century, when the rise of the middle class began. That there still is a weekly in the early years of the 21st century that fulfils the job once done by 12 röpirat proves how incomplete the consolidation of the middle class is.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> See for instance, István Csurka: Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes). Magyar Fórum, June 14, 2001.

<sup>33</sup> Zoltán Szôcs: Zsidózakata (Jewish Clatter). Magyar Fórum, August 9, 2001.

<sup>34</sup> Zoltán Szôcs: Szégyen és gyalázat (Shame and Outrage). Magyar Fórum, November 9, 2000.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> András Gerô writes: “*The modern history of Hungary is the unfinished process of transition from feudalism to the consolidation of the middle class.*” In: András Gerô: Magyar polgárosodás (The Rise of the Hungarian Middle Class), Atlantisz, Budapest, 1993. p. 9. The title of the English version of that book, Modern Hungarian Society in the Making. The Unfinished Experience, emphasizes that.

Despite their ideological identity, *12 röpirat* and *Magyar Fórum* differ in that the editors and authors of the first proudly refer to themselves as anti-Semites, while the editors and authors of the latter deny their anti-Semitism. The explanation is simple: István Csurka and his associates know the connotations of the word anti-Semitism in the post-Holocaust world. They readily propagate anti-Semitic ideas, yet they are too shy to name them as such.

# A P P E N D I X

ENIKŐ FUKK

## FOCAL POINTS IN MASS COMMUNICATION

---

Since it was set up at the end of 1999, the Zsidó Dokumentációs Központ of Budapest (ZsiDok) (Jewish Documentation Center) has collected and archived approximately 2000 publications from the Hungarian press. In addition to various articles relating to Hungarian Jews, this ever expanding data base contains some openly or implicitly anti-Semitic writings as well. (The fact alone that a document is included in the database or the “intersection-bibliography” below is not a classification regarding the attitude or the tone of the given article!)

The documentation center primarily monitors Hungarian daily and weekly newspapers, journals and the internet editions of newspapers and radio programs, gradually expanding its collection base. The following is a selection (aiming for completeness, but hardly complete) from the Jewish- or Israeli-related articles, which generated the greatest public interest in the Hungarian printed press in 2001, and which had the biggest press reaction during that year. (Several of these topics are discussed in detail in the chapters of this book.) Vera Pécsi carried out the collection for the year 2001, and the author of this article made the selection from the documents processed by her.

The “intersection” is always the earliest published report, news item or opinion about a given topic. The topic is marked with a quotation from the writing appearing as the intersection. Since this book deals with the year 2001, the following documents are – with one exception - listed according to “debates” started in 2001. Because of its importance, the selection begins with a topic that first started in the year 2000 – the issue of Holocaust education.

Our second intersection is the topic of the Romas of Zámoly. The bibliography of this topic (as well as that of the Holocaust education) can partly be found in the appendix to last year’s edition of this book. Since then, however, further articles have been published regarding these topics. Therefore, we decided to publish a list of the articles relating to them again this year. (The items already published in last year’s edition are printed in *italics*.) Apart from these exceptions, the list only includes articles published in the year 2001.

Joób Sándor: Pokorni Holocaust-emléknapot javasol

(Pokorni proposes Holocaust Memorial Day) (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 01. 19.)

*“Zoltán Pokorni has proposed April 16 as the date for a Holocaust Memorial Day. During World War II, (on this date in 1944,) Hungarian Jews began to be locked up in ghettos. In addition to commemorations, schools can organize lectures on the persecution of the Jews in Hungary on the Holocaust Day. – The commemoration is aimed at keeping the individual’s moral responsibility alive, Zoltán Pokorni said.”*

- (sz. n.): A Mazsihisz támogatja Pokorni javaslatát (Népszabadság, 2000. 01. 20.)*  
*Vill.: Új kisgazda javaslat (Napi Magyarország, 2000. 01. 21.)*  
*Zsebők Csaba: Ha az egyikről megemlékezünk... (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 01. 25.)*  
*Gróf Endre: Arány- vagy országtevésztés (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 02. 17.)*  
*Szerető Szabolcs: Megszólal a zsidó Közéleti Unió (Napi Magyarország, 2000. 02. 19.)*  
*Szőnyi Szilárd: Sokan visszaélnék a holokauszt traumájával (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 02.28.)*  
*L. K.: Nocsak (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 03. 23.)*  
*Neumann Ottó: Tanulni a tragédiából (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 04. 10.)*  
*Hovanyecz László: történelemóra Csurgón (Népszabadság, 2000. 04. 18.)*  
*Hovanyecz László: Beszélj el fiaidnak! (Népszabadság, 2000. 04. 22.)*  
*T. Zs.: Zsidóság a tankönyvekben (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 12.)*  
*Stefka István: A század magyar népirtása (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 27.)*  
*K. F. : Emléknapot a baloldali diktatúra áldozatainak (magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 30.)*  
*Joób Sándor: Tantervi előírás emlékezni a kommunizmus áldozataira (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 08. 07.)*  
*MIÉP elnökség: A holokauszt oktatása (MIÉP sajtótájékoztató, 2001. 02. 22.)*  
*(sz. n.): Javaslat a holokausztról (Népszava, 2001. 02. 17.)*  
*(sz. n.): A MIÉP sérelmezi, hogy a holokauszt emléknap idén húsvéthétfőre esik (MTI, 2001. 02. 22.)*  
*Mészáros Tamás: Az értékrendi rokonság (Népszava, 2001. 02. 24.)*  
*Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 04. 12.)*  
*Mazsihisz: Holokauszt emléknap 2001. április 17. (MTI, 2001. 04. 17.)*  
*Csurka István: A Mazsihisz politikai nyilatkozatai (MIÉP sajtótájékoztató, 2001. 04. 18.)*  
*Hanczár János: A holokausztra emlékeztek a Parlamentben (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 04. 18.)*  
*Dési János: A biciklisták és a MIÉP (Népszava, 2001. 04. 19.)*  
*-kz.: Élet (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 04. 20.)*  
*Mészáros Tamás: A heti válasz elmaradt (Népszava, 2001. 04. 21.)*  
*Lakatos Pál: A MIÉP és a Mazsihisz (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 04. 22.)*  
*Horváth D. Gábor: Bolgár és az antiszemiták (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 04. 23.)*  
*Csurka István: Nincs különbség áldozat és áldozat között (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 04. 26.)*  
*Király József: Holokausztállítás, holokauszttagadás (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2001. 09. )*  
*Losonczi Péter: Füst az égen (Népszava, 2001. 09. 29.)*  
*Karsai László: Csurka eszméi és célja (Népszabadság, 2001. 12. 20.)*

Pilhál György: Cigányút (Double meaning: The wrong way, but literally: the Romas' road) (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 07. 28.)

*“Although it is conceivable in theory that the Romas' uproar began simultaneously at several points of the country (Zámoly, Csór, Zugló, Pesthidegkút, Debrecen...), it is hardly true in practice. ... Only those who have practiced it before can perform such coordinated, accurate work. During the taxi drivers' blockade, for example. Those who are experienced in discrediting the country abroad. Those who fill the Western press with reports on the 'evil conditions' here. Those who call the Hungarians anti-Semites and try to keep frightening Europe with Csurka. Those who are now trying to use the misery of a minority to their own advantage, in order to make political capital and obtain foreign supporters. But this one will be too big a bite. It will go down the wrong way (onto the Romas' road).”*

*Berkes Béla: Jeruzsálemi tanár támogatta a zámolyiakat (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 08. 05.)*

*Hering József: Jeruzsálemből jön a pénz a cigányoknak (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 08. 17.)*

*(sz. n.): Kanada, Kuba vagy Izrael? (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 08. 31.)*

*Kertész Péter: A holokauszt az emberről szól (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 10. 13.)*

*Lovas István jegyzete (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 10. 15.)*

*Tar Zsuzsanna: Lejárató titkosszolgálati akció? (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 03. 03.)*

*Lovas István jegyzete (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 03. 04.)*

*Eörsi István: Mondom a magamét (Népszava, 2001. 03. 05.)*

*(sz. n.): Nemzetközi botrányt kavart a Jane's cikke (Népszabadság, 2001. 03. 06.)*

*(sz. n.): újabb cikk a zámolyi romákról (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 03. 10.)*

*Lovas István: Lovas István jegyzete (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 03. 11.)*

*-sl-: Élet (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 03. 16.)*

*Tar Zsuzsanna: A Jane's kitart állításai mellett (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 03. 19.)*

*Lovas István: A véralgebra bosszúja a gyűlölet ellen (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 03. 21.)*

*Szöcs Zoltán: A romák és a cigányok (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 03. 22.)*

*Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 03. 22.)*

*Csapody Miklós: Parlamenti felszólalás (Parlamenti Napló, 2001. 03. 26.)*

*ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt: Parlamenti felszólalás (Parlamenti Napló, 2001. 03. 27.)*

*(hering): Egyházügyről és diszkriminációról (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 03. 29.)*

*Koncz Lajos: Kristallnacht a parlamentben (HVG, 2001. 05. 26.)*

*Nagy N. Péter: Egy mondat (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 03.)*

*Molnár Péter: Gyűlöletbeszéd Magyarországon (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 10. 26.)*

*(sz. n.): Franka Tibor új könyve (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 30.)*

*Nagy N. Péter: A zsinat üzenete (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 30.)*

*Melegh Attila: A "Kelet-Nyugat" beszédmod (Népszabadság, 2001. 12. 12.)*

Franka Tibor: “A MIÉP a kormány kurvája”

(“MIÉP is the government’s whore”) (Népszabadság, 2001. 04. 05.)

*“The daily Magyar Hírlap, where I used to be a senior staff member, was bought in 1989 by a gentleman named Maxwell, whose looks alone could make the tissue paper in your pocket crumple. This type has a runny nose, with ears set below their nose and they are club-footed. They are very easy to spot. When I went to the Holy Land, I understood everything straight away. I believe, we, Hungarians, are different...”*

R. Székely Julianna: Fülel és orrcimpák (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 04. 09.)

Kertész Péter: Holokauszt-tagadás? (Népszava, 2001. 05. 15.)

Kácsor Zsolt: Farkasszemet nézők (Népszabadság, 2001. 12. 12.)

H. J.: Testvéri segítség Izraelnek? (Brotherly help for Israel?)

(Magyar Fórum, 2001. 05. 10.)

*“Jozsef (Tomi) Lapid, president of the Israeli Sinnuj (Change) Party, and member of the Knesset’s Foreign Affairs and National Security Committee, spoke on April 29 in Hebrew on Jerusalem radio about the latest resolutions of the Strasbourg-based Council of Europe. The Novi Sad-born Israeli politician spoke with appreciation, in fact, even with gratitude to Hungary and its politicians who actively contributed to preventing the Council of Europe’s general meeting from passing– as the Jerusalem politician put it – an anti-Semitic resolution.”*

Györi Béla: A láthatatlan folyamatok pusztításai (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 05. 10.)

Magyar Országgyűlés MIÉP frakciója: A MIÉP tiltakozik a palesztin népirtás ellen (2001. 05. 23.)

Pál Gábor: Eörsit bírálja a MIÉP (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 05. 24.)

Kepecs Ferenc: Ellenségem ellensége (Népszava, 2001. 05. 29.)

-hering-: Az izraeli–palesztin viszállyról (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 05. 31.)

(sz. n.): Elítélték az izraeli agressziót (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 05. 31.)

H. J.: Herczog Edit szelleme (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 05. 31.)

H. J.: A magyar szélsőjobb hallgat minket (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 06. 07.)

Márton László: Fogadatlan prókátorok (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 06. 11.)

Bächer Iván: Szép vagy, gyönyörű vagy Magyarország (How beautiful you are, oh, Hungary – title of a irredentist song) (Népszabadság, 2001. 06. 30.)

*“I was first and foremost informed by dozens of phone calls from friends of the fact that, on a television program, well-known journalists discussed a little*

*article of mine as well as me, personally. Several people claimed that the tone of the program was considerably rougher than that of my controversial essay, which constituted part of my literary activity and which shocked the Hungarian and the international public, and because of which I finally was kicked out from behind the trenches of power. Later I was also given the transcript of the program, and I must say that there is no getting around it. I received a fair bit of Jew-bashing again, me, the Slovak."*

Bencsik András: A mai zsoldosokról (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 07. 05.)

Bencsik András: A Lovas jelenségről (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 07. 05.)

Székely Kecskés János: Láttam boldog lányokat is (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 07. 05.)

Haeffler András: Bayer Zsolt esete a sajtószabadsággal (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 11. 18.)

Nyilvánosság Klub monitorcsoport: "Best of..." (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 11. 26.)

Kondor Katalin: Kivel beszélnek? (Népszabadság, 2001. 12. 11.)

Thury Gábor: Kell egy csapat – Fradi-foci a Várszegi-birodalomban

(One needs a team – Fradi-football in the Várszegi-empire) (Origo, 2001. 07. 21.)

*"Fradi, or rather, the football team of Budapest's green-and-white club, changed hands on Thursday. However, the new majority-owner is not one of those who was much talked-of earlier as a potential investor; – the savior (?) is Fotex Rt. This is not the first time Gábor Várszegi (president of Fotex) has flirted with Ferencváros. ... It is worth considering how Fradi-supporters must now be feeling. Even at the time when the two clubs were founded, there were enormous social differences between their social bases: MTK (Magyar Testgyakorlók Köre), set up in 1888, represented the assimilationist aspirations of the Jews who had chosen the path of Magyarization. ...FTC, founded in 1899, had urban lower-middle-class groups as its base in the Ferencváros district, which had a predominantly petit bourgeois and working-class population, with a particular nationalistic bent. The identity of the petit bourgeois, who considers himself as Hungarian – 'a decent Hungarian type' – is contrasted with the upper middle class person 'with a businesslike mentality and foreign roots' who supports MTK. By now, the FTC side has outgrown the boundaries of District IX, Ferencváros. The all-national character of the FTC is well represented by the fact that, in certain provincial cities, local supporters often cheer on Fradi against their own team. Fradi supporters have always considered themselves as belonging to the 'simple people', while regarding those standing above them on the social ladder as belonging to the category of the 'Jews'."*

- MIÉP-elnökség: Fradi–Fotex – nemzetellenes tranzakció (MIÉP sajtótájékoztató, 2001. 07. 25.)
- Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (I–II.) (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 07. 26.)
- (sz. n.): Rejtélyes korábbi ajánlat után ma szavaznak az FTC közgyűlésén (Népszabadság, 2001. 07. 26.)
- Krajczár Gyula: Nemzet, jelkép, Fradi (Népszabadság, 2001. 07. 26.)
- Kun Péter: Az ügyészség még tájékozódik (Népszava, 2001. 07. 26.)
- Szász István: Hol a határ? (Népszava, 2001. 07. 26.)
- (sz. n.): Zsidó szervezetek tiltakozása a MIÉP állásfoglalása ellen (MTI, 2001. 07. 26.)
- Szily László: A vicces tornatanár és a zsidók (Index, 2001. 07. 26.)
- B'nai B'rith Első Budapesti Közösség: A Magyar Köztársaság Legfőbb ügyészenek! (B'nai B'rith, 2001. 07. 27.)
- (sz. n.): Elítélik a MIÉP-et (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 07. 27.)
- (sz. n.): Feljelentették Bognár Lászlót (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 07. 28.)
- Hegyí Iván: Labdarúgás: Benn a futball, kinn a szégyen (Népszabadság, 2001. 07. 30.)
- (sz. n.): Döntenie kell az ügyészségnek a MIÉP-alelnök ügyében (Népszava, 2001. 07. 30.)
- Index/MTI: A zsidó szervezetek feljelentik a MIÉP-et (Index, 2001. 07. 30.)
- Kun Péter: Hat zsidó szervezet feljelentést tett az ügyészségen (Népszava, 2001. 07. 31.)
- Ügyészségi nyomozók vizsgálják Bognár kijelentését (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 01.)
- Magyar–Izraeli Baráti Társaságok Országos Szövetségének közleménye (MTI–OS, 2001. 08. 01.)
- SZDSZ: Fradi-ügy: az SZDSZ a miniszterelnököt bírálja (MTI, 2001. 08. 01.)
- Hollós János: Beszélgetés a Reggeli Krónikában (Miniszterelnöki Hivatal, 2001. 08. 01.)
- Szenvédi: Egyesítik a MIÉP elleni feljelentéseket (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 08. 01.)
- Az MTK és a Fradi egyaránt nemzeti kincs (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 02.)
- Az ügyészségi nyomozóhivatal feljelentés-kiegészítést rendelt el a MIÉP-alelnök kijelentéseivel kapcsolatban (MTI, 2001. 08. 02.)
- Index/MTI: A Die Presse a Fradiról és a miniszterelnökről: Amikor Orbánnak elakadt a szava (Index, 2001. 08. 02.)
- Dési János: Hallgatni Fradi (Népszava, 2001. 08. 02.)
- Hadas Miklós: Örökrangadó (Magyar Narancs, 2001. 08. 02.)
- Heti zsidó (Magyar Narancs, 2001. 08. 02.)
- hering-: A Fradi megvásárlásáról (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 08. 02.)
- Dávid Ibolya a sportrendezvényeken előfordult rendbontásokról (MTI, 2001. 08. 03.)
- L.K.: Dávid Ibolya szigort ígér a lelátói rendbontók ügyében (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 03.)
- (sz. n.): Raoul Wallenbergre emlékeztek Budapesten (MTI, 2001. 08. 03.)
- Bencsik András: Botrányszезon (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 08. 03.)
- Megyesi Gusztáv: Sieg Heil! (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 08. 03.)
- Nagy N. Péter: Egy mondat (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 03.)
- (sz. n.): ...örökrangadó (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 04.)
- Csontos János: Nyár esti magyar klezmer (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 08. 04.)
- Kunstar Csaba: Dávid Ibolya büntetné a lelátókról uszítókat is (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 08. 04.)
- Orosz István: A szellem és a palack (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 08. 04.)
- György Péter: A fordulat (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 04.)
- (sz. n.): A miniszterelnök nem határolódik el (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 06.)
- Kósáné Kovács Magda: A gyűlöletbeszédéről – újra (Népszava, 2001. 08. 06.)
- Szántó András: Pénz és mocskok (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 07.)
- Főrsi István: A miniszter asszony viccelődik (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 07.)

- Kun Péter: Bognár László aligha vádolható bűncselekmény elkövetésével (Népszava, 2001. 08. 07.)
- Kéri László: Friditől Fraditig (Népszava, 2001. 08. 08.)
- Galsai Dániel: Tévéfotel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 08. 09.)
- Szöcs Zoltán: Zsidózakata (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 08. 09.)
- (sz. n.): Feljelentések a MIÉP ellen (HVG, 2001. 08. 11.)
- Dávid Ibolya: Fröccsen a sár (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 08. 11.)
- Bokor Pál: Szabadságot Bognár Lászlónak! (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 08. 11.)
- Ripp Zoltán: Csurka foglyai (Népszava, 2001. 08. 11.)
- T. B.: Polgári per antiszemita jelenségek miatt (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 11.)
- Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 08. 16.)
- Gazdag István: A Fradi, a retkek és Shylock (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 08. 16.)
- Varga Imre: Gyűlölettől elvakítva (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 08. 16.)
- Halmi Gábor: Az ügyészség esete a MIÉP-pel (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 08. 17.)
- (sz. n.): Megtagadta a nyomozást az ügyészség a MIÉP-es kijelentések ügyében (MTI, 2001. 08. 17.)
- Központi Ügyészségi Nyomozó Hivatal: Határozat a nyomozás megtagadásáról (Magyar Köztársaság Ügyészségének honlapja, 2001. 08. 17.)
- (sz. n.): Az ügyészség szerint a MIÉP nem sértett törvényt (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 18.)
- (sz. n.): A MIÉP közleménye (MTI-OS, 2001. 08. 18.)
- Vajna Tamás: A száztizenhat éves ÜTE-sztori (HVG, 2001. 08. 18.)
- (sz. n.): A Magyar–Izraeli Baráti Társaságok Országos Szövetsége javaslata (MTI, 2001. 08. 19.)
- (sz. n.): Megkésétt korrekció (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 08. 21.)
- Patay Gábor: Legkésőbb ősszel tovább folytatódhat a Bognár-ügy (Népszava, 2001. 08. 21.)
- (sz. n.): Az izraeli külügyminiszter Orbán Viktornál (MTI, 2001. 08. 21.)
- Nagy N. Péter: Ferencváros, Angyal utca (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 22.)
- Gyurisné Braunsteiner Márta: A VII. kerületi alpolgármester közleménye (MTI-OS, 2001. 08. 23.)
- MTI: Orbán Viktor: "Légből kapott, üres vádaskodás" (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 29.)
- Nagy N. Péter: Kód miatt – folytatódik (Népszabadság, 2001. 08. 30.)
- Ludwig Emil: Lajtán innen, időn túl (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 09. 03.)
- Eörsi Máttyás: Heraus mit uns! (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 09. 03.)
- MIÉP-alelnök kijelentései – az Legfőbb Ügyészség elutasította a feljelentők panaszát – a Mazsihisz véleménye (MTI, 2001. 09. 03.)
- A Legfőbb Ügyészség nyomozásfelügyeleti főosztályának panaszelterjesztő határozata (Magyar Köztársaság Ügyészségének honlapja, 2001. 09. 03.)
- Seszták Ágnes: Az ügybuzgó polgármester (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 09. 05.)
- Karácsony Ágnes: Ön sem ért a focihoz? (168 óra, 2001. 09. 06.)
- hun-: A gázmaszk és a Mazsihisz (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 09. 06.)
- Eörsi István: A söpredék buzgósága (Népszabadság, 2001. 09. 08.)
- Lovas István: Az antiszemitázók alkonya Durban után (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 09. 08.)
- Mészáros Tamás: Egy válasz anatómiája (Népszava, 2001. 09. 10.)
- B' nai B' rith: Újabb panasz (B' nai B' rith, 2001. 09. 11.)
- Riba István: Vita a közösség elleni izgatásról (HVG, 2001. 09. 15.)
- Spánn Gábor: Hajrá Fradi... (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 09. 22.)
- A MIÉP aláírásgyűjtést indít a keresztény magyarság védelmében (MTI, 2001. 10. 03.)
- Sinkovics Ferenc: A MIÉP a választások után megkerülhetetlen lesz (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 10. 18.)

Molnár Péter: Gyűlöletbeszéd Magyarországon (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 10. 26.)  
 MIÉP Elnökség: Mélyen alászállt aláírás (MIÉP sajtótájékoztató, 2001. 10. 31.)  
 Pogonyi Lajos: A gyűlölet tízpercei (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 12.)

Chrudinák Alajos: Izraeli apartheid és hazai védelmezői (Apartheid in Israel and its Hungarian defenders) (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 09. 06.)

*“Now that Israel and Zionism have been accused of racism at the UN conference in Durban, false and slanderous articles have suddenly been published in the Hungarian press defending Israel, which has been severely violating international law and human rights for several decades. These philo-Semitic manifestations of hatred disregard the facts, those of the occupation and oppression, pretending they do not exist, and turn the meaning of the events and reality inside out. They call the justifiable resistance of the population of the occupied territories ‘terrorism’, and term the murderous aggression of the occupying Israeli military policing ‘justifiable self-defense’. These lobbyists are permanently rattling their anti-Semitic sabers, launching smear campaigns against anyone daring to contest the Zionist dogma and legends placing Israel above all international law.”*

Csurka István: Ég a Pentagon, romokban a globalizmus fellegvára (www.miep.hu, 2001. 09. 12.)

Chrudinák Alajos: Faji és vallási diszkrimináció Izraelben (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 09. 13.)

R. Székely Julianna: Így hazudunk mi (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 10. 03.)

Chrudinák Alajos: “A liberális nyájszellem agyagba döngöli a szuverén gondolkodást” (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 10. 04.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 10. 18.)

Chrudinák Alajos: Miért antiszemita a zsidó Saron tábornok? (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 22.)

Chrudinák Alajos: Arafat a cionista öshéja célkeresztjében (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 13.)

Chrudinák Alajos: Jacques Chirac: Bush álljon elő bizonyítékokkal (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 20.)

Dzindisz Magdaléna: Kirekesztés egy kerületi lapban (Exclusion in a district newspaper) (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 09. 07.)

*“‘A genuine Nazi writing from beginning to end’ – Gábor Fodor, leading official of the Alliance of Free Democrats, classifies the article written by MIÉP vice-president Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. for the newspaper of the party’s District XVI organization. Mr. Hegedűs would not comment on his writing. The full-page essay titled ‘Keresztyén magyar állam’ (Christian Hungarian state), written by the MIÉP vice-president Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. about Hungary’s thousand-year-old statehood, history and primarily the Jews, was published on the cover page of*

*the district newspaper.” ... “In the article, Lóránt Hegedűs speaks about the Tatar and Turkish devastation of the country, the rule of the Habsburgs, then comes to the following conclusion: ‘but the Christian Hungarian state would have warded off even this, had not, as a result of the self-renunciation of the Compromise of 1867, an army of Galician vagabonds arrived, who had been gnawing away at the country, which, still, despite everything, again and again, has always been able to resurrect itself from its ruins, from the bones of its heroes. So hear, Hungarians, the message of the 1000th year of the Christian Hungarian state, based on 1000 ancient rights and legal continuity, the only one leading you to life: Exclude them! Because if you don’t, they will do it to you!’”*

B’nai B’rith: újabb panasz (B’nai B’rith, 2001. 09. 11.)

ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt: “Rekeszd ki őket!” (HVG, 2001. 09. 15.)

Riba István: Vita a közösség elleni izgatásról (HVG, 2001. 09. 15.)

T. B.: Feljelentették ifjabb Hegedűs Lórántot (Népszabadság, 2001. 09. 17.)

T. B.: Nyomozás a MIÉP-alelnök cikke kapcsán (Népszabadság, 2001. 09. 19.)

(sz. n.): Nyomozás a MIÉP-alelnök írása kapcsán – közösség elleni izgatás?

(Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 09. 19.)

Pál Gábor: Csurka István bírálja a kormányt (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 09. 20.)

(sz. n.): A református egyház igeellenesnek ítélte ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt írását (MTI, 2001. 09. 20.)

Jezsó Ákos: Feszültségek a reformátusoknál (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 09. 21.)

Dobozi Pálma: Akár egyházi fegyelmi eljárás is indulhat ifjabb Hegedűssel szemben

(Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 09. 22.)

A szerk.: Kérjek engedélyt zsidózni? (Magyar Narancs, 2001. 09. 27.)

Sándor Zsuzsanna: A politika papjai (168 óra, 2001. 09. 27.)

(sz. n.): A MIÉP aláírásgyűjtést indít a keresztény magyarság védelmében (MTI, 2001. 10. 03.)

Bruck András: Nézettség és erkölcs (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 10. 04.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 10. 04.)

(sz. n.): Házkutatás volt az Ébresztő szerkesztőségében (Népszabadság, 2001. 10. 06.)

Index/MTI: Gyanúsítás Hegedűs Lóránt uszító cikke ügyében (Index, 2001. 10. 08.)

Bánfai Tamara: Eljárás indul Csurka ellen is? (Népszabadság, 2001. 10. 10.)

Szöcs Zoltán: Elegend van! (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 10. 11.)

(sz. n.): Ügyészségen a kirekesztők ügyei (Népszava, 2001. 10. 12.)

Locsmándi Andrea: Feljelentés az ifj. Hegedűst védő Csurka-cikk miatt

(Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 10. 13.)

Lakos Nóra: Szankcionált Pannon Rádió (Népszava, 2001. 10. 15.)

B. K.: Hegedűs Lóránt vétke (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 10. 18.)

Sinkovics Ferenc: A MIÉP a választások után megkerülhetetlen lesz

(Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 10. 18.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 10. 18.)

Görgey Géza: A perec, ha kerek (Népszabadság, 2001. 10. 22.)

(sz. n.): Egymillió ORTT-bírság a Pannon Rádióknak (Index, 2001. 10. 26.)

Molnár Péter: Gyűlöletbeszéd Magyarországon (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 10. 26.)

- Tábori Gabriella: Pannon Rádió: pénzbüntetés az ORTT-től (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 10. 27.)
- Czene Gábor: Zsinati javaslat ifjabb Hegedűs ellen (Népszabadság, 2001. 10. 27.)
- Czene Gábor: Hívó értelmiségiek a rasszizmus ellen (Népszabadság, 2001. 10. 29.)
- Értelmiségiek egy csoportjának levele egyházi vezetőkhez: Közös lelkiismeret-vizsgálatra van szükség (Népszabadság, 2001. 10. 30.)
- Ugró Miklós: Hívó értelmiség levelét megírta (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 10. 31.)
- MIÉP Elnökség: Mélyen alázállt aláírás (MIÉP sajtótájékoztató, 2001. 10. 31.)
- Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 01.)
- Papp László Tamás: A szabadság ellenségeinek szabadsága (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 07.)
- Sághy Erna: Pártegyház (168 óra, 2001. 11. 08.)
- Varga: Erőt adó igazság (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 08.)
- H. J.: Válságban a szürkeállomány (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 08.)
- Szöcs Zoltán: A transzvesztitáról és az aláírókról (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 08.)
- V. Bálint Éva: A magyar közélet türehtelen szennyező (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 11. 09.)
- Czene Gábor: Kampányelemmé vált az antiszemitizmus (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 10.)
- Pogonyi Lajos: A gyűlölet tízpercei (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 12.)
- Cz. G.: Nincs válasz a hívó értelmiségiek nyílt levelére (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 15.)
- Gidó Média Kft.: Támogatást kér a Pannon Rádió (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 15.)
- (sz. n.): Egy forintra perlik ifjabb Hegedűst (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 21.)
- Sághy Erna: Református ősz (168 óra, 2001. 11. 22.)
- (sz. n.): Igeellenesnek ítélte ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt cikkét a református egyház zsinatának ülése (MTI, 2001. 11. 28.)
- (sz. n.): Protestáns válasz a hívó értelmiségieknek (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 28.)
- Sághy Erna: Áldás, békeesség (168 óra, 2001. 11. 29.)
- Nyusztay Máté: Antiszemitizmus: a tendencia az ijesztő (Népszava, 2001. 11. 29.)
- Nagy N. Péter: A zsinat üzenete (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 30.)
- Hegedűs Lóránt: Absurda absurdorum absurdissima Debreceniensa absurda (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. )
- Terebesi Éva: A Hegedűs család és a zsinat (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 12. 02.)
- (sz. n.): Felfüggesztették a kritikus református lelkészt (Index, 2001. 12. 04.)
- (sz. n.): Felfüggesztett református lelkész (Népszabadság, 2001. 12. 04.)
- (sz. n.): Az ügyészség ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt mentelmi jogának felfüggesztését kezdeményezte (MTI, 2001. 12. 04.)
- Görgey Géza: Gyóntató papok (Népszabadság, 2001. 12. 04.)
- (sz. n.): Kiadja-e Hegedűst a parlament? (Népszabadság, 2001. 12. 05.)
- Csurka István: Nyilatkozat (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 06.)
- Bertók László Attila: Tisztán állok Isten előtt (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 12. 13.)
- MTI: Ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt megismételte vádjait (Népszabadság, 2001. 12. 15.)
- Nagy Szilvia: Botrányos ülésnappal búcsúzott a T. Ház (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 12. 19.)
- Éliás Ádám: Egy galíciai jöttment vallomása (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 12. 20.)
- Bencsik András: Válasz Éliás Ádámnak (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 12. 20.)
- Szöcs Zoltán: Hegedűs kontra kirekesztők (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 20.)
- ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt: Önként vállalt kiadatás (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 27.)
- Döbrentei Kornél jegyzete (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 12. 30.)

Csurka István: Ég a Pentagon, romokban a globalizmus fellegvára  
(The Pentagon is on fire, the citadel of globalization has been ruined)  
(www.miep.hu, 2001. 09. 12.)

*“Many of my writings and parliamentary speeches are the proof that this did not take me by surprise; I knew it had to happen. The world’s oppressed peoples could no longer suffer without a counter-attack against the humiliations inflicted upon them by globalization, the exploitation and the ongoing systematic genocide in Palestine. However, the level of organization reflected by the attacks carried out in several places simultaneously makes it clear that there is a very large force behind them. It is no longer just about Palestine and Israel, but also about the American missile defense plan, which would provide that country with special individual protection.”*

Lovas István: Egy terrorista levele Amerikához (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 09. 16.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 09. 20.)

Losonczy Péter: Füst az égen (Népszava, 2001. 09. 29.)

Lovas István: Más hangok (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 09. 30.)

Chrudinák Alajos: “A liberális nyájszellem agyagba döngöli a szuverén gondolkodást”  
(Magyar Fórum, 2001. 10. 04.)

Sinkovics Ferenc: A MIÉP a választások után megkerülhetetlen lesz  
(Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 10. 18.)

Szöcs Zoltán: Megérett a folytatás (The continuation has ripened)  
(Magyar Fórum, 2001. 09. 13.)

*“I believe it is especially significant that István Csurka – who is not particularly famous for repeating his own ideas over and over again in his writings – has given his recently published major study the subtitle ‘Some thoughts on plazas, vanguards and the invasion of Hungary’ – thereby referring to his famous essay entitled ‘Some thoughts...’, published in 1992. In this case, the choice of a similar title is not self-repetition, but an indication of the fact that the content of the recent analysis entitled ‘Ten out of ten’ is a direct continuation – because it is a direct consequence! – of all that was said about the situation in Hungary in the study written nine years earlier.” “I want to follow the path, the way and the aim of Israeli capital investments in Hungary, with special regard to ‘real estate developments’” – Csurka says in the introduction to ‘Ten out of ten’. It is all the more important to discuss this issue because this small country with a population of 5 and a half million made capital investments in Hungary valued at more than USD 900 million – almost exclusively in real estate! – over the past five years.”*

Csurka István: Tízből tíz

Részletekben megjelent:

I. rész (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 06. 28.)

II. rész (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 07. 05.)

III. rész (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 07. 12.)

IV. rész (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 07. 19.)

V. rész (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 07. 26.)

VI. rész (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 08. 02.)

Yehuda Lahav: Izrael: ki- és bevándorlók (Népszabadság, 2001. 09. 06.)

Szöcs Zoltán: Megérett a folytatás (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 09. 13.)

(Author unidentified): Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary in 2000 – book presentation (MTI, 2001. 09. 26.)

*“A collection of essays entitled ‘Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary in 2000’ has been published by the B’nai B’rith First Budapest Community. The Hungarian–English publication documents and analyzes anti-Semitic statements published in the Hungarian press or made at public forums, the publishers told the press at the presentation of the book in Budapest on Wednesday. One of the editors, journalist Mátyás Vince, said the book is not intended as a polemical writing, but rather as a report; the quotations selected to represent the presence of anti-Semitic discourse in Hungary are from the texts collected in the data base of the Zsidó Dokumentációs Központ (ZsiDoK) (Jewish Documentation Center), set up by the association.”*

Sztankay Ádám: Rossz mondatok (168 óra, 2001. 09. 27.)

Dési János: Jobb híján (Népszava, 2001. 09. 28.)

Szöcs Zoltán: Elegem van! (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 10. 11.)

(sz. n.): Gyűlöletbeszéd (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 10. 12.)

Hering József: Számonkérendő szavak és tettek (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 10. 18.)

Farkas Zoltán: „A megkülönböztetés veszélyes, mert haragot vált ki” (HVG, 2001. 10. 27.)

Gerő András: 2001. november eleje (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 11. 10.)

Szerető Szabolcs: Az egyetlen gond (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 11. 21.)

Hering József: Cionista dzsihad az al-Dzsázíra ellen (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 22.)

Kovács Zoltán: Három nyilatkozat (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 11. 26.)

Hering József: Saron a Harmadik Birodalom vezére? (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 13.)

(sz. n.) Magyar ATV: Sajtóklub pénteken (Magyar Nemzet Online, 2001. 12. 14.)

Sajtószabadság Központ: Az érthető frekvencia; A Pannon Rádió műsorai (Center for Freedom of the Press: The easy-to-understand frequency band; The programs of Pannon Rádió) (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 09. 27.)

*“Topics, expressions and views which used to be considered as taboo have emerged in Hungarian discourse recently. Particularly anti-Semitic speech, which only used to appear in an encoded form in the press and the media, has become increasingly open. The staff of the Sajtószabadság Központ (www.sajtoszabadsag.hu) (Center for Freedom of the Press) examined how anti-Semitic and other exclusionary content are featured in the programs of the recently launched Pannon Rádió.”*

H. Z.: A médiahatóság vizsgálja a Pannon Rádiót (Népszabadság, 2001. 09. 29.)

Locsmándi Andrea: Médiacsatározás a közszolgáltatásról (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 10. 04.)

Lakos Nóra: Szankcionált Pannon Rádió (Népszava, 2001. 10. 15.)

(sz. n.): Egymillió ORTT-bírság a Pannon Rádióknak (Index, 2001. 10. 26.)

Molnár Péter: Gyűlöletbeszéd Magyarországon (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 10. 26.)

Tábori Gabriella: Pannon Rádió: pénzbüntetés az ORTT-től (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 10. 27.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 01.)

Bak Mihály: újabb bírságot kaphat a Pannon Rádió (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 11. 15.)

Gidó Média Kft.: Támogatást kér a Pannon Rádió (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 11. 15.)

(sz. n.): Törvénytörtő tulajdonviszonyok a Pannon Rádióknál (Index, 2001. 11. 23.)

(Author unidentified): Nyílt antiszemitizmusra panaszkodik az amerikai nagykövet (US Ambassador complains of open anti-Semitism) (Index, 2001. 11. 20.)

*“I am concerned to hear of openly anti-Semitic and anti-foreigner sentiments in Hungary, particularly from certain circles of the political elite’, the US Ambassador said in a speech held at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. ‘We, in the United States believe that no political speech should be censored, even the most reprehensible. However, the fact that certain ideas are not to be censored does not make them acceptable in polite company, and it is the duty of the leaders of all political parties to call such hate-talk by its name and unambiguously reject it. There is no room for hesitation here; this is too important for Hungary’s international image and its future as a democracy.’”*

(sz. n.): A kellemetlen élmény (Magyar Hírlap, 2001. 11. 20.)

Szász István: Jó hírünk meg a folklór (Népszava, 2001. 11. 20.)

Szerető Szabolcs: Az egyetlen gond (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 11. 21.)

(sz. n.): Van-e politikai antiszemitizmus? (Népszabadság, 2001. 11. 21.)

- Zord Gábor László: A gyűlöletbeszéd csak ront a helyzeten (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 11. 22.)
- Mészáros Tamás: Letagadni a letagadhatatlant (Népszava, 2001. 11. 24.)
- Kovács Zoltán: Három nyilatkozat (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 11. 26.)
- Nyusztay Máté: Antiszemizmus: a tendencia az ijesztő (Népszava, 2001. 11. 29.)
- Seszták Ágnes: Az egyedülállóan rasszista Magyarország (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 11. 29.)
- Kondor Katalin: Kivel beszélnek? (Népszabadság, 2001. 12. 11.)
- Székely Kecskés János: Európa legnagyobb hamukája (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 12. 13.)
- H. J.: Martonyi János lehetőségei (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 13.)
- Csurka István: A középjobb mint önfeladás (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 13.)
- (sz. n.): Magyar ATV: Sajtóklub pénteken (Magyar Nemzet Online, 2001. 12. 14.)
- Lovas István: Csomó a kákán (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 12. 16.)
- Bencsik András: Válasz Éliás Ádámnak (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 12. 20.)
- Szöcs Zoltán: Hegedűs kontra kirekesztők (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 20.)
- (sz. n.): Péntek esti sajtóklub (Magyar Nemzet Online, 2001. 12. 21.)
- (sz. n.): Mennyből a Nancy... (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 12. 27.)
- Döbrentei Kornél jegyzete (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 12. 30.)

ORTT RESOLUTION  
PANNON RÁDIÓ VIOLATES THE LAW

---

*(abridged)*

Resolution<sup>1</sup> by the National Radio and Television Board (ORTT)

Within its authority provided by §112 of Act I/1996 on radio and television broadcasting (hereafter: Rttv), the National Radio and Television Board has passed the following resolution against Gidó Média Kft.–Pannon Rádió (1181 Budapest, Havanna u. 78.) as Broadcaster:

The Board establishes that the Broadcaster violated the provisions of (2) and (3) of §3 of the Rttv on September 4, 2001. Therefore, in line with Point (1) a) of §112 of the Rttv as well as with the broadcasting contract signed with the Broadcaster and with Point (1) d) of §112 of the Rttv, the Board calls upon the Broadcaster to discontinue the censured behavior and obliges the Broadcaster to pay a penalty of HUF 1,000,000, that is one million forints.

The fine must be paid within 8 days from receipt of the resolution to the account of ORTT Broadcasting Fund no. MNB 10032000-00280226-00000000.

No appeal against this resolution may be sought through the administrative procedure; for a review of the decision it is possible to turn to the court within 30 days from receipt of the resolution.

Reasoning

The Board examined provisions of the Rttv and found the following: In the radio program broadcast on September 4, 2001, entitled “*Zsinórmérték, vallási lélekébresztő*” (Religious measure, spiritual reveille), the following was read aloud by Calvinist pastor Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. “*Wherever the light of God’s Spirit, conquering and sustaining the world, appears, the negative spirit, the devil, will become unbearably hysterical, then cold-bloodedly calculated and basely vulgar. This is how the Tatars, Turks, and last but not least the Russians appeared, representing a devastating hysterical anger: to destroy the miracles*

---

<sup>1</sup> No. 1470/2001. October 26.

*of the Asian mentality, superior to space and time, experienced in the Christian space and time. And this is how the Habsburgs appeared, representing a cold-blooded base hatred for half a millennium, the least talented and most narrow-minded dynasty in Europe, in fact, the whole world. But the Christian Hungarian state would have warded off even this, had not, as a result of the self-renunciation of the Compromise of 1867, an army of Galician vagabonds arrived, who had been gnawing away at the country, which, still, despite everything, again and again, has always been able to resurrect itself from its ruins, from the bones of its heroes. If their Zion of the Old Testament was lost because of their sins and rebellions against God, let the most promising height of the New Testament way of life, the Hungarian Zion, be lost as well. It is also Ady who says the following about the Hungarian Zion: 'There have never been this many confusions, desires, passions, Jews raging in any nation...' Since it is impossible to smoke out every Palestinian from the banks of the Jordan using Fascist methods often imitating the Nazis themselves, they are returning again to the banks of the Danube, now in the shape of internationalists, now in a jingoistic form, now as cosmopolitans, in order to give the Hungarians another kick just because they feel like doing so. They become hysterical just from the expression 'Christian Hungarian state.' They say it is exclusionary. On August 20 of every year, you can hear the false note in their screeching, aiming to dispossess the Hungarians, about St. Stephen's receptive Hungarian state. László Németh says we would like to see such a clear situation today as there was in St. Stephen's multilingual state, where those belonging to the minority could not pretend they belonged to the majority under the guise of patriotism.*

*So hear, Hungarians, the message of the 1000th year of the Christian Hungarian state, based on 1000 ancient rights and legal continuity, the only one leading you to life: Exclude them! Because if you don't, they will do it to you! To this we are warned by the sufferings of 1000 years, the heritage of our robbed and 1000-times plundered country, still there that 'height', and last but not least by the stone-throwing sons of Ramallah."*

The Board believes that the above program reflects an extremist ideology, and Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. used expressions directly referring to the Hungarian Jews and suitable for inciting hatred. ("Army of Galician vagabonds, "so they are returning to the banks of the Danube, now in the shape of internationalists, now in a jingoistic form, now as cosmopolitans, in order to give the Hungarians another kick.") He also combined the notion of Christian Hungarian statehood with discriminative ideas openly excluding other peoples

and ethnic groups. (*“In St. Stephen’s multilingual state, where those belonging to the minority could not pretend they belonged to the majority using the guise of patriotism”, “exclude them! If you don’t, they will do it to you!”*) The presenter of the program justified these ideas with quotations from works by Sándor Petöfi, László Németh and Endre Ady, which thereby gave them a different meaning.

Freedom of speech is a basic constitutional right; however, the boundaries of this freedom – just like those of others – are often blurred; therefore, these rights must be limited by the law, to a certain extent. It is a classical thesis that the validity of one freedom spreads only so far as it does not infringe upon a freedom of another kind. This requirement appears in the general principle reflected by Paragraph (1) of §3 of the Rttv, concerning responsible broadcasting, which means that although different opinions can be freely communicated over the airwaves, broadcasters are responsible for their content, and the programs must not violate basic constitutional rights and human rights:

“In the Republic of Hungary, broadcasting can be freely practiced – within the scope of this Act; information and opinions can be freely forwarded through broadcasting, and the Hungarian and foreign programs designed for public reception can be freely received. Within the scope of the law, broadcasters are free to determine the contents of the programs and bear responsibility for them.”

Considering the above, by broadcasting the above text read aloud on the program entitled *“Zsinórmérték, vallási lélekébresztő”* (Religious measure, spiritual reveille), the radio station infringed upon Paragraphs (2) and (3) of §3 of the Rttv restricting the freedom of speech, but marking the boundaries of this freedom and guaranteeing the prohibition of discrimination, under which:

“Broadcasters must respect the constitutional order of the Republic of Hungary; their activities must not violate human rights and must not be suitable for inciting hatred against persons, sexes, peoples, nations, national, ethnic, linguistic or other minorities, or any church or religious group.

Broadcasting must not aim at openly or implicitly insulting or excluding any minority or majority, or at condemning them or presenting them on the basis of racial criteria.”

Although the Board sanctioned the Broadcaster for the first time, due to the gravity of this offence, the Board calls upon the Broadcaster to discontinue the censured behavior in line with Point (1) (a) of §112 of the Rttv, and obliged the radio station to pay the penalty specified in the broadcasting contract in line with Point (1) (d) of §112 of the Rttv.

Under Point 3.1. of the broadcasting contract signed with Gidó Média Kft: “Broadcaster undertakes to observe the effective provisions of the Act at all times during the validity of the contract.”

Point 3.7. of the contract stipulates “Broadcaster shall be free to determine the contents of the program within the scope and under the conditions of the Act and the Contract with the proviso of bearing responsibility for them under the Act and this Contract.”

Under Point 6.2. of the contract: “Broadcaster undertakes to pay a penalty to the Board for non-performance or breaching of the Contract for any reason within Broadcaster’s responsibility.”

Point 6.2.2. of the contract specifies that the penalty be based on the annual broadcasting fee valid in the year when the penalty claim was generated, which, in the year 2001, amounts to HUF 11,529,000, or eleven million five hundred and twenty nine thousand forints.

Under Point 6.2.3. of the contract, the amount of the penalty payable for non-performance or breaching of the contract in the first instance cannot exceed 20% of the basis of the penalty, which in this case is HUF 2,305,800.

Since the Board imposed a fine on the Broadcaster for the first time, by exercising its right of deliberation, the Board set the amount of the penalty payable by the Broadcaster at HUF 1,000,000, or one-million forints.

Under Paragraph (2) of §136 of the Rttv, no appeal against the resolution may be sought through the administrative procedure. Paragraph (3) of §136 of the Rttv provides an opportunity to request a review of the resolution by court procedure.

Budapest, October 26, 2001.

On Behalf of the National Radio and Television Board  
Dr. Körmندی-Ékes Judit, President

STATEMENT BY MIÉP:  
FRADI-FOTEX  
A TRANSACTION AGAINST THE NATION

---

The purchase of Fradi<sup>1</sup> by Fotex is not a sports issue primarily. It is much more about poking into a social phenomenon that ran through the entire twentieth century, which sprang up repeatedly around Fradi despite all the blows, plundering and neglect it received. Fradi, and the football team in particular, has become a national symbol. Fradi is not just the team of one Budapest district.<sup>2</sup> It has become more than that over the years for the man-in-the-street who could experience and express his patriotic feelings and social misery by lining up behind the team. With this team now acquired by Fotex Rt, a company set up and owned by László Békesi,<sup>3</sup> that is, by the so-called reform-communism and liberalism of the SzDSz,<sup>4</sup> which also owns the equally successful, in fact, often more successful MTK, which, in turn, has always been associated with the well-to-do Jewish middle class of Budapest, the people of Fradi have been deceived. The nationalistic feeling and the common man's attraction that Fradi has enjoyed across the country have been destroyed. MTK has privatized Fradi.

The clouds started to gather over the long-standing club at the time when the Torgyán-Szabadi pair was allowed to control FTC, but we hoped that the sky would clear after their fall. However, the opposite has happened. FTC has been acquired by a greedy and unscrupulous business group, which has nothing to do with either the Ferencváros or the Hungarians. Apart from business considerations, the aim was to carry out a social restructuring, to fudge the conflicting interests of Hungarian society, the clashing interests of the rich and the poor, the capitalist and the common man.

As a result, the common man will be unable to express his antipathy and discontentment in often undoubtedly rude and condemnable ways, express his affiliation through cheering on his team or calling the other side this or that. Thus,

---

<sup>1</sup> The commonly used name of the football team Ferencváros or FTC.

<sup>2</sup> Ferencváros, the IX. district of Budapest.

<sup>3</sup> Fotex was never owned by László Békesi. The founder and major shareholder of Fotex is Gábor Várszegi.

<sup>4</sup> Alliance of Free Democrats, the liberal party in Hungary.

when the matter dies down, undoubtedly some shouting and scoffing will disappear, but Hungarian society will lose an important aspect of its national feelings. The grandstand will be empty; section "B center" will disperse.

Fradi will be merged into MTK. It will merge into an unscrupulous business, which can afford to buy anything, although no one knows where its money comes from. Although this is not certain either. According to the published contract, the buyer, Fotex, will have the right to withdraw from the deal until August 1 without any further consequences, but FTC will not. This seems to suggest either that Mr. Várszegi is waiting for the arrival of certain government funds, which he needs in order to make the payment, or he is waiting to see whether he will be able to buy the valuable real estate around the Fradi-stadium. Very clever!

The government and the Sports Ministry bear major responsibility. A government that claims to be a nationalist one should not have allowed the destruction of the Ferencváros to happen. Torgyán and Szabadi<sup>5</sup> were the first malpractice, now Várszegi is the fatal mistake.

MIÉP condemns this dark, transaction against the nation and calls upon its supporters to express their mourning and protest against the ruination of the Hungarian Fradi by wearing a green-and-white ribbon<sup>6</sup> tied round with a black one.

July 25, 2001

The Presidium of MIÉP

---

<sup>5</sup> Leading politicians of the Independent Smallholders Party and for a short period leading officers of Fradi.

<sup>6</sup> Green and white are the colors of Fradi.

A FORMAL COMPLAINT  
IN THE FRADI-FOTEX CASE

---

To: The Chief Prosecutor of the Republic of Hungary!  
1050 Budapest  
Markó-u.16

Honorable Chief Prosecutor!

The Executive Board of the B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge hereby makes a formal complaint against person(s) unknown alleging criminal offense of incitement having committed against the community in violation of Paragraph 269 of the Criminal Code.

I.

At a press conference on 26 July 2001, László Bognár, a Member of Parliament, and Vice-President of the Hungarian Justice and Life Party (MIÉP), promulgated a statement of the Presidium of the MIÉP entitled "*Fradi-Fotex transaction against the nation*" and subsequently replied to questions posed by reporters.

The contents of the statement and the comments made by László Bognár constitute the statutory requirements of the criminal offense of incitement to hatred against the Jewish community as a religious group. They do also offend against other groups of the population.

The person expounding the decision of the Party's presidium made the remarks at a press conference openly advertised and held, and thus the remarks made there meet the concept of – moreover expressly aim at – generating great publicity.

II.

The Statement of the Presidium, and subsequent remarks elucidated and amplified by the individual, contains references to their social connections embedded in its text that are – in our judgment – an explicit incitement to hatred.

As is currently acknowledged, occasionally violent incidents and assaults increasingly dominate the stands of soccer grounds. In this regard, the pronouncements at the press conference must be deemed as incitement carried out with specific intent.

The purport of incitement within the meaning of the criminal law can clearly be inferred from the reasons set out in Decision 30/1992 (V.26) of the Constitutional Court.

The issue of proportion of rights must be considered: the right to freedom of speech is curtailed when a more important fundamental constitutional right is infringed. The prohibited incitement to hatred begins where the constitutional, fundamental rights of human dignity, personal security and, in the extreme case, the lives of others may be endangered.

Incitement to hatred is a danger to break peace and a violation of numerous personal rights. Opinion – including political opinion – and the intentional assertion of an opinion in front of a large group of people are not the same.

Incitement to hatred is the emotional preparation to violence. Incitement constitutes a criminal offense when a person urges, excites, incites to carry out hostile activities against a group, organization or takes measures against them.

### III.

The documentation enclosed and the formal complaint herein serve as evidence that the pronouncements were made in public.

The text of the statement of the Presidium of the Party issued on 25 July 2002 printed from the internet site of MIÉP ([www.miep.hu](http://www.miep.hu)) – apart from the fact that the same contains factually untrue statements – in itself constitutes the elements of statutory criminal offense under Paragraph 269 (c) of the Criminal Code.

#### Quoting from the Statement:

*“Fradí, and the football team in particular, has become a national symbol. Fradí is not just the team of one Budapest district (Ferencváros). It has become more than that over the years for the man-in-the-street who could experience and express his patriotic feelings and social misery by lining up behind the team. With this team now acquired by Fotex Rt, a company set up and owned by László Békesi, that is, by the so-called reformist communism and liberalism of the SzDSz (Alliance of Free Democrats), which also owns the equally successful, in fact, often more successful MTK, which, in turn, has always been associated with the well-to-do Jewish middle class of Budapest, the people of Fradí have been deceived. The nationalistic feeling and the common man’s attraction that Fradí has enjoyed across the country have been destroyed. MTK has privatized Fradí...*

*FTC has been acquired by a greedy and unscrupulous business group, which has nothing to do with either the Ferencváros or the Hungarians.”*

According to the correspondent of the Hungarian Press Agency (MTI) reporting on the event and quoting verbatim, in the amplified and expanded statement of the party the following remarks were also made:

*“MIÉP condemns this dark transaction against the nation and calls upon its supporters to express their mourning and protest against the ruination of the Hungarian Fradi by wearing a green-and-white ribbon tied round with a black one.”*

László Bognár, on being questioned about why he considered the sale of the soccer team *Ferencváros* as being anti-national, referred to a study by a sociologist. He explained that *“the identity of the petit bourgeois, who considers himself as Hungarian – ‘a decent Hungarian type’ – is contrasted with the upper middle class person ‘with a businesslike mentality and foreign roots’ who supports MTK. By now, the FTC side has outgrown the boundaries of District IX, Ferencváros. The all-national character of the FTC is well represented by the fact that, in certain provincial cities, local supporters often cheer on Fradi against their own team. Fradi supporters have always considered themselves as belonging to the ‘simple people’, while regarding those standing above them on the social ladder as belonging to the category of the ‘Jews’.”* Bognár quoted in the report of the MTI (Hungarian Press Agency) dated 25 July 2001. No: BD 0110 4 130 MTI 6.20021

The Report of the MTI was quoted in various edited forms by the Hungarian press. The event aroused public interest and may be accompanied by international attention.

#### IV.

In the opinion of our organization, the resolution of the Presidium of MIÉP in the amplified form expounded upon at the press conference openly incites against Jewry as a religious and ethnic minority.

For the sake of clearer understanding we are now taking a detour to explain and to convey the meaning of the message of incitement as expounded upon at the press conference. We wish to point out the recently increased anti-Semitic manifestations of the right- and extreme-right wing press, which rarely refer specifically to “Jews”. The notion is wrapped up in symbolically and implicitly coded statements. The frequently used code words (synonyms) for the Jew are “foreigner”, “foreign hearted”, “alien-looking”, “foreign-rooted”, etc.

In the racist manner of speech, both overt and covert elements are present, nay complementing each other. In the prejudicial manner of speech, the dis-

paraging words used in describing Jews that are always present in anti-Semitic writings are characteristically repetitious.

The new coded language that has adopted a few constant patterns is, of course, equally understood and equally interpreted by the person who feels affected by the coded wording or not, whether in using this language, hearing it or reading it.

In light of the above, the communiqué presented at the press conference conveyed the message that if Fradi (FTC), which is understood to be the symbol of the nation (covertly in the text), is being purchased by Fotex, a firm connected with the Jews, it is therefore the Jews who acquired Fradi; this deal has destroyed the nationalist feelings of the common man identified with the supporters of Fradi.

According to a differently coded terminology, Fradi was acquired by a greedy, unscrupulous business group that has no connection with Hungarians and therefore the deal is against the nation. At the same time this excludes the Jews from the Hungarian nation.

The reference to Jews who are above “Fradi” supporters on the social ladder suggests a picture of the enemy; it describes a picture of a society in which the people of the Fradi are beneath and the Jews above.

The statement appearing in another part of the text referring to the transformation of society is a clear appeal to the elimination of this suggested enemy (i.e. “the Jews”).

No longer than a few years ago, with even a more moderate public statement of incitement than was now made by MIÉP, the inciter was then convicted by the Hungarian courts. Since then common racist discourse has become a daily routine, moreover a political phenomenon.

## V.

In view of the fact that we have no knowledge – nor could we have such – about the person(s) who have written the contents of the Statement and their reasons behind it, and furthermore, since we wish to avoid the charge of baseless accusations against anyone having committed a crime, therefore the charges herein are preferred against perpetrator(s) unknown, with, nevertheless, a proviso that apart from the possibility of others as well, we allege that László Bognár, who held the press conference, could himself, for good reasons, be suspected of having committed a criminal offense.

The fact that the quoted statement was made at the party’s press conference by a Member of Parliament – the vice-chairman of a political party represented in Parliament – is by far the most dangerous for the public.

With regard to the contents of the incitement delivered – the resulting actions, which might be directed against Jews as a racial and religious group, accompanied by the unsavory bi-product of tragic memory – having advanced to the field of politics, moreover suggests legitimacy.

The statement of the party made public caused widespread public reaction. It is not merely suitable to disturb the public order – this has already happened. The daily press talks about the “open incitement” of MIÉP, of private individuals, office holders, politicians and church officials who announced that due to those statements they felt offended in their “Hungarianness”.

The criminal culpability of these events cannot be selectively interpreted apart from their historical context, either in place or time, and we will not attempt to analyze the statements made verbatim using precision scales.

By means of such an inflammatory and persistent manner of incitement, the violence otherwise not unknown in the soccer stands may widely spread, thereby leading to the intimidation, insult and assault of persons of Jewish, or presumed to be of Jewish origin. All the necessary elements for purposes of the commencement of criminal proceedings, including the possible invitation to violent assault, are therefore present.

The possible consequences are unpredictable and boundless. According to the opinion of the members of our organization, the authorities of the democratic Republic of Hungary must not remain idle.

## VI.

The introductory words of Act No V of the year 1972 concerning the Office of the State Attorney, state:

“The Chief Prosecutor of the Republic of Hungary... ensures the protection of the rights of the citizens... and the consistent prosecution of any act offensive or threatening the constitutional order.”

“The Prosecutor is obliged to take measures specified in law, provided the laws of the Republic of Hungary are infringed.” And finally:

“The legal tasks determined in this Act shall be executed by the Chief Prosecutor or by an appropriately designated Prosecutor (Act, Paragraphs 1,2 & 4).”

In the event of a well-founded suspicion of a criminal offense liable to prosecution *ex officio*, the authority is obliged to commence such proceedings *ex officio*.

The unanimous view of the Executive Board of the B'nai B'rith is that it should draw the authorities' attention to this obligation and at the same time, on its part, wishes to make a formal complaint herewith due to the well-founded suspicion of a criminal offense having been committed.

Honorable Chief Prosecutor!

Under the statutory act, the investigation of the matter belongs to the exclusive jurisdiction of the prosecuting authorities (Act No. V / 1972, Appendix 1a).

Taking into consideration the subject matter's prominent public importance, the involvement of a political party, and the necessity of possible actions to be initiated concerning the question of parliamentary privilege of certain Members of Parliament, we do hereby request that the Hon. Chief Prosecutor follow each stage of the proceedings with marked, personal attention.

By virtue of Act No. LXIII of the year 1992 dealing with the protection of personal data and with the publication of data of general interest, we request that the data of the persons preferring these charges on behalf of the Organization should, in the course of each stage of the proceedings, be considered under Par.2, Section 2/a of the Act as special data.

The signatories do not consent to their names being made public.

B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge  
1065 Budapest  
Révay utca 16

Budapest, 27 July 2001

**“B’nai B’rith published the first volume of the book on anti-Semitic discourse last year with the intention to hold a mirror to all those concerned by or interested in public discourse in Hungary. To those concerned by or interested in who, where, how and why anti-Semitic discourse is being used openly and implicitly. This remains our chief ambition this year: to hold a mirror, to record, to reflect, sometimes to analyze, and to argue only in exceptional cases. We wish to offer our readers a report on the state of affairs, not a polemical writing.”**

**“...many far-right journalists are denying the presence of anti-Semitic discourse in the Hungarian mass media. This book is meant to contravene this denial. We are not trying to record that ‘*public discourse is anti-Semitic in Hungary*’, as one of our critics not familiar with the basic rules of the Hungarian language put it, but that *there is anti-Semitic discourse in Hungary*. This is what we intend to record, and our commitment was strengthened by the numerous positive responses received in connection with last year’s book, encouraging us to carry on with our initiative.”**

**DR. TIBOR SZESZLÉR**