

ANTI-SEMITIC  
DISCOURSE  
IN HUNGARY  
IN 2000

**ANTI-SEMITIC DISCOURSE IN HUNGARY IN 2000**  
**REPORT AND DOCUMENTATION**

# ANTI-SEMITIC DISCOURSE IN HUNGARY IN 2000

Editors:

ANDRÁS GERŐ, LÁSZLÓ VARGA, MÁTYÁS VINCE

Published by B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge



Budapest, Hungary 2001

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., Phone: 36-1-475-0525, e-mail: zsdk@matavnet.hu

Copyright ©2001 by B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge and the Authors

ISBN 963 00 7650 0

Published by B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge

Printed by Stádium Printing House, Budapest, Hungary

## CONTENTS

---

Publisher's Foreword . . . . .	129
ANDRÁS GERŐ: Documenting and Reporting. . . . .	133
LÁSZLÓ VARGA: A Change in the Course of Discourse . . . . .	137
LÁSZLÓ KARSAI: History, Holocaust and Politics. . . . .	147
ZSÓFIA MIHANCSEK: Revealing Quotes from Magyar Fórum, Magyar Demokrata, Vasárnapi újság ( <i>abridged</i> ) . . . . .	155
GÁBOR SCHWEITZER: A Dispute over the Crest of Erzsébetváros ( <i>abridged</i> ) . . . . .	173
GYÖRGY TATÁR: The Palestinian Costume ( <i>abridged</i> ) . . . . .	179
GÁBOR MURÁNYI: "Them" and "Us" ( <i>abridged</i> ). . . . .	195
GÁBOR SCHWEITZER: "MAZSIHISZTÉRIA" ( <i>abridged</i> ) . . . . .	201
Appendix . . . . .	209
VERA PÉCSI: Focal Points in Mass Communication . . . . .	209
ENIKŐ FUKK: Anti-Semitic Books on the Hungarian Book Market . . . .	223
ORTT DECREE: Vasárnapi Újság is Unlawful ( <i>abridged</i> ). . . . .	227

## PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

---

*"I have never shared the opinion that anti-Semitism is created by Jews. Anti-Semitism is created by anti-Semites and not by Jews. At the same time I have to say that it is also not the Jews but the non-Jews who must fight against anti-Semitism. Our task is to line up the non-Jews."* This was said by Stephen Roth at B'nai B'rith's 1992 conference, held in Budapest, on combating anti-Semitism in a democratic society. We are trying to take Stephen Roth's advice.

Founded in New York in 1843, B'nai B'rith became over the years the world's largest Jewish organization. (B'nai Brith means "Sons of the Covenant," with the term "covenant" referring to the alliance between God and the Jewish people, a key concept in Jewish tradition.) The organization's fundamental principle – the creation of unity among Jews – was declared upon its foundation and is still valid today. B'nai B'rith places special emphasis on the historical identity and common fate of the Jewish people. Action against racism and especially anti-Semitism is closely connected to the organization's universal objectives.

B'nai B'rith's Hungarian member organization – the B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge – was established in 1990. It is registered as an association.

The Executive Board of the B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge,

- sensing that anti-Semitic voices have become ever louder since the political transition;
- sharing the rightful indignation and concern of its members as well as of other Jewish organizations and personalities;
- complying with the widespread demand to take public action against this unsettling phenomenon;
- mindful of the heavy burden carried by the previous generation;
- realizing the risks inherent in remaining silent,

decided to hold up a mirror to all those who are affected by or interested in the phenomenon in order to make it more visible. Therefore, in late 1999 the Budapest Lodge of B'nai Brith established the Jewish Documentation Center (ZsiDoK) in Budapest.

The Center is doing pioneering work in Hungary. Its objective is to monitor and document Hungarian Jewish life including:

- the public activities and publications of Jewish organizations;
- scholarly research related to Jews and Jewish life;
- public statements concerning Jews;

- racist and especially anti-Semitic acts and statements in the public sphere and in the activities of organizations on the extreme right.

The creation and continued operation of the Jewish Documentation Center (ZsiDoK) have been made possible by support primarily from the members of the B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge. The initiative and its implementation were welcomed by a relatively large portion of Hungarian society. The European organization of B'nai B'rith was instrumental in helping us through the initial phase of our work and the Washington headquarters of B'nai B'rith also encouraged us to pursue our goals and provided valuable support. The Jewish Documentation Center submitted a grant application and received financial support from the Association of Hungarian Jewish Communities (MAZSIHISZ) and the Hungarian Jewish Heritage Public Foundation. MAZSIHISZ also provides funding for current operations.

Through its media monitoring service, run in cooperation with other organizations, the Center keeps track of relevant articles appearing in the Hungarian press. It ensures that these publications are electronically processed and kept on file. The Center's procedure is to gather, store and classify data pertaining to Hungarian Jewry, to make such data accessible to researchers, and to cooperate with already existing Hungarian programs as well as international organizations. At present the Center is only collecting contemporary data, but it would like to extend its scope and include materials dating back to the political transition and eventually as far back as 1945. One of the plans to be realized in the near future is to ensure Internet access to researchers working on our surveys.

The reviewing of the Hungarian printed press in the year 2000 resulted in the collection of hundreds of documents – articles, essays, etc. In addition to factual information pertaining to Hungarian Jewry, the material includes a fair amount of unquestionably anti-Semitic pieces, as well as writings that are regarded as anti-Semitic by certain segments of the public and works that triggered discussions on anti-Semitism. Thus, the database of ZsiDoK is not simply a collection of anti-Semitic articles, but rather a documentation of public discourse pertaining to anti-Semitism. The documentation of radio and television programs is problematic at present, although such materials should clearly be collected and processed as well.

The Center is counting on the contributions of concerned organizations, institutions, researchers and other private individuals, as cooperation and mutual exchange of data may facilitate the creation of a significant database providing reliable sources for research. Naturally the Center, since its incep-

tion, has provided serious researchers and all interested parties access to its database.

Relying on this developing database, the B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge wishes to publish reports regularly that would hold a kind of mirror to events taking place in Hungary. This book is our first attempt to give a picture of anti-Semitic acts and utterances occurring in Hungary in the year 2000. As indicated by the title, the volume compiled by the editorial committee is primarily aimed at documenting the facts themselves as well as trends in anti-Semitic discourse. So at the same time it is both more and less than a comprehensive report on last year's anti-Semitic manifestations in Hungary.

It has been a subject of heated debate whether our publication should be a brief and factual situation report or a volume of essays based on the collected data. This time we chose the latter approach, which still leaves the question unanswered. Our dilemma could be more easily resolved if readers of this book would share their reactions with us.

There were other discussions on whether to publish a separate volume in English or to issue a bilingual edition. Due in part to economic considerations, we opted for a bilingual publication: the first part of the book is in Hungarian, the second in English. The English version is somewhat shorter; some of the papers appear in an abridged form so as not to overtax foreign readers whose knowledge of the current Hungarian situation may be limited.

Whenever an original paper has been abridged in translation, this is indicated at the beginning of the article.

We would like to thank Dr. Tibor Szeszlér, former president of the B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge, for conceiving the idea of the Center and bringing it to fruition; historian László Varga for the professional and intellectual guidance he provided in behalf of the editorial committee, as well as the members of the editorial committee – historian András Gerő, journalist Mátyás Vince, economic historian Vera Pécsi and research fellow Gábor Schweitzer – for their selfless and invaluable work.

The Executive Board would like to take this opportunity to express its appreciation to the entire ZSiDoK staff.

Special thanks to Ferenc Olti and István Kardos for acquiring and setting up the computer system used in the project and for providing high quality software support.

*The Executive Board of the B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge  
Budapest, June 2001*

ANDRÁS GERŐ

## DOCUMENTING AND REPORTING

---

The story of anti-Semitic discourse has been an ongoing one for a long time. Its past is preserved by contemporary sources, scholarly treatment and human memory. We know, we hear, we read and sense its presence.

It would be false and misleading to term the prevalence of anti-Semitic discourse in Hungary a new phenomenon. Obviously, the collapse of Communism and the arrival of political freedom have contributed to its resurfacing, though of course it existed before, in a world without freedom. Thus one should not blame freedom for the phenomenon, but rather those who use the language of anti-Semitism.

An ongoing history can be divided into phases or periods and scholars often do just that. Those living in the present are not blessed with tomorrow's hindsight; their perceptions therefore often prove to be deceiving.

Many in present-day Hungary feel that anti-Semitic rhetoric has become more vociferous. Others say it only appears that way and that such rhetoric remains sporadic. Some blame the government for it; others refrain from doing so.

Because past and present are interpreted and judged differently, the reactions to anti-Semitism are also different. The phenomenon may be minimized or overstated; understood or condemned. One may choose to remain silent or be moved to write an angry retort.

Or one may attempt simply to show what is going on – opt for something other than silence or political action or historical, sociological analysis.

This 'something else' means documentation; observing and reporting. It's a bit like going outside and reporting on the weather for those who remain indoors. The one doing the reporting offers no explanation as to why the weather is the way it is, he is not interested in making comparisons with other climatic conditions and is not the least bit interested in the different reactions to the prevailing weather. He is merely reporting it.

We all know of course that in analyzing or verifying our perceptions, we need reliable information about the "current weather" and if we wish to delve into causes we must have accurate knowledge about the world of effects.

It also goes without saying that underlying every kind of documentation are certain intellectual assumptions. Making these assumptions explicit is impor-

tant, indeed essential, for it makes the nature of the report and its results easier to appreciate.

The first and most important of these assumptions – one backed up by knowledge and experience – is that speech is a form of action, as hurtful as an act of physical violence. And so, if we wish to present a comprehensive picture of anti-Semitism, we must document anti-Semitic speech as well. Obviously, we have to distinguish between private and public utterance. What makes private speech private is that it's not addressed to the public at large. But as soon as it appears in a form that is accessible to large numbers of people, it becomes public discourse, and assumes a different character. Similarly important is the fact that public speech makes documentation possible. The primary aim of such reporting is not to identify anti-Semites, but to answer the larger question: 'What is anti-Semitic discourse like in present-day Hungary?'

However, as soon as we focus on such discourse we must face the challenge posed by any type of racist language, namely that both overt and covert elements are present in them, and they complement and amplify each other. And since anti-Semitism has been an ongoing story, the range is from open anti-Judaism to subtly coded anti-Jewish sentiment – from the figure of the fanatical Jew using Christian blood in the baking of Passover matzo to such euphemisms as 'alien-hearted people,' used frequently in the Hungarian press. A seemingly multifarious but in reality repetitive and simplistic language makes it clear that anti-Semitic code-words and entire suggestive vocabulary must be seen as part of anti-Semitic discourse.

This discourse may be about symbolic or actual Jews, though its primary objective is always to convince people that restricting or eliminating the Jewish presence in a community is to the benefit of that community. Anti-Semitic discourse appeals to standard prejudices which may be generalized, though the purpose is never general – it is aimed against a specific group. In our case what has to be documented is anti-Semitic discourse aimed – metaphorically or concretely – against Hungarian Jewry. Naturally, this limitation may seem questionable, since Hungarian Jewry constitutes but one part of the 'world conspiracy of Jews'. Yet our limited focus is justified, since the primary goal of anti-Semitic discourse is to incite local anti-Jewish sentiments. In this report, therefore, public utterances concerning Israel or Jews in other countries are not significantly represented.

The combination of multifaceted perceptions and objective documentation adds another dimension to the report, affecting its very nature.

The documentation presented here makes it amply clear that anti-Semitic discourse is alive in many segments of contemporary Hungarian society and is not the exclusive property of the extreme right. Nevertheless, in the year 2000 several centers of activity have emerged; institutionalized outlets and venues for anti-Semitic discourse have evolved. Moreover, certain political events and concerns tended to reinforce anti-Semitic trends in public discourse. (It ought to be noted that since the report covers the year 2000, it makes no mention of the latest institutionalized outlet for anti-Semitic discourse: Radio Pannon, which began to broadcast in the fall of 2000.) It seemed appropriate to include in our report, along with the documentation, a description of some of these new centers of Hungarian anti-Semitic discourse. The descriptions may be seen as a counterweight to bibliographic documentation and may make the form of the report itself a little more supple.

Yet the form remains intact since these new centers of anti-Semitic activity are presented in an essentially descriptive – and only at times interpretative – manner. The familiar characteristics of anti-Semitic discourse (the selective citing of facts, deliberate obfuscation, etc.) are pointed out in the text, but the report is not a series of argumentative essays. Therefore, aside from several justifiable exceptions, formal refutations of anti-Semitic assertions are not included in the report, if only because one of the basic characteristics of the anti-Semitic approach is its total disregard of facts.

Although neither a rebuttal nor a call for direct political action, this volume does have a purpose; it has not been produced for its own sake.

Our main objective was to document public discourse in Hungary today. Moreover, we wished to revive the tradition of anti-Semitism reports associated with the name of Stephen Roth. Thirdly, we would like to continue to present, on a regular basis, systematic documentation of anti-Semitic discourse in Hungary and provide a reliable basis for further analysis.

Finally, our hope is to initiate the kind of discussions of anti-Semitic discourse – its size, prevalence, salient characteristics, limits – that make a dispassionate treatment of the phenomenon possible.

No one can ever boast of having created a perfect work. This is certainly true of this endeavor. The report can no doubt be further developed, refined, and improved. Hopefully the readers of the volume will help us in this new process.

One thing we can already say with certainty: words do not vanish, they live on and those who utter them can be made to answer for them no matter how much time has gone by.

The space for irresponsible speech may become a little smaller.

## A CHANGE IN THE COURSE OF DISCOURSE

---

The 1998 Hungarian elections resulted not only in a change of government but also

- in the winning of parliamentary seats by MIÉP (Hungarian Truth and Life Party), a right-wing political formation noted for its xenophobia and its anti-Semitic public utterances, and
- in the public recognition by the new government and by the leading governing party FIDESZ-MPP (Fidesz-Hungarian Civic Party) in particular of several already existing media outlets (*Magyar Demokrata*, a weekly news-magazine, *Vasárnapi újság*, a program on Hungarian Public Radio) that had used covert, and occasionally even overt anti-Semitic language in the past. As a consequence of their newly favored position, these outlets moved from the periphery toward the center of public attention.

When MIÉP entered Parliament and formed a faction, it did not become more radical. What did happen was that due to its electoral success the party gained access to political forums (Parliament, Budapest City Hall) where previously anti-Semitic pronouncements were considered inadmissible.

While MIÉP shrewdly availed itself of the opportunities these public forums offered and adjusted its extremist language accordingly (that is, it used a more moderate tone in Parliament than in City Hall, and seemed more restrained in the latter than in its own organs, the *Magyar Fórum* weekly and *Radio Pannon*), the political forums themselves also made accommodations to the growing political influence of MIÉP, contributing thereby to the legitimization of anti-Semitic discourse. This was clearly a departure from earlier practice and contrary to prevailing norms in democratic societies.

The first covert, albeit clear expression of anti-Semitism in the Hungarian Parliament occurred on September 8, 1998 in connection with a report by the ombudsman in charge of the rights of national and ethnic minorities. In the course of the debate, Loránt Hegedüs Jr. (MIÉP) said among other things: *“I wish only to suggest that there is in Hungary a situation whereby people of a minority origin, without revealing their origin, harm majority interests; that is to say, they do not make the safeguarding of national interests possible, first and foremost, in my opinion, in the mass media. They allow themselves to make statements that*

*harm the Hungarian nation's ability to protect its interests and therefore hurt the feelings of the Hungarian people. I think it is imperative that steps be taken against this type of discrimination, too."*

Csaba Tabajdi, (MSZP-Hungarian Socialist Party) called on his fellow MP to elaborate on his statement. In his response Hegedűs stated: *"... I did not say there is a minority in Hungary that as a minority harms the Hungarian national interest; but I did say that there are people, quite a few in number and belonging to a minority, who, due to their apparently historically inherited position, harm the Hungarian national interest. In this connection I wish to add that nothing would be resolved if I were to identify the minority. And why should I – the individuals themselves do not want to reveal that they belong to this minority."*

Eventually, three MSZP (Socialist) deputies responded to this speech. *"Representative Loránt Hegedűs used expressions, familiar to the arsenal of extremist rhetoric, to describe Hungarian Jewry – in other words, he was engaging in Jew-baiting. Please correct me if I have misunderstood you, and please tell us what you meant, even if you were referring to the frailties of otherwise outstanding Hungarians."* (Magda Kósa-Kovács, MSZP)

*"In the Hungarian Parliament there's no room for easily misunderstood statements, which one of our fellow representatives refuses to clarify. He owes an explanation not only to his constituents but also to those representatives who applauded his remarks, probably in good faith, perhaps not noticing its peculiar implication."* (Ildikó Lendvai, MSZP)

*"The late hour and fatigue may be the reason why amidst the clapping urging us to close the debate, the Speaker of the House as well as a few representatives did not notice what just happened in this chamber. As a Hungarian and a member of Parliament I'm ashamed that Representative Loránt Hegedűs has seen fit to say what he did; I don't wish to argue with him because it's impossible to argue with him; it would make no sense to do so. But it would be useful to declare, and for the Speaker of the House to note, that we have been exposed to Jew-baiting in the House this past hour."* (Csaba Tabajdi, MSZP)

Loránt Hegedűs firmly rejected the accusation of anti-Semitism: *"I would not like to see my words misconstrued. I did not name the minority you mentioned. (Ildikó Lendvai: He didn't name it!) But you did several times. Now, since your intention is obviously to make me reveal what minority I had in mind, let me tell you – and the minutes will bear me out – that I did not say ethnic and national minority, but used only the word minority. So, in this case, in my formulation Jewry as a minority could not even remotely figure as a point of reference."*

In Parliament MIÉP deputies (primarily Party President István Csurka) were usually satisfied with making allusions, the anti-Semitic content of which could be easily decoded by their constituents and even by the general public. It was in this manner that Csurka referred to the 1882 Tiszaeszlár blood libel case in connection with the cyanide poisoning of the Tisza River in 2000. (*“What if not only the open eyes of fish killed by cyanide will stare at us accusingly? What if fate will wash ashore blue corpses too at Tiszaeszlár and elsewhere?!”*<sup>1</sup>)

In his parliamentary speeches, Csurka habitually reaches conclusions that hint at a world-wide conspiracy of “international Jews” and Hungarian “communist Jews” against the Hungarian people. Let me give just one example: *“Among the owners of this company we find Seagram, which is part of Mr. Bronfman’s empire – the same Bronfman who is president of the World Federation of Jews and who also owns the [Hungarian] Tv2 television station. It’s not likely that the chairman of its board of directors, Thomas Rényi, despite his Hungarian name, or rather, a name that sounds as if it were taken from the daily Népszabadság, has anything to do with the Hungarian world of farms or with the workers of Borsod County (laughter), but perhaps more with the banker and broker Gábor Rényi who was implicated in the Novotrade affair but was acquitted. The Bank of New York owns more than a 50 % share (including a related energy fund) in Mol, the Hungarian Oil Company. Therefore, in all probability, it will be able to obtain from the Hungarian state a 70% rebate in Mol Ltd.’s profit tax for ‘99 – this while schools and hospital wards have to be closed and doctors wheel patients out of surgeries themselves. In 1998, this tax allowance was only 50 percent. The company’s tax rate was reduced from 9 to 5.4 percent. In this same period, the commercial TV stations were given VAT preference, that is, they did not have to pay the compulsory VAT of 4-5 billion forints. This would not have been possible without the Bank of New York dictating the terms. The ownership of the Bank of New York looks like the following. Beside the former Népszabadság-affiliated or Hungarian liberal-oriented ministers, shareholders include well-known Russians such a Semyon Mogilyevitch and the recently arrested then released Guzminsky. Then there is a man named Gömöri, a Hungarian. So, beside the Rényis, a well-defined circle is tightening the ring around the Hungarian gasoline consumers, in fact, around our culture and our whole life. This circle is merciless and foreign, and is interested only in its own gains. Mol Ltd. is in fact controlled by them.”*<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> June 13, 2000.

<sup>2</sup> June 19, 2000.

The FGKP (Independent Smallholders Party) and its president József Torgyán, even when using extremist rhetoric in parliamentary speeches, never resorted to anti-Semitism. It was exceptional, and therefore all the more rude, when Under-Secretary Béla Szabadi of this party said in Parliament, in response to an address by a member of the opposition charging that the Agriculture Ministry and its affiliated companies were illegally subsidizing the country's most popular soccer team: "*How is [the] Ferencváros [soccer team] financed? I think with [only] half the money that the team gets which [the parliamentary member] presumably supports.*" In Hungary it was readily understood that the under-secretary meant the MTK<sup>3</sup> sports club, and thus he was alluding to the Jewish origin of the member of the opposition. The Parliament accepted his response by a margin of 143 votes.<sup>4</sup>

In the General Assembly of Budapest City Hall (where MIÉP won seats in 1998) not only had the tone coarsened, but the nature of the remarks themselves became more openly anti-Semitic. The question concerning the restoration of Raoul Wallenberg's Budapest statue was the first occasion seized by MIÉP. In the assembly MIÉP deputy György Dancsecs gave voice to the opinion that in 1944 Jewish leaders and Wallenberg collaborated with Hungarian Nazis.<sup>5</sup> MIÉP deputy Lóránt Schuster said: "*Vladimir Ilyich... Wallenberg does not require a statue on every corner, in every city, like his predecessor.*"<sup>6</sup> Then he closed the debate by saying that "*it's not the tail that wags the dog. Anyway, Shalom.*"<sup>7</sup>

History was MIÉP's favorite topic in City Hall, too. First Dancsecs summoned Bárdossy's spirit<sup>8</sup> ("*In memory of the martyr Prime Minister László Bárdossy, I say: God save Hungary from you people!*"<sup>9</sup>). Then he, too, broached the topic of Tiszaeszlár<sup>10</sup>; after questioning its blood-libel character,<sup>11</sup> he called on the General Assembly to pay tribute to "*the memory of historical Hungary and Eszter Solymosi*"<sup>12</sup> with a minute of silence, because a "*straight road led from Tiszaeszlár to Trianon.*"<sup>13</sup>

But the most offensive statement was made by Schuster: "*We think order will come when the old comrades return underground and (since they are getting on in years) take their place in the few plots left in the "Pantheon of the Labor Movement." And there will be peace in the sky when the three birds of the Free Democrats – rot, weiss and grün<sup>14</sup> – fly away for good. That's when there'll be order here on Earth.*"<sup>15</sup>

Almost from the beginning, the *Vasárnapi újság* program of the Hungarian Public Radio began broadcasting extremist views. Its first producer, Béla Györi,

a founding member of MIÉP, continues to play an influential role. The founder and later president of the party, István Csurka, has been a permanent outside associate of the program since the political transition. Pál Lakatos, until recently the executive producer of the program, was a MIÉP candidate in a municipal election; his chief assistant, Tibor Franka, entered a parliamentary by-election also as an MIÉP candidate.

It cannot be regarded as a normal state of affairs in a constitutional state when a public radio station provides a weekly platform for extremist views (*Vasárnapi újság* calls itself “Hungary’s most listened to magazine program on public radio”<sup>16</sup>), yet Prime Minister Viktor Orbán went even farther when first he called *Vasárnapi újság* his favorite radio program, then twice (on February 27 and June 28, 2000) he lent respectability to the program by appearing personally in its studios.

The Prime Minister was aware of the provocative nature of his presence there: *“Look, when you open the papers tomorrow, you’ll read attacks on me for coming here and for being on this program, after what was said in an interview last week or perhaps two weeks ago; they will write that, naturally, I’m giving a seal of approval to everything that was said there.”*

<sup>3</sup> The MTK soccer team was founded by a group of Jewish merchants in Budapest in 1899.

<sup>4</sup> September 5, 2000.

<sup>5</sup> January 27, 1999.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> April 29, 1999.

<sup>8</sup> László Bárdossy was the Prime Minister of Hungary in 1941-42. He was sentenced to death as a war criminal in 1946 by the Hungarian People’s Court.

<sup>9</sup> 18 October 1999. At a General Assembly meeting on June 29, 2000, he spoke about Bárdossy in greater detail: *“I dare say that László Bárdossy was sentenced to death in a show trial; and László Bárdossy was not alone. Everybody after 1945 everybody was sentenced to death in show trials.”*

<sup>10</sup> Tiszaeszlár is the name of the village where supposedly a ritual murder took place in 1882. A trial was held in Nyíregyháza the following year, which ended with the acquittal of all the accused.

<sup>11</sup> May 25, 2000.

<sup>12</sup> Eszter Solymosi was the alleged victim in the Tiszaeszlár blood-libel case.

<sup>13</sup> June 1, 2000.

<sup>14</sup> A double reference to Jewish-sounding surnames and to the red/white/green birds on the emblem of the SZDSZ (Free Democrats) party.

<sup>15</sup> June 15, 2000.

<sup>16</sup> Tibor Franka in *Vasárnapi újság*, June 18, 2000.

What the Prime Minister was referring to (and he reiterated it as a listener in connection with the commemoration of Dezső Szabó<sup>17</sup>) was his statement that *“the strongly racist terms of the period of 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922 cannot be cited without due caution in a public-service program, which is, unfortunately, what happened here.”*

The broadcast in question not only revived Szabó's racist views of eighty years ago, but placed them in a contemporary context, bringing into question the government's freedom of action, asserting that *“... at that time the Entente was our overseer; now it's Brussels, New York and Tel Aviv.”*<sup>18</sup>

The advice the Prime Minister gave strictly as a listener – *“if you can, use my opinions or the opinions expressed here (and they are not just my opinions, by the way) in preparing your next program”* – may easily be taken to mean that it was only Dezső Szabó's views that he considered objectionable, aside from that he agreed to promote the program. (Both times the Prime Minister was interviewed by Pál Lakatos and Tibor Franka.)

A greater tolerance of extremist views that could surely lead to their legitimation, affected the governing party itself. For instance, László Kövér, the second man in Fidesz-MPP, authorized by law to stand in for the Prime Minister should the need arise, made a gesture toward the MIÉP when in public he termed “extremist” the *“liberal attitude of rejecting traditional values as advocated by the Party of Free Democrats.”* At the same time he stated that in his view MIÉP was reacting to this attitude, even if its responses were *“not really well thought out.”*

In another statement, Kövér blamed MIÉP for discussing unavoidable issues such as Trianon and the Jewish question in an unacceptable manner.<sup>19</sup> In an interview a few days later, he tried to elaborate. Referring to a lecture he delivered four years earlier, he explained: *“I said then that there is no or only a very*

<sup>17</sup> Dezső Szabó (1879-1945), a famous Hungarian writer.

<sup>18</sup> Szabolcs Kerekes, “Emlékezés Szabó Dezsőre” (Remembering Dezső Szabó), *Vasárnapi újság*, June 11, 2000.

<sup>19</sup> *Magyar Hírlap*, June 14, 1999. Ágnes Hankiss, a Fidesz deputy on the advisory board of the Hungarian State Radio, later reported Kövér's statement as follows: *“MIÉP causes perhaps the greatest damage in public discourse when it renders unacceptable such topics and concepts that, in themselves, could be dealt with. Such topics are Trianon, for instance, or the Jewish question.”* “Kis magyar zsidókérdés” (The Hungarian Jewish question), in *Magyar Hírlap*, November 17, 1999. Further quotations are from the same source.

*small chance for establishing a civilized right-of-center force without the cultural, financial, and media support of Hungary's Jews." While maintaining his opinion, he went even further: "Unless the influential intellectual elite of this Jewry is able to overcome its positive and negative prejudices concerning the various Hungarian political parties, normal public life in the country will be impossible."*

He went on to assert that not only extremist forces have an interest in maintaining anti-Semitism and political prejudices, but also those who *"present themselves as the sole bona fide guardians of Hungarian Jewry. These forces have an interest in preserving the appearance of a threat, since only in case of genuine danger is defense necessary."* His criticism, he maintained, was directed not against the Federation of Jewish Communities, but the SZDSZ (Free Democrats), and he called it unfortunate that the Jewish organization took offense, for that suggested that raising the question *"outside Jewish circles"* was automatically considered *"improper."*<sup>20</sup>

It is a reasonable assumption that K v r did not appreciate the fact that he made this statement not simply as a person outside of *"Jewish circles,"* but as the number two man in the government. Regardless of his intentions, his statement gave rise to the widely shared view that it virtually revived official political anti-Semitism, absent in Hungary since 1944.

The case had been widely debated for months when  gnes Hankiss finally decided to formulate the *"theoretical basis"* as it were of this statement, offering a rationale for anti-Semitic public speech. Although Hankiss acknowledged that *"the phrase 'Jewish question' is laden with the odium of the anti-Jewish laws and Nazism, and in this respect its use is not very fortunate, another would be better, but there isn't another word, at best the phenomenon could be described in roundabout terms; for that reason it's used all over the world."*

More than half a century after Auschwitz,<sup>21</sup> Hankiss gives voice to the opinion that the existence of the Jewish question is denied only by those *"who are*

<sup>20</sup> In *Magyar Nemzet*, June 18, 1999.

<sup>21</sup> She raises the question: *"Can the Jewish question be discussed publicly? Undeniably, the Holocaust, the enormity of the tragedy, makes it much more difficult to talk about it. But he who for whatever reason and in whatever manner makes use of the memory of the victims for political purpose commits just as much of a sacrilege as he who disparages or denies the fact that genocide had taken place."* *Magyar Nemzet*, November 17, 1999. Further quotations are from this article by Hankiss.

*excessively worried by its existence, for they know well that if they were to acknowledge it and deal with it publicly, they'd have to probe into deep-seated lies and delusions, which for whatever reason they are desperate to keep under wraps, unclarified.*" In other words, Hankiss calls on "both sides" to do some self-examining, "to see what is untruthful or useless in their thinking, what may offend the other side... I think Jews should accept the fact that they cannot take the comfortable and untruthful position that there is no Jewish question, only an anti-Semitism question." Finally, after laying the above "theoretical basis," the author reaches the conclusion that "in Hungary after the historical transition, the Jewish question caused tension only in the country's political life."

According to Hankiss, by itself the extreme right could not have placed the Jewish question – nor the anti-Semitism question – on the political agenda; it also needed the Jews, at least certain Jews, the bad ones, or as Kövér put it, "an implacable, unbending group: the ruling elite of the Free Democrats." This leads Hankiss to conclude that "it seems the current standing of the Jewish question hardly allows for a substantive examination that is independent of the political conduct and development of the Free Democrats."

In other words, there is no universal Jewish question, only a "Free Democrat-Jewish" question: "No one can seriously believe that the Free Democrats is a Jewish party in the sense that the overwhelming majority of its members or constituents are Jews." But, according to the author, the leadership is another matter, sensitivity about which is demonstrated by the fact that they made sure to elect the non-Jew Gábor Kuncze as president of the party.<sup>22</sup>

According to Hankiss, therefore, it is MIÉP on one end of the spectrum that identifies the Free Democrats with Hungarian Jewry, while on the other the Free Democrats make the same identification in order to be able to "protest loudly and visibly against a phenomenon for the perpetuation of which they – consciously or unconsciously – do all they possibly can." In other words, Hankiss believes that keeping anti-Semitism alive serves the Free Democrats' interests.

Though she intends it as an impeccably modern formulation, the author finally arrives at the traditional anti-Semitism of the extreme right, namely the charge of Bolshevik-liberal plutocracy against Jews. In her article there is a

---

<sup>22</sup> "Before anyone claims that all this is wild fantasizing, since the problem itself does not exist, I ask: Why did they choose Gábor Kuncze for the role when they could have just as easily chosen somebody from among the founders and previous leaders of the Free Democrats?"

vague, implicit reference to three “self-defeating” generations of Jews with a slight hint (Béla Kun’s name<sup>23</sup> is invoked) at the Bolshevik “tradition.” All this culminates in the statement that the reason why the Hungarian Socialist Party had to form a coalition with the otherwise extremist (!) liberal Free Democrats in 1994 was not “*to make the Socialist Party palatable or to gain absolution for past sins, but in order to intertwine and mesh beyond recognition the interests of Hungarian Jewry with the Socialists’ own post-communist interests... It is from this spiritual ghetto – from the stifling embrace of the post-communist left – that Hungarian Jews should finally seek release.*”

It is not the aim of this report to enter into polemics with those engaged in anti-Semitic rhetoric; nor is it to try to disprove their propositions. I have discussed Hankiss’ article at length because I consider it a milestone. On the one hand it introduced a more “civilized” version of the anti-Semitic parlance of the extreme right and thrust political anti-Semitism, into the political mainstream, and on the other, it presented a model of how to make the most of anti-Semitic parlance in party politics. This is exemplified by the well known – though apart from its “message” to the Free Democrats meaningless – statement made by Kóvér, for whom Hankiss is busy making excuses – “*This party [FIDESZ-MPP] is not a liberal party in which a person is not elected president because his parents are communist Jews.*”<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Béla Kun (1886-1938), of Jewish origin, was the leader of the Hungarian Communist Government in 1919.

<sup>24</sup> “Bízhatunk a jövőnkben” (We Can Put Our Faith In Our Future). In *Magyar Nemzet*, February 5, 2000.

LÁSZLÓ KARSAI

## HISTORY, HOLOCAUST, AND POLITICS

---

The following is an analysis of more than 40 articles from Hungarian newspapers, as well as commentaries heard in the *Vasárnapi újság* (Sunday News) program of the Hungarian Public Radio. The material, approximately 150 typewritten pages in length, appeared in print or was broadcast between spring 1999 and fall 2000.

### STYLE

The style and tone of most of these pieces are offensive, they are replete with personal attacks – opponents are routinely regarded as enemies. The journalist István Elek would send to a psychiatrist anyone daring to criticize FIDESZ-MPP<sup>1</sup> leader and former secret service minister László Kövér, who is all for reviving discussion of “*the Jewish question*” (see Epilogue). Those who criticize Kövér engage in “*the worst kind of demagogy,*” in addition to being “*hysterical, ignorant, overemotional slogan-mongers incapable of rational thinking.*”<sup>2</sup> The journalist Zsolt Bayer says that what the other side is doing is “*scoundrelism.*”<sup>3</sup>

István Csurka<sup>4</sup> talks about “*liberal-homosexual-hermaphroditic-cosmopolitan*” authors, noting that the presence of works by certain writers of Jewish origin (Péter Rényi, István Gábor Benedek and György Dalos) at the Frankfurt Book Fair “*makes the whole fair business seem very fishy.*”<sup>5</sup>

The frequent use of the adjectives socialist-liberal and left-liberal as well as a new generation of derisive “diminutives” – ‘szoci’ (for socialist), ‘bolshi’ (for bolshevik), ‘commie,’ etc. – suggest something about the tenor of today’s political parlance.<sup>6</sup>

The use of the words ‘left wing’, ‘liberal’, ‘communist’, and ‘Jew’ as synonyms is also a recurrent element in the new rightists’ arguments, the aim of

---

<sup>1</sup> FIDESZ–Hungarian Civic Party, the biggest party in Hungary’s coalition government.

<sup>2</sup> In *Magyar Hírlap*, August 16, 1999.

<sup>3</sup> In *Vasárnapi újság*, July 23, 2000.

<sup>4</sup> István Csurka, president of the right-wing MIÉP (Hungarian Truth and Life Party).

<sup>5</sup> In *Havi Magyar Fórum*, August, 1999.

<sup>6</sup> István Lovas uses the phrase “*left-liberal media frauds.*” (In *Magyar Demokrata*, April 27, 2000.)

which is always to discredit the opponent/enemy. The word 'liberal' thus becomes a dirty word, similar in meaning to (stinking) Jew.

István Csurka is so intent on proving that 'leftist,' liberal,' and 'Jew' mean the same thing that he even points out that (leading Jewish communist party ideologist) József Révai's granddaughter had a child by Gábor Demszky, the SZDSZ<sup>7</sup> mayor of Budapest. According to him, the Muscovite Jewish writers (Béla Illés and others), these "*hacks and traitors*," came to Hungary with the Red Army in 1945.

In the extreme right-wing press, the post-1945 communist regimes appear as a single, monolithic unit. No difference is made between Mátyás Rákosi<sup>8</sup> and János Kádár<sup>9</sup>, nor is it ever mentioned that the Kádár regime had undergone changes over the years. It is in this spirit that György Timár, lawyer and Parliamentary deputy of the FGKP<sup>10</sup>, speaks about Jews who had joined the ÁVÓ (State Security Organs) in 1945 and left it repentant in 1990, "*wearing a skull-cap*."<sup>11</sup> For Csurka, ancestry is so important, he never misses an opportunity to mention the Jewish origin of Béla Kun and György Aczél, and in speaking about János Kádár he notes that while he was not Jewish, "*... his origins are lost in the stale darkness of the servant's room of the Csermanek household in Fiume*."<sup>12</sup>

In addition, Aczél is an emblematic figure in Csurka's world, both as the absolute master of Kádárist cultural policy and supposed father figure to the Free Democrats.

Csurka speaks about writers who "*support the Free Democrats as Jews*."<sup>13</sup> According to Zsolt Bayer, the Free Democrats is the only party which keeps track of the racial and religious affiliation of its membership.<sup>14</sup>

Free Democrats supporters, i.e., Jewish, left-wing liberals are traitors who for a price slander Hungary abroad by calling it anti-Semitic, claims journalist István Lovas.<sup>15</sup>

Sometimes Csurka's terminology clearly follows that of the well-known (populist) writer László Németh.<sup>16</sup> In one of his articles, Csurka refers to two

<sup>7</sup> SZDSZ, the Alliance of Free Democrats is the liberal party in opposition in the Parliament.

<sup>8</sup> Mátyás Rákosi (1892-1971), Hungarian Communist leader between 1940-1956.

<sup>9</sup> János Kádár (1912-1989), Hungarian Communist leader between 1956-1989.

<sup>10</sup> FGKP, the Smallholders' Party is the second biggest party of the coalition government.

<sup>11</sup> In *Magyar Demokrata*, March 30, 2000.

<sup>12</sup> In *Népszava*, May 20, 2000. Csermanek was Kádár's original name.

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

<sup>14</sup> In *Vasárnapi újság*, 23 July 2000.

<sup>15</sup> In *Magyar Demokrata*, September 21, 2000.

<sup>16</sup> László Németh (1901-1975).

populist writers of the interwar period as “*true Magyars*” – József Erdélyi who had close ties to the extreme right during World War Two and who is known for incendiary poems that invoke notorious blood libels, and the similarly anti-Semitic István Sinka. Borrowing Németh’s distinction between “*true Hungarian*” and “*shallow Hungarian*,” Csurka also distinguishes between different Hungarians. Accordingly, there are genuine Hungarians, that is, the non-Jews; then there are those who are even more Hungarian, and on top of the heap are the most deeply Hungarians, the racially pure poets who are destined to be the leaders of the nation.

Csurka and his MIÉP party advocate that foreigners be kept out of Hungary. Csurka fears another Russian invasion and has already identified the vanguard as “*Russian and Ukrainian Jews*” who infiltrate Hungary through business contacts, banks and real estate purchasing agents.<sup>17</sup> According to Tamás Bánovics, representative of MIÉP in Budapest City Hall, mostly Israeli, German, and Ukrainian citizens are buying up apartments in Budapest. He also claims that “*half of Transdanubia is in foreign hands.*”<sup>18</sup>

Wherever foreigners, particularly Jews appear (George Soros seems to be the arch villain), they subvert everything from church to family, so they can freely conduct their business “*in an already devastated area.*”<sup>19</sup> In his interview with journalist István Lovas, Jonathan Sunley describes himself as a conservative who is utterly convinced that there is a Free Mason-Jewish-Communist world conspiracy. He “*knows for a fact*” that George Soros is a Soviet agent who is also supported by the US State Department. He says Soviet agents operate everywhere, they dissolved the Soviet Union and now are busy spreading “*rotting liberalism*” in the USA, so that after the disintegration of both systems the Jews could take off their communist and capitalist masks and openly assume power.

## HISTORY

### The Glorious Past

Extreme right-wingers deliberately aim to create a new and glorious past. According to the head of the Administrative Bureau of Budapest, László Grespik, “*the past is necessary for the future because a glorious past can be*

---

<sup>17</sup> In *Magyar Demokrata*, September 21, 2000.

<sup>18</sup> In *Magyar Fórum*, July 13, 2000.

<sup>19</sup> In *Magyar Demokrata*, August 10, 2000.

*a creative, mobilizing force if society is properly instructed in it.*"<sup>20</sup> In his study "proving" the Scythian-Hunnish-Magyar origin of the Hungarian people, he rejects the idea of any kinship with what he calls "*unwashed, barbaric, yurt-dwelling*" Finno-Ugric ancestors. Grespik states that the Magyars were the "*first people in the world to have a written culture, the first to create a state.*" According to him the Magyars and the Japanese have a common ancestry, and their DNA, like light traveling from Sirius to Earth, twists nine times.<sup>21</sup>

Grespik calls the members of the Catholic Church including the Pope himself "*Jewish Christians,*" and says that already the famous 16th century Hungarian jurist, István Werbőczy, believed the papacy to be "*based on a Jewish manner of interpreting religion.*" According to him, Judaism is a religion of cruelty and vengeance – "*an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.*" What he says in effect is that Jesus could not have been Jewish, but a Magyar-Scythian-Parthian-Hunnish prince.<sup>22</sup>

#### In the Footsteps of Glorious Ancestors

Zoltán Szócs, an editor of the weekly, *Magyar Fórum*, talks about the "*blessed memory*" of Gyôzô Istóczy,<sup>23</sup> an infamous figure of 19th-century Hungarian history – the leader of a Hungarian and international anti-Semitic movement. Szócs writes about the "*slow, stealthy, but incessant settlement*" of Jews in Hungary, which leads – Istóczy had already "*established*" this – to the inevitable "*destruction of a nation.*"

In the spring of 1882, Istóczy and his fellow representative Géza Ónódy talked about blood libel in the Hungarian Parliament in connection with the disappearance of a young girl, Eszter Solymosi, who drowned near Tiszaeszlár. Today, in connection with the recent cyanide poisoning of the Tisza River, Csurka again criticized the post World War I peace accord of Trianon and suggested that Eszter Solymosi was murdered, her murderers were never apprehended,<sup>24</sup> etc. etc.

---

<sup>20</sup> In *Magyar Demokrata*, December 23, 1999 – January 6, 2000.

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

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

<sup>23</sup> In *Magyar Fórum*, November 9, 2000.

<sup>24</sup> Eszter Solymosi was the alleged victim of Jews in the infamous Tiszaeszlár blood-libel suit in 1882-1883, which ended with the acquittal of the accused Jews.

Prime Minister Viktor Orbán called István Tisza<sup>25</sup> the last great statesman before István Bethlen<sup>26</sup>, whom only the “foreign-minded” [that group would have to include Endre Ady<sup>27</sup>] considered nationalistic, and after whom there were only “Károlyis and Béla Kuns.” Orbán mentioned the democrat Count Mihály Károlyi, the leader of the bourgeois democratic government of 1918-1919, in the same breath with his political opponent, Béla Kun, the leader of the short-lived communist Republic of Councils of 1919.<sup>28</sup>

### Trianon

Csurka demanded that there be irredentist literature at the Frankfurt Book Fair,<sup>29</sup> while Grespik, taking his cue from the Holy Crown tenet, called the Trianon borders “non-sanctifiable” and proposed that an effort be made to reclaim areas taken away in 1920.<sup>30</sup> Csurka’s idea was that Transylvania should be “pulled back” into European history by turning it into an independent country of 7 million Romanians and 3 million Hungarians.<sup>31</sup>

Zoltán Szôcs felt it necessary to publish a selection of articles by the writer and publicist Dezsô Szabó (1879-1945), written during his most racist and anti-Semitic period, in 1920-1921. In explaining why he deemed it important to republish these intellectual “gold nuggets,”<sup>32</sup> Szôcs said that in his view Szabó’s articles have an “uncanny topicality” even today. Szôcs has learned from Szabó that in the course of the history of our nation our leaders have almost always been foreigners...

Szôcs cites Szabó’s opinion which echoes the line of argument expressed in the anti-Semitic pamphlet, *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, according to which communist revolutionary Jews are the vanguard of capitalist-imperialist Jewry; they operate like two blades of a pair of scissors. According to Szôcs, Dezsô Szabó was also right in saying that Hungarians are instinctively repelled by the market; under the conditions of free-market capitalism they are doomed.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>25</sup> István Tisza (1861-1918), Prime Minister of Hungary between 1903-05 and 1913-17.

<sup>26</sup> István Bethlen (1874-1946), Prime Minister of Hungary between 1921-31.

<sup>27</sup> Endre Ady (1877-1919), a renowned modern Hungarian poet.

<sup>28</sup> Prime Minister Viktor Orbán’s speech inaugurating the statue of István Tisza in Debrecen, October 31, 2000.

<sup>29</sup> In *Havi Magyar Fórum*, August, 1999.

<sup>30</sup> In *Magyar Demokrata*, December 23, 1999-January 6, 2000.

<sup>31</sup> In *Népszava*, May 20, 2000.

<sup>32</sup> In *Magyar Fórum*, July 6, 2000.

<sup>33</sup> In *Vasárnapi újság*, June 11, 2000.

Csurka's party proposed the rehabilitation of former Prime Minister László Bárdossy at the beginning of 2000 by calling a martyr the man who was largely responsible for Hungary's alliance with Nazi Germany in the war against the Soviet Union.<sup>34</sup> It was during Bárdossy's tenure as prime-minister that the third anti-Jewish law was passed and nearly 20,000 Jews were deported.

#### Nazism, Fascism, Communism

In the newspapers of the political group that calls itself bourgeois-conservative, one is not likely to find unambiguous attempts to excuse Nazism or fascism. In one of his writings, László Tökéczi calls it downright absurd to think immediately of fascism or anti-Semitism when one doesn't like something. He notes that hundreds of Hungarian Jews got their diplomas in fascist Italy.<sup>35</sup> Citing Francois Furet, he also points out that the Comintern had sent Jenő Fried, a Hungarian Jew, to France, where in a year or two he successfully planted the idea in the heads of many French intellectuals that anyone who is an anti-communist must be a fascist.<sup>36</sup> (At that time, up to August 23, 1939, in fact, Fried's job was relatively easy. Until the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact the Soviet Union could rightly be viewed as the single, consistently anti-fascist and anti-Nazi state...)

#### Holocaust

Hungarians on the extreme right today do not deny the facts of the Holocaust. In his controversial article<sup>37</sup>, István Lovas gave a number of examples in an attempt to prove that the Jewish Holocaust was not unique, notwithstanding Yehuda Bauer's accepted definition of what makes the Holocaust unique in a study also published in Hungarian.<sup>38</sup> Lovas is being dishonest when he asserts that those who argue for the uniqueness of the Holocaust cite the proportion of

<sup>34</sup> In *Magyar Fórum*, January 13, 2000.

<sup>35</sup> In *Magyar Nemzet*, September 7, 2000.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> István Lovas: "Összehasonlító véralgebra és a holocaust" (Comparative Blood Algebra and the Holocaust) (In *Népszabadság*, 3 May 1999.) In his article, Lovas misquotes Yehuda Bauer and Raul Hilberg, the two highly respected experts on the Holocaust he refers to. He also misquotes and therefore falsifies the minutes of the Wannsee Conference in order to manufacture arguments for his anti-Semitic article.

<sup>38</sup> "Definiálható-e a holocaust?" (Can the Holocaust be Defined?) In *Válóság*, No.11, 1987.

exterminated people, the rapidity of liquidation and the mechanism of extermination.

What Yehuda Bauer and many Holocaust experts maintain is that it is not the number killed (nearly six million European Jews), nor the rapidity of liquidation, nor the mechanism of murder that prove the uniqueness of the Holocaust. It is the intention alone, the decision to kill every single European Jew, that makes the Holocaust unique and distinct. There was no conceivable reason for this particular genocide. It was the first time in history that the leaders of a state ordered the extermination of every member of a group of people classified on the basis of a specific religion and were able to mobilize the whole state apparatus for the execution of their plan. The objective and its cold, bureaucratic and large-scale execution makes the Holocaust unique and distinct.

Both Mária Schmidt, a historian and one of the chief advisors of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, and János Pelle fail to mention that although some Jewish historians and publicists consider the Holocaust incomparable with any other genocide, there is a newly articulated position increasingly gaining ground, according to which this type of comparison and even a comparison between the Gulag and the Nazi concentration camps, is fully acceptable, professionally and morally. In a way, it's easy to see the logic of their reasoning, which is essentially that the unique features of a thing can be highlighted only in comparison with other things.<sup>39</sup>

According to Schmidt, in order to ensure the prosperity of the German people, the Nazis "*were willing*" to cleanse the world of Jews.<sup>40</sup> The Nazis attached great importance to the extermination of Jews; to them it was tantamount to saving world peace, indeed saving the world. Schmidt also declared that "*... the Holocaust, the extermination or the saving of the Jews, was a minor, we might say marginal consideration, not included among the war aims of either side.*"<sup>41</sup>

According to Schmidt, the West was unwilling to face the crimes committed in the name of communism because if it did, it might have "*risked destroying its carefully built up self-image, and thereby the legitimacy of the Western democracies.*"<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Pelle (In *Napi Magyarország*, February 19, 2000); Schmidt (In *Napi Magyarország*, November 13, 1999).

<sup>40</sup> In *Napi Magyarország*, November 13, 1999.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

Lovas cites Jewish authors in America and elsewhere, who criticize the existing Holocaust industry.<sup>43</sup> Lovas's aim is to talk not about the thing itself – anti-Semitism and the Holocaust – but about its after-life; in doing so he engages in vulgar anti-Semitism, but in a way that would make it hard to call him anti-Semitic.

### Epilogue

László Kövér's pronouncement, made while he was still a government minister, that the Hungarian Jewish question should be discussed anew, caused a major controversy. The defenders of his position István Elek among them, could not understand why so many people were offended by Kövér's statement. In Hungary there is a Gypsy question, while there is no German or Serbian question, for instance. But is there a Jewish question? Kövér says there is, but right-winger István Csurka's answers "*are not framed properly*" (also true of his comments on Trianon), which makes public discourse on these questions not quite acceptable. According to Kövér (and he openly talked about this as far back as 1995), the reason why there is a Jewish question in Hungary is that there exists an influential elite, a circle of leading Jewish intellectuals, without whom or in opposition to whom, it is impossible to have normal public discussions of issues.<sup>44</sup> Elek also thinks that there exist such (obviously Jewish or Jewish-liberal-left-wing-affiliated) "*opinion-forming intellectual groups*" that "*shape the political language.*"<sup>45</sup>

The power of Jewish influence in culture, the media and politics constitutes one of the basic tenets of the extreme right. This idea conceals another, highly aristocratic and contemptuous opinion of the common people. The implication is that the people are too stupid and too easy to manipulate and the only reason they do not vote for non-communist, non-liberal non-Jews is that the press, TV and radio are all in the hands of Jewish communist liberals.

Tökéczki too, says that MIÉP is not an extreme right-wing party but a "*radical plebeian party*" which "*shows explicitly right-wing symptoms only with regard to issues of national concern.*"<sup>46</sup> According to this view, irredentism, anti-liberalism, anti-Semitism, and xenophobia are merely a part of the "*national concern*" of this "*radical plebeian*" party, which cannot therefore be classified as right wing on the basis of these ideological, political characteristics...

---

<sup>43</sup> In *Vasárnapi újság*, September 3, 2000.

<sup>44</sup> In *Magyar Hírlap*, August 16, 1999.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> In *Magyar Nemzet*, September 7, 2000.

ZSÓFIA MIHANCSIK

## REVEALING QUOTES

---

*Magyar Fórum, Magyar Demokrata, Vasárnapi újság*  
(abridged)

Below follows a selection of quotes from the articles published in the course of 2000 in two (far) right weeklies, the *Magyar Fórum* and the *Magyar Demokrata*, and also from a radio program entitled *Vasárnapi újság*, characterized by the same political orientation as the two weeklies. I selected pieces, dealing primarily with Jewish topics, that I found characteristic of the tone of the weeklies and of the program. Of the three media, *Magyar Fórum* uses the most consistent anti-Semitic language and, thanks to István Csurka<sup>1</sup>, this paper offers the most homogeneous and consistent world-view. They can interpret any issue in the context of “destructive Jewish world power” and “world conspiracy.” At the same time, they are the least shy: although they have a rich vocabulary of synonyms for Jew, they use the term openly with a negative connotation. The quotes in my paper are grouped according to certain key words and thematic focuses. I tried to make my descriptions related to the quotes objective and dispassionate.

### — MAGYAR FÓRUM —

The weekly *Magyar Fórum* discussed Jewish themes over 100 times in 2000, mainly in articles focusing specifically on Jews but sometimes only mentioning or hinting at them. The articles I reviewed included *Frankfurti zsarnokság (The Tyranny of Frankfurt)*, a piece by István Csurka from 1999.

*Magyar Fórum* widely uses synonyms/paraphrases for Jews which are easily understandable for the reader. The synonyms/paraphrases used are the following: Member of the Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ), communist, Bolshevik, international, liberal, homosexual, hermaphrodite, cosmopolitan, globalist, alien, outlandish, Pharisee.

---

<sup>1</sup> István Csurka is the President of the right-wing MIÉP party.

The Description of the Jewish Character,  
Their Methods and Tools, the Consequences of Their Actions  
and Ways to Protect One Against Them

Jewish Traits

*“They believe or have trust in nothing but instant and tangible profit.”<sup>2</sup>*

*“Body without soul: whether politician, banker or writer, in fact he is an atheist and materialist. Any God-given or man-made law is a burden to him unless it serves his benefit...”* If *“they are questioned about their deeds they complain loudly that they are being persecuted. They are the persecuting persecuted, the best disciples of Hitler and Stalin.”* They are cowardly and rootless.<sup>3</sup>

*“I look at them and wonder what an immense opportunity for success, career advancement it is, how satanically it must feel to have no moral scruples, how satisfying to know that talking cynically can become a lifestyle... They can attack, fight and hush up with arrogant and uninhibited clattering the fair, educated and ethical opponent who was brought up according to European norms.”<sup>4</sup>*

*“They are cowardly and impertinent at the same time. Money is their god, their mother tongue..., their baggy eyes, flabby skin, sweaty palms, cold feet and wry smile give them away ... They ignite fear and live from fear. They provoke quarrel and discord ... They have infiltrated every political party, church and community. They are ready for any kind of betrayal or treason because they are shallow. They have no god, nation, language, homeland or world-view, only bank accounts. ... They are greedy, mean, wicked and ugly.”<sup>5</sup>*

Their Helpers, Institutions and Institutionalization

*“At the moment our society cannot (or can only to a very small extent) resist the outlandish political influence representing alien interest and transmitted by the television channels that obstruct normal ways of thinking about public issues...and suppress the national character or make fun of issues that are vital for the nation. [...] By now, Tv2<sup>6</sup>, owned by the highest echelon of the MSZP and SZDSZ has the highest viewer rating. One of the owners of the channel is*

<sup>2</sup> Péter Szabó Szentmihályi, “A farizeusok gyávasága” (The Cowardice of the Pharisees). February 17, 2000.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Zoltán Szócs, “Gyuri bohóc, a kultúrfelelős” (Gyuri Clown, in Charge of Culture). July 6, 2000.

<sup>5</sup> Péter Szabó Szentmihályi, “A Sátán ügynökei” (The Agents of Satan). December 14, 2000.

<sup>6</sup> Tv2 is one of the leading Hungarian commercial television channels.

*David Bronfmann, president of the Jewish World Congress. The head of the TV channel<sup>7</sup> is a former journalist of the party-state.”<sup>8</sup>*

Certain authorities in charge of soccer affairs ban through decrees the shouting of racist slogans during the games: *“The referee ..., in order to keep his international qualification, allowing him to referee the matches of the verbally abused nation for good money, chooses to blow his whistle in his homeland when Hungarian races play against Hungarian races.” “...Can the sponsor be abused verbally? We can presume that the sponsors of both teams, the home team and the guest team alike, belong to the same race..., because only this protected ethnic group has money.”<sup>9</sup>*

### Their Methods

They intentionally discredit Hungary: *“They publish articles in the Western press, in which they besmirch the state of affairs in Hungary and Hungarians.”<sup>10</sup>*

Step-by-step, they have taken the institutions of intellectual life: *“They had already taken over the TV screen, the theater and the microphone. And most of education, too. The final move in the operation is taking over of literature.”<sup>11</sup>*

*“They want to obtain global material and intellectual power, which they may have already accomplished through multi-national companies, international organizations and a network of banks.”<sup>12</sup>*

They impose threat: *“... They instill fear in the people, in the ranks of intellectuals who are inclined to think and in those who nurture Hungarian feelings ... in order to seize power.”<sup>13</sup>*

It is they, who incite anti-Semitism because they can turn it into a business. Jewish compensation: *“The leaders of the Jews are the ones who primarily benefit from it ... all over the world, it is the elected representatives, heads of boards, committees and foundations that reap the benefit from the Holocaust and recklessly incite anti-Semitism.”<sup>14</sup>*

<sup>7</sup> A reference to Dezső Pintér, former editor of the daily Magyar Hírlap.

<sup>8</sup> István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel” (Through Hungarian Eyes). January 20, 2000.

<sup>9</sup> István Csurka, “Kit szidjunk s hogyan?” (Whom to Abuse and How?) August 3, 2000.

<sup>10</sup> István Csurka, “A frankfurti zsarnokság” (The Tyranny of Frankfurt). In *Havi Magyar Fórum*, August 1999.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Péter Szabó Szentmihályi, “A farizeusok gyávasága” (The Cowardice of the Pharisees). February 17, 2000.

<sup>13</sup> István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel” (Through Hungarian Eyes). June 15, 2000.

<sup>14</sup> Tibor Franka, “Sárga csillag – cigánysors” (Yellow Star – the Gypsy Fate). March 30, 2000.

In order to make a better bargain, they falsify the number of Holocaust victims: *“David Irving proved scientifically that there were no gas chambers suitable for mass murder in Auschwitz. ... I quote a sentence by Irving: ‘The Soviet authorities ... handed over to Germany the death registers of Auschwitz, according to which a total of 74,000 people died there and not 2, 3 or 4 million’.*”<sup>15</sup>

They hide facts: *“Of course, the Communist authors of the black book of Communism (former, blundering, reformist and repentant Communists) ... are silent about the genetics of Bolshevism, that is, about the families of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Béla Kun<sup>16</sup>, Rákosi<sup>17</sup>, Horn<sup>18</sup> and the other bloody handed mass murderers.”*<sup>19</sup>

They use undercover agents: *“Péter Agárdi, the president of the Board of Hungarian Radio, also had the task of placing as many cosmopolitan people in the editorial offices as he possibly could ... let us put it the way it is: the institution is led by people of Jewish origin.” “...these channels are in alien hands now, they serve alien purposes and Hungarians have no say in this issue.”*<sup>20</sup>

#### The Effects of the Jewish Intrigues on the Hungarian Nation

*“What is taking place in Frankfurt is the Holocaust of Hungarian literature.” “...This step in the process of the cosmopolitan give-away of Hungary, the changing of this country’s character is much more than a question of literature. It is part of giving up the Hungarian national identity, it is part of the agony of Hungary.”*<sup>21</sup>

They intentionally devalue all that is Hungarian: *“First, literature filled with Hungarian spirit, Hungarian content, one written for Hungarian readers has to be degraded to the level of a second-rate, valueless and poorly paid activity. Literature that is international, deals with the Holocaust, is cosmopolitan, and publishable in the ‘West’, shall have priority.”*<sup>22</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Zoltán Szócs, “Harc a józan ész ellen” (Fight Against Common Sense). April 27, 2000.

<sup>16</sup> Béla Kun (of Jewish origin) was the leader of the short-lived Hungarian communist republic in 1919.

<sup>17</sup> Mátyás Rákosi (of Jewish origin) was the communist leader of Hungary until 1956.

<sup>18</sup> Gyula Horn, MSZP politician, formerly Foreign Minister in the last communist government.

<sup>19</sup> J.P.P., “Bitang bitóbitórlók” (Villainous Usurpers of the Gallows). July 13, 2000.

<sup>20</sup> István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel” (Through Hungarian Eyes). August 3, 2000.

<sup>21</sup> István Csurka, “A frankfurti zsarnokság” (The Tyranny of Frankfurt). In *Havi Magyar Fórum*, August 1999.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

They push aside those who are Hungarian, including Csurka: *“None of my plays have been staged since 1990.” “I have been banned by the same liberal, Budapest-based Jewish leaders of theatrical life who in the 70s and 80s had been all for them.”* [Now they hate them because] *“I cannot put up with the fact that the new system “is so anti-Hungarian, false, and let us tell as it is: Jewish dominated.”*<sup>23</sup>

A false image of Hungary is created: *“What does the world come to know about the country that is this year’s Special Guest in Frankfurt?” ... That it’s a Communist, Jewish-dominated and, at the same time, anti-Semitic country.”* [The article also included a list of books written by Hungarian Jewish authors.] *“Hungary’s representation becomes unbalanced ... they send the message that ... it [the Holocaust] is the main concern of the Hungarian nation and Hungarian literature.”*<sup>24</sup>

*“...In the name of establishing balance, the finance minister and the president of the National Bank of Hungary have drained the economy, and then, Suchman<sup>25</sup>, relying on the good advice of the advisors planted into MSZP by the Israeli Workers Party, sold out entirely this bankrupt economy...”*<sup>26</sup>

#### Protection Against Them in General

*“If you recognize and identify them by name they will lose their power.”*<sup>27</sup>

We should not aim for Europe: *“Why would we aim for Europe? Only to replace the Soviet muzzle with another one from London?... Shall we give up our national values and introduce a democracy where marriage between lesbians and homosexuals is legalized notwithstanding the alarming decline of the Hungarian population? Shall we become one large department store chain here, a gateway to the East? Shall we forget everything that has made us Hungarian and Christian?”*<sup>28</sup>

Armed self-defense units should be formed: *“We have to cast out from our society ...the shallow and decadent lifestyle imposed upon it by neo-liberalism...”*

<sup>23</sup> István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel” (Through Hungarian Eyes). June 15, 2000.

<sup>24</sup> István Csurka, “A frankfurti zsarnokság” (The Tyranny of Frankfurt). In *Havi Magyar Fórum*, August 1999.

<sup>25</sup> Tamás Suchman, a leading (Jewish) politician of MSZP (Socialists), then head of the State Privatization Agency.

<sup>26</sup> István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel” (Through Hungarian Eyes). October 26, 2000.

<sup>27</sup> Péter Szabó Szentmihályi, “A farizeusok gyávasága” (The Cowardice of the Pharisees). February 17, 2000.

<sup>28</sup> István Csurka’s speech delivered in the Heroes’ Square in Budapest : “Új magyar feltámadást!” (For a New Resurrection of Hungary). March 16, 2000.

*Within five years, we can create a new armed force, the National Guard (Nemzet-őrség), relying on young armed servicemen with diplomas, who are well-trained in sports, and with whom we can defeat the Mafiosi and strengthen the police ... We have to establish law and order in Budapest and the other major cities.”<sup>29</sup>*

#### Protection Against Them in the Economy

*“... We do not need the guardianship of the World Bank, nor the help of the toll-takers.” “... we have to immediately eliminate from the monetary system all the elements that do not belong there. The government needs a set amount of freely usable, interest-free money”; “we must eliminate immediately the two-faced nature of the Hungarian economy and its unfairly overburdened state.” ... “privatization must be revised.”<sup>30</sup>*

*Autarchy: “We need to adopt a self-defense policy. We need our own projects, own road constructions, own education and own army. And for that we need money that is ours and does not come from loans... money that serves only Hungarian purposes and comes from Hungarian work.”<sup>31</sup>*

#### Protection Against Them in Politics

*The Hungarian radicalism of the MIÉP and its nation saving program: “We want to live, and we want to live as Hungarians, which requires from us purification, unselfishness, Christian faith, a coexistence with our 1000-year-old past and respect for our predecessors ... and respect for the Hungarian Mother.” “The nation needs strong hands now.” “Only clean hands can be strong.”<sup>32</sup>*

*“... There is only one way to escape. To promote the accession to power and representation in government to an extent larger than fifty percent of the forces that ... can keep Hungarian lands in Hungarian hands and ... work for a flourishing Hungary . At the moment, most of the representatives and supporters of MIÉP and Fidesz are behind this.”<sup>33</sup>*

<sup>29</sup> István Csurka’s speech delivered in the Heroes’ Square in Budapest : “Új magyar feltámadást!” (For a New Resurrection of Hungary). March 16, 2000.

<sup>30</sup> István Csurka, “A MIÉP elnökségének értékelése az elmúlt évről és a jövő kilátásairól” (The assessment of the past year and the future prospects by the presidium of MIÉP). January 6, 2000.

<sup>31</sup> István Csurka’s speech delivered in the Heroes’ Square in Budapest : “Új magyar feltámadást!” (For a New Resurrection of Hungary). March 16, 2000.

<sup>32</sup> István Csurka, “A MIÉP elnökségének értékelése az elmúlt évről és a jövő kilátásairól” (The assessment of the past year and the future prospects by the presidium of MIÉP). January 6, 2000.

<sup>33</sup> István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel” (Through Hungarian Eyes). October 26, 2000.

## Methods of Argumentation and Discussion

What follows is not an exhaustive enumeration but rather examples of the methods used characteristically and consistently by the weekly to describe Jews.

### Collocating and Mixing up Various Qualities in Order to Stigmatize

(Jew = criminal; Jew = a person who instigates Gypsies) *“They hold against Hegedűs Jr.<sup>34</sup> that he dared to enumerate some ethnically distinct Mafia groups that have settled into Hungary, namely, Russian, Georgian, Russian Jewish, Georgian Jewish and Israeli. ... The only thing they objected to was the fact that somebody dared to mention the ethnic origins of the Mafia, as though the mere mention of their ethnic origins in itself constituted to anti-Semitism.”<sup>35</sup>*

*“At a Roma Holocaust memorial ceremony, Katalin Katz, ... lecturer of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem spoke about ... the fact that the life and fate of Jews and Romas are related... and then ... she handed over a considerable amount of money, obviously not her own, to help the Zámoly Roma have a good time in Strasbourg... How cynical it is of a Hungarian born Israeli citizen to come to Budapest, accuse Hungary of racism and then offer financial support to groups who also act against the democratically elected government.”<sup>36</sup>*

### Alluring Analogies

*“At the moment, well over 200 purchase transactions [of real estate] by Israelis are taking place [in Budapest]. Before the troops of Ben Gurion, Shamir and Begin had occupied the territories, a debate about which is now going on in Camp David, first they purchased many of them. For a song. Because the Bedouins needed the money.”<sup>37</sup>*

### Unjustifiable or Even Nonsensical Statements to Prove the Theory of Jewish Conspiracy

*“In fact, Demszky’s<sup>38</sup> attack is directed against the non-Jewish forces in the leadership of his party [the SZDSZ] and is aimed at unlimited Jewish rule ...*

<sup>34</sup> Loránt Hegedűs, MIÉP-politician, Member of the Parliament.

<sup>35</sup> István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel” (Through Hungarian Eyes). June 15, 2000.

<sup>36</sup> József Hering, “Jeruzsálemből jön a pénz a cigányoknak” (Money for Gypsies Comes from Jerusalem). August 17, 2000.

<sup>37</sup> István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel” (Through Hungarian Eyes). July 20, 2000.

<sup>38</sup> Gábor Demszky, Mayor of Budapest, a leading politician of SZDSZ (liberals).

*Demszky together with Böhm and Haraszt<sup>39</sup> want the SZDSZ and the country to be led by the most militant, Bolshevik-rooted Jews.” “...The SZDSZ and the MSZP will also be sacrificed by the ruling elite. Because ... the final goal is to make Hungary a safe place for the settlement of Jews fleeing, or being rescued, from Russia, the Soviet Empire and the increasingly dangerous Middle East. Now is the time to obtain land and real estate ... and the Demszky-type 'hateful guys from the old gang' are the most suitable for that job...”<sup>40</sup>*

---

<sup>39</sup> András Böhm and Miklós Haraszt<sup>i</sup> are well-known politicians of the SZDSZ.

<sup>40</sup> István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel” (Through Hungarian Eyes). October 26, 2000.

— MAGYAR DEMOKRATA —

The quotations below are from articles published in the weekly *Magyar Demokrata* in the year 2000. I selected articles that either specifically dealt with the Jewish question or made references to it in an anti-Semitic and racist “interpretative” context while discussing other issues and revealed how the issue the given article dealt with was “connected” to the “destructive dealings” of Jews (Gypsies).

Hungarians and Jews

“Dirty Jews” shouted at the MTK – Fradi<sup>41</sup> soccer matches: *“Here they try to make an issue out of something that concerns only a couple of hundred people. They try to make it seem as though it were characteristic of a larger group of people, say, Hungarians in general.”*<sup>42</sup>

The destruction and desecration of Jewish cemeteries: *“If a single tablet of stone is removed, they immediately alert the whole country.”*<sup>43</sup>

Liberals Are the True Hatemongers

After enumerating examples of how the “*leftist liberal*” media “*distorts facts*”: *“...we can only reiterate very mildly and with restraint: You are selfish cosmopolitans and internationalists for whom this [land] is not a homeland only an outpost, and you are interested in nothing but your pockets.”*<sup>44</sup>

*“The Hungarian public is divided into two camps engaged in a bitter fight for life or death. It is unacceptable that one of the two parties that is at war defines itself by its ties to the Jewish race...”* “...As regards those on the other side [Jews], *their insane and desperate hatred should not be left without reaction.*”<sup>45</sup>

*“...After the last of his regular brief visits to Hungary [sic!], when he routinely called the country or the people anti-Semitic, representative Tom Lantos”*<sup>46</sup> was punished at home *“because he ran over a ten-year-old boy just outside the Capitol. The boy suffered minor injuries”*.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Both MTK and Fradi are traditional Hungarian soccer clubs. Because of their history MTK is frequently referred as a “Jewish team” and Fradi as a “genuine Hungarian team”.

<sup>42</sup> Zoltán Csöryi, “A dezinformáció iskolái” (The Schools of Disinformation). May 4, 2000.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> András Bencsik, “Barikádok között” (Between Barricades) July 20, 2000.

<sup>46</sup> A reference to Hungarian born US Representative Tom Lantos.

<sup>47</sup> István Lovas, “Szikinger dermatoglyphiai alapon” (Szikinger on a Dermatoglyphic Basis). May 11, 2000.

The SZDSZ, Leftist Liberals and Jewish Communists

Interviewer: “*Can the desperate hatred felt by Hungarian leftist liberal intellectuals against the civic government and conservative powers be related ... to the fact that there are Jews who are Jewish by origin only but who incite the alleged Hungarian anti-Semitism keep the issue of the Holocaust on the agenda?*”<sup>48</sup>

“*Some Jews had put on 'pufajkas'<sup>49</sup> the ÁVÓ uniform ...*” and then, around 1990 they thought “*it wiser to take their pufajkas off and put on their yarmulkas*”, because this way they could say that “*the poor Jew is being persecuted*” should anyone try to make them responsible for the past. *So they could not be dealt with. The same way Rákosi, Gerő, Mihály Farkas, and Béla Kun<sup>50</sup> were not Jews, only Bolshevik, internationalist Muscovites of Jewish origin.*” In other words: “*Bolsheviks try to make use of the Jewish question in their rear-guard fights.*”<sup>51</sup>

The legal system uses a double standard. The court turned down the appeal of the 56-ers' Association for a Ft 15 billion compensation from the MSZP and the Munkáspárt (Workers' Party), despite the fact that the appeal was “*analogous to reparation paid to Jews*”. If the Nazi party were reconstituted in Germany after 1945 and Jewish organizations demanded compensation from it, would the Nuremberg court have ruled that the organizations filing the claims “*had not existed at the time when the persons, who later founded them, were confined in concentration camps?*”<sup>52</sup>

“*The leftist-liberal hysteria dreadfully resembles the Bolshevik hysteria, according to which anyone who was not on their side was necessarily a Nazi, an anti-Semite, that is, an enemy... and was to be destroyed... the new Bolsheviks are merciless in this fight. The new Bolsheviks, who are organized along mysterious ideological-ethnic lines, are not afraid to face the consequences of the dis-*

<sup>48</sup> “Minden címkézéstől és előítéllettől elhatárolódom.” Interjú Timár György kisgazda képviselővel. (I reject all sorts of labeling and prejudice. An interview with FGKP MP György Timár). March 30, 2000.

<sup>49</sup> Reference to a warm coat – pufajka – worn typically by the Communist Secret Police members, the ÁVÓ.

<sup>50</sup> Reference to four leading communist politicians of Jewish origin

<sup>51</sup> “Minden címkézéstől és előítéllettől elhatárolódom.” Interjú Timár György kisgazda képviselővel. (I reject all sorts of labeling and prejudice. An interview with FGKP MP György Timár). March 30, 2000.

<sup>52</sup> András Bencsik, “Nürnberg öröksége” (The Legacy of Nürnberg). May 4, 2000.

*crimination resulting from the tug of war of Semitism and anti-Semitism... Communists, who were helped into power by Bolsheviks, and who were the greatest murderers in the history of mankind, used this method of argumentation masterfully against anyone who stood in the way of their accession to unlimited power. The essential difference is not that their contemporary followers call themselves liberals but that, as of yet, they have not gained full and unlimited power.*<sup>53</sup>

Interviewer: Soros' most harmful deed "was that he planted the seeds of infernal hatred to be incited every day by the papers that he supports ... against people who love their country."<sup>54</sup>

In connection with the draft designs of the crest of Erzsébetváros (in which a Menorah is depicted), the author quotes Cecil Tormay: "The times when Jews were not allowed to stay in Buda and Pest are long gone... Within 50 years, they have come to own the city... They spread over entire streets", which "become rapidly dirty, and the same smell comes from every gate", the typical smell of the ghetto. "...it seems as if some kind of stubborn, hostile life dwelled here, a life unshared by us ..." Note by the author: "The Menorah is, indeed, unnecessary. It brings back very bad memories."<sup>55</sup>

### Israel

"While they call Haider a Fascist, Israel shells Lebanon... the houses of Palestinians are torn down by bulldozers. Here, anyone not of Jewish origin is a goy. What is it if not racial theory?"

"The largest amount of capital comes to Hungary from the country where discrimination and government terror are the most virulent." They ask every well-meaning person "to support our initiative for a referendum aimed at preventing citizens of countries where human laws and existence are not respected from obtaining real estate in Hungary..."<sup>56</sup>

"Even in international terms, the Israelis are the leading traders of synthetic pills... Israel is the money laundering center of the world ... Barak was the first leader to congratulate Putin on taking Groznii." The survey of Tv2 failed to

<sup>53</sup> András Bencsik, "Barikádok között" (Between Barricades). July 20, 2000.

<sup>54</sup> Lovas István: Interjú J. Sunley-val "Soros – rombolni a nyugati civilizációt" (An interview with J. Sunley by István Lovas. Soros – to Destroy Western Civilization.). August 10, 2000.

<sup>55</sup> Miklós Kelemen, "A menóra és árnyékai" (The Menorah and its Shadows). October 23, 2000.

<sup>56</sup> András Bencsik, "Mária oltalma" (Mary's Protection). October 12, 2000.

mention the fact that *“Israelis are the leading purchasers of real estate in Hungary, but – and this was not pointed out – it is very important for the leftist-liberal powers that the proliferation of Israeli interests in the country go unnoticed for Hungarians.”* At the same time, *“real estate is purchased in preparation for the immigration of Israeli, Ukrainian, Georgian and Armenian Jews ...”*<sup>57</sup>

#### The Holocaust and the Holocaust Memorial Day

The Holocaust Memorial Day *“is the degrading of Hungarian national identity to a secondary level.”* *“Holocaust is pouring even from the tap, completed with the defamation of the national colors of Hungary... and the threatening of people with racism and Fascism...”*<sup>58</sup>

*“Unfortunately, there are people who benefit from the Holocaust, ... who take smaller or larger amounts of the money that the unfortunate, old, lonely and sick people will never get”*<sup>59</sup>

#### Globalization, International Jewish Capital

*“While earlier there was Communist ideology and nothing else but the Communist ideology, now there is the international, liberal, globalist ideology and nothing else but that.”* The author enumerates the tenets of the liberal credo (alcoholism, narcotics, single parent families, globalization etc.); Item. 12.: *“Positive discrimination (affirmative action) for minorities...”* They are outraged if *“the Jewish faith is mentioned in a negative context; however, they find the Inquisition the only phenomenon worth mentioning in connection with Catholicism.”*<sup>60</sup>

Soros *“...aims to undermine the most basic institutions of society – government institutions, as well as the church and the family – ...and when these institutions are sufficiently weak, he can operate as a businessman much more easily amid the ruins. ... There are people who say that the money comes from an*

<sup>57</sup> Miklós Kelemen, “Betelepülők. Az izraeliek térnyerése Budapesten és Magyarországon” (Settlers. The Expansion of Israelis in Budapest and Hungary). October 19, 2000.

<sup>58</sup> Olvasói levél: Arány- vagy országtévesztés (A reader’s letter: Mistaken proportions or mistaken country). February 17, 2000.

<sup>59</sup> “Minden címkézéstől és előítéllettől elhatárolódom.” Interjú Timár György kiscgazda képviselővel. (I reject all sorts of labeling and prejudice. An interview with FGKP MP György Timár). March 30, 2000.

<sup>60</sup> Zoltán Csörnyei, “A hülyítés fejezetei” (Chapters of Fooling People). April 13, 2000.

*official American source, because it is easier to use Soros' network as a channel" for certain purposes of American foreign policy. "Only very few people are familiar with the activity of the American 'philanthropist', such as his support of the legalization of narcotics and euthanasia ... Generally, it is the Jews who are attracted to him and his foundations."*<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Lovas István: Interjú J. Sunley-val "Soros – rombolni a nyugati civilizációt" (An interview with J. Sunley by István Lovas. Soros – to Destroy Western Civilization.). August 10, 2000.

— VASÁRNAPI ÚJSÁG —

The quotes below were selected from 52 broadcasts (transmitted by the Kossuth channel of Hungarian Public Radio from 6:00 to 8:30 a.m. every Sunday). Due primarily to the shortage of space, I did not quote from every single item that deserved coverage. However, the content as well as the terminology used below are characteristic of the items that were not included.

*Jews in the Zenés Kalendárium (Music Calendar)*

*Music Calendar* is a special section of the program, dealing with history. Related to anniversaries, it selects news from papers published decades earlier. By doing so, it anticipates the content of the whole program both in the choice of the themes and the tone. Jewish topics are permanent elements of the calendar section, as well as the rest of the radio program. Consequently, the image the Calendar has of the Jews is identical with the image of Jews prevailing in the press during the Horthy<sup>62</sup> era. Let us see some news items from the past.

The reason why poor people living in Northern Hungary starve and emigrate to America en masse is the massive influx of people from Galicia. Although the news item does not identify the Jews, it refers to them as “aliens”: “*These aliens do not bring money from neighboring Galicia. On the contrary, they want to get rich at our expense. The immigrants open grocery stores and pawn shops, and lend money to poor locals, who sell their crop before harvest and are left with nothing for the winter.*” (January 30)

The profiteering aliens who were dislodged by the Nyíregyháza police force are “*from Galicia.*” In order to avoid misunderstanding, the news item makes it clear that “*the state police carry out the dislodgment with the help of the Jewish community.*” (March 26)

The police chief “*bans Jewish-Polish singers*” from the cabarets: they are “*lewd girls and comedians*” who sing obscene songs in cafés. (October 26)

Jewish Themes in the Core Program

In some of the cases, they made use of internal conflicts within Jewish organizations, interviewing those who were excluded from power. In other cases, the anchor people or columnists introduce a specific subject or, at other times, they

---

<sup>62</sup> Reference to Miklós Horthy, Regent of Hungary between 1920 and 1944.

quote anti-Jewish letters to the editor, most of which had been written by Jewish people and are, therefore, authentic. In 31 of last year's 52 broadcasts, they explicitly targeted Jews.

About Jews and anti-Semitism

*"... we may have already gotten used to the fact that there is only one decent manner in which the relationship of Hungarians and Jews can be tackled: the manner that is acceptable for those speaking on behalf of the Jews."*<sup>63</sup>

*"... whose interests does it serve to have anti-Semitism? Let us put it bluntly: ... it serves the interests of those who benefit from the Holocaust, who pocket the abandoned wealth of the victims of the Holocaust, this way or that way."*<sup>64</sup>

About Hungarian Jewish Leaders and Intellectuals (Considered to be Jewish)

They reject Hungarian national values: *"They claim that a Jew can only be a leftist and cannot be a conservative, nor can he identify with national values."*

*"They cannot tell a candle used in a Scandinavian house from a Menorah, and still they cannot accept Hungarian national values."* *"They are intellectuals pursuing an aggressive policy of protecting minorities."*<sup>65</sup>

They are profiteers: *"Over the past 50 years ... a group of villainous parasites imposed itself on Jews. It consists of an international gang of criminals, who are holding masses of dispossessed Jews fully in check with compensations and through manipulations in connection with the Holocaust. Such parasites living at the expense of Jews and benefiting from their sufferings are Holocaust lawyers and the top leaders of claims organizations."* *"They are gangsters with a criminal record."*<sup>66</sup>

They keep the state administration in check: *"... they want to do away with everybody who dares to express any opinion that is different from the views of the MAZSIHISZ<sup>67</sup> and people in its orbit ... How much longer will Jewish citi-*

<sup>63</sup> "A zsidóság nevében" (In the name of Jewry. An interview by Tibor Franka with Tamás Goldmann Galambos and Gábor Ács). January 16, 2000.

<sup>64</sup> "Tanúvédelem és kiszolgáltatottság" (Protection of Witnesses and Being at Others' Mercy, Tibor Franka in conversation with György Timár). March 12, 2000.

<sup>65</sup> "A zsidóság nevében" (In the name of Jewry. An interview by Tibor Franka with Tamás Goldmann Galambos and Gábor Ács). January 16, 2000.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

<sup>67</sup> MAZSIHISZ is the Alliance of the Hungarian Jewish Communities.

*zens tolerate that in our country, on its way towards the European Union, a small group of people considering themselves Jewish keep the state administration in check? If Jewish people raise their words against them, they can be sure that they will be labeled anti-Semites or opportunistic Jews.”<sup>68</sup>*

The opponents of the present government<sup>69</sup>: *“...if somebody, say, supporting this government, is conservative and also Jewish, and is fed up with the fact that this government is constantly labeled anti-Semitic, ... then they call this person a self-hating, anti-Semitic Jew. ...They can and will use any means to discredit and destroy this government, as they did with the government of the late József Antall. And the people who use such tools are, in my view, lowly scoundrels.”<sup>70</sup>*

#### About Jews Living in Hungary In General

Most of them *“would like to live here in peace with the nation that received them”*; however, *“certain political interest groups, ... try to use the intellectual potential and connections of the Jewish people living in Hungary for their own political goals.”* – the interviewee names the SZDSZ as an example.<sup>71</sup>

*“90% of them do not consider themselves Jewish and basically, they cannot be considered Jews. They are the ones who incite ill sentiments against the 5,000 or 10,000 religious Jews living in Hungary: They keep mentioning Auschwitz, and label people anti-Semites. 99% of them were members of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (MSZMP<sup>72</sup>) and are still the most zealous leftists.”<sup>73</sup>*

#### About Their Anti-Hungarian Activities

*“...some citizens of the world, for whom Hungary is but a hotel to stay in temporarily, keep condemning us. It is very sad that public opinion is often shaped by them.”<sup>74</sup>*

<sup>68</sup> Postabontás. (Opening the Mail). May 28, 2000.

<sup>69</sup> FIDESZ-MPP and FGKP “civic” coalition.

<sup>70</sup> “Falig érő liberalizmus” (Liberalism Reaching the Wall. Pál Lakatos in conversation with Zsolt Bayer). July 23, 2000.

<sup>71</sup> “A zsidóság nevében” (In the Name of Jewry. An interview by Tibor Franka with Tamás Goldmann Galambos and Gábor Ács). January 16, 2000.

<sup>72</sup> MSZMP was the name of the Hungarian communist party between 1956-1989

<sup>73</sup> “A zsidóság nevében” (In the name of Jewry. An interview by Tibor Franka with Tamás Goldmann Galambos and Gábor Ács). January 16, 2000.

<sup>74</sup> Postabontás. (Opening the Mail). January 23, 2000.

*“Dezső Szabó<sup>75</sup> writes that the Communist, Socialist, revolutionary Jew is only a vanguard, a living tank of capitalist-imperialist Jewry, and should they become victorious, they will distort Communism, annul freedom and every individual right. For them the worker is only a blind tool, their Communism and Socialism is but a transitory phase towards a new, capitalistic rule of the world, already based on the broad foundation of the entire race. ... In this free competition ... Hungarians are doomed. Our enemies are well aware of this, and this is why they force us to partake in free competition.”<sup>76</sup>*

*There is no money for the development of Hungary and Hungarians, “because this monetary oligarchy uses it up, wastes it and takes it abroad... They do not pay taxes because they have close ties with international capital...” If they settle here in such great numbers, buy real estate and land ... people who are aliens this or that way ... what will be left for us? Land, as the example of Palestine shows, is fundamentally a living space (Lebensraum).”<sup>77</sup>*

*“...They want to prevent Hungary from taking its due place among the nations. ... They distort the international image of Hungary in a very conscious manner ... they defame Hungary’s present civic government ... by causing tensions.” But the government “cannot post guards beside every [Jewish] grave...”<sup>78</sup>*

#### Their International Influence, Their Impact on the World Economy

*In the days of Dezső Szabó “... The powers of the Triple Entente were our supervising authorities, then Moscow took this position, now it is Brussels, New York and Tel Aviv. We have always had supervising authorities.”<sup>79</sup>*

*The Hungarian media was silent about the latest Israeli-Palestinian conflict: “Now, there is only one group whose imaginary or real power can create such unity against the world...”<sup>80</sup>*

<sup>75</sup> Dezső Szabó, famous Hungarian writer (1879-1945).

<sup>76</sup> “Emlékezés Szabó Dezsőre” (In memoriam Dezső Szabó) An Interview with Zoltán Szócs by Szabolcs Kerekes. June 11, 2000.

<sup>77</sup> “Falig érő liberalizmus” (Liberalism Reaching the Wall. Pál Lakatos in conversation with Zsolt Bayer.) July 23, 2000.

<sup>78</sup> “A ledöntött kereszt” (Cross Hurlled Down. An interview by András Tótfalusi.) November 5, 2000.

<sup>79</sup> “Emlékezés Szabó Dezsőre” (In Memoriam Dezső Szabó). An interview with Zoltán Szócs by Szabolcs Kerekes. June 11, 2000.

<sup>80</sup> Notes by István Lovas. October 15, 2000.

### About the Relationship of the SZDSZ and the Jews

*“I do not consider the prominent MPs of the SZDSZ Jewish because they would protest, citing their right to privacy ... Therefore, when they try to protect me, it basically means that they want to exclude my Jewish culture from the society. They consider it anti-Semitic if somebody calls something Jewish, for example.”<sup>81</sup>*

*“There is only one party in Hungary that keeps track of the ethnic identity and faith of its members ... which as part of its image-building takes special care not to have a Jew as its leader. Since its foundation, the Szabad Demokraták Szövetsége (Alliance of Free Democrats) has done a lot to keep alive the fears of Jews living in Hungary and incite hatred and conflict among Jewish and non-Jewish citizens.”<sup>82</sup>*

*“...I know that the SZDSZ people are a special type who, by definition, are always right. So I can only support Veronika Spira who said that the 600,000 victims were too few.”<sup>83</sup>*

### About the Holocaust

About the Holocaust Memorial Day initiated by Education Minister Zoltán Pokorni: *“...any victim, whatever his or her religion or race, deserves honor, including Hungarians”* The person who wrote the letter hopes that *“the leaders of the country do not intend to divide the nation.”<sup>84</sup>*

Israel urges European countries to reject Haider: *“the racist, chauvinistic, nationalist and religious state”*, which *“feels that at this point Jews can live merely off the memory of the Holocaust”.*<sup>85</sup>

*“...I abhor the fact that many people ... dare to say explicitly that of all the things that ever happened here only the Holocaust was a crime, or that everything the Communists did in the world and in Hungary was nothing compared to the Holocaust.”<sup>86</sup>*

<sup>81</sup> “A zsidóság nevében” (In the Name of Jewry. An Interview by Tibor Franka with Tamás Goldmann Galambos and Gábor Ács). January 16, 2000.

<sup>82</sup> “Falig érô liberalizmus” (Liberalism Reaching the Wall. Pál Lakatos in conversation with Zsolt Bayer.) July 23, 2000.

<sup>83</sup> “Baráti körök országos találkozója” (National Meeting of Friends’ Associations. Speech delivered by István Lovas). November 26, 2000.

<sup>84</sup> Postabontás. (Opening the Mail). January 30, 2000.

<sup>85</sup> “Haider, ahogy Csurka István látja” (Haider, as István Csurka Sees him. Interview with István Csurka by Pál Lakatos.) February 13, 2000.

<sup>86</sup> “Falig érô liberalizmus” (Liberalism Reaching the Wall. Pál Lakatos in conversation with Zsolt Bayer). July 23, 2000.

GÁBOR SCHWEITZER  
A DISPUTE OVER THE CREST OF  
ERZSÉBETVÁROS

---

*(abridged)*

In the autumn of 2000, the Socialist (MSZP) and Liberal (SZDSZ) leaders of the municipal government of Erzsébetváros, Budapest's 7th District, decided to have a crest designed for the district. Consulting an expert in heraldry, the designers made four drafts, which were hung in the Mayor's Office for the residents of the district to see and express their opinion. The residents could cast their votes until October 29, 2000 and the district council was going to pass a decision on November 16. In full accordance with the rules of heraldry, each of the drafts depicted a motif of a stylized red rose – referring to Queen Erzsébet, after whom the district is named – and a stylized menorah, the seven-arm candelabra that has been a sacred symbol of Judaism for thousands of years. (In the drafts, a silver menorah appeared on a blue background.)

The November 2, 2000 issue of the daily, *Magyar Nemzet*, refers to the menorah as the subject of the “*dispute over the crest*” only as “*one of the symbols of the state of Israel.*” The paper quotes András Hont, president of the 7th District's FIDESZ-MPP local chapter, saying that “*the district has no historical tradition that would fully connect the Jewish religion with local public administration.*” At the same time, he added that “*The proposed drafts are highly suitable for provoking anti-Semitic sentiments and at the same time, may hurt the feelings of other religious denominations.*” Tibor Varga, president of the Erzsébetváros MIÉP (Hungarian Justice and Life Party)<sup>1</sup> said that either the symbol of each “*major religious group*” in the district should appear on the crest, or none. Varga claimed that 7th District Mayor Zoltán Szabó's aim was to generate conflict among “*people of different faiths*” living in the district.<sup>2</sup>

The November 2., 2000 issue of the weekly *Magyar Fórum*<sup>3</sup> blamed Mayor Zoltán Szabó for the conflict: “*Mayor Szabó created a situation in which the*

---

<sup>1</sup> MIÉP is a right-wing party in opposition.

<sup>2</sup> Gidró – Pál: “Címervita Erzsébetvárosban.” (A Dispute over the Crest of Erzsébetváros). In *Magyar Nemzet*, November 2, 2000.

<sup>3</sup> Magyar Fórum is the weekly of the right-wing MIÉP.

*members of the district council soon to vote on the drafts, as well as the residents of the district have no chance to avoid the issue of the menorah, which is also a symbol of the Jewish state and religion.*" The author of the article also claimed that all four drafts were made using the national colors (blue and white) of Israel.<sup>4</sup>

The November 3, 2000 issue of *Magyar Nemzet*<sup>5</sup> quotes Mayor Zoltán Szabó, justifying the inclusion of the menorah in the crest by declaring that "*this part of the city has long been the center of Hungary's Jewish population.*" The Mayor emphasized that the menorah appearing in the herald is stylized, and pointed out that the combination of blue and silver (not blue and white) according to the heraldry expert referred to Queen Erzsébet. Szabó also noted that he would consider it senseless to call a local referendum to decide the issue. The article also mentions the opinion of the district's political opposition who declared that there is no place for a symbol that also appears on the Israeli crest to appear in the symbolic image of a Budapest district."<sup>6</sup>

The title of an article in the *Magyar Fórum* by Zoltán Szöcs, "*Szégyen és gyalázat*" (*Shame and Disgrace*), leaves little doubt about the author's sentiments and bias. In Szöcs's opinion, the Mayor of Erzsébetváros "*cynically and aggressively ... intends to replace the historic crest of the district with a herald displaying a Jewish symbol.*" Szöcs condemns Szabó's plan as "*a crime against the nation.*" When Szöcs saw the drafts, which "*transform the symbol and colors of the official national crest of Israel into a symbol of a district of Budapest,*" displayed for opinion in the Mayor's Office, it caused him to declare, "*what is this, if not a classic case of high treason?*" Nothing other than the "*blessed memory Győző Istóczy*" came to his mind. Istóczy was the founder of the Hungarian Anti-Semitic Party, who as early as the last third of the 19th century "*foresaw everything, but of course nobody listened to him.*" He went on to quote from a speech Istóczy delivered in Parliament in 1878, wherein the anti-Semitic politician envisioned that in the next century, the Hungarian nation in a "*testament*" would make Jews its "*overall heir.*" Szöcs embellished Istóczy's words by adding that the "*constant, secret, inch by inch and unremitt-*

<sup>4</sup> "Izrael felségjele Erzsébetváros címerében". (The Insignia of Israel in the Crest of Erzsébetváros). In *Magyar Fórum*, November 2, 2000.

<sup>5</sup> *Magyar Nemzet* is a pro-government daily newspaper.

<sup>6</sup> Kriszta Gidró, "Szabó Zoltán a kerületi címeréről" (Zoltán Szabó on the Crest of his District). In *Magyar Nemzet*, November 3, 2000.

*ting occupation of Hungary by newcomers” has been taking place ever since.*

In Szôcs’s opinion, all MIÉP members must protest against this “*anti-Hungarian conspiracy,*” because “*those who do not protest are not true followers of MIÉP.*”

Szôcs sees the entire 20th century as a “*genocidal*” offensive against a nation by an “*alien race,*” carried out in a manner that is meticulously “*thought out, planned*” whose path can be “*retraced*” step by step and ultimately “*analyzed.*” An assessment of these processes leads those who think the way Szôcs does to one “*consistent conclusion:*” that “*this is a conspiracy! Except that it is no longer secret, as illegality is less and less necessary. It is now possible to conspire openly against us, as the 7th District Mayor has done.... How many more offenses must they commit against us before we rally en masse and tell them quietly that this is as far as our patience has lasted and explain to them where their place is from now on. After all, we are the ones at home here, we are the majority, we are the nation.*”

At the end of his article, Szôcs returns to the theme of the district Mayor, declaring that he “*obviously dared to take the risk*” of the “*Jewish crest move*” because he “*had been ordered to do so and encouraged by sources from serious and important places.*” Szôcs is convinced that the issue of the crest of Erzsébetváros is not about “*the exaggerated ethnic zeal of a restless Jew*” but about much more than that: “*...I repeat: this is a well organized process of ejection, the final prize being control of the Carpathian Basin.*”<sup>7</sup>

In the November 12, 2000 broadcast of *Vásárnapi újság*, a program on Hungary’s public service radio, reporter Tibor Franka interviewed not only Szabó but György Haán, a Free Democrat (SZDSZ) member of the district council. In his introduction, Franka commented that the menorah appearing in the drafts of the Erzsébetváros crest led him to imagine what it would be as if “*...say the turul,<sup>8</sup> ...appeared in the crest or on the flag of a city or county in Israel, since there are many Jews living in Israel who were born or once lived in Hungary.*”

At the end of the program, Franka quoted data from the media, according to which from a total population of 70,000 in the 7th District, some 10,000 to 12,000 are Jewish, while 40,000 are Christian. In addition, some 15,000 Roma,

---

<sup>7</sup> Zoltán Szôcs, “Szégyen és gyalázat” (Shame and Disgrace). In *Magyar Fórum*, November 9, 2000.

<sup>8</sup> The mythical bird of the ancient Magyars.

Serb, Croatian, Armenian, Bulgarian, and German ethnic minorities live in that district.<sup>9</sup>

The 7th District section of the Keresztény Értelmiségiek Szövetsége (Alliance of Christian Intellectuals – KÉSZ) issued a petition in protest against the drafts. In their opinion, the designs had been made without “*careful consideration and may divide the local population.*” Those signing the document, namely, Catholic Bishop Antal Spányi, Greek Catholic Archdeacon György Virányi, Evangelical Deacon Zoltán Szirmai, Calvinist pastor Tamás Végh, and Baptist pastor Gyula Lukács, expressed the hope that “*no religious symbol belonging to any one denomination will appear exclusively in the crest.*”<sup>10</sup>

The November 15, 2000 issue of *Magyar Nemzet* reported that György Hunvald, the MSZP (Socialist) Deputy Mayor of the 7th District, as distinct from Mayor Szabó, would put to tender the execution of the district’s herald. At the same time, he proposed to the presidents of the parties in the district council to “*decide the issue by consensus.*”

Two days later, the *Magyar Nemzet* carried an interview by István Stefka with Mayor Zoltán Szabó. Stefka mentioned in his question that the menorah in the plans for the district’s herald hurt “*the pride of the local population*” because it must be also taken into account that “*a large number of religious Christians, as well as Roma people live in the district.*” In his response, Mayor Szabó explained that a crest “*is composed of historical motifs and is not meant to represent the religious, ethnic, or national composition of a given community.*” Stefka’s next comment was directed at the “five-pointed star” above the menorah also appearing in the drafts. Szabó replied that the symbol viewed as a five-pointed star is none other than a motif for the rose.

In an article in the *Hetek* weekly in connection with the debate over the herald, Katalin Földvári calls readers’ attention to markedly anti-Semitic characteristics. “*Paradoxically, the conjecture that the appearance of a symbol representing a minority may give rise to negative sentiments is [itself] anti-Semitic, unless it carries the hidden message that it is an act of provocation.*” Földvári

<sup>9</sup> “Megbélyegzett címer ügy” (The Stigmatized Issue of a Crest). In *Vasárnapi újság*, November 12, 2000.

<sup>10</sup> “Menorás címerterv: egyházi tiltakozás” (Drafts for a Crest: Churches Protest). In *Népszabadság*, November 15, 2000.

also mentions that the menorah is mentioned not only in the Old Testament – in the Hebrew sacred writings – but also in the Book of Revelations, that is, it also forms part of the tradition of the New Testament.<sup>11</sup>

The article published by Zoltán Szôcs in *Magyar Fórum* openly and proudly carries an anti-Semitic content and message. (It would be worth evaluating to what extent the article is suited to incite hatred and public provocation.) In a forced though purposeful argument, he constructs in his article a theory of Jewish conspiracy, which he justifies historically by referring to Gyôzô Istôczy. For Szôcs the issue of the 7th District crest is nothing but a sideshow in a coordinated attempt by the “racially alien and genocidal” Jews (and their allies) to acquire hegemony over the Carpathian Basin. His article, which shows the author’s inadequate awareness of historical facts (e.g. Jews did not settle in Erzsébetváros in the past 100 - 120 years but generations earlier, before the district became independent from [neighboring] Terézváros), does not refrain from making threats: “*This was as far as our patience lasted, let’s explain to them where their place is from now on.*” An important element in Szôcs’s publication is that he connects anti-Semitism, the openly declared fight against Jews, with the activities of MIÉP party present in the Hungarian Parliament (“*whoever does not protest against it, is not a true follower of MIÉP*”).

---

<sup>11</sup> Katalin Földvári, “Vita Erzsébetváros címeréről” (A Dispute over the Crest of Erzsébetváros.) In *Hetek*, November 18, 2000.

GYÖRGY TATÁR

## THE PALESTINIAN COSTUME

---

*(abridged)*

The concepts of the political Right and Left as they originated in Europe, if applied to the third world, have one by one come to naught. The Third World is in fact, the third. The Middle East conflict that has steadfastly occupied international media has consequently given birth to a certain political media language in the West, which when spoken brings the traditional Right and Left to a proximity never before experienced. The traditional anti-Semitism of the far Right can recognize a more balanced version of its own viewpoint in the anti-Israel arguments of the liberal Left. In this manner, it can simultaneously refer to it for reinforcement, as well as attack it. That is, turn it against Jews – due to the vested interest of its representatives – for being a propaganda still too lenient. The fascism that has surfaced in response to the “defense of human rights” – against the Jews – only seems like a new phenomenon. Malicious name-calling in the words of despicable liberalism is merely a further distortion of the mode of mentality that spread throughout Europe in the wake of the Enlightenment. This mind-set is often characterized ironically, as either I hate Jews because they let loose the false doctrine of Christianity throughout the world; and/or I hate Jews for rejecting Christianity.

The Jew-hating extreme Right continues this historical practice, this time against the liberalism of the Left. On the one hand, it views it as interest-based Jewish ideology, whose false doctrines dishevel the “self-serving” nation state; and on the other, it brands Israel as a country of international adventurers that completely disregards all liberalism of human rights. From a broad perspective, the new Right is in agreement with the position of the Muslim world on this point. Accordingly, this part of the third world takes a stand on the international stage in defense of a “common” liberalism between Left and Right, at the same time representing Israel and “international Jewry” as a toxic wellspring beneath the common principles of Christianity and Islam.

Media that identifies itself as left wing or liberal attempts to free itself from this compromising alliance. It does so by simply keeping silent before its own audience and itself on those shared “off-shoots” of the European right and Muslim press that resemble too closely the classic western hatred of Jews (blood

libel, international conspiracy, etc.). This stance contributes strongly to the emerging view that the democratic West and the third world – supposedly also galloping toward democracy and western liberalism in the midst of difficult historical struggles – in reality only have one common enemy, a danger to the entire world: Israel.

If we were to observe the Hungarian media alone, which in every respect conforms without effort to the international media's use of a "newspeak" language – with the single exception of the newspaper, *Hetek*<sup>1</sup>, the most significant and dramatic finding, disregarding serious differences in style, is that the Right and Left are speaking the same language.

In the course of the first three and a half months of the "Al Aksa-intifada" that began at the end of September, 2000, readers of the daily press, television viewers and/or radio listeners never realized from the Hungarian right wing press, and hardly ever from the leftist press, that the daily recurrence of clashes – at times several hundred – were all initiated by the Palestinians. The entire spectrum of the press (from the liberal dailies to the extreme right's obscure publications) seemed practically silent about the fact that on the Palestinian Autonomous Territory – under the Oslo agreement – not a single Israeli policeman or soldier is stationed. In order for attacking groups to come into contact with Israelis at all, they must first leave the Autonomous Territory to assault the "occupying" guard stations, the present position of which was stipulated as a certain phase of the Oslo agreement. This pact, signed by both parties, came after painstakingly lengthy negotiations pouring over geographic maps.

The silence was continually sustained in the Hungarian media by its unique "prepositions technique:" news broadcasts of Palestinian skirmishes consistently described the places of battle as for example, "Israeli soldiers shot and killed a Palestinian *in* Ramallah," "*in* Gaza" etc. These prepositions had the arduous task of glorifying the cities so named as the sites of battle against Israeli occupation. It has been nearly seven, but in any case, six years since Israeli occupying forces had been stationed in either city.

At the same time, neither the Hungarian left nor the right wing press allowed even a mark from those Arab protest writers living in the West (for example, Josef Farah living in the US) who accused Arafat of cynical use of the media. They cited cases where the victims were children, calling it conscious "martyr

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hetek* is closely aligned with the religious community, Hit Gyülekezete (Faith Church, Hungary).

production.” This cynicism serves no other function but to cover up internal Palestinian and – for the most part liberal – external international public opinion over the fact that in the summer of 2000 at Camp David, the Palestinians rejected the historically and perhaps the only imaginable territorial division that could have existed between the Jewish and Palestinian states.

This fact was not evident from the Hungarian press because it was only the argument of the Israeli Right, that is, of the “enemies of peace,” which stated that in the years following the Oslo agreement terrorist attacks claimed twice as many Israeli lives as before. In the new international Orwellian language (which the Israeli Left happens to speak as fluently as CNN), they are all “martyrs of peace” and have become the necessary and – unfortunately – unavoidable victims of the “peace process.” It was also impossible to discern from news broadcasts or any assessment of the situation that the violation of agreements and accords by both sides – by the nature of the problem – is asymmetrical. Israel, having already given up a territory, can only react to the PLO’s violations, on every point, without exception, by delaying the execution of the agreed upon steps.

The Israeli Left, in order to follow its politics of peace at any cost, is without doubt, seriously responsible for never having raised before internal or international forums that the Palestinians were continually violating agreements. The Israeli Left thereby intentionally created the impression that the treaty violations were nothing other than attempts by the Israeli Right to put forward obstacles and to seize power. The liberal press in Hungary echoed this Israeli leftist argument completely. Middle East correspondents of the Hungarian press are from among the most acknowledged representatives of this leftist Israeli media circle. (For example, Jehuda Lahav, is a regular correspondent for *Népszabadság*<sup>2</sup>; his reports the extreme right-wing *Magyar Demokrata* in its most rabid writings calls “accurate.”<sup>3</sup>

The Hungarian press accepts without commentary or confutation the fact that – despite every treaty and agreement – the armed conflict continues “for the sake of liberating Palestine,” and there is no attempt even being made to determine the extent of geographic expansion once Palestine is liberated. Namely, that there be a final and unequivocal declaration that the territorial imperative will stop at the borders of Israel. The Hungarian press carries not

---

<sup>2</sup> *Népszabadság* is the biggest circulation daily newspaper in Hungary.

<sup>3</sup> Balázs Molnár, in *Magyar Demokrata*, November 9, 2000.

even a reference when Palestinian political or media statements attest to exactly the opposite. Both the right and left wing press keep uniformly silent on those official and public Palestinian standpoints according to which the “just inheritance” of the Palestinian people extends from the Mediterranean Sea to the River Jordan.

The Hungarian press also adapts the liberal “newspeak” language whenever Israel is a victim of attempted mass murder. Along with the international community, it calls upon the country to “resist the enemies of the peace process, who can be found on both sides” and to continue on the path begun in Oslo. In plain English: do not be led astray by the fact that you are being shot at. This is merely the act of extremists marching in the same direction side by side with the forces for peace. And do not retaliate by any means because then these same forces for peace will open fire, equipped with permission and the support of the world’s international forces for peace. The fact is that Israel does not wish to proliferate another enemy even more hostile than the others in the Arab world, who are already relentlessly implacable toward Israel. It can only take up this position if it is militarily defensible and is supported by the guarantee of a working and enforceable peace treaty. This stance appears in the Hungarian press, true to form, as the thwarting of Palestinian attempts to establish peace.

There is probably news or commentary about the Middle East almost every day. I do not recall a single article that questioned, at least in theory, the peaceful nature, with respect to Israel, of the anticipated Palestinian state or tried to view the issue from the side of Israel. What steps would be taken if this new nation – supported by other Arab countries – were to continue its terrorist attacks against Israeli territories. It’s as if this question did not even exist. If the Palestinian Autonomy did not even hold to its side of written agreements to stop terrorism in the period before becoming a nation, why would it adhere to them as a sovereign country? The liberal press, which it explicitly does not pose, replies by saying that the Palestinian uprising – with all the accoutrements of terrorism – would probably cease immediately if Israel were to give up the settlements. Beyond the fact that for all intents and purposes there is taboo-like silence over the fact that Arab terrorism dates back to Jewish mass settlement that predates the establishment of the country, it also neglects to mention – adhering to Arab propaganda – that for months on in 2000 it reported the cause of uprising to be not the settlements, but Sharon’s visit to the Temple Mount. This tendency is widespread. The liberal press follows the changes in the course of the Palestinian propaganda. Even if it does take notice of the directional

change, it attributes it no significance because it considers every form of criticism levied at Israel equally warranted.

When the Hungarian and international media – emulating the Islamic world – voice their doubts as to the viability of the Israeli peace initiatives, there isn't a single correspondent, not even left wing, who poses the question why is it then that the Israeli Army since 1993 – based on agreement – has been retreating step by step from the territories it occupied in 1967. Does it perhaps wish to gain momentum so that it can invade the areas it had once occupied? Wouldn't it have been much more convenient to have not withdrawn at all? And if its objective had been to delude the world for seven years, with this conjecture have we not reached the reality of the extreme right?

The romantic ideal of the European leftist tradition has always been the revolutionary activist, the rebel, the partisan and the civilian protesting an oppressive and deceitful regime. Oppression in this tradition was always personified by the uniformed “armed to the teeth” soldier. The traditional right-wing ideal was just the opposite, finding joy in crisp uniforms, memorial tributes and in the accessories of the irresistible power of order. The Second World War and the society, i.e. the ideological history that followed it, stacked new layers on these two traditions. Having come under the Communist influence of power, leftist elements began to emerge in the ideal image of the Right: the image of the civilian street revolutionary struggling against the Soviet army. At the same time, the western European Left placed its organized civil disobedience against Soviet military power (as well as Chinese, Vietnamese, etc.), its “partisan army” claiming its heritage with glory.

The third world, and within it the segment for various reasons most closely aligned with the West, namely the Arab and Islamic world, is presented in the guise of a gigantic costume-rental establishment. Earlier, the Left donned the garb one after another of colonized and exploited natives. Later, in order to attribute an everyman significance to its own particular life, it masqueraded in costumes from the shop's deep recesses as American blacks led by Malcolm X, Latin-American guerrillas led by Che Guevara, and Ho Chi Minh's revolutionary fighters.

The archetype of the Right throughout this time was the populace, understood in a naturalistic-ethnic context to be struggling against an all-inclusive foreign oppressor who in this international rental establishment did not find an appropriate costume for some time. This predicament – not without some justification – was based on alienation from the suspicious Soviet and left wing background of the world's “mass uprising of people.” A great turning point came with the

appearance of the Palestinian costume's potential. This garb is the first in which the Right and Left are difficult to distinguish from one another. Clothed in this costume, they can each identify themselves as revolutionaries against the global oppression of the single superpower that rules the world economy: Israel, as the central and mutual enemy, fortuitously embodies the requisite elements for the potential to demonize by the Right and Left.

For anyone examining the liberal Left, Israel is trampling on the Palestinians' right to national self-determination. It is the transgressor on basic human rights on the occupied territories – and in part on its own territory as well; it is an imperialist military oppressor of civilians, a racist regime similar to South Africa. Criticism against Israel always aligns with universal human rights values. Arguments in defense of Israel on the other hand – stemming exclusively from the special position of the country and its people – are always particular; that is, they appear as apologies distinct from the universal. Anyone, therefore, who dons the Palestinian costume for his/her political or ideological role represents – according to Western anti-Israeli traditions – a higher and more universal echelon than one who talks about self-defense. From the perspective of the above mentioned leftist vision of the ideal image – the civilian partisan – the image in the media of crowds of “protesting” Palestinians is immeasurable: women and children – civilian, of course – hurling rocks; youth – civilian, of course – shooting with slingshots and throwing Molotov cocktails; and – for the most part also – civilian armed personnel mingling with them defending the masses. Starting from the tradition that the oppressed have a right to wage war, murder of the oppressor, therefore, is an inalienable human right. The oppressor merely acts but cannot rely on rights of any kind, not even self-defense. On the liberal side, in the main, the situation has evolved wherein every aggressive Palestinian protest or terrorist attack is in some way part of the “peace process,” while Israel's every step in self defense or retaliation is an obstruction to peace.

For the Right, the arrival of the Palestinian costume came as a virtual redeemer: the fact that it can rely on the Left's and liberalism's entire anti-Israeli arsenal without limit in its propaganda appears to free it from its inherited accusation of anti-Semitism. In Hungary, from a radio broadcast called, *Vasárnapi újság*, through the aforementioned *Magyar Demokrata*, to the article in the *Magyar Fórum*, every Jew-hating outburst begins with a dissertation based on references to articles and reports in the western liberal press. Additional citations include UN resolutions, declarations by legitimate international organizations, news broadcasts by the international liberal media, statements by Amnesty

International, and/or interviews of prominent – non-Hungarian speaking – members of the Israeli Left (cf. an interview of Shulamit Aloni on the front page of the *Magyar Fórum*, or the already mentioned report in the *Magyar Demokrata* of a San Francisco rabbi's anti-Israeli denouncement.)<sup>4</sup>

The only discernible difference in inflection between liberal and right wing Israeli criticism – though difficult to distinguish – is that while the liberals don the Palestinian costume more in keeping with human rights activists rising up against oppression, the right does so in the guise of one of the peoples the Jews persecute everywhere throughout the world. In Csurka's writing in the *Magyar Fórum*,<sup>5</sup> he embellishes the article repeatedly with renewed puns so that the name of Camp David itself, which served as the location for the peace negotiations, does not lack for Jewish associations. Csurka associates the "global monetary system" directly with the American aid given to Israel. From this perspective, the conclusion can be immediately drawn that Israel does not want peace at all since taking this step would halt the flow of this capital. A paragraph later Csurka proclaims that, of course, America and Israel wish to "force" the Arab world to peace – and of course, a liberal democracy – since this is a precondition for "global" exploitation. Before our very eyes, Camp David becomes the center for world capitalism's global exploitation for the sake of Israel. From this vantage point it is merely a step – and the article takes this step – to where Israelis wishing to purchase residential real-estate in the Hungarian capital are following the same Zionist tactics with which they first acquired property in Palestine. Later, when they were not permitted further purchases, they took the territory through military occupation. Csurka's train of thought is based on the premise that the Arab-Israeli conflict is the "key element of world politics and global enterprise." This premise is followed by a loose reference – without date and time – to a supposed secret American weapons experiment in which only Israel was permitted to participate and from which even NATO allies were excluded. Israel and the United States in this light represent joint dominance over the globe. However, as we can learn, the Arab world is not in a "completely vanquished position" after all "because now there are guilty Jews who have also committed murders." In plain language: since no one is sinless, it is totally immaterial as to what our claims are, whom we accuse of what offense, and/or associate with what.

---

<sup>4</sup> Balázs Molnár, in *Magyar Demokrata* November 9, 2000.

<sup>5</sup> István Csurka, "Magyar szemmel" (Through Hungarian Eyes). In *Magyar Fórum*, July 20, 2000.

Most of the writings of the extreme Right, and so Csurka's as well, represent moral outrage in tone – but only in that. In terms of content, however, morality stands exclusively to be used as quite an effective tool for besmirching the enemy. Since the “enemy” is morally “sullied” itself and according to European intellectual tradition “truth” has always been in relation to morality, as far as the press is concerned in this regard, the concept of truth itself has lost meaning. The writers of these articles probably barely sense the extent of fabrication and distortion present in their work; whereas, all the adjectives they use in the context of morality are denunciatory, the condemnation of which is neutralized for their part by the other half's “sinful” past. If everyone were equally culpable morally, it would be impossible to find one's bearings in the world on the basis of moral concepts; divergence would exist solely between effective and less effective lies.

According to Csurka, the Hungarian (liberal) press uses the tensions in the Middle East in order to distract focus from the burning issues of Hungarians by “*instigating against the extreme right.*” The burning issue is, of course, “*the foreigner, fulfilling the financial considerations of Camp David,*” as well as a US-Russian “globalist” agreement on the settlement of Russian Jewish refugees into Hungary. It is probably no accident that Csurka accuses those three Israeli politicians (Ben Gurion, Shamir and Begin) of the occupation of Palestinian territories who happened not to have taken one square centimeter of the occupied areas. This hidden innuendo – unless it stems from an incredible ignorance on the subject matter – refers to the territory of the state of Israel itself. The sentence is positioned within the issues raised in context of the real-estate purchases in Budapest by Israelis. In this respect, it is not merely individuals whose human rights have been violated who masquerade in the Palestinian costume, but the entire Hungarian people.

The anti-Semitism concentrated on Israel takes a separate path in the newly termed “traditionalism” of the far right gnosis.<sup>6</sup> The eminent representative for this racist science-fiction orientation to the Sumerian-Magyar relationship is András Bencsik,<sup>7</sup> who wrote an article from the Middle East under the title, “Mary's Protection.” The beginning of the text pays tribute to John Paul II on

---

<sup>6</sup> I refer here to those Hungarian branches of intellectual movements that constitute chauvinistic versions of what is referred to in the West as New Age.

<sup>7</sup> András Bencsik, “Mária oltalma” (Mary's Protection). In *Magyar Demokrata*, October 12, 2000.

the Pope's offering of the world and the new millennium to the guardianship of the Virgin Mary. The author reverts back to Hungary through a similar gesture King Stephen<sup>8</sup> made and, without any of the Hungarian Christian denominations raising a voice in protest, mentions as fact that in Mary's "figure", a specter of an ancient goddess who could not be forgotten glimmers through." This acknowledgement, therefore, addresses the Pope's having taken "another step on the path that leads to forgotten roots." The closing remarks in the text address the Hungarian public: that they should prevent the influx of Israeli capital into the country and let a referendum decide whether Israelis may purchase domestic real estate. The final sentence calls upon everyone who in any way respects "God's mercy" (namely, the faithful of all the religions of the world) and those who "follow truth on other paths." He includes those "who cannot believe" but are honorable people (hence, atheists who do not belong to any of the world's religions) "to defend against those who trample on these holy principles." The division of humanity is obvious: on the one side are the Jews, morally depraved, on the other, the entire population of the world.

At the beginning of the Mid-East conflict, the entire world press carried a photograph of a mortally wounded little Arab boy in the arms of his father. Setting aside that whoever gets stuck in the middle of an open fire confrontation between two warring sides can be shot at any age, it was the liberal spectrum of the international press in this case who carried out what in Hungary is referred to as "coded" Jewish defamation.<sup>9</sup> It was never mentioned outright, but the continual repetition of a series of photographs intimated that the inhumanity of the Israeli military is specifically responsible for the possibility that child murder could take place at all.

Everyone is aware, at least in our culture, the kind of associations that come into play when a small child dies at the hands of a Jew. From among the world's many deaths of children, this single example owes its "sensationalist" inference due to the fact that the Hungarian extreme right press (primarily István Lovas) castigated the liberal press for its not taking up the matter sufficiently, while

---

<sup>8</sup> First King of Hungary who Christianized the pagan Magyars in 1001 AD and was subsequently canonized by the Catholic Church.

<sup>9</sup> "Coded" Jewish defamation in the Hungarian press are those anti-Semitic innuendoes in which the word "Jewish" is not even mentioned. Characteristically, expressions such as "foreign heart," "divergence from the spirit of the Hungarian nation," "genetically Communist," etc.

András Bencsik, in the article mentioned above,<sup>10</sup> clearly articulates what the liberal press “left out”: the only crime of the Palestinian child was that he was not born a Jew. Here, it is obvious that the reference is that of a racist execution where mass genocide against the Palestinians is brought into context in the second half of the article with the influx of Israeli capital into Hungary. The Hungarian people also dress themselves into the costume of the murdered Palestinian child. It was in this vein that István Lovas discussed the subject on the radio broadcast of *Vasárnapi újság*.<sup>11</sup> Referring to a report by the “Fact-finding Committee on the 1956 Deportations,” he protested that the Hungarian Romas from Zámoly who sought asylum in Strasbourg were financed by a private Israeli individual.<sup>12</sup> He objected on the basis that this issue “at the present does not have the requisite moral preconditions,” since “in the Jewish State the most serious racist-inspired atrocities are suffered by the Palestinian minority.”

The image of minority persecution is sustained by the right wing press in all its narrative not as a last recourse by blending the difference between the Arab minority within Israel and the armed Palestinian attacks from outside it. It is because of this conscious diffusion, for example, that the already mentioned András Bencsik<sup>13</sup> could write that “*the Jews [sic!] have been heedlessly humiliating and placing Palestinians in concentration camps.*” This is probably a reference to refugee camps, which understandably cannot be on Israeli territory since the refugees fled from there to escape beyond the borders of the country where the camps happen to have been established by their Arab brethren. For the most part, the right wing press is in agreement with the liberal in this morally motivated deliberate ignorance. Israel’s verbal persecution in both the right and left wing media stems from the same vine: in the universal history of the West, the mini-state committed to survival provides a first hand opportunity for Jew-hating to be not directed against a minority – at least in terms of appearances. With the exception of truth, every prerequisite for a clear conscience is given.

<sup>10</sup> András Bencsik, “Mária oltalma” (Mary’s Protection). In *Magyar Demokrata*, October 12, 2000.

<sup>11</sup> István Lovas’ notebook. In *Vasárnapi újság*, October 15, 2000. (*Vasárnapi újság* is the most extreme anti-Semitic program of the Hungarian Public Radio, aired every Sunday morning. According to his own admission, it is Prime Minister Viktor Orbán’s favorite program.)

<sup>12</sup> The Hungarian press carried news that the Roma families from Zámoly who sought political asylum in Paris were financed from the personal assets of an Israeli professor named Katalin Katz. The Israeli professor is a specialist on the Roma holocaust, and came into contact with the Romas in Zámoly as a result of her work.

<sup>13</sup> András Bencsik, “Háborús bűn” (War Crime). In *Magyar Fórum*, October 26, 2000.

The direct identification of Israel, Jews and “globalism,” which is to be circumvented, creates a difficult predicament at times: the anti-Semitism of the far right is occasionally indignantly forced to defend the “globalist” media centers (CNN, BBC etc.) against Jewish institutions accusing them of partisanship. This dilemma gives birth to a unique solution: in Lovas’ article, “*Enough!*”<sup>14</sup> referring to “global taxes” and the entire relevant international press, he condemns the liberal Hungarian media for belittling Jewish atrocities. The article ends with an association between the murder of children and Israelis acquiring real estate in Hungary.

The question that must be addressed fundamentally and answered is how this Orwellian “newspeak” media language, as I have phrased it, came to evolve, this language spoken – at least in the West’s presence – equally by the Arab world and the Western public, including the Hungarian. Furthermore, what could be the function of this language? This language on the part of the media is one that deconstructs the legitimacy of the Jewish State and came about through a not overly complicated division of labor. The far Right, ensconced in the cultural circles of the West – embraced by the entire Arab world – in practice never criticizes what Israel does or fails to do. We are not facing a criticism of action, but that of being. A characteristic example of how this criticism of being manifests itself is that a criticism of “action” is drawn entirely from thin air. News, for example, that Israel is infecting Arab children with the HIV virus spread throughout the Egyptian and entire Arab press, or that it is jettisoning poisoned candy from aircraft onto Palestinian playgrounds. The Hungarian equivalent of this action is the charge of ritual murder at Tiszaeszlár, to which Csurka repeatedly refers<sup>15</sup>. From among this selection the liberal media usually “only” uses the image of Israel raising its hand against Islamic shrines, for which, by the way, there has never been an example. When the Jewish shrine called Joseph’s Grave was completely razed, the Hungarian far right press referred to the European Enlightenment and Islam’s assessment simultaneously. The Jews mistakenly attributed the grave to Joseph’s burial site; at the same time, the same

---

<sup>14</sup> István Lovas, “Elég volt!” (Enough!). In *Magyar Demokrata*, October 19, 2000.

<sup>15</sup> Cf.: György Tatár, “Arik, Izrael királya” (Arik, King of Israel). In *Élet és Irodalom*, February 16, 2001. In 1882 at Tiszaeszlár, Hungary, a young Catholic girl was found missing in the course of which village Jews were charged with her ritual murder. In the lawsuit that lasted several years, the charges were finally dismissed, but the charge remained as a national treasure in Hungarian anti-Semitic culture.

news broadcasts failed to raise the question whether the location of Mohammed's ascension into heaven identified as Jerusalem by Islam was authentic.

The right wing press for "Christian tactical" reasons, and the liberal because of enlightened "scientific tactical" reasons, seemingly never touch upon or report on the Arab war propaganda's deepest root. This bedrock is the avowed conviction, both political and religious, passionately held and dominant from the school to every form of electronic media expression before the Arab public, that the Jews never had any connection to Palestine or Jerusalem, historically, culturally or religiously, where in addition, no shrine ever stood. The Dacian-Romanian continuity,<sup>16</sup> well known in Hungary, is represented here by the Philistine-Canaanite-Palestinian continuum. This position, which here in Hungary is complemented by the newly enlivened publication of a book on Jesus being Scythian, "Jesus, the Prince of Partus" allows absolutely no legitimacy to the mere existence of Israel.

This criticism of being on the part of the Arabs and the European Right regarding Israel is complemented by the European liberal Left's expressed criticism of action with respect to the Jewish State. This uninterrupted criticism in the local and international media, as well as in countless UN resolutions of condemnation, while never formally calling to question the legal justification for a Jewish state, it nevertheless fails to skip any opportunity to voice its displeasure when and about an issue when the Arab side – and the extreme right – questions this very legitimacy. Although the liberal media does not accept this de-legitimizing criticism of existence shared by the Arabs and the far right, it however thoroughly without any qualms accepts all the consequences that derive from this criticism of being. The West does not identify with the Arab belief that no Jewish presence can be found archeologically in Jerusalem that pre-dates Islam. However, in one part it remains silent on the presence of this belief, and on the other concurs with the political consequences stemming from it, calling upon Israel to account for it in terms of an action program.

---

<sup>16</sup> The theory of Dacian-Romanian continuity plays a part in the debate between Hungary and Romania as it pertains to the historical accession of Transylvania. A pseudo-scientific Romanian theory purported to prove that the Dacian tribes romanized through Emperor Traianus are the ancestors to the subsequent Romanians, and so the Romanians have been living in Transylvania since ancient times.

To summarize: there is complete unanimity between the Hungarian liberal press (and of course, not only) and the far Right anti-Semitic press in that the exclusive provocateur and sustainer of the bloody conflict in the Middle East is Israel. According to the liberals, Israel arrives at this position not by the fact of its existence but through its incomprehensibly intransigent and inflexible politics. The far Right's position is the same; however, it sees these policies inseparable from Israel's existence. It is difficult to resist the impression that the liberal side is being restrained from drawing conclusions to this line of thought merely by some timidity held over from the holocaust.

In the *Magyar Demokrata*, Balázs Molnár comments<sup>17</sup> for example on the well-known fact that there are Israeli politicians from the ranks of former Israeli terrorist. This subject recurs frequently as an argument in the liberal press as well, diminishing the weight of Arab terrorism. The two types of media share in the treasure of the depth of silence, however, about the fact that the terrorism by extreme Zionist organizations – primarily against the British – was halted by Ben Gurion when he placed them outside the law and destroyed them militarily.

István Lovas attests further to the conscious garbing of the Palestine costume. During a broadcast of *Vasárnapi újság*, he accused Jewish organizations who protested against the program saying it was an attempt to “intimidate.” He went on to say, “a command to halt must be given to those in Hungary...who wish to provoke an intellectual intifada.” A fight for freedom by the extreme right against “occupying” Jewish organizations becomes equated with the Palestinian uprising in this light. The position of Israel in the media and at times of writers who take a pro-Israel stand, is confusing. The cause is not in the least because if they were to take on the right wing's (and Islam's) criticism for existing with appropriate rebuttal, the liberal criticism of action itself would appear attacked as well – due to the similarity of criticisms. It would be this liberal criticism of action that would reject any accusation of anti-Semitism, followed in its wake by similar neo-Nazi outrage, pretending as though they were only criticizing actions. Fascism manages to benefit even from liberal indignation. It disguises its criticism of Israel's existence – in contrast to the accusation of anti-Semitism – as a criticism of action. It mimics the liberal's outrage and since the liberal press makes no attempt to ponder the situation and its distorted outrage at the hands of the Right, it allows the right wing media, without qualm, to take a fur-

---

<sup>17</sup> Balázs Molnár, “Keleten a helyzet változik” (The Situation is Changing in the East). In *Magyar Demokrata*, October 26, 2000.

ther step beyond their “shared” indignation on “both” behalfs. Behold, the Jews respond to the constant criticism with repeated statements about anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism, therefore, is slander. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

This unusual cooperation between the Right and Left results in the media position for example, that when Israeli political action does not conform to the right wing and Arab shared criticism of existence, the liberal criticism of action immediately takes over. This criticism can only appear unbiased because due to the division of labor it can always view itself as being merely critical of action, the criticism of existence having already been accomplished. Joined in an unspoken alliance of liberal criticism of action and anti-Semitic criticism of existence – at least in terms of Israel – they divert any accusation of hating Jews together.

Similarly, maintaining the myth jointly about Sharon’s “Arab gorging” and “mass genocide” serves the purpose, above all, of beclouding the fact before the Arabs that the atrocities committed in the camps (Sabra and Shatila) were perpetrated by Arabs. For the West (both liberal and right wing) it does the same in that Christians did them. By the same token, one can call Churchill German gorging, and Roosevelt Japanese gorging. It is here that we arrive at one of the possible historical functions for this curious manifestation, that the Right and Left both speak the “newspeak” as applied to the Middle East. The most serious culpability of the media – including the leftist and the liberal media – is that it elicits a destructive reaction through explicit and un verbalized historical analogies in the European public spirit on a number of fundamental points of consensus. These areas of accord – especially after World War II – have formed the basis of western moral and political identity.

The use of such reprehensible language, which the European consensus otherwise applies only to Nazi and other mass-murderous regimes, as addressed to Israel, who can only survive in the Arab Middle East as a result of its military strength, not only inflates this rhetoric but has a retroactive effect. It helps to destroy and reconstruct common convictions about Nazism and to corrode those principles that make Europe’s existence worth having. To call Israel exclusively to account for the misery of more than half a century of Palestinian refugee camps, which is the persistent subject shared by both the right and liberal Hungarian press, smuggles the forced return of refugee or exiled Germans to “the common German soil” into the unfulfilled but morally entitled realm of possibility.

The memory of the Second World War – with particular attention to the holocaust – has taken root in moral recollection as the battle between Good and Evil. The Right has always had an interest in the deconstruction and re-editing of this moral and

political structure. However, during the Soviet regime, it had slim opportunity for doing so. The existence of the Soviet Union poisoned the aforementioned moral consensus in a unique manner. On the one hand, it created a myth of itself as the absolute Evil's primary victor, and on the other, it constituted for the Right precisely the most vulnerable point in the alliance of the Good – justifiably. In addition, it was Soviet propaganda in part that initiated an attempt to dislodge the Jews afflicted by the holocaust from the circle that opposed Evil. In the wake of the dissolution of the Soviet Union and as consequence that the Soviet Union itself had degenerated into the midst of the Evil ones – in part justifiably, the impression grew that the world war period can be regarded as the battle between Good and Evil from the perspective of “Jews” alone. In other words, anyone who does not consider World War II simply as one of the wars and the holocaust as one of innumerable genocides, can only be a Jew serving his or her particular self interest, which he or she wishes to force on others.

In global terms, the European Right, dressed in the Palestinian costume as an ally of the Islamic world, is hard at work on this “Jewish” perspective, overcoming this last obstacle. It finds an – unconscious – ally in this struggle, in dogmatic liberalism, also dressed in the Palestinian costume. The fact is that left wing liberalism in its own fashion affirms the shared siege of arguments, irrational, unenlightened, not civil, and not democratic, professed and heralded by both the Arab world and the European far right. For example, the fact that it regards the Arab insistence on the Temple Mount a just religious and political claim, while that of the Jews as part superstition and part colonial imperialism, is as much a part of Europe's moral and intellectual self-depreciation as the branding of murderous forces as mere “extremists.” In the manner that bank robbery is not extremist theft, bombing crowded cafés or buses is not extremist politicizing. This type of media language in subsequent retroaction is capable of viewing the holocaust as mere political radicalism combined with mistakes in the history of science (i.e. racist theory). On this path, apocalypse becomes a natural disaster.

Lacking the necessary awareness in connection with Israel and the Middle East, the liberal media – including the Hungarian – contributes to an interpretation of certain elements in the moral and political consensus that developed after World War II which are contrary to its own. This European understanding concerning the holocaust is eroded as a result of the Left and Rights' fighting full blast against a “double standard,” while using a double standard. The greatest problem is not in the immorality – and in part stupidity – of the double standard, but in the fact that it may some day become the exclusive measure.

GÁBOR MURÁNYI  
“THEM” AND “US”

---

(abridged)

It would be an exaggeration to claim that by the year 2000 the distinction between “them” (that is, an indefinite group comprising: Jews, people who consider themselves Jewish on religious or secular basis, assimilated people of Jewish descent, and others) and “us” (that is, “non-Jews,” an indefinite group comprising: “Hungarians”) had been fully accepted in public discourse. It is a fact, however, that it no longer causes any major shock. From this point of view, the last year of the millennium began not on January 1, 2000 but in August 1999. At this time, the monthly edition of the weekly, *Magyar Fórum*,<sup>1</sup> carried an article by István Csurka formulating more clearly than ever before his anti-Semitism – a fact he had not concealed very much before. Although in his article, *A frankfurti zsarnokság (The Tyranny of Frankfurt)*, he referred to the writers representing Hungary at the Frankfurt Book Fair as the “*people chosen by the current Hungarian cultural policy-makers,*” he also declared that from their works the world would discover that the year’s Guest of Honor (Hungary) at the Fair is a “*Communist, Jewish-dominated, and at the same time anti-Semitic country, which once had some kind of culture and literature but...[that] what happened in Frankfurt was the Holocaust of Hungarian literature...*” By making such a claim, Csurka followed the footsteps of Mihály Kolosváry-Borcsa<sup>2</sup> president of the Hungarian National Chamber of the Press during the 1940s and a government commissioner under Szálasi’s Fascist regime. In order to make it easier for his readers to orient themselves, Csurka, [like his predecessor], italicized *certain* names on the list of writers representing Hungary at the book fair.

The article was published in August but reached full impact late September-early October. A string of writers expressed their shock and rejection. “*As far as I am concerned, I am not a very aggressive person but a calm Hungarian gentleman, in quotation marks, and I look upon human baseness with interest*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Havi Magyar Fórum* (Monthly Hungarian Forum).

<sup>2</sup> In “A zsidókérdés magyarországi irodalma” (*The literature of the Jewish issue in Hungary*), Stúdium 1943, Mihály Kolosváry-Borcsa writes the following: “*Attention!... The orientation of the works of writers whose titles or names appear in italics is Jewish or pro-Jewish.* (p. 80.)

*rather than contempt. In the new ten years, we have seen numerous examples of such behavior but this is the way of the world. However, this list of italicized names goes beyond the limit.... Every end has a beginning,*" commented Péter Esterházy, internationally acclaimed Hungarian writer, on the new-old "invention."<sup>3</sup>

By then Hungarian society had been over the "Jewish issue debate" set forth by László Kövér, president of the governing Fidesz Party. At a theatrical forum in June 1999, Kövér declared, or as the Prime Minister's chief advisor István Elek put it, made a "passing remark" that *"the civic government should not allow the Jewish issue to be addressed [merely] by the intellectual and political extreme..."*<sup>4</sup> In an open letter, Elek emphasized the acceptability of the idea of "them and us," pointing out that *"indisputably, the Jewish issue has been an important topic in Hungary's public life during this decade of the change in regimes. What is more, judging from the opinion-forming, ongoing debate by the intelligentsia, it is one of the most important issues. Yes, I repeat very firmly: the Jewish issue. Because it has always been an issue in Hungary, it is, and will remain so in the foreseeable future."*<sup>5</sup> Other advisors to the Prime Minister, as well as state commissioners, also began to deal with the subject.<sup>6</sup>

The example set by Csurka seemed worth following and found its way from the print media to the public morning broadcast of Kossuth Rádió. In the middle of May, István Lovas, regular contributor to the program *Vasárnapi újság* presented a collection of cases, articles, interviews and opinions which he considered ...

<sup>3</sup> "Patriótagyakorlatok. Ungárise közbevetés" (Exercises in Patriotism. A 'Hungarian' remark), In *Élet és Irodalom*, October 8, 1999, p. 3.

<sup>4</sup> István Elek, "Nyílt levél a Magyar Hírlap főszerkesztőjének. Kövér László miniszter és a zsidókérdés" (Open Letter to the Editor-in-Chief of *Magyar Hírlap*. Minister László Kövér and the Jewish Issue.) In *Magyar Hírlap*, August 16, 1999, p. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> See for example, opinions and writings by Mária Schmidt. "I usually discuss other issues with the Prime Minister," *MaNcs*, November 4, 1999, pp. 6-7. "Holocaustok" a XX. században. ("Holocausts in the 20th Century"), *Napi Magyarország*, November 13, 1999, p. 5., and p. 7 of *Magyar Hírlap* on the same day. Also: Ágnes Hankiss: Kis magyar zsidókérdés ("Brief Hungarian Jewish Issue"), In *Magyar Nemzet*, November 17, 1999 p. 8. It may as well be considered a kind of change of direction in the policy of the governing Fidesz-MPP Party that in mid-January, 2000, Minister of Education Zoltán Pokorni, who was somewhat later named candidate for the presidency of this party, informed the public of his idea that in the future, high-schools throughout Hungary should hold a Holocaust memorial day every year.

And I have to stop here, as his remarks contained no opinion or statement that could be summed up or formulated clearly. He enumerated cases already known to the public, in which people appearing on his list harmed Hungary’s reputation abroad primarily by creating the impression that Hungary is an anti-Semitic country. At the end of several minutes of long remarks, he summarized as follows: *“And now let us enumerate the names again: Miklós Vámos, Miklós Gáspár Tamás, Miklós Haraszti, Edit Herczog, Iván Fischer, István Eörsi, Klára Fehér, Mária Vásárhelyi, Tom Lantos, Imre Kertész and János Bródy. Those citizens [of Hungary] who have finally been fed up with all this are beginning to ask a curious [sic!] question increasingly more loudly and ponder what the possible answer may be. And this question is: what do all these people have in common? The Vasárnapi Ujság is searching for the answer. Of course, maybe the people listening to us know what it is. Perhaps it is already whispering in the wind.”*<sup>7</sup>

In next day’s issue of *Népszabadság* daily, Endre Aczél made the following remark: *“We are not children, are we? When we read a list of names we know immediately what the person who compiled the list supposes, or believes to know about the origin of the people he enumerates.”* He called this *“open Jew-bashing”* a case of *“italicizing aloud.”*<sup>8</sup>

Five days later, István Elek commented on the controversial event in the daily *Magyar Nemzet*, in his capacity as a private individual, without reference to his official function. He declared that *“unfortunately, this time I have to say that Aczél is right. If the term Jew-bashing makes any sense, then this is clearly a case of it. Not an open example, as Aczél termed it, but concealed, suggested, attributed through innuendo. If István Lovas were asked whether he truly believed that any justifiably objectionable behavior by the ladies and gentlemen he enumerated could be explained by their origin, I am convinced he would reject the idea.”*<sup>9</sup>

A week after the radio program Lovas responded to the charges in *Magyar Nemzet*. More precisely, he responded only to Aczél, as he did not deem the

<sup>7</sup> István Lovas. In *Vasárnapi újság*, May 14, 2000.

<sup>8</sup> Endre Aczél, “Közszolgálati zsidózás” (Anti-Semitic remarks/Jew Bashing in the Public Service Media), In *Népszabadság*, May 15, 2000. p. 5.

<sup>9</sup> István Elek, “Jelentéstani töredékek. A teljes magyarság kulturális integrációja” (Fragments in Semantics. The Cultural Integration of the Entire Hungarian Nation), In *Magyar Nemzet*, May 20, 2000, p. 6.

comments by Elek worthy of response. In his full-page article he asked the following: “*Could anyone possibly imagine that I was thinking of ‘Jews’ when I compiled the names on the list? ...When I considered that they had something in common I instinctively thought of an adjective I wanted to avoid for the simple reason that László Csúcs had already lost a lawsuit for applying the term to employees of the Hungarian Public Radio. (For the purpose of clarification in this article: the compound word [I thought of] has one element, which is about “treason.”)*”<sup>10</sup>

Elek, whose article was left unanswered, submitted a second article dealing with semantics. However, *Magyar Nemzet* refused to publish the article by Elek who until then had been a regular contributor to the paper. This action led the Prime Minister’s chief advisor to publish his article in *Magyar Hírlap* for a single instance only – due to heavy protest by readers – and explained: “*...what I am talking about is that if Lovas’ words are not motivated by anti-Semitic prejudice, which I have serious ground to suppose, what is the point of activating the minefields of political language, and calling forth well-known reflexes?*”<sup>11</sup>

Judging by his article, Elek expressed this realization, which many considered to have been his “weapon-wielding,” not with an intent to practice self-criticism, since discussion of the “Jewish issue” was well within the political language’s force field among the power elite. Echoing the decision by the Budapest Chief Attorney’s Office in June, he was of the opinion that this also violated no law. (Contrary to the legal interpretation of charges brought by leaders of MAZSI-HISZ [Magyarországi Zsidó Hitközségek Szövetsége - Alliance of Jewish Communities in Hungary] against reprinting, half a century after its first publication, the aforementioned book by Mihály Kolosváry-Borcsa, *The Literature of the Jewish Question in Hungary*.)<sup>12</sup> “*Attorney Gyula Nyilas, head of the department at the Budapest Chief Attorney’s Office... rejected the claim to investigate the issue.... He justified the decision by asserting that the law does not intend to punish simply the act of causing hatred, awakening hatred, but only the incite-*

<sup>10</sup> István Lovas: Válasz Aczél/Acsády Endrének és Elek Istvánnak egy jegyzet ügyében (“In response to Endre Aczél/Acsády and István Elek on the Matter of Some Remarks). In *Magyar Nemzet*, May 22, 2000, p. 9.

<sup>11</sup> István Elek, “Jelentéstanai töredékek. Lovas Istvánnak és R. Székely Júliannának” (Fragments in Semantics. To István Lovas and Júlianna Székely), In *Magyar Hírlap*, July 3, 2000, p. 7.

<sup>12</sup> See our writing on this issue titled “MAZSIHISZTÉRIA”.

ment to hatred, which in addition to being a direct abuse of the freedom of speech, is the emotional preparation for violence. Incitement... is an expression or a series of expressions ‘aimed at provoking hostile and harmful acts, motivated by strong emotions or basic instincts’ rather than careful consideration, reason and understanding. The resolution does not dispute that the book in question is anti-Semitic and crudely racist. The Chief Attorney acknowledges that its publication may be objectionable to many people. However, its content does not contain the aforementioned elements of incitement. Consequently, no investigation is to be conducted for want of a punishable offense.”<sup>13</sup>

Another change the millennium year brought was that the second or third instance of the revival of the old-new practice of listing caused no uproar anymore. In the fall, the *Magyar Demokrata* published a two-part “investigative article” disclosing that “Hungary had numerous economic ties with Israel in many fields. Such friendly ties with Israel may become a source of danger within ten years, as it may cause conflicts with the Arab world, which makes up one-third of the world.”<sup>14</sup> After describing the danger the article discussed various cases of economic intrusion by Jews and at the end of the first part, the author criticized the Hungarian public administration, which was “paralyzed” by and defenseless against Israeli capital, a major source of which was the “Ofer Brothers group of hotel industry investors, present in Hungary since the mid-1990s.” The argument concluded with a brief statement and that list, from which conclusions may be drawn: “...HVG<sup>15</sup> carries reports on the Ofer Brothers because its editors, and feature writers, people such as György Schreiber, Béla Weyer, Judit Artz, György Heimer, András Pető, Júlia Vásárhelyi, András Lindner, Tibor Muck and András Bánkuti most probably consider the expansion of Israeli capital desirable, or at least are neutral on the subject.”

The second part of the article continued on with the enumeration as follows: “Zoltán Szabó the Mayor of Budapest’s 7th District, who once was appointed

<sup>13</sup> Cz. G.: “Antiszemita, de nem uszító”. Ismét kiadták Kolosváry-Borcsa Mihály könyvét. (Anti-Semitic but Does Not Provoke Incitement. Mihály Kolosváry-Borcsa’s Book is Re-published), In *Népszabadság*, July 5, 2000, p. 5.

<sup>14</sup> Miklós Kelemen, “Betelepülők 1. Az izraeliek térnyerése Budapesten és Magyarországon” (Settlers 1. The Acquisition of Property by Israelis in Budapest and in Hungary), In *Magyar Demokrata*, 2000/41. (October 12) pp. 24-25.

<sup>15</sup> *HVG/Heti Világgazdaság* (Weekly World Economy) is Hungary’s leading economic and political weekly.

*state secretary at the Ministry of Culture by the Horn government similarly played the Gozsdu udvar<sup>16</sup> into Israeli hands for Ft 800 million. The winner of the tender, Arje Jom-Tov, became the owner of the Magyar (!) Ingatlan (Hungarian Real Estate) Kft. This is another example of expanding connections on the basis of ethnic origin and of selling out the country.”<sup>17</sup>*

The Mayor of Erzsébetváros, Budapest’s 7th District, who at the end of last year proposed that the crest of the district, home to the largest synagogue in Europe should contain a menorah, became a target of attacks by the far right.<sup>18</sup> His idea was far from being supported unequivocally and he ended up by being called a traitor. In an article by Zoltán Szöcs published in the weekly *Magyar Fórum* the author’s conclusion includes a threat: *“I do not know how many of us will protest in every possible way against this anti-Hungarian plan, but I will definitely do so. I consider this cynical attempt a test: those who do not protest are not true members of MIÉP! What else must they commit against us before we come to our senses in mass numbers and nicely and quietly tell them that this was as far as our patience lasted, and to explain to them where they belong from now on. After all, we are the ones at home here and we are in the majority. We are the nation. We still are. And, grotesquely, they know and feel it much better than we. And I say, they are afraid of it.”<sup>19</sup>*

---

<sup>16</sup> Gozsdu udvar is a historic group of buildings in Budapest.

<sup>17</sup> Miklós Kelemen, “Betelepülők 1. Az izraeliek tényerése Budapesten és Magyarországon” (Settlers 1. The Acquisition of Property by Israelis in Budapest and in Hungary), In *Magyar Demokrata*, 2000/42. (October 19) pp. 21-23.

<sup>18</sup> See our writing on this topic titled “A Dispute over the Crest for Erzsébetváros”.

<sup>19</sup> Zoltán Szöcs, “Szégyen és gyalázat” (Shame and Disgrace), In *Magyar Fórum*, November 9, 2000, p. 13

GÁBOR SCHWEITZER  
“MAZSIHISZTÉRIA”<sup>1</sup>

---

(abridged)

The past few years saw the appearance, in reprints, of a large number of widely known anti-Semitic publications on the Hungarian book market.<sup>2</sup> To mention just a few examples: *The International Jew* by American car industrialist Henry Ford, who later withdrew his work [from circulation] and a new edition of one of the most infamous anti-Semitic junk publications, a re-issue of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.<sup>3</sup> The publication of these works raised, among others, legal issues falling primarily within the scope of constitutional and criminal law. How can these publications be reconciled with basic Constitutional rights? How far does the freedom of opinion extend and where does incitement against the public or a community begin? Attempts have been made to answer these questions by the Constitutional Court, as well as in everyday legal practice.<sup>4</sup>

In the course of 1999, the Gede Testvérek Bt. (Gede Brothers Bt.) published a reprint of Mihály Kolosváry-Borcsa's work, first published in 1943, *A zsidókérdés magyarországi irodalma. A zsidóság szerepe a magyar szellemi életben. A zsidó származású írók névsorával.* (*Literature on the Issue of Jews in Hungary; The Role of Jews in Hungarian Intellectual Life; A List of Writers of Jewish Origin*). In the first third of this volume of over 300 pages the author discusses the past and present of Jews and anti-Semitism in Hungary, while the rest – the larger section – of the book presents a bibliography of the Jewish issue, divided into thematic chapters.

Kolosváry-Borcsa relegated the material into three categories: he used bold characters for works of “*Hungarian and anti-Semitic*” orientation and italicized

---

<sup>1</sup> MAZSIHISZ is the acronym for the Magyarországi Zsidó Hitközségek Szövetsége (Alliance of Jewish Communities of Hungary), HISZTÉRIA in English is hysteria.

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed list of anti-Semitic books on the Hungarian market, see Appendix.

<sup>3</sup> For more information on the subject, see: “András Nyerges, Reprint antiszemitizmus” (Reprint anti-Semitism). In *Heti Világgazdaság*, (HVG) November 13, 1999.

<sup>4</sup> For more on the interpretation of the freedom of opinion, see resolution 30/1992 ( 26.05.) by the Constitutional Court; on the interpretation of incitement see, Legf. Bír. Br. I. 1062/1996 guidance by the Supreme Court, in: *Bírósági Határozatok*, 1997/4., pp. 257-260.)

those written by “*Jews or Jewish advocates*.”<sup>5</sup> The last 24 pages of the book contain a list of “*writers of Jewish origin*,” including names of those who converted to Christianity, marked by an asterisk, with their original family name appearing in parentheses. Unbiased scholarly analysis unequivocally includes Kolosváry-Borcsa’s work among the clearly anti-Semitic publications. “Kolosváry-Borcsa offers a summary of an anti-Semitic approach to history, or to put it more precisely, he provides a catalogue of all the ideas, fragments of theories, judgments and prejudices – including blunt misinterpretations, both intentional and unintentional – that have appeared in Hungarian historiography, literature and journalism over the past two centuries. ... His work is probably the most systematic and carefully structured text *that presents and discusses the history of Hungary’s Jewry from an anti-Semitic point of view*,” writes János Gyurgyák in his monograph published recently (italicization from the original text).<sup>6</sup>

Legal proceedings in the case of Kolosváry-Borcsa’s book began in March, 2000 after MAZSIHISZ filed a complaint with the Chief Attorney’s Office for incitement against the public. The Jewish organization requested that the Chief Attorney ban the book from publication or circulation and initiate action to that end.<sup>7</sup> In the complaint, MAZSIHISZ pointed out that in addition to incitement, the act of reprinting the book violates personal, as well as reverence rights and that it also infringes on the anti-discrimination law by including the “*list of the names of writers of Jewish origin*.”

The following month, the Chief Attorney’s Office assigned the case to the Budapest Chief Attorney’s Office as the competent body, which on June 13, 2000,

<sup>5</sup> Mihály Kolosváry-Borcsa, “A zsidókérdés magyarországi irodalma. A zsidóság szerepe a magyar szellemi életben. A zsidó származású írók névsorával.” (The Literature on the Issue of Jewish in Hungary. The Role of the Jews in Hungary’s Intellectual Life. The List of the Names of Writers of Jewish Origin.) Stádium, 1943. 80. Re-published by, Gede Testvérek Bt., 1999.

<sup>6</sup> János Gyurgyák, “A zsidókérdés Magyarországon” (The Jewish Issue in Hungary). Budapest, Osiris, 2001. 401. Gyurgyák finds the theories of Jewish separatism and Jewish conspiracy the most characteristic elements in Kolosváry-Borcsa’s view of history, (Ibid. pp. 402-403). Gyurgyák also stresses that for Kolosváry-Borcsa the final goal is “not merely to dissimilate the Jewish population in Hungary but to fully exclude it from the body of the nation.” (Ibid. p. 410.)

<sup>7</sup> Dr. Oszkár Egri, attorney for MAZSIHISZ kindly allowed me access to some documents submitted by the organization and also to the letters and resolutions by the Chief Attorney’s Office, and the departments of the Budapest Chief Attorney’s Office handling the case. I hereby thank Dr. Egri for handing me over these documents.

declined to investigate the case stating that no crime had been committed.<sup>8</sup> In the resolution, the Chief Attorney’s Office declared that the publication of the book cannot be classified as incitement against a community. In reasoning the resolution, the Chief Attorney’s Office referred to the interpretation of the relevant law by the Constitutional Court and concluded that in the case of incitement against a community “*criminal liability for actions classified as incitement is restricted to the most dangerous forms of behavior only; namely, those that the law finds criminal only in the most extreme cases, resulting in the disturbance of public order and peace.*” Provoking hatred is insufficient grounds for actual manifestation of incitement against a community. It is also necessary that the act in question instigate hatred. According to the legal authority handling the complaint, although the publication of the book “*may give rise to negative sentiments in many [people], it does not contain the aforementioned elements of incitement to hatred.*”

On July 3, 2000 MAZSIHISZ appealed to the Chief Attorney to review the ruling of the Budapest Chief Attorney’s Office and order an investigation (the appeal also extended to other cases pending at the time). The request cited protection under the Constitution for not only the freedom of opinion but also that of human dignity. “*Furthermore, within the context of such relevance,*” the appeal states, “*in the cause of protecting human dignity, even the freedom to voice an opinion may be curtailed to a certain extent.*” MAZSIHISZ urged legal proceedings and declared that should the Chief Attorney refuse to initiate such, or fail to resolve the matter, the organization would turn to the members of the European Union and international public opinion.

In his response, the Chief Attorney informed MAZSIHISZ that his office was investigating issues for “*incitement against a community, violation of a national symbol and the use of the symbols of authoritarian regimes.*” The investigation was extended to include the procedure through which complaints were handled, the lawfulness of dropping the case and the practice of prosecution.<sup>9</sup> The Chief Attorney mentioned three specific cases (actions motivated by hatred against Jewish citizens; and actions aimed at causing hatred against Jewish citizens) in which charges were raised between 1997 and 1999. He thereby assured MAZSIHISZ that the “*Attorney’s Office will proceed consistently with the Constitution*

---

<sup>8</sup> Resolution No. NF. 4761/2000 by the Budapest Chief Attorney’s Office.

<sup>9</sup> Chief Attorney: NF. 2370/2000-II

*and relevant laws in every case falling within its authority where the suspicion or strong suspicion of crime exists.”*

In a resolution on August 24, 2000 the Budapest Chief Attorney’s Office upheld the appeal by MAZSIHISZ against rejection of its request for investigation, and ordered the Investigation Department of the Budapest Police Headquarters to carry out the investigation.<sup>10</sup> Justification for the resolution to investigate was based not on suspicion of the crime of incitement against a community, however, but for violation of the rules of data handling. The resolution referred to relevant passages in the Penal Code: “*Any person who unlawfully makes public special data s/he obtained while in the process of handling data regulated under the law on the protection of personal data, commits a crime.*” The Gede Testvérek Bt. (Gede Brothers Co.), commissioned with publication of the new edition was privy to such special personal data, which the publisher in the process of data handling had failed to obtain permission to use from the persons involved, or their legal heirs. The suspected evidence of crime, therefore, is based on the mishandling and abuse of personal data. The resolution also mentioned that in the course of the investigation there will be opportunity to examine whether incitement against a community had taken place. [As of the deadline for material in this publication, namely, June 2001, almost a year after the resolution to investigate had been ordered, the case is still pending.]

The November 12, 2000 issue of *Magyar Fórum*, the weekly newspaper of MIÉP carried an article entitled, “MAZSIHISZTÉRIA” by Zoltán Szöcs, who set out to honor the memory of Kolosváry-Borcsa and his book, which by then had become the subject of an investigation.<sup>11</sup> His article is worth a closer look also because his selection of facts from the life of Kolosváry-Borcsa is strongly biased and the same can be said about his description and judgment of Kolosváry-Borcsa’s book.<sup>12</sup>

The target of Szöcs’s attacks was Gusztáv Zoltai – to whom he mistakenly refers as the president of MAZSIHISZ (in fact, Zoltai is its managing director) – who would hand over Kolosváry-Borcsa to the “executioner” on December 6

<sup>10</sup> Budapest Chief Attorney’s Office NF. 4761/2000/3-II.

<sup>11</sup> Zoltán Szöcs, “Mazsihisztéria.” In *Magyar Fórum*, October 12, 2000.

<sup>12</sup> The preposterousness and distortions in Szöcs’s article were pointed out by Péter György in his article, “Igen! könyvégetők vagyunk...” (“Yes, We Are Bookburners”) in *Népszabadság*, November 3, 2000.

every year, if he could.<sup>13</sup> Since he cannot, Szôcs continues, “*Zoltai has nothing left to do but...to methodically blot out his memory.*” According to Szôcs, the work of Kolosváry-Borcsa, who as the president of the Országos Magyar Sajtókamara (Hungarian National Chamber of the Press) forced into obedience an “*unpatriotic and unethical press,*” is but “*a volume of documents, bibliographical in nature, containing facts and data exclusively.*” “*The work,*” Szôcs continues, “*provides an overview of Hungarian literature in its entirety from A to Z, based on preparation that displays admirable erudition and calm scholarly objectivity. Without sentiment, he systematically indicates which author or individual work is anti-Semitic, Jewish, or pro-Jewish. It is a sensational work...its publication was badly needed.*” In the end, the people’s court sentenced Kolosváry-Borcsa to death, writes Szôcs, “*on charges not unrelated to his book.*”

In the next part of his article, Szôcs discusses MAZSIHISZ’s charge and the proceedings that followed. He then calls the readers’ attention to some events that he considered more than controversial or inconsistent. First, he noted that while MAZSIHISZ filed a complaint against Gede Brothers, publishers of the Kolosváry-Borcsa book, Maccabi Publishing House was allowed to reprint the Magyar Zsidó Lexikon (Hungarian Jewish Lexicon), and Magyarországi zsidó és zsidó eredetű családok I-III. (*Jewish Families and Families of Jewish Origin in Hungary, vol. 1-3*), which “*contain data about the former and new names of Jewish persons in much more detail than Kolosváry-Borcsa’s book.*” From all this, Szôcs merely concluded that the law “*does not use equal judgment in various cases for the crime of disclosing former family names: in some instances it considers it permissible, ...whereas in other cases it is found impermissible and inciting for hatred.*”

In order to understand more of Szôcs’s article, it is necessary to enumerate the landmarks in the life of Mihály Kolosváry-Borcsa. Born in 1896, after fighting in WW I, Kolosváry-Borcsa worked for the racist paper, *Szózat*,<sup>14</sup> from the early 1920s and somewhat later joined the Hungarian Press Agency (MTI). In 1935, he began work in the press department of the Prime Minister’s Office.

---

<sup>13</sup> Mihály Kolosváry-Borcsa was sentenced to death by shooting and as the President of the Republic rejected his plea for pardon he was executed on December 6, 1946 (despite the fact that the People’s Court supported his plea).

<sup>14</sup> The title of the publication is the title of Hungary’s second anthem written by Mihály Vörösmarty.

Between 1937 and 1944, except for a short interval, he was the editor-in-chief of the semi-official newspaper, *Függetlenség* ("Independence"). Under the Imrédy government, in 1938, he was appointed head of the press department at the Prime Minister's Office, in which capacity, he banned the publication of some 400 papers and periodicals. From 1939 he was a Member of Parliament (Magyar Élet Pártja/Hungarian Life Party) and from June that year, president of the Hungarian National Chamber of the Press. After the German occupation of Hungary, he was appointed government commissioner for press affairs in the spring of 1944 by the Sztójay government. Later, he was promoted to State Secretary (in charge of the same affairs). Except for the period of the short-lived Lakatos government, he fulfilled this post until December 27, 1944 – that is, also under the Szálasi government.<sup>15</sup>

On June 16, 1944, when Kolosváry-Borcsa was still Government Commissioner, "*works by some 120 authors of Jewish origin and by 130 foreign writers were pulped,*" which, according to official reports, meant the "*destruction of 447,627 Jewish books.*"<sup>16</sup> This carefully prepared act, legitimized by decrees, was preceded and introduced by a radio speech Kolosváry-Borcsa made on May 22, 1944. The aim of the speech was to inform the public of the forthcoming events, namely, the purging of Hungary's intellectual life from Jewish influence. In the speech he made references to his work, *The Literature on the Issue Jews in Hungary*, published a year before.<sup>17</sup> "*The process of withdrawing Jewish books from circulation is nearing an end,*" he said on the radio, "*and the many tens of thousands of books will be put to serious use in the national economy: they will go to the paper-mill.*"<sup>18</sup> Theory thus became practice. Everything he wrote about in the theoretical part of his book reached near fulfillment.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Szálasi's arrow-cross movement was the Hungarian Fascist movement.

<sup>16</sup> Randolph L. Braham, "A magyar Holocaust" (The Hungarian Holocaust) vol. 1. Budapest, Gondolat, 1988, p. 397.

<sup>17</sup> The script of the radio speech was published in the May 23, 1944 issue of the daily, *Pesti Hírlap*. For an abstract of the speech, see: "Vádirat a náciizmus ellen. Dokumentumok a magyarországi zsidóüldözés történetéhez. (Indictment against Nazism. Documents for Study of the History of the Persecution of Jews in Hungary) vol. 2. Eds.: Ilona Benoschofsky, Elek Karsai. Budapest, MIOK, 1960. pp. 102-105.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* 104.

<sup>19</sup> The transportation of Jews living in the country to death-camps was halfway through when the books were pulped.

However, Kolosváry-Borcsa committed an even more serious crime. In 1944, as president of the Chamber of the Press, he handed over to the Gestapo the addresses of the Chamber’s Jewish members.<sup>20</sup>

The article by Szôcs published in *Magyar Fórum* makes no mention of the above facts in Kolosváry-Borcsa’s life, as these darkest spots on his life’s path would not fit the image of the martyr he described. He also neglected the fact that the volume, which he considers unbiased, contained a 70-page theoretical and historical section quoting facts from the history of anti-Semitism in Hungary and the author included his anti-Semitic commentary and opinion in almost every paragraph. This section was also included in the new edition of the book.

---

<sup>20</sup> See Ildikó Kováts: A MÚOSZ (The MÚOSZ – National Association of Hungarian Journalists). In, MÚOSZ Évkönyv (yearbook), 1996. and also Randolph L. Braham: A magyar holocaust. (The Hungarian Holocaust) vol. 1. Budapest, Gondolat, 1988, p. 439.

# A P P E N D I X

VERA PÉCSI

## FOCAL POINTS IN MASS COMMUNICATION

---

In the first year of its work in 2000, the Budapest Jewish Documentation Center (ZsiDoK) collected and stored on computer more than 700 articles published in the Hungarian press. In addition to information related to Hungarian Jewry, the database also contains open or coded anti-Semitic writings, as well as reports, interviews, and editorials that have generated a debate on the issue.

Since the on-line version of the Hungarian national daily and weekly publications was the primary source for the documentation, the selection is by no means complete. Several examples from the Hungarian printed media that are not on the Internet were left out, while a great many Jewish-related documents from the on-line version of *Vasárnapi újság*, a program on Hungarian Public Radio, are included. The database contains the bibliography, the complete text, and reference data for every document.

The fact that a document is included in the database does not represent a value judgment. The list that follows is a selection from the ZsiDoK database, and at the same time, an attempt to arrange part of these documents around so-called “focal points.” We selected those writings as focal points in the wake of which a number of articles appeared, which either generated debate or provoked comment in a wide circle.

In each case, the focal point is the earliest report, news item or opinion. Each topic is introduced with a quotation from the document that opened the debate. Although in selecting the focal points, we relied mainly on writings published in 2000, we have also included a few others that were published in 1999 but were still a subject of discussion in 2000. The list also contains some documents that were published before the present publication’s deadline in June 2001.

István Lovas: Összehasonlító véralgebra és a holocaust (“Comparative Blood Algebra and the Holocaust”) (In Népszabadság, March 5, 1999.)

*“What makes the Holocaust unique in the history of genocides? The number of victims? As we have seen, it is not that. The proportion of liquidated people? As*

*we have seen, it is not that either. The rapidity or efficiency of extermination? Deliberateness? None of these. Those who stress the uniqueness of the Shoah, set out from conclusions they draw in advance, pass them through the sieve of facts, then arrive at the conclusions they have already drawn and announce that indeed the Shoah is unique. This is a classic case of circular reasoning. But we can perform these acrobatics in logic for almost every genocide, from Cambodia and East Timor through Bosnia, to Rwanda, if we use the safety net of racism or ethnocentricity.... Those who aggressively and categorically arrogate uniqueness to their own Holocaust almost always devalue the Holocaust of weaker peoples when they promote their own interests. This behavior is equivalent to that of anti-Semitic historical revisionists who deny the suffering of Jews in the Shoah and who say exactly the same things about the Shoah as those who maintain the Shoah's 'uniqueness' generally say about other genocides – namely, that the number of [people] killed is exaggerated, that the deaths were the result of provocation or the act of war. The narcissistic assertion of uniqueness and the accompanying denial of the suffering of others are the mirror images of the same worthless, indeed, atrocious “coin.” And if there is anything that is immensely scandalous, unjust and that must be stamped out once and for all, it is precisely this view.”*

Eötvös Pál: Egy közlésről (Népszabadság, 1999. 03. 05.)

Tamás Gáspár Miklós: Sirrablók és halottgyalázók (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 16.)

Popper Péter: “Szikárra edzett nehéz dárdahegy” (Mozgó Világ, 2000. 01.)

Szerető Szabolcs: Megszólal a Zsidó Közéleti Unió (Napi Magyarország, 2000. 02. 19.)

-sl-: Élet (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 06. 23.)

Eörsi István: Séta egy incidens körül (Magyar Narancs, 2000. 06. 29.)

Tamás Gáspár Miklós: A korona évtizede (Népszabadság, 2000. 07. 04.)

Nehéz-Posonyi István: Nyílt levél a szerkesztőknek (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 07. 05.)

Mihályi Gábor: Antiszemitizmus itt és most (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 09. 19.)

Lovas István: A véralgebra bosszúja a gyűlölet ellen (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 03. 21.)

Karsai László: Holokauszt: egyediség, tények, hazugságok (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 04. 06.)

Révész Sándor: Egy plagizátor (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 04. 06.)

Yehuda Lahav: Miféle cél: túljárni? (Élet és Irodalom 2001. 04. 04.)

Z.H.: Kövér foglalkozna a zsidókérdéssel (“Kövért Would Address the Jewish Issue”) (In Magyar Hírlap, June 14, 1999.)

*“We have become tired of the constant demand to distance ourselves from MIÉP,” said Minister of Intelligence Services László Kövér at a forum held at the Komédióm Theater last night. In answer to a question from the audience*

*concerning MIÉP, Kövér said that he did not think that there was only one extreme [political wing] in Hungary. By way of example, he mentioned what he considers the liberal conduct the Free Democrats represent, which rejects values and traditions. According to Kövér, MIÉP is the appropriate response to this attitude, “even if not too successfully.” The Minister, however, faulted Csurka and his Party for discussing inappropriately a number of questions that need to be addressed. According to the Minister, the Jewish issue and Trianon are such matters.”*

- Várkonyi Tibor: Szorongatva (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 06. 16.)  
 Vértés István: Levelek a szerkesztőhöz (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 07. 19.)  
 Dombóvári György: Levelek a szerkesztőhöz (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 07. 26.)  
 Elek István: Nyílt levél a Magyar Hírlap főszerkesztőjének (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 08. 16.)  
 Kocsi Ilona: Nyílt válasz Elek Istvánnak (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 08. 16.)  
 Ungvári Tamás: Diszkrimináció és demokrácia (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 08. 19.)  
 Peter B. Cserhalmi-Friedman: A csend csak ront a dolgon (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 08. 19.)  
 Dr. Torma Zoltán: “Ha hallgattál volna, bölcs maradtál volna...” (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 08. 19.)  
 Ungváry Rudolf: A tanácsadó meg a “zsidókérdés” (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 08. 26.)  
 (sz. n.): Elek beszélne a zsidókérdésről (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 08. 28.)  
 MH/MTI: Zsidó Nyári Fesztivál (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 08. 30.)  
 Szabó Miklós: “Zsidókérdés” vagy antiszemitizmus (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 09. 01.)  
 Fencsik Flóra: Nagyon kis feneket kerítve... (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 09. 01.)  
 Lang Magda: Demokráciában nem lehet (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 09. 01.)  
 Gerő András: Egy polgár naplója (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 09. 04.)  
 Tamás Pál: Fütty az erdőben (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 09. 16.)  
 Bíró Béla: Disputa (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 09. 23.)  
 Rózsa T. Endre: Disputa (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 09. 30.)  
 Nyerges András: Reprint antiszemitizmus (HVG, 1999. 11. 13.)  
 DHG: Politikai üzlet (Napi Magyarország, 1999. 11. 16.)  
 Hankiss Ágnes: Kis magyar zsidókérdés (Magyar Nemzet, 1999. 11. 17.)  
 Babarczy Eszter: Hálózatháború (MaNcs, 1999. 12. 09.)  
 V. Bálint Éva: Párbeszéd és önvizsgálat (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 12. 11.)  
 Bruck András: Nincs mit megbeszélni (Népszava, 2000. 02. 02.)  
 Elek István: A baloldali szellemi elit balítéleteiről (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 06.)  
 Elek István: A teljes magyarság kulturális integrációja (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 20.)  
 Nehéz-Posony István: Nyílt levél a szerkesztőknek (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 07. 05.)  
 Nehéz-Posony István: Jogtörténeti tanulmány a zsidókérdésről (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 08. 11.)  
 Timár Sándor: Megint a kettős mérce (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 09. 16.)  
 Mihályi Gábor: Antiszemitizmus itt és most (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 09. 19.)  
 Debreczeni József: Az SZDSZ válsága (Népszava, 2000. 11. 11.)  
 Tamás Gáspár Miklós: “A történelmi SZDSZ” és mai kritikusai (Népszava, 2000. 11. 18.)

(no author): Schmidt Mária a holocaustról (“Mária Schmidt on the Holocaust”) (In Magyar Hírlap, November 12, 1999.)

*“The professor of history expounded in her lecture that the term ‘Holocaust’ cannot be applied only in the case of Jews killed during the Second World War because genocide also took place under communism. She noted that when the Second World War is mentioned today, almost everybody only thinks of the Holocaust, whereas, it was a minor, marginal issue.”*

Schmidt Mária: “Holokausztok” a XX. században (Napi Magyarország, 1999. 11. 13.)

N. I. E. – D. E.: Támadják Schmidt Mária nyilatkozatát (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 13.)

DHG: Politikai üzet (Napi Magyarország, 1999. 11. 16.)

Jezsó Ákos: A romák kárpótlást kérnek (Napi Magyarország, 1999. 11. 16.)

Tamács Gáspár Miklós: Sírablók és halottgyalázók (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 16.)

Lovas István: Kettős mérce (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 18.)

Stefka István: Holokauszt-értelmezések Magyarországon (Napi Magyarország, 1999. 11. 20.)

Nyerges András: Méricskélnei a mérhetetlent (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 23.)

Szilágyi Ákos: Schmidt Mária és kora (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 23.)

Hegyi Gyula: A náciizmus egyedi gonoszsága (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 23.)

Kopátsy Sándor: Holocaust csak egy volt (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 23.)

Balázs Zoltán: A meggyőződés könnyed elviselhetetlensége (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 30.)

Dr. Virág Teréz: Felületesség vagy manipuláció? (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 30.)

Ungvári Tamás: Ugyan kinek az érdeke? (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 30.)

Breznyai Enikő: TGM indulatos kirohanása (Magyar Hírlap, 1999. 11. 30.)

Joób Sándor: Pokorni holocaust-émléknapot javasol (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 01. 19.)

Bruck András: Nincs mit megbeszélni (Népszava, 2000. 02. 02.)

Szerető Szabolcs: Megszólal a Zsidó Közéleti Unió (Napi Magyarország, 2000. 02. 19.)

Neumann Ottó: Tanulni a tragédiából (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 04. 10.)

Elek István: A baloldali szellemi elit balítéleteiről (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 06.)

Lovas István: Napi sajtószemle (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 07. 03.)

Mihályi Gábor: Antiszemitizmus itt és most (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 09. 19.)

Lovas István: A véralgebra bosszúja a gyűlölet ellen (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 03. 21.)

(hun): Bárdossyért szól a harang (“The Bell Tolls for Bárdossy”) In Magyar Fórum, January 13, 2000.)

*“At 12 noon on Sunday the 16th, in Saint Stephen’s Basilica in Budapest, an expiatory mass will be held for the salvation of the late Prime Minister László Bárdossy. György Dancsecs, Representative of the MIÉP faction of the City Council, announced that a motion for a new trial in the case of the martyred Prime Minister is in process. The politician stressed that one of their main tasks is to learn in depth and make public the [country’s] historical background, because even ten years after the change in regimes Hungarians have*

*a false, distorted and misguided view of their social, scientific and cultural history.”*

Sükösd Mihály: Bárdossy: mártír vagy háborús bűnös? (Mozgó Világ, 2000. 01.)

A szerk.: Szükület (MaNcs, 2000. 01. 20.)

V. I.: Szentmise a vértanú miniszterelnökért (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 01. 20.)

Dr. Varga László: Numerus clausus (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 02. 17.)

Pelle János: A Bárdossy-ügy és a médianeurózis (Népszabadság, 2000. 02. 19.)

Sipos Balázs: A szélsőjobb útja a hatalomba (Népszava, 2000. 05. 20.)

Udvarvölgyi Zsolt: Jobbra tarts! (Népszava, 2000. 05. 20.)

Sz. I. M.: Zsidózás, trágárság, rágalmazás (Index, 2000. 06. 29.)

Mayer Rudolf: A MIÉP Bárdossyra emlékezett (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 12. 11.)

Sándor Joób: Pokorni holocaust-emléknapot javasol (“Pokorni Proposes Holocaust Memorial Day”) (In Magyar Hírlap, January 19, 2000.)

*“Zoltán Pokorni proposes that April 16 be declared Holocaust Memorial Day, the day that Jews started to be confined to ghettos in Hungary during the Second World War. In addition to commemorating the Holocaust, schools could organize lectures on the persecution of Jews in Hungary. ‘The purpose of the commemoration is to keep alive the individual’s sense of moral responsibility,’ 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 országtévesztés (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 02. 17.)

Szerető Szabolcs: Megszólal a Zsidó Közéleti Unió (Napi Magyarország, 2000. 02. 19.)

Szönyi Szilárd: Sokan visszaélnék a holokausztraumájával (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.)

(sz. n.): A MIÉP sérelmezi, hogy a holokausztra emléknap idén húsvéthétfőre esik (MTI, 2001. 02. 22.)

MIÉP elnökség: A holokausztra oktatása (MIÉP sajtótájékoztató, 2001. 02. 22.)

Mészáros Tamás: Az értékrendi rokonság (Népszava, 2001. 02. 24.)

Csurka István: A MAZSIHISZ politikai nyilatkozatai (MIÉP sajtótájékoztató, 2001. 04. 18.)

(sz. n.): Javaslat a holokausztra (Népszava, 2001. 02. 17.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 04. 12.)

MAZSIHISZ: Holokausztra emléknap 2001. április 17. (MTI, 2001. 04. 17.)

- Hanczár János: A holokausztra emlékeztek a Parlamentben (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 04. 18.)  
 Dési János: A biciklisták és a MIÉP (Népszava, 2001. 04. 19.)  
 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 antiszemita (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 04. 23.)

István Csurka: Magyar szemmel ("Through Hungarian Eyes") (In Magyar Fórum, January 27, 2000.)

*"The Romas from Zámoly now live in one of Buda's most beautiful locations. Rent free, and allegedly only so as to enable the two bankers to drive out the only remaining owner who did not sell his apartment to them... There was a similar situation on Benczúr Street, where the Jewish Community, that is, a limited liability company or some such closely affiliated with it, wanted to force the remaining residents of a building to sell their apartments using threats and coercion.... If the idea takes root that anyone, or any group of people not indigenous to and not belonging there may settle in the Buda hills, this [practice] may be extended easily to the entire country. Once settled, our chances of getting back the Buda region, the apartments and living space built by the Christian middle class, is the same as Syria has getting back the Golan Heights."*

- Hering József: Terjeszkedő Izrael Budapesten (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 07. 03.)  
 G. N. É.: A külföldi ingatlanharcosok ellen (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 07. 13.)  
 Vajta Zoltán: Grespik kenyeret dobált a riporterekre (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 09. 16.)  
 Nyerges András: Színrebotás: Clausus, nullus, ököljog (Magyar Hírlap 2000. 09. 23.)  
 Lovas István: Elég volt! (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 10. 19.)  
 Kelemen Miklós: Az izraeliek térnyerése Budapesten és Magyarországon (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 10. 19.)  
 Csurka István: Nyilatkozat (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 10. 26.)  
 A magyar közélet szolgája vagyok – Hering József interjúja Grespik Lászlóval (Magyar Fórum, 2000. november 9.)

László Kövér: Bizhatunk a jövőnkben ("We Can Trust in Our Future")  
 (Speech delivered: January 29, 2000, in Magyar Nemzet February 5, 2000.)

*"This is not the Liberal Party wherein a person is not elected president because his parents are communist Jews."*

- Bruck András: Nincs mit megbeszélni (Népszava, 2000. 02. 02.)  
 Petri Lukács Ádám: Vagyunk, akik vagyunk (Népszabadság, 2000. 02. 02.)  
 Szalai Erzsébet: Shakespeare szabadon (Népszabadság, 2000. 02. 02.)  
 Pilhál György: Apák és fiúk (Napi Magyarország, 2000. 02. 04.)  
 Gerő András: Egy polgár naplója (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 02. 05.)

OSSZIÁN: Kétezer leütés (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 02. 07.)

Németh Péter: Középen ragadt az SZDSZ (Népszava, 2000. 02. 07.)

Szerető Szabolcs: Megszólal a Zsidó Közéleti Unió (Napi Magyarország, 2000. 02. 19.)

Szőnyi Szilárd: Sokan visszaélnék a holokauszt traumájával (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 02. 28.)

Lovas István: Lámpaernyőt csinálók a bőrödből (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 03. 26.)

Lovas István: Krokodilbőröből lámpaernyő? Tényleg, kinek a szégyene? (Napi Magyarország, 2000. 04. 13.)

Lakatos Pál: Falig erő liberalizmus (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 07. 23.)

I. H.: Tábor a lágerről (“Soccer Fans and Deportation”) (In Népszabadság, March 20, 2000.)

*“I am quite certain that for MTK fans losing the game 2-3 was not the worst thing that happened on Hungária Boulevard Saturday. It was far worse that they had to listen repeatedly to the concentration camp “hit song” of the Ferencváros fans: “The train is leaving, the train is leaving for Auschwitz.” It greatly distressed every decent person in the stadium, as was it depressing to face the fact that the presence of police notwithstanding, it is evidently possible in Hungary, at the turn of the millennium, to call for deportation publicly in chorus without the slightest consequence...”*

(sz. n.): ízléstelen, de nem törvénytelen rigmus (Népszabadság, 2000. 03. 20.)

Szakonyi Péter: Hétvégi rasszizmus (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 03. 21.)

-kz-: Élet (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 03. 24.)

Kántor Péter: Levél egy Fradi-drukkerhez (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 03. 24.)

Szále László: Növeli, ki eltűri a bajt (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 03. 27.)

Kőbányai János: A nem Auschwitzban kötött szerződésről (Népszabadság, 2000. 03. 31.)

Neumann Ottó: Tanulni a tragédiából (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 04. 10.)

Márton László: Hová megy a vonat? (Népszava, 2000. 04. 13.)

Mihályi Gábor: Ausztria sorsára juthatunk (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 04. 18.)

kövesdi: A példa statuálása (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 04. 21.)

Takács Anna: Akkor még nem! (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 04. 28.)

I.E.: Dole és Lantos a szabadabb sajtóért (Népszabadság, 2000. 05. 03.)

(sz. n.): Külügyi ígéret a fajgyűlölet visszaszorítására (Népszava, 2000. 05. 10.)

Elek István: A teljes magyarság kulturális integrációja (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 20.)

(sz. n.): Visszavont rendőrségi határozat (Népszabadság, 2000. 06. 01.)

Krajczár Gyula: A mocsár dala (Népszabadság, 2000. 06. 01.)

L. Bandi: Sipszó a B-középnek (Index, 2000. 07. 20.)

István Lovas: Lámpaernyőt csinálók a bőrödből (“I’ll Make a Lampshade from Your Skin”) (In Vasárnapi újság, March 26, 2000.)

*“According to a Dutch journalist, the editorial in Napi Magyarország proposed that a lampshade be made out of the skin of a left-wing media sociologist. In*

*other words, the newspaper, Trouw – which means loyalty, truth, trustworthiness – in the tolerant Netherlands for all intents and purposes informed its readers that the Hungarian government organ in its editorial position espouses the making of lampshades out of human skin.”*

Vásárhelyi Mária: Kinek a szégyene? (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 04. 07.)

Lovas István: Krokodilbőrből lámpaernyő? Tényleg, kinek a szégyene? (Napi Magyarország, 2000. 04. 13.)

Seszták Ágnes: A lámpaernyő meg a krokodil (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 04. 20.)

Lovas István: Külső képünk belülről 4. (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 01. 04.)

Reuters: Pert vesztett David Irving (“David Irving Loses Lawsuit”)

(In Magyar Hírlap, April 12, 2000.)

*“British historian David Irving lost the libel suit he filed against an American historian and her publisher. The American historian had called her British colleague a denier of the Holocaust, a falsifier of history, who said that Auschwitz ‘was barely more than a Disneyland built for tourists after 1948.’”*

R. Hahn Veronika: David Irving, a történelmi tények elferdítője (Népszabadság, 2000. 04. 15.)

Szöcs Zoltán: Harc a józan ész ellen (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 04. 27.)

Lovas István: Szikinger dermatoglyphiai alapon (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 05. 11.)

Molnár Balázs: Elmaradt a szembenézés (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 05. 11.)

Pelle János: A népirtások indítékai (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 13.)

Velancsics Béla: Századunk vétke (Népszava, 2000. 05. 13.)

Mink András: Az ingovány határa (Népszabadság, 2000. 05. 18.)

Stéphane Courtois: Az öldöklés évszázada (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 27.)

J. P. P.: Bitang bitőbitorlók (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 07. 13.)

Schweitzer Iván: A különbség (HVG, 2000. 07. 29.)

F.K.: Antiszemita könyv a piacon? (“An Anti-Semitic Book on the Market?”)

(In Magyar Nemzet, April 20, 2000.)

*“A book by a well known extreme-right anti-Semitic theoretician of the inter-war period, Zoltán Bosnyák, bearing the title, Jewish Dominance in Hungary, first published in 1937, is again being sold. Using statistical data, the author analyzes the structure of the social stratification and positions held according to the domicile of Hungarian Jewry at that time. The work, published almost a month ago by Gede Testvérek Co., discusses in detail the anthropological and character traits of the various ‘types’ of Jews, their settlement and preponderance in the Carpathian Basin.”*

- Kronstein Gábor: Fejvédelem a fajvédelem ellen (Népszabadság, 2000. 04. 28.)  
 Murányi Gábor: Mindegy, csak harc legyen (HVG, 2000. 06. 10.)  
 Cz. G.: "Antiszemita, de nem uszító" (Népszabadság, 2000. 07. 05.)  
 Szócs Zoltán: Mazsihisztéria (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 10. 12.)  
 Lovas István: Külső képünk belülről 4. (Magyar Demokrata, 2001. 01. 04.)  
 (sz. n.): Nyomozás nyilas irodalom kiadói ellen (Népszabadság, 2001. 01. 11.)  
 Ságghy Erna: A náci biznisz (168 óra, 2001. 02. 22.)  
 R. M.: A Gede-könyvek sorsa (Magyar Fórum, 2001. 03. 08.)

Lovas István jegyzete (István Lovas' commentary) (In Vasárnapi újság, May 14, 2000.)

*"Let us list the names we heard: Miklós Vámos, Miklós Gáspár Tamás, Miklós Haraszti, Edit Herczog, Iván Fischer, István Eörsi, Klára Fehér, Mária Vásárhelyi, Tom Lantos, Imre Kertész, and János Bródy. Those citizens who have finally grown tired of all this are beginning to ask a strange question increasingly more loudly and to ponder a possible answer. The question is: what do these people have in common? Vasárnapi újság is seeking to find the answer. Of course, the listeners may know. Perhaps it is already whispering in the wind."*

- Aczél Endre: Közszolgálati zsidózás (Népszabadság, 2000. 05. 15.)  
 Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 05. 18.)  
 Elek István: A teljes magyarság kulturális integrációja (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 20.)  
 Lovas István: Válasz Aczél/Acsádi Endrének és Elek Istvánnak egy jegyzet ügyében (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 05. 22.)  
 Mihancsik Zsófia: Európai nyilvánosságok (Népszava, 2000. 06. 02.)  
 Aczél Endre: Közszolgálati zsidózás (II.) (Népszabadság, 2000. 06. 16.)  
 Megyesi Gusztáv: Csak foci (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 06. 23.)  
 Elek István: Lovas Istvánnak és R. Székely Juliannának (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 07. 03.)  
 Tamás Gáspár Miklós: A korona évtizede (Népszabadság, 2000. 07. 04.)  
 Eörsi István: Egy kínos fejleményről (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 07. 05.)  
 Nehéz-Posony István: Nyílt levél a szerkesztőknek (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 07. 05.)  
 Nyerges András: 8 buta kérdés 2 kedves úrhoz (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 07. 14.)  
 Bencsik András: Barikádok között (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 07. 20.)

Szabolcs Kerekes: Emlékezés Szabó Dezsőre ("Remembering Dezső Szabó") (In Vasárnapi újság, November 6, 2000.)

*"Szabolcs Kerekes: In his lead article, 'Anti-Semitism,' Dezső Szabó writes that love does not mean that we should love those who take away the future from our children, who take the country from those of my race. The law of love binds us first and foremost to those who are of our own, to our kind. This is natural.*

*Szabó could not fail to emphasize enough that it was never foreigners he spoke out against, but the fact that they are assessed more favorably and reach better positions in this country than local residents. The title of one of his editorials is 'The Reoccupation of Budapest.'*

*Zoltán Szűcs: In 'The Reoccupation of Budapest' Szabó talks about Hungarians having acquired the city at a price, that there was never a race who paid more for every bit of land than the Hungarians. By Szabó's time, in 1920, when these articles were written, the Hungarian capital had become un-Hungarian to an astonishing degree. The Hungarian spirit could not really feel at home there anymore. People of foreign origin dominated the place seemingly everywhere."*

Neumann Ottó: Vissza a kőkorszakba (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 06. 13.)

Aczél Endre: Közszolgálati zsidózás (II.) (Népszabadság, 2000. 06. 16.)

Várkonyi Tibor: Kötéltánc (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 06. 19.)

Németh Péter: Illetlenek és lövöldözők (Népszava, 2000. 06. 19.)

Lakatos Pál interjúja Orbán Viktorral: "Támadások tüzeiben kellett dolgozni" (Népszabadság, 2000. 06. 19.)

Aczél Endre: Orbán a MIÉP-rádióban (Népszabadság, 2000. 06. 20.)

Szász István: Mindennapi zsidózásaink (Népszava, 2000. 06. 21.)

Pogonyi Lajos: Szabó Dezső, az ellentmondásos alkotó (Népszabadság, 2000. 06. 21.)

Uj Péter: Dzsiudzsicu (Népszabadság, 2000. 06. 21.)

Szűcs Zoltán: Egyéni vélemény (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 06. 22.)

György Péter: Gyűlölet és tehetetlenség (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 06. 23.)

Makai József: Három, rövid, nyári (szakorú) (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 06. 24.)

(sz. n.): Meneszthetik Lakatos a Vasárnapi újság éléről (Népszava, 2000. 07. 06.)

Szűcs Zoltán: Gyuri bohóc, a kultúrfelelős (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 07. 06.)

Buják Anikó: Lakatos Pál – szupersztár (168 óra, 2000. 09. 07.)

(no author): A fővárosi MIÉP képviselő botrányos felszólalása ("MIÉP City Councilor's Scandalous Speech at City Hall") (MTI, Hungarian News Agency, June 16, 2000.)

*"According to Lóránt Schuster, 'there will be order in heaven when the three birds of the Free Democrats, Roth, Weiss, and Grün fly away for good and that is when there will be order here on Earth.' The City Council member also expressed his hope at the general assembly that the Free Democrats would not get into Parliament in the next elections."*

G.K.-P.G.: Schuster-beszédeket gyűjt az SZDSZ (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 06. 17.)

(sz. n.): A fővárosi közgyűlés vitája Schuster Lóránt miépes képviselő hozzászólásai kapcsán (MSZP Budapest Online, 2000. 06. 29.)

Sz. I. M.: Zsidózás, trágárság, rágalmazás (Index, 2000. 06. 29.)

Vajta Zoltán: Alpári vita a fővárosi közgyűlésben (Magyar Hírlap, 2000. 06. 30.)  
 P.G.: MIÉP-aggodalmak a demokráciáért (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 07. 03.)  
 Gidró Kriszta: Komplementer színek (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 07. 03.)  
 Varga Imre: Európa a büfében (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 07. 06.)  
 Osszián: Kétezer leütés (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 07. 17.)

György Pihál: Cigányút ("The Roma Question") (In Magyar Nemzet, July 28, 2000.)

*"It is conceivable theoretically that trouble with the Roma will start simultaneously at different spots in the country (Zámoly, Csór, Zugló, Pesthidegkút, Debrecen...), but not really in practice.... Such coordinated, precise action comes only with practice – acquired, let's say, during the taxi blockade of 1989, by those who have experience in discrediting the country abroad. By those who fill the Western press and sound the bugle about the 'evil' conditions in Hungary. Those who slander the Hungarian population as anti-Semitic and scare Europe with Csurka. Those who now use the misery of an unfortunate minority to win seats in Parliament, to find foreign patrons. But it will be too big a bite to swallow this time and it shall go down the wrong hatch."*

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 jegyzete (Vasárnapi újság, 2001. 03. 11.)  
 -sl-: Élet (Élet és Irodalom, 2001. 03. 16.)  
 Tar Zsuzsanna: A Jane's kitarat állításai mellett (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 03. 19.)  
 Lovas István: A vérlegebra bosszúja a gyűlölet ellen (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 03. 21.)  
 Csapody Miklós: Parlamenti felszólalás (Parlamenti Napló, 2001. 03. 26.)  
 ifj. Hegedűs Loránt felszólalása a Parlamentben (Parlamenti napló, 2001. 03. 27.)  
 Koncz Lajos: Kristallnacht a parlamentben (HVG, 2001. 05. 26.)

Bencsik András: Mária oltalma ("Mary's Protection") (In Magyar Demokrata, October 12, 2000.)

*"The people influential in the Hungarian media were not moved by the child's death, a victim of everyday fascism and racism. In the same way that they pay little attention to the fact that the greatest stream of capital coming into*

*Hungary is from Israel, the country where discrimination and government terrorism take the most violent form.... We call upon every person of good will, every social and political organization that believes in justice and rule of law to support our initiative for a plebiscite on preventing the acquisition of real estate by citizens of countries where human law and existence, and even the principle of reciprocity are not respected."*

Báthory Gábor: Köszöntő (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 10. 15.)

Lovas István jegyzete (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 10. 15.)

Lovas István: Elég volt! (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 10. 19.)

Kelemen Miklós: Az izraeliek térnyerése Budapesten és Magyarországon (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 10. 19.)

-sl-: Élet (Élet és Irodalom, 2000. 10. 20.)

Csurka István: Nyilatkozat (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 10. 26.)

Bencsik András: Háborús bűn (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 10. 26.)

Molnár Balázs: Keleten a helyzet változik (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 10. 26.)

Zoltai Gusztáv: Postabontás I. (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 10. 29.)

(sz. n.): Postabontás (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 11. 05.)

Molnár Balázs: Tikkun azt jelenti, gyógyítás, javítás (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 11. 09.)

Lovas István: Sajnálatos események – avagy jogositvány borús napokra és jegyzetírásra (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 11. 12.)

Tar Zsuzsanna: Lejárató titkosszolgálati akció? (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 03. 03.)

MIÉP frakció: A MIÉP tiltakozik a palesztin népitás ellen (MIÉP sajtótájékoztató, 2001. 05. 23.)

Pál Gábor: Eörsit bírálja a MIÉP (Magyar Nemzet, 2001. 05. 24.)

Kepecs Ferenc: Ellenségem ellensége (Népszava, 2001. 05. 29.)

Pál Lakatos: Bauer Miklós múltja, avagy zsidó kínozta a zsidót ("Miklós Bauer's past: or a Jew who tortured Jews") (In Vasárnapi újság, October 15, 2000.)

*"Dr. Kálmán Pécsi: Mr. Vámos mentioned that I had to go by myself to the police to hand over the documents. The reason for this was that the president of the Jewish Community told Mr. Vámos that he disapproved of our activity concerning Miklós Bauer, forgetting that in this case it is not only Miklós Bauer who professes to be a Jew, but that those he harmed were also of Jewish origin."*

*Pál Lakatos: The summoned, György Vámos, is also Jewish.*

*Dr. Kálmán Pécsi: It is quite obvious that Minister of Justice István Rics is of Jewish descent, so was István Somogyi-Zinger, also Magda Bárdi, furthermore, we could continue the list of the names of people of Jewish descent who were tortured by the State Security Authorities [ÁVH]."*

Zoltai Gusztáv: Postabontás I. (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 10. 29.)

(sz. n.): Postabontás (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 11. 05.)

(sz. n.): Elhatárolódás vagy félreértés? (Népszabadság, 2000. 11. 13.)

R. M.: Hamisan vádoltak (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 11. 23.)

(sz. n.): Baráti körök országos találkozója (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 11. 26.)

Gidró-Pál: Címervita Erzsébetvárosban ("Dispute Over the Crest of Erzsébetváros") (In Magyar Nemzet, November 2, 2000.)

*"The menorah, one of the symbols of the state of Israel, appears in the four designs for coat-of-arms that the district's Mayor Zoltán Szabó and the Hungarian Socialist-Free Democrats party coalition submitted to the local government of Erzsébetváros. The proposal generated a serious debate between members of the majority and the opposition. The Hungarian Democratic Forum [MDF] of the 7th District [Erzsébetváros] proposes that a local plebiscite be held on the issue."*

H. J.: Izrael felségjele Erzsébetváros címerében (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 11. 02.)

Pillhál György: Címeres ötlet (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 11. 03.)

Szôcs Zoltán: Szégyen és gyalázat (Magyar Fórum, 2000. 11. 09.)

Franka Tibor: Megbélyegzett címer ügy (Vasárnapi újság, 2000. 11. 12.)

(sz. n.): A menóra nem botránykô! (MTI-OS, 2000. 11. 12.)

Stefka István: Gyengül az MSZP (Magyar Nemzet, 2000. 11. 17.)

Kelemen Miklós: A menóra és árnyékai (Magyar Demokrata, 2000. 11. 23.)

ENIKŐ FUKK

## ANTI-SEMITIC BOOKS ON THE HUNGARIAN BOOK MARKET

---

The list below contains those books of anti-Semitic intent that were published in Hungary in 1999 and 2000. Some books might have of course escaped our notice, among other reasons because we relied on the catalogues of the National Széchenyi Library (OSZK), and our experience has been that – although publishing houses are obliged to send so-called mandatory deposit copies to OSZK – approximately one third of the books included in our list could not be found in the OSZK registers.

In the summer of 2001 almost all the books from our list were available at such Budapest bookstores, as the *Fehérlófia* and the *Püski Könyvesház* as well as on the Internet – for example in the *Kiskapu* bookstore.

Looking at the list, we may conclude that two publishing houses have specialized in publishing anti-Semitic books, mostly reprints: the *Gede Testvérek Bt.* in Budapest and the *Új Kékszalag Kiadó* of Békéscsaba. Compared to previous years, 1999 and 2000 brought a real breakthrough in this field. While in the mid-1990's only one or two anti-Semitic reprints were published per year (e.g. Miklós Bartha: *Kazárföldön*, Magyar Fórum könyvek, 1996), in the past two years dozens of such books – mostly the 'masterpieces' of the pre-1945 anti-Semitic literature – were published and became available to a wider public through – among others – the bookstore of Mr. Sándor Püski, who was recently decorated by the government of Hungary...

BARY JÓZSEF: A TISZAESZLÁRI BŰNPER (THE TISZAESZLÁR TRIAL)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 1999

Reprint

Original: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, Budapest, 1933

BOSNYÁK ZOLTÁN: A MAGYAR FAJVÉDELEM ÚTTÖRŐI (THE PIONEERS OF HUNGARIAN RACE PROTECTION)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Original: Stádium, Budapest, 1942

BOSNYÁK ZOLTÁN: MAGYARORSZÁG ELZSIDÓSODÁSA kiegészítve a "FŐVÁROSUNK ELZSIDÓSODÁSA" című fejezettel (HOW HUNGARY CAME TO BE DOMINATED BY JEWS, including the chapter "HOW BUDAPEST CAME TO BE DOMINATED BY JEWS")

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Original: Held János Budapest, 1937 és 1935

BOSNYÁK ZOLTÁN: ZSIDÓKÉRDÉS I–II. (THE JEWISH QUESTION)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Original: n.d.

CHALDEUS SIMON: A ZSIDÓ VILÁGSZÖVETSÉG VESZEDELME AZ EMBERISÉGRE (HOW THE WORLD ALLIANCE OF JEWS THREATENS MANKIND)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Original: Títán, Budapest, 1928

HOUSTON STEWART CHAMBERLAIN: THE APPEARANCE OF JEWS IN THE HISTORY OF THE WESTERN WORLD

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Original: n.d.

DOROS GÁBOR: A MAGYARSÁG ÉLETEREJE: A NEMZETTEST BIOLÓGIÁJA, FAJEGÉSZSÉGE ÉS EUGÉNIAJA (THE LIFE FORCE OF THE HUNGARIAN RACE: THE BIOLOGY OF THE CORE NATION, THE HEALTH OF THE RACE AND EUGENICS)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Original: Turul, n.d., 1944

DÖVÉNYI NAGY LAJOS: TARNOPOLBÓL INDULT EL... (THEY SET OUT FROM TARNOPOL)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2001

Reprint

Original: n.d.

HERMANN FEHST: BOLSEVIZMUS ÉS ZSIDÓSÁG, kiegészítve Kmoskó Mihály: A ZSIDÓSÁG VILÁG-URALMI TÖREKVÉSEI című tanulmányával (BOLSHEVISM AND THE JEWS, including the study "JEWISH ATTEMPTS TO RULE THE WORLD")

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Original: Baltha J. ny., Mezőberény, 1936 and

Kmoskó: Apostol ny., Budapest, 1921

FEJÉR LAJOS: ZSIDÓSÁG (JEWRY)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 1999

Reprint

Original: Veritas, Budapest, 1936

FIALA FERENC – MARSCHALKÓ LAJOS: VÁDLÓ BITÓFÁK (A MAGYAR NEMZET IGAZI SÍRÁSÓI)  
(ACCUSING GALLOWES – THE REAL DESTROYERS OF THE HUNGARIAN NATION)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 1999

Reprint

Original: Süli, London, 1958

HENRY FORD: A NEMZETKÖZI ZSIDÓ (A VILÁG LEGFŐBB PROBLÉMÁJA) Négy kötet egy könyvben  
(THE INTERNATIONAL JEW, THE WORLD'S GREATEST PROBLEM)

Új Kékszalag Kiadó, Békéscsaba, 2000

OLYSÓI GABÁNYI JÁNOS: MÁRTÍRJAINK (AZ "ŐSZIRÓZÁS FORRADALOM" ÉS A PROLETÁRDIKTATÚRA  
ÁLDOZATAINAK MEGGYILKOLÁSA, LELKI ÉS TESTI MEGKINZÁSA) (OUR MARTYRS – THE MURDER AND  
MENTAL AND PHYSICAL TORTURE OF THE VICTIMS THE REVOLUTION OF 1918 AND OF THE  
COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIP)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Original: Honvédelmi Sajtóvállalat, Budapest, 1922

RICHARD E. HARWOOD: A HATMILLIÓS ZSIDÓ MÍTOSZ NYOMÁBAN (DID SIX MILLION REALLY DIE?)

Új Kékszalag Kiadó, Békéscsaba, 2000

Original: Published by the author, England, 1974

VITÉZ KOLOSVÁRY-BORCSA MIHÁLY: A ZSIDÓKÉRDÉS MAGYARORSZÁGI IRODALMA (THE LITERATURE  
OF THE JEWISH QUESTION IN HUNGARY)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 1999

Reprint

Original: Stádium, Budapest, 1943

KOÓS KÁLMÁN: VOLTUNK, VAGYUNK, LESZÜNK (WE WERE, WE ARE, WE SHALL BE)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 1999

Reprint

Original: Hungarista Mozgalom (The Hungarist Movement), Buenos Aires, 1960

MAGYAR FUTÁR – (VÁLOGATÁS A KÉPESLAP 1941–44 KÖZÖTT MEGJELENT SZÁMAIBÓL)  
(THE HUNGARIAN MESSENGER – SELECTED ARTICLES FROM ISSUES OF THE MAGAZINE PUBLISHED  
BETWEEN 1941 AND 1944)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

MARSCHALKÓ LAJOS: KIK ÁRULTÁK EL 1918-BAN MAGYARORSZÁGOT? (WHO BETRAYED HUNGARY  
IN 1918?)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Original: Stádium, Budapest, 1944

MARSCHALKÓ LAJOS: ORSZÁGHÓDÍTÓK (AZ EMANCIPÁCIÓTÓL RÁKOSI MÁTYÁSIG)  
(THE CONQUERORS: – FROM THE EMANCIPATION TO MÁTYÁS RÁKOSI)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 1998

Reprint

Original: n.d.

MARSCHALKÓ LAJOS: VILÁGHÓDÍTÓK (THE CONQUERORS OF THE WORLD)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, n.d.

Reprint

Original: n.d.

BENITO MUSSOLINI: A FASIZMUS DOKTRÍNÁJA ÉS EGYÉB VILÁGNÉZETI MUNKÁJA  
(THE DOCTRINE OF FASCISM AND OTHER IDEOLOGICAL WORKS)

GONDOLATOK (IDEAS)

A KORPORATÍV ÁLLAM (THE CORPORATE STATE)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Based on the following publications:

A fascizmus doktrínája (The Doctrine of Fascism) – Vallecchi, Firenze, 1935

A korporációs államról (The Corporate State) – Vallecchi, Firenze, 1940

Benito Mussolini gondolatai (The Ideas of Benito Mussolini) – Elegius, Budapest, 1928

ÖHQUIST, JOHANNES: A FÜHRER BIRODALMA (DAS REICH DES FÜHRERS) (THE FÜHRER'S EMPIRE)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 1999

Reprint

Original: Stádium, Budapest, 1943

(Hungarian Translation: Mihály Kolosváry-Borcsa)

SOMOGYI ISTVÁN: A SZABADKÖMÜVESSÉG IGAZI ARCA I. KÖTET, A SZABADKÖMÜVESSÉG  
FELELŐSSÉGE TRIANONÉRT II. KÖTET, A FÖLDALATTI MAGYARORSZÁG (THE REAL FACE OF FREE  
MASONRY. VOL. I. THE FREE MASONS' RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRIANON, VOL. II, UNDERGROUND  
HUNGARY)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest, 2000

Reprint

Original: Apostol, Budapest, 1929

SZÁLASI FERENC: HUNGARIZMUS 1. (A CÉL) (HUNGARISM 1. – THE FINAL GOAL)

Gede Testvérek Bt. Budapest n.d.

Reprint

Original: n.d.

ORTT RESOLUTION  
VASÁRNAPI ÚJSÁG VIOLATES THE LAW

---

*(abridged)*

In December 2000, a resolution by the ORTT (National Radio and Television Board), ordered an investigation into the program *Vasárnapi újság* (*Sunday Magazine*) broadcast by Kossuth Rádió, the public radio station in Hungary. The enquiry resulted in a resolution – adopted at the body’s 13 June 2001 session – establishing that the program severely and regularly violated the provisions of the Radio and Television Act. The resolution included a written warning to the broadcaster – Magyar Rádió Rt. (Hungarian Radio Broadcasting Co.) and called upon it to cease the violations and to refrain from future violations of the law.

The Internet magazine Népszabadság Online, which was the first media organ to publish the text of the decision, commented that this was the first case in which instead of objecting to actual utterances, the ORTT had declared that it was ‘the entire spirit of the program that violates media law.’

Among other things, the enquiry asserted: “each of the program items under scrutiny contained topics related to foreign ownership in Hungary and – in connection to this – the state of Israel and Jewry, so it is clear that the program series *Vasárnapi újság* is capable of inciting hatred. According to the scrutineers of the program series, it is not only in regards to Jewry that the program communicates biased attitudes: the same attitudes resonate, although not on such a regular basis, in connection with Roma and other minority groups too (e.g. homosexuals).”

RESOLUTION BY THE NATIONAL RADIO AND  
TELEVISION BOARD (ORTT)

In accordance with its powers as defined in paragraph 112 of the 1996/1 Laws relating to Radio and Television (known as the Media Law, hereinafter Rttv.), the Országos Rádió és Televízió Testület (National Radio and Television Board – ORTT) made the following resolution in the case of the Kossuth Rádió station (Budapest, 1088 Bródy Sándor u. 5–7.), part of the Magyar Rádió Rt. (Hungarian Radio Broadcasting Co.):

The ORTT declared that the broadcasted *Vasárnapi újság* program regularly violates

§ 3. (2) and (3), § 4. (1), § 23. (1) and (2) of the Rttv.

Therefore, under § 112. (1) b) of the Rttv, the ORTT established the violation of law via a written notice and ordered the broadcaster to discontinue such practices immediately and refrain from future violations.

No administrative appeal is possible against this resolution. However, a review by the courts can be applied for within 30 days of receiving the resolution.

## REASONING

In resolution No. 108412000. (XII. 13.), the ORTT ordered an investigation into the program entitled *Vasárnapi újság* (*Sunday News*) on Kossuth Rádió.

Upon investigation the ORTT established the following:

I) Violation of § 4. (1) and § 23. (2) of Rttv:

The program characteristically presents its topics in a highly biased, limited and controlled manner based on a consistently applied system of notions and arguments, regardless of the fact that a range of topics are discussed on the program. The most striking feature of the program is that the topics are always presented in accordance with the above mentioned system of notions and arguments thus making it impossible to provide objective information for its audience.

The program conveys a certain worldview that limits it to presenting topics from one angle and there is little or no room for voicing counter-arguments. The makers of the program present the information they regard as valid (disregarding other points of view) with a conviction that excludes even the remotest possibility of representation of other viewpoints in the program.

In addition to the above, sometimes openly and sometimes in an allusive fashion, the program discriminates against the minorities it targets. No representatives of the minorities presented negatively are offered a chance to make counter arguments or voice opposing opinions to those presented in the program.

The ORTT found that, as suggested by the reasoning above, the program does not meet the high standards required of public service as the biased and one-sided manner of the presentation of its themes doesn't allow balanced information to be broadcast. Furthermore, given its public service function, Magyar Rádió Rt. should take particular care to protect the delicate balance between minority and minority, as well as between minority and majority. However, this program seems to increase the tensions that, unfortunately, exist among these groups.

The ORTT established that the broadcaster's program entitled *Vasárnapi újság*, in its entirety, violates regularly the § 4. (1) and § 23. (2) of Rttv:

*Under § 4. (1) of Rttv:*

"Information relating to domestic and international situations, events and disputes holding public interest is to be presented from various angles, factually, up-to-date, objectively and in a balanced manner."

*Under § 23. (2) of Rttv:*

"The public service broadcaster and public program provider shall provide regular, exhaustive, unbiased, authentic and precise information about domestic and international events of public interest, as well as events, contexts, issues impacting on the lives of people living in the broadcasted areas and characteristic opinions of these events and issues, including differing viewpoints. In the course of providing this service, the public broadcaster and program provider shall see that information of public interest, not mentioned in § 137, is broadcasted."

The tone and ideology of the program violates media law.

This also coincides with the one-sidedness mentioned earlier as it is manifest in the presentation and discussion of race, nations etc., and, in fact, it increases the program's potential for causing hatred. It is not the use of certain words and expressions (for example reference to person's religion) that is objectionable but the fact that the program becomes one-sided in the discussion of themes related to these expressions and strengthens the prejudices already present in society.

It is the "you-know-what-I-mean" inferences based on prejudices that makes the information potential for inciting hatred. Merely the fact that somebody's Jewish origin is mentioned is obviously not a cause for inciting hatred. Legally, ethnic origin is considered as "specific data" and, in individual cases, the handling of such data is beyond the powers of the ORTT. At the same time though, use of the title "Jews torture Jews" is obviously not just a mere description of the affected persons' faith, but suggests that the members of the group it refers to, did not even show mercy towards one another (alluding to most basic prohibitions in civilized groups). Considering in addition to this the fact, that in each of the programs the ORTT reviewed there appeared a topic related to the selling off of Hungary to foreigners and linking this concept to Israel, Jews and the Jewish nation, it becomes quite clear that the *Vasárnapi újság* can incite hatred.

It was also found upon inspection that the program spreads prejudiced views against Roma and other ethnic groups, as well as other minorities (such as the gay community), even though this is not done as frequently as in relation to the people of Jewish faith or origin.

...

During the inspection period, the ORTT found the following violations of law that support the above conclusions:

October 1, 2000

After an interview conducted by Gábor Báthory with Dr. László Grespik dealing with foreign purchases of real estate in Hungary, the anchorman quoted data on purchases of apartments by Israeli, Austrian and US citizens. At the end of the program, phone-calls from listeners were cited. One of the callers commented on the issue of foreign ownership of Hungarian real estate. The caller's comment had implicitly anti-Semitic overtones but the actual statements he made, word for word, could not be described as anti-Semitic. The information provided by the program served as a foundation, from which the caller drew this conclusion for himself: *'the Hungarian real estate market is dominated by Jews, it is vital to make use of restrictions and measures that are taken are interpreted as anti-Semitic by others.'* The statement is characteristic of anti-Semitic rhetoric.

...

October 15, 2000

In the introduction to the October 15, 2000 edition of the program, the anchorman (Gábor Báthory) drew a parallel between the "double standards" in Hungary, as he described the situation here and the killing of a Palestinian boy in Israel. The premise of this rhetoric was to express that the Jewish minority enjoys unfair advantages in Hungary. Different rules and laws apply for this group, which puts the majority at a disadvantage, just as in the Arab-Israeli conflict. According to the anchorman, not just the Jewish minority but homosexuals too are in the same advantaged position in Hungary.

...

The ORTT established that ... in the cases described above, statements offending the given minorities were made, such that the program could cause hatred in those listening against these groups. The program provider thus violated § 3 (2) of Rttv.

October 15, 2000

In an interview dealing with the past of Budapest based lawyer Dr. Miklós Bauer, former lieutenant-colonel of the ÁVH,<sup>1</sup> the religion of Mr. Bauer and

---

<sup>1</sup> The ÁVH/ÁVO (State Defense Authority) was the Hungarian KGB in the 1950s.

other affected people was mentioned without justification. (The title of the interview was *The past of Miklós Bauer or Jews tortured Jews*). The journalist (Pál Lakatos) and the interviewee (Dr. Kálmán Pécsi) mentioned the religion of several affected people.

...

The ORTT found that in the above case, the program provider seriously violated § 3. (3) of Rttv, as the title of the interview expressed a negative judgment and though the intentionally provocative questions of the interviewer, Pál Lakatos, the interview could have no other aim than to portray the Jewish minority negatively.

September 24. 2000

A news item from September 13, 1910 was read out in *Zenés Kalendárium* (Calendar of Music) and was commented on by the editor. The commentary related to an investment made by foreign investors and the Jewish community: *“Ninety years ago, on September 13, 1910, the Budapesti Hírlap wrote the following: ‘A celebration was held in the main church of the Israelite community of Buda. The community celebrated the exhumation and transfer of the remains of Mózes Kunitzer, the first famous Chief Rabbi of Buda and his successor, Chief Rabbi Schwab from the Szabolcs Street Jewish cemetery to the one on Kozma Street. At the celebration, Chief Rabbi, Dr. Arnold Kiss praised the honorable memory of Kunitzer and Schwab, and then Rabbi Bertalan Edelstein said a prayer for the souls of the late rabbies.’ Just to note an interesting fact, on the site of the Szabolcs Street cemetery there used to be a market and now an expensive shopping mall is being constructed by foreign investors.”*

The ORTT found that the lines quoted above are classic examples of the violation of § 3. (3), as the event that took place in the early 20th century has no current news value and, judging by the commentary, the anchorman could have no other aim than to offend the Jewish minority and to present the subject (the construction of a shopping mall) in a racial context.

Under § 3. (3) of Rttv “The program providers’ services cannot be aimed at offending or discriminating against any minority or majority openly or in implicitly, nor can it present and judge minorities or majorities on a racial basis.”

On the basis of the above, the ORTT considers that the Vasárnapi újság program series by Kossuth Rádió regularly commits serious violations of § 3 (2) and (3), § 4 (1) and § 23 (1) and (2) of Rttv; and therefore, it declares in a writ-

ten notice that violations of said laws have taken place. It also orders the program provider to discontinue the practice of violating the law and to refrain from doing so in the future.

Under § 136 (2) of Rttv, no administrative appeal is admissible against this resolution. Under § 136 (3) of Rttv, the affected party may appeal for a review of the case in court.

Budapest, June 13, 2001.

On Behalf of the National Radio and Television Board  
Dr. János Wéber  
Rotating Chairman of the Meeting

**“Although neither a rebuttal nor a call for direct political action, this volume does have a purpose; it has not been produced for its own sake.**

**Our main objective was to document public discourse in Hungary today. Moreover, we wished to revive the tradition of anti-Semitism reports associated with the name of Stephen Roth. Thirdly, we would like to continue to present, on a regular basis, systematic documentation of anti-Semitic discourse in Hungary and provide a reliable basis for further analysis.**

**Finally, our hope is to initiate the kind of discussions of anti-Semitic discourse – its size, prevalence, salient characteristics, limits – that make a dispassionate treatment of the phenomenon possible.**

**One thing we can already say with certainty: words do not vanish, they live on and those who utter them can be made to answer for them no matter how much time has gone by.**

**The space for irresponsible speech may become a little smaller.”**

**ANDRÁS GERÔ**