

ANTI-SEMITIC
DISCOURSE
IN HUNGARY
IN 2002-2003

ANTI-SEMITIC DISCOURSE IN HUNGARY IN 2002-2003

Report and Documentation

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

"It is not easy and not pleasant to see into this deep heinousness, but I believe we must take a look at it, because whatever could take place yesterday may happen again tomorrow, perhaps to us or to our children."

(Primo Levi: *The Drowned and the Saved*.
(Budapest: Európa Könyvkiadó, 1990) p. 63.

This is the third volume of our collection of essays entitled *Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary*. After the first collection of articles about the year 2000 and the second one about 2001, we have now compiled one volume for 2002 and 2003.

After the reception of the first two volumes, the organizer of the documentation efforts which begun in 1999 and the editor of this series, the Budapest Lodge of B'nai B'rith, became convinced that documentation and the reports made and published are necessary and important. Many people believe that the mirror we held up to Hungarian society provided an important portrait of an era as well as a diagnosis. It seems we have not worked in vain and the mirror we are holding is not distorting: one can recognize a number of phenomena in Hungary at the turn of the millennium. We pointed out in the first two volumes and have continued to emphasize that the language used in anti-Semitic speech in Hungarian public writing and/or "orations" is a peculiarly coded one. Anti-Semitism and anti-Judaism, which can unmistakably be felt in these texts, appears in devious sentence structures, in obliquely expressed, and sometimes references transposed multiple times. Whenever this concealed meaning is exposed, it generally triggers some pseudo-indignation and objection from people using this language, saying: we are not anti-Semites! We did not say that, but you see, Jews – and Jew-hirelings – cry anti-Semitism for anything! (See, for instance, the article published in the August 9, 2001 issue of *Magyar Fórum*, given the untranslatable title *Zsidózakata* ["Jewish rattling"].)

Despite the fact that anti-Judaism is veiled, these texts carry a clear message, understandable for everyone. The repeated appearance of century-long elements of anti-Semitism in 19th and 20th century Hungary is much in evidence in allusions, names and references. A good example is an event discussed in this book, namely, the Hungarian Justice and Life Party's (MIÉP) wreath-laying in Tiszaeszlár. Those to whom Tiszaeszlár, the village where the 1882 blood libel case happened, means nothing (especially if they don't live in Hungary) will not understand MIÉP's symbolic act. (For this and other reasons it is difficult to translate the encoded anti-Semitism written in Hungarian into any other language.)

We strive to include all relevant communication heard in public or broadcast in the media into the database of documents forming the basis of B'nai B'rith's publications on anti-Semitic public discourse, and collect all written material that primarily appears in the press and subsequently on the Internet. (We do not follow Internet forums where, under the cover of anonymity, anti-Jewish hatred sometimes breaks out with such crushing force that it makes one wonder if anything has changed in people's head after the Holocaust on this matter.)

The limited size of this volume, which has been compiled from part of the documentation, will not allow for the discussion of every single phenomenon of the period in question. Our goal is to point out characteristic events of the period. We aspire to avoid repeating ourselves, so we do not make comments on and "dismiss" cases that would involve response to repeated racist manifestations of the same persons or periodicals. However, in some other cases – for instance, in the case of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. – we deemed it important to recall and continue the account of events, especially because in this latter issue the developments also had implications on Hungarian legislation in 2003.

During the preparations of this material, covering two years, we found that, firstly, the number of openly anti-Semitic manifestations decreased after the 2002 parliamentary elections, and, secondly, that it was pushed back to certain well-definable forums of public life. We thought that if our goal was documentation – as it is –, we also had to document reduction in anti-Semitic discourse. Unfortunately, we still had abundant "source material" available.

Recent events such as the street demonstration turning into an open anti-Semitic demonstration in front of Tilos Radio's building¹ in early 2004 imply that the positive change of sentiments was temporary. It became proven again that dormant anti-Semitic feelings might be warmed up by using any kind of excuse under the appropriate circumstances and with the contribution of "adept" speakers, and anti-Jewish emotions – in the strictest sense of the word – can be ignited² (The case will be discussed in more detail in our next volume documenting anti-Semitic discourse in 2004.)

*

In the Foreword to our previous volume we quoted some lines of appreciation written by Professor Randolph L. Braham about our work. We are citing from

¹ This media law case was not finally closed at the time of editing this volume.

² After the speeches held at the demonstration, some participants set Israel's national flag on fire and burnt it, but – obviously – not as a sign of objection to Israel's politics.

another work this year. A distinguished person published his essay on the Holocaust at a distinguished place, including his opinion on our book. The following quotation is from György Poszler's³ writing entitled *Hát értik ezt?* (Who can understand this?) (*Vigilia*, Budapest, 2003/7, pp. 528–530):

“Two collections of documentary essays: Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary in 2000 and the same in 2001. And another collection of essays: *Túl a bûnön és bûnhódésen* (Beyond crime and punishment) by Jean Améry.⁴ I've been mulling over them for half a year...

...these books evoke demons. It's worth summing up a few elements from them. They point out that in 2000 and 2001 the voice which used to be more tentative and sporadic became stronger and more frequent. That is, a kind of turn took place in public discourse. Its carriers are certain newspapers and radio programs, almost creating a sense of specialization. There are also selections of texts and quotations. These selections are the most astonishing, yet most convincing parts of the two volumes. Also, there are bibliographies of “literature” republished in recent years. The authors range from “classical theoreticians” to “classical practitioners”, e.g. from Henry Ford to Ferenc Szálati. And from good-humored, “patriarchal” anti-Semites of the day before yesterday to ill-humored, anti-patriarchal murderers of yesterday. There are references to earlier myths of blood libels and subsequent hysteria of Freemasonry. They discuss the spectacular scandals of recent years... . An intensifying tendency in all this is the contraposition of “us” and “them”, and then on to explicitly worded exclusion. (...) The tone has progressively degraded. It would be worth – and there's an attempt for – comparing these texts with the phraseology and metaphors of the extreme right-wing press of 60 years ago. The books are becoming ever thicker. It is probably not the length of the analysis but the size of the material to be processed that grows. What will the next volume be like?”

Here it is. This is what it's like.

Dr Tibor Szeszlér

*On Behalf of the Executive Board of the B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge
Budapest, March 2004*

³ György Poszler: member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, university professor, aesthete and literature historian.

⁴ Budapest: Mûlt és Jövô Kiadó, 2002.

ANDRÁS GERŐ

FIVE QUESTIONS – FIVE ANSWERS

We have followed the developments of anti-Semitic discourse in Hungary since 2000. The time that has passed and the publication of this present volume are bound to raise some questions.

Question One: Has anti-Semitic discourse subsided or increased since 2000?

The answer is apparently simple and unambiguous, but in fact there is no real good answer to the question.

On first appearances, it would seem that it has subsided. It has, because – as it became apparent from our previous books – some institutionalized hubs of anti-Semitic discourse have disappeared and others were moved to the periphery of politics. *Pannon Radio* has practically ceased to exist, and the Hungarian Justice and Life Party was voted out of Parliament in the 2002 elections. This means that the institutionalized element that many instances of anti-Semitic rhetoric could be associated with before 2002 disappeared both from the radio and from Parliament.

However, the answer becomes less unambiguous if we consider that anti-Semitic discourse appears in other public channels in a tone stronger than before. Readers and browsers of various Internet forums will often meet content and linguistic structures which, either openly or in an encoded form, fall into the category of anti-Semitic discourse. Obviously, appearance on the Internet has a different quality than presence in Parliament, yet it definitely qualifies as publicity reaching beyond the private sphere. It is worth mentioning here that this collection of essays, in accordance with its philosophy, does not deal with private discourse, which could not be researched easily anyway. The subject of scrutiny is public rather than private discourse.

Nonetheless, trying to answer the original question leads to a real methodological problem which cannot be solved easily.

Question Two: Should we examine Internet forums?

If we wish to perceive the spread of anti-Semitic discourse, the answer is unequivocal: yes, Internet forums must be included in our examination and research.

However, this affirmative answer will again raise serious methodological problems which can hardly be solved in a fair way. Some topics surface, then

disappear, and often cannot be traced. They are temporary and volatile manifestations. Often we don't know whether there is one person or several people behind an entry, which obviously influences the handling and evaluation of a given source. Since people appear anonymously on Internet forums (hiding behind pseudonyms, which is a general feature of these forums), it cannot be ascertained whether their comments actually reflect their opinions or are simple intellectual provocations.

Another aspect to consider is the difficulty to grasp the full spectrum of Internet discourse: it requires rather extensive research, which then necessitates unconventional methods in source exploration. In short, changes should be made to the methods of document gathering in accordance with the changing structures of communication, but for the time being we have no adequate solution to handle the problem either in terms of content or methodology.

Question Three: Is anti-Semitic identity included in anti-Semitic discourse?

The answer here is a simple and clear 'no': people engaging in anti-Semitic discourse do not regard themselves anti-Semitic, and refuse such identity in public. On the other hand, others regard people using anti-Semitic rhetoric as anti-Semites and associate such identity with them.

In the approach taken by this book, this problem is sensed, but the present effort does not interpret itself in this dimension. It is a real issue why and to what extent the image of someone developed by themselves and by others are different. To us, however, the relevant problem is not this, but the manifestations and use of anti-Semitic discourse in public. Others can research the differences between self-image and the image formulated about one's self-image with different research methods, and the analysis of anti-Semitic discourse might be necessary for such a research. Consequently, we won't say how strong anti-Semitism is today in Hungary. This is not the question we pose, which means that we don't have an answer to a question we never asked. We only believe that without mapping out anti-Semitic discourse it is not possible to answer other questions either.

Question Four: Do we have to repeat ourselves?

Again, the answer seems easy: we don't have to repeat ourselves. If, for instance, in our previous volumes we analyzed *Magyar Fórum*'s manifestations that fit in the anti-Semitic discourse, there is no point in doing it again.

Nonetheless, our intention to avoid repeating ourselves does not mean that – for instance, again – the magazine mentioned above is not engaged in the same rhetoric for which we have already analyzed it. The fact that a topic is not

included among these studies does not have any further implications. It could have, but it does not have now. Anti-Semitic discourse, in a few cases, shows continuity manifested in institutionalization as well. However, it is sufficient to indicate continuity, and it does not need to be analyzed each time.

Question Five: Do we tell everything?

Yes, we tell everything that we deem to be important. However, it became obvious from the answers given above that these studies and the source base do not encompass the entirety of anti-Semitic discourse. What we don't know, we don't want to know.

Here is everything that we think is important, without being fully comprehensive.

Documents and analyses from us – and conclusions made by readers.

This is what we want and what we do. Neither more and nor less.

(Translated by Andrea Megyes)

JUDIT CSÁKI

“AUSCHWITZ BY THE MINUTE”

Reflections on the Anti-Semitism Discourse Surrounding Nobel Prizewinner Imre Kertész's Reception in Hungary

The biggest shame in all of this – for Hungarians, for non-Hungarians, for Jews, for non-Jews, in other words all of us – is that there is any kind of reflection on the anti-Semitic discourse surrounding Nobel prize-winner Imre Kertész's Hungarian reception. Not because being an anti-Semite is shameful, but rather because Imre Kertész's Nobel prize was taken out of its own self-evident context by both the left and the right – anti-Semites and non-anti-Semites – and became entangled in the realm of the anti-Semitism debate.

Throughout all of this, it appears that being an anti-Semite is in fact a shameful thing. This becomes evident – to stay on theme – because the authors of the various somewhat anti-Semitic, openly stated or coded, intentional or unintentional, racist publications try in a myriad of ways to shake off the accusation (perhaps even before being accused) of anti-Semitism. They try to prove the opposite in colorful ways from “I have Jewish friends,” to the enigmatic “actually I like Jews.”

IMRE KERTÉSZ, HUNGARIAN WRITER

This is already a tricky question. “It was announced early yesterday afternoon in the Swedish capital that Hungarian writer Imre Kertész has received this year's Nobel prize,” reported Norbert Haklik in the newspaper *Magyar Nemzet* after the prize was announced.¹ “Hungarian writer Imre Kertész has received the Nobel prize,” wrote András Bencsik.² The first report – which itself came from a report from the “Swedish capital” – contained a completely appropriate formulation, as did every Czech, French, English and every *foreign* press release. If this plain adjectival construction appears in a writing in Hungary, however, it

¹ Norbert Haklik, “Kertész Imre Nobel-díjat kapott” (Imre Kertész Received the Nobel Prize), *Magyar Nemzet*, October 11, 2002: 1.

² András Bencsik, “Magyar diadal (Hungarian Triumph)”, *Magyar Demokrata*, October 17, 2002.

has very simple – if not anti-Semitic, then at least differentiating – undertones, or also very simple – provocative – aims. Bencsik’s writing was an example of the former, while Gáspár Miklós Tamás provides a sample of the latter: “Hungarian writer Imre Kertész has won the Nobel prize. He is Jewish.”³ Here TGM* – as everyone understands – is translating the above context so that “Hungarian” evidently means “Jewish.”

András Bencsik quotes a part of TGM’s article where TGM quotes from one of Kertész’s statements – which Bencsik quoted at nearly every forum that can be called right-wing – although it was not actually Kertész’s statement, but rather taken from one of his works (this type of confusion later becomes chronic): “Why is it such a provocative claim to be a ‘Hungarian writer’? Obviously because I’m not. (...) Because what is this supposed to mean? Something like: even though I’m not a ‘Hungarian writer’ accept me as a Hungarian writer and let me be one, too...”⁴ Bencsik claims that he would gladly accept and allow Kertész to be anything he chooses, and clearly among Hungarians: “There are some who do not want to see the understanding, loving respect and – indeed – acknowledging affiliation surrounding this unparalleled and indisputably honored occasion, but rather look at it as a vengeful, scornful reckoning and exclusive victory.”⁵ “Some who do not want to see...” here clearly refers to TGM in the previously mentioned article.

Throughout his article, Bencsik deems Kertész’s Nobel prize as a remarkable, joyous occasion.

Many, however, have called Kertész’s Hungarianness into question. At the end of his own work, Zoltán Szőcs straightforwardly asks: “so who will be the first Hungarian to receive the Nobel prize and when?”⁶ Szőcs has a relatively simple formula; he has no hidden thoughts to hunt for, and nothing is hidden or coded. According to him, the Hungarian media “nearly passed out from singing his praises” when covering Kertész’s Nobel prize. To put it simply: the writer hates all of this fuss with Kertész, the Nobel prize and Jewishness all in one. He obviously hates Kertész as a Jew because he is an anti-Semite, and as a writer because he, Szőcs, only chooses to read books based on racial sympathy or

³ Gáspár Miklós Tamás, *Magyar Hírlap*, October 11, 2002: 11.

* Tamás Gáspár Miklós, philosopher and writer, is usually referred to as “TGM” in the Hungarian press.

⁴ Imre Kertész, *Valaki más* (Someone Else) (Budapest: Magvető, 1997) 113.

⁵ Bencsik, *ibid.*

antipathy. Szőcs only read one book by Kertész, *Someone Else*, and this is the first and last one by Kertész in his life – and he opened a not-so-new *Új Magyar Lexikon* (New Hungarian Encyclopedia) under Kertész's name (who does not have an entry there, anyway) only upon hearing about the Nobel prize. But he knows for sure, because he does not know much about Kertész, it means “there isn't much to know about Imre Kertész,” and he knows even better that “Kertész's works give no indication of why he is famous.” In addition to all of this, Szőcs is quite irritated because, according to him, “Auschwitz comes to Kertész's mind always, everywhere about everything.” But there is also the “Auschwitz by-the-minute” and “the writer who has lived in Berlin since the beginning of time” and loves to reminisce among Germans.⁷

(Barely two months later this same writer – when the *Donkey Cart* plagiarism story* was already in full swing – in connection with one of Kertész's statements, seriously proposed the theory that the real Kertész had died in Buchenwald, and that our Imre Kertész had stolen his identity. He unconditionally deduced from this that Kertész had therefore never been in a concentration camp, but I could not find it where Szőcs says that perhaps the dead Kertész had written *Fatelessness*.⁸)

The deep conviction that Kertész is not a Hungarian (writer), is built broadly into a few works of József Hering. “Imre Kertész, a writer from Hungary, received the Nobel prize this year. We could say: finally the Hungarian language, people and nation have been honored with this long-deserved recognition. But we cannot say this because Imre Kertész – contrary to the opinion of the Stockholm award committee – has not presented universal concerns and reflections of mankind in his books written so far, but almost exclusively the emotions surrounding the Jewish fate and fatelessness.⁹ Quite a lot is crammed into these few sentences: the Jewish fate and fatelessness (i.e. the Holocaust) is not a universal concern, nor does it touch all of humankind. Also: Kertész is not Hungarian, at most, Kertész is “from Hungary”; and: the Hungarian language,

⁶ Zoltán Szőcs, “Auschwitz Nobel-díjat kapott (Auschwitz Wins the Nobel Prize)”, *Magyar Fórum*, October 17, 2002.

⁷ Ibid.

* Kertész was accused of plagiarizing a story with this name by an old acquaintance.

⁸ Zoltán Szőcs, “Orvkertészet felső fokon (Garden Poaching at the Highest Level)”, *Magyar Fórum*, December 19, 2002.

⁹ József Hering, “Sikeres téma, sikeres író (Successful Theme, Successful Writer).” *Magyar Fórum*, October 17, 2002.

people and nation have not been honored with the Nobel prize, because obviously this has nothing to do with them.

Hering is especially upset, though perhaps Kertész is not to blame here, that until now we Hungarians could explain our Nobel prize exclusion on the fact that we are a small isolated language, “there is another Jewish language, Yiddish, which is now spoken by even fewer people than Modern Hebrew, yet Isaac Bashevish Singer was awarded the Nobel prize.¹⁰ Naturally, it also smarts that “author Shmuel Yosef Agnon, who wrote in Modern Hebrew, a language much smaller and more isolated than Hungarian, received the Nobel prize in 1966 after marching out themes that even most Israelis found indigestible.” Not only does Hering know exactly what the provincial Shmuel wrote, but he also knows what themes are indigestible for most Israelis. In a similar vein, the work of Nelly Sachs, who was “completely bland,” nevertheless latched onto the Jewish Holocaust theme with great fondness.” (Which could also be reversed to read: “she latched onto the Holocaust theme with great fondness,” but was nevertheless “completely bland.”)¹¹

Hering is also exceptionally knowledgeable about small and/or remote peoples’ literature. He knows that the huge Arabic-based culture “has and had a huge mission in civilization,” and that is why it is unfair that “nevertheless only one Arab writer, Nagib Mahfuz, has ever received the Nobel prize.” But he also knows that among the Palestinians, for example, “contemporary poet Salim Jubran or Mahmud Darwish can talk at least on the same level and with the same credibility about the Palestinian tragedy in Arabic as Kertész talks about the Jewish Holocaust in Hungarian.”

Let’s stop here for a second just to correct this logical leapfrog. Did Imre Kertész deserve the Nobel prize, and would the two Palestinian writers deserve it for the same accomplishments, or would none of them deserve it, since there is nothing universal in their work, only particular subjects? And, if we are to follow this logical leapfrog, what about: “It’s disgusting that writers depicting the Holocausts of other peoples, for example of the Palestinians, the Sudenten Germans or the killing of Hungarians in the last century, on a high literary level cannot receive this increasingly discredited prize.” [Note: Why would you want to receive an increasingly discredited prize?]

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

HOLOCAUST RELATIVISM

Imre Kertész's Nobel prize – according to some highly dubious but nevertheless clear logic – whipped up a renewed wave of Holocaust relativism in a quite small circle, but strongly nonetheless. The representatives of this logic propose it out of fear and caution before “we strong-arm Hungary into a *mea culpa* as Germany was.”¹² István Lovas, for example, – as we find out from an open letter to Péter Bárányi¹³ – had no qualms about spending money in Italy to buy the book *The Illustrated History of Nazi Germany*, where he learned that the number of Jews lost in the Holocaust (“as you know, Hitler didn't commit genocide against the Jews, but just the European Jews”, writes Lovas, and obviously this sentence means “only the European ones” or it means: the European Jews are not the Jews) “is over 5 million and the number of Jews from Hungary lost [sic] is more than 180,000”. They don't say how much more, but it is possible that it is so much more that we get to Kertész's figure of 800,000. The point of this letter is a number, or rather two numbers: that according to the Italian book, there were only 180,000 victims, as opposed to 800,000 for Kertész. According to Lovas, Kertész is lying many times over about the real figure.

The previously mentioned Zoltán Szőcs article, “Auschwitz Wins a Nobel Prize,”¹⁴ can be interpreted as “another Jew got something for his alleged suffering.” In a number of his writings Szőcs dances around carelessly for a long time with his thoughts for and against, but in the end he loses control of his passion. This seems to be fairly automatic.

The best and most telling article of this kind (although it is fairly absurd “of this kind”), in which the “not so hidden intentions” are actually well hidden, plays a significant role in making me see things this way. The article is Domokos György Varga's piece in *Élet és Irodalom* (Life and Literature) magazine,¹⁵ in which he not only willingly admits and establishes that *Fatelessness* is a mas-

¹² István Szelei, “A 'Na és?' relativizmusa: Hogyan kell szembenézni a 'nemzeti felelősségg' mértekével (The Relativism of 'Yeah, so?': How to Face the Weight of 'National Responsibility'), *Magyar Demokrata*, December 5., 2002.

¹³ István Lovas, “Nyílt levél Bárányi Péter igazságügy-miniszternek (Open Letter to Justice Minister Péter Bárányi),” *Magyar Demokrata*, December 12, 2002.

¹⁴ Zoltán Szőcs, “Auschwitz Nobel-díjat kapott (Auschwitz Wins a Nobel prize)”, *Magyar Fórum*, October 17, 2002.

¹⁵ György Varga Domokos, “A feladvány,” (The Problem),” *Élet és Irodalom*, January 10, 2003.

terpiece – “In every way, Imre Kertész’s *Fatelessness* – thank God! – is a masterpiece” – he also proves it through a long analysis with citations, although with an unorthodox logic.¹⁶ The tone of Varga’s writing is muted, even soothing: his goal is to be the moderator between left and right, praising one, even two, liberal journalists, and chastising certain forms of “Hungarianism” and nationalism, and takes a shot at “hard-line warriors” from *Demokrata* magazine. Using a clever literary trick – in a long effusion on the novel – Varga provokes a compassionate reader reflex, not only from sceptical leftists, but even from those who remember his article, written 10 years ago, yearning for a new *numerus clausus* (“in things that effect the life of the majority, I think it is necessary to pay attention to proportions,” *Népszabadság*, April 29, 1990). Then suddenly, he writes: “How can we explain the fact that Germany welcomed Kertész’s Holocaust literature, and that the way to the Nobel prize surely ran through the German publisher of his books and through the publisher’s recommendations, whereas in Hungary not even the left-liberal groups, who are normally interested in promoting the fight against anti-Semitism, showed any special interest in putting Kertész and his works at the center of attention for its value and volume. It is a fact that not even winning the Kossuth prize was enough to make the disturbed (in their emotional and spiritual worlds) Hungarians discuss and argue over the writer and the topic on either side. Just as if one side would not have seen a timely, easily exploitable possibility (political business) in it, and the other side would have lacked an inclination to have their noses rubbed in the most Godless and greatest sin: that the Jews were carried away and murdered.”

What Varga means is that Hungary, as such, is not interested in keeping up the memory of the Holocaust, it is only the “left-liberal groups,” meaning the Jews themselves and Jew-lovers.

The reason that no wide-ranging debate emerged about Kertész and his work is that the Jewish and the liberal side did not notice the business opportunity in it, and the right wing did not want the label of a “guilty nation”. Here, the roles are handed out in an anti-Semitic way: the one side profits from the memory of Auschwitz, while the other side is scared of being found guilty (Although they are not – that is how we should understand it.)

Varga respects and thinks highly of Kertész, who has said, announced and written many times, that he is not happy in Hungary, and especially: he does not feel at home in Hungary. “We could actually tell him, then why are you here, go

¹⁶ In a section below I analyze Hungarian teacher Kálmán Szabó’s critique.

home to Israel! – but what would be the point to get rid of someone who is truthful, frank and upstanding, when nowadays people like this are as rare as a four-leaf clover among Jews and Hungarians (and Jewish Hungarians). Not to mention a Nobel prizewinner.” This can also be taken to mean: Kertész could be sent *home* to Israel, since as a Jew that is his home. This is a typical anti-Semitic mentality: it is *self-evident* that he, Varga, is at home.

György Petőcz replied to Varga in the following way: “Just to keep it simple, let’s accept from Varga that the left-liberals (or the Jews or anybody else) use the memory of the Holocaust opportunistically, for a one-sided, very concrete advantage. Which means they profit from history, using it as a tool in the political and cultural war with the nationalists. Fine. But what kind of moral or historical logic, when referring to the injuries, interests and truths of today, suggests that the past or history could be used to defend the opportunistic left-liberalists, and that we can expose the truth of the ostracized and their ostracizers? I ask: can *today’s* manipulations by the descendants of those ostracized in the past – to follow the simplistic logic of the right – justify the *past actions* of the one-time ostracizers? What kind of influence do the arguments, injuries, understandings or misunderstandings of today have when thinking about the moments of Jewish genocide or the path that led there? When thinking about 1944, what does it mean that ‘*the guilty are also victims, if they are victims, and the victims are also guilty if they are guilty*’”? Is not Kertész instead correct when he says, in the case of Auschwitz, that ‘*not for a second can good and bad be confused*’ (see his Nobel prize speech)? What could possibly absolve those who passed the Jewish laws, loaded the freight cars or opened the gates to the gas chambers? Or ‘*Auschwitz has become the mythological symbol of the breach of contract. (...) the Holocaust is a symbol for the absolute breech of contract-law, and as such, drives us back precisely to the complete violation of the original Law, the Contract*’, which Ágnes Heller writes in relation to Kertész (*The Holocaust as Culture*). How can we compare this whole Hungarian hubbub over political integrity and the momentary injuries and ridiculous daily rope-pull of our political elite, with this very different level of Law and violation of law? How can we compare these formulated short-term truths in the political battle of the day, made up in response to the other side’s momentary tricks, slight-of-hand, and hypocrites, with the ‘absolute values’ that should also encompass Varga’s ‘common coordinate system?’ Shouldn’t we separate the daily struggles of political correctness and cultural wars from the moral and historical examination of the Holocaust from an emotional and analytical perspective as well? Varga mixes

the two levels in an unacceptable way, making any kind of clear perspective impossible. This is the major failure of his article.”¹⁷

Domokos György Varga is not nearly alone in saying what György Petőcz points out: that any kind of – moral, political or existential – poor decision or behavior of a descendent of the Jewish victims does not establish the innocence of the one-time excluders.

THE HUNGARIAN SWEDE

Károly Antal Tóth is not the least bit Swedish, but he is very Hungarian. It is true that he lives in Sweden – which, fortunately for him, no one rubs in his face. However, Kertész is blamed for spending his fellowship time in Germany, even though he lives in Hungary, which is an eloquent testimony to how relativism can be applied to more than just the Holocaust.

Tóth gave his first article – which we will analyze now – the title *Nobelesdi* (The Nobel Game), which appeared first on the Internet, and was later published by *Havi Magyar Fórum* (Hungarian Monthly Forum).¹⁸ Géza Szőcs, his one-time fellow warrior, reacted to this¹⁹ – actually to the Internet version – and Károly Antal Tóth soon responded (who tried to have his response letter also published in *Népszava*, but after the newspaper refused the missive, it first appeared on the Magyar Nemzet online website).²⁰ In the end, Tóth summarized the fight among Swedish Hungarians that resulted from the original article.

Tóth started his first article with a touching story of a Doctor Stern and his family, who died in a concentration camp, but “even today (...) I count them among my lost loved ones.” Thus, following his writing’s logic, there are Jews he loved and mourned, and therefore “I do not understand what the recent Nobel prizewinner Imre Kertész, who, according to an announcement in October said that ‘Hungary still hasn’t faced up (...) to the Holocaust question,’ wants from me.”²¹ Of course Hungary has faced up to it, alleges Tóth. At this point – in place of my own words – I quote from the response by Géza Szőcs: “You do not understand –

¹⁷ Petőcz, ibid.

¹⁸ Károly Antal Tóth, “Nobelesdi (the Nobel Game)”, *Havi Magyar Fórum*, March 2003.

¹⁹ Géza Szőcs, “Nobelesdi (The Nobel Game),” *Népszava*, February 13, 2003: 7.

²⁰ Károly Antal Tóth, “Válasz Szőcs Gézának (Answer to Géza Szőcs),” *Havi Magyar Fórum*, May 2003.

²¹ Károly Antal Tóth, “Nobelesdi (the Nobel Game)”, *Havi Magyar Fórum*, March 2003. 03.

you write – what Imre Kertész wants from you, when he says that Hungary has not yet faced up to the question of the Holocaust, rejecting the reaction regarding it.

You claim that you don't know anybody who wouldn't know or feel the tragedy of the Holocaust.

Um.

And if Kertész was not just thinking of your acquaintance? If perhaps he knows others who think differently? (Or do not know it, or do not feel it.) But I don't think that is the question. Rather it is whether the nation has truly probed its conscience with a cathartic, absolving and redeeming result, that 'everyone' – the entire nation – 'knows and feels' the Holocaust tragedy.

You think that this probing of the conscience actually has happened (or didn't need to happen).

And Kertész thinks it hasn't happened, although it should have. I think we're not wrong to say that this is what he wants from you. And from others as well.²²

To this, Károly Antal Tóth responds: "According to you it is not enough for people to know and feel the tragedy of the Holocaust. You say that the question is 'whether the nation has truly probed its conscience with a cathartic, absolving and redeeming result, that 'everyone' – the entire nation – 'knows and feels the Holocaust tragedy.' You have adopted the opinion of what Kertész expects Hungary to do. Which in essence means a collective probing of conscience, and when we see how seriously guilty we are, the cathartic experience of the common guilt will have a liberating effect. This cannot be a one-time event, because the sin that has been committed once has spread to the entire nation and clearly passes from one generation to the next, and therefore every generation has to go through this cleansing process to relieve the burden of the Holocaust.

Tell me, Géza, do you really think it is fair and human to expect our nation to feel collective guilt and sin? Is there any basis at all? Especially since most people today were not alive at that time, and only a tiny minority of the population at the time had real responsibility for what happened. It is not enough for you to feel sympathy and anger in knowing the events of the past, but rather you want to subject our nation to the humiliation of never-ending guilt? You just want the best, I'm sure, in saying that every repetition of remorse aids the cleansing process. And you call me crazy."²³

²² Géza Szőcs, "Nobelesdi (The Nobel Game)," *Népszava*, February 13, 2003: 7.

²³ Károly Antal Tóth, "Válasz Szőcs Gézának (Answer to Géza Szőcs)," *Havi Magyar Fórum*, May 2003.

Tóth – not only in this case – twists Géza Szôcs's words around: probing the conscience and facing up became “permanent collective sin and (never-ending) guilt.” It is only important to mention this because most of the responses to Kertész's statements (at least to those that dealt with this topic) follow in the same vein: rejecting the vision of a permanently guilty and sinful nation (although neither Kertész, nor anyone else, expected this from anybody) and rejecting the necessity of facing up and dealing with it. This refutation exists widely in the published works: those who think that there is nothing even to face up to (Holocaust denial) usually write that whatever this thing was good for, that much we've already faced up to. Not to mention that we would be better off facing up to the murders of the Bolshevik dictatorship (Holocaust relativism) and many of them think that if they think of all of this as sad and tragic [whether honestly and internally convinced or because of social expectations (?)], the facing up and responsibility and all of that, that we are done with it on a collective level. I do not believe that this last point – make no mistake – is anti-Semitism (although whoever thinks this way could also be an anti-Semite, like Tóth), but instead shows the retarded level of social awareness.

In Tóth's first writing his intentions are to give a literary critique of Kertész's works and a spiritual analysis of Kertész's mentality. The literary critique portion – from which the following quotes are taken – shows in great detail another typical phenomenon: the desire that critics debate the literary value of the works, especially *Fatelessness*, and therefore the legitimacy of the Nobel prize. They – because there are many of them – act as if their critical activities would not be influenced by the anti-Semitism that is pushed into the background in these cases, but nevertheless motivates the entire action – whether this concealment, that is anti-Semitism, is conscious or not. What is clearly not conscious with any of them is that their expectations and numerous criticisms of his work follow the canons of the last decade of Social-Realist criticism, obviously because it is the only system these literary quacks are familiar with.

Let's look at Tóth's example, quoting Imre Kertész about the writing aspects of *Fatelessness*, and elsewhere – for example, in *Gályanapló* (Galley Diary) – Tóth confronts the novel on these counts. “In the sense of the previously mentioned writing principles, we would expect that the method of formulation and editing would help us to *better feel this horror*²⁴ that we call deportation and

²⁴ All of the italics was added by the author, J. Cs.

concentration camp, and, for example, the German soldiers, who are the guards, are going to have an *atmosphere more appropriate to their roles*. Instead, we can read things like: on the train with the deportees, the 'military police were also there, armed, sullen and buttoned-up to the chin, like they are overseeing tempting goods that they are not allowed to touch, and I thought that it was probably because of an even higher authority: the Germans.' The protagonist, György Köves, arrives in Auschwitz after the Germans saved him from the Hungarian military police, and this is what he says about the SS soldiers he sees: "I can say that I didn't find them threatening at all: they were walking up and down at ease, making their rounds from column to column. They answered questions, they were nodding hello, and they even patted some of us on the back or shoulder." He felt trust immediately with the doctor who chooses whether the new arrivals are sent to the work camp or to the gas chamber, because he had a neat appearance and kind eyes. The following sentence proves the disjointed *relationship between content and style*, and (to put it lightly) the *unusual morality* of the *hero*: 'In the meantime – I hear – they are pretty nice to them [the prisoners], they are surrounded with caring and love. The children are playing ball and are singing, and the place where they have them gassed is between a pretty lawn, a park and a flower bed: and that is why it gave me the feeling this is some kind of joke, like a student prank.' About this, we cannot really say anything else but that this is *not the writing of a person with normal feelings*.

In the spring of 1945 Buchenwald was liberated, and the hero returned home to Budapest. *It never occurred to him to thank God for his freedom*, or his sickness, because of which he did not have to work for months while lying in a hospital where he meets people (captives) who help him to miraculously stay alive. Instead he feels hatred towards everyone and *unjustly accusing* the Jews he knows who were not taken away to the camps. Reading all of his books, we can be sure, even if he denies the connections, that this is Imre Kertész's autobiography.

Actually *all of his works are full of a lack of love*, as if the feeling of love would be unknown to him. In his eyes, people are like objects, most of the time they are too much of a burden, and in the best cases they are useful in some way. In his entire life's work, there is only one character who he describes with some warmth: his first wife (*The English Flag*), about whom, we learn in an interview, never existed."

The literary quacks who critiqued this book – and here Tóth is not alone – continually confuse fiction with reality and Kertész's statements with his books, which means they are only willing to read *Fatelessness* as non-fiction. They also

fail to understand the basis for Kertész's poetics; that the writer shows and illustrates a completely unacceptable and incomprehensible horror through the absurd narrative style of an accepting, habituated, accustomed and loving(!) narrator, and if a naive reader takes everything literally and factually, the reader will confuse everything and understand nothing. This is how the character Gyuri Köves is confused with Kertész (as an adult today). Tóth quotes (from *Kudarc* [Fiasco]) the opinions of the first literary advisors to reject *Fatelessness*, which he naturally agrees with – and not even this arouses his suspicion as to his ideological and aesthetic grounding and critical methods. He also criticizes the title of the book – and this already belongs to the absurd part of his writing: "in any case, the title of the book is based on a misrepresentation, and probably he only longed to create a stir. I looked up the meaning of the word fate in a number of foreign language dictionaries. It clearly has two meanings: it is either the generally negative development of somebody's life, which is necessary, and thus practically unavoidable, or it is the power that leads our life. All of this means that Kertész's assertion is completely wrong when he says that fate is 'the necessity that comes from our freedom' to decide, whereas fatelessness is when 'we live through a predetermined life imposed upon us as reality' (*Galley Diary*). If he insists on using the word fate, then he should have chosen the title Misfortune or some variation of it."

The writer is on truly slippery ground when he engages in psychology. Maybe he even believes himself when he writes such things as: "the disturbance in his human relationships also appeared early" or that "the personality turning to despair is the breaking down of the emotional life," and "sadistic imagination." Clearly Tóth is already preparing to talk about "hatred," "conscious evil," and "dirty accusations" without any kind of "concealment," "coding" or "circuitous writing" concerning Kertész (i.e. in this respect, presumably Kertész was supposed to talk about the Hungarian consciousness in taking part in the Nazi genocide of the Jews). The dam is giving way and evidence is starting to pile up: with references from an appropriate book that indicate there was an insignificant number of Holocaust victims compared to those in the Gulag, the wide range of Jew-saving actions taken by Horthy, and the actions of the militant Jews to prevent the assimilation of other Jews (by inciting anti-Semitism, and Tóth believes "this goal is reasonable"), all suggests the Jews simply should not assimilate, and under no circumstances should they decide whether they want to be either Jews or Hungarians (or perhaps both) because this should be decided – according to Tóth, I believe – by someone especially qualified, such

as Hungarians like Tóth. And in some cases – if the Jews in question are nice – they will even like them...

After all this we finally get to the point: “Imre Kertész is not a Hungarian writer.” “I wonder why Imre Kertész is actually lying about himself and about us? Perhaps because he is looking to roast his meat *in the flames of Auschwitz*²⁵ in the hopes of walking away with the biggest prize: the Nobel prime rib? But with that he disgraces the memory of millions who do in fact deserve to be memorialized, but by respectful writers and other artists.” In the response to Géza Szőcs’s article²⁶ there is also mention of the undeserved Nobel prize, as well as “there are at least two dozen living writers and poets living in Hungary who are more talented than Kertész.”

Tóth also issued a command to all of the worthy Hungarian writers that: “The Swedish Academy of Sciences deserves, with its ridiculous decision, that in case in the next hundred years a real Hungarian writer receives the award (the main stress is not on Hungarian but on real!) it should be rejected with contempt.”

The affair, meaning Tóth’s article, made more waves than listed here, and these are not insignificant, but they are not pertinent to us here. The Swedish group Stockholmi Magyar Ökumenikus Önképzőkör (Hungarian Ecumenical Scholarly Society of Stockholm) – whose members have largely expressed disdain for Tóth’s article – have rid themselves of him.²⁷

THE CASE OF THE HUNGARIAN TEACHER WITH KERTÉSZ

The subtitle of the two-part article by the Hungarian teacher Kálmán Szabó is “A Nobel Prizewinning Work through the Eyes of a Hungarian Teacher”.²⁸ Its title is “Facelessness.”

²⁵ This italics is also by J.C.

²⁶ Károly Antal Tóth, “Válasz Szőcs Gézának (Answer to Géza Szőcs),” *Havi Magyar Fórum*, May 2003.

²⁷ For ample reference, see: Károly Antal Tóth, “Közleményesdi. Svédországi reakciók Kertész-látletemre (The Publication Game. Reactions in Sweden to my Kertész Diagnosis,” *Havi Magyar Fórum*, July 2003.

²⁸ Kálmán Szabó, “Arctalanság: Egy Nobel-díjas mű a magyartanár szemével (Facelessness: A Nobel Prizewinning Work through the Eyes of a Hungarian Teacher)”, *Magyar Demokrata*, Nos. 51–52. 2002.

At the head of his article is a quotation from an antiquated stylebook by Gusztav Makay (*Teaching Literature*), and obviously has a highly ironic aim: “The teaching of literature is the subject that offers the richest, most adventurous, educating possibilities. (...) Of course, our teaching of literature does not serve just any kind of educational purpose. the historical materialist worldview, socialist patriotism, in tight relationship with social morality.””

It starts with: “Imre Kertesz’s book *Fatelessness* appeared in 1975. No one paid it much notice.” This – and similar assertions, such as nobody at home knew Kertesz, critics did not write about him, his books were not read – is the most common and grossest mistake²⁹ to appear on both sides in connection with Kertesz’s Nobel prize. Szabo only uses this mistake as an ironic (?) springboard, from which, a paragraph later, he leaps into grandiose heights: “presumably, Imre Kertesz is the first and last Holocaust survivor to carve a Nobel prize out of spending one year in a concentration camp.”

It is just like a Hungarian teacher to say something that works on multiple levels. He is claiming an awful lot in this serious concoction. He claims that Kertesz is not a writer – as a Holocaust survivor he did not write a novel, but carved a Nobel prize. The word “carved” (*faragott*) refers to the forced (bungled) work, the goal of which was again not to “craft” a novel, but a prize. Then: the “one year of [concentration] camp life” could be only a factual description of the situation, but it includes belittling (a Nobel prize for just one year?!), “camp life” rhymes with terms like “soldier’s life,” and “student life,” but there is no death in it at all...

At first he stumbles into the title. “Let’s not split hairs. Let’s not pick a fight right away with the title. Let’s not criticize the fact that we don’t even have a word like that. (And then he does split hairs and pick a fight. J. Cs.) There is no point to look for the word ‘fatelessness’ in our dictionaries. Of course we wouldn’t even find ‘fateless’ as a privative adjective because it is simply a meaningless concept, because you can’t make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear. Since if somebody (or something) exists, then it has a fate. Fate goes together with existence.” He confuses grammatical and content criticism: Szabo thinks this word doesn’t exist because it’s not in the dictionary, and it doesn’t matter if we understand it. We don’t want to understand it because it says something that we don’t like. We, as Hungarians.

²⁹ The writer of these lines, for example, dealt with him for the first time at a university seminar in 1976 while studying to become a literature teacher.

"A Hungarian cannot understand this." Let's get past the stupidity of this statement: this is "Jewing." The Jew as language-wrecker. But, for example, István Csurka, the Hungarian, does understand it. He even borrows the word from Kertész, to use it himself as a threatening vision: "Without an intellectual leader who is smart, rooted, one with the people and without power, the nation is sentenced to death. The nation will be strangled and thrown in the grave as everything becomes perfectly regulated and European. Hungarians await their *fatelessness*.³⁰ If they fail to say 'No.'"³¹

Szabó calls our attention to the disproportionate construction of the novel in his role as literary critic. "The book presents camp life in five chapters (226 pages). Although the protagonist *spends three days altogether* in Auschwitz, he devotes two chapters (54 pages) of text to *these three days*. In a similar way, the time he spends reminiscing and on the plot development is thrown out of whack when Gyuri enters the hospital, which the writer introduces in two chapters (82 pages). These *disproportions* also reveal that the novel's history of events are *contrived, far away from the experienced reality of camp life*, and stays *average and colorless*." Using the word "altogether" in reference to Auschwitz is already gross irreverence (either, the way Szabó uses it, he thinks the time Kertész spent there is not enough, or the talking about it is too much, or in a common other context: "altogether only this or that many Jews", etc.). As if there would be a standardized content-length formula: this much time requires this many book pages, whether you are talking about Auschwitz or an excursion to Lake Balaton. According to Szabó, because of this, the story is also contrived, which basically means that the writer just invented the story at his desk. Szabó also knows for sure that "it is far away from the experienced reality of camp life." I would stress that Szabó is not well versed in the reality of camp life (since I assume he does not know anything about it, at least compared to Kertész), but – and this is really absurd – he has such a strong opinion about the reality of camp life experienced by Kertész and he knows it for sure that the story is far from it. But let's go on.

"The writing elements of classical short stories and novels – conflict development, the cathartic experience that results from the tension of the disparate thoughts and plot threads arriving at the climax, the fusion of the introduction

³⁰ Bold added by J.C.

³¹ István Csurka, "Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes)", *Magyar Fórum*, September 4, 2003. This article appeared before the EU referendum, and by the end he was asking the people to vote "no."

and conclusion – are held together by the cohesive strength of the story. *Here you have none of this.*" Considering the object of my article, the considerable professional idiocy of this text in what he says about classical novels, catharsis, and all else, which is also rejected by the majority of the world's literary experts, and happens to be – to put it lightly – a basis of the perspective of Social-Realist literature, is not what is important. It is instead important how Szabó makes it clear that here you have none of this, in order to prevent someone from presuming he can find it. But since serious and anti-Semitic prejudice drives Szabó's pen in his literary criticism as well, that is why it is so important for him that – based on what I consider an outdated perspective that he employs – he makes the work appear poor in all respects. I have to add that not everybody shares this opinion, because most do not dare to tread through the minefields of the literary critic. It is enough for them to accept that the book is good on the basis of an opinion of a well-versed critic, and they are satisfied with criticism hurled at the writer.

Szabó feels the writer failed to include dialogue that could make the otherwise dry topic "more colorful" and could make reading easier because it is difficult this way. In the end he disagrees with the irony, saying that by employing this "joking tone," Kertész undermines the authenticity of camp life."

CONSPIRACY THEORY

"The pressure, threats and intimidation have spread since the Swedish Royal Academy announced the Nobel prize for literature. (...) Clearly it became a question of hegemony and who wears the pants in Hungary."³² István Csurka, the writer of these sentences, strengthens this statement with a strong parallel: "Since the moment of the announcement, and obviously upon command to accept the award in Hungary, the media has acted the same as it did one year earlier to accept the terrorist attack of September 11 in New York. The attack against New York is an attack against all of humanity and against democracy. Whoever does not accept the official American version is the enemy. It was also mandatory to accept the official American version without criticism, and everybody who thought differently was guilty, especially if they dared pick it apart."

³² István Csurka, "Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian Eyes)", *Magyar Fórum*, January 16, 2003.

The media echo of Kertész's Nobel prize and the attack against the WTC in Csurka's perspective must be compared since, evidently, the same lobby demanded both: the Jewish lobby. Of course, Csurka does not say exactly what he wants to say: since, according to him, the media received the command to make readers accept Kertész's Nobel prize and *not* to accept the bombing of the twin towers.

But his answer to the question "*cui prodest?*" is smarter, and is, as we find from Csurka's grandiose and far-reaching trains of thought, to be found in the world order and globalization. "The Nobel prize decision was taken the night before the accession. It was awarded to Kertész, who only writes about the Holocaust. The Nobel prize was given to the Hungarian ruling upper-class, whose members are mostly formerly Jewish-bantering Aczél-cadre, who were the model students in the failed political changes that were needed for accession and also for privatization." The whole group, which is composed of Jews and was responsible for the political changes, received the prize as a reward. And right when they got their reward, the Nobel prize for literature, they immediately started to work on introducing their dictatorship. "With the Nobel prize, Hungarian society is now faced consciously and purposefully with the question of hegemony. Openly. The main ambition of the rulers today is to introduce, in the hours of common joy, means to restrict the freedom of speech and reduce the general liberties that might disrupt their hegemony." There are "commands" and "censorship", with the Nobel prize acting as a field-marshall's baton in the hand of the rulers, who make "500,000 Hungarian smallholders" homeless, they fire people to replace them with their own, rip the antenna of a small broadcaster out of the wall, they vilify a child who shouts something at the prime minister on a country road, slander a small union only because they do not like the name and behavior of its members, just to set an example". They are already preparing the hatred law and the censorship law, "they want to roll back all of the freedoms they were forced to grant in 1989-90 [sic]". Because of Csurka's increasingly theatrical sensibilities, his runaway imagination wins out over the former writer. Even the sentences are bad, for example, "And besides that, they want to make it obvious that the Jewish elite, which already has been in power over the Hungarians, but has not emphasized this quality of theirs, even covered it up, and only pouted if someone noticed it, and now they want to make this dominance obvious."

Tibor Franka writes: "Why is it that more and more Hungarian citizens, parties, civil organizations and we, Hungarian writers, have become suspicious about

Imre Kertész's ethics and professional work, and why does the left protect him so? Let's start from far away. I found out from Hungarians living in Sweden that for a long time there have been problems selling Scandinavian goods. Even the members of the royal family use their personal charm and trips to make Swedish products attractive abroad. Knowing this, the airplane business with Hungary was very important. At the same time, the wish of certain groups to make Holocaust denial punishable in Hungary by introducing the hatred law, has to be served, and has to be prepared emotionally, otherwise the purchase of real estate in Budapest or in the countryside by foreigners could create a scandal. The airplanes are Swedish, the Nobel prize is Swedish, and Imre Kertész is a Jew from Hungary living in Germany. It is all clear, of course only according to my calculations, because I cannot prove the connections.³³ Now everyone knows how the Grippens got to Hungary, and why we need a law to forbid disagreeing with foreigners buying Hungarian land, "in [Buda]Pest and in the countryside" [sic]. So for Franka, Imre Kertész's Nobel prize is the result of an underground conspiracy. In this conspiracy "certain groups" who are interested in forbidding Holocaust denial got together with the Swedish national lobby, which is willing to do anything, even giving away the Nobel prize, just to win the huge Hungarian market.

THE COVER OF NIGHT

So in the end, I would like to write briefly about the television show that was the most talked about at the time. "The Cover of Night"³⁴ program was actually filmed at an evening that was held by the Cover of Night "friends" in the Hungarian House. The show was led by Gábor Matúz, and starred Péter Szentmihályi-Szabó and Kornél Döbretei. One of their common characteristics is that they all think Kertész did not deserve the Nobel prize. Szentmihályi Szabó és Döbretei had not read a single line by Kertész. Matúz – because he had to make a program about it – finished six books in two days. "I don't mind, at least I know who got the Nobel prize this year..."), he said.

³³ Tibor Franka, "A Nobel-díj az utcán hever" (Nobel Prizes Now Grow on Trees), *Magyar Fórum*, January 9, 2003.

³⁴ "Éjjeli menedék" (The Cover of Night), quoted in László Györi, "Magyar lobogók (Hungarian flags)," *Élet és Irodalom*, November 29, 2002.

He was talking for a long time in his introduction about how long the nation had been waiting for the Nobel prize, and now Kertész got it, but the nation did not. After Szentmihályi Szabó said very proudly that he had not read anything by Kertész, it was revealed that the audience had not either during their cheering. Kornél Döbrentei: "we came here not only because of the Nobel prize, but also because of our wounded sense of justice. (applause) (...) And this wounded sense of justice, in us since Trianon, has not been cured, and Hungarians have been deprived of their self-esteem, character and territory. And then came the lost war, followed by the communist dictatorship. I was listening to young people before, whose youth was stolen away, just as our generation's was. (...) Those leaders above Gyula Illyés and any other society who try to support Hungarian poets outside our borders are replaced, ...they tore down the Széchenyi Plan, which would have served to lift up the people, they strengthened the Bene... Decree as collective guilt, and at this very moment we could still be happy that a so-called Hungarian had received the Nobel prize. But the very second this news was delivered, Imre Kertész's fate-fellows quickly denied that it was a Hungarian award, one of them calling in to the television, the other in writing. It was a kind of hate speech right from the beginning. ... (...) And it is terrible that if somebody gets one of the world's biggest Nobel prize [sic], the biggest most esteemed literary award with the unspoken suggestion [sic] of a people's collective guilt, and that is why it hurts..."

(Translated by Andrea Megyes)

ZSÓFIA MIHANCSIK

CONTROVERSY OVER THE “HATE SPEECH” LAW

This paper presents the debate that began in Hungary in autumn 2003 on the proposed amendment on Section 269 entitled: Incitement against the Community of the Hungarian Criminal Code. Introducing the bill in Parliament, the Minister of Justice said the amendment was justified because the existing provisions of law were not asserted by the courts chiefly because the Constitutional Court and the Supreme Court had given conflicting interpretations of said section in 1992 and 1997, respectively. Among legal practitioners and left-liberal intellectuals the debate focused in part on the interpretation of the Criminal Code section concerned and in part on whether or not it was justified to restrict the freedom of speech on any grounds, including the collision of fundamental freedoms the freedom of expression *versus* the right to human dignity. By contrast, press organs of the political Right and Far Right came up with opposing views. They denounced the proposed law amendment as an expression of what they called a repressive attitude of the Government, alleged attempts at muzzling discordant opinions, selling out to “alien powers” and a “Jewish conspiracy.” It is these latter views that are of relevance for the purpose of the volume *Anti-Semitic Discourse*, and that is why this paper offers a survey of them. The quotes below have been taken from commentaries published in *Magyar Nemzet*, *Magyar Demokrata*, *Magyar Fórum* and *Magyar Jelen*. The section entitled “Chronology” surveys the several stages in the debate on the proposed amendment of the law and the positions taken by the political parties and groups of intellectuals.

About the Amendment of Act IV of 1978 on the Criminal Code

INCITING HATRED AGAINST THE COMMUNITY

In force:

Section 269 (1) A person who, before a wider public,
(a) incites hatred against the Hungarian nation or some nationality,
(b) incites hatred against some people, denomination, race or certain groups of the population,
shall commit a felony and may be imprisoned for up to three years.

Changes in the Hungarian Criminal Code between 1978 and 2004

(A Chronology Published by the daily *Magyar Hírlap*)

Date	Category of crime	Conduct	Offended Party
1978-1989	Incitement Aggrieving the community	Derogatory expression/action to incite hatred. The same conduct without the aim of inciting hatred. Qualified more seriously when done in the media or otherwise before a wider public.	The Hungarian nation, the state order of people's democracy, the people's republic and its key institutions, the nationalities and denominations of Hungary.
1989-1996	Incitement against community	1. Inciting hatred before a wider public. 2. Using an offensive or derogatory expression or committing such conduct before a wider public.	The Hungarian nation, the nationalities, groups of some people, denomination or race. The Hungarian nation, some nationality, people, denomination or race.
1992	To protect the freedom of speech, the Constitutional Court quashed the penal category: "using an offensive or derogatory expression or committing such a conduct before a wider public."		
1996-tól	Incitement against the community	1. Inciting hatred before a wider public. 2. Committing some other act that can incite hatred before a wider public.	The Hungarian nation, some nationality, people, denomination, race, and certain groups of the population.
1999	The Constitutional Court quashed the penal category: "other act that can incite hatred" for being obscure.		
2003-2004 (draft)	Incitement against the community	1. Inciting hatred or inviting to a violent act before a wider public. 2. Insulting or humiliating others before a wider public in a way that violates their human dignity.	Some national, ethnic, racial or religious group or certain groups of the population. A person who belongs to a national, ethnic, racial or religious group.

The amended text if it had been modified according to the original proposal:

Section 269 (1) A person who, before a wider public, incites hatred or invites to commit a violent act against a nation, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group or certain groups of the population, shall commit a felony and may be imprisoned for up to three years.

(2) The punishment defined at item (1) shall be applicable for a person who, before a wider public, violates human dignity by

(a) insulting or humiliating another person or persons because of their national, ethnic or religious affiliation,

(b) stating that a person or persons are inferior or superior because of their national, ethnic, racial or religious affiliation.

The amended text as it was modified on 8 December 2003:

Section 269 (1) Who, before a wider public, incites hatred or invites to a violent act against a nation, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group or certain groups of the population, shall commit a felony and may be imprisoned for up to three years.

(2) A person who, before a wider public, violates human dignity by insulting or humiliating another person or persons because of their affiliation to a national, ethnic, racial or religious affiliation, shall commit a misdemeanour and may be imprisoned for up to two years.

CHRONOLOGY

September 5, 2003

"Gábor Kuncze announced the decision of the parliamentary group of his party during a break in the discussions of his parliamentary group [...] He said the Alliance of Free Democrats (AFD, Hungarian acronym: SzDSz) opposes the restriction of the freedom of speech by instruments of the penal law, that is, by amending the Criminal Code. Instead, the politicians and other public personalities should condemn hate speech and extreme phenomena." *Hungarian News Agency (MTI)*

"By contrast, the bigger party in the ruling coalition has welcomed that the government intends to punish hate speech by amending the Criminal Code. Gábor Juhász, a deputy leader of the parliamentary group, said: the Socialists are confident that the Opposition will unanimously support the proposed amendment in

Parliament and, as a result, 'animosity will hopefully cease in both public and private lives.' He expressed the hope that the amendment of the Criminal Code would enable law-enforcement agencies to remove persons who deliberately disrupt sports events." *Magyar Nemzet*

September 17, 2003

"The Hungarian Democratic Forum (HDF, Hungarian acronym: MDF) does not back the proposed amendment of regulations on hate speech [...] Ibolya Dávid said there had been two similar attempts and both were found unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court, which cited the importance of the freedom of speech." *Magyar Nemzet*

October 21, 2003

"Parliament discussed in second reading the amendments of the Criminal Code related to hate speech. Only the parliamentary group of the Hungarian Socialist Party (HSP, Hungarian acronym: MSzP) supported them. [...] Introducing the debate, Justice Minister Péter Báránky said restriction of hate speech is meant to safeguard public peace and protect the dignity of the members of communities. He added that the activities identified in the proposed amendments had for long been categorized as a felony in most of the countries of Europe. Moreover, in other countries they carry stiffer sanctions. [...] Gábor Fodor (ADF) underlined that resolute action is needed against hate speech and the Free Democrats favour all such constitutional efforts. However, the Free Democrats do not support amendment proposals that restrict the freedom of speech without a good reason and pave the way for action against the opponents of hate speech. He added: if Parliament adopted those amendments, they will be counterproductive, as they will create a precedent for action to be taken against the opponents of anti-Semitism, racism and exclusion. [...] László Salamon (Alliance of Young Democrats, Hungarian acronym: Fidesz) pointed out that in one of its earlier rulings the Constitutional Court had taken a firm stand in favour of the freedom of expression. He said no bill could be adopted that ran contrary to the Constitutional Court's position and in his view the proposed amendments did so." *Hungarian News Agency*

October 25, 2003

Both the Alliance of the Jewish Communities of Hungary (Hungarian acronym: MAZSIHISZ) and international Jewish organizations hope that the Hungarian Parliament will redefine the sanctions to be applied to hate speech – a commu-

niqué of MAZSIHISZ says. [...] 'The present rules are inappropriate because in Hungary no court has brought down sentences that adequately punished those people who endangered others by inciting hatred. [...] our alliance is firmly of the view that those affairs need to be re-regulated.' [...] MAZSIHISZ emphasises that in case of incitement to hatred, the freedom of expression needs to be restricted because such phenomena endanger the constitutional rights of a considerable section or minor minority groups of society, and protecting those rights is a priority." *Magyar Nemzet*

November 6, 2003

"The Regional Court of Budapest, acting as a court of appeal, acquitted Calvinist minister Lóránt Hegedűs Jr.¹, a former deputy chair of the Party of Hungarian Justice and Life (Hungarian acronym: MIÉP) of the charge of incitement against the community. Hegedűs was tried on the charge of incitement against the community because, publishing an article in the local MIÉP organ of the district 16 of Budapest (*Ébresztő*, which means wakening) he invited his readers to exclude the Jews, to whom he referred as 'vagabonds from Galicia.' A court of first instance issued a suspended sentence of 1.5 years of imprisonment." *Index [an Internet magazine]*

November 8, 2003

"Free Democrat politicians criticized the proposed amendments of the law on hate speech at their meeting held in Budapest on Saturday. [...] Gábor Fodor said that, if Parliament adopted the amendments, 'all persons who oppose racism and anti-Semitism and favour the freedom of speech' could be sent to the dock. 'We have to tolerate views that we disagree with or find repugnant,' he added. 'Let us pitch our ideals against theirs, let us pitch our views against theirs.' [...] 'Let us create a political vacuum around those who practise racism and hate speech.' In his contribution to the meeting, Péter Gusztos, MP, who is on the executive board of AFD, described Calvinist minister Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. (who had been acquitted of the charge of incitement against the community a few days before) an 'anti-Semitic vagabond who is pernicious to the nation.' [...] He denounced what he called the 'encoded phrases' of politicians who had lost their influence on running the country. He added that it was impossible to devise sanctions for encoded political phraseology. *Hungarian News Agency*

¹ An essay on various aspects of that case written by Gábor Schweitzer can be found in this volume.

November 12, 2003

A statement issued by Balázs Horváth (HDF): “The proposed amendments are imprecise and as such would unjustifiably curtail the freedom of expression. They could be used as a tool to silence criticism of those in power. [...] Members of the Hungarian Democratic Forum are convinced that the notion of hate speech carries a broader meaning than speaking ill of Gypsies, Jews and Communists or referring with a negative overtone to some people as ‘bourgeois in thought.’ Any attempt motivated by selfish political and economic interests that seeks to undermine the prestige of the work of public prosecutors and judges also come under the heading of hate speech.” *Hungarian News Agency*

November 17, 2003

Károly Herényi, leader of the parliamentary group of HDF: “...until the transition [to the multi-party system] these rules of law [on hate speech] sought to regulate the relation of state and individual so as to consolidate the power of the state. After the transition those rules of law were confined to regulate the relation among individuals. ‘The proposed amendments are now evoking the pre-transition attitudes and mentality: they chiefly seek to safeguard the power of the state.’ [...] ... the HDF regards it unacceptable that the amendments seek to protect the national and ethnic minorities yet fail to mention the protection of the Hungarian nation.” *Hungarian News Agency*

November 18, 2003

“Gábor Kuncze and Ferenc Mádl, President of the Republic of Hungary, concurred on that hate speech is an undesirable phenomenon. [...] After his consultation with Ferenc Mádl on Tuesday in Budapest, Gábor Kuncze told journalists that President Mádl would examine the hate speech-related amendments after their parliamentary approval and then he would decide whether or not to use his constitutional veto by sending them to the Constitutional Court. *Hungarian News Agency*

November 19, 2003

András Heisler, President of MAZSIHISZ, told Magyar Nemzet: “...several court decisions have recently caused concern among members of the Jewish community, who are understandably sensitive to such issues. [...] ... the series of disquieting events began with scenes that occurred on 30 May, after a football match between Ferencváros and Debrecen on Üllői Road. The next stage

was the trial of Lóránt Hegedûs Jr. [...] Consequently, MAZSIHISZ expects each of the parliamentary parties to support the early adoption of the amended law on hate speech. *Magyar Nemzet*

November 23, 2003

"Two Socialist MPs have submitted a motion for an amendment under which no punitive sanctions would be applied to persons who allege that a person or a group of persons are inferior or superior on the strength of their belonging to a national, ethnic or religious group. The motion of Balázs Csákabonyi and Zoltán Szabó is related to the hate speech section of the Criminal Code. Yesterday the motion was discussed in Parliament's constitutional and human rights committees separately, and MPs belonging to the government parties backed it. According to their motion it would be a misdemeanour if a person violates human dignity before a wider public by insulting or humiliating another person or persons just because they belong to a national, ethnic, racial or religious group. [...] Representatives of the government supported the motion because, as they put it, such action involves less danger to society. Gábor Fodor (ADF) said he would vote in favour of the motion even though he hoped that Parliament would eventually vote against amending that rule of law. Róbert Répássy (Fidesz) expressed his anxiety over the absence of the legal category: hate speech against the nation. Whereas the law protects minorities and religious groups, it fails to protect nations. Répássy made it clear that his party would not support the proposed new text of the Criminal Code either with or without the amendments." *Magyar Nemzet*

November 25, 2003

"Speaking in Parliament on Tuesday, Gábor Fodor called on the parties to reject anti-Semitic and racist phenomena. [...] He spoke before the House began its ordinary business. He recalled that the German Christian-Democratic Party had expelled one of its members, Martin Hohmann, because in October he had delivered an anti-Semitic speech in his constituency. [...] 'were those speeches delivered in Hungary, I regret to inform you, they would not cause any controversy because we have become so accustomed to such a tone.'" *Hungarian News Agency*

December 8, 2003

On Monday Parliament amended the section of the Criminal Code on incitement against the community. The provisions on hate speech were redefined in a vote

of 184 for and 180 against. Ayes came from MPs of the HSP and the ADF, nays from MPs of Fidesz (153), HDF (16), ADF (8), cross-benchers (2) and HSP (1). When asked by the news agency about his maverick vote, HSP MP Mihály Kökény said he pressed the wrong button. Fidesz and HDF were unanimous in their rejection. Gábor Kuncze, president of ADF, who chairs his party's parliamentary group, said earlier that the members of his parliamentary group had a free hand at the vote. Yes votes came from Miklós Hankó Faragó, Gábor Horn, Zoltán Kis, Mária Kóródi, Gábor Kuncze, Bálint Magyar, Imre Mécs, Gábor Szalay, Gábor Világosi and Ferenc Wekler. Eight ADF MPs – Gabriella Béki, András Bôhm, Mátyás Eörsi, Gábor Fodor, Péter Gusztos, Éva Mézes, Iván Petô and István Szent-Iványi – disagreed with stiffening the sanctions on hate speech.” *Hungarian News Agency*

December 22, 2003

President Ferenc Mádl has decided to use his constitutional veto. He is requesting the Constitutional Court to tell if the amendment of provisions on hate speech comply with the constitution. [...] The communiqué the president's office has issued says: [...] ‘there is the danger that the amended provisions might restrict the freedom of expression more than justified by the constitution.’ The communiqué points out that, under the amended passages of the law, it would be punishable to violate human dignity by insulting or humiliating persons on the strength of their belonging to a nation, race, etc. The president is of the view that this provision serves its purpose inappropriately. The amended text of the law carries no reference to public peace and the dignity of communities. It seeks to protect dignity and integrity, which it terms as rights attached to the personality. There are however other provisions in place to protect those rights. Anyone may seek legal remedy on the grounds of defamation if their dignity were violated owing to his belonging to a community. ‘As in a procedure related to incitement against the community the court has to consider if public peace was disrupted to such a degree that endangers the basic freedoms of the individual, serious uncertainties might arise in the course of formulating a judgement.’ Moreover, in case the dignity and integrity of a person are violated, it is the personal right of the aggrieved party to decide whether they resort to the punitive powers of the state. As [under the proposed amendments] the public prosecutor could initiate a legal procedure over incitement against the community irrespectively of the intentions of the aggrieved party, such procedure might damage the individual’s autonomy. The president is of the view that, in addition to those irregularity in terms of form,

the amendments would curtail the freedom of expression to a higher degree than what the Constitutional Court considers acceptable." *Hungarian News Agency*

December 24, 2003

"In a communiqué issued yesterday, MAZSIHISZ declared that Jews in Hungary are concerned and disappointed to learn Ferenc Mádl, Hungary's highest-ranking public personality, has prevented that an amendment of the Criminal Code, which makes hate speech punishable, could enter into force. MAZSIHISZ calls for unequivocal laws so that 'courts could not issue free passes on legal grounds for leaders of the ever louder anti-Semitic circles.'" *Magyar Nemzet*

MAGYAR NEMZET ON THE AMENDMENT OF THE CRIMINAL CODE AND ON HATE SPEECH

An Assessment of the Hate Speech Law

"The amended passage of the law is reminiscent of the infamous Section 58 of the Soviet Penal Code. It is flexible – but it is a weakness rather than a strength –, it is obscure, and may be applied arbitrarily. Even if the amendments seem to be insignificant, those 'nuances' heavily curtail the freedom of expression and pose a serious threat to the freedom of the press." *Miklós Ugró: Hate Speech Defect. Magyar Nemzet, December 10, 2003*

The Purposes of the Hate Speech Law

To close the ranks of the camp of voters of the ruling coalition:

"For a long time now the government coalition is keeping the topic of actions against hate speech on the agenda so as to fabricate so sort of a common enemy and close the ranks of heterogeneous left-liberal camp. [...]" *Dávid Megyeri: Hate Mongering in the government. Intolerant acts of the government, or; how much power does the Opposition have in Parliament. Magyar Nemzet, November 29, 2003*

So that the government could divert attention from the real problems

"The lower their popularity, the louder the popular discontent, the more concerned defenders of democracy are at home, abroad and at the European Union,

the more the government is attempting in Parliament to question the moral and professional competence of the civic parties (i.e. Fidesz and HDF) and those loosely attached to them." *Hate Mongering in the government. Intolerant acts of the government, or, how much power does the Opposition have in Parliament.* Magyar Nemzet, November 29, 2003

To discredit in the public eye the maverick civic [i.e. centre-right] thinkers

"The ruling coalition, which defines itself as left-wing, is trying to manipulate society. With only a few months to go until Hungary's accession to the EU, the government forces attempt to weaken the livelihood of dissident civic thinkers and discredit their political and spiritual leaders." *Hate Mongering in the government. Intolerant acts of the government, or, how much power does the Opposition have in Parliament.* Magyar Nemzet, November 29, 2003

*The Political Purpose the Government is Pursuing
by Keeping Hate Speech on the Agenda:*

Keeping the Anti-Semitic Danger on the Agenda

"...the ruling Left-wing citing 'the justified anxiety of the people,' readily joined the game that has been going on between the extremists and those responding to hatred in a hateful manner. In this affair the HSP and the ADF (the latter doing their most recent unprincipled flip-flops in connection with the superfluous and apparently unconstitutional 'hate speech law') are trying to hit two birds with one stone. Once again they are attempting to discipline one of the autonomous branches of power [the judiciary] and they are trying to hype an ostensibly ultra right danger and the question of anti-Semitism. Ever since 1990, those issues have been used within and outside Hungary as a big stick to beat the moderate, democratic Right-wing." Szabolcs Szerető: *Every Jack will get his Jill.* Magyar Nemzet, November 15, 2003

"Q: Do you consider all critical remarks about Jews as anti-Semitic? How would you draw a line between criticism, the freedom of speech and the anti-Semitic phenomena?

A: It is very difficult to draw that line. It is understood that critical remarks can be justified. However, the basis of criticism should not be that person's religious conviction.

Q: But it is so easy to hide behind that. You must have heard about cases when a person of Jewish origin responded to whatever critical remarks he got by citing anti-Semitism.

A: I disapprove cases where justified criticism is received with an unjustified response." *The Jews cannot accept any repressive regimes. Interview with András Heisler, president of MAZSIHISZ, by Ákos Jezsó and Dávid Megyeri. Magyar Nemzet, May 14, 2003*

A Method: Instances of the Freedom of Expression are Also Categorized as Hate Speech

[About the decision of the management of the state-owned Hungarian Television Co. Ltd. to terminate a weekly programme, entitled "Night Shelter"] "What happened? An interview was broadcast in which a historian described the initial days of the 1956 Revolution as an anti-Semitic pogrom. Such an opinion clashes with the mainstream canon of historiography, but it is within the boundaries of the freedom of expression. [...] ... as is well known, two radical commentators, László Seres and ádám Petri Lukács, have officially complained [about 'Night Shelter']. It is worth examining the role of György Baló (who regularly interviews the Prime Minister). Earlier, he was content by exercising limited censorship of 'Night Shelter.' But now he apparently gave his approval to shutting down a programme on political grounds. The explanation was cynical – the historian insulted the Hungarian nation – [...] ... neither the Hungarian public, nor the Complaints Committee of the National Radio and Television Council (ORTT) accepted it. (The ORTT has since declared that the 'Night Shelter' had not violated the media law.) [...] The president of the Hungarian Television, whose legitimacy is questionable, finds his time too precious to apologize for that affair or take action to ensure the conditions for the freedom of expression." *János Csontos: Day Shelter. Exclusionists, isolationists, complainants and those being complained about. Who is intolerant about differing opinions? Magyar Nemzet, November 26, 2003*

Method: Using Double Standards

"The government and its press allege that Irving – and 'Night Shelter' – have disgraced the 1956 Hungarian Revolution and War of Liberation because mixed them with anti-Semitism. Earlier, philosopher Miklós Tamás Gáspár, who raged over the acquittal by the court of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr., wrote in a newspaper that intensive anti-Semitism, which flared up in Hungary in the spring of 1990, has not been a passing episode. I have to conclude that, by applying a Left-Liberal

logic in his article, the philosopher disgraced the democratic transition [to the multi-party system]. The newspaper that carried his opinion piece without an editorial comment is privately owned. Consequently, it is impossible to shut it down, just as it happened to 'Night Shelter.' But at least it would be a nice gesture to redirect from it the state-sponsored advertisements." *Szabolcs Szerető: Every Jack will get his Jill. Magyar Nemzet, November 15, 2003*

"Journalist István Lovas has filed a claim at the court against Miklós Tamás Gáspár over his mud-slinging commentary published by *Magyar Hírlap*. [...] Just as in the trial of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. the prosecutor's office brought a charge against György Metes, editor in chief of *Ébresztő*, which had carried Hegedűs' article, Lovas, acting in the hope of 'a consistent prosecution procedure' has initiated criminal investigation against Pál Szombathy, editor in chief of *Magyar Hírlap*, which had carried the article, entitled 'Enough of That.' Miklós Tamás Gáspár [...] alleges that the courts favour anti-Semitism. He is pessimistic about the outcome court procedures in such cases. In his article he invites his soul mates to stage a demonstration. By doing so, he calls for extra-judiciary action. Such a call is a sinful action because it aims at disrupting public peace and the work of the Constitutional Court – writes István Lovas in the claim that he has filed with the prosecutor's office." *Is Miklós Tamás Gáspár slinging mud again? The commentator who has already received a court sentence for his anti-Semitic remarks has now defamed the Hungarian judges. Magyar Nemzet, December 9, 2003*

MAGYAR FÓRUM ON THE AMENDMENT OF THE CRIMINAL CODE AND ON "HATE SPEECH"

The Purpose of the Amendment of the Law on Hate Speech

Preparing the Israeli "occupation"

"...unless the denial of the Holocaust is made punishable and sanctions are introduced against hate speech, the purchase of real estate by foreigners in Budapest and in the countryside would provoke popular discontent." *Tibor Franka: Is the Nobel Prize lying on the street? Magyar Fórum, January 9, 2003*

"The preparations are ready. Now the occupation is underway. Whoever dares to complain, must be silenced, persecuted and removed from their position. On the agenda is an onslaught on the National Bank of Hungary so that inflation should

rise, which makes the lives of the people more difficult, so that they should be anxious about their livelihood and to secure funds for the anti-Hungarian government projects. On the agenda is an onslaught on the *Magyar Nemzet* to rob even the middle-of-road national [i. e., right-wing] forces of a daily paper. On the agenda is an onslaught on the Hungarian Radio Co. Ltd. and 'Vasárnapi újság' [a right-wing weekly programme broadcast each Sunday morning] so that even that moderate voice should come off the air. On the agenda is an onslaught against everything that is Hungarian, national and could help the survival of the people." *István Csürka: Through Hungarian eyes. Magyar Fórum, April 17, 2003*

"... the hunt on supporters of Ferencváros is motivated not just by the desire of pacification [...] ...the other aim is to deliver the message that there is anti-Semitism in Hungary. Unconscionable persons allege that of Hungary, a country that has one of the nicest refurbished synagogues in Europe, in whose neighbourhood shops and restaurants owned by a certain circle of people are mushrooming. [...] ... yes, indeed, it can be foretold that certain things will happen in sports stadiums and during cultural events. Some sort of an expression of discontent, some sort of a protest." *gki: Where protest is muzzled. Magyar Fórum, July 3, 2003*

"Perhaps never before have we been subjected to such a wicked and sly colonization, one that tries to hide behind laws and international regulations. [...] For the time being, the job is to be fulfilled by the government of Medgyessy. That is the very purpose for which the elections were rigged, with international assistance. The arch-organizer is Ron Werber from Israel. His philosophy of "rob everything" has become the bylaw for the government. The government is taking over hospitals in the interest of Israeli companies, pharmaceutical firms and builders of shopping malls. The aim of the government is to privatize the hospitals. It is the Israeli firms and bank managers who benefit from this destruction of Hungarian families [...] whoever fails to prevent [the government] from committing those sins, will become its accomplice. After all, the proposed law on the denial of the Holocaust and the draft laws that seek to restrict the freedom of speech, assembly and thought, are all sinful. *István Csürka: Through Hungarian eyes. Magyar Fórum, July 31, 2003*

Reassuring the Jews who are in managerial posts

"It is difficult to understand why does *Élet és Irodalom* [literary weekly] publish so often articles of Mária Vásárhelyi even if her writings cause damage to

their cause. Those writings are so aggressive that they embarrass even those who agree with them [...] Mária Vásárhelyi is a biased, overly sensitive Jewish woman with a wounded soul. She is suffering from 'the fear of being left on the shelf.' [...] ... she has premonitions about the future; she wants to use every opportunity while they are in power and while she can persuade the present government to act firmly. [She wishes the government] to secure the adoption of a law on the Holocaust, stop hate speech; secure that the students of Church schools should demonstrate against the reactionary clergy and against the Christians rather than against Members of Parliament who tell lies. The Hungarians, the Christians and all those who are not Zionist and do not favour Judeo-Bolshevism should shiver – and then Mária Vásárhelyi will rest contented." *István Csurka: Through Hungarian eyes. Magyar Fórum, April 10, 2003*

Suppressing the Opinion of Citizens (the Hungarian people)

"On December 17, 2002 policemen collected numerous torn copies of *Fateless* by Imre Kertész that were thrown all over the streets of Hódmezővásárhely. Apparently, the Nobel Prize-winning book was subjected to that procedure by people who had received copies free of charge a few weeks before from the local government of the town. The officials referred to what happened as 'littering and disrupting order.' Now, the question is: who did so? The author, the publisher, the printer, the [Nobel Prize] committee, the municipality or the media? One thing is certain: the local residents are innocent. All they did was expressing their opinion. After all, they have the right to do so." *Tibor Franka: Is the Nobel Prize lying on the street? Magyar Fórum, January 9, 2003*

"In a country that is being taken over by, among other methods, accelerating the extinction of its people, the freely elected Parliament adopted the bill on hate speech, which was introduced by those accelerating the dying off of the indigenous population. The bill on hate speech forbids the people to think of their colonizers in anger. When the bill was adopted in Parliament, some MPs of the parties that had submitted it did not even take the trouble to vote in favour it. By contrast, some of the MPs, who claim to be representatives of Christian values and guardians of national interests, did not even find time to take their seats in the assembly hall and consequently could not vote against the bill. That bill is openly anti-Christian and anti-nation. It curtails the freedom of speech and the freedom of thought. [...] If there was order in the ranks of the MPs of Fidesz

and HDF and if the MPs were aware of their duty, if many of those MPs did not flirt with MPs on the other side of the divide, then this bill could have been thwarted. [...] The abject Hungarian people are exploited to the extreme and now they are even stripped of the right to moan. They must shut up, what is more, they must not even think of complaining. They are expected to suppress all their passions. The colonizers are satisfied when the subjects do not even dare to think of opposition. From now on, nothing is as important as the contentment of the colonizers. Christians and even more Christian (ouch!) party chairpersons are guarding their contentment." *István Csurka: Through Hungarian eyes. Magyar Fórum, March 4, 2003*

Hate Speech: Who Really Cultivate and Provoke It?

"Some say the militant section of Jews provoke anti-Semitism so as to prevent the assimilation of their less militant fellow Jews. There seems to be logic in that tactic. If that is truly the case, we have to declare that the tactic is immoral." *Antal Károly Tóth (Göteborg): The Nobel Prize Charade. Havi Magyar Fórum, March 2003*

"Said Chief Rabbi Tamás Löwy in Eger in a kaddish delivered to the memory of Jewish victims in June 1999: 'we still do not know the explanation how could Hungary – and a culture centre like Eger in it – become an instrument and indifferent onlooker of hatred, an accomplice of destruction.' It follows from his words that he considers a whole country, all of its towns and residents instruments of anti-Jewish hatred and the indifferent onlooker and accomplice of their annihilation. [...] Blaming an entire population for an act that it never committed is tantamount to 'hate speech' or, in plain talk, incitement. That is in fact incitement in two ways: it incites Jews against the non-Jews and the other way round. After all, who can like persons who slander them?" *Antal Károly Tóth (Göteborg): The Nobel Prize Charade. Havi Magyar Fórum, March 2003*

"The need for the Holocaust law and the hate speech law is generated by using agent provocateurs who shout anti-Semitic slogans among supporters of Ferenc-város [football club]. They are attempting to legalize the consumption of narcotics and are badmouthing those citizens who dislike the idea. Those persons are attempting to cite *force majeur* to curtail the human rights [of their fellow

Hungarians] that only a few years before were themselves posing as the champions of human rights. That is alarming." *István Csurka: Through Hungarian eyes. Magyar Fórum, June 26, 2003*

What Solution could be Used instead of the Law on Hate Speech?

"Manfréd Weiss, Baron Kornfeld and their families – who by the way were eager supporters of the allegedly demonic Horthy regime – bought their escape to Switzerland with the assistance of Weesenmayer and Eichmann. Meanwhile the poor and the innocent starved in the barracks [of concentration camps] behind barbed wire. The Hungarian people have expressed their condolences in connection with those victims and paid reparations to the victorious powers. Yet a new indemnity is now being imposed and fresh censorship is about to be introduced. A law is in the making about hate speech, and the denial of the Holocaust is to become a crime. Censorship is to cover both research and literary work. Let me remind you that such acts are dangerous in Hungary. Only those people can think about imposing such laws who know nothing of the nature of Hungarian people. To ensure the renaissance of you all [i. e., the Jews], it is not advisable to introduce a law that would prohibit the denial of the Holocaust and punish hate speech. Once such a law is introduced, Hungarians will consider themselves as prisoners and will rebel by uttering the forbidden phrases in defiance. It would be unwise to impose prohibitions on Hungarians in connection with acts they never even think of committing. Imposition of such a law would be humiliating, and we would rebel against it. [...] If they impose such a law after all, all Hungarians whose dignity would be hurt would write and talk only about that, and such phrases would be shouted from the grandstand during football matches. If however no such prohibitions are introduced and if the emotions of Hungarians are not hurt with conspicuous purchases of real estate in Hungary, then no one will hear hate speech." *István Csurka: An open letter to Judit Várnai-Shorer [Ambassador of Israel to Hungary]. Magyar Fórum, March 9, 2003*

"Certain militant Jewish circles at home and abroad are blaming Hungarians collectively and have been blackmailing them for half a century. They are doing so even though in 1919 Béla Kun, Tibor Szamuely and Ottó Korvin and, after 1945, Mátyás Rákosi, Ernő Gerő, Mihály Farkas and Gábor Péter (and the list could be continued) and other Jewish mass murderers had a lion's share in the

Holocaust of Hungarians. (They or their children are still in control of Hungary.) It would never occur to sober-minded people to blame for that act the Jews collectively. They are applying double standards to Hungarians. [...] The time has come to differentiate between what is genuine hate speech – and should be punished indeed – and the justified statement of facts." *József Hering: The truth of Martin Hohmann. Magyar Fórum, November 20, 2003*

**MAGYAR DEMOKRATA AND MAGYAR JELEN
ON THE AMENDMENT OF THE CRIMINAL CODE AND
ON "HATE SPEECH"**

"When asked why the Alliance of Free Democrats opposed a separate law on hate speech, Gábor Fodor answer with a smile that, if such law is adopted, two of his favourite weeklies, *Magyar Narancs* and *Élet és Irodalom* would be repeatedly denounced [...] ... it cannot be ruled out that some of the articles published there might qualify as hate speech and incitement. That is what I call foresight. [...] If somebody reports in the press that Israeli investors have purchased Hajójári-sziget [an island on River Danube in Budapest] and they have a major residential park built there, where only foreigners may buy apartments, perhaps only Jews who wish to escape from a chaotic political situation [in Israel] and weather it out here – well, is such an account tantamount to hate speech or incitement, or is it just one several freely-conceived opinions." *Ágnes Seszták: Life and Literature [reference to the title of Élet és Irodalom]. Magyar Demokrata, November 6, 2003*

[Miklós Tamás Gáspár] "has anti-Semitism and racism on his mind when he gets up and being different and the minorities when he goes to bed. In between, he sees in his mind's eye Nazis who are persecuting Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals and homeless persons. [...] ... no proper, ultra-left, ultra-liberal opinion piece is conceivable unless it includes at least one unjustified accusation about the anti-Semitism of certain people [...] we are ignoring such dogmatic nonsense in the name of the freedom of speech." *Balázs Ágoston: Mysterious terrains. Magyar Demokrata, November 20, 2003*

"Miklós Tamás Gáspár is annoyed if the public-service television broadcasts views – David Irving's opinion – which he does not like. [...] Just because an

independent Hungarian court has passed a sentence that he did not like, Miklós Tamás Gáspár has charged Hungarian judges of being anti-Gypsy, misogynic, homophobic, xenophobic, anti-Semitic and hating the poor. He does not even care to substantiate his charges. Just because he disagrees with the views of the political Right-wing, he charges his opponents with fascism." *B.P.: Enough of that. Magyar Demokrata, November 20, 2003*

"The liberal-Bolshevik leadership [of Hungary] has decided to intimidate and oppress the people! [...] ... if Hungarians are robbed even the right to express their opinions freely, they will be doubly deceived and robbed of all their belongings. They will live as slaves in their homeland. [...] Hungary's present leaders [...] keep parroting that in Hungary special criminal law protection should be accorded to the religious and national minorities to defend them from the 'bloodthirsty' majority nation. [...] In fact, the opposite is true. In Hungary it is the majority nation that deserves protection against increasingly arrogant minorities and alien 'investors' who are inundating the country. [...] One wonders what might be the reason that a law is to be introduced in Hungary against 'hate speech'? Some swastikas spray-painted in underground car parks? Ridiculous! [...] The day when the proposed law becomes effective the freedom of speech and of the press will die. What our ancestors shed their blood for in 1848 and 1956 will be terminated." *Attila Szakállas: Citizens are once again "educated". Magyar Jelen, September 27, 2003*

"A two-party dictatorship has been put in place. Now Fidesz, now the HSP is in power. The two parties change places at the helm when the danger arises that a third force, that of the people, might get stronger and genuine changes would get underway. [...] Fidesz does not recruit its supporters from among the vagabonds, but the dominant majority of the leaders of Fidesz are only in politics and are only patriots because they expect financial gains for that – they do not differ in the least bit from those standing on the other side of the political divide. [...] It is an important development that by now the popular-national radical forces have mustered enough strength to demonstrate their values. A part of the media has become independent of the parties. It is not by accident that desperate efforts are made to repair the repressive regime with a law on hate speech. [...] The first stage of any revolution is an intellectual and spiritual revolution. That is doubly so when at stake is the reinstatement of the Holy Crown into the power. The Holy Crown means, among things, the knowledge of what I may do,

what am I obliged to tolerate from the powers that be, when I have the duty to revolt and how I should revolt. It is these pieces of information that the traitor intellectuals, whose mentality is alien to the Hungarians, sought to conceal from the Hungarian people by destroying Hungarian spirituality.” *László Juhász: A new pact is underway on Rózsadomb [a posh neighbourhood among the hills of Buda]. Magyar Jelen, December 14, 2003*

(Translated by Iván Sellei)

GYÖRGY HEIMER

ARROW CROSS* COMMEMORATIVE EXHIBITION IN KÓSZEG

An exhibition called “Horthy’s Soldiers, Szálasi’s Arrow Cross People” opened in March 2003 in Kőszeg, West Hungary. The small exhibition organized in three rooms, on a mere 70 square meters, triggered national controversy. Even independent experts far from political circles qualified the Arrow Cross apolo-gia – also referred to as a ‘military exhibition’ – as one-sided, false and as an attempt to absolve the one-time ‘Leader of the Nation’, Ferenc Szálasi. How-ever, Kornél Bakay, director of the museum and curator of the exhibition, declared that he presented the era in question objectively. Several people, mainly from the right, believed that the commemorative exhibition on local history was only inflated by the media, which inflates everything anyway.

“Due to external causes, the military exhibition had to be closed,” read a brief sign that informed visitors sauntering in the rooms of the Miklós Jurisics Castle Museum in Kőszeg.

The majority of visitors will probably never learn that the show, opened on March 19, 2003 on the 59th anniversary of Hungary’s German occupation and bearing the title “Horthy’s Soldiers, Szálasi’s Arrow Cross People”, was – make no mistake here – a neo-Nazi propaganda attempt. And the most compelling one of the “external causes” was the national wave of protests going on for weeks, in the wake of which the organizers thought it would be a good idea to sound retreat and close the ‘military exhibition’ after less than a month.

* “Arrow Cross, Arrow Cross party members (nyilas, nyilasok): collective name for Hungarian extreme right-wing parties and movements appearing in the 1930s, and for their members. Arrow Cross Party – Hungarist Movement: extreme right-wing Hungarian political party (1939–1945), its leader from Autumn 1940 was Ferenc Szálasi. Its ideology was Hungarism, which blended German National Socialist elements ('leader principle', extreme anti-Semitism) with conservative religious ethics ideas. Its symbol was the arrow cross, originating from the swastika. After Horthy's radio proclamation on October 16, 1944 that led to no success, the party came to power with a coup executed with the help of the Germans. During its reign lasting until the end of March 1945 and covering an increasingly smaller area with the Soviet troops pushing forward, it committed a series of war crimes as well as crimes against humanity.” (*Magyar Nagylexikon*, Budapest, 2001).

¹ www.index.hu, source: MTI, April 14, 2003.

The Alliance of Jewish Communities in Hungary (MAZSIHISZ) voiced its indignation in an announcement issued on April 7, 2003: "It is an unprecedented assault on the memory of the victims that the Arrow Cross leader, who was rightly sentenced to death for war crimes and crimes against humanity, received such commemoration, inexplicably and from public funds, with the knowledge of government and local officials, at the dawn of our EU accession."¹ The Raoul Wallenberg Society also demanded that the exhibition be closed, and Gábor Görgey, the then Minister of National Cultural Heritage (NKÖM) and László Kocsi, State Secretary of the same Ministry, also expressed their condemnation. "Although the ministry is not legally entitled to close down the exhibition (since the county museum is not under the ministry's auspices), leading officials of the Ministry feel that it is their moral obligation to object to the content of the exhibition," read NKÖM's announcement.² "The exhibition carries a simplifying and misleading message that represents the most sinister figures of the Holocaust era in Hungary in a one-sidedly positive way, making them appear as heroes, while unethically remaining silent about the mass deportations of Jews."

Sándor Horváth, Director of the Vas County Museums Directorate, said to MTI that the exhibition was not placing Ferenc Szálasi on a pedestal and was merely presenting the era through documents and photographs.³ According to the local newspaper *Kőszeg és vidéke* (Kőszeg District), Kornél Bakay, Director of the Kőszeg Museum, said at the exhibition opening: "historians are not judges and it is not their job to judge... We wanted to evoke an era and present images from the history of 20th-century Hungary, which belongs to us even if they don't only show glorious and elevating events." Lieutenant-Colonel István Ravasz, Director of the War Memorial Maintenance Authority, carried on the solemn sentences, enthusiastically praising the documents presented.⁴

Although it is possible that some objects from the exhibition material – military relics from the Horthy-Szálasi era kept by 'private collectors' for several decades – were unique findings, but experts contributing to the related debate pointed out a number of times that the exhibition abounded with factual errors, and served an ideology which goes hand in hand with the ideas of the Arrow Cross movement and anti-Semitism. The experts, historian Tamás Stark and Vilmos Gál, museologist of the Hungarian National Museum, who were asked

² www.nyugat.hu

³ MTI, April 7, 2003.

⁴ *Kőszeg és Vidéke*, April 18, 2003.

by NKÖM to function as impartial arbiters in the wake of the unfolding scandal, also came to the conclusion that the exhibition had to be closed down temporarily, but “with some amendments and adjustments it could adequately present the topic.”⁵

So what did this small exhibition contain in its mere three rooms? As Tamás Stark wrote, the approach of the organizers was aptly reflected by the large board hanging in the ‘hall’ of the exhibition, displaying the following sentences: “The Italian fascist, the German National Socialist and the Soviet international socialist (communist) dictatorships of the 20th century critically determined Hungary’s fate as well. Hungary, broken up and crippled in 1920, was given back part of its territory by the Great Powers, but the 172,000-km² country became occupied by the German Third *Reich* on March 19, 1944. Foreign occupation lasted for 47 years, because the victorious Stalin’s Bolshevik hoards subsequently occupied our country in 1945. And the occupation forces were always aided by numerous people from inside the county.”

Tamás Stark points out that “reference to the communist movement as international socialism is unknown either in history or political science. With this new terminology, the organizers obviously tried to emphasize the similarity between National Socialism and communism. The term ‘Bolshevik hoard’, taken from contemporary journalism, also has a special tone, and is not used in specialist literature. Based on these factors, visitors can assume that in the next rooms they will see a presentation of an army which was fighting on Germany’s side largely under geopolitical pressure against the Soviet forces aspiring to subjugate Hungary. This simplifying notion carries the message that Hungarian troops were engaged in a righteous and justifiable fight, so they deserve commemoration and the respect of posterity.”

The various uniforms of the army were displayed in a spectacular way, remarked Stark, but there was no reference to those people who were also serving in the army, yet could not wear uniforms – instead, they were treated as prisoners of war. Their number was quite high, though: in 1942, 30,000 people were sent to the eastern front to do forced labor, while in 1944 there were 100,000 of them. In a window niche one could see a portrait of Döme Sztójay, one of the most dismal figures of Hungarian history: during his short term as prime minister, Jews from the countryside were deported in the summer of 1944 (for which

⁵ Tamás Stark (Institute of History, Hungarian Academy of Sciences) – Vilmos Gál (museologist, Department of Modern History, National Museum of Hungary): *Expert Opinions* (manuscript).

the Budapest People's Court sentenced him to death on March 22, 1946). However, the organizers failed to convey this fact.

From the small corridor refurbished with photographs taken during the excavation of the 'Szálasi Bunker' near Kőszeg, another room, called "Szálasi's Arrow Cross People", opened. The display board summarizing the characteristics and history of the era read as follows: "along with the people of the German *Reich* of the time (...) it was the Hungarians who suffered the most in the last months of WWII, since, in the wake of the German occupation, the Hungarian Arrow Cross Party came to power, led by Ferenc Szálasi. The Hungarist Movement was neither identical with Italian fascism, nor with German National Socialism. The Hungarian Arrow Cross Party did not propagate either a totalitarian state or racial superiority. Nonetheless, they were the adversaries of Bolshevism and international capitalism. They came to power on October 6, 1944 by making their military alliance with Germany their priority, placing blind faith in the *Führer*'s long-awaited miracle weapon." In the large display case devoted to Szálasi, the following quotations could be read about 'the Leader of the Nation', written by contemporaries: "Because of his talent, diligence, non-materialist attitude, honest character and good manners, Szálasi was one of the most excellent General Staff officers. (Marcell Stomm: *Memoirs*). "He stood out from the other commanders. He cared for his men, and with his casual demeanor he crossed the usual, stiff boundaries between officer and private. Whenever the company marched out, he would march with them, during breaks he would sit down among his men and ask them about their lives at home and their families. He would speak up for his subordinates among higher-ranking officers. He was definitely liked by his men." (Gyula Kádár: From Ludovika to Sopronköhida).

Although in the display case about the Arrow Cross leader's life there were even two books about the Szálasi trial, those who were not familiar with the period might have thought – based on the texts displayed and the quotations – that Szálasi was a worthy man, and, although they were too helpful with the Germans, the Arrow Cross people weren't bad, after all: they hated Bolshevism, which has since failed in Hungary as well, and they did not like "international capitalism", which is not to the liking of many other people either. There were several problems with the texts and quotations displayed, remarked Tamás Stark. The quotations drew a one-sidedly positive image of Szálasi. These quotations are eligible to be included in an exhibition – but only in the case that other kinds of contemporary opinions about Szálasi are also represented.

Actually, the first few words of the quotation taken from Marcell Stomm were omitted: "Here he interposed that 'I heard it from several General Staff officers that...'). In other words, what we could read was not Stomm's own opinion, but what he had heard. In fact, Stomm showed Szálasi as a valuable but neurotic person who deserved better. The quotation taken from Gyula Kádár was accurate, but also misleading. The passage that came after the quoted lines went on to say: "These are commendable traits of a military person. However, his personal behavior was quite repugnant. First of all, his immense and abnormal conceit. He wanted to know everything better than others, not only in military subjects but everything else as well. He was a know-all, supercilious and pompous." All in all, the one-time fellow-soldier had a disastrously poor opinion of Szálasi.

The text on the main display board quoted above did not shed light on the period, but rather obscured it. Although the precondition of Szálasi's regime was Hungary's German occupation, they only came into power due to the thwarting of Horthy's national escape attempt, and not on October 6, as the display board told us, but on October 16. Szálasi was thinking in terms of a totalitarian state, and he was strongly influenced by racism. "It does not transpire as obvious from the exhibition that he was responsible for the continuation of the war and that the country became a theater of war for a further 5 months. Nor did the exhibition shed a light on Szálasi's accountability for throwing the Jewry still remaining in Hungary at the mercy of the Germans, the death marches affecting about 50-70,000 people and deportations, the ghetto in Pest and the mass murders carried out in Budapest. Although there was a display board about the only Hungarian gas chamber, which was in Kőszeg, and another photo about deportations in Kőszeg, which actually had happened before the Arrow Cross regime. There were photographs about the exhumation of Jews murdered in Budapest, but, due to the lack of captions, the visitor could not locate the event." They also displayed an Arrow Cross uniform and the flag of the Kőszeg organization of the Arrow Cross Party. There were also posters from the period and pictures of the Szálasi government, on the same display board with László Endre's photo (I wonder why). There was no explanatory text to the photographs, so the visitor could never learn that László Endre, State Secretary for the Ministry of the Interior, and Andor Jaross, Minister of the Interior, were controlling the deportation of countryside Jewry.

The exhibition said farewell to the visitor with two quotations, one of them from István Bethlen: "We don't want the blessings of the bountiful development of Western democracy, nor do we want any kind of dictatorship." The other quo-

tation is from Péter Veres: "One part of those who control the life of our people today are not Hungarians, and the other part are bad Hungarians." The people quoted here played no role in the Arrow Cross era, and these sentences do not originate from the Arrow Cross period but from before that. Tamás Stark asked why they were still placed here. Did they reflect the political credo of the organizers?

The answer was given by historians László Karsai and Judit Molnár,⁶ with much more heated words: "The exhibition is characterized by boundless anti-Communism and blinded anti-Semitism. Miklós Horthy is represented as a heroic developer of the country, and Ferenc Szálasi as a heroic anti-Communist. Szálasi, although the exhibition makes sure this is not revealed, was a devoted and consistent anti-Semite, who would not have tolerated Jews in his would-be totalitarian state. True, he was a good soldier, but there is no word in the exhibition about why Horthy called the Arrow Cross people 'Green Shirted Bolsheviks'. The radical populist Arrow Cross Party, which took vulgar Jew-bashing to the streets and disseminated demagogue propaganda, were the extreme right-wing opposition of the Horthy regime, and the exhibition keeps silent about this fact. Here, 'communist' is a synonym for 'traitor'. In harmony with this concept, Nazis and the Arrow Cross are only anti-Communists, and they only fight against the Red Army, and, of course, international (meaning: Jewish) capital. There is not a word or a picture about the other members of the antifascist armed coalition... 1945 is presented as the year of the Soviet occupation, without mentioning why Red Army troops got here."

The organizer of the exhibition, in order to counterbalance his one-sidedness, also gave an account of the persecution of Jews in 1944 through a few photographs and enlarged diary excerpts. However, Szálasi had nothing to do with these: the Arrow Cross could only start plundering Budapest Jews, shooting them on the banks of the Danube and organizing the Budapest ghetto after they came into power and 437,000 countryside Jews had already been deported. At this exhibition there is no actual mentioning of the death marches of November-December 1944 at Hegyeshalom or the forced laborers who were handed over to the Nazis by the Arrow Cross. Yet, it is a well-known fact that 35,000 of them were building a fortification system at the Low Alps to protect Vienna and Berlin.

The exhibition strove to appear professional and academic. To this end, it presented figures quoted by historian Tamás Stark in 1989 (301,000 Hungarian

⁶ László Karsai – Judit Molnár, "Jelentés (Meaning)," *Élet és Irodalom*, April 18, 2003.

Jews died during WWII). It is possible that Kornél Bakay had indeed not heard of Stark's most recent research, according to which nearly 500,000 Hungarian Jews died during the war. However, displaying Tibor Zinner's reference book and a book by Elek Karsai and László Karsai entitled *A Szálasi-per* (The Szálasi Trial) cannot counterbalance the fact that in a display case at the end of the exhibition excessively anti-Semitic "reference books", including a book containing "the most interesting" articles from the WWII illustrated magazine *Magyar Futár* (Hungarian Courier), are promoted.

The museum debate was later joined in by Krisztián Ungváry, another historian from the younger generation, who, analyzing the Szálasi apologia in Kőszeg, wrote:⁷ "The exhibition suggests, among other things, that so far there have only been one-sided representations of the Arrow Cross. This is true, although in a different way than the organizer had thought. Indeed, party-state historiography spread various lies about the Arrow Cross Party so that the confrontation with the war, anti-Semitism and the dictatorship could be controlled. The strength of the Arrow Cross Movement did not originate in the support of Germans: their ideology was an independent Hungarian phenomenon. The Hungarian extreme right wing did not have to copy foreign examples. In Hungary, 'the protection of the race' had been a dominant political notion since 1919. Extreme right-wing representatives became MPs in much larger numbers and earlier than in Germany. NSDAP in Germany gained a 6-percent representation in Parliament in 1924, then, half a year later, 2.4 percent, while in Hungary 12-14 percent of MPs were members of the Association of Awakening Hungarians before 1926. Besides Szálasi's various parties, there were several dozens of parties between 1920 and 1939 which used the terms 'fascist' or 'national socialist' in their names. At the first national secret ballot in 1939, they received 25 percent of the votes... Had they been supported by the Germans, it probably could not have happened that due to the lack of the deposit required (10,000 pengő for each constituency) the Arrow Cross Party could only put up 63 candidates in the 135 individual constituencies. However, in 1939 in the same constituencies they obtained an average of 40 percent of the votes! This result is astonishing in view of the fact that the Arrow Cross did not have press (their papers were banned), there were hardly any party funds, and 72 members

⁷ Krisztián Ungváry, "Kik azok a nyilasok (Who are the Arrow Cross?)," *Beszélő*, June-July 2003; "Nyilasok és legendák (The Arrow Cross Party and Some Legends)," *Népszabadság*, June 4, 2003.

of the party leadership had been arrested immediately before the elections.” Ungváry added that it was also a misconception that the majority of the Arrow Cross members were criminals and vagrants. “With the Arrow Cross Party seizing power, true, the reign of criminals came in, but can the ‘Green Flood’ of October 1944 regarded as representative for the whole movement? In early 1938, when Szálasi’s party was established, 466 members from Budapest were registered, 99 of whom had PhDs. This shows that the Arrow Cross Party started out as a characteristically intellectual party.”

Péter György voiced an even more disastrously low opinion:⁸ “I don’t think it would be a wise solution if (...) I called the attention of authorities to close down the exhibition immediately. The adult men who allowed all this, I assume, knew what they were doing. I don’t think they are either ignorant or as naïve as they could not see that it was Ferenc Szálasi’s apotheosis that began among the walls of the Castle Museum. In my opinion, the best solution is an open debate. I hope that both Hungarian museum professionals and the relevant supervisory organs of the Hungarian state will create an opportunity for Kornél Bakay and his official superiors to explain in an objective and honest debate what their reason was to elevate the Arrow Cross Party among Hungarian saints.”

Later developments show that this proposal remained a voice crying in the wilderness. In his hot-tempered response,⁹ Kornél Bakay calls György a professional liar and an amateur aesthete: “Your kind is only capable of gut hatred and vilification, in a lineup of powers similar to that of US forces: 10-ton bombs against soldiers armed with revolvers, and a 500-percent technology edge. You are right in one thing. The western part of Europe and America have always manifested much greater sympathy toward left-wing ideas and Bolshevism than National Socialism and fascism...”)

Thus, there was no public debate clarifying the issue; moreover, Bakay did not come up with too many more sober arguments in the polemic that surged up in the wake of the exhibition. However, it became known from media appearances by the Kőszeg Museum curator – who is an archeologist by profession, an acknowledged researcher of Hungarian prehistory and the European Middle Ages, Department Head and honorary doctor at the King Lajos the Great Private University in Miskolc – has close ties with MIÉP. He even ran as a MIÉP can-

⁸ Péter György, “Kiss János és Szálasi Ferenc” (János Kiss and Ferenc Szálasi), *Népszabadság*, April 14, 2003.

⁹ Kornél Bakay’s response: “Levélváltás (Exchange of Letters)”, *Népszabadság*, April 8, 2003.

dicate for Parliament, about which he commented that he did not accept the request of the MIÉP President because he desired to be in the limelight, but because he avowed himself to be a 'Hungarian history person'. "I think the 2002 elections are of vital importance, because everything has to be done to prevent the conductor's baton from being seized again by openly anti-Hungarian and anti-nation powers. I am willing to suspend my tranquil life as a scientist for this cause, since I think this is more important than anything."¹⁰ Whether the archeologist of prehistory and the Middle Ages distorted the facts due to the lack of professional competence or his ideological attachments should be decided by the reader, but the fact is: the 'military exhibition' was closed on April 18, 2003. According to *Magyar Nemzet*'s¹¹ report, the private collectors who lent the majority of the exhibition material asked their objects and documents back feeling threatened and being concerned about the safety of their objects in the venomous atmosphere induced by the demand of MAZSIHISZ, the threats, bomb scares and the media. "'We could not protect ourselves and the exhibition material from the goons, so I was forced to close the exhibition,' said Bakay. 'We are prepared to prevent possible theft attempts, but we cannot defend ourselves against the gorillas coming here with iron clubs.'" We can learn from the rest of the report that 'the gorillas with iron clubs' refers to the visit paid by MAZSIHISZ representatives on April 11, when – according to Bakay's account – the leaders of the organization and the bodyguards accompanying them "pushed aside the museum guards and were shouting that they would smash my face and destroy the exhibition with iron clubs. We recorded this in the guards' log, because Gusztáv Zoltai, the managing director of MAZSIHISZ, drove away the police, who came to the scene upon my call."

MAZSIHISZ Chairman András Heisler gave his response to this in a sizeable interview he gave to *Magyar Nemzet*:¹² "If I want to put it politely, my answer is that they (i.e. the accusations) are not true. Naturally, we bought our tickets, there were no security guards with us, and we went through the exhibition without saying a word aloud. The only thing that might have made us stand out from

¹⁰ Tibor Franka, "A magyarság kőszirt Európában (Hungarians are the Rock of Europe), *Magyar Fórum*, December 20, 2001.

¹¹ Pál Swendt, "Vaspántok a múzeum ajtaján (Iron Bands on the Museum Doors)," *Magyar Nemzet*, April 19, 2003.

¹² Ákos Jezsó – Dávid Megyeri, "A zsidóság semmilyen diktatúrát nem tud elfogadni (Jews cannot Accept Any Kind of Dictatorship)," *Magyar Nemzet*, May 14, 2003.

all other museum visitors was that the camera of a TV channel was following our museum tour. True, László Karsai, the historian who came with us, later went to see Kornél Bakay, but I don't know what happened in his office, since I wasn't there."

The right-wing press, which described the exhibition as objective, thorough and well-designed, explained its forced closure as a result of "the pressing atmosphere induced by the media". In their announcement¹³ objecting to the closure, Lelkiismeret '88 Csoport (Conscience '88 Group) wrote that "it is high time that the truth concerning Ferenc Szálasi came to light. MAZSIHISZ stands in the way of this honest intention when, referring to the reports of some 'members of the Jewish community and other Hungarian citizens', they demanded that the exhibition be closed and eventually got their own way... Why is MAZSIHISZ afraid of the representation of historical reality? Due to the factors described above, our Group distances itself from the aggressive and censorious policy." In his magazine, *Magyar Fórum*, István Csürka even created an ideology around the "fast, aggressive and offending intervention"¹⁴ of MAZSIHISZ. According to him, there were scientific efforts in Kőszeg, referring to the fact that Bakay had been working for years on excavating the Szálasi Bunkers on Szabó Hill. In Csürka's opinion, the exhibition did not qualify, but rather represented history. Then he goes on to say: "In the fact that MAZSIHISZ objected, passionately interjected, called for the closing of the exhibition and proposed measures for punishment, there is some desperation. As if they were trying to fight for a *status quo* which can only be sustained now this way: aggressively and with a wild struggle. The desperation is triggered by the exhaustion of the Holocaust as a right to power and a source to gain power. It's been washed away by time, and no politics can be built upon it any more. Such is life. Things pass and vanish. Even pain and memories do. But there is something else. Present events, the gory ruthlessness of the war raging now and the merciless genocide in Israel and Palestine send the Holocaust off the stage. Now it is especially hard to regard the genocide carried out by the Nazis as special and unique, as the one and only incomparable grievance of humanity: the Israeli state is doing something similar to a small nation, and the Israeli state orders a huge war against

¹³ "Tiltakozás a kőszegi kiállítás bezárása miatt (Objection to the Closure of the Kőszeg Exhibition)," Imre Kocsis, Chairman of the Conscience '88 Group. Budapest, April 2003 (announcement).

¹⁴ István Csürka, "Kőszeg," *Magyar Fórum*, April 17, 2003.

another state, and the USA carries it out. The uniqueness of the Holocaust is fading, and the special, unique request for sympathy that MAZSIHISZ demands for itself and Hungarian Jews, and through which they want to influence politics, demand laws and punishment, is also vanishing. This is the problem with the exhibition in Kőszeg: the Holocaust well is drying out.”

Demokrata,¹⁵ however, cites the right-wing’s recurring ‘double-gauge theory’, also connecting it to the fact that an exhibition on Stalin’s dictatorship was staged in Budapest at the time of the Kőszeg show. The magazine presented it as a great revelation that the organizer of the Budapest exhibition was one of the ‘extensions’ of the Soros Foundation, Open Society Archives. “With all these ties with Soros,” the author of the article adds with a not-so-undecipherable encoding, “why is the press not writing indignantly about this exhibition?” István Rév, Director of the Archives, gave the following answer in *Népszabadság*:¹⁶ “the subject of the exhibition is not Stalin, but the dictator’s corpse. It shows the death of the leader embodying the Soviet Union, the interregnum that followed, the start of the end, and the political system going down into the tomb. The exhibition – as it can be expected from every institution taking their profession seriously – presents and analyzes things. We usually commemorate our martyrs, heroes and loved ones. The show in Centrális Galéria remembers and reminds people of things, but does not commemorate. Open Society Archives gave substantial aid to the Memorial Foundation and Archives in Moscow to prepare a comprehensive demographic analysis of the victims of the Stalinist terror.” The urgent nature of a clarifying and explanatory history lesson was also indicated by the television program called *Élesben* (Live)¹⁷, in which several viewers voiced their opinion on the matter. One of the viewers was asserting that anyone regarding themselves right-wing in today’s Hungary will immediately be stamped fascist, anti-Semitic and an excluder. “I think it is outrageous that today in Hungary MAZSIHISZ and about forty left-wing people, calling themselves intellectuals, are telling me what I can see and what cannot be exhibited, what is democratic and non-democratic. If we compare fascism and communism, well, fortunately, most fascist leaders were convicted, while among the ÁVH [the communist political police] leaders there was Gyula Horn, who

¹⁵ Balázs Ágoston, “Szálasi és Sztálin (Szálasi and Stalin),” *Magyar Demokrata*, 2003/16.

¹⁶ István Rév, “Nem emlékkiállítás (Not a commemorative exhibition),” *Népszabadság*, April 19, 2003.

¹⁷ MTV, *Élesben* (Live), Presenter: Péter Obersovszky, April 22, 2003.

became Prime Minister, and the former Minister of Finance is now Hungary's Prime Minister."

Giving a final summary of the issue, historian Krisztián Ungváry, who was in the studio during the program, said: "the biggest problem with the exhibition in Kőszeg is not that it misrepresents what happened to Jews. Ferenc Szálasi's political credo can be compared to the *Khmer Rouge* in Cambodia, which lead to genocide. This man was the enemy of his own people... He had laws through which he would have implemented the most inhuman, bloodiest terror for both Jews and Christian." However, it seems that these arguments were not sufficient either. To the question (which, however, cannot be regarded as representative) asked of viewers whether an exhibition that does not repudiate unambiguously the atrocities committed by Szálasi and the Arrow Cross should be closed, 65 percent of people phoning the show said 'no', and only 35 percent said: yes, it should be closed.

(Translated by Andrea Megyes)

JÁNOS DÉSI

GRESPIK AND THE JEWISH ISSUE

On November 25, 2003, at the Central District Court of Pest in a lawsuit against József Abai and his accomplices on the charge of public sedition, László Grespik, defense attorney for the secondary defendant, asked the judge whether she regarded herself as Jewish or had Jewish ancestors, for if she had, she might have been biased in the case.

The case began when in February 1999 the police dispelled a skinhead concert, then initiated legal proceedings against some of the musicians performing there. According to the Public Prosecutor's Office, "the seven defendants of the lawsuit, driven by neo-Nazi and Arrow Cross party ideologies, and, primarily, racist ideas forming the dominant element of these ideologies, formed skinhead bands in 1999 and prior to that. (...) At the concerts, the lyrics sung included the following unambiguous references to Jews in Hungary: 'You scum of the earth, stinking dirty hoard parasites on our country! They got what they wanted, and are holding Hungary in their hands (...) They are the ones who are allowed to do anything, fight them, protect yourself!'"¹ Here's another passage, from a different source: "Run, run, stinking Jew, sooner or later you'll turn into soap anyway."²

In the lawsuit that was still in process at the time of the compilation of this book, the defense attorney for the secondary defendant was László Grespik, former MP candidate of MIÉP.

At the first day of the trial, November 25, 2003, the attorney asked the following question: "'As it is my duty as a defense attorney, and due to the nature of the case I suggest that the judge declare whether she observes the Jewish religion or is of Jewish origin, and whether, resulting from her any other relationships with Jewry, she deems herself biased.' The judge first averted the answer: 'I am not obliged to answer the proposed question,' then continued: 'Considering the nature of the case, however, I answer the question posed so that it can-

¹ *FigyelőNet/MTI*, November 26, 2003.

² Anna Kulcsár, "Alkotmányelemzés Grespik ügyben (Analyzing the Constitution for the Grespik Case)," *Magyar Hírlap*, February 27, 2004.

not be a problem later: I am not biased and not a Jew, and, as far as I know, I have no ancestors of the said origin.’’³

Since then, a great number of politicians⁴ and legal experts⁵ have taken a stand on whether such a question can be posed, and how the judge should have proceeded. For this reason, we will examine the question heard in the courtroom only from one aspect, namely, whether the question was anti-Semitic or not.

The attorney himself explained the reason behind his question: ‘‘Had the judge said that she was of Jewish origin or observed the Jewish religion, by referring to the content of the indictment I would have regarded it my obligation to propose her exclusion from the trial.’’⁶

Grespik’s logic was the following: since the lyrics heard at the concert were offensive for Jews, the judge would not be able to make an unbiased judgment if she were Jewish. A similar proposal has already been made in recent Hungarian legal history. On May 15, 1991 at the Central District Court of Pest, at the trial of László Romhányi, Editor-in-Chief of the *Szent Korona* (Sacred Crown) magazine, who was also charged with public sedition, the attorney of the defendant submitted a plea of recusal and demanded an investigation whether any members in the council of the court led by Dr László Péntek were of Jewish or Romanian origin. Eventually, the court refused this motion, presented by Defense Attorney Dr László Nagy.⁷

³ ‘‘Grespik was denounced for his question about Jews,’’ *origo*, March 17, 2004.

⁴ The question was denounced by Prime Minister Péter Medgyessy and Viktor Orbán, leader of the opposition party Fidesz-MPSZ, as well as by the New Generation of SZDSZ. At the same time, according the right-wing alliance Jobbik, Orbán’s declaration of the denouncement means that ‘‘the liberal Fidesz is searching for the road leading back to SZDSZ’’ (*Magyar Hírlap*, December 3, 2003.)

⁵ The Budapest Chamber of Attorneys initiated an investigation, and the ombudsman for data privacy also declared his opinion: ‘‘No legal objective can be formulated with regard to which the defense attorney can handle information concerning the origin and religion of a judge during legal proceedings.’’ (*origo, ibid.*) Zoltán Lomnici, Chairman of the Supreme Court, said about the case: ‘‘The discrimination of judges according to their race, religion or gender is unacceptable.’’ (MTI, November 28, 2003.)

⁶ *Figyelőne/MTI*, *ibid.*

⁷ It has to be mentioned only for the sake of historical accuracy that the final judgment was eventually delivered in November 1993, when the Municipal Court mitigated the suspended prison sentence of László Romhányi – former publisher and Editor-in-Chief of the magazine, who had been charged on three accounts of public sedition and for the offence of insulting a public official – to a fine of 27,000 Forints. In the meantime, Romhányi was sentenced for instigation to murder.

Later, in the lawsuit against Albert Szabó, there was an attempt to discredit witnesses by asking whether they were of Jewish origin.⁸

The Debrecen Chamber of Attorneys declared their position in a similar case in 1992. Due to the fact that the defense is entitled to the right of deliverance, guaranteed in the constitution, no disciplinary proceedings were initiated.⁹

No doubt, it is the constitutional right of every defendant to have an unbiased court to deliver judgment in their case. After Grespik's question, a great number of publicists asked: will it be possible at all to find a judge for a divorce suit in the future? Would a male judge be biased in favor of the husband, and a female judge in favor of the wife?

The great majority of legal experts pronounced, in connection with the debate, that no distinction can be made among judges on the basis of their origin, religion and the like.

It follows from Grespik's question and his explanation quoted above that, according to him – and his colleagues posing similar questions – utterances insulting Jews and incitements against them actually offend Jews.

At the same time, if the court adjudicates that an offence has been committed, these utterances will not offend "the Jews", but the constitution and the laws of the Republic of Hungary, as the court will also deliver a judgment "in the name of the Republic of Hungary". Thus, the question posed is anti-Semitic, since it assumes that due to the sheer fact of someone being "Jewish or of Jewish origin", i.e. due to their religion, origin, etc., they will not be able to make an unbiased decision in a legal case.

It must also be added that the press organs which usually latch on to such opportunities to put forward their prejudices against Jews remained fairly silent.

Still, Péter Szentmihályi Szabó drew the following conclusion in *Magyar Demokrata*:¹⁰ "whether you can ask someone's religious affiliation or origin, the answer is clearly 'yes', except if Jews are concerned"

Which, in this present case, is controversial in itself, since even along Grespik's logic it is not "the Jews" who are concerned here, because the judge

⁸ The author of this article was also subpoenaed, and the defense attorneys and the defendants were trying to make him appear biased on the grounds that he might be Jewish but he definitely wrote for "Jewish" papers, and thus his testimony could not be accepted. The court rejected this position.

⁹ Kulcsár, *ibid.*

¹⁰ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, "Szellemi polgárháború (Intellectual Civil War)," *Magyar Demokrata*, December 4, 2003.

– as Grespik put it, 'very honestly' – answered the question and said that she was not Jewish. Nor did Grespik say that it was about Jews – according to him the question is whether the judge could be regarded biased if she was Jewish. Regardless of this, according to Szentmihályi, "a sputtering, almost inarticulate howl and instigation" followed in the form of commentaries on the attorney's question.

Szentmihályi closes his article by saying: "So, the intellectual civil war is raging, and anyone can see that it proceeds with ever rougher means. The stakes of the war are not entirely clear, since a provocative and impatient minority inflames the emotions. In Hungary there is still no anti-Semitism, moreover, there is no terrorism, thank God. But it seems as if the real goal of the war were to make it happen at last."

In other words, is it the Jews who want, moreover, who "create" anti-Semitism as a result of Grespik asking about the possible Jewishness of the judge at a trial?

(Translated by Andrea Megyes)

GÁBOR SCHWEITZER

LICENCE FOR VERBAL EXCLUSION?

or the Sentencing and Acquittal of Lóránt Hegedüs Jr.

The 2002 volume of the *Anti-Semitic Discourse* series gave an account of the case of Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., which was unresolved at the time.¹ When we went to press with that volume in summer 2002 we informed readers that the prosecutor's office indicted the deputy chairman of the Party of Hungarian Justice and Life (Hungarian acronym: MIÉP). There have two developments since then: in December 2002 a court found Hegedüs guilty and in November 2003 another one acquitted him. The Appendix to this volume carries the full text of the sentence each of the court of first and second instance. See below the scenario of events.

Entitled, "Christian Hungarian State," the article signed as Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., Vice-President of MIÉP, was published by *Ébresztő* (Wakening), press organ of the district 16 chapter of MIÉP, on 16 August 2001.² Hegedüs is a Reformed (i. e., Calvinist) pastor at a long-established congregation of Budapest and, in 2001, was a member of the parliamentary group of MIÉP.³

Hegedüs Jr. emphasizes in the article that, ever since its foundation a thousand years ago, the Hungarian state suffered "countless incidents of martyrdom." The representatives of "devastating, hysterical animosity" were Tartars, Turks and Russians. He refers to the Habsburgs as "cold-blooded and mean," and "the most untalented and most obtuse dynasty in Europe, what is more, all over the world." The quotes that follow give the reader a sense of what Hegedüs Jr. thinks of the Jews of Hungary, or at least, a part of them:

¹ Gábor Schweitzer, "Exclude Them, or if You Don't...!," *Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary in 2001*, ed. András Gerő, László Varga and Vince Mátyás (Budapest: B'nai B'rith Budapest Lodge, 2002) 227–236.

² Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., "Keresztyén magyar állam (Christian Hungarian state)," *Ébresztő*, No. 3, 2001 (third year in the life of that publication). The sentence of the court of first instance includes the full text of the article. See Appendix to this volume.

³ Since 2002, MIÉP has no representation in Parliament. In summer 2001 the Hungarian press carried commentaries on an anti-Jewish statement by another deputy chairman of MIÉP, László Bognár. As it will be recalled, B'nai B'rith and others appealed to the Chief Public Prosecutor so that Bognár should be called to account but to no avail. For a detailed account of the case, see our 2002 volume: Tibor Szeszler, "The Fradi-Fotex Affair," *ibid.* 217–226.

"The Christian Hungarian State could have withstood even that, if, as a result of the self-renunciation of the Compromise of 1867 [between Austria and Hungary], the hordes of the vagabonds of Galicia had not invaded it; who, as if they were the old self of man without salvation, in an ancient onslaught fretted and are still scrunching this homeland, which, despite all this, is capable of resurrection from its ruins, on the heaps of the bones of our heroes. With their Zion of the Old Testament lost because of their sins and rebellions against God, let the most promising eminence of the moral order of the New Testament, the Hungarian Zion be irretrievably perished."⁴

"And because it is not possible to burn out every single Palestinian from the banks of river Jordan with Fascist methods very often surpassing even those of the Nazis, they come to the banks of the Danube, sometimes as internationalists, sometimes as nationalists, and sometimes as cosmopolitans, to kick into the Hungarians once again, because they feel like it..."⁵

"Now let you Hungarians listen to the one single message of survival over the thousandth year of the Christian Hungarian state, which has been based on the ancestral inheritance and continuity of right: EXCLUDE THEM! FOR IF YOU DO NOT EXCLUDE THEM, THEY WILL EXCLUDE YOU! [original emphasis] Of this message we are warned by the misery of thousand years, by the inheritance nevertheless existing "high above" of our country that has been robbed and looted a thousand times, and last but not least by the stone-throwing sons of Ramallah."

The Hungarian media noticed the exclusionist article in early September. About two weeks later, in response to initiatives from individuals, the prosecutor's office started an investigation into the case and, for the time being, referred to the author as an "unidentified person." A few days later, a pro-MIÉP UHF radio station, Radio Pannon, gave airtime to Hegedűs to read out his article, even though it was already legally controversial. Before September went out, the Hungarian News Agency MTI reported that the board of the synod of the Reformed Church issued a disclaimer about the article. The communiqué says

⁴ The dots refer to an omitted part of the text where Hegedűs quotes a line from a poem by the Hungarian poet Endre Ady on the "Hungarian Zion."

⁵ The dots refer to an omitted part of the text where Hegedűs recalled that King Stephen I (in the 11th century) had called for a state that embraced immigrants and encouraged the use of several languages. Whatever stratagem a minority employs, Hegedűs wrote, it cannot pose as if it stood for the majority.

Hegedüs' views ran contrary to the Reformed teachings and creed and were unworthy of the Reformed Church. (The Reformed synod has been consistently adhering to that position ever since.) But another communiqué, issued by the Danubian Reformed Church District, where the bishop was Hegedüs' father: Lóránt Hegedüs Sr., only went as far as reminding Hegedüs Jr. to be more careful about "nuances of content" in statements that he made in another than clerical capacity.

In December 2001, investigators stated that the article could be suspected of inciting against a community as its author called for excluding a group of people. Accordingly, the Chief Public Prosecutor's office recommended to Parliament that it should suspend the immunity of Hegedüs Jr. The motion to suspend his immunity was carried by a large majority on 18 December. (Both MIÉP and Hegedüs Jr. approved the idea.) As from January 2002, Hegedüs Jr. was questioned as a suspect. He pleaded not guilty and filed a complaint about the hearing. He stressed that, being a Member of Parliament, his writing of the article was nothing more than using his right to freedom of expression.⁶

While the investigation was underway in the first half of 2002, and independently of it, several individuals sued Hegedüs Jr. for violating their human dignity with certain passages of his article (for instance, the phrase: "vagabonds from Galicia"). The civil-law courts rejected those petitions on formal grounds, claiming that personality rights could only be asserted in person.⁷ There was one modest achievement though. A court of first instance handed down a non-binding sentence in a civil suit confirming that the article had violated the human dignity of the plaintiff, who is a Holocaust survivor and as such, was indeed involved in the case personally.⁸

In June 2002, the prosecutor's office indicted Hegedüs Jr. for inciting against a community.⁹ The trial took place at the Metropolitan Court of Budapest. The

⁶ "Ifj. Hegedüs gyanúsított (Lóránt Hegedüs Jr. has Become a Suspect.)" *Népszabadság*, January 19, 2002.

⁷ It follows from the courts' logic that only actual "vagabonds from Galicia" could have legitimately sued Hegedüs Jr.

⁸ Gábor Halmi, "Gyűlöletbeszéd: Büntető vagy polgári jog? (Hate Speech: Criminal or Civil Law?)" *Élet és Irodalom*, September 12, 2003. We ignore other civil-law suits related to Hegedüs Jr.'s article.

⁹ B. T.: "Vádat emeltek ifj. Hegedüs ellen (Hegedüs Jr. is Indicted.)" *Népszabadság*, June 15, 2002. The prosecutor's office also indicted György Metes, editor in chief of Ébresztő, but his role is outside the interest of this paper.

prosecutor stated that the article written by Hegedüs Jr. is blameable for inciting hatred and raise a temper against particular groups of people. Categorizing Hegedüs Jr.'s action as a felony, namely, incitement against the community, the prosecutor recommended that a suspended prison sentence should be passed. Defending his article Hegedüs Jr. said he did not use the phrase "vagabonds from Galicia" to refer to Jews in general, instead, to those spiritual heirs of Mátyás Rákosi and Ernő Gerő who "insulted Christian values." He said during the trial that he had meant his article to be a response to an article published earlier in *Magyar Hírlap* – although there is no reference whatsoever to that earlier article. The defence counsel to Hegedüs Jr. stressed that an MP had legitimate rights to voice his opinion and that the prosecutor's petition did not to identify the persons whose exclusion the article concerned allegedly incited to.¹⁰

The Metropolitan Court of first instance resolved that the accused had committed the felony of incitement against the community and sentenced him to one and a half years of imprisonment, which it suspended for three years of probation. The court took the position that Hegedüs Jr. must have been aware that his article had a content that incited to hatred. Moreover, he had to be aware that his article included incitement to hatred against Jews. When defining the sentence (at least that could be read in press reports even though the Reasoning, as carried by the Annex to this volume, is silent about it) the court considered as an aggravating circumstance that the accused, who is a churchman, should have acted in a more circumspect and responsible manner.¹¹ The court of first instance pointed out that decades before in Hungary Jews were excluded after the Parliament of the time had passed anti-Jewish laws. The court added that exclusion might lead to separation in the physical sense.¹² Speaking to journalists after the sentence was announced, MIÉP President István Csurka said the court was under political pressure and that this country should be called Palestine rather than Hungary.

The prosecutor acknowledged the sentence but Hegedüs Jr. and his co-defendant filed an appeal.

¹⁰ "Felfüggesztett börtönt kért az ügyész (Prosecutor Requests Suspended Prison Sentence)," *Népszabadság*, December 5, 2002.

¹¹ "Elítélték ifj. Hegedüs Lórántot. A MIÉP alelnöke felfüggesztett szabadságvesztést kapott (Lóránt Hegedüs Jr. Sentenced. MIÉP's Vice-President Gets Suspended Prison Verdict)," *Népszabadság*, December 7, 2002.

¹² Endre Babus: "Kitáblázott döntés. A Hegedüs-itélet és a gyűlöletbeszéd-vita (Sentence in the Hegedüs Trial and Controversy over Hate Speech)," *Heti Világ gazdaság*, November 15, 2002.

At this point, let us remind the reader that the Criminal Code has been repeatedly amended since Hungary's transition to multi-party democracy. (For an account of those changes, see the paper "Changes in the Hungarian Criminal Code between 1978 and 2004" by Zsófia Mihancsik in this volume.)

The non-binding sentence of the Metropolitan Court of first instance illustrates that – despite the restricting interpretation issued by the Constitutional Court and the equally restricting sentencing policy of the Supreme Court – there exists a court position under which it is possible to establish the fact of incitement to hatred and, on that basis, incitement against the community. There is room for drawing another conclusion: the freedom of expression may eventually be restricted – even if in a narrow scope – with instruments of criminal law if the protection of human dignity is at stake.

In an interview for *Magyar Fórum* a few weeks before the trial of second instance, Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. described the procedure of first instance a "typical show trial." "In an atmosphere of the hatred of Hungarians, [the court] sought to condemn the freedom of speech, thought and expression alongside Ady, Dezső Szabó and László Németh."¹³ Of the trial of second instance he said: "In case the court is impartial, there is no offence to speak about, which means there can be no question of a sentence."

The trial of second instance took place at the Budapest Regional Court on November 6, 2003. The court revised the former sentence and, in the absence of a felony, acquitted Hegedűs Jr. It resolved that the exclusionist writing by Hegedűs Jr. was not blameable for incitement against the community. According to the court's verbal reasoning, Hegedűs' article reflected a subjective opinion and as such does not violate the freedom of the press. The freedom of speech could only be restricted with instruments of criminal law in "special and justified cases."¹⁴ By adhering to the Constitutional Court's policy, the court of second instance resolved that opinions might be freely aired as long as that does not escalate into incitement to hatred. Hence it follows that instruments of criminal law may only be used to restrict the freedom of speech in extreme cases, when there is a clear and present danger to public peace and social order. It is possi-

¹³ Zoltán Szőcs, "Orbán az úrasztala, Hegedűs a bíróság előtt" (Orbán before the Communion Table, Hegedűs before the Court)," *Magyar Fórum*, October 16, 2003.

¹⁴ "Felmentették Hegedűs Lórántot (Lóránt Hegedűs Acquitted)," *Magyar Nemzet*, November 7, 2003.

ble to consider the article by Hegedûs Jr. as embarrassing, insulting or disquieting but that is not tantamount to the felony of incitement against the community. According to the position of the Regional Court of Budapest, the statement: “**EXCLUDE THEM! IF YOU FAIL TO DO SO, THEY WILL DO IT TO YOU!**” does not suggest the intention that Hegedûs Jr. wished to incite to an exclusionist action.¹⁵ The non-appealable sentence was brought into line with the above-mentioned restrictive interpretation and practice of the Constitutional Court and the Supreme Court. By restrictive we mean that the court applied a very strict (and hard to apply) constitutional interpretation when establishing the fact of incitement to hatred and the need to use punitive sanctions.

In this connection, let us refer to related events that occurred in November. After studying the decision of the court, Bishop István Szabó Bogárdi, superior of Hegedûs Jr. at the Reformed Church, called on Hegedûs Jr. to apologize for what he had done. Moreover, Bishop Bogárdi told the press that the sentence on Hegedûs Jr.’s acquittal “did not relieve our Church from the burden that had been created by the controversial statement of that pastor. In fact, the honour and integrity of our Church is being questioned and compromised.”¹⁶ Hegedûs Jr. did not fulfil his Bishop’s request. He cannot ask for the forgiveness of those whom he insulted – he wrote – because in his controversial article he borrowed his ideas from Ottokár Prohászka, Dezsô Szabó and László Németh – who have been dead for long – so he cannot apologize on behalf of those deceased writers.¹⁷

At the end of November, a few weeks after the non-appealable sentence was made public, the Appellate Department of the Prosecutor’s Office of Budapest issued a request to receive the documentation of the case of Hegedûs Jr. “for official use.” That authority has the right to recommend for the Supreme Court – in cases where such special legal remedy is justified – to revise a non-appealable court sentence.¹⁸

¹⁵ “Fölmentették ifjabb Hegedüst (Lóránt Hegedüs Acquitted),” *Népszabadság*, November 7, 2003.

¹⁶ “Püspöki felszólítás ifj. Hegedüsnek (A Bishop Issues a Call to Hegedüs Jr.),” *Népszabadság*, November 20, 2003.

¹⁷ “Nem kér bocsánatot ifj. Hegedûs (Hegedûs Jr. Refuses to Apologize.),” *Népszabadság*, November 21, 2003.

¹⁸ Erna Sághy: “Kis magyar uszításos (Minor Precedents for Incitement in Hungary),” 168 óra, No. 49. 2003; “Hegedûs ügy: Felülvizsgálat? (The Hegedûs Case: Revision?)” *Magyar Hírlap*, November 27, 2003.

No such legal measure has occurred until we go to press. However, the non-appealable sentence of acquittal and the controversy that followed it in the press have mobilized the greater part of legislators to take steps towards the more efficient protection of human dignity. After a heated and much publicized debate, Parliament, voting with a slight majority, amended the Criminal Code so that the text of that law should be modified in a manner that complies with the Hungarian constitution and should include rules that are more efficiently applicable to problems of legal interpretation. The amended version of the Criminal Code could not become effective up to the time when we go to press. It is a question yet to be answered whether or not it will ever become effective. The Hungarian public is waiting for a fresh interpretation of relevant legislation from the Constitutional Court.

(Translated by Iván Sellei)

ÁRON MONORI

SHYLOCK, SHARON AND THE SHOAH BUSINESS

The Image of Jews in Magyar Demokrata

At the parliamentary elections of 2002 voters decided to oust from Parliament the Hungarian Justice and Life Party (MIÉP), the most notorious users of anti-Semitic discourse in Hungarian politics, and together with the party its weekly magazine, *Magyar Fórum*, also started out on the road towards marginalization. At the same time, the weekly magazine *Magyar Demokrata* gained a key position among the opinion-forming forums of the Hungarian right wing. The gestures of the former governing party, Fidesz Hungarian Civic Party (Fidesz-MPSZ), and especially of former prime minister Viktor Orbán (presently the Chairman of Fidesz) given to the paper raised *Magyar Demokrata* to the mainstream of the right-wing press. The close connection between the party and the magazine became more and more obvious.¹ As a culmination of this process, Editor-in-Chief András Bencsik joined the party (at the time of closing the manuscript, he is a member of the cultural section of Fidesz), and a Fidesz column called *Szövetség* (Alliance), published as editorial content and marked with the party's emblem, was launched in the magazine,² indicating the confidential relationship between the editors of *Magyar Demokrata* and the leadership of Fidesz. With this support – entailing a considerable rise in circulation, also leading to a financial boost for the magazine³ – the style and content appearing in the paper became ever more acceptable, in fact a kind of benchmark, for the centre-right “civic” reader, and extremities gradually developed into an example, norm and normality.⁴

¹ The publisher of the paper, Magyar Ház Alapítvány (Hungarian House Foundation), received state real estate free on Andrásy út; Viktor Orbán called his followers to subscribe to and read *Magyar Demokrata*; the foundation was the organiser of a series of events called “Történelem Főutca” (“The High Street of History”) where leading Fidesz politicians appeared side by side with extreme right-wing journalists, the paper also undertook a considerable role in organising “civic cells” called into being by Orbán, it published their programmes and promoted their leaders.

² The column has been published since July 17, 2003.

³ After Viktor Orbán invited his followers to subscribe to the magazine, its circulation suddenly rose from 30-40,000 to 60,000. See: Gábor Juhász, “A jobboldali hetilapok piaca 1989-2003 (The market of right-wing weekly magazines: 1989-2003),” *Médiaakutató*, Spring 2004.

⁴ In the summer of 2003, 90 percent of *Magyar Demokrata*'s readers were stable voters of Fidesz-MPSZ (earlier, e.g. according to a survey conducted in 2001, more than half of the readers were MIÉP voters). See: Juhász, *ibid.*

SEARCHING FOR IDENTITY AND FINDING ROLE MODELS

Magyar Demokrata assumes a significant role in rephrasing an obsolete, old-new nationalistic Hungarian identity. Besides the pseudo-scientific rewriting of Hungarian prehistory⁵, this also appears through the apologetic review of Hungarian history and politics between the two world wars, also called the 'Christian course'. From the viewpoint of our research, this latter one has an important role: this was the era when an extremist, racist politician could be prime minister in Hungary,⁶ when the political elite elevated the Christian-national idea, also integrating political anti-Semitism, to the level of official ideology, carried out anti-Jewish, discriminative jurisdiction, and eventually their majority passively watched over the tragedy of Hungarian Jews in 1944. The writings of *Demokrata* discussing this period aim at absolving this kind of politics.

"The parliamentary rule of law lasting for a quarter of a century is associated with the name of Miklós Horthy,"⁷ points out the magazine, and goes on to say: "we respect our Governor (...) as the greatest Hungarian personage and statesman of the 20th century."⁸

The sentences below (quoted from other authors by the journalist) and their grouping along a concept implicitly puts the racist and anti-Semite Gyula Gömbös, and the ideology represented by him, into a positive context. "Gyula Gömbös was driven by one thing only: to make a different country from Trianon's Hungary, to help the peoples and inhabitants of the country advance (...) one can hardly challenge the honesty of his intentions to improve things."⁹ The author of the article, referring to Lajos Marschalkó¹⁰ (!), calls Gömbös the

⁵ On the ahistorical, mythicizing works about "Hungarian prehistory" promoted by *Demokrata* see: Áron Monori, "Identitáskeres(ked)ôk (Identity Seekers and Dealers)," *Magyar Narancs*, October 30, 2003.

⁶ Gyula Gömbös, an anti-Semitic and racist politician, was Prime Minister of Hungary between 1932 and 1936.

⁷ B. Á.: "A baloldal Horthy ellen (The Right Wing Against Horthy)," *Magyar Demokrata*, May 29, 2003.

⁸ "Horthy és a Hortobágy (Horthy and the Great Hungarian Plain)," (Szilvia Kállay-Nagy's interview with Sándor Faludi, leader of the farmer's section of Fidesz-MPSZ.) *Magyar Demokrata*, September 18, 2003.

⁹ Krisztián Vass, "Gömbös Gyula síremléke (Gyula Gömbös's tomb)," *Magyar Demokrata*, October 17, 2002.

¹⁰ Marschalkó is an infamous anti-Semitic journalist, author of several propagandistic anti-Semitic books. He emigrated to Germany in 1945.

creator of the Christian press, and presents him as the national politician elevating “advanced conservatism” to the level of government program.¹¹ In *Demokrata*, Gömbös is, of course, not an extreme right-wing figure, but “the leading figure of the Hungarian right wing”.¹² At the end of his essay, the author quotes, implying his approval, some lines from József Erdélyi’s¹³ (!) poem *A Vézérhez* (To the Leader), eulogizing Gömbös: “the water of life seethes on the right, the water of death on the left, choose, Hungarian: one of them makes you younger, the other makes you older and kills you”.¹⁴

The intimate relationship of the magazine with the era referred to above also becomes apparent when Demokrata supports events like the celebration of “the Day of Honor”¹⁵, given its name by the Blood and Honor Cultural Association, a Hungarist organization carrying the slogan of *Hitlerjugend (Blut und Ehre)*. Demokrata regards the demonstration of the “right-wing youths”, marching with Árpád-stripe flags*, symbols and armbands recalling Nazi and Arrow Cross Party emblems, as completely natural, and as dignified remembrance of the soldiers. “the general public has been fed for weeks now with the question whether Blood and Honor, an organization with about ten members, can commemorate the anniversary of the attempted break-out of Hungarian and German troops during the siege of Budapest in WWII. After

¹¹ Krisztián Vass, “Gömbös Gyula síremléke (Gyula Gömbös’s tomb),” *Magyar Demokrata*, October 17, 2002.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ József Erdélyi was an infamous Judeophobe poet belonging to the ‘populists’ (as opposed to ‘urbanists’, who were the other camp that formed among Hungarian writers in the 1930s). He was permanent correspondent for various extreme right-wing papers in the 1930s and 1940s. He is mostly known for his poem Solymosi Eszter vére (Eszter Solymosi’s blood), written in 1937, referring to the Tiszaeszlár blood libel case in which Jews were accused of ritual murder. After WWII, he was sentenced to three years in prison for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

¹⁴ Krisztián Vass, “Gömbös Gyula síremléke (Gyula Gömbös’s tomb),” *Magyar Demokrata*, October 17, 2002.

¹⁵ For today’s Hungarists “the Day of Honor” is the anniversary of February 11, 1945, when German and Hungarian troops attempted to break out from the Soviet blockade surrounding Budapest. In the 1990s they managed to commemorate the event several times with neo-Nazi demonstrations in the Buda Castle.

* Árpád-stripe flags are Hungarian historical flags bearing four red and four white strips and originate from the era of the Árpád Dynasty. The armband of the Hungarian Nazi party called the Arrow Cross Party consisted of the Árpád-stripe flag bearing the arrow cross symbol in the middle. It has recently become the major symbol in extremist right-wing demonstration.

the demonstration was banned several times and the venues changed, a few dozen somber youths in black clothing, waving Árpád-stripe flags, laid wreaths and flowers on a symbolic grave in Kossuth tér. 17,000 soldiers are buried in this symbolic grave, Hungarians as well as Germans.”¹⁶ There is no mentioning of what the emblems appearing at the demonstration symbolize, or that the organization is probably the Hungarian chapter of the international neo-Nazi network called *Blood and Honor*.¹⁷ At the same time, an investigation carried out by the Municipal Public Prosecutor’s Office establishes that the organization coordinating the demonstration that *Demokrata* stood up for “openly advocates neo-Nazi ideas.”¹⁸

Occasionally, *Demokrata* is not afraid of some careful apologia for Hitler and Hitler’s Germany either. The magazine makes members of the *Hitlerjugend* appear as role models, who “in the last days of the war were defending their country with heroic courage, guns in hand, many of them sacrificing their lives in the fight against the Anglo-Saxon and Soviet hordes that greatly outnumbered them, and with their prowess they added everlasting glory to Germany’s historic almanacs...”¹⁹ Then, we are informed that the *Führer* himself also commemorated these young heroes: “I die with a light heart, knowing that the determination of the youths bearing my name is unmatched in history.”²⁰ The author also gives credit to the Nazi party because “the NSDAP was proud to have 17 (!) Nobel prize winners among its members, a number that could not be beaten by all the communist parties of the world together (of course, at that time the Nobel prize ceremony did not count as one of the largest national festivities of Jews)...”²¹ The writer, in an attempt to legitimize his ideas, presents Hitler as the “Titan”, the proponent of *realpolitik*, the “most popular revolutionary

¹⁶ “Nazis go home”, *Magyar Demokrata*, March 20, 2003.

¹⁷ Although the members of the organization denied that they belonged to the international Blood and Honor network, in previous years they participated in “the Day of Honor” event in the Buda Castle together with other chapters (various West-European skinhead and neo-Nazi groups) of the international association. In addition, the Yearbook of the National Security Office refers to the association as Blood and Honor Hungária, and lists them among extreme right-wing organizations. (See: <http://www.nbh.hu/szelso.htm>).

¹⁸ MTV1, March 02, 2003. (for more details, see: <http://www.zeg.hu/page/cikk/d/1/8925/1>).

¹⁹ István Gazdag, “A halott oroszlánról (About the Dead Lion),” *Magyar Demokrata*, July 18, 2002.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

leader of the modern world” by cutting and pasting bits from the texts of scientists and politicians²² enjoying great respect in the democratic world, and speaking through them.

This approach to Nazi Germany logically leads to the topic of the Holocaust, often dwelt upon by *Magyar Demokrata*.

THE HOLOCAUST IN DEMOKRATA

The magazine approaches the topic of the final solution aiming at the extermination of European Jewry from two sides. On the one hand, some thoughts revitalizing and denying the Holocaust appear in it, aiming at its partial denial, and diminishing its significance and scale. On the other hand, the Holocaust does not appear for itself, as the tragedy of the whole humanity, as a historical or moral problem, or as the remembrance of Auschwitz. What is important in the magazine’s approach is the afterlife of the Holocaust, shown from a special angle, called the Holocaust industry. The main point of this is that “the Jews” blackmail and manipulate European peoples and nations, including the Hungarians and Hungary, with the Holocaust in order to squeeze out as much compensation as they can.

In the magazine one can encounter an (oblique) challenging of the occurrence of the Holocaust, and the denial or relativization of its certain details already unfolded by historians. “The Jews, as a proof of the viciousness of the Nazi regime and every other regime known from history, usually refer to the extermination of Jews at a so-called industrial scale (Holocaust), its specifically unique means (gas chambers) and its symbolic site (Auschwitz). However, the facts, as we know, are stubborn things. (...) among the immense number of documents becoming available for the victorious powers after the downfall of the Third Reich, there is not a single one that contains an order for the extermination of Jews. The occurrence of the Holocaust is only supported by recollections of survivors and testimonies forced out from officers of the one-time camp administration (often through exquisite torture). Resulting from the nature of the issue, *the conclusive force of both sources is rather doubtful*. [italics

²² The author cuts out and pastes fragments side by side, according to his concept, from the writings of Arnold J. Toynbee, John Lukacs and Charles De Gaulle.

added by the author, Á.M.] (...) [Elie Wiesel] invented a method of extermination that never existed: the 'white-hot pits', while on his return from Auschwitz he 'forgot' to mention the gas chambers. Which is not that surprising, since none of the gas chambers in the former concentration camps is an original edifice – all of them were built by the victors after the war, obviously for propaganda purposes."²³

A recurring practice in the magazine is to underestimate the number of the Holocaust victims, and to insist that the numbers used are absolutely unreliable. "As to Auschwitz, it is enough to say that, after several decades of juggling with the numbers of those who died in the camp, the majority of historians say that the most probable number of victims is 1.1 million...")²⁴ (According to most specialists, this number is a great deal higher than the one quoted by *Demokrata*).²⁵ The magazine, referring to a historic study published in Italian, states that "the total loss of lives is 'above 5 million', and the lives lost among Jews from Hungary is 'more than 180,000'.²⁶ (...) it is high time that the 'from-to' numbers permissible by law were determined. (...) What are the limits between which you can still quote figures without being sentenced to prison?"²⁷

The magazine rejects the idea of facing responsibility in connection with the Holocaust (i.e. the German example), and regards the process of remembrance and clarification that took place in German society wrong: "in fact, it was not a 'historic clarification' that took place in German society in the past two decades, but the implantation of a historic trauma with a new dimension, namely, the notion of the 'guilty nation'. This trauma is not rooted directly in the tragedy of the Holocaust, but in its interpretation. Today's cultural policy cannot be con-

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ From all the relevant researchers, the lowest number (1 million) is only used by Raul Hilberg. Most experts estimate that the number of Auschwitz victims was between 1.5 and 3.5 million. The number of Jewish victims of the Holocaust is generally estimated at 6 million. (For detailed figures used by researchers, see: László Karsai, *Holocaust* (Budapest: Pannonica Kiadó, 2001) 116.

²⁶ Moderate estimates quote much higher figures. According to Tamás Stark, the number of Hungarian Jews perished in the Holocaust is 440-465,000, while László Karsai believes the same figure was around 550,000. (Tamás Stark, *Zsidóság a vészkorszakban és a felszabadulás után* (Hungarian Jews during the Holocaust and after the Second World War): 1939-1955 (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete, 1995), 76; and Karsai, ibid. 253.)

²⁷ István Lovas, "Nyílt levél Bárány Péter igazságügy-miniszternek (Open Letter to Justice Minister Péter Bárány)," *Magyar Demokrata*, December 12, 2002.

tinued for very long in Germany...”)²⁸ A reader’s letter goes as far as qualifying the German regulations – i.e. the indictability of Holocaust denial – as stepping back into the “dark Middle Ages”.²⁹

But the Holocaust mostly appears in *Demokrata* as the business of “the Jews”, as the “Holocaust industry” or the “Holocaust business”. “...now the opportunity has opened for manipulations of all kinds, primarily out of financial motivations, with the number of victims and the horrors that people went through. (There is no business like Shoah-business, say revisionist historians debating the official and also compulsory concept of the Holocaust, hinting at the extortionate amounts squeezed out of various European governments and institutions by Jews as war compensation.).”³⁰ The “Holocaust industry – namely, the industrial-scale tapping established on the Holocaust” has, according to the magazine, proved to be “unashamedly profitable”.³¹

According to *Demokrata*, the exploitation of the Holocaust as a topic has also gained undeservedly large ground in Hungarian science and culture. “...in his absence, even Imre Kertész received something, as a kind of accompaniment to his Nobel Prize from home; the small, glittering thingy will come handy in Berlin, it will be nice to show off with as something he had got from the natives. (...) Although the fashionable rubbish invented by Fukuyama about the era after history has drawn to an end, but a large number of people have made their living from it, just like from the Holocaust industry...”³² “...there was basically not a single living fiction writer dealing with the issues of Hungarians present at the Frankfurt Book Fair. Krúdy, Márai, Kosztolányi – and that’s it. And among today’s writers the mostly favored are those who live off of and abuse the Holocaust issue.”³³ The accusation is that all this is the cultural variation on the Holocaust industry.

²⁸ István Szelei, “A »Na és?« relativizmusa (The Relativism of ‘Yeah, so?’),” *Magyar Demokrata*, November 28, 2002.

²⁹ Elemér Farkas, “A holokauszt tagadása (The denial of the Holocaust),” Reader’s Letter, *Magyar Demokrata*, 12 September, 2002.

³⁰ István Gazdag, “A halott oroszlánról (About the Dead Lion),” *Magyar Demokrata*, 18 July, 2002.

³¹ István Gazdag, “A bűntudat kufárjai (The Profiteers of Guilt),” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 3, 2002.

³² Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “A történelem árnyékában (In the Shadow of History),” *Magyar Demokrata*, March 27, 2003.

³³ “Nem csak ágyúval lehet lőni (It’s not only cannons you can shoot with),” Krisztina Baracius’s interview with Kornél Döbretei, *Magyar Demokrata*, October 17, 2002.

In order to make the Holocaust an appropriate tool in Jews' hands, the continuous maintenance of guilt is needed: "In Hungary there is a Holocaust commemoration every week, and they make sure that Hungarians do not forget even for one day what happened to Jews fifty years ago."³⁴

One of the favorite topics of Holocaust revisionists is questioning the unique nature of the Holocaust. Demokrata also makes use of this device. According to an article of the magazine, the uniqueness does not exist, and is only the creation of the Jewish notion of being chosen and superior: "What exactly (...) does the uniqueness [of the Holocaust] lie in? Probably in who its dead are. In the fact that while in the African country [i.e. Rwanda, A.M.] 'only' tutsis and hutus were slaughtered, in Auschwitz the victims were mainly (but not exclusively) Jews? And the Bible says, 'for he that toucheth you (i.e. Jews) toucheth the apple of his eye.'"³⁵

The essence of the magazine's attitude toward the Holocaust was phrased as follows: "as to [the Holocaust] we must mention the phenomenon called Holocaust industry."³⁶ The attempt for the total annihilation of the European Jewry, then, cannot be interesting in itself for the readers of *Demokrata*. It can only appear as a business manipulation of Jews, which has to be uncovered.

ANTI-ZIONISM AND ANTI-ISRAEL BIAS

A frequent form of the appearance of anti-Semitic sentiment is anti-Zionist³⁷ and, in close connection with it, anti-Israel propaganda, which most of the time conceals anti-Semitism. Israel's Middle East policy and the Israeli-Palestine conflict serves as a good pretext to put forward anti-Zionist ideas.

³⁴ Ágnes Seszták, "Válasz a Libérationnak (Answer to Libération)," *Magyar Demokrata*, February 28, 2002.

³⁵ István Gazdag, "A halott oroszlánról (About the Dead Lion)," *Magyar Demokrata*, July 18, 2002.

³⁶ Balázs Ágoston, "Játék a tüzzel (Playing with Fire)," *Magyar Demokrata*, December 4, 2003.

³⁷ According to the international literature on anti-Semitism, the independent function of anti-Zionism is the representation of anti-Semitic attitudes, which are regarded as taboo after the Holocaust, in a presentable form. See e.g. Helen Fein, "Contemporary Conflicts: How the Jewish Claims and Jewish Nationhood affect Anti-Semitism?" *The Persisting Question. Sociological Perspectives and Social Contexts of Modern Anti-Semitism*, ed. Helen Fein, (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987).

In this latter issue, *Demokrata* only presents the false concept of a “racist, oppressive (Nazi!) regime” versus a “small oppressed nation fighting for its freedom.” It essentially promotes the Palestinian viewpoint, and ignores facts and events not fitting into its conception. It does not mention the Palestinian institutions training suicide bombers at an industrial scale, the anti-Semitic propaganda³⁸ present in the Arab world for decades, which, according to Bernard Lewis, evokes the anti-Semitic propaganda of Nazi Germany both in its content and prevalence.³⁹ It is not mentioned either that Israeli military actions are largely (naturally questionable as to their proportionality, efficiency and moral grounds, but still:) reactions to terrorist acts.

The magazine states that Israel “is perhaps the most hideous racist state of our age (...) [where] Palestinian children are not sent to their death, as the Zionist, racist media tries to represent.”⁴⁰ The authors of *Demokrata* go as far as comparing the Jewish state to Nazi Germany: “let’s take the most excellent country of the world, Israel, self-trained for fascism, which is exterminating a nation with a thoroughness that would put the Germans to shame, and with the approval of the cultured world...”⁴¹ According to a columnist of the magazine, it is a custom in this country to shoot 3-month old babies in the head.⁴² This accusation (i.e. that of genocide) is a recurring element in the articles of the magazine.⁴³ Thus, Jewish people, taken out from their former role as victims, become perpetrators: “they do to Palestinians what the Nazis did to them”, so

³⁸ In Arab scholarly and public life the denial of the Holocaust, the absurd accusations of ritual murder traced back to Talmudic laws, or the use of the Protocols of the sages of Zion (a document that has been proven to be a fake) as a legitimate scientific reference work is generally accepted. See e.g.: Rivka Yadlin, *An Arrogant and Oppressive Spirit: Anti-Zionism as Anti-Judaism in Egypt*, (Oxford & New York: Pergamon Press, 1989), or Rinald L. Netter & Suha Taji-Farouki, eds. *Muslim-Jewish Encounters, Intellectual Traditions and Modern Politics* (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1998).

³⁹ Bernard Lewis, *Semites and Anti-Semites: An Inquiry into Conflict and Prejudice* (New York and London: WW Norton and Co., 1986) 201.

⁴⁰ István Lovas, “Viszontválasz (Answer to a Reply),” *Magyar Demokrata*, September 4, 2003.

⁴¹ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “Tractatus Socio-Psychiatricus”, *Magyar Demokrata*, January 16, 2003.

⁴² István Lovas, “Nyílt levél Bárány Péter igazságügy-miniszternek (Open Letter to Justice Minister Péter Bárány),” *Magyar Demokrata*, December 12, 2002.

⁴³ See also: Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “Ember embernek ügynöke (Man is Man’s Agent),” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 16, 2003; Balázs Ágoston, “Játék a tüzzel (Playing with Fire),” *Magyar Demokrata*, December 4, 2003; László Szentesi Zöldi, “Áldott legyen a kéz (Be the Hand Blessed),” *Magyar Demokrata*, June 15, 2002.

the moral foundation of Israel's existence ("the genocidal, racist, etc. Jewish state) can also be questioned. The archetype of the ruthless, mass murdering Jew in the magazine, is Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon.⁴⁴

However, according to *Demokrata*, the activities and attitude of the Jews described above is not a novelty, for they had been doing that earlier, too: "The Jews once occupied the land of Canaan in the name of Jahveh, slaughtered its inhabitants, and then, after many centuries of being scattered around the world, are now trying to enforce their 'ancient right' in a similar way on the same piece of land against Palestinians."⁴⁵

As regards terrorism, we can learn that the real terrorists are the Jews, who have been carrying out their terrorist activity since the 1930s to this very day: "20th-century history is encumbered with numerous gory terrorist actions: yet Zionist violence is unique in the sense that one-time murderers are distinguished citizens today (...) the murders are still going on, and the defenseless can still be ruthlessly murdered by the assumed right of the more powerful (...) state terrorism is only different from the Dir Jassin massacre because state-of-the-art firearms have replaced knives dripping with blood. The hand holding it is the same – not of the gentle Jacob, but of Esau –, it is the hand that brought suffering and imbalance to people."⁴⁶

In *Demokrata*, anti-Israel bias often goes hand in hand with anti-Americanism. The United States is the evil power which is the main tower of strength and helper of the Jewish state in achieving its unlawful objectives: "Israel, aided by the Big Brother, is presently working on the creation of Greater Israel...")⁴⁷ "America and Israel are provoking the whole world...")⁴⁸

A special product of the anti-Israel (in fact, anti-Jewish) rhetoric and propaganda (not relating directly to the Middle-East conflict) is the series of articles

⁴⁴ See e.g. Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, "A demokratikus terror (The Democratic Terror)," *Magyar Demokrata*, Február 13, 2003; or Balázs Ágoston, "Játék a tüzzel (Playing with Fire)," *Magyar Demokrata*, December 4, 2003.

⁴⁵ István Gazdag, "A halott oroszlánról (About the Dead Lion)," *Magyar Demokrata*, July 18, 2002.

⁴⁶ László Szentesi Zöldi, "Áldott legyen a kéz (Be the Hand Blessed)," *Magyar Demokrata*, June 15, 2002.

⁴⁷ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, "Nagy-Magyarország feltámadása (The Resurrection of Great Hungary)," *Magyar Demokrata*, June 12, 2003.

⁴⁸ Péter Szabó Szentmihályi, "Már megint a vesztes oldalon? (On the Losing Side Again?)," *Magyar Demokrata*, February 27, 2003.

published in *Demokrata* for six continuous weeks.⁴⁹ Its aim is to divert suspicion to Israelis (Jews) and the state of Israel in connection with the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. According to the author, “Our series attempts to put together the mosaic pieces that have been taking shape at an ever faster pace. Our method (...) is based on the most cautious handling of facts, and the relentless avoidance of lies and distortion.”⁵⁰ The goal is admittedly the making of a weapon against the *leviathan* which is not named precisely but can be easily identified by those familiar with conspiracy theories: “thus, we can forge a hard-pointed spear from truth which, stabbed at the heart of the mendacious beast weighing more and more heavily on the world, can make a wound which is more ailing if we walk the path marked out by honesty and facts.”⁵¹

In order to achieve the appropriate impact, in the introduction to the series of articles (and again in the second part) the statement, disguised as a question, appears: “Does Israel have anything to do with the 9/11 terrorist attacks against the United States?”⁵² *Demokrata*’s answer: “our columnist goes as far as saying that it has. Our magazine breaks the taboo of taboos, in a sequel of articles.”⁵³

The title of the series, “The hideous secret. The connection between Israel and the 9/11 terrorist attacks” is extremely promising, but the content of the articles does not live up to expectations in terms of facts. The articles try to hammer into the readers’ head the accusations concerning “the Jewish role” in 9/11 primarily through insinuation, and with information regarding Israeli secret services published in the American and European press, none of which raises the idea that there were Israelis behind the attacks. The sources referred to (or rather the quotations of *Magyar Demokrata*) are in fact not about this issue, but about other types of activities, as well as data collection of the Israeli intelligence carried out in the United States.⁵⁴ At the same time, the grouping of the writings quoted along the magazine’s conception and their introductions including accusations are suitable for implanting suspicion in the reader, and thus evoking anti-

⁴⁹ Botond Dobó, “A szörnyű titok (The Hideous Secret), 1-6.,” *Magyar Demokrata*, March 21–April 25, 2002.

⁵⁰ Botond Dobó, “A szörnyű titok (The Hideous Secret), 1.,” *Magyar Demokrata*, March 21, 2002.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid. and March 28, 2002.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ See the references in the article series.

Jewish sentiments. To enhance the impact and prove Jewish immorality, the magazine (allegedly, based on the reports of *Bergen Record*, a newspaper published in Jersey City) does not fail to mention that “[Israeli tourists] were discernibly celebrating after the first explosion and the next one.”⁵⁵

Following this, the magazine goes on weaving the myth about the Jews standing behind the 9/11 terrorist attack: since in the given period “the American-Israeli image touched rock bottom (...) what was needed by the USA and pro-Israeli forces under such circumstances was exactly a brutal attack by ‘Islamic fanatics’, as a result of which the USA would become the victim, and the tables are turned. Is it possible that that’s what happened on September 11? America and the whole Western world was unified in the fight against terrorism.”⁵⁶ To reinforce his statements and implications, the author also presents “Talmudic proof”: “Just one more thing. On September 11, there are exactly 111 days left until the end of the year. There are various occult factors connected to these numbers and dates. Islamic terrorists would never use a date having a meaning in numerology and astrology – which practices are among the Satan’s devices – as the time of their action. This numerology is more befitting for the cabbala.”⁵⁷

The magazine also does promotion for anti-Israel events, such as the photo exhibition held in the Hungarians’ House. The text speaks for itself: “An exhibition on Palestine languishing under Jewish occupation. Let’s see what we have to avoid – something that we are only at the beginning of.”⁵⁸ It becomes clearly obvious here that the Palestine problem is interesting for Demokrata not purely in itself: it carries a warning for Hungarians that they should defend themselves against the ‘foreigners’ before it is too late. The issue has a Hungarian relevance, which explains the actual reason behind the magazine’s friendliness toward Palestinians. According to *Demokrata*, Zionists are present in Hungary, too, and carry out their detrimental activities side by side with the “Reds” and the “unrelentingly anti-Hungarian cosmopolitans.”⁵⁹ The reader can find out from the magazine that they can do so because they have the real power.

⁵⁵ Botond Dobó, “A szörnyű titok (The Hideous Secret), 1.,” *Magyar Demokrata*, March 21, 2002.

⁵⁶ Tibor Franka, “America.doc,” *Magyar Demokrata*, April 10, 2003.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Anita Németh, “Előre Nagy-Izraelért (Onward for Great Israel!)” *Magyar Demokrata*, May 16, 2002.

⁵⁹ Balázs Molnár, “Halad a népi demokrácia szekere (The People’s Democracy Is Going Forward),” *Magyar Demokrata*, December 5, 2002.

However, this leads to the topic of international economics and politics being dominated by Jews.

THE MYTH OF INTERNATIONAL JEWISH POWER

The idea of the global economic, political and media power controlled by the international Jewry is one of the most classic elements in the system of anti-Semitic accusations. The harmful activities of the “New York-Brussels-Tel Aviv axis”, which influences events in world politics and determines international financial processes, are often condemned by Demokrata.

According to the paper, processes in world politics are, naturally, controlled by Jews from the background: “the world is going towards uninhibited violence that does not even require reasons with the leadership of America (and Israel), striving for a total control over the material and intellectual powers of the world, which can only lead to failure – unfortunately, possibly together with a significant part of the world’s population.”⁶⁰ Somewhere else we can learn that the leader of today’s only superpower, President Bush, functions as “Israel’s outstretched fist”.⁶¹ Moreover, “In American plutocracy, the ideal tenant of the White House is a puppet, an actor, a mouthpiece. Bush is really the president whom those who actually control the United States had been dreaming of: uneducated, mentally challenged, greedy in financial matters and prone to corruption, yet appears to be simple to the extent necessary but is still presentable on screen, in other words, the prototype of the useful idiot. However, he is not obtuse enough not to realize his own basic interests. This may be the explanation for the spectacular about-face of Bush, who had earlier been so traditionally hostile to Israel and the Jewish issue...”⁶²

The magazine suggests that certain Jewish circles are able to exert powerful influence not only on American but Hungarian politics as well. This could already be seen at the time of the political changes: “[Hungary] in 1988-89 obviously started a development of the South American type, led by a small group of *comprador bourgeoisie* alien to the nation (...) one of the most resolute design-

⁶⁰ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “A demokratikus terror (The Democratic Terror),” *Magyar Demokrata*, February 13, 2003.

⁶¹ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “A korlátlan hazudozás hazája (The Homeland of Unlimited Lies),” *Magyar Demokrata*, May 22, 2003.

⁶² Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “Bush biblikus busidója (Bush’s Biblical volte-face),” *Magyar Demokrata*, May 27, 2003.

er and executor of this process was the Alliance of Free Democrats, which has just celebrated the 15th anniversary of its rule over the country. Since then it has proved several times that it has not too much to do with its chosen name, but at least – and this deserves praise – they did not include 'Hungarian' in their name. (...) the total loss of values and credit has made liberalism a swearword, probably turning it into a vulgarism forever, as the accommodator of Soros's⁶³ Open Society, multiculturalism, cosmopolitan uprootedness and globalization."⁶⁴

Demokrata believes that Péter Medgyessy was also helped to power by America and Israel,⁶⁵ and today's Hungarian (left-wing and liberal) political and economic elite is a creation of the international Jewish power. "The citizen who had just started to become conscious of himself had to see not only that he was deceived and plundered before he could wake, that he was robbed of his future before he could fight for his present, but he had to realize eventually that the perestroika was not a Soviet-Russian invention but only the local prelude and introduction to a worldwide process (...) The capos used to wave red flags with the sickle and hammer, now the same people are raising the Star-Spangled Banner. Back then the center was Moscow, now the multiple center of power has its seats in several sub-centers at the same time: in Washington, Tel-Aviv, New York and Brussels and Strasbourg (...) the – let's use this term – red experimental period proved to be highly useful and successful. Now the blue era is coming: the red flag will be replaced by the blue one (...) the bloodthirsty ghost of communism (...) after it had haunted and ruined Europe and Asia, now – in a different shape – is preparing to take over the world."⁶⁶

SZDSZ people, "who belong to the hollókaszt"⁶⁷ ['raven caste'],⁶⁸ then use the power they gained to the detriment of the Hungarian people: "we are unable

⁶³ Reference to George Soros, the number-one archetype of Jewish financial power in Hungarian anti-Semitic political journalism.

⁶⁴ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, "Szellemi polgárháború (Intellectual Civil War)," *Magyar Demokrata*, December 4, 2003.

⁶⁵ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, "A történelem árnyékában (In the Shadow of History)," *Magyar Demokrata*, May 27, 2003.

⁶⁶ András Bencsik, "A proletkult mítosza (The Myth of the Proletarian Culture), 1.," *Magyar Demokrata*, February 27, 2003.

⁶⁷ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, "A korlátlan hazudozás hazája (The Homeland of Unlimited Lies)," *Magyar Demokrata*, May 22, 2003.

⁶⁸ Besides *Demokrata*, I have only seen the particularly tasteless pun "Holocaust-hollókaszt" (holló = raven, kaszt = caste) on Internet forums with the most extremist attitude.

to get rid of this small, aggressive, extremely arrogant lot which thrives by always citing human rights, because they themselves make the laws and immediately change them before they would start to apply to them as well. They have become exempt from every consequence of their treason constantly committed since 1945 with this simple trick...”)⁶⁹ In order to achieve their goals regarding power, they do not shrink from unlawful means either: “George Soros unlawfully influences Hungarian elections from abroad... ”⁷⁰

The capital necessary for such actions is always held by the international Jewish capitalist (often epitomized by George Soros), the *Shylock-Jew*. Moreover, capital can only belong to Jews, since – as it becomes apparent from the magazine – there are no Christian capitalists: “Such capital does not exist, the last Christian tycoon was Henry Ford,⁷¹ and he did get his deserts. Unfortunately, this is the situation: Christian existence and sense of justice does not allow for the development of the motivation system of either the socialist, or the liberal or the capitalist mentality and approach.”⁷² In other words, money – and the power that goes with it – is always in Shylock’s hand.

We can learn from the magazine that Jewish groups having substantial capital and political power are able to influence Hungarian government organs and legislation as well: “Hungary has become a show pupil of the Holocaust school with the slogan ‘from kindergarten to university’, where the leaders of the Jewish World Congress come to discuss drafts of legal instruments with the Ministry of Justice...”),⁷³ moreover, “the efforts to make hate speech indictable (...) became urgent at the pressure of the Jewish World Congress...”);⁷⁴ “Hegedűs Jr. used literary quotations in his article instead of his own words, and he spoke of neither physical violence nor anyone’s racial inferiority. However, the Parliament suspended the parliamentary immunity of the MP. The public prosecutor’s office is investigating at present...”⁷⁵ At the same time, “The Hungarian

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ (no author), “Helyesítés (Correction),” *Magyar Demokrata*, October 17, 2002.

⁷¹ Besides being a businessman, Henry Ford, the automobile industry tycoon, was also famous for his belligerent anti-Semitism and his book *The international Jew* in which he presented it. It is by no accident that Demokrata’s columnist sees him as an epitome of the “Christian” capitalist.

⁷² Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “Ember embernek ügynöke (Man is Man’s Agent),” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 23, 2003.

⁷³ Balázs Molnár, “És huss, elrepült (And it Just Flew Away),” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 30, 2003.

⁷⁴ (no author), “Üsd a fasistát (Beat the Fascist),” *Magyar Demokrata*, November 20, 2003.

⁷⁵ Krisztián Vass, “www.zsido.com,” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 31, 2002.

specialists of the American Thought Police have completed the amendments of the constitutional framework of politically correct hate speech.”⁷⁶

Jewish influence also leaves its mark on cultural life: “I know the time is close when (...) every Hungarian citizen will have to present their own copy, [i.e. of Faithlessness, a novel by Imre Kertész, Á.M.] have it stamped every month and recite the designated parts to supervisors.”⁷⁷

After all this, it is almost natural that every field of scientific, cultural and economic life is dominated by “the alien-hearted”: “Perhaps nowhere else in Europe is Jewry as over-represented in science, culture, economy and finance, and in the written and electronic media as in Hungary. (Many of them got there with their talent, and many of them through a peculiar *protek-cionizmus** [italics added by the author, Á.M.].)”⁷⁸ “...even at present, the selection of the unfittest is relentlessly working. The circles and the cultural terrorism which scoff at literature dealing with vital issues of the nation already have an established coterie.”⁷⁹

In anti-Semitic literature the myth that the press and the media is controlled by Jews is a separate category, and there is ample reference to it in *Demokrata* as well. According to them, in Hungary there are broadcasting services that expressly operate under Jewish control, and also, “the Jews” are able to influence efficiently the content appearing in Hungarian media: “ATV channel (...) is in the hands of a pro-Israeli sect.”⁸⁰ “The neo-Nazi, racist heavies of the Hungarian Television”⁸¹ falsify their reports on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in favor of Israel, they lie, disparage the Palestinian Authority, and hush up news that are unpleasant for the Jewish side.⁸² At the same time, “the Israeli ambas-

⁷⁶ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “A demokratikus terror (The Democratic Terror),” *Magyar Demokrata*, February 13, 2003.

⁷⁷ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “Már megint a vesztes oldalon? (On the Losing Side Again?),” *Magyar Demokrata*, February 27, 2003.

* A pun on the Hungarian word ‘protekcionizmus’ (protectionism), where the second part, ‘cionizmus’ means ‘Zionism’.

⁷⁸ Zsolt Ungváry, “Igazságatlanságok sora (Series of Unfairness),” *Magyar Demokrata*, February 28, 2002.

⁷⁹ “Nem csak ágyúval lehet lőni (You cannot shoot only with cannons),” Krisztina Baracius’s interview with Kornél Döbrentei, *Magyar Demokrata*, October 17, 2002.

⁸⁰ István Lovas, “O. J. Simpsontól Grespikig (From O. J. Simpson to Grespik),” *Magyar Demokrata*, December 12, 2003.

⁸¹ István Lovas, “Közzolgálati rasszizmus (Racism in Public Media),” *Magyar Demokrata*, March 13, 2003.

⁸² Ibid.

sador always protests whenever there is (was) a report on television (these cannot be seen any more) or on the radio which does not correspond to his ideas.”⁸³

The magazine is convinced that Hungarian media authorities are also under Jewish influence because, when the managing director of MAZSIHISZ (Alliance of Jewish Communities in Hungary) submitted a complaint to ORTT (National Radio and Television Commission) about a commentary read out in Hungarian Radio’s program *Vasárnapi újság* (Sunday News), which he deemed to be anti-Semitic, “ORTT, quite astonishingly, immediately launched an investigation upon Zoltai’s urging, following which ORTT, in a procedure resembling martial law proceedings, condemned Hungarian Radio.”⁸⁴ On another occasion, a columnist of the magazine urges the Budapest Ambassador of the Palestinian Authority to file a complaint with the media commission, for “Everyone should see whose interests are served, similarly to the public television, by ORTT.”⁸⁵ This closes the circle. In *Demokrata*’s world, the media and the authorities supervising it are alike controlled by “the Jews”.

SINS OF JEWS

In *Demokrata*, Jews in Hungary are alien-hearted, foreigners, “non-Christians stationing in our country,”⁸⁶ are different from us Hungarians, the “natives”.⁸⁷ These foreigners have collective traits and collective sins. Sins attributed to persons or groups identified as Jews, or occasionally to “the Jews”, are often presented in the magazine. From time to time, absurd accusations also appear. Among them is, for instance, slave trade, presented as a specifically Jewish activity spanning over history, because of which – the magazine believes – “the Jews” should be made to pay damages: “In the light of the latest historical research, it has been proven by now that the slave trade between Africa and

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ István Lovas, “Posztumusz üdvözlet (Posthumous Greeting),” *Magyar Demokrata*, September 25, 2003.

⁸⁵ István Lovas, “Közszolgálati rasszizmus (Racism in Public Media),” *Magyar Demokrata*, March 13, 2003.

⁸⁶ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “Az ügynök provokál (The Agent Provokes),” *Magyar Demokrata*, December 12, 2002.

⁸⁷ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “A történelem árnyékában (In the Shadow of History),” *Magyar Demokrata*, March 27, 2003.

America going on for centuries was actually a *Jewish monopoly*. (...) To make the picture complete: the whole slave trade from Europe to Arabia – called 'white or blond gold' – in the Middle Ages was also controlled by Jews and (...) and they still pocket billions from the human trafficking conducted these day between the third world and Europe...”⁸⁸

Of course, the sins committed by Jews are not surprising, since “in the fifth book of Moses one can find the instructions on the basis of which Jews are still handling such⁸⁹ and similar conflicts. ‘and when Jehovah thy God delivereth it (the city) into thy hand, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword: but the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take for a prey unto thyself.’ (Deut. 20:13-14) And Jews act accordingly.”⁹⁰ Consequently, Jewish sins are theologically determined, so the inclination to them cannot be changed.

The magazine claims that those who stand behind the war against terror carry out evil acts against Hungary as well: “Now it is the industry against terrorism that the globally spreading beast wants (...) And the invaders are just coming and coming in orderly array, not knowing of mercy and benevolence. (...) We have become exiles in our own country! This is already a defensive war, where the foreign army has ventured too far. (...) Corvin Alley, come between us, stop the billow of the debauched troops! Hold down their hands, and pass an eternal judgment on them! They should not be able to come back ever, *place a crown of thorns on our heads, or crucify us on their own faltering cross!* [italics added by the author, Á. M.]”⁹¹ The crown of thorns and the crucifixion evoke the Christ-murderer Jews for the experienced reader.

In its comments on the “execution” of the highly anti-Semitic Pannon Rádió⁹² the magazine already predicts the future punishment of the crimes committed: “So this is it for Pannon Rádió, and the rest of the commercial radio and

⁸⁸ István Gazdag, “A bűntudat kufárjai (The Profiteers of Guilt),” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 3, 2002.

⁸⁹ Previously, the article accused a “Jewish” paper with implying the need for the castration of Arab men.

⁹⁰ Henrik Németh, “Lovas Istvánnak (To István Lovas),” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 31, 2002.

⁹¹ Tamás Molnár, “Ez már háború (This is Already War),” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 16, 2003.

⁹² In the autumn of 2002, the majority owners of Gidó Média Ltd., the company operating Pannon Rádió, transformed the radio station into a non-political commercial channel with new editors, while the MIÉP-advocate minority owner (Foundation for the István Bocskai Open University) was objecting to this. In other words, the decision was not made by the authorities.

television stations (...) are going on to serve the subcultural filth, the multicultural gibberish, with their singing and deranged presenters with their speech defect, and with their anti-religious, Hungarian-abuser, deeply ignorant press workers. Good work, boys and girls, congratulations on behalf of the colleagues as well. But if the big storm which is due to break out at least once every hundred years should strike a little earlier by accident, please keep all those lies to yourselves. You did all this out of revenge, it felt good, but once you'll have to pay for everything, and you know that best, you who learned arithmetic on bank notes when you were children...")⁹³

Hinting at the crimes committed by Jews under the communist regime, the magazine often refers to the "Jewish dominance" in the former power-enforcement organizations, especially among the officers and leaders of the State Security Bureau (ÁVH). "The House of Terror is indeed not a Holocaust museum – it is about the stations of the humiliation of the Hungarian nation. And it is extremely liberal in not mentioning at all who formed the general staff of ÁVH."⁹⁴ "We can be sure that, regardless of his qualities, the Nobel prize will never be awarded to a Hungarian writer who makes the following comment: 'Jews have still not been confronted with ÁVH. I hope that after this acknowledgement they will have more opportunity to confront it.'"⁹⁵

In the world view promoted by *Demokrata*, the Jews, although they accuse Hungarians of hatred, are in fact the real malignant ones. Imre Kertész and Elie Wiesel,⁹⁶ similarly to Tom Lantos, Charles Gati and György Soros, hate and slander Hungarians.⁹⁷ "Paul Lendvai belongs to the caste which loves to lecture stupid Hungarians being trapped at home, similarly to Fejtő, Soros, Lantos and the others...")⁹⁸

⁹³ Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, "Az ügynök provokál (The Agent Provokes)," *Magyar Demokrata*, 12 December, 2002.

⁹⁴ Ágnes Seszták, "Válasz a Libérationnak (Answer to Libération)," *Magyar Demokrata*, February 28, 2002.

⁹⁵ Balázs Molnár, "Kertész nem diszkriminál (Kertész does not Discriminate)," *Magyar Demokrata*, November 14, 2002.

⁹⁶ István Lovas, "A likvidalandó sőpredék (The Scum To Be Liquidated)," *Magyar Demokrata*, January 9, 2003.

⁹⁷ István Lovas, "Különös látogatás (A Strange Visit)," *Magyar Demokrata*, August 21, 2003.

⁹⁸ Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: "Ébredés a Tolvajok Köztársaságában (Waking in the Republic of Thieves)," *Magyar Demokrata*, July 17, 2003.

THERE IS NO ANTI-SEMITISM IN HUNGARY, ONLY ALLEGATIONS OF ANTI-SEMITISM (SPREAD BY JEWS)

At the far right – including *Demokrata* – it is almost compulsory to deny the presence of anti-Semitism in Hungary, and to condemn (occasionally threaten) those who call attention to this “non-existing” phenomenon: “[the book] bearing the title ‘Anti-Semitic public discourse in Hungary in 2001’ is a shame on the character of the editors, an even bigger shame on the country, but is the biggest shame on us, Hungarians, who have been bearing this unfounded humiliation for years. Those who compile these so-called anti-Semitic writings laugh aloud among themselves at how stupid the Hungarians are and how much can be still done to them. In our own country our noses are incessantly pushed into the virtual toilet, on the side of which the sign reads: Anti-Semitic Lumpkin Hungarian. There are such dignitaries saying this as Nancy Goodman Brinker or Tom Lantos.”⁹⁹

According to the theory, the goal of “the Jews” is the sustenance of accusing others with anti-Semitism, in the background of which there are, of course, political and power-driven aspirations: “In Hungary there are no national socialist or fascist movements or parties of major significance. For this reason, there are attempts to marginalize the right-wing government and MIÉP in their writings.”¹⁰⁰ “The allegation of anti-Semitism is the joker of political liberalism which is always bound to be a winning card. Anyone who runs through the papers of the past months will be shocked to see the deluge of allegations of anti-Semitism which gushes on the conservative camp. The thought actually evolves in many people that certain powers wish to provoke real anti-Semitism, which would then serve as a pretext for a reckoning with the conservative camp.”¹⁰¹

The magazine says that the allegations of anti-Semitism are part of an intellectual civil war between “a provocative minority” and the majority. “So, the intellectual civil war is raging, and anyone can see that with ever rougher means (...) a provocative and impatient minority inflames the emotions. In Hungary

⁹⁹ Ágnes Seszták, “Irodalmi közbeszéd itt és most (Literary Public Discourse Here and Now),” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 9, 2003.

¹⁰⁰ Krisztián Vass, “www.zsido.com,” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 31, 2002.

¹⁰¹ Gábor Bencsik, “Üsd az intoleránst! (Beat the Intolerant Ones!),” *Magyar Demokrata*, January 30, 2003.

there is still no anti-Semitism, moreover, there is no terrorism, thank God. But it seems as if the real goal of the war were to make it happen at last.”¹⁰²

Demokrata has even created a complete (albeit rather confused) theory to discredit the critics of anti-Semitic phenomena. According to this, ‘the A-gun’ (meaning the fight against anti-Semitism as a political weapon) is a constructed element of culture, which spreads like wildfire in modern societies.¹⁰³ ‘Anti-Semitizing’ (i.e. the criticism of anti-Semitic speech), which spread together with it, is no better than anti-Semitism itself (which does not exist, for that matter). “There is Jew-bashing, yet there is no real – malignant – anti-Semitism in an official sense; at least it is not stronger and more significant than calling people anti-Semites.”¹⁰⁴ According to this statement, anti-anti-Semitic discourse falls under the same judgment (meaning: is to be condemned similarly) as anti-Semitic propaganda.

The final conclusion is that “Anti-Semitism is a stamp that anyone can be discredited with these days.”¹⁰⁵ At the same time, a threat appears, warning that in case “the Jews” carry on with their anti-Hungarian activities, they could provoke real anti-Semitic actions: “in our country no one breaks the windows of Jewish shops, there is no arson or Jew-beating. However, it seems there are people who try everything to provoke this. For instance, on November 18 there were reports that Israel would not respond to Hungary’s request for the extradition of an Israeli ex-agent who became involved in a fight in Szeged in 1999 (...) Salamon Berkowitz does not strive for peace either (...). As it is apparent, continuous provocations perturb our everyday life, and there are people who, for some reason, heap a flux of false accusations on the conservative right. This is a dangerous game. Hungarian wisdom and patience has always proved to be stronger than provocations, but who knows when the wind turns here as well.”¹⁰⁶ Here the “provocative” and “impatient” Jew appears in contrast to the “wise” and “patient” Hungarian. The message is that they cannot live in the same environment and society forever, because patience will run out at some point.

¹⁰² Péter Szentmihályi Szabó, “Szellemi polgárháború (Intellectual Civil War),” *Magyar Demokrata*, December 4, 2003.

¹⁰³ György Varga Domokos, “Az A-fegyver, mint sikeres mém (The A-gun as a Successful Meme),” *Magyar Demokrata*, June 13, 2002.

¹⁰⁴ György Varga Domokos, “Törzsek harca (War of Tribes),” *Magyar Demokrata*, May 23, 2002.

¹⁰⁵ Balázs Ágoston, “Játék a tűzzel (Playing with Fire),” *Magyar Demokrata*, December 4, 2003.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

SUMMARY

Reading *Magyar Demokrata*'s articles relevant to our topic discussed, one can see a wide repertoire of the elements of an anti-Semitic system of thoughts. The editors of the magazine strive for the full rehabilitation of the Horthy era, when anti-Semitic discrimination was a practice, and for absolving its foul policy. It presents the emblematic figures of this period (including illustrious representatives of Hungarian racial protection and political anti-Semitism) as personalities who can serve as examples for today's people. Instead of presenting the Holocaust as the tragedy of European Jewry and the scandal of the century, it appears as the *Shoah business*, the business of "the Jews". The authors try to diminish the significance, the real scale and the actual events of the Holocaust and make it appear as an event not unique in history, which has been magnified by "the Jews" – in order to achieve their selfish economic and political goals. The immorality of Jews blackmailing the world with the Holocaust and their collective tendencies for committing sins is occasionally traced back by *Demokrata* to religious-traditional (Talmudic) reasons. Jews, predestined for collective sins, carry out harmful activities in the world and in Hungary alike. They have the means to do so, since – as conspiracy theories claim – massive economic power is concentrated in the hands of Jewish financiers (today's Shylocks), with which the events of world politics can also be controlled. In the arena of world politics, Israel is the demon itself, the racist, Nazi and mass murderer state, whose politics and even its mere existence can be questioned. The prime minister of the Jewish state, Sharon, is a war criminal, the archetype of the genocidal Jewish leader. However, Israel in itself is not interesting for *Demokrata*. As Bernard Lewis writes: "for Christian anti-Semites the Palestine problem is a pretext and an opportunity to express their hatred..."¹⁰⁷ Accordingly, the Palestinian issue has Hungarian relevance as well in the magazine: the oppression of Palestinians is a warning sign for us, Hungarians. That is how we can end up if we do not defend ourselves efficiently against the new conquerors.

In addition to this issue, *Demokrata* finds the alleged reason in almost every topic to "hit on" "the Jews" and disseminate its anti-Jewish obsessions, which

¹⁰⁷ Bernard Lewis, *Semites and Anti-Semites: An Inquiry into Conflict and Prejudice* (New York and London: WW Norton and Co., 1986) 256.

eventually conglomerate as a complete world view. In *Magyar Demokrata*'s world, "the Jews" dominate politics, economy and culture, beginning from war decisions on Iraq through awarding Nobel prizes to selecting the Hungarian prime minister. This system of accusations forms the basis of the anti-Semitic ideology conveyed by the magazine, this is what Demokrata propagates, and does so with significant political support.

(Translated by Andrea Megyes)

JÁNOS GADÓ

SNAPSHOT

Israel in the Hungarian Press – April 2002¹

“... You declare, my friend, that you do not hate the Jews, you are merely ‘anti-Zionist.’ And I say, let the truth ring forth from the high mountain tops, let it echo through the valleys of God’s green earth: When people criticize Zionism, they mean Jews – this is God’s own truth ... The times have made it unpopular, in the West, to proclaim openly a hatred of the Jews. This being the case, the anti-Semite must constantly seek new forms and forums for his poison. How he must revel in the new masquerade! He does not hate the Jews, he is just ‘anti-Zionist’!”

(Martin Luther King: *Letter to an Anti-Zionist Friend*)

ANTI-SEMITISM AND ANTI-ZIONISM

What's in a name? How do left-wing and/or liberal daily and weekly newspapers that have been exemplary in their stance against anti-Semitism since 1990 find their way onto the pages of a study concerned with anti-Semitism? How is it possible to mention them together with (extreme) right-wing publications? Can there be any “common denominator” with regard to this question?

It clearly isn't anti-Semitism in the traditional sense of the word. An ideology that denies or restricts the right of Jews, as individuals, to assimilate into European society as equal citizens would not be permitted in the columns of today's left-wing newspapers. The left-wing and liberal press will not tolerate discrimination against Hungarian citizens on the basis of their ethnicity, nor any open or veiled accusations of conspiracies, corruption of the race etc. against those of Jewish origin. In this respect they are truly in line with current European standards, something that is certainly not true of the right-wing press – with the possible exception of *Heti Válasz*.

The common factor is anti-Zionism. This is not an ideology, but a daily practice: the veiled questioning of the Israeli state's right to exist. The means of doing so: infinite exaggeration of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, causing the

¹ Abridged Hungarian version.

struggle depicted as a standoff between Palestinian civilians and Israeli soldiers to take on apocalyptic proportions, and European public opinion to regard Israel as the greatest single threat to world peace. By no means does this originate from Hungary. It is the product of today's humanist, minority-loving European left-wing press, and in this respect too, the Hungarian left-wing press is following the European example. (Although it still has a long way to go, since the tone of voice tolerated in certain European papers – with accusations of fascism and genocide leveled at Israel – is still not customary in the Hungarian left-wing press. The Hungarian (extreme) right wing stands closer to Europe in this respect.)²

"What we are seeing is pent-up anti-Semitism," wrote Charles Krauthammer in the *New York Times*. "The release – with Israel as the trigger – of a millennium-old urge that powerfully infected and shaped European history."³ We call this pent-up anti-Semitism anti-Zionism, which expresses, in modern language condemning Israel and being protective of human rights and minorities, what was expressed in religious terms by the anti-Judaism of the middle ages and in the language of politics and "science" by the anti-Semitism of the 19-20th century: the Jews (the Jewish state) have no place among the ranks of decent people (nations, states). In anti-Zionist language, the modernized version, many of the old anti-Jewish clichés are permitted. Instead of child-murdering Jews there are now Israeli soldiers killing Palestinian children, the Jewish world conspiracy has been replaced by the "influential American Jewish lobby." The responses to these are also similar to those of the past: rather than boycott Jewish shops, refuse to buy Israeli goods, instead of the university *Numerus Clausus* a boycott of Israeli research scientists by the international scientific community, etc.

A special form of Holocaust denial – a manipulation rejected and deeply condemned by the left wing – has taken root among the left in Europe: the previously mentioned accusations of fascism by the Jewish state, the comparison of its politicians with Nazi leaders and its army with the SS. But what does all this

² See, for example, statements made by Portuguese writer José Saramago during his visit to Jenin in March 2002, according to which the events in the Palestinian territories can be compared with Auschwitz. The Hungarian left-wing press were extremely restrained in their response to these comments, and the March 26 issue of *Népszabadság* even reported the outraged replies of Israeli writers. However, the extreme right-wing press were overjoyed at the ramblings of Saramago, who, incidentally, has communist leanings (!)

³ Charles Krauthammer, "Europe and 'Those People,'" *New York Times*, April 26, 2002.

have to do with Holocaust denial? They are both a means of flight from the heavy burden of the moral debt owed to the Jewish people. The mechanism of Holocaust denial is a primitive one: if there wasn't a Holocaust then we can't be held responsible for it. The demonizers of Israel add another twist: there was certainly a Holocaust, but the Jews today are behaving exactly the same as the Nazis did back then, so they shouldn't demand anything from us Europeans.

The scenes depicted on television screens and in daily and weekly newspapers in the west only show the confrontation between Palestinian children (pregnant mothers, old ladies, etc) and Israeli soldiers. This indoctrination, repeated on a daily basis, leads public opinion in the west to see Israel as the most despicable country imaginable, with its soldiers who wage war on children and pregnant women. (See the public opinion research results published in November 2003, showing that Europeans consider Israel the greatest current threat to world peace.) It is against this background that statements are made to the effect that "Condemning Israel is not anti-Semitism."

The Hungarian left wing and its various forums, which generally use the terms "Europe" and "European" to mean "desirable" or "the best possible," have naturally also taken on board the European vision of the Middle East. In my opinion the uncritical assumption by today's Hungarian left-wing press of this viewpoint – heavily biased against Israel – is reprehensible.

AN OCEAN IN THE DROP. MIDDLE-EAST COVERAGE IN THE HUNGARIAN PRESS IN APRIL 2002.

The following is my attempt to respond to the view of Israel presented in the Hungarian press, in light of the above. The specific example I shall use is the bloodiest series of events so far in the new Intifada: the Israeli counter-strike to a series of Palestinian attacks which killed 124 people in March 2002.

In response to the terrorist acts, on March 29, 2002 the Israeli army, the Cahal, launched "Operation Defensive Shield," with the aim of destroying terrorist infrastructure within the Palestinian territories. This maneuver was first the time that the Cahal penetrated deep and into Palestinian territories for any length of time. Three of the towns affected made the newspaper and TV headlines for weeks: Ramallah, Jenin and Bethlehem. The first was the location of Arafat's besieged headquarters, the second was where the heavy fighting gave rise to accusations of mass murder, and in the third the church considered to be

the birthplace of Jesus was occupied by armed Palestinian militia, upon which it was surrounded by the Israeli forces. The media ensured that the events here were distorted out of all proportion. The mass media reports coming out of Bethlehem made every effort to reduce the role of the Palestinian militia to a minimum, and seemed to give the impression that the Israeli army was storming the most holy site of Christianity.⁴ This type of distortion, like the ocean in a drop, shows the stance of the mass media with regard to the entire conflict in the Middle-East.

THE LEFT-WING AND LIBERAL DAILY PRESS

All the daily papers reported events in a “politically correct” tone – in other words they distanced themselves equally from both parties – with the result that they also reported the most incredible Palestinian accusations (for example, of “Genocide” in Jenin, the demolition of the refugee camp) and their rebuttals by the Israelis, which naturally presented Israel in a bad light. In this respect, they worryingly followed the cue of the international press. However, there are subtle differences between the Hungarian national daily papers.

The April 4 issue of *Népszabadság* reports event in the holy city under the headline *Israeli siege in Bethlehem*. The Israeli policeman in the picture, with a contorted expression, is beating a woman with his truncheon. According to the caption: “Peace protestors harmed.” Those who manage to overcome their initial outrage at this example of Israeli aggression and brutality are informed by the bold-type catch line that “Israeli troops have surrounded the Bethlehem cathedral located on the presumed site of Jesus’ birth, since 200 Palestinian militia had taken refuge inside.” Only in the second part of the article are we informed of the reason for the standoff – the fact that it began with a retaliatory strike by Israel. The same impression is given off by the headline and the photo. This is a common trick, used in almost every newspaper report about Bethlehem. First readers learn of the action taken by Israeli troops, and only afterwards are they informed that it was in fact the response to an act of violence by the Palestinians.

Later, the above article continues as follows: “Latin patriarch Michel Sabbah announced that the intruders had laid down their weapons, and so he had decided to offer them refuge.” It is doubtful whether those terrorists who shot the

⁴ János Gadó, “A dzsenini vérvád és társai (The Jenin Blood Libel and Others),” *Szombat*, June 2003.

church gates to pieces, and of who – it is common knowledge – hardly value their own lives, let alone others', respect the holiness of a Christian church. It does not occur to the correspondent (Jehuda Lahav) to question the words of the patriarch. But he is far more skeptical of the stance taken by the Israeli spokesman, carefully placing speech marks around his obvious statement that "the Palestinians are cynically abusing the sanctity of the Christian churches."

In its lengthy Middle-East summary on April 4, *Népszava* can only spare one paragraph for the occupation of the Bethlehem church. "There was a siege yesterday in Bethlehem, when over 300 Palestinians sought refuge in the Church of the Nativity, including – according to Israeli reports – several dozen Palestinian militia who have been on the authorities' wanted list for some time. The church has been surrounded by Israeli tanks and troops. According to Israeli soldiers, some of those inside the church have opened fire on them." So first the reader learns that the Palestinians were "seeking refuge," and only later that "according to Israeli reports" (they said it, we're just passing it on) "several dozen militia" are among their number. The author (*Népszava*-summary) does everything possible to make the brutal occupation of a church seem like a flight to sanctuary.

In the April 10 issue of *Népszabadság* Demeter Pogár writes that "The Franciscan monks and civilian and armed Palestinians trapped in the church are threatened with destruction." The subtle transition is astounding: how it is possible to lump Palestinian terrorists together with Franciscan monks, and show them as victims. The next paragraph: "The Patriarch of Jerusalem recently spoke of how the building offers sanctuary to Arabs and Jews alike." Thus, the reality of the terrorist occupation of the church is masked with the fiction of an Arab-Jewish commune.

One of *Népszava*'s tasteful photographs – printed courtesy of Reuters (April 8) – depicts the Israeli tanks viewed from behind a string of rosary beads, clearly implying a standoff between peaceful Christians and aggressive Jews. "Twenty Christian and humanitarian organizations have announced their intention to hold a peace march to the church. The roads to the world-famous building are blocked by Israeli soldiers," continues the *Népszava* report, once again making it clear that humanists and Christians are on one side, Israelis on the other. (*Magyar Hírlap* reports the same events in a similar style.)

Three days later (April 11), a return to the same cliché. According to a seemingly endless article in *Népszava* entitled "The world wants peace in the Middle-East": "[The Israelis] would not abandon their siege of the Church of the

Nativity, one of Christianity's most important shrines, even at the request of Pope John Paul II, without the surrender of more than 200 armed Palestinians, classified as extremely dangerous terrorists, who have been hiding in the building for over a week." So even the Pope, one of the greatest moral authorities of our time, is unable to persuade the Jews to stop laying siege to one of Christianity's most important shrines. The author ("MTI reports") does not complicate the issue by mentioning that the militia are Muslim, since that would not fit in with the fiction of a Jewish-Christian confrontation. A further inaccuracy is that there is no question of a siege, since the Israelis (in contrast to the Muslims) did not attack the church – but the Hungarian and international press still used the word "siege" in this manner. By doing this, the leftwing paper presents a textbook example of the clichés of Christian anti-Judaism. Because there's no need to describe in detail the images that the silhouette of a Jewish soldier destroying Jesus' birthplace bring to mind. The article's title "The world wants peace..." further heightens the contrast, as it is perfectly clear who, in the author's opinion, does not want peace.

In most of their reports on the Bethlehem conflict all three dailies write about "the Palestinians seeking refuge in the church," blurring the fact that in reality the church was occupied by armed militia. The basic stance of all three papers is political correctness. They refrain from exclusively blaming a single party. *Magyar Hírlap* occasionally goes beyond the clichés, giving voice to opposing opinions⁵ and allowing us a glimpse of the everyday reality of Palestinian terror.

The photographs accompanying the reports often carry a completely different message to that of the text. While the latter eventually informs us, one way or the other, that the Bethlehem church is being occupied by Palestinian militia, there is no sign of this in the pictures. All that can be seen is the smoking church and the Israeli soldiers. Not a single picture is shown of the Palestinians. The Hungarian press usually works with agency photos (mostly from *Reuters*) but, similarly to their western counterparts, wordlessly acknowledges the fact that in this grave and symbolic conflict, the pictures only show Israelis as the aggressors. The photographers and cameramen, who so bravely dodge the Israeli soldiers, do not even attempt to enter the Church of the Nativity and photograph the Palestinian militia. Of course, they wouldn't have had much chance to do so,

⁵ This writer published his counter-opinion under the title of "Dimensions" in the April 20 issue of the paper.

but it is strange that nobody had a problem with this until it was mentioned a few times that the Israeli army was obstructing the correspondents in their work.⁶

Political correctness then, with its rejection of the primitive dichotomy of good and evil, only applies to the *text* of the reports. Meanwhile, the pictures show helpless Palestinians – and behind them (in the picture of the “peace activities”) a world that yearns for peace – confronted by the military might of Israel.

MAG YAR NEMZET

Hungary’s only right-wing national daily paper did not even cultivate an illusion of political correctness, and held Israel responsible for everything from almost the first day of the conflict. Its lengthy reports and editorials are crowded with phrases like “Israel crucifies the Palestinian nation” (March 30), “Israel is a terrorist state” (same article), “the indescribable barbarism of the Israelis” in the church (April 9), “massacre of Palestinian civilians and refugees” (April 15), “Israel’s decades-old disregard for the law,” “desecration of the holy shrines of Christianity” (April 6), etc.

The paper first reports on the Bethlehem conflict in its April 3 issue. “In the evening, 150 were trapped in the Church of the Nativity after Israeli units occupied the town. According to eyewitnesses the people fled into the church to escape the gunfire of the Israeli soldiers. Among them are at least twenty wounded, who are being attended to by the priest.” The report turns the facts on their head. Without even mentioning the Palestinian militia, it tells a fictional story of the Christian priest treating the wounded Palestinians, fantasizing about peaceful cooperation where the reality is armed force.

The next day’s issue is more precise: “On Tuesday evening 150 Palestinian policemen and militia sought refuge in the Church of the Nativity, one of Christianity’s holy shrines, during a battle with Israeli armored vehicles and helicopters.” Later, we can read about the “200 Palestinians sheltering in the church” (April 8), while according to a sidebar the following day, the Pope “feels a great affinity with those who are ‘at this moment undergoing great hardship’ in the Bethlehem church”.

⁶ In the April 4 report by *Népszabadság*, we can read that “the Israeli authorities are increasingly obstructing the work of the press in the militarized zone.”

In its April 13 issue the paper reports on a speech given by Arafat over the phone and played over loudspeakers in a Christian church in Cairo, in which he said that “the Palestinians are defending the holy places from the Israeli onslaught.” The paper publishes this cynical speech (as the church was occupied by extremists from Fatah, Arafat’s own organization) without any additional comment.

Having had their fill of politically correct anti-Israel sentiment, certain writers at the paper feel that the political exploitation of Christianity is the best way to strike out at the Jewish state.

“Following the Christian celebration of Easter, Israel’s merciless Bethlehem siege, its invasion of the Church of the Nativity and rampaging against the Christian Palestinians has enraged the Christian world,” Alajos Chrudinák, who publishes in *Magyar Fórum* and speaks at Palestinian demonstrations, is quoted as saying in an interview (April 6).

In the same issue Levente Sitkei writes about the “hate that yearns to annihilate the unwanted neighbor” and which “is laying siege to the Church of the Nativity, built on the site of Jesus’ birthplace.” In this article Israel has now become the embodiment of the apocalyptic evil, come to destroy the foundation stone of the Christian world. Besides all this, articles employing politically correct turns of phrase can also be found (April 2), which speak of “mutual hate.”

However, the photos in *Magyar Nemzet* do not differ fundamentally from those carried by the left-wing papers: Israeli soldiers and tanks, Palestinian civilians among the ruins.

THE RIGHT-WING WEEKLY PAPERS

The weeklies’ interest in the Middle-East was limited by the fact that the events in question occurred exactly between the two rounds of the Hungarian general elections. This meant that those papers with no professional foreign correspondents covered the Middle-East only sporadically.

An article on the Middle-East published in the April 19 issue of *Heti Válasz* reads as follows: “The attacks by the Israeli soldiers are no longer aimed at the Palestinian Authority and its leaders. Their real objective is to destroy the infrastructure of national existence – and not terrorism! This involves not only the destruction of weapons and food reserves, but also the ruining of arable land and detonation of the Palestinian TV building, the airport, the docks and police buildings.” The hackles of the author – Bianka Maleczki – were no doubt raised

by the western media's false imagery of apocalyptic destruction. "Israel would have done better to strengthen the internal legitimacy and power of a moderate leadership willing to compromise, in place of the humiliation and massacre of the innocent masses," continues the article. And this sentence sets the tone for the whole article, which is a mixture of political analysis and aggressive anti-Israeli sentiment. The text exceeds the boundaries of political correctness, since its basic stance is not the strict tit-for-tat logic of daily events, but holds Israel responsible for the whole conflict. A week later the paper once again reports on the Israel army's "crimes committed in the Jenin refugee camp," and that according to the Palestinians there are 500 dead under the rubble. However, fulfilling the minimum requirements of political correctness the author – Zsolt Estefán – also reports that "Israel claims it never did anything of the sort, that it has never committed war crimes." Later on the article continues: "The military operations launched against the West Bank settlements with the aim of stamping out terrorism slowed in pace, and brought ever diminishing returns." This sentence gives a good illustration of the tone of the whole article, which unequivocally condemns Israel, but remains within the boundaries of actual events, the "here and now" – not portraying the Israel state as evil for evil's sake.

The majority of the *Heti Válasz* articles that I examined remained within the boundaries of political correctness, and only in a minority of cases do they contain undertones of the extreme right. And this in itself is a unique among the right-wing media.

The extreme right-wing weekly entitled *Demokrata* does not pay any special attention to the Middle-Eastern hostilities, although its 2002/15 issue opens with an extreme right-wing cliché: "The Sharon government has lived up to its reputation and replied with aggression to the Arab peace offering, which is further proof of the fact that 'Israel is a terrorist State,' said Lebanese president Emil Lakud." However, after this introduction the article strays towards the familiar extreme right territory of millennia-old history, genetics and conspiracy theories. According to the author – Ildikó Hankó – genetic research has proven that the Palestinians and Jews are closely related, but that someone is doing all in their power to prevent the results of the research being made public, even though they could shed light – as it were – on the causes of the conflict between them.

This issue of *Demokrata* carries another text about Israel: In his serialized novel entitled *The Terrible Secret*, Botond Dobó reveals that the September 11 attacks on New York were in fact the work of the Israeli secret service. This is a clear link to contemporary Arab anti-Semitism, since in the Arab world of

today – as among the Hungarian extreme right – this is a commonly held view. The logic of this ridiculous premise is obviously attributable to the “it’s all the fault of the Jews” mentality.

Magyar Fórum’s Middle-East “expert” József Hering writes this in the paper’s April 18 issue:

“Many refer to the Jenin refugee camp’s heroic resistance to the superior military technology of the Israeli invaders as the Palestinian Stalingrad. In the light of actual events, the Israeli killing and destruction, the capture and humiliation of a great many of the survivors; the situation of the residents could be accurately described as being similar to the struggle of the Jewish insurgents in the Warsaw ghetto.” “... Despite any number of UN Security Council resolutions calling for a withdrawal, EU statements condemning the violence and mass demonstrations around the world, the Israeli invaders continue their manhunts, their methodical genocide, the humiliation, capture and murder of the elected and internationally recognized political leadership of the Palestinian people. And besides this, they regularly shoot up the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, one of Christianity’s most holy places.”⁷

The above text was the most poisonous piece of comment on Israel that I found among the outpourings of the Hungarian press from those weeks. The author doesn’t even attempt to create an illusion of balance, but shamelessly lays into Israel. He uses Stalingrad and the Warsaw ghetto as examples, and cites the EU despite his being against Hungary’s accession. The only classic anti-Semitic image is the shooting of the Church of the Nativity. The common denominator in this total ideological chaos is as follows: everything’s good that can be turned against Israel. The presence of left-wing anti-Israeli sentiment is a warning sign that anti-Semitism is coming up to date, speaking in a modern tongue – by no means should it be treated as an obsolete philosophy, a fossil from the past.

(Translated by Andrea Megyes)

⁷ József Hering, “Izrael engedelmes palesztinokat akar (Israel wants obedient Palestinians),” *Magyar Fórum*, April 18, 2002.

JÁNOS DÉSI

A BLOOD LIBEL HISTORY FROM MIÉP

*The Old Accusations were Revived by Csurka and his Followers
at Eszter Solymosi's Grave*

"On 11 September, 2003, the Hungarian Justice and Life Party (MIÉP) laid a wreath on the grave of Eszter Solymosi, the 13-year-old Calvinist girl who disappeared without a trace 120 years ago. It has been a taboo topic, up to this day, that the members of the Jewish community of Tiszaeszlár murdered the Christian girl 120 years ago for ritualistic reasons, and that they were acquitted as a result of political pressure."

(Excerpt from the publication of the Youth Section of the Hungarian Justice and Life Party, September 2003)¹

THE PAST

A recurring accusation of Hungarian anti-Semites, even 120 years later, is that Eszter Solymosi, the thirteen-year-old servant girl, was murdered by Jews for ritualistic reasons in 1882. They believe that, although the Israelites were nearly proved guilty of the crime, the accused finally had to be released, as a result of a huge international Jewish conspiracy. Blood libel – originating from the Middle Ages and remaining rather virulent in Eastern Europe in to the modern age,² with similar cases surfacing in Hungary even after World War II³ – is definitely among the most malicious and sinister anti-Jewish lies, which, however, did not concern the leaders of MIÉP, primarily István Csurka and Béla Gyôri,

¹ The announcement can be found at the following URL address, in the news bulletin of the Youth Section of MIÉP: [http://www.miep.hu/It/elemek/ITt“vagyunk!003.htm](http://www.miep.hu/It/elemek/ITt>vagyunk!003.htm).

² Tamás Kende, "A vérvád az újkori Kelet-Európában, Egy előítélet működése (Blood Libels in Modern-Age Eastern Europe: How a Prejudice Works)," *Vérvádak üzenete* (The Message of Blood Libels) (Budapest: Minoritás Könyvek, 1996).

³ An interesting summary on this has been compiled by János Pelle: "Tiszaeszlár viaszhangja – Vérvádhisztériák a magyar sajtóban (The repercussions of Tiszaeszlár – Blood libel hysteria in the Hungarian press)" and Éva Standejszky: "A háború utáni vérvádak történelmi háttere (A Historical Background to the Blood Libel Cases After WWI)". Both of them published in: *Vérvádak üzenete* (The message of blood libels) (Budapest: Minoritás Könyvek, 1996).

when digging it up again at the 120th anniversary of the great trial. They were not deterred by the incredible amount of literature on the case of Eszter Solymosi of Tiszaeszlár, nor from the obvious facts contained in the literature.⁴ Nonetheless, authors and publishers known for their anti-Semitic sentiment have tried from time to time to persuade their readers that the murderers were the Jews, after all.⁵

Let's have a quick overview of the story. Gyözô Istóczy, representative of the Rum constituency, delivered a speech addressed to the Minister of the Interior in April 1875, in which he virtually raised the idea of the establishment of an anti-Semitic party.⁶ At first, his fellow representatives rejected Istóczy's pro-

⁴ The most widely known of these are: a book by the counsel of the defence, Károly Eötvös, *A nagy per; mely ezer éve folyik* (The Great Trial Going on for a Thousand Years), Vols. I-III. (Budapest: 1904); as a novel: Gyula Krúdy, *A tiszaeszlári Solymosi Eszter* (Eszter Solymosi of Tiszaeszlár) (Budapest: Magvetô, 2003); Iván Sándor, *A vizsgálat iratai, tudósítás a tiszaeszlári per körülmenyeiről* (Documents of the Investigation and Report on the Facts Surrounding the Trial in Tiszaeszlár) (Budapest: Kozmosz könyvek, 1983); Judit Elek-Miklós Sükösd: *Tutajosok, a tiszaeszlári per dokumentumai* (Memories of a River, The Documents of the Tiszaeszlár Trial) (Budapest: Magvetô, 1990). Kálmán Mikszáth reported on the trial every day in *Pesti Hírlap*, later published in a collection of articles: *Mikszáth Kálmán összes mûvei* (The Complete Works of Kálmán Mikszáth). *Cikkek és karcolatok* (Articles and sketches), Vol. 70. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977), or on the Internet at <http://mek.oszk.hu/00900/00901>. Miklós Erdély made a film about the story of Eszter Solymosi at the Béla Balázs Film Studio in 1982, and Judit Elek's Memories of a river was first shown at the Budapest Film Festival in 1990. The most thorough study of the story is: Andrew Handler, *Blood Libel in Tiszaeszlár* (New York: Boulder, East European Monographs, 1980).

⁵ The most widely known among these are the memoirs of one of the investigators of the case, József Bary, who had always stressed the guilt of the Jews: József Bary, *Tiszaeszlári bûnper* (The Tiszaeszlár Trial) (Budapest: 1933). Published by Egyetemi nyomda; second edition published by Sándor Püski in 1942; third edition by the Gede testvérek (Gede Brothers) Publishing House in 1999, a reprint of the 1933 edition; and *Magyar Fórum* also published the book. József Adamovich, "Tiszaeszlár-Zsidókérés. Válasz Schuck Salamon karcagi fôrabbinak (Tiszaeszlár – The Jewish issue. An answer to Salomon Schuck, Chief Rabbi of Karcag)," *A keresztenyek a zsidókról* (Christians about Jews) (Budapest: Hunyadi M. mûintézet: 1882), D. Kászonyi, *Solymosi Eszter, a tiszaeszlári véráldozat* (Eszter Solymosi, the Blood Sacrifice of Tiszaeszlár), 1882. These three books were ordered to be destroyed by the Prime Minister's Decree issued on February 26, 1945 on "The destruction of publications containing Fascist and anti-Soviet ideas". Also: Lajos Marschalkó, *Tiszaeszlár. A magyar fejvédelem hûskora* (Tiszaeszlár: The heroic age of protecting the Hungarian race) (Debrecen: 1943). Marschalkó returned to the subject several times, stressing the guilt of the Jews.

⁶ György Száraz, *Egy előítélet nyomában* (Tracing a prejudice) (Budapest: Magvetô Kiadó, 1976).

posal. In connection with a discussion on state marriages in 1882, the possibility for Christian-Jewish marriages triggered a huge debate in Parliament. Jewish students were even attacked at universities, because “there are a lot of Jews”. In February 1882 in Vas, Istóczy’s county, Catholic priests were already requesting the abolition of Jewish emancipation.

Istóczy found a follower in the House of Representatives in Géza Onódy, a landowner from Tiszaeszlár, representative of the Tiszalök constituency. And it happened to be at Tiszaeszlár that a servant girl, Eszter Solymosi, disappeared on April 1, 1882, three days before Passover. In his work already cited, György Száraz also raises the question as to whether it was Onódy himself who, after hearing about the case, discovered the great opportunities presented by it or his local followers handed over to him the material of the blood libel in a ready-made form. What is sure is that in his speech in Parliament on May 23 Onódy stated that the Jews committed a ritualistic murder, “Let me repeat, Honourable Gentlemen, that apparently according to the Talmud, which contains the religious rules of Israelites, the blood of an innocent Christian girl has to be taken at the feast of Penance.”⁷. In his address the next day Istóczy puts forward the goal of blood libel: “The trial will have a crucial influence on the future of the whole Jewry for several centuries, and this trial will become a sensational ‘cause célèbre’ all around the world.” Even at this stage, he adds: “We might well be afraid that the Jewish moneybags, who are already bustling in Nyíregyháza, will smother the whole issue.” Yet, Istóczy goes on reading a letter in Parliament allegedly written to him, even before the actual investigation was begun: “this flagrant attack carried out by Jews is not a fabrication.”⁸

The story is as follows: on April 1, 1882, Eszter Solymosi, a 13-year-old servant girl of Tiszaeszlár, left her master’s house to buy some paint. She never appeared alive again. The rumor that she was murdered by Jews soon spread through the village. In the wake of the speeches held in Parliament, anti-Semitic incidents sprang up around the country: in many towns Jews were attacked, and at several places the military had to be called in to protect them. In this highly-charged atmosphere, Magistrate József Bary ordered the arrest of three kosher butchers staying in Tiszaeszlár – the village community was preparing for the election of a butcher – and, among others, they started to interrogate Sámuel

⁷ 109th National Meeting, May 23, 1882. In: *Kirekesztők. Antiszemita írások 1881–1992* (Excluders: Anti-Semitic writings 1881–1992), ed. László Karsai, (Budapest: Aura Kiadó 1992).

⁸ *Kirekesztők* (Excluders), *ibid.*

Scharf, the five-year-old son of the local *shammash*, who claimed that his father lured Eszter Solymosi into the synagogue and cut her neck, and his brother Móric also helped him. At first, Móric denied everything, but the clerk of the neighboring village, under whose supervision he was put, “pumped” him to testify against the Jews. Móric “confessed” that he saw through the keyhole how the girl’s blood was drawn. Lead by József Bary, the laborious investigation continued, and 12 other Jews were arrested as suspects.⁹ Soon, the body of a drowned girl was found in the River Tisza. The district doctor and a woman from Tiszaeszlár immediately recognized it as the body of the disappeared servant girl, upon which the Magistrate had the clothes – Eszter Solymosi’s clothes – removed from the body, then the body was shown to the mother, who claimed that it was not her daughter. The Magistrate insisted upon claiming that the Jews, in order to divert suspicion from themselves, acquired a dead body, dressed her in the clothes of the murdered girl and hired raftsmen to “find” it. Bary had the raftsmen arrested, as well.

At the same time as the trial, vehement anti-Semitic propaganda was raging in most parts of the country. Prime Minister Kálmán Tisza took a stand against the blood libel. The defence of the case was lead by MP Károly Eötvös. At the trial which began on June 19, 1883 in Nyíregyháza it was eventually proven that the charge was unsustainable, and the accused were acquitted on August 3. According to the judgment, the circumstances “make it possible that the dead body might have been of Eszter Solymosi.” Reference made here to the body found in the Tisza, excludes the possibility of murder. There was no cut on the neck, and the girl clearly drowned. Eszter Solymosi’s mortal remains were buried in the Roman Catholic cemetery of Tiszaeszlár.¹⁰

Móric Scharf admitted that he had been coached what to say in his testimony that would serve as grounds for the charge, and he did so after being threat-

⁹ All in all 57 Jews and 16 Christians were arrested in connection with the case for various lengths of time.

¹⁰ *Magyar Zsidó Lexikon* (Hungarian Jewish Encyclopaedia) (Budapest: Magyar Zsidó Lexikon, 1922), entry name: Tiszaeszlári vérvád (The Blood Libel of Tiszaeszlár). Both Eötvös and Bary discuss the question in their writings why she was buried in the Catholic cemetery. According to Bary, the reason was that the body was unknown, so her denomination was also unknown. Eötvös said that the reason why Bary and his supporters did not bury her in the Calvinist cemetery was that by doing so they would have admitted that it was the Calvinist girl’s body. And they did not bury her in a Jewish cemetery because a blood libel calls for the blood of a Christian virgin.

ened. “The work of the investigating authorities served the interests of anti-Semitism from the beginning. The magistrate accepted the story of the blood libel as a fact from the first minute, and he carried on with the investigation in this direction.”¹¹ It must be added that neither Public Prosecutor Sándor Kozma, nor Ede Szeyffert, Deputy Public Prosecutor for the prosecution at the trial accepted the blood libel, and, as the defence also acknowledged, they were making efforts to find out the truth.¹²

During the trial a lot of newspapers published inflammatory anti-Semitic commentaries, and Prime Minister Kálmán Tisza was compelled to order the confiscation of such inflammatory publications.

Even after the acquittal, anti-Semitic pogroms occurred around the country. In Budapest, for instance, only the military could bring the anti-Jewish activity and looting under control, and only by declaring a state of emergency. In several counties, such as Zala and Somogy, the Minister of the Interior had to impose martial law in order to protect Jews. The attacks against Jews lasted until the end of the year, and only by the deployment of considerable military force was it possible to contain them.¹³

THE PRESENT

The ill-fated Eszter Solymosi always remained a favourite symbol of Hungarian anti-Semites. The symbol of Jewish cruelty, inhumanity and otherness. And from the viewpoint of anti-Semites, it is not a problem in the least that the story, according to sources available, is not true. This only proves that the press, the control of the public opinion and the opportunity to manipulate masses is in the hands of Jews. Moreover, they also have control over jurisdiction, since the girl’s murderers were acquitted as a result of the pressure of international industrialists.

In 2003, at the anniversary of the “great trial”, these opinions resurfaced, primarily in the weekly magazine *Magyar Fórum*, and in organs of organizations

¹¹ Judit Kubinszky, *Politikai antiszemizmus Magyarországon* (Political anti-Semitism in Hungary) (1875-1890) (Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1976).

¹² After the accused were acquitted, they gave thanks for their acquittal in the Nyíregyháza synagogue, where the Jewish community – to express their acknowledgement – prayed together for the public prosecutor, his deputy and the defense attorneys.

¹³ Száraz, ibid., Kubinszky, ibid.

close to MIÉP. At the same time, another interesting feature appeared: several media outlets, perhaps due to their ignorance, borrowed the wording from the MIÉP president.

*"István Csurka called September 11th a memorable day. On this day, at the 120th anniversary of the Tiszaeszlár judgment, a conference will be held in the village by people examining the events from a special point of view, emphasized the politician, adding that MIÉP will also be there at Tiszaeszlár to represent the interests of Hungarians and lay wreaths at the statue of Eszter Solymosi, who disappeared at the age of 13."*¹⁴

The "people examining the events from a special point of view" were distinguished historians and specialists, who happened to again prove the accusations untenable, also recalling the circumstances that made their spread possible. However, a more interesting question is why it serves the interests of the Hungarian people if a wreath is laid at Eszter Solymosi's statue. (N.B.: Solymosi does not actually have a statue in Tiszaeszlár.) Were the editors not aware that such references to Eszter Solymosi are old, tried and tested anti-Semitic provocations?

In Duna TV's report on the "memorable day", although the correspondent does mention that the accused were acquitted, the only thing quoted from Ottó Gáll, chairman of the Károly Eötvös Circle of Friends, was "no community can be accused of murder only on grounds of their origin."

Then the correspondent cites István Csurka, according to whom the accused were acquitted on the orders of Kálmán Tisza, the then prime minister, in spite of the fact that Eszter Solymosi's body could not be found. Then Csurka himself appears on screen and adds: "So we, when remembering this, do not object to the judgment, but to its historical consequences and to the falsification of history."¹⁵

The venue where Csurka and his followers laid the wreath is interesting in itself. As we could see above, the body found in the river was buried in the Catholic cemetery of Tiszaeszlár. However, anyone who believes that Eszter Solymosi was murdered by Jews cannot accept that that was the girl's body.

In 1992 Csaba Kenessey, a man of Hungarian origin, asked permission to erect a tombstone for Eszter Solymosi. On the marble tombstone he had the fol-

¹⁴ *Duna Hiradó* (Duna News), Duna TV, September 5, 2003., 8 pm. Similarly to other references made by television and radios stations, accessible in the database of the Observer Media Monitoring.

¹⁵ *Duna Hiradó* (Duna News), Duna TV, September 11, 2003., 8 pm.

lowing line engraved: “To the memory of my darling daughter, Eszter Solymosi.”¹⁶ There is no one lying in the grave, since the people who erected it think that the servant girl’s body was “destroyed” by the Jews, and so her corpse could not be found. The grave soon became a place of worship, and the National Front, lead by József Györkös, lay a wreath there every year.¹⁷ *Népszabadság* gave the following account of the events: “I heard in the village that a group of non-local youths, marching with árpád-stripe flags*, lay a wreath at the grave each year. The Hungarists – as they refer to them in the village – never miss the opportunity to have their photograph taken at the place of worship that has started to gain a cult status in certain circles.”¹⁸

The person who erected the grave, “Csaba Kenessey, a Hungarian living in Western Europe, does not believe in the blood libel, but he does believe it was a murder case. ‘While reading the book written by József Bary, the magistrate investigating the Tiszaeszlár case, I find it abominable that there is no trace of the unfortunate girl, Eszter Solymosi,’ Kenessey explains. ‘Although I don’t believe in the blood libel, I still think Bary is right in saying that the representatives of justice were bribed.’¹⁹

One persistently recurring element is that the judges were bribed or severe pressure was exerted upon them to achieve the acquittal of the defendants. There must definitely be an explanation why the accused were acquitted in the first instance, and then in two further instances of appeal.

For example, István Csurka writes the following: “The court then acquitted the Tiszaeszlár Jews from the blood libel as a result of the pressure directly exerted by Prime Minister Kálmán Tisza.”²⁰

¹⁶ Details on the erection of the grave can be found in: Zsolt Kácsor, “Solymosinak van sírja Eszláron (Solymosi Has a Grave in Eszlár)”, *Népszabadság*, March 8, 2003; and “Még mindig élnek az előítéletek (Prejudices still prevail)”, *Magyar Hírlap*, August 4, 2003.

¹⁷ “Hatvanmillió forint volt az ítélet ára? (The Judgment Cost 60 million forints?)”, *Magyar Jelen*, September 12, 2003.

* Árpád-stripe flags are Hungarian historical flags bearing four red and four white strips and originate from the era of the Árpád Dynasty. The armband of the Hungarian Nazi party called the Arrow Cross Party consisted of the Árpád-stripe flag bearing the arrow cross symbol in the middle. It has recently become the major symbol in extremist right-wing demonstration.

¹⁸ Kácsor, *ibid.*

¹⁹ “Hatvanmillió forint volt az ítélet ára? (The judgment cost 60 million forints?)”, *Magyar Jelen*, September 12, 2003.

²⁰ István Csurka, “Magyar szemmel (Through Hungarian eyes)”, *Magyar Fórum*, September 4, 2003.

The article in *Magyar Jelen* quotes from János Marschalkó's book, *Conquerors of a Country*, citing a novelistic passage according to which not long before the judgment was announced Prime Minister Kálmán Tisza had dinner with Ferenc Korniss, Court Council Chairman. There Korniss said he thought that the accused Jews were guilty. Upon this, Tisza told him that in that case the Rothschilds would not grant the loan they had promised, as a result of which the Monarchy might, but Hungary definitely would, go bankrupt, the forint would depreciate, and the various nationalities would revolt.

Also in *Magyar Fórum*, Béla Gyôri writes the following: "as a result of pressure exerted by liberal Prime Minister Kálmán Tisza, the court ended the procedure and acquitted the accused without giving any evidence and closed the case, and the memory of Eszter Solymosi was doomed to oblivion."²¹

In addition to the fact that there is no evidence whatsoever that the accused were acquitted upon some international Jewish blackmailing, even József Bary writes in his memoirs: "Verhovay's²² story about the meeting in Téglás is purely a figment of the imagination. In his book 'Masters of the Country' he relates that Prime Minister Kálmán Tisza ordered Ferenc Korniss to Téglás, Hajdú County, a few days before the pronouncement of the judgment, and that the acquittal was a result of this meeting. This meeting did not happen, and no one attempted to influence Korniss, not even indirectly. Everyone knew his uncompromising character. Tisza only tried to affect the outcome of the trial through his press and prosecutor, but he would not even have dared to interfere directly with the adjudication procedure."²³

So Bary, who is otherwise a frequent reference point for all those who try to prove the guiltiness of the Jews, contradicts Csurka, who talks about the direct pressure coming from Tisza, and the article of *Magyar Jelen*, which trots out again the story of the fictitious dinner.

Béla Gyôri's text is more interesting. The "pressure" coming from the "liberal" Tisza could naturally be indirect, too, and we will get back to it later. But why

²¹ Béla Gyôri, "A MIÉP tisztaeszlári koszorúi (The wreaths of MIÉP at Tisztaeszlár)," *Magyar Fórum*, September 18, 2003.

²² Gyula Verhovay (1848-1906), journalist. His paper, *Függetlenség* (Independence) was a fierce advocate of the anti-Semitic standpoint at the time of the Tisztaeszlár trial. Later he elaborates his viewpoint about the "great Jewish conspiracy" in his work entitled *Az ország urai* (Masters of the Country). Between 1884 and 1887, he was Member of Parliament for the anti-Semitic group of Gyôzô Istóczy.

²³ Bary, *ibid.* 597.

is it so strange that someone is acquitted due to the lack of “evidence”? Only on the grounds of evidence can anyone be convicted, and if there is no evidence, they must be acquitted.²⁴ Of course, one can hint that the evidence was not sought deliberately, but anyone who reads the trial documentation will see that such a thorough investigation had never been carried out before in Hungary. And, concerning the remembrance of the case: as the numerous articles published since then show, Eszter Solymosi’s story never became forgotten, and anti-Semites have always made sure that it surfaces regularly.

If Eszter Solymosi drowned in the river, or if there is the slightest possibility that she was killed (Bary also mentions that a rape and murder could also have happened), there is no point in laying a wreath at her grave. Along the Tisza River, people often drown in the river, and legal literature gives accounts of innumerable murder cases – yet no political parties lay wreaths and organize demonstrations at the graves of the victims. All this only makes sense if it is charged with political significance, and from the viewpoint of MIÉP it is only valid if Eszter Solymosi was really murdered by the Jews. What is interesting here is not Eszter Solymosi, the little servant girl, but Eszter Solymosi, the victim of the Jews.

Both Csurka and Gyôri only hint at it. If a conference is organized in Nyíregyháza on the anniversary of the trial on the topic of what actually happened and why the blood libel did not hold water, then a newer chapter of lies is opened and it is just outrageous, says Gyôri.

Both Csurka and Gyôri mention that the story has the capability of making “honest Hungarians” look like anti-Semites in the world and ruin their reputation. Csurka goes as far as stating that one of the reasons of Trianon, or, in other words, the truncation of Hungary’s territory, was that numerous articles were published blaming Hungarians, without any grounds, in connection with the trial, and among other things, this led to chopping parts off Hungary, “that is why such an unusually severe, unjust judgment could be pronounced over Hungary.”²⁵

²⁴ “There was not a single material proof on the basis of which the alleged murder of Eszter Solymosi could have been blamed on the Jews of Tiszaeszlár. There was no blood-stained knife, not even a single hair or piece of clothing, nothing that could have proved that Salamon Schwartz and his companions murdered the poor girl.” László Karsai, “Bary József vizsgálóbíró emlékiratainak sorsa (What happened to József Bary’s memoirs),” *Élet és Irodalom*, January 30, 2004.

²⁵ *Magyar Fórum*, September 18, 2003.

Csurka contradicts even himself here. Some time earlier he and his followers were saying that the accused were acquitted, among other things, due to the pressure coming from the press. The official representatives of the Hungarian state, i.e. the prosecutors, did not accept the story of the blood libel either. Even the Prime Minister himself was working towards the acquittal of the accused Jews, Csurka and his followers say. The court acquitted them in the first, second and then third instance. It is without a doubt that there were some people participating in the procedure who were trying to manipulate the facts, according to the alleged wishes of part of the press, the prosecution and the political leadership – but, after all, the accused were not convicted. On this basis it is quite difficult to make Hungary look bad or anti-Semitic. On the contrary, it was proven that the accused of a blood libel case, for instance, would not be convicted in 19th-century Hungary if they are innocent. Just a few years before, Dreyfus was *convicted*, in another case of huge symbolic importance and so the fact the Tiszaeszlár Jews were not convicted, should serve as a credit to the Hungarians.

However, it is a fact, as we already mentioned before, that after the acquittal there were numerous anti-Jewish provocations, and anti-Semitic riots broke out. If this news tarnished the reputation of the country, the people touching off and taking part in the riots are responsible for that and not those who tried to prevent all this, such as the politicians representing the official standpoint, or the press, which gave an account of the events.

With a clever journalistic phrase, Csurka found a surprising justification for the guiltiness of the Tiszaeszlár Jews. “And then came 1919, when Szamuely, Béla Kun and György Lukács, member of the upper middle class, proved that the cruelty of Jews, which the investigators of the Tiszaeszlár case started to suspect, does exist. Did not the 133 gory days of the Commune, with the lynching of many innocent Hungarian peasants, lords and burghers, prove in retrospect that an immense hatred of Hungarians was burning in these people who had flocked into the country? Did 1919 prove retroactively that among the Galicians, whose culture was alien and different even from the culture of the Hungarian-born Jewry, there were probably some with such intentions and such bloodthirsty passion?²⁶

In other words, if Szamuely, Kun and Lukács, who were Jews, acted cruelly and were killing people, it justifies, as it were, that Jews in general are cruel and murderers, “which the investigators of the Tiszaeszlár case started to suspect” – which implies that apparently the investigators were not on the wrong track.

²⁶ Magyar Fórum, September 18, 2003.

THE FELONS FROM GALICIA

The rhetorical question at the end of the quotation about “the Galicians” is characteristic. According to the next catch phrase that so often returns is that the actual felons are not the “real” Hungarian Jews, but the Galicians who had flocked into the country. This is how the authors try to ward off the accusation of being prejudiced. Not every Jew is bad, only the ones from Galicia. However, this is a similar branding of a group, merely on the basis of its origin and religion.

For instance, Bary writes in his book: “The majority of the Tiszaeszlár Jews emerged from the Khazar scum, which Miklós Bartha characterized so aptly, showing a great ability of observation: ‘They don’t study, don’t cultivate themselves, they don’t wash; they only do business and make children. They perjure themselves. They often commit arson. They mutilate their enemy’s livestock. They accuse others without any grounds. They bribe people wherever they can. (...) They pray loudly and cheat silently. They scalp the tilth off the soil and the skin off people. They are as fecund as bugs. They are as resourceful as sparrows. They ravage like rats.’ This description fits word by word the Jews who lived in and around Tiszaeszlár at the time of the Tiszaeszlár trial. (...) Miklós Bartha gives a description of the Khazar scum from Galicia with such lively colors and apt precision”²⁷

Let’s now ignore the question whether an investigator whose task is to undertake investigations in a case should have such prejudiced thoughts about the people involved in the case. What should be noted, however, is how “Galician” will become the synonym for “everything bad” after Bary in the rhetoric of Csurka and Lóránd Hegedűs Jr.²⁸

And now let’s go back briefly to the role of the press. Béla Gyôri wrote the following: “Those formerly accused and their circles accused the whole Hungarian nation of barbarism, spreading blood libels and the persecution of races and nationalities.”²⁹

Then he goes on to say: “Here, at the grave that does not cover the ashes and bones of the murdered girl. The mounds of the grave cannot cover the little girl’s ashes because she was done away with, she disappeared like a Hungarian river without a landscape.”

²⁷ Bary, *ibid.* p. 24.

²⁸ For more details about Lóránd Hegedűs’ case, see Gábor Schweitzer’s study in this book.

²⁹ *Magyar Fórum*, September 18, 2003.

“Murdered” – stated as a fact, while this could, as we know, never have been proved. But let’s see the rest.

“She was done away with” – by whom? Again, an unanswered question; but fortunately enough, the readers of Magyar Fórum can suspect the answer.

Another part of the sentence is even more characteristic. No one ever accused “the whole Hungarian nation”. Also, the prosecutors and the lawyers refuting the blood libel, the judges passing the verdict of acquittal, and the journalists speaking for the innocently accused were also Hungarians, as we referred to it earlier.

And, as regards the accusation of “races and nationalities” being persecuted, Béla Gyôri is probably not familiar with the events of the time. Gyôzô Istóczy wrote after a press libel trial he won: “According to the verdict of the jury, anti-Semitism is a rightful concept, the anti-Semitic movement is a legitimate and lawful movement, thus, the anti-Semitic party has been declared to be a political party equivalent to all other national parties, and its goals and the means to achieve these goals are legal and constitutional.”³⁰

In other words, it is Istóczy who proudly spoke about how the policy of exclusion and anti-Semitism was acceptable in Hungary. And, following the massive riots that broke out after the acquittal, Istóczy, the enthusiastic advocate of Hungarian political anti-Semitism, came to the same conclusion as Béla Gyôri, who now happens to appear under the MIÉP banner. Istóczy wrote the following: “In Budapest, and especially in Zala County, the riots often turned into looting, sometimes Jews were beaten to death. (...) everyone knows that the causes and the direct evocators of these are the Jewsthemselves, and the indirect causes are the honorable Members of Parliament and the government.”

In other words, the pogroms were the Jews’ faults, says Istóczy, while Gyôri stated that the bad reputation of the country can be attributed to the Jews, who were accused innocently and then acquitted.

According to Csurka, it is important to talk about the past. “Hungary, while it is pushed into the EU, also has to be thrust into a different consistence. Its land has to be taken, and the unlimited domination of a diminutive minority has to be recreated. Tiszaeszlár has to be intimidated again.”³¹

Who can be that certain diminutive minority – we can go on guessing. Fortunately, all this comes through rather clearly from the context within the article. At the beginning of his article, the MIÉP leader underlines that, although

³⁰ Quoted by Kubinszky.

³¹ *Magyar Fórum*, September 18, 2003.

the members of the Tiszaeszlár Jewish community were acquitted from the charge of having murdered the Calvinist girl for ritualistic reasons, this only happened under the pressure exerted by Tisza.

THE BIG TRIAL THAT HAS NOT ENDED YET

Why is it necessary to bring up again and again this 120-year-old story? A few quotations might be sufficient to see the reasons:

“The accused were acquitted due to their background, at the pressure of Rothschild,’ says Endre János Domokos, leader of the extremist organization called Vér és Becsület (Blood and Honor).”³²

The same article quotes an elderly lady from Tiszaeszlár: “both my grandfather and my father said that the Jews had murdered Eszter Solymosi, then offered money to the Hungarian aristocracy to hush it up.”

Tiszaeszlár Mayor Imre Juhász also says: “I even heard that according to some people the Jews had to be acquitted because Baron Rothschild sent a message from America: Hungary would not get more loans if the accused were convicted.

‘This sounds absurd,’ I interjected, and the Mayor responded:

“Who knows what the truth is. But the majority of bankers are still Jewish, aren’t they?”³³

“Blood libel is a superstition, which is alive and well. It is alive enough that it raises its head and jumps to its feet in quite unexpected circumstances, and savages those who are caught in its path. All great and noble souls bear responsibility to defeat it,” writes Eötvös in his book *The Great Trial*.

(Translated by Andrea Megyes)

³² Regardless of the acquittals in the Tiszaeszlár blood libel trial, there are people who believe in ritual murder. *Magyar Hírlap*, August 4, 2003.

³³ Zoltán Kácsor’s article in *Népszabadság*, quoted above.

A P P E N D I X

JÚLIA KÖRNER

FOCAL POINTS IN THE MEDIA

Since it was set up in 1999, the Jewish Documentation Center of Budapest (ZsiDok) has been collecting and archiving articles published in the Hungarian press that are related to the subject of anti-Semitism. The database presently contains more than 3,000 documents. The majority of the periodicals can also be found on the Internet, many of them in a much greater length than their printed version. Although we are trying to follow the Internet publications as well, we had to give up on the idea of perfect comprehensiveness.

Documentation is also made more difficult by the fact that the same articles appear on the Internet with a different title or date (e.g. because they are posted on the Internet before the printed version comes out).

Along with all these deficiencies, we have collected the events of 2002 and 2003 which generated the greatest reverberations in the press, indicating the relevant articles contained in the database.

There are a great number of other topics that are not centered around a single event but deal with certain problems and phenomena in society. Among these are, for instance, the disparagement of the Holocaust, the emigration of Israelis into Hungary ("quartering"), the invention of various conspiracy theories ("New York–Tel Aviv axis"), the denial of anti-Semitism in Hungary, or "the oppression of Hungarians".

Naturally, there are several subjects which have kept recurring in public discourse for years. Lóránt Hegedűs Jr.'s case was dwelt upon in our previous volume, and another article is included in this book as well. Also, in the appendix you can find the text of the court sentences of the first and second instances.

The various focal points are often closely related to one another – it would be difficult, for instance, to separate the Hegedűs case from the issue of sanctioning hate speech. Perhaps they were still separable in 2002, but there was already plenty of overlapping between the materials related to the two subjects. When considering the 2003 documents we did not see any more why the two topics should be separated. A particularly strong link between the two topics was

Gáspár Miklós Tamás's article in *Magyar Hírlap*, which caused a great stir (Ebből elég volt – That's Enough, November 10, 2003.) Also, by questioning the independence of judges, this article further widened the scope of this topic.

Similarly to the previous two volumes, we quote some passages from articles on the list that recall the topic or are particularly characteristic of the debate around it.

"Silencing" Pannon Rádió

There is a radio station – with close links to a parliamentary party – which evokes the times of 1944: At the telephone directory assistance they say its address is unknown, and it only has a mailbox number. A radio station that incites against Jews, gypsies and "communists". A radio station whose presenters are mainly MP candidates for MIÉP. This station is Pannon Rádió, the channel of Great New Hungarians with close links to the 'court opposition'. (György Vámos, "Ébresztő, jön a Virradat – Wake up, Dawn is Approaching, Népszava, January 02, 2002.)

Györi Béla: És mégis szól a Pannon Rádió (Magyar Fórum, 2002.08.29)

D.P.: NZZ: a Pannon a leghírhedtebb rádió a térségben (Népszabadság, 2002.06.01.)

(sz.n.) Felhívás, kérés, kérdés (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.05.)

(sz.n.) Magyarok! (www.miep.hu, 2002.12.)

Hering: Kommandósok némitották el a Pannon Rádiót (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)

Szabó C. Szilárd: Nyers vélemény Pannóniáról (Délmagyarország, 2002.02.20.)

Györi Béla: Közlemény a Pannon Rádióról (Magyar Fórum, 2002.08.15.)

Vámos György: Ébresztő, jön a Virradat! (Népszava, 2002.01.02.)

VT: A Neue Zürcher Zeitung a Pannon Rádióról (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.07.30.)

Csuri Ákos: Mi lesz veled Pannon Rádió? (Vasárnapi Újság, 2002.05.26.)

V. I.: Csurka István beszéde a Kossuth Lajos téren (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)

Kenedi János, Vásárhelyi Mária: Jeletés a Pannon rádióról II. (Élet és Irodalom, 2002.04.12.)

T.B.: Vádat emeltek ifj. Hegedűs ellen (Népszabadság, 2002.06.15.)

(kist): Tüntetés a nemzettrontról erők ellen (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)

Zab Ervin: Ébredő magyarok az éterben (Utolsó Figyelmeztetés, 2002.08.)

Pál Gábor: A MIÉP is perelni készül (Magyar Nemzet, 2002.08.01.)

H.L.: A stílusváltó frekvencia (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.06.15.)

(sz.n.) Rágalmazási per (Kék Nefelejcs Nagykörös, 2002.08.03.)

NSZ munkatársa: Elítélték ifj. Hegedűs Lórántot (Népszabadság, 2002.12.07.)

G. Kirkovits István: Harsan a kúrt (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.26.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: Az ügynök provokál (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.12.12.)

Kenedi János, Vásárhelyi Mária: Jeletés a Pannon rádióról I.

(Élet és Irodalom, 2002.04.05.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2002.06.06.)
Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)
Chrudinák Alajos: Francia nagykövet: "Izrael egy szaros kis ország" (Magyar Fórum, 2002.01.03.)
Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2002.11.28.)
Varga: Az erőt adó forradalom (Magyar Fórum, 2002.10.31.)
Györi Béla: Miért jelöltette magát Csurka István? (Magyar Fórum, 2002.09.19.)
Varga Imre: Függetlenségünk biztosítéka a nemzeti radikalizmus (Magyar Fórum, 2002.08.22.)
Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2002.10.24.)
Pelle János: A Nobel-díj üzenete (Heti Válasz, 2002.10.25.)
Károlyi Tamás: ügynökök kímélenek! (Magyar Fórum, 2002.10.24.)
Varga Domokos György: Törzsek harca 3. (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.05.30.)
Sz.Z.: A Magyar út Körök Mozgalom hatodik országos gyűlése (Magyar Fórum, 2002.10.17.)

Proposal Concerning the Punitive Measures for Holocaust Denial and the Restriction of Hate Speech

They hide reports on reality here and there among news. In addition, they set up the Thought Police, and draw up the legal regulation on Holocaust denial. Not out of honor, but in order to intimidate people. They do so to turn the nation more weak and inferior, so that they could rule the country more easily and simply to achieve their selfish goals. (B. Gy., ("Nagygyűlések országszerre – General Assemblies All Over the Country," *Magyar Fórum*, October 10, 2002.)

There probably won't be any hangings, for the time being, although if with Sharon's Heiszlers the Hungarian-hating system adopts Sharon's methods as well, they might also happen. However, they will punish "anti-gayness", anti-Semitism, nationalism, playing ancient Hungarians, Sumerology and making historical references to the Gesta Hungarorum; and there will be internment, forced labor, shooting on the basis of suspicion, and lynching. (István Csurka, "Magyar szemmel – Through Hungarian eyes," *Magyar Fórum*, July 4, 2002.)

M.N.: Felháborodás és a valóság (Nagykörös, 2002.02.02.)
Seszták Ágnes: Még egyszer a gyűlöletheszdról (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.02.07.)
Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2002.07.04.)
Seszték ágnes: A bunyóskedvű idol (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.08.12.)
Seszták ágnes: Egészpályás feltámadás (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.08.12.)
Rozgics Mária: útkeresés a Salamon-torony ámyékában (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.09.12.)
Farkas Elemér: A holokauszt tagadása (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.09.12.)
Gy.B.: Nagygyűlések országszerre (Magyar Fórum, 2002.10.10.)
Franka Tibor: Össznemzeti kiárusítás (Magyar Fórum, 2002.11.14.)

(sz.n.) Magyarok! (www.miep.hu, 2002.12.)

Szócs Zoltán: Karsai Co. (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.05.)

Lovas István: Nyílt levél Bárány Péter igazságügy-miniszternek
(Magyar Demokrata, 2002.12.12.)

Varga Domokos György: Az A-fegyver mint sikeres mém 2. (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.06.19.)

Bíró András: A fal lebontása tárgyában Népszabadság, 2002.10.10.)

Lovas István: Gyűlöletprogram (Vasárnapi Újság, 2002.02.10.)

Csúri Ákos: Orbán Viktor III. (Vasárnapi Újság, 2002.09.22.)

Lovas István: A félelem béra (Vasárnapi Újság, 2002.05.05.)

Györi Béla: Himnusz a bíróságon (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)

Varga Domokos György: Az "ellenség" gyomrában 3. (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.07.25.)

Gruiz Márton: Az erkölcs agóniája Magyarországon (Magyar Nemzet, 2002.09.14.)

Gazdag István: A halott oroszlánról (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.07.18.)

Bencsik András: Szépen, nem szélsőségesen (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.12.12.)

The Trial of Lóránt Hegedüs Jr.

Csurka compared the investigation carried out against Lóránt Hegedüs Jr. to the lawsuit against Cardinal Mindszenty, triggered by "a few small sentences published in an insignificant paper". (B. K., MIÉP-nyitány Szegeden – MIÉP-overture in Szeged, *Délmagyarország*, January 26, 2002.)

NSZ munkatársa: Elítélték ifj. Hegedüs Lórántot (Népszabadság, 2002.12.07.)

T. B.: Vádjavaslat ifj. Hegedüs Lóránt ellen (Népszabadság, 2002.06.06.)

T.B.: Vádat emeltek ifj. Hegedüs ellen (Népszabadság, 2002.06.15.)

hirösszefoglaló: Felfüggesztett börtönt kér az ügyész (Népszabadság, 2002.12.05.)

WB: Ifjabb Hegedüs nem érzi bünösnéki magát (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.05.)

Simon Zoltán: Elutasított kereset a MIÉP és ifj. Hegedüs ellen (Népszava, 2002.04.27.)

Riba István: Kerülő úton (HVG, 2002.04.13.)

Györi Béla: Himnusz a bíróságon (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)

Hering: Ige a kiáltás jogáért (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)

(MTI): Elutasított kereset MIÉP-erek ellen (Népszabadság, 2002.05.25.)

Kulcsár Anna: Első fokon pert nyert az ifjabb Hegedüs (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.04.27.)

(kist): Tüntetés a nemzettrontról erők ellen (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)

Népszava-információ: Csak értekezett ifj. Hegedüs... (Népszava, 2002.12.05.)

K.B.: MIÉP – nyitány Szegeden (Délmagyarország, 2002.01.26.)

V.I.: Csurka István beszéde a Kossuth Lajos téren (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)

Varga: Csurka: Legfontosabb választási célunk a liberális nemzettrontrás visszaszorítása (Magyar Fórum, 2002.01.24.)

Vass Krisztián: www.zsido.com, (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.01.31.)

(sz.n.) Ellenellenlenség-jelenség (HVG, 2002.09.07.)

R. Székely Julianna: Mit üzen a tévé? (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.09.11.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2002.12.12.)

- Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2002.02.14.)
Csurka István: Gázolás (Magyar Fórum, 2002.10.03.)
Erdélyi Péter: Csurka tévévitát akar Medgyessyvel (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.02.15.)
Kulcsár Anna: Elégítétek kérnek a magyar zsidóság védelmében (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.02.16.)
Szále László: Elfödi, ki növeli a bajt (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.03.01.)
Wohlgemuth Brigitta: Ifjabb Hegedűs nem érzi bünösnek magát (Magyar Hírlap, 2002. 12. 05.)
Kis János: A szólásszabadság próbája (Magyar Narancs, 2002. 02. 07.)
Szőnyei Tamás: Gyilkos könyvek (Magyar Narancs, 2002. 04. 04.)
Bánfai Tamara, Csuhaj Ildikó: Kirekesztő beszéd: marad a szabályozás (Népszabadság, 2002.01.29.)
Czene Gábor: Egyházi szerepek és pártviták a választás előtt (Népszabadság, 2002.02.23.)
T. B.: Személyiségi próbáper a MIÉP és a párt alelnöke ellen (Népszabadság, 2002.02.16.)

The acquittal of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. and the related article written by
Gáspár Miklós Tamás – the independence of courts and hate speech

It might be offending, astonishing and may give rise to concerns, but the article published in MIÉP's district newspaper did not incite anyone to aggression – this could be the summary of the final sentence of acquittal delivered in the case of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. and György Metes by the Municipal Court. The judge trying the case in the first instance had a different opinion, and sentenced the author of the article, Hegedűs Jr. to suspended imprisonment, and the publisher, Metes, to the payment of a fine. (NSZ correspondent, "A lelkész fölmentették – Minister acquitted, Népszabadság, November 11, 2003.)

Since the political changes occurred, there have been several thousands of known cases involving hate speech and action. Nevertheless, there have only been one court judgment to condemn such acts. (László Márton, "Tiltsuk-e a gyűlöletbeszédet – Should Hate Speech Be Banned, Magyar Hírlap, September 20, 2003.)

- Vita a gyűlöletbeszédről (cikkarchívum) (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.08.)
hírösszefoglaló: Folytatódhat ifj. Hegedűs ügye (Népszabadság, 2003.11.28.)
Kulcsár Anna: Mégsem zártul le ifj. Hegedűs ügye (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.27.)
hírösszefoglaló: Felfüggesztett börtönt kér az ügyész (Népszabadság, 2003.12.05.)
WB: Ifjabb Hegedűs nem érzi bünösnek magát (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.12.05.)
Bugyinszki György: A betük szelleme (Magyar Narancs, 2003.11.23.)
(grécy): Rekeszdbé (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.22.)
(MTI): Csillag a bíró ablakán? (Népszava, 2003.11.28.)
Nyerges András: Várom a következő lépést (Magyar Hírlap, 2003. 11.13.)
Szakács Árpád: Belültek a bíró ablakán (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.28.)
(NSZ munkatársa: A lelkész fölmentették (Népszabadság, 2003.11.07.)

- (VG): Hatott a Hegedűs-féle ítélet? (Világgazdaság, 2003. 11. 11.)
 Szakács Árpád: Felmentették Hegedűs Lorántot (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.07.)
 Györi Béla: A per és a célja (Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.13.)
 Horváth Ádám: A gyűlölet hónapja (Magyar Fórum, 2003.12.11.)
 Domonkos István: Az ítéletet értelmezni nem lehet (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.13.)
 Riba István: Kitáblázott döntés (HVG, 2003.11.15.)
 Nemes József: Jogrendszerünk diszkrét bája (Magyar Hírlap, 2003. 11.17.)
 NSZ munkatársai: Ifj. Hegedűs felmentése után újabb koalíciós vita (Népszabadság, 2003.11.08.)
 Szakács Árpád: Politikai támadás a bíróságok ellen (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.11.)
 V. I.: Nem bűn a szabad véleménynyilvánítás (Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.13.)
 Hack Péter: A szabadságnak ára van (Heted, 2003. 11.14.)
 hirősszefoglaló: Szabó püspök felszólítja ifj. Hegedűst (Népszabadság, 2003.11.20.)
 Hering József: Az ige testté lett (Magyar Fórum, 2003.12.04.)
 MH-álláspont: Gyűlölethatár (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.08.)
 Adrassew Iván: A sátán lelésében (Népszava, 2003.11.11.)
 Kerekes Ottó: A gyűlöletheszédről (Népszabadság, 2003.11.19.)
 Pálmai Erika: Ne legyen elvárás a bírálat (Népszava, 2003.11.11.)
 Petri Lukács Ádám: Van másik (Népszava, 2003.11.18.)
 Juhász László: Tiltakozásul a tiltakozásra (www.magyar-jelen.com, 2003.11.09.)
 Balázs Zsolt: Az ilyen joggyakorlat rossz (Magyar Hírlap, 2003. 11.26.)
 B. Szabó Károly: A legjobb eszköz a nyilvánosság (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.27.)
 Nyerges András: Múlik-e, ami késik? (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.22.)
 Jeney E. Róbert: Felkiáltójel! (A Szabadság, 2003.11.21.)
 Szönyi Szilárd: Tesznek a gyűlölet ellen (Heti Válasz, 2003.11.21.)
 Seszták Ágnes: Óvakodj a filozófustól! (Magyar Demokrata, 2003.11.27.)
 Simor András: Kovászoló igazság (Népszava, 2003.11.19.)
 Arató Judit, Pungor András: Polt Pétert hetedszer is leszavazták (Népszava, 2003.11.18.)
 (sz. n.) Ki szorul itt védelemre? (Népszava, 2003.11.15.)
 Pungor András: Felmentették a kirekesztésre felhívó Hegedűst (Népszava, 2003.11.07.)
 Tamás Gáspár Miklós: Ebből elég volt (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.10.)
 P. E.: Már csak a Legfelsőbb Bíróság változtathat a "kirekesztés"-ügyön (Népszava, 2003.11.08.)
 Ármás János: Bünbakot találni könnyű (Napló, 2003.11.11.)
 Seszták Ágnes: Szálljatok le rólunk! (Magyar Demokrata, 2003.11.13.)
 Bencsik András: Most a bírók kapták meg (Magyar Demokrata, 2003.11.13.)
 Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.13.)
 Varga Imre: Erőszakká fajult az uszító örölet (Magyar Fórum, 2003.12.04.)
 Bojár Gábor: Gyűlölet- vagy szólásszabadság? (HVG, 2003.11.15.)
 Kis János: A bírói döntéstől a törvény fölötti döntésig (Élet és Irodalom, 2003.11.21.)
 Varró Szilvia: Fajtiszta ülésterem (Népszabadság, 2003.11.28.)
 Schiffer András: Pálfordulás a semmibe (Népszabadság, 2003.11.20.)
 Csuhai Ildikó: Gyűlöletheszéd: változik az SZDSZ álláspontja (Népszabadság, 2003.11.11.)
 T.B.: Uszítás vagy izgatás (Népszabadság, 2003.11.13.)
 Révész Sándor: Türelem, nyugalom (Népszabadság, 2003.11.08.)
 Kende Péter: Nácibeszéd és büntetőpolitika (Népszabadság, 2003.11.20.)
 Tábori Gabriella: Szabad demokrata fordulat (Magyar Nemzet, 2003. 11.11.)

- Bognár Tibor: Gyűlölet-védő-beszéd (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.17.)
- Tábori Gabriella: Az izgatás büntetése a pártállamot idézi (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.18.)
- Sebestyén István: A harag papja (Hetek, 2003.11.14.)
- Nehéz-Posony Márton: Az átlagosnál primitívebb... (Népszabadság, 2003.11.13.)
- Nyusztay Máté: Gyűlöletbeszéd: megosztott az SZDSZ (Népszabadság, 2003.11.15.)
- Pogonyi Lajos: Nem lehet a valóságról beszélni (Népszabadság, 2003.11.22.)
- Nehéz-Posony István: TGM fogadatlan prókátora (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.15.)
- hírösszefoglaló: Négy ombudsman, egy vélemény (Népszabadság, 2003.11.18.)
- Szőcs Zoltán: Orbán az úrasztala, Hegedűs a bíróság előtt (Magyar Fórum, 2003.10.16.)
- Sütő Gábor: Karácsonyi üzenet ifj. Hegedűs Loránthoz (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2003.12.)
- Faggyas Sándor: Baljós üzenetek (Heti Válasz, 2003.11.14.)
- Varga Imre: A rasszizmus szabad demokráciája (Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.27.)
- Petri Lukács Ádám: Van úgy is, hogy nem (Népszava, 2003.11.26.)
- Kauker Kinga: Miért hallgat a Fidesz? (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.27.)
- Bíró Béla: Indulatok hordaléka (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.15.)
- Révész Sándor: Veszély és érzete (Népszabadság, 2003.11.13.)
- Harangozó László, Kasztnér Gábor: A bűvöpatak újra előtört (Hetek, 2003.11.28.)
- Kovács Zoltán: Nem ért a fociohaz (Élet és Irodalom, 2003.11.14.)
- Szőcs Zoltán: Az öriület intézményesítése (Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.20.)
- B. Gy.: Szavas bögés (Magyar Narancs, 2003.09.11.)
- Szalai Erzsébet: Sajnos... (Népszabadság, 2003.11.27.)
- Joó Hajnalka, Perger István: Parázs vita a gyűlöletbeszédról (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.11.)
- Solymosi Frigyes: Egy okos ember balgaságai (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.18.)
- Szász István: Bizalmi elv (Népszava, 2003.11.17.)
- Pálmai Erika, Sebes György: Kritizálni lehet a bíróságokat, de tekintélyüket ôrizni kell (Népszava, 2003.11.15.)
- Györi Béla: Elég volt a Népszabadságból (Magyar Fórum, 2003.09.25.)
- Para-Kovács Imre: Iszapbírózás (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.17.)
- Szikinger István: Függetlenségi harc (Népszabadság, 2003.11.20.)
- Seregi András: A főbíró nem tartja jónak a közállapotokat (Népszabadság, 2003.11.13.)
- Szakács Árpád: Mádl körültekintő nyilatkozatokra int (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.13.)
- Pogonyi Lajos: Vérbeli komédiás szeretnék lenni (Népszabadság, 2003.11.19.)
- Marinov Péter: Ebből tényleg elég volt! (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.13.)
- Földes Anna: A félelem és a féltes jogán (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.13.)
- (sz.n.) Lomnicai: nem állok harban a kormányfővel (Népszava, 2003.11.13.)
- MN munatársai: Az ombudsmanok a kormányfónel (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.19.)
- Varga Imre: Tombol a hülyeség (Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.20.)
- Hack Péter: Rend és szabadság (Hetek, 2003.11.21.)
- Kumin Ferenc: Vadakat szólni (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.15.)
- Kulcsár Anna: Bírálható, de független a bíróság (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.13.)
- NSZ munkatársa: Bírói függetlenég, emberi egyenlőség (Népszabadság, 2003.11.19.)
- ifj. Hegedűs Lóránt felmentő ítélete (szerkesztett változat) (2003, www.nemzetor.hu, Nemzetör 64. száma)
- Varga Gergely (szerk.): Gyűlöletbeszéd: törvény és mozgalom (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.12.)
- Bánhidai Károly: Lázad a MIÉP (Magyar Demokrata 2003. 01. 23.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: Szellemi polgárháború (Magyar Demokrata, 2003. 12. 04.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.20.)

Dr. Kovács László: Gyűlöletbeszéd, usztás, kirekesztés alul- és felülnézetből

(Magyar Fórum, 2003.12.04.)

Csurka István: A MIÉP szétbomlasztásának céljai és módszerei

(Havi Magyar Fórum, 2003.02.)

Csurka István elnöki beszámolója a MIÉP XI. országos gyűlésén (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2003.03.)

Sütő Gábor: Karácsonyi üzenet ifj. Hegedűs Loránthoz (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2003.12.)

Szócs Zoltán: Tizéves a MIÉP (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2003.07.)

Bognár Tibor: Gyűlölet-védő beszéd (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.17.)

MN munkatársai: Az ombudsmanok a kormányfónél (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.19.)

Szakács Árpád: Belőttek a bíró ablakán (Magyar Nemzet, 2003. 11. 28.)

Sághy Erna: Távol és közel (168 óra 2003. 01. 23.)

Halmai Gábor: "Gyűlöletbeszéd" (Élet és Irodalom, 2003.09.12.)

Ignácz Valéria: Aki legyőzte Hegedűs Lórántot (Hetek, 2003.07.25.)

Siposhegyi Péter: A gyűlölet törvénye (Hetek, 2003.10.03.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.27.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2003.12.11.)

Hering József: Martin Hohmann igazsága (Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.20.)

Szócs Zoltán: Megtért a vándor (Magyar Fórum 2003. 12. 11.)

Varga Imre: A rasszizmus szabad demokráciája (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 11. 27.)

V.I.: Tisztújító országos gyűlést tartott a MIÉP (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 12. 18.)

Juhász László: új rózsadombi paktum készül? (www.magyar-jelen.com, 2003.12.14.)

Csontos János: Nappali menedék (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.26.)

Bayer Zsolt: Elég volt! (www.nemzetkor.hu, 70. szám)

Tábori Gabriella: Szük körű vita a gyűlöletbeszédről (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.20.)

Seszták Ágnes: Az élet meg az irodalom (Magyar Demokrata, 2003.11.06.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: A demokratikus terror (Magyar Demokrata, 2003. 02. 13.)

(sz.n.) Bizonyítás (Magyar Demokrata, 2003. 06. 12.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel, 2003.01.16.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel, 2003.04.10.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel, 2003.04.17.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel, 2003.05.08.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel, 2003.06.26.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel, 2003.07.31.)

Csurka István: Nyílt levél Várnai-Shorer Judit asszonynak, Izrael magyarországi nagykövetének!

(Magyar Fórum, 2003.09.11.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel, 2003.09.18.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel, 2003.10.16.)

Franka Tibor: A Nobel-díj az utcán hever? (Magyar Fórum 2003.01.09.)

(gki): Kussország rajtra kész (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 07. 03.)

Gy. B.: új programra készül a MIÉP (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 05. 15.)

Gy. B.: Mindig kell egy barát (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 11. 06.)

Györi Béla: A kosdi költök találkozója (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 05. 15.)

A MIÉP budapesti küldöttgyűlése: állásfoglalás (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 05. 15.)

- dr. Csisztay Gizella: A pusztulás útjain (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.)
Tóth Károly Antal: Nobelesdi (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2003. 03.)
Juhász László (c.n.) (www.magyar-jelen.com, 2003. 11. 09.)
Szakállas Attila: Ismét "nevelik" a polgárt (www.magyar-jelen.com, 2003.09.27.)
MN munkatársa: Zsidó szervezetek kérése (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.10.25.)
Keresztes Lajos: Furkóbot a baloldal kezében? (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.01.23.)
MN munkatársa: A Mazsihisz a gyűlöletkeltés szankcionálásáért (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.05.)
Hirősszefoglaló: Vita a gyűlöletbeszédról (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.10.)
MNO: Az OC... tiltakozik ifj. Hegedűs Loránt felmentése ellen (www.mno.hu, 2003. 11. 11.)
MNO: Medgyessy Péter levele Lomnici Zoltánnak (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.11.)
MNO: Kuncze Gábor találkozót kért Mádl Ferencről (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.11.)
MTI: Az MDF a szólásszabadság korlátozása ellen emelt szót (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.12.)
Csontos János: Demokraták kontra antifasiszták (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.12.)
Szakács Árpád: Lomnici a jogállamiságot félti (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.12.)
MTI: Bárándy Péter a gyűlöletbeszédről és a bíróságokról (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.13.)
Csontos János: Amikor az orca ég... (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.14.)
Szerető Szabolcs: Zsák a foltját (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.15.)
MTI-OS: MEÚSZ: veszélyben a sajtó- és szólásszabadság (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.16.)
MTI: Gyűlöletbeszéd: az MDF nem támogatja a Btk. Módosítását (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.17.)
Tábori Gabriella: Ha lesz szöveg, Mádl Ferenc dönt (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.19.)
Csontos János: Utószó a jogállamhoz (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.20.)
MN munkatársa: Sólyom László kontra Bárándy (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.24.)
MTI: Fodor ismét elhatárolódásra szólít (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.25.)
MN: Támogatott "felsőbbrendű" módosítás (www.mno.hu, 2003.11.25.)
MNO: A MIÉP budapesti küldöttgyűlések közleménye (www.mno.hu, 2003.05.10.)
MNO MTI: Gyűlöletbeszéd: előkészítés alatt a Btk.-módosítás (2003.07.08.)
MN munkatársa: Aggódiak a Jobbik (www.mno.hu, 2003.07.31.)
MNO MTI: Gyűlöletbeszéd – a Fiatal Baloldal összel módosítaná a Btk.-t
(www.mno.hu, 2003.08.24.)
Keresztes Lajos: Kell egy törvény?! (www.mno.hu, 2003.09.02.)
MTI: Az SZDSZ már azzal is beéri, ha nem emel adót az MSZP? (www.mno.hu, 2003.09.05.)
MN munkatársa: Gyűlöletbeszéd: nem büntetné az SZDSZ (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.09.05.)
Hinel Attila: Az SZDSZ-nek nincs belső alternatívája (www.mno.hu, 2003.10.15.)
MNO MTI: Csak az MSZP támogatta a Btk. Módosítását (www.mno.hu, 2003.10.21.)
Megyeri Dávid: Gyűlöletkeltés a kormány politikájában (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.11.29.)
Pozsonyi Ádám: "áll egy ifjú élmunkás a téren" (www.mno.hu, 2003.12.01.)
Csontos János: Kertész leszek, fáról jövök (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.12.01.)
MN munkatársai: Össztű Juhász Ferencre (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.12.02.)
Balogh Zsigmond: A zsákmánypárti plutokrácia és a bírósági szerv (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.12.05.)
Hinel Attila: Gyűlölettörvény light: vállalható kompromisszum? (www.mno.hu, 2003.12.08.)
MN: újra uszít Tamás Gáspár Miklós? (www.mno.hu, 2003.12.09.)
MN: Megszavazták a gyűlölettörvényt, éles vita a forinatról (www.mno.hu, 2003.12.09.)
Tábori Gabriella, Kis Ferenc: Elfogadták a gyűlölettörvényt (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.12.09.)
Ugró Miklós: Gyűlöletbeszéd-hiba (www.mno.hu, 2003.12.10.)
MNO: Lovas István feljelentése Tamás Gáspár Miklós ellen (www.mno.hu, 2003.12.11.)

MTI: Gyűlöléteszéd-tanácskozás Kaltenbach, TGM és Vitányi részvételével (www.mno.hu, 2003.12.12.)

MNO-összeállítás: December 22.: Magyar politikai élet (www.mno.hu, 2003.12.22.)

Szakács Árpád: Kontroll alá kerül a gyűlölöttörvény (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.12.23.)

MN munkatársai: A Mazsihisz csalódott Mádlban (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.12.24.)

Márton László: Tiltsuk-e a gyűlöléteszédet, Magyar Hírlap, 2003.09.20.)

Szárali Exhibition in Kőszeg

An exhibition was opened in Kőszeg about Horthy's soldiers, Ferenc Szálasi and the Arrow Cross, on March 19, the anniversary of Hungary's German occupation. According to the curator of the museum housing the exhibition, a genuine representation of the era can be seen. However, an MSZP representative of the Kőszeg local government said that the exhibition commemorated the rule of the Arrow Cross. MAZSIHISZ has also voiced its objection. (NSZ correspondent, "Szálasi-kiallítás a kőszegi várban – Szálasi Exhibition in Kőszeg Castle, Népszabadság, April 8, 2003.)

Bokor László: Tetemrehívás (168 óra, 2003.04.24.)

Fekete György: Horthy, a mázlista? (Élet és Irodalom, 2003. 05. 09.)

(sz. n.) Görgey a kőszegi kiállítás ellen (Heti Válasz, 2003.04.18.)

Murányi Gábor: Egy kiállítás kérdései (HVG, 2003.04.26.)

Németh Szilárd, Szarka Klára: Indulatos múzeumi séta Kőszegen (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.04.11.)

Doboz Pálma, Éber Sándor Szálasi-árvák a holokaust-emléknapon (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.04.17.)

Biczó Henriett: Kőszegen ma bezárták a Szálasi nyilasai című kiállítást (Magyar Hírlap, 2003. 04. 18.)

hírősszefoglaló: Bezár a kőszegi kiállítás (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.04.18.)

Jezsó Ákos – Megyeri Dávid: A zsidóság semmilyen diktatúrát nem tud elfogadni
(Magyar Nemzet, 2003.05.14.)

NSZ tudósítása:

György Péter: Kiss János és Szálasi Ferenc (Népszabadság, 2003.04.14.)

Á. Varga László: Nem tudtunk róla, nem jártunk hozzá (Népszabadság, 2003.04.18.)

(sz. n.) Mától bezár a Szálasi-kiallítás (Népszabadság, 2003.04.18.)

Levélváltás (György Péter és Bakay Kornél közt) (Népszabadság, 2003.04.18.)

NSZ munkatársa: Szálasi-kiallítás: visszakért dokumentumok (Népszabadság, 2003.04.19.)

Megyeri Dávid – Haklik Norbert: Vihart kavaró kiállítás (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.04.09.)

Swendt Pál: Vaspántok a múzeum ajtaján (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.04.19.)

(hun): Bezárták a kőszegi kiállítást (Magyar Fórum, 2003.04.24.)

Megyeri Dávid: átalakítás vagy ellehetetlenítés? (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.05.02.)

Boros Menta: Egy vitatott korszak emlékei (www.magyar-jelen.com, 2003. 05. 7.)

Csontos János: "Antiszemita vogymuk" (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.05.29.)

(sz. n.) Görgey a kőszegi kiállítás ellen (Heti Válasz, 2003.04.18.)

NSZ munkatársa: Mától bezár a Szálasi-kiállítás (Népszabadság, 2003.04.18.)
 Radnóti Sándor: Helytörténet, viselettörténet (Élet és Irodalom, 2003.04.18.)
 Népszava-információ: Szálasi-kiállítás a kőszegi várban (Népszava, 2003.04.07.)
 Egri János: A kőszegi kiállítás utóeleje (Vasárnapi Hírek, 2003. 05. 18.)
 Bokor László: A gyeplúszállás lakója (168 óra, 2003. 04. 17.)
 Csurka István: A Mazsihisz a kőszegi kiállítás azonnali bezárását követeli (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 04. 17.)
 Karsai László, Molnár Judit: Jelentés (Élet és Irodalom, 2003. 04. 18.)
 Budapest TV – Sajtóklub 2003. április 23. (www.nemzetor.hu, 2003. 04. 23.)
 Budapest TV – Sajtóklub 2003. Május 14 (www.nemzetor.hu, 2003.05.14.)
 (ser): A Mazsihisz bezáratná a tárlatot (Vas Népe, 2003.04.15.)
 MTI: Kőszeg: a Mazsihisz elégedett (Népszabadság, 2003.04.22.)
 Láng Róbert: Még egyszer Horthyról (168 óra, 2003.04.17.)
 Egri János: Egy kiállítás utóeleje (Népszava, 2003.05.06.)
 Péceli András: Egy bezárt kiállítás "dicső" emlékei (Vasárnapi Hírek, 2003. 05. 04.)
 Avar János: Önleplezők (Vasárnapi Hírek, 2003.04.20.)
 (sz. n.) Egy külföldi Magyarországon (www.nemzetor.hu, 2003.05.28.)
 Á. B.: Bezárt az egyik kiállítás (Magyar Demokrata, 2003.04.24.)
 Ágoston Balázs: Szálasi és Sztálin (Magyar Demokrata, 2003.04.17.)
 Budapest TV – Sajtóklub 2003. április 16. (www.nemzetor.hu, 2003.04.16.)

László Grespik Asked if the Judge Was Jewish

Years after the neo-Nazi meeting in the Viking Club, the members of the bands performing are brought to trial. There were 'Sieg heil' greetings and a song called "Here runs the Jew" was sung. The charge was incitement against the community, reported TV2 in its evening news. According to the report, Hungarian and foreign neo-Nazis were celebrating the 'Day of Honor' in the Viking Club on February 13, 1999. The TV program was informed that the concert was recorded by the National Security Office with secret service methods, then filed a report against the members of two bands. The Public Prosecutor's Office brought the musicians to trial with the charge of incitement against the community. The first question of defense attorney László Grespik to the judge was about her background, because if she had been Jewish, he would file a claim on the prejudice of the judge. After the production of evidence, the court is expected to deliver a sentence next sprint. Viking Club closed shortly after the scandal and has not opened since then. (News Summary, *Népszabadság*, November 26, 2003.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2003.12.04.)

Lovas István: O. J. Simpsontól Grespikig (Magyar Demokrata, 2003. 12. 04.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: Szellemi polgárháború (Magyar Demokrata, 2003. 12. 04.)

(erszékely): Grespiki kérdés (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.27.)
 Megyesi Gusztáv: Lex Grespik (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.28.)
 MH-álláspont: Lakmusz (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.28.)
 MH-összeállítás: A kamara vizsgálatot indít Grespik ellen (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.28.)
 (sz. n.) Grespik zsidózott a skinheadek védelmében (Népszava, 2003.11.27.)
 Varró Szilvia: Fajtiszta ülésterem (Népszabadság, 2003.11.28.)
 Népszava-információ: Grespik jogellenesen kérdezte a bírót a skinheadperben
 (Népszava, 2003.11.27.)
 (rk): Vihart szült Grespik kérdése (Színes Mai Lap, 2003.11.28.)
 S. Z.: Veszélyekre figyelmeztetnek (Népszava, 2003.11.28.)
 (sz. n.) Grespik zsidózott a bíróságon (Blikk, 2003.11.27.)
 (mti): Grespik kérdése: zsidó-e a bíró? (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.11.27.)
 Horváth Ádám: A gyűlölet hónapja (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 12. 11.)
 (BN): Az antiszemitaizmus ellen (Mai Budapesti Nap, 2003. 11. 28.)
 Szakács Árpád: Belőttek a bíró ablakán (Magyar Nemzet, 2003. 11. 28.)
 Schreiber László: Arc, bőr (Mai Budapesti Nap, 2003. 11. 28.)
 (Almási): Grespiket meglepte a botrány (Vasárnap Reggel, 2003. 11. 30.)
 (MTI): Meglepő kérdés (Heted, 2003. 11. 28.)

Commemoration in Tiszaeszlár Held by MIÉP

On September 11, 2003, the Hungarian Justice and Life Party (MIÉP) laid a wreath on the grave of Eszter Solymosi, the 13-year-old Calvinist girl who disappeared without a trace 120 years ago. It has been a taboo up to this day that the members of the Jewish community of Tiszaeszlár murdered the Christian girl 120 years ago for ritualistic reasons, and that they were acquitted as a result of political pressure. (MIÉP IT, September 2003., www.miep.hu)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 09. 04.)
 Györi Béla: A MIÉP tiszaeszlári koszorúi (2003. 09. 18.)
 Dr. Kovács Zoltán: Fejezet a Németh László Társaság történetéből (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2003. 09.)
 (sz. n.) A százhúszeréve zajlott perre emlékeztek (Kelet-Magyarország, 2003.09. 12.)
 R. Székely Julianna: Tiszaeszlár, 2003 (Vasárnapi Hírek, 2003. 09. 14.)
 nvr: Ellenkoszorúzás Tiszaeszláron (Magyar Hírlap, 2003. 09. 12.)
 Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum, 2003. 09. 18.)
 (sz. n.) Tiszaeszlári vérvádper (Heted, 2003. 09. 19.)
 Nagy V. Rita: Még mindig élnek az előítéletek (Magyar Hírlap, 2003. 08. 04.)

Imre Kertész's Nobel Prize and the Shooting of 'Faithlessness', the Film

The Swedish Royal Academy awarded the 2002 Nobel prize in literature to Imre Kertész "for writing that upholds the fragile experience of the individual against

the barbaric arbitrariness of history". (Péter Dunai, "Kertész Imre kapta az irodalmi Nobel-díjat! – Imre Kertész Received the Nobel Prize in Literature," *Népszabadság*, October 11, 2002.)

(2003)

Bányi Péter: Az intő jel (Magyar Demokrata 2003.01.09.)

Lovas István: A likvidálandó söpредék (Magyar Demokrata 2003.01.09.)

Franka Tibor: A Nobel-díj az utcán hever? (Magyar Fórum 2003.01.09.)

Molnár Balázs: Sajtó és a hazugság (Magyar Demokrata 2003.01.16.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum 2003.01.16.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum 2003.03.06.)

Csurka István: Magyar szemmel (Magyar Fórum 2003.10.16.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: Tractatus Socio-Psychiatricus (Magyar Demokrata 2003.01.16.)

Szűcs Zoltán: Orbán az úrasztala, Hegedűs a bíróság előtt (Magyar Fórum 2003.10.16.)

Hering: A holokausttipar Irakra is kivetítve (Magyar Fórum 2003.03.20.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: Ember embernek ügynöke (Magyar Demokrata 2003.01.23.)

Hering József: A holokaust kettős mércéje (Magyar Fórum 2003.04.24.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: Már megint a vesztes oldalon? (Magyar Demokrata 2003.02.27.)

Szűcs Zoltán: Alusznak tán, hogy nem hallják? (Magyar Fórum 2003.11.27.)

Dr. Kovács László: Vakulj, magyar! (Havi Magyar Fórum 2003.02.)

Gyurkovics Tibor: Idehaza-odahaza (Magyar Nemzet, 2003. 11. 08.)

ifj. Hegedűs Lóránk felmentő itélete (Szerkesztett változat) (www.nemzetor.hu, 2003.11.06.)

Lenhardt Balázs: Baj van Wass Alberttel (Magyar Demokrata 2003. 02. 20.)

Seszták Ágnes: A megrendelő és az ô zsenije (Magyar Demokrata 2003. 03. 13.)

Szalay Károly: A Kertész-szindróma (Magyar Demokrata 2003. 01. 23.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: Mi lett volna, ha...? (Magyar Demokrata 2003. 01. 30.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: A történelem árnyékában (Magyar Demokrata 2003. 03. 27.)

Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: Nagy-Magyarország feltámadása (Magyar Demokrata 2003. 06. 12.)

Varga Domokos György: A feladvány (Élet és Irodalom 2003. 01. 10.)

Dr. Kovács Zoltán: Aggályoskodások (Havi Magyar Fórum 2003. 01.)

Tóth Károly Antal: Nobelesdi (Havi Magyar Fórum 2003. 03.)

Tóth Károly Antal: Közleményesdi (Havi Magyar Fórum 2003. 07.)

Tóth Károly Antal: Válasz Szűcs Gézánnak (Havi Magyar Fórum 2003. 05.)

Jezsó Ákos – Megyeri Dávid: A zsidóság semmilyen diktatúrát nem tud elfogadni
(Magyar Nemzet, 2003. 05. 14.)

Schmidt Mária: Az Élet és Irodalom levelét megírta (Magyar Nemzet, 2003. 06. 28.)

Budapest TV – Sajtóklub 2003. Május 7 (www.nemzetor.hu, Sajtóklub, 2003. 05. 07.)

Szűcs Géza: Nobelesdi (Népszava, 2003. 02. 13.)

Márton János: Kertész nyom a latban (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.05.29.)

Szegedi tudósító: A polgármester is feljelentette Mónust (Népszabadság, 2003. 01. 31.)

Pajor András: Kertész szobra, Magyar Fórum, 2003. 03. 13.)

Koloszár Tamás: Holokauszt, megbékélés, szembenézés (Kisalföld, 2003.02.15.)

- Boros János: Auschwitzi beszélő (Élet és Irodalom, 2003.01.24.)
 Jenő Veress: Makaó (Népszava, 2003.11.19.)
 NSZ munkatársai: Sorstalanság: viszály a díszlet miatt (Népszabadság, 2003.09.03.)
 Schrötter Tibor: Koncentrációs tábor a Pilisben? (Magyar Fórum, 2003.09.18.)
 Budai Rózsa: Egy imát a holokauszt áldozataira írt (Vas Népe, 2003.04.12.)
 ts.: így zsidózunk mi (Magyar Narancs, 2003.01.23.)
 Pajor András: Aminek híjával vagyunk (Magyar Fórum, 2003.03.13.)
 (sz. n.) Kertész Imre köszöntése (Diplomata Magazin, 2003.01.)
 Bauer Péter: Szembesülés (168 óra, 2003.02.13.)
 MIÉP IT Országos Elnöksége: állásfoglalás (Magyar Fórum, 2003.10.02.)
 Murányi Gábor: "A Nobel-díjat zavaró repülésnek éreztem" (HVG, 2003.09.06.)
 Fekete G. Kata: Czeizel Endre a zsidó kultúráról, az elvándorlásról (Tolnai Népújság, 2003.02.01.)
 Dunai Péter: Ki vett jegyet jeruzsálemi buszra? (Népszabadság, 2003.03.14.)
 Gréczy Zsolt - Szále László: A túlélés koreográfiai (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.09.13.)
 Malomvizi Zsolt: A politikát mindig is irritálta a művészeti (Magyar Hírlap, 2003.09.03.)
 F. G. K.: Előbb elkergettük, aztán kérkedünk a Nobel-díjasainkkal (Békés Megyei Hírlap, 2003.01.27.)
 Bölcş István: Feljelentés (168 óra, 2003.01.23.)
 Földes Anna: Nem csak Kertészről van szó (Élet és Irodalom, 2003.01.31.)
 Seres László: Egy jobboldali menedék vége (Népszabadság, 2003.11.04.)
 Falusy Zsigmond: Filmszakadás (Népszabadság, 2003.09.15.)
 Csontos János: Bolgár Rádió, Budapest (Magyar Nemzet, 2003.09.20.)
 Boros János: Auschwitzi beszélő önmagunkról szólunk (Élet és Irodalom, 2003.02.07.)
 G. Németh Éva: A Pilis üzenete (Magyar Fórum, 2003.12.25.)
 Murányi Gábor: A szomorú valóság (HVG, 2003.09.20.)
 Varga László: Tévképzetek és balítéletek (Élet és Irodalom, 2003.11.28.)
 Szentmihályi Szabó Péter: Az elnapolt forradalom (Magyar Demokrata, 2003.10.30.)
 Rádai Eszter: "A Sorstalanságot a Kádár-rendszerrel írtam" (Élet és Irodalom, 2003.05.30.)
 Kántor Yvette: Egyszer minden pohár betelik! (www.nemzetor.hu, 2003. 26.szám)
 dr. Csiszlay Gizella: A pusztulás útjain (Havi Magyar Fórum, 2003.11.)

(2002)

- J. Györi László: Magyar lobogók (Élet és Irodalom 2002. 11. 29.)
 Bencsik András: Magyar diadal (Magyar Demokrata 2002.10.17.)
 Kállay-Nagy Szilvia: A mi Nobel-díjunk (Magyar Demokrata 2002.10.24.)
 Molnár Balázs: Semmit semmiért (Magyar Demokrata 2002.12.12.)
 Seszták Ágnes: Baljós árnyak (Magyar Demokrata 2002.12.12.)
 Szabó Kálmán: Arctalanság (Magyar Demokrata 2002.12.12.)
 Hering: Sikeres téma, sikeres író (Magyar Fórum 2002.10.17.)
 Hering: Izraelben megrötták Orbán Viktort (Magyar Fórum 2002.10.31.)
 Szócs Zoltán: Auschwitz Nobel-díjat kapott (Magyar Fórum 2002.10.17.)
 Szócs Zoltán: Kertészeti kézikönyv (Magyar Fórum 2002.10.24.)
 Szócs Zoltán: Karsai & Co. (Magyar Fórum 2002.12.05.)

- Szôcs Zoltán: Orvkertészet felsô fokon? (Magyar Fórum 2002.12.19.)
- Haklik Norbert: Dorongával álázott Nobel-díj (Magyar Nemzet, 2002. 10. 21.)
- Lovas István: Nyílt levél Bárányi Péter igazságügy-miniszternek (Magyar Demokrata 2002. 12. 12.)
- Molnár Balázs: Kertész nem diszkriminál (Magyar Demokrata 2002. 11. 14.)
- Szelei István: A "Na és?" relativizmusa (Magyar Demokrata 2002. 12. 05.)
- Bartis Ferenc: Kertész kedély (Bartis Ferenc új versei, Havi Magyar Fórum 2002. 12.)
- Haklik Norbert: Kertész Imre Nobel-díjat kapott (Magyar Nemzet, 2002. 10. 11.)
- Haklik Norbert: Irodalom vagy politika? (Magyar Nemzet, 2002. 10. 16.)
- Haklik Norbert: Náciikkal le a katolikusokat (Magyar Nemzet, 2002. 11. 13.)
- Kristóf Attila: Én nem tudom... (miért jár Nobel-díj...) (Magyar Nemzet, 2002. 12. 10.)
- MTI: Kertész Magyarországról és a holokausztról (Magyar Nemzet, 2002. 10. 18.)
- MN munkatársa: Egy szerző, aki a nemzetek felett áll, Pósa Zoltán: A jelölés titkai (Háttér) (Magyar Nemzet 2002. 10. 12.)
- Pósa Zoltán – MTI: Auschwitz és az irodalom (Magyar Nemzet, 2002. 12. 09.)
- Pelle János: A Nobel-díj üzenete (Heti Válasz 2002. 10. 25.)
- (sz. n.) A hét kérdése: Ismerik-e Kertész Imrért idehaza? (Heti Válasz 2002. 11. 08.)
- Éber Sándor: Kertész Imre átvette a Budapest díszpolgára címet (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.05.)
- NSZ munkatársa: A holokausztról katarzis kell (Népszabadság, 2002.12.09.)
- Heller Ágnes: A Sorstalanságot Isten angyala diktálta magyarul (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.12.)
- Dunai Péter: Kertész Imre kapta az irodalmi Nobel-díjat (Népszabadság, 2002.10.11.)
- Tóth-Szenesi Attila: A MIÉP szerint Kertész Imre nem szereti a magyarokat (Index, 2002. 11. 14.)
- Szarka Klára (szerk.), (közreműködtek: Burkovits Ferenc, Dreissiger Ágnes, Németh Szilárd, Szombathy Pál, V. Bálint Éva): Az Ember évét köszönjük Kertésznek (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.19.)
- Orosz István: Kertész Imre értünk szólt (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.09.)
- Tihanyi Péter: Egy magyar megdicsöölt (Hetek, 2002.12.13.)
- "Jönnek a magyarok" – Lapvisszhangok Kertész Imre díjáról (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.09.)
- Féderer Ágnes: Beszéd után, díjátvétel előtt (Népszabadság, 2002.12.09.)
- Horváth Gábor: Csontváz a szekrényben (Népszabadság, 2002.12.05.)
- Földes Anna: A mi Kertész Imrénk (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.11.02.)
- MH-összefoglaló: Kertész Imre Nobel-díjának látványos nemzetközi fogadtatása (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.12.)
- MTI/MH: Kertész Imre: a szélsőjobb nem a nemzet képviselője (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.21.)
- NIZS: Bushék várják Kertész Imrért (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.25.)
- Nagy Emőke: A sorstalan ember sorsa (Nők Lapja, 2002.11.06.)
- A Svéd Akadémia indoklása: A történelem barbár önkényével szemben (Népszabadság, 2002.10.11.)
- Kóczyán Péter: Kertész Imre és a jobboldal (Népszabadság, 2002.10.24.)
- Dési András: Kertész Imre Párizsban (Népszabadság, 2002.11.30.)
- (sz. n.) Kertész Imre békét akar teremteni Magyarországon (Népszabadság, 2002.10.18.)
- (sz. n.) Az emberiesség törhetetlen tanúbizonysága (Népszabadság, 2002.10.12.)
- Weyer Béla: Önvizsgálati jegyzőkönyvek (HVG, 2002.10.19.)
- Földvári Zsuzsa, Vásárhelyi Júlia: Befogadók (HVG, 2002.12.21.)
- Murányi Gábor: Megkoronázva (HVG, 2002.10.19.)

- MN munkatársai – MTI: Nobel-díjjal száműzetésben? (Magyar Nemzet, 2002.10.18.)
 MTI: Nobel-díj mint boldogságkatasztrófa (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.02.)
 Seres László: Sors (Népszabadság, 2002.12.10.)
 Garam Katalin, Járai János: Sors és szabadság (168 óra, 2002.12.19.)
 Tihanyi Péter: "Angyal diktálta ezt a regényt" (Hetek, 2002.10.18.)
 Bacher Iván: Kertészmagyarország (Népszabadság, 2002.10.26.)
 Dunai Péter: Vadászjelenetek az Unter den Lindenben (Népszabadság, 2002.11.16.)
 Podhorányi Zsolt: Kertész Imre ma veszi át az irodalmi Nobel-díjat (Népszava, 2002.12.10.)
 Szegő Gábor: Kertész ma átveszi a medált és a diplomát (Blikk, 2002.12.10.)
 MTI-információ: Kertész Imre a Svéd Akadémián (Népszava, 2002.12.19.)
 Kőbányai János: Kertész Imre és Jób (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.11.)
 Bíró Béla: Egyidejűség (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.26.)
 Tamás Pál: A Kertész-effektus (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.16.)
 Tóth Ferenc: Szembe kell nézni a múlttal (Tolnai Népújság, 2002.11.06.)
 Szále László: Kertész Unió (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.12.)
 G. A.: Vehetnék léghajót, de nem teszem (Kiskegyed, 2002.11.05.)
 MTI: Kertész Imre a szélsőjobbról (Nógrád Megyei Hírlap, 2002.10.21.)
 Lax Tamás: Kertész Imre az, aki a pokolba szállt le és élve jött fel onnan (Kacsa, 2002.10.17.)
 Petri Lukács Ádám: Ott hatok, ahol a holokausztot emberi tragédiának tekintik
 (Népszava, 2002.10.12.)
 Gerhardt Máté: Kertész előtt hever Budapest (Blikk, 2002.10.18.)
 Halkó Gabriella: Kertész folytatja (Színes Mai Lap, 2002.10.20.)
 szszj: Kertész diplomata lett (Vasárnapi Blikk, 2002.10.20.)
 Népszava: Kertész Imre Budapest díszpolgára lesz (Népszava, 2002.10.18.)
 KM-VBE: Népszerűséget hozott a Nobel-díj (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.19.)
 Varga László: Nyílt tér (Élet és Irodalom, 2002.02.08.)
 V. Gy.: Összefogás a Sorstalanság-filmért (Népszabadság, 2002.12.10.)
 Tamás Gáspár Miklós: Kertész Imre magyar író Nobel-díjas. Zsidó (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.11.)
 Szele György: Ki a magyar? (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.05.)
 Babarczy Eszter: Nobel-dilemma – itt az alkalom (Népszabadság, 2002.10.19.)
 (mti): "Minden Nobel-díjasnak van ellentábra" (Kisföld, 2002.12.07.)
 Dr. Del Medico Imre: Görgey enyhén mér (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.17.)
 Torgny Lindgren: Laudáció (Népszava, 2002.12.14.)
 Podhorányi Zsolt, Kepcs Ferenc: Auschwitz mind a mai napig tart (Népszava, 2002.12.10.)
 Részletek a Nobel-díjas magyar író előadásából: Mivé lett a XX. században a nyelv?
 (Népszabadság, 2002.12.09.)
 Szilágyi Ákos: Az eredődötörténelmi bűn (Népszabadság, 2002.12.14.)
 Dr. Del Medico Imre: Kertész könyvének gondolkodva (Népszava, 2002.12.09.)
 Kovács András Bálint: Ki a mi? – az alkalom megradagása (Népszabadság, 2002.10.28.)
 Pelle János: A bűntudat ritusai (Népszabadság, 2002.10.30.)
 Tordai Péter: Laudáció Kertész Imrének (Népszava, 2002.10.30.)
 Népszava-információ: Lovas Istvánnak elege van a Deutsch Tamásokból (Népszava, 2002.11.08.)
 írás-: Nemlétező író, nemlétező olvasó (Kacsa, 2002.10.31.)
 NSZ: A regényt viszi Washingtonba a kormányfő (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.10.25.)
 Dragos Erzsébet: A 17-es székben (168 óra, 2002.10.24.)

Sombor György: Együtt (168 óra, 2002.10.24.)

Bársony Éva: Sorstalanság-film: készenlét a rosszra (Népszava, 2002.10.19.)

Bársony Éva: Ennyi év után is idősrére maradt (Népszava, 2002.10.21.)

Vásárhelyi Mária: Nobel-díj – történeti keretben (Élet és Irodalom, 2002.10.18.)

MTI: Kertész Imre a szélsőjobbról (Békés Megyei Hírlap, 2002.10.21.)

Laudációk (Népszava, 2002.10.19.)

Podhorányi Zsolt: Sokan nem képesek szembenézni a múlttal (Népszava, 2002.10.12.)

(sz. n.) Sorstalanság, holokauszt (Magyar Narancs, 2002.12.19.)

Lengyel László: Kinek az embere? (Magyar Hírlap, 2002.12.19.)

Hovanyecz László: Magyarabbak a magyaroknál (Népszabadság, 2002.12.19.)

Bayer Zsolt: Nekünk ez jutott (Magyar Nemzet, 2002.11.15.)

Lovas István: Nyílt levél Bárányi Péter igazságügy-miniszternek (Magyar Demokrata, 2002.12.12.)

**COURT DECISION IN THE FIRST INSTANCE
IN THE CASE OF LÓRÁNT HEGEDÜS JR.**

Summarized communication

**Municipal Court of Budapest
Case No.: 13.B.423/2002/7.**

IN THE NAME OF THE REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY!

The Municipal Court of Budapest delivered the following

sentence

passed on the basis of the reconvened sessions of the public hearings held on 4th and 6th December 2002:

GYÖRGY METES as primary accused

found guilty: as an accomplice acting in the crime of incitement against the community

On the above grounds the Municipal Court of Budapest sentenced Metes György as primary accused to the pecuniary penalty of payment of an amount equal to 350 (in words: three hundred and fifty) days' fine.

The amount of the fine charged for one day has been assessed by the court to be HUF 1,500 (in words: one thousand and five hundred Hungarian forints) to be paid by the primary accused György Metes.

In case of non-payment of the pecuniary penalty by the primary accused György Metes thus determined by the court in the sum of altogether HUF 525,000 (in words: five hundred and twenty-five thousand Hungarian forints), the pecuniary penalty shall be changed into the sentence of imprisonment in minimum security prison for a period of days equal to the number of daily items of the fine non-paid.

LÓRÁNT HEGEDÜS Jr., as accused of the second degree

found guilty: as an accomplice acting in the crime of incitement against the community in cumulative offence

On the above grounds the Municipal Court of Budapest sentenced Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., to imprisonment to be carried out in prison for the period of 1 (one) year and 6 (six) months.

The execution of the sentence of imprisonment in the case of Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., as accused of the second degree has been suspended by the court for a probation term of 3 (three) years.

The civil claims filed in this criminal action have been ordered by the court to be adjudged by other statutory proceedings of the civil lawsuit.

The accused are ordered by the court to the payment of the costs of the criminal proceedings incurred up to this date or that may incur in this connection at any time in the future.

Justification

György Metes, as primary accused
(*personal data*)

Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., as the accused of the second degree
(*personal data*)

György Metes, primary accused, president of the MIÉP (Party for Hungarian Truth and Life) Organization of District XVI (of Budapest), and the editor-in-chief of the journal Ébresztő published by the same organization of MIÉP. Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., as the accused of the second degree, is the vice-president of MIÉP, and ex-member of the Parliament.

In August 2001, upon the request of György Metes, primary accused, Lóránt Hegedüs, Jr, wrote an article titled "The Christian Hungarian State" to com-

memorate the 20th August; this article was published in the journal entitled Ébresztő issued by the MIÉP organization of District XVI in 12000 copies.

The article read as follows:

“Christian Hungarian State,

This is how we can address our thousand year old country relying on the gold deposit of countless incidents of martyrdom suffered in the course of ten centuries. With the words of “the young and free Sándor Petőfi appearing in the light of undying glory on the plain of Transylvania” we can “look down into the ocean of the past/Beholding cliffs that rise to storm the skies/My hero land, your deeds of courage vast/We had our word to say on Europe’s stage/And ours was not a minor actor’s part/As dreaded by the world our drawn sword’s rage/As children dread the lightning in the dark.”

And let me refer to the words of László Németh, who wrote about the mission of the Hungarian nation extending to the whole of Central-Eastern Europe, organizing these peoples into a unit of quality, and in the absence of such mission the life of the Hungarian people would gradually fall into decay.

Christian Hungarian State! What a powerful organizing force appeared in you and had been exerted by you within the wreath of the Carpathian Mountains and far beyond them, radiating the resounding triumph of the Christian ethics whereby small groups of people and large communities, societies, people and nations are arranged in “beautiful and brilliant order”.

However, Jesus Christ says: “My kingdom is not of this world.” This is where we can understand the real underlying cause and reason of all Hungarian suffering. “Our fight is fought with the Hungarian inferno” – wrote Endre Ady. Where the light of the Soul of God, conquering and invigorating the world, appears, the negative soul, the devil will become intolerably hysterical, then it would turn into something cold-bloodedly deliberate and meanly vulgar.

This was how the Tatars, Turks and last, but not least the Russians turned up as the representation of the devastating, hysterical animosity: to destroy the wonders experienced by the spiritual constitution in the space and time of Christ, which is above the Asian space and time.

And similarly, this was how the Habsburg-house made its presence here to display its cold-blooded disposition to meanness, as the most untalented and most obtuse dynasty in Europe, what is more, all over the world.

The Christian Hungarian State could have withstood even that, if, as a result of the self-renunciation of the Compromise of 1867, the hordes of the vagabonds of Galicia had not invaded it; who, as if they were the old self of man without salvation, in an ancient onslaught fretted and are still scrunching this homeland, which, despite all this, is capable of resurrection from its ruins, on the heaps of the bones of our heroes. With their Sion of the Old Testament lost because of their sins and rebellions against God, let the most promising eminence of the moral order of the New Testament, the Hungarian Sion be irretrievably perished.

Also, Ady stated about the Hungarian Sion: "Never ever so much chaos, passion, violence, and Jewishness raved in a nation ..." And because it is not possible to burn out every single Palestinian from the banks of river Jordan with Fascist methods very often surpassing even those of the Nazis, they come to the banks of the Danube, sometimes as internationalists, sometimes as nationalists, and sometimes as cosmopolitans, to kick into the Hungarians once again, because they feel like it.

They become hysterical even from the salutation: CHRISTIAN HUNGARIAN STATE.

They say: it is exclusion. Every 20th August this false proposition is squawked by them cheating Hungarians out: the Hungarian state founded by King Saint Stephen I of Hungary was a receptive one. Of which László Németh said that we would like to have today such a clear situation as it had been in the multilingual state of Saint Stephen, where, under the mask of patriotism, the minority could not lie themselves into majority.

Now let you Hungarians listen to the one single message of survival over the thousandth year of the Christian Hungarian state, which has been based on the ancestral inheritance and continuity of right: EXCLUDE THEM! FOR IF YOU DO NOT EXCLUDE THEM, THEY WILL EXCLUDE YOU!

Of this message we are warned by the misery of thousand years, by the inheritance nevertheless existing “high above” of our country that has been robbed and looted a thousand times, and last but not least by the stone-throwing sons of Ramallah.”

Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., accused of the second degree, read out the above text in Pannon Rádió; which was recorded, and at 6.55 and 7.55 a.m. on 4th September 2001 it was broadcast in the programme entitled “Religious norms and spiritual call” of the same radio channel.

The immunity of Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., ex-member of the Parliament was suspended by the Parliament of the Republic of Hungary in its decision no. 89/2001. (XII.20.) dated 18 December 2001.

The Central Investigation Office of the Public Prosecution presented a bill of indictment No. Nyom. 174/2001. against György Metes as primary accused and Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., as accused of the second degree, including excerpts of the text of the article quoted above to substantiate the accusation of one count of the crime of incitement against the community, in violation of the statutory provisions stated in Article 169 b) of the Hungarian Criminal Code, which was committed by the accomplices acting in the crime and which was committed by Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., as accused of the second degree, in cumulative offence. The prosecutor present at the trial clarified the factum of the crime, and, by maintaining the legal classification of the act, added to the charges the entire article written by Lóránt Hegedüs Jr.

György Metes, as primary accused and Lóránt Hegedüs, Junior, as accused of the second degree, made a detailed confession admitting the facts but not pleading guilty.

In his confession György Metes, as primary accused, confirmed that it was upon his request that Lóránt Hegedüs, Junior compiled the article presented as a crime in the indictment. He also stated that he had read the article prior to the publication and found no grounds to refuse its publication, therefore he published it unchanged, in its original version. He also acknowledged that in his opinion the article could be interpreted in various ways, even in the way presented in the bill of indictment.

In his confession Lóránt Hegedüs Jr. as accused of the second degree, stated that he had only drawn the conclusion from the words of Sándor Petőfi, Endre Ady and László Németh. It had not been his intention to incite hatred, as it would have been inconsistent with both his education and profession. He stated that he had only exercised his right of expression of opinion granted by the constitution when he had written that article. He had only responded to the article entitled “The methodology of Exclusion” written by István Hell, in accordance with the decision of the MIÉP group in the Parliament and MIÉP President István Csurka. Lóránt Hegedüs Jr. also told the court that the term “exclusion” in its original Latin meaning, as “excommunication” meant exclusively intellectual and spiritual dissociation, therefore it could not be qualified as exhortation to commit any criminal act.

...

Due to the nature and type of the case, the court inevitably had to address the issue of anti-Semitism, anti-Jewish feelings as well as the topic of incitement to hatred.

It can be established that no definition is available for anti-Semitism up to this date. Its peculiar feature is that raising the issue itself generates tensions or induces people to take a point of view. This concept can be assigned to a wide range of opinions from the simple dislike of the Jews quite up to the physical persecution of the Jewish people.

All that can be stated in connection with this concept is that it is a social and political trend directed against the Jews, which can be traced down almost in every society from the ancient times up to the present days, sometimes in weaker forms, sometimes in stronger manifestations, depending on the current tensions prevailing in the given society.

Every democratic and civilized society tries to suppress the views of exclusion and discrimination, including anti-Semitism. Among the set of the tools available for this purpose, criminal law may be the ultimate means only and can be employed exclusively under the predetermined conditions set by Hungarian and international legislation.

In summary, the court is bound to address anti-Semitism only to the extent the right of the expression of opinion granted in the constitution is concerned, having regard to the fact that anti-Semitism is ordered to be punished by the Hungarian Criminal Code in force exclusively if it is manifested as an incitement to hatred. Even then, the court examines not anti-Semitism but the incitement against the community.

The right of the expression of opinion is granted by Act XX of 1949 as amended, on the Constitution of the Republic of Hungary, in Article 61. /1/, as a fundamental constitutional right, which is, however, determined as a liberty that may be subject to restriction in the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Neither of them makes any distinction as to the positive or negative quality of the opinion expressed or whether it may cause injury to anyone or not.

According to the position of the court, opinions in this extraordinarily wide scale may be expressed freely as long as they do not turn into incitement to hatred. Conclusively, the statutory provision in Article 269 of the Criminal Code may not be supposed to offer a specific protection by criminal law against the expression of opinions that are insulting, offensive or perhaps humiliating.

Accordingly, the only thing the court had to decide upon was whether the article or lecture is to incite hatred or not. Upon looking into this matter, extraordinary importance must be attached to the fact that incitement has no specific interpretation in criminal law. This must be all the more emphasized because the question what is capable of incitement and what is not cannot be approached subjectively. In this case both indictment and adjudication would be subject to individual judgement, political sensitivity or tolerance. Consequently, in delivering the judgement the court had to proceed in a manner to eliminate subjective elements as much as possible, and to base its judgement exclusively on the facts and on the legal regulations which are strictly applicable to the case.

Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights passed by Session XXI of the General Assembly of the United Nations on 6 December, 1966, which was promulgated by Law Decree No. 8 of 1976 states that “everybody has the right to free expression of opinion and this right includes the freedom of dissemination of all kinds of data and thoughts ...”). At the same time,

Article 20 /2/ specifies that “any propagation of national, racial or religious hatred which incites to discrimination, hostility or violence, shall be prohibited”.

Pursuant to Article 4 of the agreement promulgated by Law Decree No. 1 of 1969, which may impose legal sanctions on the Hungarian State, the participating states shall:

“a) declare that any propagation of ideas based on racial superiority or racial hatred, any incitement to racial discrimination, all aggressive acts or incitement directed against groups of persons of any race, colour or ethnic origin, furthermore any support, including the financial support, of racist activities shall qualify as acts of crime subject to punishment by penal law.”

Article 10 point 1 of the European Convention of Human Rights contains a further provision, which states that “Everybody has the right of the free expression of opinion. This right includes the freedom to form opinions and the freedom to know and transfer information and ideas, irrespective of borders and without the right of intervention therein by the authorities.”

Based on all the aforementioned it can be established that here two types of obligations have to be faced. On the one hand, the obligation to ensure the free expression of opinion, and, on the other hand, the obligation of subjection to criminal sanctions of all incitement to national, racial or religious hatred.

...

The court has come to the conclusion that it is a fact that the provision of certain liberties and at the same time the restriction thereof for the protection of the rights of others are in contradiction with each other and may unavoidably lead to clashes of interests.

In certain cases, especially where political, religious or racial issues are concerned, the exercise of a right, which manifests itself in a negative expression of opinion, may cause actual infringement of the law in the area concerned.

In such a case both parties have sufficient grounds to apply for the enforcement or protection of their specific rights, whereupon any decision taken may cause injury to the other party.

Now the task is passed onto the legislator to define the constitutional boundaries of the expression of opinion so that it should not cause a disproportionate injury to the lawful interests of others while it could be enforced in the widest possible range.

...

In colloquial usage, the word 'hatred' means a vehement, hostile emotion. Incitement is a statement or series of statements which are aimed at inducing a malicious and hostile behaviour which is not based primarily on reasoned, rational and consciously considered views, but on rage and base instincts.

According to the grammatical interpretation of the law, therefore, the one who incites to hatred, intends to excite vehement, hostile feelings arising out of rage or base instincts.

In these definitions, according to the viewpoint of the court, it is emphasized that the encouraging, provoking or instigating act shall be aimed at inducing some behaviour or activity which is hostile or causes damage.

This is also pointed out in Article 20 /2/ of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, stating that the act subject to punishment is "hostility or incitement to violence", whereas pursuant to Article 4 of the agreement promulgated by Law Decree No. 1. of 1969 it is any "violent act or incitement thereto."

In summary, according to the viewpoint of the court, the objective adjudication, which is free of emotions and subjective elements, of the acts made subject to the indictment can be ensured only by the construction of the concept 'incitement' in line with the aforementioned and also in accordance with the definitions of the various international conventions. Any departure therefrom would bring about particularly harmful consequences. The broad construction would lead to unjustified restrictions of the constitutional liberties, while the narrow construction would cause uncontrolled outbursts of rage.

...

In Resolution No. 30/1992. (V.26.) Ab the Constitutional Court stated a stare decisis opinion concerning the issue, namely, that while maintaining the free-

dom of expression of opinion, it is necessary and justified – albeit only in a narrow range and as an ultimate solution – to intervene by the means of criminal law, where the protection of the violated legal matter cannot be ensured in any other way.

In view of the aforementioned, the court had to form an opinion not on the validity of the content of what had been published or communicated, but the suitability thereof to incitement to hatred.

According to the viewpoint of the court, the examination and evaluation of the content of the statements subject to indictment would require a political and historical fact-finding and assessment which can be neither the aim nor the task of the present criminal proceeding as it lies beyond the adjudication of the criminal procedure.

...

The court did not accept the presentation of the defense on behalf of the accused.

Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., accused of the second degree, intended to communicate to the reader or the listener his own point of view using the ideas of well-known personalities who are highly esteemed by the entire Hungarian society. In his article, when quoting excerpts from Sándor Petőfi, Endre Ady or László Németh, after each passage a kind of partial postulate is formulated based on the content of the excerpt, as if it were an explanation of the aforementioned passage. At the end of his article, in accordance with the final conclusions representing his own viewpoint he claimed the following: "EXCLUDE THEM! FOR IF YOU DO NOT EXCLUDE THEM, THEY WILL EXCLUDE YOU!".

It is the position of the court that Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., in order to support his own ideas, quoted such well-known works of such well-known persons of which each is suitable in itself to influence people. The mentality of the whole article corresponds to Lóránt Hegedüs's own final conclusions.

The court refuses to agree with such conclusions and viewpoints, no matter in what form they are presented, and denounces such ideas on moral grounds and firmly dissociates itself from them.

The concept of 'exclusion' composed in the article has no specific construction in criminal law. Also in this case, for the purposes of interpretation, the court considered the definition worded in the Hungarian Concise Dictionary of Definitions. According to the Hungarian Concise Dictionary of Definitions, the word 'exclusion' means that he who makes exclusion, hampers somebody in the enforcement of his rights or prevents him from getting his share of, or partaking in something.

Obviously, exclusion may have lawful and also illegal means. The article made subject to the indictment does not contain any data which would call for the use of any illegal means.

It must be established, however, that calling upon to conduct exclusion is deemed to constitute a criminal act by itself, in view of the fact that exclusion may lead to some kind of physical segregation, or serve as a basis for that. No matter to what extent it may be "legitimate", exclusion by all means would preclude the possibility of the enforcement of some kind of right for particular members of the Hungarian society. Such orders for a so-called "legitimate exclusion" corresponding to the call by the accused were stated in Act No. IV of 1939 on the limitation of the social and economic expansion of the Jews as well as in Act No. VIII of 1942 on the regulation of the legal status of the Israelite denomination. The objective of these provisions also was to prevent certain members of the society from exercising their rights via "legal regulations".

According to the viewpoint of the court, Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., accused of the second degree, was aware that the statements expressed in his article were suitable to incite and add fuel to hatred. This fact was acknowledged also by György Metes, the primary accused of the indictment, when he stated in his confession that, from this aspect, the article may be interpreted this way.

The call to the exclusion of a certain part of the society and their stigmatization thereby, in other words, the arousing of hatred in itself may be suitable to disturb the social order, peace and public tranquillity.

In summary the court establishes therefore that Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., accused of the second degree made statements directed against the Jews which are suitable to incite hatred as described in the Hungarian Criminal Code. The final aim of

this article was, and the accused was aware of it, that the aroused hatred might as well erupt from the enclosed world of emotions and manifest itself for others. This conduct constitutes and qualifies as incitement against the community as stated in the statutory provision in Article 269. b) of the Hungarian Criminal Code.

...

The accused committed their act in great publicity as the periodical paper entitled Ébresztő had a circulation of 12000 copies, while the article communicated in the programme of Pannon Rádió was broadcast to an audience of a precisely not definable, however, large number of listeners.

Based on the aforementioned, the court concluded that by their conduct carried out in great publicity, György Metes, primary accused and Lóránt Hegedűs Jr., accused of the second degree, incited hatred against a national, ethnic, racial and religious group, namely against the Jews. This conduct was performed by Lóránt Hegedűs Jr. in cumulative offence.

Accordingly, the court pronounced György Metes, primary accused, guilty of incitement against the community which constitutes a criminal act violating Article 269 b) of the Hungarian Criminal Code and is to be qualified in accordance with that Article, which he committed as an accomplice; and Lóránt Hegedűs Jr., accused of the second degree, guilty of incitement against the community which constitutes a criminal act violating Article 269 b) of the Hungarian Criminal Code and is to be qualified in accordance with that Article, which he committed as an accomplice in cumulative offence.

...

The extraordinary danger to society, exerted by their act, was assessed by the court as an aggravating circumstance at the disadvantage of both accused. In respect of Lóránt Hegedűs Jr., accused of the second degree, the fact that he committed his act as a member of the Parliament and as a vice president of a political party, was assessed by the court as a further aggravating circumstance.

In view of the extenuating circumstances in respect of Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., accused of the second degree, the sentence of imprisonment was suspended by the court for a probation period pursuant to Article 89 /1/, /2/ and /3/ of the Hungarian Criminal Code.

...

Budapest, 6 December, 2002

Edina Kaszay
associate judge

Dr. László Szebeni
presiding judge

János Kocsis
associate judge

**COURT DECISION IN THE SECOND INSTANCE
IN THE CASE OF LÓRÁNT HEGEDŰS JR.**

Summarized Communication

**Municipal High Court of Appeal of Budapest
Case Reg. No.: 3.Bf.111/2003/10**

IN THE NAME OF THE REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY!

The Municipal High Court of Appeal of Budapest delivered the following

S e n t e n c e

at the public hearing held on 6 November 2003:

Judgement No. 13.B.423/2002/7. delivered and pronounced by the Municipal Court of Budapest on 6 November 2002 in the criminal proceeding launched against György Metes and his accomplice, charged for the commitment of the criminal act of incitement against community, has been

r e v e r s e d.

Whereby
accused in the first order, charged with the criminal act of incitement against the community,

accused of the second degree, charged with the criminal act of incitement against the community, committed in cumulative offence, are hereby

a c q u i t t e d

from the indictment.

The eventual costs incurred in the criminal procedure shall be borne by the state.

J U S T I F I C A T I O N:

György Metes, primary accused and Lóránt Hegedűs Jr., accused in the second degree, were pronounced guilty of the criminal act of incitement against the community, which was committed by them as accomplices, and by Lóránt Hegedűs, Junior, accused in the second degree, in cumulative offence. The Municipal Court of Budapest sentenced György Metes as primary accused to the pecuniary penalty an amount equal to 350 days' fine, where HUF 1500 is charged for each day item, totalling HUF 525000; and Lóránt Hegedűs Jr., accused in the second degree, to imprisonment of 1 year and 6 months, suspended for a probation term of 3 years.

The civil claims filed in this criminal action were ordered by the court to be adjudged by other statutory proceedings of the civil lawsuit.

The accused were ordered by the court to the payment of the costs of the criminal proceedings that may incur at any time in the future.

...

The sentence of the trial court has been appealed by György Metes, primary accused and Lóránt Hegedűs, Jr, accused of the second degree for acquittal; the duly authorized defense attorney of the primary accused lodged an appeal for acquittal of his client on the grounds of absence of any criminal offence committed by him; the duly authorized defense attorney of the accused of the second degree lodged an appeal for dismissal of the criminal procedure and also for the acquittal of his client on the grounds of absence of any criminal offence committed by him.

The prosecutor acknowledged the sentence of the first instance at the hearing in respect of both accused.

In warrant No. Bf.98/2003. the Public Prosecutor's Office presented the motion to add the distribution of the newspaper article to the facts of crime, otherwise to uphold the judgement.

The representative of the Municipal Appellate Chief Prosecutor's Office who was present at the public hearing (BF.139/2003.) by maintaining the written

warrant of the Public Prosecutor's Office, moved for the uphold of the sentence of the first instance.

At the public hearing the accused and their defense attorneys maintained their appeal unchanged.

...

The statement of facts established by the court of the first instance, – which has not been opposed to by appeals – is substantiated as it presents the newspaper article made subject of the indictment, the background to its composition, furthermore, the fact that it had been read out by the accused of the second degree in a Pannon Rádió programme.

...

The evidences bearing significance in terms of the adjudication of the case was revealed and considered by the court of the first instance. The indictment filed by the prosecutor which formed the basis of the criminal procedure was exhausted, and it was detailed why it was deemed that the culpability of the accused could be established. The legal justification, however, contains certain statements which are irrelevant in respect of the present case. Weighing of these circumstances is outside the duties of the court as judicature.

The irrelevant circumstances to be omitted from the justification of the judgement are as follows:

- In the decision of the court of the first instance (the last two passages on page 4 and the first three passages on page 5) it is elaborated what qualifies as anti-Semitism in the view of the court. The definition of the anti-Semitism and the analysis of its nature is not the task of the criminal court of trial of the given case.
- The decision of the court (last passage on page 5, first passage and third passage on page 6) gives an overview of what kind of duties the legislature has in connection with the international legal regulations; furthermore, it explains (last passage on page 6 and first passage on

page 7) what tasks legislature has to face. This detailed description is contrary to the otherwise correct statement of the court of the first instance that in the course of the criminal proceedings of the case it is confined to the charges stated in the indictment. It also implies that the indictment shall be fully exhausted, however, it may not be transgressed (passage the last but three on page 4 of the judgement).

- Furthermore, the wording “denounces such ideas on moral grounds” in the fifth passage on page 9 is also to be omitted as it is in contrast to the requirement of an objective procedure which is otherwise correctly stated by the court of the first instance. The particular conviction professed by the individual judge cannot bear any relevance to the decision concerning the indictment. Also, the historical overview in the last passage on page 9 about the anti-Jewish laws was also irrelevant for similar reasons because in the present case the performance of the crime of apartheid pursuant to Article 157. /2/ of the Hungarian Criminal Code was not even stated. This criminal act is performed by someone who takes any legislative or other kind of measures in order to intentionally prevent some racial group from participating in the political, social, economic and cultural life of a country. The subject of the indictment was not a legislative or some other kind of measure, but a newspaper article.

In spite of the circumstances bearing no significance in the delivery of the judgement as detailed in the aforementioned, in its decision the court of the first instance voiced a number of principles with which the court of the second instance agreed.

One important principle was that from the point of view of the adjudication of the act made subject to indictment it bears no relevance whether any proceedings were launched against which of the persons, as the court may decide on the criminal liability only of that person against whom an indictment has been filed. Significance shall be assigned not to the words, expressions or parts of the sentences, but to those sentences in their original context from which it can be established undoubtedly whether the accused committed a criminal act, and if they have, what kind of criminal act they performed.

In summary, the court is obliged to address anti-Semitism only to the extent the right of the expression of opinion granted in the constitution is concerned, having regard to the fact that anti-Semitism is ordered to be punished by the Hungarian Criminal Code in force exclusively if it is manifested as an incitement to hatred. Even then, the court examines not anti-Semitism but the incitement against the community. Even then not anti-Semitism, but the incitement against community shall be subjected to the scrutiny of the court. Another well-founded argument is that in Article 61. /1/ of the Constitution of the Republic of Hungary, as well as in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights the right of expression of opinion is stated as a fundamental constitutional right.

None of the aforementioned distinguishes as to the positive or negative content of the opinion expressed, and whether or not it may cause any injury to a person or persons.

Opinions may be freely expressed as long as they do not turn into incitement to hatred. Conclusively, the statutory provision in Article 269 of the Criminal Code does not constitute any specific protection offered by criminal law against the expression of offensive, insulting or possibly humiliating opinions. Accordingly, the only thing the court has to decide is whether the incriminated article or communication incites hatred or not.

The fact what makes incitement and what not, cannot be approached subjectively. In such a case both the indictment and adjudication would then be subject to individual judgement, political sensitivity or tolerance.

Accordingly, in passing the judgement the court shall proceed in order to eliminate subjective elements as much as possible, and to base its judgement exclusively on the facts and on the legal regulations which are strictly applicable to the case.

...

There is no democratic society without pluralism and tolerance; the freedom of expression of opinions is one of the corner-stones of the democratic society, one of the prerequisites of its development. This freedom shall be granted also to thoughts, information, ideas and principles which are offensive, astonishing or alarming.

However, in spite of the fact that in its judgement the aforementioned principles and resolutions were addressed in detail in respect of the issue of the performance of the criminal act of incitement to hatred in the given case which violated Article 269 of the Criminal Code, the court of the first instance arrived at a false legal conclusion. At the same time its legal viewpoint contradicts its statement presented in the last but one passage on page 9 of the judgement, which confirmed that "the article made subject to indictment does not contain any data which called for the use of unlawful means".

...

The appeal launched by the accused and the defense attorneys for acquittal is substantiated.

On the basis of the statement of the facts established by the Municipal Court of Budapest, a false conclusion has been drawn concerning the culpability of the accused where the speech with its previously conceived content, carefully designed construction, which was presented in written form, as well as in the form of a voice recording and a radio broadcast, and which, undoubtedly, contained statements offending and humiliating the part of the Hungarian Jews originating from Galicia, was assessed as one exceeding the boundaries of the right of the expression of opinion and freedom of speech, which constitutes a criminal act.

The criminal conduct of the incitement against the community as defined in Article 269. b./ of the Criminal Code is incitement to hatred. Incitement to hatred is a serious abuse of the freedom of the expression of opinion, and it is an emotional preparation to violence. In the justification of the resolutions passed by the Constitutional Court and in the case decisions No. BH.1997/165. and BH. 1998/521. of the Supreme Court a definitive guideline is provided as to how the incitement to hatred shall be construed.

To summarize the aforementioned: the person who

- calls to violent acts,
- calls to the performance of such an action or conduct, where
- the danger is not only assumed but there are actual rights endangered and there is a direct threat of a violent act,

is deemed not as someone who exercises the right to the freedom of expression of opinion, but one who commits the incitement to hatred.

In the colloquial meaning of the word, a perceivable moral disapproval is assigned to incitement.

The content of incitement to hatred, – as a concept used in criminal law – has been formulated by the practice of judicature. The person who in large public incites to hatred against particular groups of people, shares not only his antipathy, unfavourable or offending views and ideas arousing concern with other people, by setting the mood of the public, but also he displays a rebellious conduct generating tension, which is suitable to arouse the rage of the people and to violate the social order and peace.

The heated hatred may turn into extreme activity, ultimately into the eruption of violent acts. The incitement against the community is basically not a political but a legal crime, and as such, has been listed among the crimes against public tranquillity.

The person who provokes active, efficient hatred in others, performs incitement to hatred.

The opinion expressed in the article/voice recording published by György Metes, primary accused and written then read out to voice recording and communicated via radio broadcast by Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., accused of the second degree, may be offensive, astonishing and also alarming.

However, the criminal act of incitement against the community as determined in Article 269. b./ of the Criminal Code is not constituted thereby. The newspaper article does not call upon the performance of any activity or conduct or some violent act. It is not even suitable to stimulate the active effective hatred in the reader or in the listener which is required for the facts as described in the statutory provision.

It follows from the (immaterial) endangering nature of the criminal act that the assumed existence of the danger (abstract endangerment) is not sufficient for its performance.

Danger means the realistic possibility of the occurrence of the injury, that is, the prevalence of a situation where the possibility of the development of the process in the direction of the occurrence of the injury has to be reckoned with.

The conclusion of the Municipal Court of Budapest that it is sufficient that the offender has the foresight that the aroused hatred might as well emerge from the enclosed world of emotions and manifest itself in a manner perceivable also for outsiders is not substantiated; it must satisfy also the triple requirements detailed above.

Nor was the reasoning shared by us in respect of the statement that the invitation for exclusion by itself constitutes a criminal act, as no such provision is contained in the Criminal Code currently in force, or was contained in the Criminal Code in force at the time of the performance of the act. On the other hand, in its judgement the Municipal Court of Budapest failed to address the extent of the danger, the tangibility thereof, as well as the degree of violence.

From the call “Exclude them! For if you do not exclude them, they will exclude you” it does not follow and cannot be assumed that it was the intention of the accused to encourage its readers / listeners to conduct violent acts. From the part of the sentence “they will exclude you” it cannot be concluded that the author of the article fears violence on the part of the Jews originating from Galicia, and desires to prevent it.

Evidently, in the absence of any threatening violent conduct by the Jewish people the necessity of the prevention of any violent conduct may not even occur, and thus, such preventive violent exclusion is not encouraged by the accused of the second degree, not even indirectly.

The constitutional principle described in the judgement and the case decisions brought by the Supreme Court were left out of consideration by the Municipal Court of Budapest when it failed to confront the criteria of incitement to hatred with the newspaper article and the radio programme featuring in the given case.

This comparison was subsequently performed by the Court of Appeal according to the aforementioned, and in its review it was concluded that the conduct of the accused was not factual. The incitement to hatred as an element of the factum of

crime as determined in the statutory provision is absent, therefore the accused are acquitted from the indictment for the criminal act of incitement against the community, violating Article 269. b./ of the Criminal Code, on the grounds of absence of any criminal conduct (pursuant to Article 331 /1/ of the Criminal Procedure).

...

In view of the fact that the court of the second degree did not establish the performance of criminal acts at the disadvantage of either of the accused, the civil claim launched by N.N. was refused without the examination of the legitimacy of suit (BH.1998/217.).

Pursuant to Article 339. /1/ of the Criminal Procedure, the costs of the criminal proceedings eventually incurred up to this date shall be borne by the state for reasons of acquittal of the accused.

Dated: Budapest, 6 November 2003

...

Dr. Péter Nehrer
presiding judge

Dr Katalin Csere
presenting judge

Dr Éva Lányi
judge

The decision No. 3.Bf.111/2003/10. of the Municipal High Court of Appeal in respect of György Metes, primary accused and Lóránt Hegedüs Jr., accused in the second degree shall become legally binding as of 6 November, 2003.

Dated: Budapest, 6 November 2003

Dr. Péter Nehrer
presiding judge

“It is not easy and not pleasant to see into this deep heinousness, but I believe we must take a look at it, because whatever could take place yesterday may happen again tomorrow, perhaps to us or to our children.”

PRIMO LEVI

This is the third volume of our collection of essays entitled *Anti-Semitic Discourse in Hungary*. After the first collection of articles about the year 2000 and the second one about 2001, we have now compiled one volume for 2002 and 2003.

...The repeated appearance of century-long elements of anti-Semitism in 19th and 20th century Hungary is much in evidence in allusions, names and references. A good example is an event discussed in this book, namely, the Hungarian Justice and Life Party's (MIÉP) wreath-laying in Tiszaeszlár. Those to whom Tiszaeszlár, the village where the 1882 blood libel case happened, means nothing (especially if they don't live in Hungary) will not understand MIÉP's symbolic act.

DR TIBOR SZESZLÉR