

we still claim that these regimes 'proclaim the superiority of planned economies over their market counterparts' (p. 5)? These empirical realities in the five surviving communist regimes suggest that, in a future edition, the definition of a communist regime adopted in this study may need to be amended. In sum, this is an important book that takes on a big question. Its findings deserve close attention by historians, political scientists, and sociologists.

Martin K. Dimitrov
Tulane University, New Orleans
mdimitro@tulane.edu

References

- Linz, J. and A. Stepan. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mesa-Lago, C. 2012. *Cuba en la era de Raúl Castro: Reformas económico-sociales y sus efectos*. (Cuba in the Era of Raúl Castro: Economic and Social Reforms and Their Effects) Madrid: Colibrí.
- Park, K.-A. and S. Snyder. (eds.) 2013. *North Korea in Transition: Politics, Economy, and Society*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

David Boromisza-Habashi: *Speaking Hatefully. Culture, Communication, and Political Action in Hungary*
Pennsylvania, PA, 2013: University of Pennsylvania Press, 148 pp.

What happens when freedom of speech targets a liberal political environment? How can liberal polities legislate effectively against racist public discourse? Who decides what qualifies as hate speech? These questions increasingly relate to the freedoms and un-freedoms in both new and established democracies that struggle with delineating the limits to freedom of speech in policy and public debates regarding migration, religious rights, and the rights of

sexual and ethnic minorities. The freedom of public debate in new democracies has received more attention in the literature, showing that promoting an unconditional freedom is likely to make ethnic and national conflict worse [Snyder and Ballantine 1996]. But the tone of pro-jihadist or anti-Muslim discourse in the West European public and political sphere indicates that any democracy can be prone to passivity in the face of hate speech.

Hungary has felt the brunt of these questions and issues, given the tone of racist and sexist speech that has gripped politics in the country since the ascendance of the extreme and conservative right in the last decade. There is an acute confusion in the country regarding the provisions of freedom of speech, despite the abundance of racist and sexist expressions in the public discourse and media [Hammer 2006] that are sometimes qualified as 'public feelings'— especially on the infamous theme of 'gypsy crimes'. Boromisza-Habashi's book presents this confusion rather succinctly with an elaboration of diverse stakeholders and their rhetorical resistance to each other on the issue. However, this is a very limited book, as the debate that the book presents is almost a decade old. Only in the final chapter, the author refers to 'the gruesome murder that took place in the village of Olaszliszka' (p. 107) in 2006 where a non-Roma, Hungarian man was beaten to death by a Roma crowd on the premise that his car hit and badly hurt a Roma girl. This incident provided a spark for much of the extreme-right hate speech and action against the Roma population in Hungary. The subsequent political action led by Jobbik and the paramilitary groups associated with it should have deserved major attention in any book on hate speech in Hungary. It is rather disappointing that neither the author nor the publisher considered the immense problems that Hungary has faced with hate speech much recently. This book, pub-

lished in 2013, says next to nothing about the political action and hate speech that Jobbik triggered in the Hungarian public sphere.

Looking at more recent developments in Hungary, one can see how Boromisza-Habashi only illuminates the background for later problems that were at the cusp of freedom of speech and hate speech. In 2009, a report from the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance stated that freedom of speech in Hungary targeted the liberal environment thanks to the legal protection it provided for racism in public discourse. The same report noted that the very high level of constitutional protection afforded to freedom of expression made it impossible for the authorities to legislate effectively against racist expression. Consequently, and remarkably, the almost total absence of limits of free speech in Hungary complicates the task of promoting a society that is more open, diverse, and tolerant toward its own members. Domestically, Hungarian legal experts based at the Eötvös Károly Institute also pointed to the problem of hate speech against the Roma, gays, and Jews in Hungary. However, rather than making legal changes to curb freedom of expression and chipping away at the constitutional texts, Miklósi, Navratil, Simon, Somodi, and Szabó proposed that the fight against hate speech should be waged through social policy. Therefore, the legal experts shifted the burden to political power holders to act against all kinds of hate speech.

Yet, power holders were also unenthusiastic in their efforts. At a press conference held on 29 January 2009, in Miskolc, on unveiling a series of thefts and robbery, Albert Pásztor, chief of the Miskolc Police, stated that the perpetrators of violent robberies in public areas are Gypsies. He continued, 'In fact, in Miskolc Hungarians may only rob banks or gas stations, while the Gypsies commit all other robberies.' He was dismissed shortly after. However,

an unlikely multiparty coalition came to his support. Fidesz and Magyar Gárda announced their support for Pásztor. The Mayor of Miskolc from MSZP, Sándor Káli, kept on with Pásztor and stated that the Roma issue was not specific to Miskolc and has become 'a crucial question in North Eastern and Southern Hungary'. According to the mayor, Albert Pásztor had simply stated the facts and should be supported rather than dismissed. Local party members of the SZDSZ even addressed a letter to the Minister of Justice that they were shocked to learn about the dismissal of Albert Pásztor and that his dismissal only serves to strengthen the extremist position instead of helping the dialogue that Albert Pásztor sought to build through his work [Beréti and Szendrei 2011].

In this political context, an organisation called Véderő established itself in 2008 with the mission to respond 'to the state of war that was in effect due to Roma crimes'. From 2010 onward, this organisation started its own military training and settling in small villages with Roma populations. In 2011, their paramilitary and patrolling activities in Gyöngyöspata increased the tension in the village and reached a tipping point when the Roma asked for evacuation for safety reasons (*Népszabadság* 16 May 2011). In view of these events, the reader would like to see certain legal, socio-cultural, and political debates in Boromisza-Habashi's book regarding the particular public atmosphere, which breeds extreme-right discourse and triggers activity in the absence of legal constraints.

Indeed, the ascendance of the extreme-right Jobbik and its commitment to re-defining the law and order narrative in Hungarian political and public speech illustrates the serious socio-political implications of hate speech in Hungary. The law and order-related activities of Jobbik have been conspicuous inasmuch as the party only accepts its own definition of 'normal' Hungarians—Christian, white, heterosexu-

al, and nationally conscious [Niedermüller 2009]. With the ludicrous rhetoric that 'our homeland is under attack', Jobbik sought to foster national consciousness and replace 'lower levels of morality in Hungary' with the deep belief in national superiority and the elimination of Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, and other hidden minorities from the ranks of the nation [Czene 2007; Kende 2009]. Along with 'gypsy crimes', Jobbik's position on law and order has been welfare forgery. They see the issue of irresponsibly conceiving in order to gain access to social welfare support as a crucial problem. According to this rhetoric, welfare forgery is a Roma business, all welfare assistance should be made conditional on workfare, and no single form of assistance can be exclusive to Roma [Czene 2009]. In this respect, Jobbik is alarmed by child support for Roma—'Gypsy breeding [cigánytenyésztet] maintained by state funds'—especially given Hungary's population problem [Niedermüller 2009: 4].

Thanks to the social media and the internet, Jobbik politicians are able to communicate extensively, circulate 'hateful speech', and assert their narratives in debates on social policy in Hungary. In fact, the metaphor of 'gypsy crimes' became such a token for Jobbik and the paramilitary groups associated with it that the extreme right rhetoric dominates all the policy debates over the Roma. With respect to the strength that Jobbik gained, Karácsony and Róna noted that the media played a successful role in communicating to people 'what to think about' rather than 'what to think'. Jobbik rose to prominence with an anti-Roma voice as a result of their ownership of the issue and propagated a feeling of security amid so many challenges [Karácsony and Róna 2010: 36–37].

This political situation raised eyebrows even among the conservative voices in Hungary. According to Gábor Bencsik of the conservative right weekly *Magyar Demokrata*, liberalism was responsible for

the ubiquity of the Gypsy issue: 'SZDSZ brought gypsy human rights advocates to power and the liberal media canonized their standpoints and condemned those that diverged from the official line.' In time, hate speech became harsher in private while the public obeyed the official line. Thus, the effect was contrary to what the liberals had expected. The population was filled with prejudice, but this was hidden and contained in close networks. The real change came after Jobbik and Magyar Gárda came to prominence [2011: 18–20] and unleashed their hate speech.

Boromisza-Habashi's book only illuminates the background of what was likely to come in Hungary. The book focuses on the term 'hate speech' to expose the reader to the cultural logic of the political and moral struggle in public deliberations in Hungary. He starts with presenting Hungarian history as the context and introduces Hungary as a perpetually 'liminal' state without delving into the rich political geography literature behind the term 'liminality'. Boromisza-Habashi indicates that 'Hungarian liminality produces only adversarial factioning, which in turn leads to greater social division and chaos' (p. 14). However, the author does not reflect any further on this argument in the coming chapters and somehow leaves it as part of a very general outline of Hungarian politics and society. We should be careful about the terms that we use in academic work and not use them unless we are going to improve their conceptual quality. The analysis of Hungarian politics is so limited and dated that it does not refer to any of the established literature in the field, but instead uses Swiss newspaper articles as references. Remarks such as 'today, the ten-million-strong, thousand-year-old country has a democratically elected government, it is a member of such international organizations as the European Union, NATO, and the United Nations, and it is busily transforming the remnants of its former planned economic system into a

market economy' only deserve to be featured in travel literature.

Boromisza-Habashi's study reflects his hunch that 'it seems that Hungarians have limited agreement about the meaning of hate speech ... It also is safe to claim that the Hungarian term "hate speech" does have a core meaning: it is a locally recognized form of public expression'. While the former part of this argument does not suggest anything particularly original, the latter part could be interesting if we as readers were able to know why in Hungary, but not in other places, hate speech has become a locally recognised form of public expression. While, in an inductive manner, the book illustrates various contexts and tones of hate speech in Hungary, it does not demonstrate why any reader without a particular interest in Hungary should care to know about this. It is a great source only for people with a singular Hungarian interest.

This raises the question why this book had to come out in an English-language press. Over 113 pages, the book presents the 'diversity of meaning' of hate speech as terms of communicative action and a type of observable talk. 'The cultural meanings of a cultural term for communicative action fall into three categories', according to the author (p. 29). Without presenting any supporting literature or theories, the author mentions act-level interpretations, event-level interpretations, and style-level interpretations of hate speech. This classification reflects on Hungarian data, presented first in the original Hungarian and then later as translated to English. The data are very much context-specific and the author is shy to engage those readers who are not informed on Hungary with a general argument. In a rare attempt to reach beyond Hungary, the author states: 'In 2007, radio host Don Imus rocked the United States when he casually referred to African American players on the Rutgers women's basketball team as "nappy-headed hos" on the air', but he does not establish any links

between this particular case and the Hungarian context (p. 37). It is important to have a picture of the 'communal interpretations of the term [hate speech] as accurately as possible' (p. 40), yet the findings can resonate academically only when these 'communal interpretations' show what is or has been particularly interesting in the Hungarian case vis-à-vis other cases.

At its core, the book offers two interpretations of hate speech in two successive chapters, namely, tone versus content and how to sanction 'hate speech'. The author eventually presents his position more clearly: 'the cultural analyst can be relatively certain that broadcast talk about the issue will be culturally meaningful and morally charged' and uses a media event as a case study (p. 48). The event that he refers to is from 2004 and it spilled over into print journalism with the publication of eleven articles in the Hungarian weekly *Élet és Irodalom*—a publication commonly associated with the Hungarian liberal left. This is a clever use of a case study to show that determining whether hate speech is primarily characterised by tone or content can be contentious for intellectual camps in Hungary. Boromisza-Habashi indicates that participants used interpretations of hate speech not only to take sides in the debate but also to formulate moral stances towards the concept itself. A theoretical reflection follows this observation that 'sooner or later, the choice to treat the term "hate speech" as a key symbol circulating in Hungarian political discourse requires the cultural analyst to reflect on two core functions of communication: it organizes individual experience and facilitates the individual's participation into communal life. When the individual speaker uses a key symbolic term in front of others, the term will point to a culturally specific meaning and a social role the individual occupies' (pp. 48-49). This is quite an incisive reflection and the reader would have liked to see more of these theoretical debates sooner

rather than later. Thereafter, however, once again the author engages too closely with the case study and loses the theoretical thread.

Perhaps, a theoretical chapter in the beginning of the book would have helped to establish what exactly the author has in mind as a theoretical contribution. Nonetheless, in a following chapter that examines how to sanction 'hate speech' in Hungary, this time the author reflects on talking about 'hate speech' in the Hungarian Parliament. Without clarifying why he chose the particular time period under study, we find ourselves reading through very dense debates in the Hungarian Parliament in long quotations—first in Hungarian and then in English. The author seemingly attempts to portray whether constraints on freedom of expression by law can serve as an act against hate speech or not (p. 78). He also rightly indicates that 'creative political action takes into account key symbols related to a political issue in the political discourse of the day, the competing interpretations of those symbols, and the competing moralities that give meaning to those interpretations' (p. 80).

Overall, this book presents the background to the hate speech problems that surfaced in Hungary, especially with the rise of Jobbik. However, it missed a great chance to relate itself to recent issues of hate speech in Hungary and why Hungary can present an interesting case study for other researchers working on hate speech per se. The book is a great source for those working singularly on a particular period in Hungarian political history, but it does not appeal to anyone beyond them.

Umut Korkut

Glasgow Caledonian University

Umut.Korkut@gcu.ac.uk

References

Bencsik, G. 2011 'Mi a baj a cigányokkal?' *Magyar Demokrata*, 11 May: 18–21.

Beréti, L. and J. Szendrei. 2011. 'The Pásztor Affair.' *Hadtudományi Szemle* 4 (1): 54–57.

Czene, G. 2007. 'Gárdisták! Allj, vissza.' *Népszabadság*, 1 September. Retrieved 10 October 2014 (<http://www.nol.hu/belfold/cimkek/gardista>).

Hammer, F. 2006. *Közbeszéd és Társadalmi Igazságosság*. Budapest: Gondolat.

Karácsony, G. and D. Róna. 2010. 'A Jobbik Titka. A szélsőjobb magyarországi megerősödésének lehetséges okairól.' *Politikatudományi Szemle* 19 (1): 31–63.

Kende, P. 2009. 'Vádirat Tatárszentgyörgy után.' *Népszabadság*, 5 March. Retrieved 15 October 2014 (<http://www.nol.hu/noller/cimkek/tatarszentgyorgy>).

Niedermüller, P. 2009. 'A Jobbik megérkezett.' *Élet és Irodalom*, 19 June: 4–5.

Snyder, J. and K. Ballantine. 1996. 'Nationalism and the Marketplace of Ideas.' *International Security* 21 (2): 5–40.

Bruno Latour: *The Making of Law. An Ethnography of the Conseil d'Etat*
Cambridge 2010: Cambridge Polity Press, 297 pp.

Bruno Latour's *The Making of Law: An Ethnography of the Conseil d'Etat* is an extraordinary book which deserves to be considered from various angles: anthropology and ethnography, legal theory and philosophy, actor-network-theory (ANT), and science and technology studies (STS). It deserves a wide readership, especially among those who are interested in the anthropology of legal modernity. As an ethnographer, Latour takes us close to the workings of law embodied in the Conseil d'Etat (the French supreme administrative court and the legislative council of French government); not, as is often the case, by concentrating on concept-defining activities, but by focusing on the material practices of this legal institution. For an anthropologist it may be interesting to consider how an author, a non-jurist, has modified the method of participant observation as applied to modern law, which is well known for its resistance to the