

Ervin CSIZMADIA

A magyar politikai fejlődés logikája
[The logic of Hungarian political development]

Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó 2017, 413 pages.
ISBN 978-963-693-795-9

"I consider it's important that Hungarian politics should take over the pre-1990s era of Hungarian politics as soon as possible, and be more courageous in this respect than it has been. Western Political Science is just a good example: let us be Westerners!" – says Ervin Csizmadia's latest book. The author of the book "The logic of Hungarian political development" didn't set himself a small task, he looks at the policy and its development for about 150 years. His hypothesis is that a particular political development is present in Hungary. Furthermore, the "normal" development is not always present in all the events of history, but it is observable and mostly related to each other.

In Hungary, research on the subject was pushed to the background, but in 2017, Ervin Csizmadia puts Hungary on the list of countries undergoing political development. Scientific research of such a serious subject requires a considerable professional experience, with which the author of the political scientist stands out with.

Ervin Csizmadia's researchers as a principal associate of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Political Science Institute), as a professor, as an editor-in-chief of professional journal called Political Science Review, and as head of the Fairness Policy Analysis Center. A rich publication list also provides the author's expertise. Thousands of books are an integral part of the Hungarian political science literature. The writings of the 60-year-old political scientist have been continuously appearing in books, textbooks, articles, and studies since 1992. He is a very fertile professional in his own field of research based on the research of party systems and government theories. From his latest research "The logic of Hungarian political development", in all respects, it's a new approach to domestic politics. The Hungarian literature has not suffered from historical-political research, but the study of "political development" has only been found in international science.

The book seeks the answer to fundamental questions that are not novel in the international academic life, and even have an independent trend. The question is rightly whether there is any progress in Hungarian politics. And if it is, then what this is, what can be called development and what is its logic. In Ervin Csizmadia's book he makes a clear reference to the existence of a Hungarian political story. It also goes beyond this, because it argues that there is logic in domestic political development, it is not deadlocked, it does not decline (which has been formulated and accepted as a fact several times), but in the mirror of other countries, Hungarian politics can be called "normal".

Historical politologist author explores, analyzes and compares the works of researchers, thinkers and scholars known and acknowledged in his book, which is reflected in the rich bibliography. But first of all, Csizmadia presents his own vision, describing his position. His work is best for the readers of the Hungarian audience, but the special development of the research results can be a useful example in the international palette.

It is a fact that the explanation of the fundamental questions of political science should always be explored. No political change can be interpreted in the present, so the genre of the book is a historical-political science analysis. However, today, the present political situation is needed to define it, then it is only possible to find explanations. And the author treats the analysis of both times. The study of the historical part is somewhat more pronounced than the present. Understandably, because the scientific discourse of the book leads back to Friedrich Nietzsche. The research is divided into three parts by the author. He examines the already mentioned historical timeline as part of the History of Science, the recent timeline as part of the History of Period, and the elaboration of the hypothesis after the account of the two dimensions of time, in the section of History of Platform, History of Politics and Political Development.

The first part of the *History of Science* section lies in getting to know the debate in the field of science about the benefits or damages of history and to provide a basis for understanding the established situation. The section consists of two large chapters. First, the author explores the work of four philosophers (Friedrich Nietzsche, Benedetto Croce, Johan Huizinga, Thomas Kuhn) focusing on the importance of time dimension (history or present). It determines two types of alternate economy in this topic, on the one hand the presence of "history-oriented" or "signal-centric", on the other hand, so-called political science paradigms.¹ This is the guiding principle of the various paradigms as ideologies (1: 1960s political development; 2: Transition from democratization in 1980; 3: 2000 to the new historicalism trend), which are the alternating paradigms of the past 50 years. Subsequently, the second part of the History of Science deals with historical political science. The author interprets foreign and domestic situations. He argues that, contrary to the foreign "trend", domestic investigations are not about meditating on the current paradigm or about renewing the current situation. He will then present his own research activity in the history of political science. In detail, there is a relationship between history and present. It does this in a unique way in Hungarian science, because the Hungarian profession is locked in from historical explanations. In essence, this section of the book bases the description of the second part.

The *History of Period* part is the most meaningful part of the reader, because it is the Hungarian past (past 25 years) and the present that we have been part of. In this signen-centric topic, the author describes the literature and opinions (Ágh Attila: Hungary's Political Yearbook, several works by András Körösenyi) we have available, and then outlines two main dimensions. Each of them is the author's own alternative interpretation. In one it analyzes Hungary's foreign policy and the other in its internal political dimension. It is common for us to have a process of great change in both dimensions. Ervin Csizmadia's most interesting example is the model-patterning and sample-forming theory of the foreign policy aspect. The writer has both Europe's attitudes to discover in the Hungarian system. He claims that the pattern of pattern formation is typical of the country until the reform era, and then its aim is to catch up with the West, and then there is a kind of convergence attempt, that is, adaptation and pattern follow-up. The period between 1990 and 2010 is considered to be a transitional period, and from 2010, history will return, and pattern formation again becomes dominant in Hungarian policy-making. Instead of the West, Central and Eastern Europe is given a prominent role. The author also sees serious changes in the domestic

1 Scientific results which, for some time, served as a model for the scientific medium.

dimension, but the subject of the investigation is the post-transition political structure. In this context, he describes three areas: the party system, the perception of democracies, and the political social background. According to his views, today, the multiparty political structure is essentially simplified to one party system; the new democratic system that emerged in 1990 becomes liberal and becomes illiberal; the desired and expected social base of democratic development was established and not present in Hungary (instead of "people" and "civil society").

Following the findings and factualities of the book, Csizmadia's hypotheses follows. Here, the reader answers a number of questions. This essential part of the work was titled *History of Platform, History of Politics and Political Development*. It uses the definitions used in the previous sections for analysis, thus examining the dimensions of sample-pattern-forming presented in the political present in historical political science. For research and understanding, Hungarian philosopher of history, philosopher of culture and other famous and noted philosopher use the first great unit of the chapter. It is from these that the authors appreciate positively the pattern-forming period before the Hungarian reform era, and then the following follow-up path is regarded as the era of degradation. However, there was an approach at the time, which in the end was a follow-up to a "progress". For this reason, Csizmadia thinks that Hungarian adaptation is a reflection of features and a characteristic of Hungarian political development. It can be explained by the fact that the domestic political elite and society can not or does not want to follow patterns, at least not in the way that pattern-makers do it. Csizmadia considers the period after the change of regime that the two categories are characterized by pattern shaping, which, in his view, is not identical to the pre-post-pre-reform dimension. As for pattern formation, he notes that he can not be denied in history, we know less about him than in the present situation, but he is an integral part of Hungarian history. Then in the second unit of the chapter it is presented the longer trends in Hungarian history and asked the question whether it can be called a dead end or normal. In connection with which the author's emphasized stance is that there is clearly an abnormality of all kinds. In the third unit, he returns to reveal Hungarian pattern-keeping in relation to capitalism, democracy and parliamentarism. Units within this chapter are sequentially chronologically. In my opinion, the last part can not be taken away, but I would have read it in the logical relation of the book to this in the first unit of the chapter, in the motifs of the pattern follow-up.

The next topic in the third part underlines the fact that from the transition to the present, finds historical history, and shows the points of attachment. In this area, a major topic emerges in the author's research: the development of party formation. The author places the emphasis on finding the cause of the emergence of a dominant party system characteristic of the Hungarian party system and of the absence of the two-party system in the West. He argues that there is also a logic in the evolution of the Hungarian party system, which returns during political development. After the change of regime, for 16 years (1990–2006), the government's alternating economy (governing party – opposition party) is back in line with the 1875 two-party system. From 2006 until now, however, the dominance of the dominant party system is repeated as in the history of Hungary over the years and government cycles after 1875. The model of the big government and the many small opposition parties today can also be found in Hungarian political history.

The last chapter, which is also the title: The logic of Hungarian political development, the

shortest in its scope. I firmly state that only the processing of this chapter can not be deduced from the conclusions drawn, the hypothesis. It is necessary to study the whole book as a whole in support of the context and the conclusion.

The author has already stated that the events of 1990–2017 are not a case-by-case basis, and at this point he asks the basic question: is there any logic and connection to this development? For this, a new theoretical explanation is described by the author, the elite transformation. In short, this means that the development of a political organization depends on the elite arrangement. To understand this, he presents an “external” comparison framework, a classical Anglo-Saxon developmental model, and an internal comparative system between periods of Hungarian political development. In the last part of this chapter, the ruling party, in the author’s terms, examines the “orbanism” as a result of the logic of political development. According to Csizmadia, the return of the Fidesz party in 2010² is not a change of government, but a “change of regime” as it breaks with the failures of the left-liberal governments between 2002 and 2010. Furthermore, he argues that the party is related to the historical right-wing parties in the judgment of the changing and in crisis Europe. Thus the Hungarian Fidesz party can not understand without a historical formation and the exploration of history.

Csizmadia closes the end of the book with a conclusion, which further helps the reader to understand. He expresses his position clearly with the specific Hungarian pattern of development, which is different from the West and resembles historically related countries. Furthermore, he also openly assumes that his research aimed at overthrowing a long-standing view that the development of Hungarian politics is not decaying. In that respect, I share the opinion of the author that, even when it comes to sample-keeping, the adaptive country has its own tradition, which affects “perfect copy”.

My starting quotation is written by Csizmadia as a council, as a message (for my understanding) for experts and researchers. Reading between the lines, the essence of this: find our uniqueness because we have and show it as an example for science, the world.

All in all, the book provides a sufficient explanation not only in the reasoning but in all its elements, after all the theories have been defined. I believe that the work is not only a curiosity of a narrow specialist layer, but an interested layman is able to absorb the sentiments. Indeed, it is worthwhile to find out about a foreign researcher who is closely related to the field of research for the Hungarian historical events or the political understanding of the present. Personally, I was in the process of processing that the writer would hold the reader’s hand and explore the research that he has already called philosophies in the form of historical novel and understandable science.

Author

Ildikó Szinay

Közigazgatás-tudományi Doktori Iskola, Nemzeti Közszolgálati Egyetem

Doctoral School of Public Administration, National University of Public Service

Üllői út 82, 1083 Budapest, Hungary

ildikoszinay@gmail.com

2 In 2000, there was still a trend of its governance.