

Hungarian Border Politics as an Anti-Politics of the European Union

James W. Scott

Rithvik Vakacharla

Political Science Seminar: Article Critique 2

Argument and Critique

- **Argument:** Hungary's border politics are very nuanced as it is a struggle over national identity and purpose
 - **Critique/My View:** It would have been helpful for Scott to discuss more about why that struggle over identity and purpose exists. He briefly mentions a separation from the Austro-Hungary and the corresponding treaty in 1920, but I think it would have added to his argument had he spoke about or looked into how the EU contributed to this struggle.
- **Argument:** The country has disappointment with market liberalization and the dominance of "Core-Europe"
 - **Critique:** Scott doesn't go into showing any evidence for this beyond rhetoric speak and blanket examples of Hungarian politicians going against certain EU policies – it would be helpful to see how the cooperation between specific Core-Europe countries and Hungary has changed over time to better understand if the issue is with Core-Europe or the EU in general.
- **Argument:** There needs to be a contextualization between the relationship of Hungary's EU-contestation and geopolitical fear
 - **Critique:** I agree
- **Claim:** Hungary will never exit the EU but only promote an anti-politics towards the EU; Scott provides support by talking about the on-the-ground support from Hungarians and all parties in the country
 - **Critique:** I think this is a bold statement to make. I think anti-politics will eventually lead to them exiting the EU unless the EU starts paying attention to Hungary and giving it a voice. But, as Scott mentions, Hungarians do not believe that such a respect has been given. If the Hungarian politicians are truly looking for respect, identity, and purpose their anti-politics should convert into an EU-exit feeling in the future.

Argument and Critique cont.

- **Critique:** In general, there is a bit of bias and negativity when Scott speaks about the policies and intent of the Hungarian politics. He calls the Hungarian policies as anti-Europe and describes them with words like draconian, that have a negative connotation.
 - It could be argued the policies of Hungary help the European Union as they project against threats from the East, and are that the EU is protected from because of countries like Hungary
- **Critique:** It would have been worthwhile to speak about how Hungarian politics have impacted nearby border states like Romania and Austria where thoughts similar to those expressed in Hungary are being heard.

Points and Discussion Questions

- Do the Hungarian politicians want to expand their physical border as well as their “nation?” to include all ethnic Hungarians? What is the end game for the country with its ethnic-Hungarian supportive policies like dual citizenship?
- Scott points to speeches of Hungarian hegemony being heard outside of the country – is this important or worth looking into? What are the ethnic Romanians who are hearing this speech think about it? Will this pro-Hungarian speak lead them to push an anti-politics towards Hungary?
- Does the EU cater too much to the bigger, Western states? Can we test to see if the larger nations benefit more from the union? On a similar front, can we investigate the impact of the union on smaller, Eastern states by doing a pre-admission and post-admission comparison?
- Do we think this trend of anti-politics seen in Hungary will continue? A Danish political party was receptive to the anti-politics of Hungary – perhaps there is opportunity to research if a Hungary-like situation exists in the Scandinavian territory?