This project focuses on the political instability in Hungary and offers an historical analysis mixed with a contemporary analysis to be able to provide the full scope of why Hungary has become a kleptocratic illiberal democracy. This is a topic that has interested me for years, as I am Hungarian and have worked for the Hungarian consulates in Chicago and Los Angeles, and all of the academic pieces and articles that I have come across have always been missing important pieces of information and never connected the roots of Hungarian culture to its current political situation successfully or they have completely missed the cultural context and have viewed the country with a Western liberal democratic point of view. I completed most of my research online while also traveling to Hungary and conducting interviews both through zoom and in person.
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Introduction

When analyzing the contemporary works from Western scholars studying Hungary, I am often reminded of the words of the historian Yehuda Bauer, who stated in 2020 that, “One of the great problems that people today have who are educated in liberal societies is that they don’t understand how people can believe that stuff.” The quote was in response to the recent rise of right-wing populism and fascism across many countries and was meant to explain how oftentimes people educated in countries that are liberal democracies fail to understand the citizens of other countries because they can’t detach themselves from their own cultural and societal point of view.

It is critical to enhance our understanding of the rise of right-wing populism and to be accurate in our analysis so that events from the past will not be repeated. It is often said that Hungary is under authoritarian rule, and that Fidesz, the current ruling party, represents a far-right wing ideology and has never attempted to be a democracy. However, a further analysis of the country demonstrates how Hungary attempted to transition to a democracy and failed using the United States and Germany as democratic models. It is also evident that the clash of Communism and right-wing ideas created the current rise of right-wing populism that exists in Hungary, resulting in a complicated political landscape that has produced a kleptocratic, illiberal democracy.
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Research Questions

This paper focuses on three research questions:

• How has the Communist past of Hungary shaped its citizens’ views of its current government, and how does the public view Communism in comparison to their current form of government?

• Has there been an intentional shift to an authoritarian government over the last thirty years in Hungary, or was there merely the failure to establish a functioning democracy?

• What is the dominant ideology in Hungarian politics today, and how has it been shaped?

The answers to these questions form a cohesive narrative explaining the long-term effects of Communism and how that has led to the rise of right-wing populism in Hungary, which helps to explain the current state of the government and how it functions.
**Significance**

The intellectual merit of this research lies in its ability to draw parallels between the historical impact of Communism and the rise of right-wing populism in Europe. Additionally, this project also analyzes a former Soviet Bloc country that has struggled to establish a democratic government and a national identity, a phenomenon that can be attributed to many other countries in Europe. Through a case study of Hungary, I was able to effectively analyze not only the effect Communism has had on this country, but also the opinions of the public and what their views are of the government. There is simply not enough accurate information from contemporary academic works about Hungary to properly analyze what is happening right now, and therefore this project provides information for the academic field. This project strives to contribute to the understanding of the underpinnings of the rise of right-wing populism through this case study of Hungary.

The broader impacts of studying Hungary are vast. The rise of right-wing populism across Europe is a contemporary issue, so studying Hungary provides an opportunity to identify components of right-wing populism and apply those findings to other countries in the former Soviet bloc. Hungary is a relevant case study due to its location and history as well as the fact that it has the highest proportionate number of far-right-wing supporters of any other country in Europe. This means that Hungary is more likely to be farther along its path of a possible collapsed democracy, and this should be cause for worry. Trends in Hungary could be indicative of several other countries in Europe that are bigger and seeing a rise in far-right-wing
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supporters, such as Poland and Germany, and therefore the impact of ignoring this issue could be tremendous. At the very least, this research offers accurate insight into a former Soviet Bloc country that has failed to establish a functioning democracy and was left to attempt to do so by themselves, with no help from greater powers, which is relatable to several other countries in the region.
Review of the Literature

It is critical to understand how the current Hungarian government operates and how it came to power. The dominant literature so far provides sufficient information on the Communist and government transition period in Hungary, the rise of the Fidesz party, and the rise of right-wing populism in the country over the last ten years, but there has been a failure among academics to connect these various trends to the democratic backsliding occurring today.

The first important analysis is on that of post-Communist countries and their citizens’ views of their own governments. Hungary is not the only post-Soviet country that has struggled with establishing and maintaining a democratic form of government. Many countries under Nazi and then Soviet rule faced immense difficulty in reforming their own government after the fall of the Soviet Union. In many cases, these countries forgot their own identity and struggled to find their roles and purpose, and, in a sense, they were lost.\(^3\) After 1989, these countries had to find a way to adapt to a new world while also forming a government that would, in many cases, either be an extension of Communist rule or the exact opposite. In Hungary, the struggle to establish a foothold in a strong democratic government has been a serious problem for the past thirty years as the country has battled corruption and has struggled to form and maintain a cohesive national political identity. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Hungarians embraced democracy but came to believe that democratic principles were not necessarily

being practiced by the government. What seems to be even more intriguing is that most Hungarians believe that Hungary was better under Communism and that a free media is not that important to democracy. This demonstrates that Hungarians are oftentimes still very confused about what a democracy is supposed to be, all they know is that they don’t like what they have, but regardless of that, they still follow the media and government since they don’t have functioning alternatives. These facts all pose more questions than answers, and together they show serious gaps in the literature that this project answers, such as understanding how countries like Hungary post-Communism have struggled to find identities for themselves and establish functioning democratic governments and how Communism has impacted the views of the population on their current government and past.

Analyzing the Hungarian government and the Fidesz party’s rise to power is essential to be identifying whether there has been an intentional shift to an authoritarian government, or if it is still in the process of democratic backsliding. Through the current literature, it has been suggested repeatedly that the Fidesz party has extensive control of the media, and that Hungary has an authoritarian government. Media effectively shapes public opinion, and we have seen the abuse of the media throughout history, for example, through the use of propaganda in cases like 1930s Germany or 2010s United States. Media can become a
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dangerous tool, and if it becomes overtly biased and controlled it becomes propaganda.\textsuperscript{8} Some readings argue that even before the Fidesz party gained a super majority in late 2010, it was already looking at new broadcasting regulations and a new media system to implement.\textsuperscript{9} The current literature continues to argue that this new regulation was enacted by the end of 2010 and all the major national news networks on television as well radio had fallen under the government’s control either directly or through allies of the Fidesz party.\textsuperscript{10} Other works on Hungary have focused on higher learning and how the restriction on curriculum in higher education is also a part of the propaganda machine.\textsuperscript{11} Much of the literature on Hungary, from Western countries, generally claims that Hungary has gone down the path of authoritarianism without consideration of historical circumstances that may explain why this has actually occurred. For instance, oftentimes Hungarian academics who comment on the state of the country happen to be former Communist party members and this can provide a difficult understanding of how valid their criticisms are since they are ideological opponents of the Fidesz party and can exhibit a deep sense of bias.

To be able to fully understand the resurgence of far-right populism across Europe, it is important to analyze the history of it as well. Fascism is not a new concept in Europe and there are many parallels to be drawn between countries in Europe ninety years ago and today. In certain countries like Hungary, nationalism and the mistrust of foreigners have given rise to
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right-wing populism and the general belief is that they are better off isolated. The government continues to sew ideas into the public about a useless European Union that hurts Hungary economically and takes advantage of the citizens; this is an idea that is similar to the mistrust sewn into citizens by fascist leaders in Europe in the 1930s and the belief that they should take what they truly deserved.

Another important factor when considering Hungary’s current view on foreigners and larger powers is the Trianon Treaty. Hungarians believe that they were unfairly punished by the French after World War I because the French advocated for this treaty, which resulted in the loss of significant parts of the Hungarians’ territory where approximately four million ethnic Hungarians still live to this day. This is critical because this collective loss inspires a sense of extreme nationalism in Hungarian citizens, and they feel like a part of their culture was ripped from them. The Fidesz party wasted no time jumping on the centenary of the treaty and reminding citizens what they lost, which resulted in an outcrying of support in Hungary for the territory they feel they are owed. In many ways, it reflects Germany in the 1930s wanting to “reunite” the German speaking people and establish Sudetenland.

An important event that also draws parallels between the current Hungarian government and previous fascist governments is the refugee crisis. The Hungarian government was quick to exercise its right to shut down its borders and not allow Muslims in, a policy that was very popular amongst the public. The anti-Muslim sentiment is strong in Hungary and increased particularly after the terrorist attacks across Europe. It could be said that Hungarians view Muslims in much the same way Jews were viewed in the 1930s in Europe. This wave of xenophobia in Hungary was an opportunity for the government to gain even more control and play on the rhetoric that the European Union does not care about the country.

With this being said, there is also deep sentimentality with the Communist past in the country amongst many citizens, which makes identifying the dominant ideology in the country difficult. This is an important point to understand because in much of the literature that exists, there is not sufficient analysis of the population that prefers Communism over the current government, which results in an inaccurate portrayal of where the country is at politically and the struggle for an ideology that is really at play.

The final important point to address is the idea of democracy, because in the West democracy has been synonymous with liberal democracy. A liberal democracy is a political entity that not only has free and fair elections, but also has separation of powers, protection of basic liberties, such as religion and speech. However, this set of liberties is different from the idea of democracy itself and in the West, it has often overlapped to the point where academics
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and journalists oftentimes conflate the two. Democracy, in the last thirty years, has expanded to several countries such as Hungary, but the idea of a liberal democracy is far more complex and can even be described as a political phenomenon since liberalism and democracies both rose at the same time collectively in a number of countries in the West, even though the two are not linked naturally. An illiberal democracy is difficult to understand for a person from a liberal democracy because if there are fair and free elections but the citizenry choose to elect a racist or fascist, this is at odds with liberalism therefore appearing as if it is against their idea of democracy as well.
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Argument

The current literature provides us with enough information to understand that a form of democratic backsliding is currently happening in Hungary, far-right wing ideas are supported by the public, and that Communist Hungary was a different state altogether. However, there is little to no literature that connects the former Communist regime to contemporary Hungary, demonstrating that it directly impacted the country’s ability to establish a democracy in the first place, and how that has formed the dominant ideology in Hungary today. Furthermore, I contend that Hungary is not authoritarian, but instead a kleptocratic illiberal democracy that never established a functioning liberal democracy. Plenty of literature has covered all three of these topics separately, but there has not been an effort to combine all three concepts and establish a cohesive narrative of what has happened in the country and why it is important. The existing literature oftentimes makes the error in thinking that Hungary either never wanted to be a democracy, or that it became a democracy, then transitioned into an authoritarian government; my paper will show that Hungary is not authoritarian but instead is a kleptocratic illiberal democracy and that Hungary attempted to form a democracy but failed, as most other eastern bloc countries did because of their Communist past, and this in turn has allowed far-right wing ideology to flourish.
**Methods**

The constraints of the ongoing pandemic have led me to rely heavily on interviews as well as content and discourse analysis to conduct my research; I also used the results of surveys conducted by the Pew Research Center since it was not possible for me to carry out my own large-scale survey. I focused primarily on firsthand material and sources directly from Hungary, focusing on trying to eliminate bias from academics from Western countries who may have less cultural context. Given my background and the opportunities that I have had, I have been able to maintain contact with a number of high-profile political officials in Hungary as well as a vast number of citizens, therefore it was not difficult to construct my research around the confines of the relative restrictions that exist due to the pandemic.

**Interviews**

I interviewed six Hungarians for this project separated into three age groups; two people were between the ages of 20-30, two between 40-55, and two 65 and above. I chose these age groups because they are the most indicative of the three big periods in recent Hungarian history, the oldest generation grew up under Communism and witnessed its bloodiest period while also having stable jobs at that time, the middle generation grew up towards the last twenty years of Communism and developed lives and careers as Communism was falling, and the youngest generation was born after Communism ended and has come of age under the current government. These interviews were able to provide different insights into how the population views the government and the country; while their answers clearly
cannot be representative of everyone in their age group, there is a clear difference in opinion between all three groups. They provide a context for the history of Communism as well as the development of the current government, while also helping to explain what the current dominant ideology in the country is.

**Discourse analysis and Content analysis**

The discourse and content analysis conducted was focused heavily on two things:

1. Trying to identify if Hungary is experiencing democratic backsliding, or if it is already an authoritarian country.
2. What the ideology of the Fidesz party is.

This discourse and content analysis included a review of the Hungarian Constitution, the legal system and certain laws passed in the last twenty years, speeches given by government officials, ceremonies held by the government, such as the centenary of The Treaty of Trianon, and news reports from thirty-one media outlets. All these sources are important in identifying what the intent of the government has been since 1990 in respect to its system of governance, as well as identifying what the dominant ideology is in Hungary in contemporary times.
**Historical document analysis**

The historical document analysis is a separate tool from content analysis because this was primarily focused on identifying the Communist period in Hungary and the events that unfolded during that time. It was useful to establish a proper timeline from the start of Communism in Hungary to the downfall of Communism, and the establishing years of the current Hungarian government. This form of analysis also provides a wider context of Communism than the interviews, which are narrower in their focus and more personal. The analysis of historical documents provides a backbone for which the whole research is based on.
Findings

Historical Analysis

The first question is perhaps the most important one for our understanding of contemporary Hungary and provides precedence for the other two questions by emphasizing the significance of the history of Hungary, which is something that is often missing from academic studies. Therefore, I believe that the Communist past of Hungary is the base building block that must be analyzed first to be able to explain the consequent political events in the country.

The start of Communism in Hungary dates back to 1918 when the first Communist party, the Kommunisták Magyarországi Pártja (KMP), was formed and led by Béla Kun. Kun was a Hungarian communist activist and one of the first prominent communist figures in Hungarian history. The success of his party was short-lived, and even though it attained control of the country through a coup and promised prosperity, the Red Terror followed because the communists struggled to convince the public of their cause and they were not able to maintain order in the country, thousands of Hungarians were intimidated and murdered by the new regime in a span of four months. Following the Red Terror came the White Terror, which was considered a reprisal for the Red Terror and the violence that had unfolded against Communists as well as Jewish people until 1920.
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In 1920, Hungary re-established the Kingdom of Hungary and Miklós Horthy was named regent. The Treaty of Trianon was signed, and Hungary lost approximately two-thirds of its land; this is important because it influenced Horthy’s decisions at that time, and has continued to influence Hungarians’ opinions in contemporary times. Horthy and the government officials were extremely hostile towards Communists due to their experiences, such as the Red Terror, with the Béla Kun regime, which, combined with Hungary wanting to regain lost territory that was promised to them by the Germans, led to the country allying with Nazi Germany in World War II. Therefore, this fear and antagonism towards Communism existed in Hungary long before the Soviets took the country over after World War II, and in many ways, contemporary Hungarian politics imitates this period, just with less violence.

After World War II ended in 1945, a coalition government was installed, which was considered to be the first free elections in the country; these freedoms, is however, were short-lived and by 1947 the Communist Party, ultimately controlled by the Soviet Union, consolidated power and put Mátyás Rákosi in charge as the de facto leader of Hungary. The Rákosi period is known for mass repression and ardent violence by the government against its civilians. Rákosi resigned less than three months before the failed Hungarian Revolution of 1956, an event that is still commemorated today and is another nationalistic pressure point for Hungarian people, who continue to hold that they were abandoned by Western countries who did nothing to help them as they were slaughtered by the Soviet puppet government. This continued anger
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demonstrates general distrust that many Hungarians still hold towards major powers in the west, most importantly, the United States.

Following the Revolution, János Kádár took control of the country. The beginning of his era of rule was still violent as many former party members were executed and imprisoned, but a comprehensive change occurred in the 1960’s as Kádár focused on raising the standard of living for the citizenry through measures such as opening the country to international trade and freeing church leaders, as well as instituting other limited liberal reforms. Because of the increase of reforms and looser restrictions, Hungary was considered one of the best countries to live in as a part of the Eastern Bloc.26 Even with all the improvements the Kádár regime brought to Hungary, it was still a Communist dictatorship and certain rules and regulations had to be followed. For example, segregation was still upheld until the late 1980’s, Russians were afforded privileges by dictating when they could be wherever they wanted, such as the local swimming pool or restaurants while Hungarians could not be there.27 During the winter months, civilians had to stand in line waiting for oranges and bananas because it was not possible to get them at other points in the year, and even then, you were allotted only one to two per week. If you had the money to buy a car, you had to wait up to eight years to be able to attain one. If you wanted to go on a vacation, you had designated Party spots where you were allowed to vacation, and you would receive a red passport and that was it. This was the case unless you had a blue passport, which very few people had, then you were able to travel out of the country to the West.28 The restrictions on the Hungarians were still vast even though there
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was less violence. Apart from the general restrictions of the Communist regime, employment was extremely high because people were forced to work, therefore when Communism ended in the country in 1989, there was a huge deterioration in the livelihoods of many people that had jobs because their jobs became obsolete. After the fall of Communism, the first free elections were held in 1990, but the influence of Communism continued through the Socialist parties that followed.

In 1990, the Hungarian Democratic Forum party (MDF) won and had a tremendous amount to fix due to the collapse of the economy. The party was filled with a mix of liberal and conservative voices and was filled with scholars and intellectuals that weren’t sure how to run a government while the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP) was filled with former Communist officials. By 1994, the MDF was unable to advance any policy and failed, and MSZP won in a landslide. This essentially just meant that the Communist Party was back in control. In 1998, another switch of parties happened as the Fidesz party gained power. Viktor Orbán was the leader of Fidesz at the time (and is to this day). Earlier in his career, Orbán was considered a center right politician, reflective of Hungarian society, and vowed to never allow any movement that resembles Communism to take control of the country again. These years signified the start of politics in Hungary by the new generation that grew up under Communism but wanted nothing to do with it. The 1990’s in Hungary was a period of uncertainty and confusion; the public had no way of knowing how to construct a liberal democracy and was scared of sharing their opinions out of fear of facing reprisals, like they had in the past under communism.
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Hungarians formed a system of governance to imitate the German and American systems, but they did not know how to implement checks and balances, nor did they understand the importance of having a strong constitution. Hungary built a strong connection with Germany following the Soviet era and has relied on them heavily economically since, with Germany companies still being the top investors in Hungary to this day, so it would make sense that Hungary would look to them for political guidance as well.\textsuperscript{32} The Hungarian citizenry was also not aware of what their rights were, and they struggled to make their voices heard through voting and even by practicing free speech. The generation that was born in the late 1960s, 70s and early 80s hated Communism and if their family didn’t have ties to the Communist party, they grew to have right-wing views naturally.\textsuperscript{33} Even though a new generation was becoming involved with the political landscape, MSZP took back control of the government in 2002, and until they were kicked out again in 2010, accomplished very little for most of the citizenry. The Fidesz party under the leadership of Viktor Orbán has been in control since.

In 2011, the Hungarian Constitution was officially written with the guidance of the Fidesz party due to them gaining a super majority in 2010. By this point, Fidesz could pass any legislation that they wanted, which explains how the socially and fiscally conservative constitution was approved with a 262-44 vote, only opposed by the Jobbik party (a Neo-Nazi party), MSZP, and the Politics Can Be Different party (a green-liberal party).\textsuperscript{34} Since its inception, the Constitution has been amended five times. These changes are controversial with

\textsuperscript{32} Kelemen and Kovács. Interview with Consul General Tamás Kovács.
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the main points of contention being: the limiting of judicial powers, the fact that the powers of the constitutional court on tax and budget concerns are nonexistent until the national debt falls below 50%, only businesses with “transparent” activities are allowed to be awarded government contracts, the life of a fetus is protected from conception, an abundance of references to Christianity, and marriage defined as the union between one man and woman.\textsuperscript{35} The amendments have continued to restrict the powers of the court severely and condemn Communism, while also allowing for civil lawsuits regarding hate speech and freedom of religion.\textsuperscript{36}

Hungary has also been infamous for its response to the migrant crisis from Syria. Hungary was one of the first countries in the European Union to close its borders to migrants from the Middle East while also having one of the most open borders in Europe regarding immigration within the European Union. Many of the migrant centers that Hungary had, became overwhelmed quickly and could not support the massive influx of people. As a country that continues, to this day, to struggle with caring for its own citizens, it was a very complicated series of problems to deal with, especially considering that Hungarians have still not been exposed to a wide variety of cultures and people.\textsuperscript{37} Using this event as a platform, the Fidesz party gained support and was able to inflate a sense of racism and xenophobia. Much of the population in Eastern Europe believes that Islam was incompatible with European values, so therefore, migrants from Syria were treated very differently by countries such as Hungary as
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opposed to if they were from a country like Poland.\textsuperscript{38} After the 2015 Paris attacks, the rise of right-wing rhetoric and actions rose everywhere in Europe, including Hungary, and it was used as a tool by the Fidesz party to showcase how their border fences and strong policies against migration from the Middle East were right.

The historical analysis of Hungary is necessary to evaluate when judging why Hungary and the Fidesz party chooses to espouse traditional values and anti-immigrant rhetoric, among do a variety of related things that seem to limit democratic norms and freedoms. The effects of Communism, as well as the inability to find a stable footing in a system of governance afterwards, has formed the Hungary that exists today, and that is the perspective that Hungary should be viewed from when analyzing why backsliding is occurring. Western academics and journalists rarely consider this perspective because they don’t have experience living under a Communist government and the effect that has on the generations that follow.

**Contemporary Analysis**

As I mentioned earlier, the first question, how has the Communist past of Hungary shaped its citizens’ views of its current government, and how does the public view Communism in comparison to their current form of government, is the most important part of this research and with the context of the history considered and combined with the contemporary analysis of the country, the question can be answered by showing how the Communist past of Hungary has directly affected its contemporary politics. Today, the varying opinions on Communism due to a generational divide have created a clash of ideas in the public sphere that are often not addressed. I believe that the views on Communism are a crucial part of understanding the current ideology and attitudes of the population. Recent polls and surveys show that a majority of Hungarians prefer Communism over their current form of government. This demonstrates that there is a sense of romanticism regarding the Communist period, which could be due to the low unemployment, stable retirement plans, and stability in government that people associate with that era. Indeed, these statistics can offer a genuine explanation for why the Hungarian political system is the way it is today.

One of the major polls regarding Hungarian citizens’ views on Communism was done by Pew Research, and their poll did not break the numbers up by age group, but this is an extremely integral part of the research. As a country that has seen a massive exodus of its younger citizens, there is a high proportion of older individuals in Hungary. This demographic
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of people 60 years old or older tends to reminisce about Communism in part because they remember the stability of their pensions and paychecks before the fall of Communist rule.\textsuperscript{41} Many of the citizens in this older generation lost their jobs in 1989 due to the change of power and failed to find new jobs since they were older at the time.\textsuperscript{42} The old workplaces under Communism weren’t extremely labor intensive or difficult since there were a number of arbitrary jobs that were not integral but needed so that people would remain employed, while after the regime change, the only work many of these people could get was heavy manual labor and paid worse. In addition to that, prices for everything, such as apartments and houses, skyrocketed. The last major factor that influences this generation’s opinions on political systems is that people who retired under Communism received far more money than those who retired in the 1990s, which led to economic inequality in the 1990s. In many ways, this generation was forced to live dramatically different at a point in their lives when they could not re-establish themselves, and this inability to adapt to their environment led to their hatred of the political parties that followed, no matter the ideology of the party.\textsuperscript{43} With that being said, just because a majority of this age group reminisces about the Communist times, this does not mean that they do not have right-wing social and political beliefs; in fact more often than not, these people are still Christian conservatives and that is important to point out. When taking this into consideration and addressing that a third of the population is 55 years old or older and also noting that the 65 and above age group has increased by 4% in the population make-up of the country in the last ten years while the 14-65 age group has decreased by 4%, it is easy to
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see how the older generation’s opinions have more weight and can dominate the results of polls and surveys. The results of the Pew Research poll, when adjusted for the age groups, aligns with my findings, as well as the information provided to me by the interviewees concerning the political opinions of citizens 60 years old and older.

The middle generation of Hungarians of 40–55-year-olds is generally considered the opposite, politically, of the old generation, and they are the ones that are currently in charge of the country. This generation grew up in the 1970s-1980s and experienced the final years of Communism. However, they often did not have established careers before the fall of Communism and because they were generally younger, they did not have trouble finding jobs in the 1990s; this combined with a youthful rebelliousness and their hatred of Communism led this generation to develop a right-wing mentality and ideology. Many of the people in this group spent their teenage years oppressed by the Communist party and when the Communists lost control and the same people were just entering their adult lives, they did not forget how they were treated because it was fresh in their minds. This rebelliousness against Communism and authority also has led to them not trusting world powers such as the United States or bigger entities like the European Union, because they are afraid they will lose their country again. The growth of the right-wing and nationalistic rhetoric in the country can generally be traced back to this age group, as we have seen in the Fidesz party, which espouses rhetoric like the French being to blame for Hungary losing its territory, the United States not helping during the 1956 revolution after it promised to do so and questioning the EU’s motivations. This age
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group is oftentimes still fueled by their “never again” attitude regarding Communism and one can see this in the young Fidesz party of the 1990s and even today. Fidesz has drawn a hard line against anything that remotely resembles Communism in their minds, and this is indicative of the opinions of that whole generation’s perspective on Communism. With the individuals that I interviewed of this age group, they shared their opinions on how much they despise Communism, and their ideas often were representative of right-wing conservative ideology.

The youngest generation, the 20–30-year-olds, is oftentimes the most complex in Hungary in terms of beliefs and ideology. This generation never experienced Communism firsthand and they are often dependent on understanding it through stories from their families and seeing the effects of Communism in the country that linger. Opinions of this group are a lot more convoluted and complex than the other two groups and there is no clear political ideology that would encompass the beliefs of this generation. Their support ranges from neo-Nazi groups to Communist groups depending on the area and the city. Many of these citizens are politically homeless and want to have a closer relationship with the Western world while a large portion of them also just want to leave the country. Economic hope in the country isn’t dreadful, but there is not much hope for this generation to make a good living, so they look elsewhere like Germany or the United Kingdom and want to leave as soon as they are able to. The Hungarian government has attempted to stop this by requiring students who used federal aid to go to college to remain in the country for three years following graduation.
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is struggling to find room for the younger generation, and they are not as invested in the country as the other generations. The Fidesz party is particularly not popular with this group, and this is the generation that is not old enough to be completely invested in politics yet and oftentimes not want to be invested in the country’s direction at all. Communism doesn’t have a strong impact on this generation’s views and therefore they don’t see Communism as a threat or have any particular draw to it either.

All three generations’ experiences with Communism, or inexperience as is the case for the youngest generation, have directly impacted and molded the beliefs and ideologies of each group and created a complex clash of ideas that is more convoluted than expected. By electing a moderately right-wing party at the time, Fidesz, it was in line with most Hungarians’ views and reflective of their beliefs, however, it has captured more political power than anyone expected, and has been increasingly evolving its ideology to become more and more conservative which is more indicative of the generation that is in charge as opposed to the whole population.

Hungary’s instability over the last hundred years, inexperience with a democratic form of government and lack of guidance from the Western powers has led it to experience predictable democratic backsliding, even though it was never a liberal democracy. During my interviews with Hungarian government officials, I had asked about seemingly authoritarian actions such as the supermajority Fidesz gained in the parliament or the stacking of the courts, which has also occurred during the last eleven years, and the response I received was that the same things could happen in the United States, but the United States is more balanced when it
comes to political opinions across the country. Even though a response like this is presented with a certain bias, it provides value in the sense that because Hungary is an extremely young democracy, it has not had the proper foresight to implement an intricate system of checks and balances, therefore leading to an easy path for a single party, that is somewhat accepted by the public, to dominate.

A popular point that academics and journalists bring up regarding Hungary is the government’s dominant control of news networks and the media. This is another issue that is far more convoluted than is often implied, because it is commonly portrayed as a massive propaganda campaign ran by Fidesz and an attack on free speech. While it is true that Fidesz and its allies own many news stations and media outlets, it is also true that there are more left-wing newspapers in the country than right-wing newspapers. Out of the twenty-nine newspapers that I analyzed online, four were centrist, twelve right-wing, and thirteen left-wing; these all ranged from extremely popular sites to fringe sites and a variety of different topics covered. Hungarians get 89% of their news related information from online newspapers and these are all the online Hungarian newspapers that cover politics daily, therefore showing that there is a balance of popular news sites in terms of quantity. Both political sides use sensationalism, but it seems to be more damaging from the right-wing newspapers and there is certainly a sense of intentional lying in many stories; however, it isn’t any worse than Fox News in the United States and that news network is widely accepted as a part of free speech regardless of its content; the difference between a media outlet like Fox News and Index or

---

50 Kelemen. Interview with a 49-Year-Old Hungarian Citizen.
52 Et al.
Origo are non-existent other than the fact that the Hungarian outlets don’t generally have major TV personalities for these newspapers. The overall difference is that academics and journalists tend to portray it differently because they are quick to criticize other countries before understanding the circumstances. Hungarian media is not a Joseph Goebbels propaganda machine that it is often embellished as, but instead more like the media outlets in the United States like Fox News and NBC.

The overall general ideology of the public in Hungary is clear, it is a right-wing conservative type of culture that is fueled by fear. Communism and “the unknown” are the primary motivators of this fear that the public has; the unknown, in this respect, is referencing other cultures and religions. The year 1990 is only 31 years ago and people before that time did not have the opportunity to interact with seemingly anyone outside of their culture so it was a massive culture shock to have the country open up to the West. Since then, views have somewhat improved of other cultures and people, but in general the fear is still there, and this promotes racism and far right-wing ideology. The obvious example that comes to everyone’s mind is Hungary during the refugee crisis and how they treated migrants, which was not seen as controversial by the Hungarian public. The public can’t see how they could coexist with Muslims because the country is so homogenous with having immigrants only make up 5% of the population. After the Paris attacks in 2015, the general public consensus was that they did the right thing by shutting down their borders, even from the centrist and left-wing supporters. Hungary’s history of being conquered time and again by larger powers also feeds
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this fear and they refuse to accept anything that is not seen as Hungarian.\textsuperscript{55} In a European Union survey, only 10\% of Hungarians said they would feel comfortable having a friend that was an immigrant and over half said they feel uncomfortable.\textsuperscript{56} A perfect example of this is the experiment that sociologist Endre Sík carried out in 2006; He added a fake ethnic group (the Piréz) to a survey that Hungarians were taking regarding who they would accept as immigrants and most Hungarians rejected them, even though they didn’t exist.\textsuperscript{57} Another important point regarding this, is that this isn’t just an example of racism or Islamophobia, because when polled, the number of Hungarians that would not accept immigrants from any country, including countries like Romania and Austria, has been on the rise.\textsuperscript{58} Many Hungarians share viewpoints like this and oftentimes if they are asked about it, they will respond, like many of the interviewees I had conversations with, stating things such as “Everyone is entitled to their religion and their views, but our cultures are incompatible, or “We have enough problems on our own here we rather help your country there than have you come here.” This of course comes from a place of insecurity and not wanting to lose the Hungarian identity as has so often happened in the past, or it is at least portrayed in that manner. These are the types of feelings that right-wing populists can latch onto such as Orbán or Trump, and they have. The primary difference however is that Hungary has lost its autonomy multiple times throughout its history, especially recently, and Hungarians don’t forget about this. A primary motivator in many of the political and social views that Hungarians have is this idea of maintaining an identity and having
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a country that is considered Hungarian and only for Hungarians. This feeling mixed together with the fact that the majority of the population is made up of the middle and older generation, making up around 70% of the population, results in a strong push for right-wing ideology that Fidesz promotes.59

The Fidesz party’s ideology also must be examined to understand the motivations for the right-wing agenda that they have created. As I had mentioned earlier, the middle generation is the one that is currently in charge of the country and their ideology leans heavily to the right due to their experiences with Communism. This age group’s lack of experience outside of Hungary oftentimes promotes much of the racist rhetoric and xenophobia, but their role in the Fidesz party has been as the primary movers of the ideology from a former center-right party to a more entrenched right-wing party with less centrist ideas. The other major motivator of ideology in the country has been money, which then translates to major corruption. Since 2012, Hungary has fallen eleven spots in the CPI (Corruption Perception Index) to 69th place in the world and rose to be the second most corrupt country in the EU.60 There have been allegations of corruption on a massive scale regarding EU funds while there are the common allegations of politicians cutting deals under the table routinely. Hungary is an ideal example of Crony capitalism and the allegations, while not all proven, are certainly generally accurate and showcase a party that makes a lot of businesspeople, that are friends of the party, wealthy, who in turn make the Fidesz politicians wealthy as well. The money that politicians make during these scandals are a major motivation for policies and agreements with other

countries. If that wouldn’t be true, then there would be no explanation as to why Hungary is dealing with Russia and China. For example, they see an opportunity to make a lot of money for their own personal gain with deals with the Russians regarding natural gas, even though this is the same age group that I have discussed how they are terrified of and hate the Russians. Their primary motivator for policy agenda is their fear of outsiders, hatred of Communism and distrust of larger powers, therefore the only rational explanation for why Hungary would commit to dealings with these two large powers is the benefit that they gain through means of corruption. Heavy corruption exists in Hungary and ranges from extremely small scale to massive scale corruption and that is an aspect that is often ignored when analyzing Hungary and not understanding how they could be promoting right-wing populism while also entertaining a Communist superpower like China.

It is difficult to distinguish between a burgeoning right-wing populist party and a fascist, neo-Nazi party, however there is a discernable difference, and that difference is in the form of Fidesz and the Jobbik Party. Jobbik is considered the neo-Nazi party in Hungary, and while it has seats in parliament, it has minimal support with membership around 13,000 and dropping and in the opposition coalition primary this year placed fourth among candidates for prime minister with 14% support. It has attempted to rebrand and try to convince constituents that it is not a neo-Nazi party and has shifted focus from identity politics to accusations of corruption against Fidesz, but it has not done that successfully. This rivalry between Fidesz and Jobbik exists primarily due to Fidesz’s support for Israel and the Jewish community and obviously their
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stranglehold on the parliament. While there are still legitimate accusations of racism and xenophobia against Fidesz, it has attempted to promote its support for the Jewish people; they cite their anti-hate speech laws and bans of paramilitary organizations, and funding for Israel as examples. Fidesz has also capitalized on a lot of points that otherwise fascist organizations would such as nationalism and nativism. The centenary for the Treaty of Trianon last year showed that Hungarians still haven’t forgotten about the territory that was stripped from them by the French and they want it back; it is seemingly impossible to go anywhere in Hungary without seeing mention of Erdély (Transylvania), the Romanian territory that was stripped from Hungary in 1920, because of its dominant Hungarian population that wants to be reincorporated into Hungary. Another topic that Fidesz addressed first was the refugee crisis; by taking a harsh stance against all refugees and shutting down its borders Jobbik had no way of attacking Fidesz. This is a talking point that would have been Jobbik type of propaganda to spur its supporters up against outsiders, but Fidesz beat them to it thus causing Jobbik to lose even more supporters. There is a clear division between the two parties and while Fidesz fosters the growth of right-wing rhetoric, if not outright propagating it themselves often; it is not a neo-Nazi, fascist party but a right-wing populist party, which is a vast difference.

All in all, the Fidesz party represents the majority of Hungarians’ views and social opinions while feeding off of the citizens fear of the outside world, so it is understandable that the Fidesz party is in charge by a significant margin and that there are no real other parties that are a threat to its power. If one were to question whether Fidesz represents the view of the
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majority of the country he or she would have to look no further than the current prime minister primaries for the coalition against Fidesz in Hungary, as the winner of the prime minister nomination is also a far-right-wing candidate with his only platform being that Fidesz is corrupt. The other parties in Hungary are extremely disorganized and have their own sets of issues, or scandals from the past, which presents a serious challenge for implementing a diversity of opinions into the Hungarian political system.\textsuperscript{64} The analysis of the Hungarian political system shows not only that it is experiencing democratic backsliding, but that the foundations for a democracy were never in place when compared to Western superpowers such as the United States and Germany. Academics and journalists often make the mistake of comparing democracies and thinking of the United States as the ideal model that other countries need to imitate, while many of these countries that attempted to model their democracies after the United States are then criticized for failing instead of being given assistance, or simply not understood because of a lack of cultural context. Ultimately, Hungary will not be an authoritarian state until the right to vote is taken away or elections are rigged, until then it will be a kleptocratic illiberal democracy that has weak foundations and is currently incapable of evolving beyond that.
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Conclusion

It is evident that Hungary’s turbulent history has entirely shaped the country and its political system that can be seen today and that the country was never able to establish a functioning democracy. The middle generation’s hatred of Communism and the general public’s distrust of all foreigners has caused Hungary to sway far right and allow Fidesz to take commanding control of the government. While in power, the level of corruption has been unprecedented and the wealth gap has increased dramatically over the course of the last thirty years, but Hungary is not an authoritarian country, yet. It is conceivable that Hungary could turn into an authoritarian country relatively soon, but I posit that the only way that occurs is if the integrity of the elections gets called into question. There is no question that the Fidesz party can prove to be dangerous as it pushes the boundaries of right-wing ideology, but there is a clear demarcation between a right-wing populist and a fascist and Orbán is a populist who is interested in lining his pockets. The most likely scenario is that Fidesz remains in power for the foreseeable future, or another party takes control which would be the same thing as Fidesz and just as corrupt, and there won’t be a serious change in Hungarian politics until the youngest generation becomes the new policymakers and takes control. So, then the question remains, what exactly is Hungary right now? I believe that Hungary is a kleptocratic illiberal democracy experiencing democratic backsliding due to its communist past and never creating a functioning democracy in the aftermath with a right-wing populist in charge and that the Fidesz party still generally represents the social and political views of the population even though corruption is rampant, and the party officials are self-serving.
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