

**Attila Ágh**

Corvinus University of Budapest<sup>1</sup>

## ***Redemocratization efforts in Hungary as a second try: civil society organizations and mass movements***

### ***Summary***

This paper tries to argue that Hungary has been the classical case for the decline of democracy, including the marginalization and the state control of civil society that may be turned into the redemocratization efforts in the spirit of “bottom-up democratization”. This decline of democracy has been accomplished by the Orbán governments since 2010 given their two-thirds supermajority that has allowed them to introduce a new Constitution without national consent and without approval by referendum. The radical change in legislation has also concerned the regulation of civil society organizations and the freedom of the media. As a result, a strong resistance has emerged against this increasing authoritarian rule, producing a series of democratic innovations and has promised a second try of democratization.

**Key words:** democratic innovations, redemocratization, bottom-up democratization, participatory movements, regular mass demonstrations

### ***Introduction: Hungary as a classical case for democracy decline***

The point of departure for this paper is that the new member states have gone through a triple crisis in the quarter-century, the transformation crisis in the 1990s, the post-accession crisis in the 2000s and the global crisis since 2008 (see Ágh 2013, 2015b).

---

<sup>1</sup> Email: attila.agh@chello.hu

These three subsequent socio-economic crises have generated deep political crises and have led to the decline of democracy and to the “critical elections” changing the party systems in NMS (Ágh 2014b, 2015a, 2016). Based on these analyses, this paper turns to the topic of the renewal of civil society as a reaction to the decline of democracy. First, it points out the specificity of Hungarian development as the worst case scenario in NMS. Second, against the general background of the democratic innovations’ theory that has been based on the concept of civil society and its informal institutions as the main drivers of democratic society (Morlino 2009, 2012; Newton 2012, and Pogrebinschi 2014), this paper sees some kind of renaissance of the informal politics in Hungary. Third, it argues that these informal, civic institutions have played a democracy-supporting function against the authoritarian tendencies. Fourth, the paper gives an overview of the participatory movements in Hungary, and finally it outlines the perspectives of the redemocratization as a “Second Try” through a new kind of bottom-up democratization<sup>2</sup>.

This concept among the young democracies can be best overviewed in the Hungarian case. Hungary has largely been considered the worst case scenario of declining democracy in NMS (see e.g. Herman 2015), although it might have turned to a drive for redemocratization by the current mass demonstrations as regular participatory movements. The Hungarian developments as the worst case scenario have demonstrated that the politico-business clientèle networks — or “kleptocracy” (Varga 2014) — have led beyond state capture to complete “democracy capture”. In the regional overview of the Next Generation Democracy (NGD) prepared by the Bertelsmann Foundation (2015), Hungary has slid back to the 26<sup>th</sup> place out of the 28 EU member states in democratic institutions’ rankings, to the 24<sup>th</sup> place in inclusiveness (political and social integration) and to the 27<sup>th</sup> place in the management of policies (strategic capacity and consensus building). What is more, in the consensus building the score is very low — 2 out of 10 — the worst case in this NGD scoring<sup>3</sup>.

According to the NGD analysis, in recent years, Hungary has developed a “considerable democratic deficit [...] Hungary thus represents the most troubling case” (Bertelsmann 2015,

---

<sup>2</sup> In my former papers I dealt with the socio-economic processes in NMS focusing on the Hungarian case in the regional context, and I have prepared a data-book on the NMS developments — see Ágh, Attila (2013) *Progress Report on the New Member States: Twenty Years of Social and Political Developments*, Budapest: Together for Europe Research Centre, p. 104. I have written in parallel with this paper a recent overview of the socio-economic developments (Ágh 2015b) with the latest data of the big international ranking institutions (Bertelsmann, EIU, Freedom House etc.).

<sup>3</sup> This paper analyses the civil society and informal politics in Hungary, and deals first of all with the Hungarian NGOs that have actively engaged in preparing and supporting the current participatory movements. There is special literature on the social movements as well, see first of all Krasztev and Van Til (2013), both as an “import” international scholarship and the elaboration of the Hungarian experiences. According to the Hungarian Statistical Office (KSH) there are 57,000 civil, voluntary organizations in Hungary with 41,000 employees and 457,000 volunteers (see MACI 2015, p. 3). MA-CI is an abbreviation for Magyar Civil Szervezetek (Hungarian Civil Organizations, HU-CI), otherwise “maci” means teddy bear.

p. 6, 9). The deep “socio-economic unbalances” have resulted in the “disappointment in European integration and in the associated modernization processes promoted by political elites”. As to the civil society and informal politics, in “Hungary (under the Orbán government) civil society participation and consultation has significantly deteriorated”. Namely, political liberties and civil liberties exist mostly as “formal terms”, but not in actual terms as exercised by the population, therefore both political participation and societal participation have declined (Bertelsmann 2015, p. 11, 20, 27). The World Report 2015 of the Human Rights Watch has summarized the present situation in Hungary in very negative terms: “Rule of law and human rights further deteriorated in 2014. [...] There was fresh pressure on media and civil society. (...) Civil society came under pressure in June when the state audit office conducted surprise inspections of three NGOs that administer foreign donor money [...]. In September raided two NGOs”. As a reaction to this intimidation campaign and to the decline of democracy in Hungary, there has been an international wave of protests, at the top of these reactions even the “US President Barack Obama identified Hungary in a September speech about pressure on civil society.” (2015, p. 7)<sup>4</sup>.

### ***Democratic innovations in Hungary: the renaissance of informal politics***

Altogether, the Orbán governments have “nationalized” the civil sector with the increasing state control of the interest representations and by practising politically-biased funding for civil organizations. They have created some large, pro-government pseudo-civil organizations on one side, and have launched intimidation campaigns against the independent NGOs as the last bulwarks of the autonomous civil society on the other. In the second Orbán government (2010–2014), the first effort dominated and the big, pro-government and pseudo-civil umbrella organization emerged, while in the third Orbán government (2014–2018) the second effort has come to the fore to stop the still resisting civil organizations from operating. In fact, the Orbán governments have created a Potemkin democracy as a façade not only at the level of the big formal institutions, but also at the civil society level as the “domestication” of civil society (Nagy 2014). They have organized and lavishly financed the Civil Unity Forum (CÖF) as a huge pro-government and pseudo-civil organization. As a central “civil” organ of the Orbán government, it has carried out a total takeover of control over civil society organizations and it has sponso-

---

<sup>4</sup> In international political science the worst case scenario is Hungary, and rightly so. Even more, in the international press there are sayings about Hungary that “Hungary has always marched to a different drummer,” or “It is Europe at its most exotic.” This anecdotal approach has been confirmed by the big international ranking institutes — Bertelsmann Foundation, The Economist Intelligence Unit, Freedom House and World Economic Forum — that the decline of democracy has been the biggest in Hungary. In my former papers (Ágh 2013, 2014a,b) I have discussed the large literature of democracy decline and the authoritarian renewal with “hybrid” regimes (Armingeon and Guthmann 2014; Bridoux and Kurki 2014; Cassani 2014; Charron 2014; Demos 2013; Denk and Silander, 2012, EIU, 2014, 2015; Moeller and Scanning 2014; Papadopoulos 2013).

red almost exclusively the pro-government civil associations: “In Hungary, the analytical capacity of non-economic interest associations has suffered from the government’s control of the sector. The National Civil Fund (NCA), a body in charge of monitoring and supporting civic organizations and NGOs, was taken over by the Orbán government and transformed into the National Cooperation Fund (NEA). As the latter has only financed associations loyal to the government, there have been some small, but very important NGOs with substantial political expertise. One such NGO is the Hungarian Civil Liberties Union (TASZ), which has documented and evaluated in detail the anti-democratic actions of the Orbán government.” (Bertelsmann 2015, pp. 18–19)<sup>5</sup>.

At this point the general overview on the poor situation of democracy can be completed with a closer view of the civil world in Hungary, focusing on social activism. In its first part, the *EEA and Norway Grants Report* (Grants Report) gives a description of the NMS region, and in the second part of the Report, there are country chapters. The chapter on *The NGO Programme in Hungary* starts with the strong statement that “the model of an *illiberal democracy* is indicative of how the influence of government-promoted ideology also affects NGOs [...] the government alludes that the organizations are ‘promoting foreign interests’ with agendas and values undermining interests of Hungary”. The intimidation campaign against the NGO sector supported by this programme has resulted in a huge protest wave both domestically and internationally: “There were also police raids on the offices and personal homes of two of the consortium partners. An appeal signed by 975 NGOs from over 32 countries called on the higher institutions of the European Union to take a stand against the recent anti-democratic actions in Hungary”. (Grants Report 2015, second part, pp. 28–29)<sup>6</sup>.

As the Report demonstrates, in the Hungarian case, both the “international” and “domestic” democracy supporting and innovating institutions have appeared in large numbers and they have closely been interwoven. The Report outlined three major profiles of NGO activity in social activism: (1) “Building strategic capacity among civil society organizations” (ideas generation, professional training and cooperation of different sectors), (2) “Citizens’ interests, representation and voice” (consultation with government, mass media contracts and civic-led advocacy) and (3) “The value propositions that NGOs are bringing to society” (active citizenship, social justice and inclusive society) (Grants Report 2015, second part, pp. 38–40). The activities of the four foundations sponsored by the Norwegian Civil Fund indicate the main directions of the democracy-supporting

---

<sup>5</sup> Trade unions are rather weak in Hungary. They have been engaged in organizing their own smaller demonstrations in 2015 but their members have usually participated in those big and frequent demonstrations organized by the NGOs.

<sup>6</sup> A consortium of four foundations forms the Fund Operator of the Norwegian Civil Fund (NCF) in Hungary. Actually, “The four foundations have similar roots, being initiated by US private and public charitable organizations, each having more than 15 years of experience in grant-making and civil society development. They have comparable organizational cultures and attitudes, grounded in values respecting principles of democracy, human rights and environmental sustainability. This supports their effective partnership and close cooperation” (Report 2015, second part, p. 32).

informal institutions and civic organizations in general, since all the Hungarian NGOs concerned (see *Annex*) have been specialized in democratic innovations and in their implementations. In the declining democracy, they have provided both the spiritual ammunition and political leadership for the renewal of democracy in general and for the current mass mobilization in particular, and as a result they deserve special attention. Even a cursory view of the Hungarian informal politics in the *Annex* is only a modest compilation of the large variety of the NGOs that still demonstrates the increasing salience of the informal politics of the declining Hungarian democracy and it allows the drawing of some conclusions.

### ***Reactions of civil society to the emptied democracy in Hungary***

First, there have been two waves in the institution-building of these NGOs, with the first wave in the nineties and the second wave in the 2010s. In the first period, political attention was paid to establishing large formal institutions. In Hungary this process reached some perfection constitutionally with a democratic order for a checks and balances system. The (democratic and/or independent) NGOs appeared already in the nineties, usually as national varieties of international networks such as Amnesty International, but they did not yet play an important role. In the second period, when the big formal institutions had been occupied and emptied by Fidesz in the Potemkin democracy, however, a series of new, independent, non-profit NGOs emerged. In the 2010s, the “older” NGOs have been activated on one side, and the “new” democracy-supporting NGOs — with some “think tanks” or independent policy institutes — have entered the scene on the other (McGann 2015).

Second, the basic difference between the two periods is in the special role and salience of the media. In the first period, the printed media was still more important, while the increasing electronic media were pluralised with the appearance of new commercial stations competing for the market and having more and more influence on public opinion and public discourse. In the second period, most of the printed and electronic media has been occupied by the politico-business elite and they have heavily manipulating the public discourse. Actually, the “Fidesz world” as Potemkin democracy has been built up as an “unholy alliance” of corrupt business interests and the manipulative media. The leading tycoons of Fidesz have built up an overwhelming dominance in media step by step through “joint ventures” in the printed and electronic media orchestrated by the same oligarchs. However, electronic media has gained dominance over printed media, and even more so the internet world has become vital, including the appearance of social media. The new democratic informal politics in the 2010s has mostly relied on the internet world and social media that has facilitated its success in accessing and influencing the general public to a great extent. The internet world and social media have proved to be an effective means of access for the democratic NGOs to the public at large, first of all to young people<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> The internal tensions in Fidesz due to “the war of oligarchs” about distributing the gains from the politico-business “state capture” reached its peak in early February 2015 with an open conflict between Orbán and Lajos Simicska, the almighty business oligarch and media tycoon. As

Third, in the informal politics, the generation gap and intergenerational tensions have come to the fore. The middle-aged and the older generations have become more encapsulated in the present regime, both politically: in the formal democracy, and economically (job-wise): in the market economy. They have preserved the relatively optimistic mood of the nineties for some time in the following decades due to their life-long memory of the contrast between the old and new regimes. The incoming young generations, however, have found this new “post-communist” regime of the formal democracy and the market economy “normal” and taken for granted. Therefore, they have been confronted more and more with its deficiencies, finally with the entire system of the emerging authoritarian rule. Moreover, they have been socialized in the internet world and social media for the self-expression of their generation-cohorts. Likewise, it has been the way for the expression of their dissatisfaction with both the declining democracy and the decreasing socio-economic perspectives. Although the informal politics is not a “natural monopoly” of the incoming young generations, it is closer to their mentality. Usually, some of their brightest representatives have chosen a career in the informal oppositional politics as a generational vocation. Thus, on social media, they have very assertively formulated that they represent “a lost generation after these lost decades” in the catching up efforts of Hungary to “Europe” and they have demanded to rethink the last quarter-century’s top-down democratization<sup>8</sup>.

Fourth, the clash between the authoritarian Orbán government and the democratic NGOs has been unavoidable from both sides in any circumstances. After the occupation of the big formal institutions the authoritarian Fidesz governments have turned against the informal institutions, as the remaining big obstacle to exercising their quasi-monopolistic power, and these democracy-supporting institutions have also been mobilised against the increasingly authoritarian character of the government. While the different sorts of human rights’ violations in the nineties were sporadic, consequently, the protection of civil and political liberties was not in the forefront of political life and the media. In the 2010s, the attacks on civil society and human rights have become a systemic feature of the new authoritarian rule in Hungary. Hence, for the democratic NGOs, the defence of civil society and their own self-defence have been merged against the aggressive government actions.

Fifth, the international context, as the nested game of the external-internal linkages, has changed beyond recognition in the 2010s. In general, the two main current megatrends of the Reverse Wave in democratization and the deepening in Europeanization have collided in NMS in an acute, long-term contradiction. The Europeanization — and/or globalization — has opened up new perspectives and widened the domestic frames into international ones. Compared to the nineties, there has been new openness towards the world by the

---

The Economist (2015) comments, “The split between Mr Simicska and Mr Orbán is rooted in the question of whether business or politics will have privacy in the Fidesz dominated political order”.

<sup>8</sup> The largest generational cohort of the mass demonstrations has been the group of youngsters below 35 years, the second one of those above 60 years. Obviously, the mid-generation between 35 and 60 has been more engaged in other activities and has felt more concern about the political repercussions.

internationalization of education and communication producing some kind of the globalized/Europeanized public discourse in NMS. However, the regional trend of de-democratization in NMS has closed the domestic perspectives and distorted the former national frames of politics and communication. In particular, there has been a decreasing attention to the NMS region in the EU and world-wide compared to the nineties, when it was considered a promising area of democratization. This lost significance of the region has only been slightly compensated for by the global/European attention due to the worry about the declining democracies. Nevertheless, the crisis of the young democracies has generated increasing interest from the Western public and bigger financing by the international sponsors that has resulted in a more intensive integration of the domestic NGOs into international networks. This enhanced international integration has produced some kind of competitive cooperation among the Hungarian NGOs under scrutiny. Therefore, the joint activity has dominated their support for democracy, whereas there has also been some competition with slight differences in their political and policy approaches, or public efforts.

### *Democracy-supporting functions of the civic organizations and NGOs*

Actually, all NGOs listed in the *Annex* provide most democracy-supporting functions, although in various proportions. Each of them still has its own main profile that can be described in the terms of the “traditional” democratization and the new redemocratization functions. Obviously, the former ones have been exercised in NMS from the early nineties and they have been re-enforced in declining democracies. The latter ones have only appeared in the current redemocratization efforts under the unprecedented circumstances of the authoritarian renewal.

The “traditional” functions of the NGO sector in the “young” democracy were:

- (1) “*watchdog*” for general public in human rights protection in all dimensions: fundamental rights, minority and gender,
- (2) “*assistance*” in legal, professional and technical fields in organizing the activities of NGOs and cooperation among them,
- (3) “*research*” in constitutional-legal aspects of democratic order, moving towards the think tank or policy institute role.

The new, redemocratization functions in the declining democracy are:

- (4) “*second publicity*” to confront the official media domestically and internationally, mainly on the kleptocracy understood as the systemic feature of the authoritarian regime,
- (5) “*self-defence*” of democratic NGOs against the attacks of the authoritarian government and informing the international organizations on this conflict,
- (6) “*popular mobilization*” of large masses through the available public and social media, also involving Facebook groups more and more (Ryan 2013)<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> These functions may appear in the other NMS as well, but this list emphasizes their priorities in Hungary, while in other countries some different functions may come to the fore. Social media

The most important NGO document is the *Disrespect* declaration (Hungarian Helsinki Committee 2014), in which the four leading Hungarian “research-oriented” NGOs — EKINT, HCLU, HHC and MMM, also joined by 18 other NGOs — have formulated their assessment on the authoritarian behaviour of the Orbán government. The declaration points out that “fundamental values have been systematically disrespected in Hungary” and it offers a comprehensive overview of the present Hungarian situation. Understandably, the legal approach prevails in these NGO activities, including the *Disrespect* declaration, but research-oriented NGOs and independent policy institutes have also completed the picture of the declining democracy in Hungary with their socio-economic and (party) political analyses. From the legal side, it has been proven that both *effective* competition and *meaningful* participation has been excluded for the population at large in this Potemkin democracy. In the latest elections in 2014, the competition conditions have been distorted by the manipulated electoral legislation favouring Fidesz, the ruling party. The dominant, pro-government media misinformed the population and prevented genuine participation in the elections to a great extent (Muiznieks 2014)<sup>10</sup>.

Although in the NGOs some reasonable pragmatism has prevailed in their day-to-day activities following and criticizing the events in this Potemkin democracy, the serious deficiencies of the “top-down” macro-democracy have also been analysed by the democratic NGOs at the theoretical level of the representative democracy. The big theoretical issues for the “Next Generation Democracy” like decentralization (Multilevel Governance, MLG) and policy coordination with synergy (Multidimensional Governance, MDG) have only been discussed in these research-oriented NGOs and think tanks and not yet by the independent NGOs, but the creation of the “bottom-up” concept of redemocratization has been very high on their agenda<sup>11</sup>.

The four main fields of democratic innovations can be briefly summarized in Hungary by its basic features.

First, discussing free and fair *competition* for the representative and substantive democracy:

- (1) revealing that the competition is more than a party issue and even more than an election issue, since the effective competition in a representative democracy has to embrace all levels of society and all forms of organizations (MLG),

---

have gone through rapid changes (see its “map” by Cohen-Setton 2015). In Hungary, as usual, Facebook groups have been instrumental for mobilization in the mass demonstrations.

<sup>10</sup> On the participation-competition issue see the comprehensive analysis in the volume of Demetriou (2013), in which several chapters discuss the general situation (Lamprianou 2013) and the European developments in East and West (Markanntonatou 2013 and Kirbis 2013).

<sup>11</sup> In Hungary there are also some eminent “think tanks” or policy institutes that have described and analysed the current participatory movements, but they have not been actively involved in organizing these events. Nevertheless, they have been very active in presenting the novel character of the authoritarian Orbán regime for the international public and academia. I have attached the list of the most active policy institutes to the *Annex* but there is no space in this paper to discuss their special research profiles.



(2) offering proposals for the democratic parties as to how they can compete and cooperate, how they can still regain control over the “captured state” in this dire situation, e.g. through pre-elections for the fragmented opposition, and independent prosecutions at the courts in the blatant corruption cases (MDG).

Second, discussing active and meaningful *participation* for inclusive and sustainable democracy:

(3) the demonstration of the several levels and forms of participation as new social spaces for democratic actions in self-determination, like local communities and professional interest representations (MLG),

(4) the prioritization and thematization of the newly emerging environmental, minority and gender issues in order to give incentives for participation by presenting the deep concern of the large strata of population in promoting those issues (MDG)<sup>12</sup>.

These four types of activities have their domestic and international varieties:

(1) grant-making and professional assistance to the various civic associations enabling them to organize political actions (MLG) and to enhance their policy performance in managing the public events, demonstrations and community life (MDG),

(2) the elaboration of the new big narratives for redemocratization based on the comprehensive research projects for the political actors (MDG), and the turning to the international audience in the EU and the Council of Europe to indicate the violations of the European rules and values by the Orbán governments (MLG).

The democratic innovation literature in the West indicates the new trends against the decline of democracy. The “citizens are finding new ways [...] to engage with each other”, since new spheres of activities have been opened up beyond the traditional forms of societal and political participation. There are new ways, particularly in the young generation, to engage in the political process. The “engaged citizens” are “active in civil society groups, in protest and boycott campaigns, or interested in more deliberative forms of engagement. This may mean that they are withdrawing from the electoral process (as shown by turnout trends among younger citizens), but they are not withdrawing from the political process” (Farrell 2015, p. 3; see also Hall and Rickard 2013).

In Hungary similar trends can now be noticed. Instead of traditional forms of political participation, some new forms of societal and political participation have emerged. Political and societal/civilian participation in mass demonstrations and in building informal institutions have been high on the public agenda, as well as the intensive activity in social media, e.g., in the investigative journalism for free reporting. They are the most frequent topics of common discourse presented by the independent NGOs, yet public protests and civil disobedience actions have been limited by the fact that they would presuppose large and strong solidarity among those concerned. Basically, the inter-generational and inter-strata solidarity as the harmonization and aggregation of different interests is still weak in Hungary. The negative cohesion against the authoritarian regime is insufficient, and

---

<sup>12</sup> The international research efforts and the practical institution-building in NGOs have also relied on the IDEA (2014) and Landman (2007). On the increasing salience of informal institutions see Rothstein (1998).

the democratic opposition at its several levels and in many forms is still very fragmented, therefore the democratic forces are not yet unified and organized enough to form a positive coalition. But finally the authoritarian regime has lost the hearts and minds of the population at large and Hungarians are on the move. The NGO sector in Hungary is in a situation of flux, undergoing a rapid transformation, but it already plays a more and more relevant role in the redemocratization process.

### *The participatory movements in Hungary from the “Hot Autumn” in 2014*

Starting with a “Hot Autumn” in October 2014, there has been a wave of mass demonstrations in Hungary, although rather cyclically. Hungary has become the worst case scenario in the NMS democracy decline, but it has still shown some signs of democracy revival by these participatory movements. In 2014 there were three elections in Hungary: parliamentary ones in April, the EP in May and the municipal elections in October, and the governing authoritarian-populist party, Fidesz, won all of them. Due to these lost elections it became evident that the existing democratic opposition parties were unable to offer an alternative against this “elected autocracy” of the Orbán government. The former democratic elite that had governed the country until 2010 has been proven to be politically impotent and senile, since its leading political figures could not break the apathy of the impoverished population against the aggressive populism of the Fidesz rule (Átlátszó 2015). Thus, in this special “party vacuum” — i.e. in the lack of strong democratic opposition parties with meaningful political alternatives — the former Orbán government could mobilize the “majority of minority” at the elections, having the dominance in both public and private media. With cynical legal instrumentalism and sophisticated abuse of law, i.e. by violating the rules of the fair elections (Mudde 2014 and OSCE Report 2014), it won the parliamentary elections in 2014 by gaining a two-thirds supermajority with 25 per cent support of the electorate<sup>13</sup>.

The Hot Autumn right after the municipal elections October 2014 was the reaction of the Hungarian population both to the “hubris” of the newly entering third Orbán government and to the impotence of the small and fragmented democratic opposition parties. After the series of three — parliamentary, EP and municipal — elections, with the pre-fabricated and regained two-thirds supermajority, the re-elected Orbán government has seen no limits to its power and has acted accordingly. Its “hubris” has become overwhelming with the unrestrained exercise of power, notably with the new manifest, unscrupulous corruption cases and the ostentatious, luxurious consumption habits of the flaunting Fidesz elite (EC 2014f and ACRN-CRCB 2015). Moreover, this captured state governed by the parasitic elite has passed a tough austerity budget in 2015 for the common people with the drastic decrease of education and healthcare allocations, only the internet tax has been withdrawn after mass manifestations. The wave of demonstrations from

---

<sup>13</sup> I have analysed the Hungarian party system with special regard to the 2014 elections in several papers, for a regional comparison, see (Ágh 2015a, 2016).

October 2014 turning into participatory movements meant the end of the “permissive consensus”, or the deep apathy of the large masses. These mass demonstrations have been organized by the NGOs and civic activists and not by the parties. Altogether, in late 2014, there were more than ten demonstrations within a month in Budapest and more in the main cities. The biggest mass demonstrations mobilized about one hundred thousand people and they basically changed the public discourse and the political landscape in Hungary. The mass demonstrations have continued throughout 2015, and the demonstrations have become a constant feature of the Hungarian politics, delegitimizing this “elected autocracy”<sup>14</sup>.

### *External reactions to the democracy decline in Hungary*

In the external-internal linkages’ system, the Orbán governments have also provoked long and serious conflicts with the EU due to the constant and serious violations of the European rules and values, first of all in the media freedom that has also been discussed by the EP several times (e.g. by LIBE, the committee on civil liberties, justice and home affairs on 22 January 2015 and 2 July 2015, see EP 2013). This long story would also deserve a separate analysis, but here, it is enough to mention that these conflicts have only been cautiously managed by the European Commission, but were deeply frozen by the European Council. There have been many other conflicts in the Eurozone between the Core and Periphery that have marginalized all issues in NMS by giving preference to those issues important for the biggest and most influential member states. Therefore, these EU institutions have developed a policy of conflict avoidance, over-respecting, in the NMS cases, the sovereignty of the member states, since they have not wanted to set a precedent. Thus, these conflicts with Hungary — and also with the other declining democracies — have been pushed aside, although they have caused contaminating effects in many other member states. Although the Barroso Commission took some steps in the spring 2014, the confrontation with the damages done by the Orbán governments — and by the other NMS governments — has still been waiting for the Juncker Commission. Nevertheless, the violations of the European rules and values have been widely discussed in the European Parliament and this process will certainly continue<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> As Hungarians on the move, the wave of mass demonstrations began on 23 October 2014 (the national holiday for the October Revolution in 1956), continued with the three biggest demonstrations against the internet-tax (or in general against the 2015 budget with severe austerity measures in education and health care) on 26, 28 and 31 October that have been closely followed by the international media. The demonstrations have continued in 2015, but more in a cyclical pattern. The refugee crisis has diminished the participatory movements on one side, at the same time has created a new form of assisting the refugees with tens of thousands of people, organized e.g. by the Migration Aid.

<sup>15</sup> The brief summary has to contain the Tavares Report (2013) and the EP (2013), the introduction of the EU Justice Scoreboard (EC 2013a and 2014f) with special respect to Hungary (EC 2013b). In Spring 2014 the Barroso Commission made a big effort to initiate a procedure (see EC 2014a, b, c, d, e); its prolongation by the Juncker Commission remains to be seen. It has to be

However, despite the relative passivity of the European Commission and the clear negligence by the European Council, the Hot Autumn in Hungary already showed particularly strong external-internal linkages. In October 2014 a serious “hot” conflict began between the US and the Hungarian governments due to the rampant corruption in the huge, pro-government firms close to Fidesz that were hurting the interests of international enterprises. In an unprecedented case, in early October 2014, the US Embassy in Budapest announced an entry-ban to the US for six highly placed government officials on corruption charges, and one of them turned out to be the President of the Hungarian National Tax and Customs Office (NAV) who was forced to resign, although only some months later. This unleashed a protracted debate between the two governments on corruption in Hungarian government circles. It went well beyond the domestic corruption affairs to the zone of the international conflicts, since the US government was also unhappy about the pro-Russian attitude of the Orbán government in the Ukrainian crisis. In late 2014 this conspicuous negative turn of the Orbán regime in international relations was the general background of the mass demonstrations, although they were still motivated first of all by the domestic reasons (Amnesty International 2015 and Amnesty International Hungary 2015)<sup>16</sup>.

In such a way, these current international and domestic processes have reinforced each other, having produced these ongoing participatory movements in Hungary. No doubt that this wave of mass demonstrations has not yet led to a breakthrough against the authoritarian regime, but the character of political life has been basically changed by the institutionalization of the mass protests. The organizers of these mass demonstrations have come from the democracy schools of the above mentioned democracy-supporting institutions or NGOs. Hungarians have been on the move since October 2014 and with these “permanent” participatory movements, Hungary may make its contribution to the democracy innovations. The mass movements have been accompanied by serious debates on the relationships between the social movements and political parties, and about the alternatives to the Fidesz regime. At the time of writing the further political consequences of these participatory movements cannot be seen as to the fate of the incumbent third Orbán government. But the public discourse and political landscape have changed in Hungary beyond recognition, since a significant part of the Hungarian society has been

---

added that the European Commission has taken the rampant corruption in NMS seriously and it has supported the Report of the Transparency International (EC 2014g), see recently ACRN-CRCB (2015).

<sup>16</sup> The US actions in discovering the systemic, institutionalized corruption around the Hungarian government — and in its agencies as the NAV — were also supported and echoed by the demonstrators. In parallel with the US conflict, the Hungarian government provoked a conflict with the Norwegian government by intervening in the activities of the Hungarian NGOs sponsored by the Norwegian Civil Fund. To cut it brief, the government officials declared in the Putin style these NGO activists as “traitors” working for foreign agencies. The police raided the office of the Ökotárs Foundation on 8 October 2014, and this police raid was condemned afterwards by the sentence of the Budapest High Court. The series of attacks on the Hungarian NGOs generated a public protest and at some mass demonstrations the participants waived the EU and the Norwegian flag.

mobilized against the authoritarian government. The new generation after the systemic change has been brought up in the democratic spirit and it has tried to return to the point of departure to re-fix both the external and internal “anchors” of democratization, waving the EU flag and chanting “Europe, Europe” at the mass demonstrations. The new generation of democrats can really challenge the elected autocracy of the Fidesz-Golem and they can start a sustainable redemocratization process in Hungary<sup>17</sup>.

### ***The prospects of “Return to Europe” in NMS as a “Second Try”***

The new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe were born from the collapse of the bipolar world as Soviet rule over the region ended. The main slogan of this historical turning point was “Return to Europe” and after the failure of its first attempt in the last quarter-century this slogan has come back with a vengeance for the “Second Try”. The newly emerging democracies had naïve expectations in the nineties on the direct, quick and evolutionary application of the Western democratic model (“Western fallacy”). By now the opposite has come true, since in the NMS, both the political and policy learning process of democratization have been delayed and distorted. The newly established large formal institutions have not been filled with their genuine democratic content from the patterns of civic culture, and therefore have not been supported either with the proper informal institutions<sup>18</sup>.

Although in the eighties internal tensions were high in the “communist” countries under scrutiny, the drastic changes in the NMS region were still mainly pushed through by external megatrends such as the collapse of the bipolar world. By the following Europeanization and globalization the peoples of the NMS region have been mostly the participants of this top-down and/or “imported” democratization, but not full, conscious actors in this process. There have also been some negative external factors or spill-overs that have delayed or distorted the democratization process. First of all, the negative socio-economic changes have generated social exclusion and polarisation, causing the impoverishment of large masses as the major negative side effect of the all-out privatization in the European economic integration. The main lesson drawn from the last quarter-century is that true democracy has to be built from below as bottom-up

---

<sup>17</sup> The wave of mass demonstrations against the Orbán government in 2015 reached its peak on 15 March 2015, a Hungarian national holiday which commemorates the 1848 democratic revolution. On 23 February 2015 the demonstration-organizing units met nation-wide and formed a common organization of DEMOSZ (Democratic Movements and Organizations) to prepare the mass demonstrations against the authoritarian Orbán government throughout the country. In the first half of 2015 there were dozens of special demonstrations with some thousands taking part, usually representing professions like health care or education.

<sup>18</sup> This paper does not deal with the general development in the NMS region, but my former papers have covered the rich body of literature on democracy decline and delays in catching up in this region, see e.g. Arnould and Chandra 2014; Banac 2014; Denk and Silander 2012; Dimitrova 2010; Epstein and Jacoby 2014; ESF 2012; European Catching Up Index 2014; Innes 2014; Müller 2014; Roberts 2009; Rupnik and Zielonka 2013 and Rye 2013.

democratization through the comprehensive social reintegration facilitating the societal and political participation, leading to the genuine participatory revolution.

There is no doubt that the role of the EU in democratization and Europeanization has been overwhelmingly positive, but its negative effects have hardly been studied by the European Studies and in the NMS scholarship. The main negative effect of the EU membership is that both territorially and socially, NMS countries have been split into two parts — to the “West of the East” and “East of the East”. At the EU level the cohesion policy has been emphasized in all dimensions — economic, social and territorial — but it has not yet produced “domestic cohesion” in the NMS countries based on the common development capacities of the entire territory and all social strata in the extremely new competitive situation of European integration. The new member states have not only been more diverse but they have also been much more at a lower level of socio-economic development than most old member states. In such a way, the intensive European integration has put them under a huge competitive pressure and the large part of NMS societies has not been able to withstand this competitive pressure. The Copenhagen criteria for accession included the need for being able to withstand the competitive pressure within the EU, but this basic conditionality has been totally neglected by the domestic elites. Most elites have not been able to cope with the situation and to formulate a strategic programme in order to integrate their own countries as a whole within the EU.

Nowadays, the key issue is how to reintegrate the “East of the East” — as the internal periphery territorially and the new-old poor strata socially — to the NMS countries as a whole, since only the overall success of socio-economic catching up can lead to the redemocratization process. The decline of democracy has demonstrated that the participation issue cannot be approached exclusively from the political side, because its real roots are in the socio-economic or societal participation, dynamic job security and sustainable social prosperity. Otherwise, formal democracy becomes emptied and the people lose their interest in defending it. The formal democracy in NMS was built on weak state structures with the gap between formal and substantive democracy, therefore the true democracy or consolidated, full democracy has not yet emerged. Exactly to the contrary, the systemic decline of democracy had already begun in the nineties and the situation has worsened from decade to decade. Finally, in this internal periphery in European Governance, an intimidation campaign has taken place against the democracy-supporting informal institutions, with the NGOs as the last islands of independence, and they have been forced to fight back.

### ***Conclusions: Reinventing mass participation for the Second Try of democratization***

Hence, the shock of the “Reverse Wave” or the authoritarian revival has come in the 2010s and it has provoked a new learning process about the need for the “comprehensive” participation that allows for the organization of an adequate defence of democracy by the strong informal institutions. In the declining democracies the democracy-supporting civic

organizations have been activated and provided some models for action. The political and policy learning processes have supported and reinforced each other, which has been documented in the Hungarian case, in which the hubris of the extravagant Fidesz elite has destroyed the apathy and fear based on the permissive consensus around the elected autocracy. The ensuing political learning process has intensified the efforts of civic organizations for policy learning, to elaborate ways and means for mass demonstrations to confront the authoritarian moves of the third Orbán government. The policy learning has appeared in both theoretical studies and empirical actions, in both academic publications and public speeches. These actions have radically changed the public discourse in Hungary and new informal institutions as democratic round tables have also emerged, and with them Hungary has returned to similar organizations in the late eighties, but at the “higher level”, indeed. Under very different circumstances and 25 years later, Europeanization and democratization should be given a second try.

## References

- About ImpACT Hungary*, <http://www.demnet.hu/en/empowerment-of-civil-society/transparency-and-impact/163-about-impact-magyarország>.
- Annual Reports*: <http://autonomia.hu/hu/rolunk/evesjelentes>, <http://autonomia.hu/hu/rolunk/evesjelentes>.
- ACRN-CRCB, Corruption Research Center Budapest (2015), *From Corruption to State Capture: A New Analytical Framework*, <http://corruptionresearchnetwork.org>.
- Amnesty International (2015a), *Authorities must end unprecedented crackdown on NGOs*, <http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/hungary-authorities-must-end-unprecedented-crackdown-ngos-2015-02-02>.
- Amnesty International (2015b), Report 2014/15, *The State of the World's Human Rights*, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/pol10/0001/2015/en/>
- Amnesty International Hungary (2015), *Their Backs to the Wall: Civil Society under Pressure in Hungary* [http://www.amnesty.hu/data/file/756-back\\_to\\_the\\_walls\\_eur270012015\\_en.pdf?version=1412429919](http://www.amnesty.hu/data/file/756-back_to_the_walls_eur270012015_en.pdf?version=1412429919).
- Armingeon K. and Guthmann K. (2014), *Democracy in crisis? The declining support for national democracy in European countries 2007–2011*, „European Journal of Political Research”, Vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 423–442.
- Ágh A. (2013), *The triple crisis in Hungary: The ‘Backsliding’ of Hungarian Democracy after Twenty Years*, „Romanian Journal of Political Science” (PolSci), Vol. 13, no. 1, Summer 2013, pp. 25–51.
- Ágh A. (2014a), *The fall of the Berlin Wall and European politics: Perspectives of new Europe in the early twenty-first century*, in: J.M. Magone (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of European Politics*, London: Routledge, pp. 116–131.
- Ágh A. (2014b), *Decline of democracy in East-Central Europe: The last decade as the lost decade in democratization*, „Journal of Comparative Politics”, Vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 4–33.

- Ágh A. (2015a), *The Transformation of the Hungarian Party System: From the Democratic Chaos to the Electoral Autocracy*, „Südosteuropa”, Vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 201–222.
- Ágh A. (2015b), *The Triple Crisis in the New Member States: The historical trajectory of NMS-8 in the Past Quarter Century*, „Southeastern Europe”, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 294–317.
- Ágh A. (2016), *De-Europeanization and de-Democratization trends in ECE: From the Potemkin democracy to the elected autocracy in Hungary*, „Journal of Comparative Politics”, Vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 36–58.
- Átlátszó (2015), *A Szegények voksa [The vote of the poor]*, Common paper of Transparency-Hu, K-Monitor, Political Capital and Transparency International Hungary, <http://atlatzso.hu/2015/02/19/a-szegenyek-voksa-kozmunka-es-a-valasztas-tisztasaganak-kockazatai/>.
- Banac I. (2014), *Twenty-Five Years After the Fall of the Berlin Wall*, „East European Politics and Societies and Cultures”, Special Issue on the Post-1989 Developments in the Region, pp. 653–657.
- Bertelsmann Foundation (2015), *Next Generation Democracy*, [www.nextgenerationdemocracy.org](http://www.nextgenerationdemocracy.org) and <http://www.bti-project.org/next-generation-democracy>.
- Bridoux J., Kurki M.H. (2014), *Democracy Promotion*, London: Routledge.
- Cabada L. (2013), *Parties with No Members?: How to Ensure Political Participation in East Central Europe*, in: K. N. Demetriou (ed.), *Democracy in Transition. Political Participation in the European Union*, Heidelberg; New York; Dordrecht; London: Springer, pp. 77–94.
- Cassani A. (2014), *Hybrid what? Partial consensus and persistent divergences in the analysis of hybrid regimes*, „International Political Science Review”, Vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 542–558.
- Charron N. (2014), *European Quality of Government Index (EQI)*, <https://nicholascharron.wordpress.com/european-quality-of-government-index-eqi/>
- Cohen-Setton J. (2015), *Is blogging dead? (The Social/Communication Map)*, Bruegel, 9 February 2015, <http://www.bruegel.org/nc/blog/detail/article/1564>.
- Demetriou K. N. (ed.) (2013), *Democracy in Transition: Political Participation in the European Union*, Heidelberg; New York Springer.
- Demos (2013), *Backsliders: Measuring democracy in the EU*, <http://www.demos.co.uk/publications/backsliders>.
- Denk T., Silander D. (2012), *Problems in Paradise? Challenges to future democratization in democratic states*, „International Political Science Review”, Vol. 33, no. 1, January 2012, pp. 25–40.
- Dimitrova A. (2010), *The new member states of the EU in the aftermath of enlargement: do new European rules remain empty shells?*, „Journal of European Public Policy”, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 137–148.
- EC, European Commission (2013a), *The EU Justice Scoreboard — A tool to promote effective justice and growth*, COM(2013) 160 final, Brussels, 27 March 2013.
- EC, European Commission (2013b), *In-depth review of Hungary*, Brussels, 10.4.2013, SWD(2013) 119 final.



- EC, European Commission (2014a), *A new EU Framework to strengthen the Rule of Law*, Brussels, 11.3.2014, COM(2014) 158 final.
- EC, European Commission (2014b), *European Commission presents a framework to safeguard the rule of law in the European Union*, Strasbourg, 11 March 2014 (IP/14/237).
- EC, European Commission (2014c), *General Report on the Activities of European Union*, Brussels, 21.1.2014, COM(2014) 12 final.
- EC, European Commission (2014d), *Remarks by President Barroso on the future of Justice and Home Affairs and the Rule of Law Initiative*, European Parliament, Strasbourg, 11 March 2014 (Speech/14/204).
- EC, European Commission (2014e), *The 2014 EU Justice Scoreboard*, COM(2014) 155 final, Brussels, 17 March 2014.
- EC, European Commission (2014f), Viviane Reding, *A new Rule of Law initiative*, European Parliament, Strasbourg, 11 March 2014 (Speech/14/2002).
- EC, European Commission, Transparency International (2014), *EU Anti-Corruption Report*, Brussels, 3.2.2014, COM(2014) 38 final, [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/organized-crime-and-human-trafficking/corruption/docs/acr\\_2014\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/organized-crime-and-human-trafficking/corruption/docs/acr_2014_en.pdf).
- EEA and Norway Grants Report (2015), *Mid Term Evaluation of the NGO Programmes under the EEA and Norway Grants (2009–2014)*, <http://eeagrants.org>.
- EIU, The Economist Intelligence Unit (2014), *What's gone wrong with democracy and how to revive it*, 1 March 2014, <http://www.economist.com/news/essays/21596796-democracy-was-most-successful-political-idea-20th-century-why-has-it-run-trouble-and-what-can-be-do>.
- EIU, The Economist Intelligence Unit (2015), *Democracy Index 2014*, [http://www.eiu.com/public/thankyou\\_download.aspx?activity=download&campaignid=Democracy0115](http://www.eiu.com/public/thankyou_download.aspx?activity=download&campaignid=Democracy0115).
- EKINT (2014), *Timeline of Governmental Attacks against Hungarian NGO Sphere*, [http://www.ekint.org/ekint\\_files/File/timeline\\_of\\_gov\\_attacks\\_against\\_hungarian\\_ngos\\_20141020.pdf](http://www.ekint.org/ekint_files/File/timeline_of_gov_attacks_against_hungarian_ngos_20141020.pdf).
- EP, European Parliament (2013), *Report on the situation of fundamental rights standards and practices in Hungary* (24.6.2013), <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A7-2013-0229+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN>.
- Epstein, R., Jacoby W. (2014), *Eastern Enlargement Ten Years On: Transcending the East-West Divide?* „Journal of Common Market Studies”, Vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 1–16; Special Issue on Eastern Enlargement Ten Years On.
- ESF, European Science Foundation, Forward Look (2012), *Central and Eastern Europe Beyond Transition: Convergence and Divergence in Europe*, Strasbourg: ESF.
- European Catch-Up Index 2014 (2014), Lessenski M. (ed.), *The Gravity Effect: Findings of the European Catch-Up Index 2014*, European Policies Initiative-Open Society Institute, December 2014, <http://eupi.osi.bg/cgi-bin/e-cms/vis/vis.pl?s=001&p=0070&g=>.
- Hall J. and Rickard L. (2013), *People, Progress and Participation : How Initiatives Measuring Social Progress Yield Benefits Beyond Better Metrics*, Bertelsmann Foundation, Global

- Choices 1, [http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xbcr/SID-4F316F1B-694A6F0C/bst\\_engl/xcms\\_bst\\_dms\\_37947\\_37948\\_2.pdf](http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xbcr/SID-4F316F1B-694A6F0C/bst_engl/xcms_bst_dms_37947_37948_2.pdf).
- HEPF (2014a), *Civil Partner*, <http://www.civiljogok.hu/en>, <http://www.civiljogok.hu/en>
- HEPF (2014b), *Medium and Micro Project Proposals*, Autumn 2014, <https://norvegcivilalap.hu/en/node/10419>.
- HCLU (2014a), *HCLU Litigates Hungarian Service Providers to Terminate Data Retention*, <http://tasz.hu/en/data-protection/hclu-litigates-hungarian-service-providers-terminate-data-retention>.
- HCLU (2014b), *We do not want Roma here*, <http://tasz.hu/en/romaprogram/we-do-not-want-roma-here>.
- Herman L.E. (2015), *Re-evaluating the post-communist success story: party elite loyalty, citizen mobilization and the erosion of Hungarian democracy*, „European Political Science Review”, Vol. 7, issue 1, pp. 1–34.
- Human Rights Watch (2015), *World Report 2015, Hungary*, <http://www.hrw.org/world-report/2015/country-chapters/european-union>.
- Hungarian Helsinki Committee (2014a), *Disrespect for European Values in Hungary, 2010–2014*, 21 November 2014, <http://helsinki.hu/en/disrespect-for-european-values-in-hungary-2010-2014>.
- Hungarian Helsinki Committee (2014b), *Governmental attacks against Hungarian NGOs discussed at OSCE human rights meeting*, 23 September 2014, <http://helsinki.hu/en/governmental-attacks-against-hungarian-ngos-discussed-at-european-conference>.
- IDEA, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2014), *Constitution-building*, <http://www.idea.int/publications/constitution-building-a-global-review/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&pageid=65189>.
- Innes A. (2014), *The Political Economy of State Capture in Central Europe*, „Journal of Common Market Studies”, Vol. 52, no. 1; Special Issue on Eastern Enlargement Ten Years On, pp. 88–104.
- Kirbis A. (2014), *Political Participation and Non-democratic Political Culture in Western Europe, East-Central Europe and Post-Yugoslav Countries*, in: K. N. Demetriou (ed.), *Democracy in Transition. Political Participation in the European Union*, pp. 225–252.
- K-Monitor (2014), *Declaration of three NGOs: This is the minimum against corruption*, <http://www.ezaminimum.hu>.
- Krasztev P. and Van Til, J. (2013), *Tarka ellenállás: Kézikönyv Rebelliseknek és Békéseknék [Colourful Resistance: Handbook for Rebellious and Peaceful People]*, Budapest: Napvilág Publisher.
- Kreatív (2015), *Hogyan működött Orbán és Simicska médiabirodalma? [How did the Media Empire of the Orbán and Simicska work]*, [http://www.kreativ.hu/databanya/cikk/hogyan\\_mukodott\\_orban\\_es\\_simicska\\_mediabirodalma](http://www.kreativ.hu/databanya/cikk/hogyan_mukodott_orban_es_simicska_mediabirodalma)
- Lamprianou I. (2014), *Contemporary Political Participation Research: A Critical Assessment*, in: K. N. Demetriou (ed.), *Democracy in Transition. Political Participation in the European Union*, pp. 21–42.

- Landman T. (2007), *Developing Democracy: Concepts, Measures, and Empirical Relationships*, International IDEA, May 2007, <http://www.idea.int/resources/analysis/upload/developing-democracy-landman.pdf>.
- MACI (2015), Hungarian Civil Organizations (HU-CI) *Maci-kampány* [HU-CI campaign], <http://sziamaci.hu/>.
- Markanntonatou M. (2014), *The Post-Welfare State and Changing Forms of Political Participation*, in: K. N. Demetriou (ed.), *Democracy in Transition. Political Participation in the European Union*, pp. 43–60.
- McGann J. (2015), *Thinks Tanks and Civil Societies Program, 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index Report*, University of Pennsylvania, 1-22-2015, [http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=think\\_tanks](http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=think_tanks).
- MMM (2014), *What is the problem with the media laws?* <http://mertek.eu>.
- MMM (2015), *Gasping for Air: Soft Censorship in Hungarian Media 2014*, <http://mertek.eu/en/reports/gasping-for-air-soft-censorship-in-hungarian-media-2014>.
- Moeller J. and Skaaning S.-E. (2013), *Autocracies, democracies, and the violation of civil liberties*, in: P. Köllner and S. Kailitz (eds.) (2013), „Democratization”, Vol. 20, no. 1; Special Issue *Unpacking Autocracies: Explaining Similarity and Difference*, pp. 82–106.
- Morlino L. (2009), *Are there hybrid regimes? Or are they just optical illusion?* „European Political Science Review”, Vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 273–296.
- Morlino L. (2012), *Changes for Democracy: Actors, Structures, Processes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mudde C. (2014), *The 2014 Hungarian parliamentary elections, or how to craft a constitutional majority*, „The Washington Post”, 14 April 2014, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/04/14/the-2014-hungarian-parliamentary-elections-or-how-to-craft-a-constitutional-majority/>.
- Muiznieks N. (2014), *Report by the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe Following the Visit to Hungary from 1 to 4 July 2014*, Strasbourg, 16 December 2014, <https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2662996&SecMode=1&DocId=2218468&Usage=2>.
- Müller J.W. (2014), *Eastern Europe Goes South*, „Foreign Affairs”, Vol. 93, no. 2, pp. 12–16.
- Nagy Á. (2014), *A civil társadalom domesztikálása* [The domestication of civil society], in: B. Magyar, *A posztkommunista maffiaállam* [The post-communist mafia-state], Vol. 2, Budapest: Noran, pp. 129–142.
- Nane (2014), *Power to Change, manual against domestic violence (in five countries)*, <http://www.womensaid.org.uk/domestic-violence-articles.asp?section=00010001002200370001&itemid=1841>.
- Newton K. (2012), *Curing the democratic malaise with democratic innovations*, in: B. Geissel and K. Newton (eds.), *Evaluating democratic innovations: curing the democratic malaise?* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 3–20.
- OSCE, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (2014), *Hungary, Parliamentary Elections*, 6 April 2014, Final Report, <http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/hungary/121098?download=true>.

- Papadopoulos Y. (2013), *Democracy in Crisis? Politics, Governance and Policy*, Houndmills: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Pogrebinschi T. (2014), *The Pragmatic Turn of Democracy: Combining Representation and Participation*, WZB (Wissenschaft Zentrum Berlin) Report 2014, pp. 55–58.
- Policy Network, Farrell D. (2015), *Democratic decline or democratic evolution?* [http://www.policy-network.net/pno\\_detail.aspx?ID=4843&title=Democratic-decline-or-democratic-evolution](http://www.policy-network.net/pno_detail.aspx?ID=4843&title=Democratic-decline-or-democratic-evolution).
- Roberts A. (2009), *The Quality of Democracy in Eastern Europe: Public Preferences and Policy Reforms*, Cambridge University Press.
- Rothstein B. (1998), *Political Institutions: An Overview*, in: R. Goodin and H.-D. Klingemann (eds.), *A New Handbook of Political Science*, Oxford University Press, pp. 133–166.
- Rupnik J. and Zielonka J. (2013), *The State of Democracy 20 Years on: Domestic and External Factors*, „East European Politics and Societies”, Vol. 27, no. 3; Special Issue on The State of Democracy 20 Years On, pp. 1–25.
- Ryan L. (2014), *Scientific Democracy in the European Research Area*, „Science and Public Policy”, <http://era.ideasoneuropa.eu/2014/11/03/scientific-democracy-european-research-area/>.
- Rye L. (2013), Introduction to L. Rye (ed.), *Distant Voices: Ideas of democracy and the Eurozone crisis*, Oslo: Akademika Publishing.
- SN (2013a), *About the rule of law: Declaration of the Hungarian Student Network and the Hungarian High School Network*, [http://hallgatoihalozat.blog.hu/2013/02/09/about\\_the\\_rule\\_of\\_law\\_declaration\\_of\\_the\\_hungarian\\_student\\_network\\_and\\_the\\_hungarian\\_high\\_school\\_net](http://hallgatoihalozat.blog.hu/2013/02/09/about_the_rule_of_law_declaration_of_the_hungarian_student_network_and_the_hungarian_high_school_net).
- SN (2013b), *HaHa on how the 4<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment affects students in Hungary*, [http://hallgatoihalozat.blog.hu/9999/12/31/haha\\_on\\_the\\_4th\\_constitutional\\_amendment\\_of\\_hungary](http://hallgatoihalozat.blog.hu/9999/12/31/haha_on_the_4th_constitutional_amendment_of_hungary).
- SN (2013c), *Higher education under threat in Hungary*, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/can-europe-make-it/k%C3%A1rly-f%C3%BCzessi/higher-education-under-threat-in-hungary>.
- Tavares R. (2013), *Draft Report on the situation of human rights: standards and practices in Hungary*, European Parliament, Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, 2012/2130(INI), 2.5.2013, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+COMPARL+PE-508.211+02+DOC+PDF+V0//EN&language=EN>.
- Transparency-Hu (2015a), *A new holiday resort for the Prime Minister's family*, <http://english.atlatszo.hu/2015/01/27/a-new-holiday-resort-for-the-prime-ministers-family/>
- Transparency-Hu (2015b), *Atlatszo.hu unravels intricate web behind suspicious Budapest real estate sellout*, <http://english.atlatszo.hu/2015/02/10/atlatszo-hu-unravels-intricate-web-behind-suspicious-budapest-real-estate-sellout/>
- Transparency-Hu (2015c), *Winning the deal is all about being in the right place at the right time*, <http://english.atlatszo.hu/2015/02/10/winning-the-deal-is-all-about-being-in-the-right-place-at-the-right-time/>

- Transparency International Hungary (2014a), *Authorities should crackdown on corruption*, 27 October 2014, [http://www.transparency.hu/Transparency\\_International\\_\\_authorities\\_should\\_crack\\_down\\_on\\_corruption?bind\\_info=index&bind\\_id=0](http://www.transparency.hu/Transparency_International__authorities_should_crack_down_on_corruption?bind_info=index&bind_id=0).
- Transparency International (2014b), *Corruption Perception Index 2014*, <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2014>, <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2014/results>
- Transparency International Hungary (2014c), *CPI 2014, Hungary (in Hungarian)*, [http://www.transparency.hu/A\\_korruptio\\_2014-es\\_vilagterkepe](http://www.transparency.hu/A_korruptio_2014-es_vilagterkepe).
- Varga Á. (2014), *Kleptocracy Banned: The Hungarian Tax Authority Scandal* (24 November 2014), *Police raids against Hungarian NGOs* (25 September 2014) and *Orbán's government in an endless war against "Hungary's enemies"* (01 July 2014), Heinrich Böll Stiftung, <http://www.boell.de/en/person/aron-varga>.

*Annex**List of the most important democracy-supporting civil organizations**I. Internationally based organizations — NGOs*

**Amnesty International Hungary** (AI-Hu, Amnesty International Magyarország, <http://www.amnesty.hu> and <http://www.amnesty.org/en/region/hungary>)

Foundation date: 1961 (international) and 1989 (Hungarian)

Mission: protection of human rights against abuses

Activities: mobilizing the public to put pressure on governments, companies and inter-governmental bodies

Sponsors: private donations world-wide

Current reports:

Amnesty International (2015a), *Authorities must end unprecedented crackdown on NGOs*, <http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/hungary-authorities-must-end-unprecedented-crackdown-ngos-2015-02-02>.

Amnesty International Hungary (2015), *Their Backs to the Wall: Civil Society under Pressure in Hungary*, [http://www.amnesty.hu/data/file/756-back\\_to\\_the\\_walls\\_eur270012015\\_en.pdf?version=1412429919](http://www.amnesty.hu/data/file/756-back_to_the_walls_eur270012015_en.pdf?version=1412429919).

**Carpathian Foundation — Hungary** (CF-H, Kárpátok Alapítvány, [www.carpathianfoundation.org](http://www.carpathianfoundation.org))

Foundation date: 2002

Mission: Five Nations — One Community, cross-border regional community

Activities: supporting local developments and disadvantaged rural areas

Sponsors: Norwegian Civil Fund for International Carpathian Foundation Network

**Corruption Research Center Budapest** (CRCB, in the Anti-Corruption Research Network, ACRN, <http://corruptionresearchnetwork.org/>)

Foundation date: 2013

Activities: anti-corruption fight in an international network

Current reports:

ACRN-CRCB, Corruption Research Center Budapest (2015), *From Corruption to State Capture: A New Analytical Framework*, <http://corruptionresearchnetwork.org>

Kreatív (2015), *Hogyan működött Orbán és Simicska médiabirodalma?* [*How did the Media Empire of the Orbán and Simicska work*], [http://www.kreativ.hu/databanya/cikk/hogyan\\_mukodott\\_orban\\_es\\_simicska\\_mediabirodalma](http://www.kreativ.hu/databanya/cikk/hogyan_mukodott_orban_es_simicska_mediabirodalma).

**DemNet** (Demokratikus Jogok Fejlesztéséért Alapítvány, <http://www.demnet.hu>)

Foundation date: 1996

Mission: democracy support with a special focus on civil society development  
Activities: empowerment of civil society organizations, improve sustainability of NGOs and foster

civil society actors' social embeddedness Sponsors: USAid (Norwegian Civil Fund and Visegrad Four Fund, V4)

Current/main report:

*About ImpACT Hungary*, <http://www.demnet.hu/en/empowerment-of-civil-society/transparency-and-impact/163-about-impact-magyarorszag>.

**Hungarian Helsinki Committee (HHC, Magyar Helsinki Bizottság, <http://helsinki.hu/en>)**

Foundation date: 1989

Mission: Human rights watchdog organization

Activities: refugees and migrants, detention and law enforcement, access to justice, legal assistance

Sponsors: UN bodies, European Commission, Open Society (Soros Foundation)

Current reports:

Hungarian Helsinki Committee (2014a), *Disrespect for European Values in Hungary, 2010–2014*, 21 November 2014, <http://helsinki.hu/en/disrespect-for-european-values-in-hungary-2010-2014>.

Hungarian Helsinki Committee (2014b), *Governmental attacks against Hungarian NGOs discussed at OSCE human rights meeting*, 23 September 2014, <http://helsinki.hu/en/governmental-attacks-against-hungarian-ngos-discussed-at-european-conference>.

**Transparency International Hungary (TI-Hu, Transparency International Magyarország, <http://www.transparency.hu/en>)**

Foundation date: 1996

Mission: Anti-Corruption research and mobilization

Activities: regular reports and events, International Anti-Corruption Day (The sixth annual anti-corruption festival, “Átláccó”, 12 November 2014)

Sponsors: Freedom House, Open Society (Soros Foundation), companies

Current reports:

Transparency International Hungary (2014a), *Authorities should crackdown on corruption*, 27 October 2014, [http://www.transparency.hu/Transparency\\_International\\_\\_authorities\\_should\\_crack\\_down\\_on\\_corruption?bind\\_info=index&bind\\_id=0](http://www.transparency.hu/Transparency_International__authorities_should_crack_down_on_corruption?bind_info=index&bind_id=0).

Transparency International (2014b), *Corruption Perception Index 2014*, <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2014>, <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2014/results>

Transparency International Hungary (2014c), *CPI 2014, Hungary (in Hungarian)*, [http://www.transparency.hu/A\\_korrupcio\\_2014-es\\_vilagterkepe](http://www.transparency.hu/A_korrupcio_2014-es_vilagterkepe).

European Commission, Transparency International (2014), *EU Anti-Corruption Report*, Brussels, 3.2.2014, COM(2014) 38 final, [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/organized-crime-and-human-trafficking/corruption/docs/acr\\_2014\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/organized-crime-and-human-trafficking/corruption/docs/acr_2014_en.pdf).

Main sponsor:

**EEA/Norway Fund (NCF, Norwegian Civil Fund, <https://norvegcivilalap.hu/en>)**

Foundation date: 1994

Mission: provide grants to strengthen civil society development and to enhance contribution to social justice, democracy and sustainable development

Activities: the Fund is operated by the Hungarian Environmental Partnership Foundation in cooperation with Autonomy Foundation, DemNet and Carpathian Foundation

## *II. Domestically based organizations — NGOs*

**Autonomy Foundation** (AF, Autónomia Alapítvány, <http://autonomia.hu>)

Foundation date: 1990

Mission: strengthening civil society and social re-integration

Activities: Roma programs for developing skills and community building

Sponsors: Norwegian Civil Fund

Current Reports:

Annual Reports: <http://autonomia.hu/hu/rolunk/evesjelentes>, <http://autonomia.hu/hu/rolunk/evesjelentes>.

**Hungarian Environmental Partnership Foundation** — (HEPF, Ökotárs Alapítvány, <http://okotars.hu/en>)

Foundation date: 1995 (1991 — Environmental Partnership Association, EPA)

Mission: non-profit, politically independent organization promoting environmental improvement and awareness among civil society and the general public

Activities: grant making and training, technical assistance and expert help for NGOs, fundraising, cooperation and consultancy services for civil organizations

Sponsors: Norwegian Civil Fund, The Swiss-Hungarian NGO and Scholarship Funds

Current reports:

HEPF (2014a), *Civil Partner*, <http://www.civiljogok.hu/en>, <http://www.civiljogok.hu/en>.

HEPF (2014b), *Medium and Micro Project Proposals*, Autumn 2014, <https://norvegcivilalap.hu/en/node/10419>.

**Eötvös Károly Policy Institute** (EKINT, Eötvös Károly Közpolitikai Intézet, [www.ekint.org](http://www.ekint.org))

Foundation date: 2003 (1995)

Mission: to establish novel, unconventional institutional framework for shaping democratic public affairs in Hungary

Activities: issuing positions and publications on various legal-political issues, organizing conferences, drafting policy proposals, conducting surveys on democratic institutions like courts and on public services like education and health care

Sponsors: Open Society Institute (Soros Foundation)

Current reports:

EKINT (2014), *Timeline of Governmental Attacks against Hungarian NGO Sphere*, [http://www.ekint.org/ekint\\_files/File/timeline\\_of\\_gov\\_attacks\\_against\\_hungarian\\_ngos\\_20141020.pdf](http://www.ekint.org/ekint_files/File/timeline_of_gov_attacks_against_hungarian_ngos_20141020.pdf)



**Human Platform** (HP, Humán Platform, [www.humanplatform.hu](http://www.humanplatform.hu)), jointly with the **Kretarkor Foundation** (KrétaKör Alapítvány, <http://kretakor.eu/en/home-en/>)

Foundation date: 2011

Mission: network of two dozen networks in the fields of culture, education, social policy and health care

Activities: declarations, meetings, demonstrations, public performances for strengthening the professional values and social solidarity

Sponsors: Open Society (Soros Foundation) and private donations

**Hungarian Civil Liberties Union** (HCLU, Társaság a Szabadságjogokért, TASZ, <http://tasz.hu>)

Foundation date: 1994

Mission: non-profit human rights watchdog NGO to promote fundamental rights

Activities: strengthening civil society, protecting freedom of information, political participatory rights, rule of law, personal data protection, Roma rights advocacy and freedom of assembly

Sponsors: Norwegian Civil Fund, Open Society (Soros Foundation), ERSTE Foundation

Current reports:

HCLU (2014a), *HCLU Litigates Hungarian Service Providers to Terminate Data Retention*, <http://tasz.hu/en/data-protection/hclu-litigates-hungarian-service-providers-terminate-data-retention>.

HCLU (2014b), *We do not want Roma here*, <http://tasz.hu/en/romaprogram/we-do-not-want-roma-here>.

**K-Monitor** (Korrupció Monitor, <http://k-monitor.hu>)

Foundation date: 2008

Mission: reporting on the corruption-related actions for the transparency of public finances

Activities: website and data base with the corruption stories regularly-frequently displayed on internet in close cooperation with the NGOs of the anti-corruption profile

Sponsors: Open Society (Soros Foundation), Norwegian Civil Fund, European Commission

Current report:

K-Monitor (2014), *Declaration of three NGOs: This is the minimum against corruption*, <http://www.ezaminimum.hu>.

**Mertek Media Analysis Workshop** (MMAW, Mérték Médiaelemző Műhely, MMM, <http://mertek.eu>)

Foundation date: 1989

Mission: against the systemic politicization of the media system and manipulation of the advertising market

Activities: regular reports on media, fight for the media freedom and for an independent public media

Sponsors: Open Society (Soros Foundation), Stichting Democratie and Media

## Current reports:

MMM (2014), *What is the problem with the media laws?* <http://mertek.eu>.

MMM (2015), *Gasping for Air: Soft Censorship in Hungarian Media 2014*, <http://mertek.eu/en/reports/gasping-for-air-soft-censorship-in-hungarian-media-2014>.

**Student Network** (SN, Hallgatói Hálózat, HaHa, <http://hallgatoihalozat.blog.hu>)

Foundation date: 2011

Mission: representing students' interests, for the autonomy of higher education and for the job perspectives of graduates

Activities: organizing demonstrations and formulating demands from governments

Sponsors: self-financing, small private donations of participants

## Current reports/blogs:

SN (2013a), *About the rule of law: Declaration of the Hungarian Student Network and the Hungarian High School Network*, [http://hallgatoihalozat.blog.hu/2013/02/09/about\\_the\\_rule\\_of\\_law\\_declaration\\_of\\_the\\_hungarian\\_student\\_network\\_and\\_the\\_hungarian\\_high\\_school\\_net](http://hallgatoihalozat.blog.hu/2013/02/09/about_the_rule_of_law_declaration_of_the_hungarian_student_network_and_the_hungarian_high_school_net).

SN (2013b), *HaHa on how the 4<sup>th</sup> Constitutional Amendment affects students in Hungary*, [http://hallgatoihalozat.blog.hu/9999/12/31/haha\\_on\\_the\\_4th\\_constitutional\\_amendment\\_of\\_hungary](http://hallgatoihalozat.blog.hu/9999/12/31/haha_on_the_4th_constitutional_amendment_of_hungary).

SN (2013c), *Higher education under threat in Hungary*, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/can-europe-make-it/k%C3%A1roly-f%C3%BCzessi/higher-education-under-threat-in-hungary>.

**Transparency-Hu Foundation** (Transparency-Hu, Átlátszó.hu Alapítvány, [www.atlatszo.hu](http://www.atlatszo.hu))

Foundation date: 2011

Mission: investigating, pro-transparency and anti-corruption journalism

Activities: very active and effective watchdog NGO and online media with a vivid website of social accountability, discovering many corruption cases of government in close cooperation with other NGOs of the similar profile

Sponsors: Open Society (Soros Foundation) and private donations

## Current reports:

Transparency-Hu (2015a), *A new holiday resort for the Prime Minister's family*, <http://english.atlatszo.hu/2015/01/27/a-new-holiday-resort-for-the-prime-ministers-family/>

Transparency-Hu (2015b), *Atlatszo.hu unravels intricate web behind suspicious Budapest real estate sellout*, <http://english.atlatszo.hu/2015/02/10/atlatszo-hu-unravels-intricate-web-behind-suspicious-budapest-real-estate-sellout/>

Transparency-Hu (2015c), *Winning the deal is all about being in the right place at the right time*, <http://english.atlatszo.hu/2015/02/10/winning-the-deal-is-all-about-being-in-the-right-place-at-the-right-time/>

**Women for Women** (WW, Women's Rights Association, Nők a Nőkért Egyesület, NaNe, [www.nane.hu](http://www.nane.hu))

Foundation date: 1994

Mission: ending the human rights' violation and the threat of violence against women

Activities: advocacy, personal support services and public education

Sponsors: Norwegian Civil Fund, European Commission, private donations

Current report:

Nane (2014), *Power to Change, manual against domestic violence (in five countries)*, <http://www.womensaid.org.uk/domestic-violence-articles.asp?section=00010001002200370001&itemid=1841>.

The Civic Decoration: The **Ars Humanica Hungarica** ([www.arshumanica.org](http://www.arshumanica.org))

Foundation date: 2011

Mission: to give Hungarian Civilian Legion of Honour (Magyar Civil Becsületrend, MCB) every year to eminent persons for their civic virtue.

Activities: In February 2015 the Award was presented for the fourth time.

### *III. Major independent think tanks in Hungary*

Budapest Institute (<http://budapestinstitute.eu/index.php/en>)

Center for Policy Studies (<http://cps.ceu.edu>)

IDEA, Institute for a Democratic Alternative (<http://ideaintezet.hu/wp/english/>)

Political capital (<http://www.politicalcapital.hu/>)

Policy agenda (<http://policyagenda.hu>)

Policy solutions (<http://www.policysolutions.hu/en>)

TÁRKI, Social Research Institute ([www.tarki.hu](http://www.tarki.hu))

(There are 41 think tanks in Hungary, see 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index Report, p. 55, [http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=think\\_tanks](http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=think_tanks))

#### *Cytowanie*

Attila Ágh (2015), *Redemocratization efforts in Hungary as a second try: civil society organizations and mass movements*, „Problemy Polityki Społecznej. Studia i Dyskusje” nr 31(4)2015, s. 9–35. Dostępny w Internecie na [www.problemypolitykispolecznej.pl](http://www.problemypolitykispolecznej.pl) [dostęp: dzień, miesiąc, rok]