



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Who knows the interests of Hungary better than the Hungarian people themselves?

- A narrative analysis of the Hungarian Government's perspective on the Article
7 (1) TEU procedure against Hungary

Ellinor Ekholm

Master of Arts in European Studies
Center for Languages and Literature
EUHR18
Master's Thesis (30 ECTS)
June 2020
Supervisor: Tomas Sniegou

Abstract

After the Hungarian party Fidesz took office in 2010 Hungarian national politics has transformed to become more nationalistic. The Fundamental Law of Hungary, which entered into force in January 2012, drew wide international and European attention and attracted heavy criticism as of the respect for fundamental values. The criticism reached an apex in September 2018 when the European Parliament called on the Council to initiate an Article 7 TEU procedure against the state of Hungary. The aim of this thesis is to; (1) highlight the different arguments by which the Hungarian Government argues against the violations and alleged breach of the fundamental values of the European Union; (2) analyze how narratives of national identity, nationalism and populism are constructed and expressed in the arguments by the Hungarian Government; and (3) examine how these arguments and narratives distinguish over different contexts. This is carried out by a combined narrative analysis of data collected from the Official Legal Arguments of the Hungarian Government as well as from statements by the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán. The theoretical framework used stems from theories on national identity, nationalism and populism. The overall findings of this research have shown how the Hungarian Government utilizes narratives of national identity, nationalism and populism as means of arguing against the alleged violations of the fundamental values of the European Union. The main narratives identified comprise narratives of the distinction between the Hungarian national identity and those who are perceived as “the others”. Additional narratives identified include symbols, memories, values and narratives stressing the attachment to the homeland, as well as populist narratives of the opposition between the Hungarian people versus “the elites”.

Keywords: Hungary, European Union, nationalism, national identity, populism, Article 7 TEU, narrative, narrative analysis, Viktor Orbán.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Aim, Scope and Research Question	2
1.2	Article 7 of the Treaty on European Union	3
1.3	Primary Sources	4
1.3.1	Contextual Background - The Sargentini Report.....	4
1.3.2	The Official Legal Arguments of the Hungarian Government.....	5
1.3.3	Statements by Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán.....	6
1.4	Secondary Sources	7
1.5	Disposition of Research	8
2	Existing Research	9
3	Theory and Methodology	15
3.1	Theory	15
3.1.1	National Identity	15
3.1.2	Theories of Nationalism.....	17
3.1.2.1	Primordialism.....	17
3.1.2.2	Modernism	18
3.1.2.3	Ethnosymbolism.....	19
3.1.3	Populism	20
3.2	Methodology: Narrative Analysis	22
3.2.2	Feldman’s Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis	23
3.2.3	Labov’s Six-Part Model.....	24
4	Findings	27
4.1	The Official Legal Arguments of the Hungarian Government	27
4.2	Statements by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán	39
5	Analysis	45
5.1	National Identity Narratives	45
5.2	Nationalist Narratives	49
5.3	Populist Narratives	53
6	Discussion and Conclusion	57
7	Bibliography	62

1 Introduction

In 2010, under the leadership of Viktor Orbán, the Hungarian political party Fidesz achieved great result in the Hungarian parliamentary election, with the support of 52,7% of those who voted in the election.¹ After the entry of the Orbán Government in 2010 the new conservative government started to change the constitutional landscape of the country.² The Fundamental Law of Hungary, which despite limited public debate entered into force in January 2012, drew wide international and European attention and attracted heavy criticism as for the respect for fundamental values, including human rights and the Rule of Law. A number of European and international institutions further expressed their concerns at whether certain principles and rules of the Fundamental Law complied with European, or even with purely democratic standards.³

Since its entry the Orbán Government has been described as one of the governments with the clearest nationalist agenda in Europe and has on several occasions been at odds with EU legislation.⁴ The country has in recent years sometimes also been depicted as a nation whose government uses one of the worst forms of extremist populism.⁵ The new political shift, and with that a new political approach, came to attract further criticism as to its democratic backsliding and alleged violations against the fundamental values of the European Union. The criticism reached an apex in September 2018 when the European Parliament called on the Council to initiate an Article 7(1) TEU procedure against the state of Hungary.⁶ Article 7 of the Treaty on European Union is the final step the EU can take when perceiving a clear risk of serious breach by a Member State of the fundamental values of the European Union.⁷

¹ Rydliński, Bartosz M. “Viktor Orbán – First among illiberals? Hungarian and Polish steps towards populist democracy.” *Online Journal Modelling the New Europe* 6 (2018): 95-107, DOI: 10.24193/OJMNE.2018.26.07, p. 96.

² Szente, Zoltán. “Challenging the Basic Values - Problems in the Rule of Law in Hungary and the Failure of the EU to Tackle Them.” In *The enforcement of EU law and values: ensuring member states’ compliance*, edited by Dimitry Kochenov and András Jakab, 456-475. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017, p. 459.

³ Ibid. p. 457.

⁴ Rech, Walter. “Some remarks on the EU’s action on the erosion of the rule of law in Poland and Hungary.” *Journal of contemporary European Studies* 26, no. 3 (2018): 334-345, DOI: 10.1080/14782804.2018.1498770, p. 334.

⁵ Füredi, Frank. *Populism and the European Cultural Wars: The Conflicts of Values between Hungary and the EU*. London and New York: Routledge, 2017, p. 1.

⁶ Sargentini, Judith. “Resolution 2017/2131(INL) of September 12, 2018 on a proposal calling on the Council to determine, pursuant to Article 7(1) of the Treaty on European Union, the existence of a clear risk of a serious breach by Hungary of the values on which the Union is founded.” Jul 4, 2018. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2018-0250_EN.pdf (Retrieved 2020-03-12).

⁷ Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union. 2008. OJ C115/13, Article 7. p. 5-6.

The perspectives and arguments of the Hungarian Government on the Article 7 initiation is the primary subject being studied in this thesis, with basis in the Official Legal Arguments of the Hungarian Government and in statements by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán. This study strives to provide important insights into the relationship between Hungary and the European Union, as an understanding of the arguments and perspectives of the Hungarian Government on the alleged violations of the fundamental values of the European Union. To study the perspectives and arguments of Member States on the alleged violations of EU's fundamental values are of importance as to several reasons.

Of lately, much academic attention has been on the perspectives of the European Union on Article 7 and not as much on the perspectives of EU Member States. By vocalizing the perspectives of the Hungarian Government will this thesis contribute to the research field by providing new perspectives to the reasons and arguments behind EU violations. Furthermore, of lately, nationalist and populist waves are expanding throughout Europe more distinct than in a long time. This has come to change the political landscape of the Union as well as the relationship between the EU and several Member States.⁸ By vocalizing the perspectives of the Hungarian Government will this research thus provide an inclusive and more equitable picture on EU's fundamental values, relative to the current development within the Union.

1.1 Aim, Scope and Research Question

On September 11, 2018, the European Parliament called on the Council to initiate an Article 7(1) TEU procedure against the state of Hungary. Since then, the Hungarian Government has repeatedly expressed disagreement and dissatisfaction against the decision. The government has on several occasions further rejected the allegations of the decision and claimed them as unjustified.⁹ On November 12, 2018, two month after the initiation of Article 7 TEU, the Hungarian Government published their official arguments on the alleged violations of

⁸ Laffan, Brigid. "The Future of EU." In *European Union Politics*, edited by Michelle Cini and Nieves Pérez-Solórzano Borragán, 380-389. 5 ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, p. 381.

⁹ Hungarian Prime Minister's Office. "The official legal arguments of the Hungarian government in the Article 7 procedure in the European Council refuting the accusations of the Sargentini report." 12 Nov. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/download/3/61/81000/The%20official%20legal%20arguments%20of%20the%20Hungarian%20government%20in%20the%20Article%207%20procedure%20in%20the%20European%20Council%20refuting%20the%20accusations%20of%20the%20Sargentini-report.pdf#!DocumentBrowse>, 1-131. (Retrieved 2020-02-04), p. 1.

Hungary on the fundamental values of the EU, and on the initiation of Article 7 TEU.

By analyzing the arguments of the Hungarian Government as to the European Parliament's initiation of the Article 7 procedure against Hungary, this research aims to; (1) highlight the different arguments by which the Hungarian Government argues against the violations and alleged breach of the fundamental values of the European Union; (2) analyze how narratives of national identity, nationalism and populism are constructed and expressed in the arguments by the Hungarian Government; and (3) examine how these arguments and narratives distinguish over different contexts. The final aim is to contribute to the research field by applying a humanist approach to the research topic. To arrive at these aims, the thesis will be guided by the following research questions:

- 1) How and based on what arguments does the Hungarian Government argue against the European Parliament's initiation of the Article 7 TEU procedure against Hungary?
- 2) How and to what extent are the concepts of national identity, nationalism and populism constructed in the arguments of the Hungarian Government?

This is carried out by a combined narrative analysis of data collected from the Official Legal Arguments of the Hungarian Government as well as from statements by the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán. The combined narrative analysis comprises Martha S. Feldman, Kaj Sköldbberg, Ruth Nicole Brown and Debra Horner's rhetorical approach to narrative analysis and William Labov's six-part model. The theoretical framework stems from three theories on national identity, nationalism and populism.

1.2 Article 7 of the Treaty on European Union

The European Union is founded upon the values situated in Art. 2 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), where the following is stated: "The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities."¹⁰ Article 7 is the final and strongest action the EU can take when perceiving a "clear risk of serious breach by a Member

¹⁰ Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union. 2008. OJ C115/13, Article 2. p. 3.

State of the values referred to in Article 2”.¹¹ While certain rights can be suspended by the initiation of Article 7 it does not include tools to expel a Member State from the EU.¹²

Before 2017 Article 7 had never been used. This changed when the European Commission in 2017 found reasonable grounds for that Poland was systematically breaching the Rule of Law and human rights, among other issues. This led the European Commission to activate Article 7 for the first time ever in December 2017.¹³ This decision was not taken out of the blue but occurred after the Commission had tried to mediate the situation for years. Barely one year later, in September 2018, the European Parliament initiated Article 7 against Hungary for similar reasons as for Poland. After the initiation the procedure continues in the Council of the European Union. There it is up to the Council, by unanimous vote, to assess the issue at hand and to determine if the initiation of Article 7 TEU is necessary.¹⁴

1.3 Primary Sources

The primary sources of this thesis are compiled into two categories: The Official Legal Arguments of the Hungarian Government and Statements by the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán. Before further presenting the primary sources of the thesis, will this part begin with a contextual background briefly explaining the so-called Sargentini Report.

1.3.1 Contextual Background - The Sargentini Report

To be able to initiate an Article 7 procedure against Hungary, the European Parliament first needed to conduct a report investigating the situation in Hungary and which proved that the values on which the EU is founded upon are being seriously breached. The report was prepared by the Dutch MEP Judith Sargentini (GreenLeft) and introduced on the 4th of July 2018. The report came to be known as the “Sargentini Report”.¹⁵ The Sargentini Report consists of some of the most important and palpable violations of the fundamental values of

¹¹ Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union. 2008. OJ C115/13, Article 7. p. 5-6.

¹² European Commission. ”Rule of Law Framework.” https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/upholding-rule-law/rule-law/rule-law-framework_en (Retrieved 2020-03-15).

¹³ Closa, Carlos. “The politics of guarding the Treaties: Commission scrutiny of rule of law compliance.” *Journal of European Public Policy* 26, no. 5 (2019): 696-716, DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2018.1477822, p. 696.

¹⁴ Hungarian Prime Minister’s Office, “The official legal arguments of the Hungarian government”, p. 1.

¹⁵ Sargentini, “Resolution 2017/2131(INL) of September 12, 2018”.

the European Union by the Hungarian state. The results obtained in the Report are based on court decisions from regional and international courts, reports by EU and UN bodies and institutions, statements from local and international NGOs as well as multiple interviews conducted within the field.¹⁶ The report includes concerns and allegations against Hungary within 12 different areas.¹⁷ The European Parliament voted to adopt the Sargentini Report on 11 September 2018, thus condemning the anti-democratic turn in Hungary.

1.3.2 The Official Legal Arguments of the Hungarian Government

Since the adoption of the Sargentini Report the procedure continues in the Council of the European Union where it is up to the Council to assess the issue and to determine if an initiation of Article 7 is necessary. In this phase and to respond to the EP on the adoption of the Sargentini Report, EU Member States had to present their own position on whether they perceived a clear risk of a serious breach by Hungary on the values of the European Union.¹⁸ On 12 November 2018, two month after the adoption of the Sargentini Report, the Hungarian Prime Minister's Office published a document comprising the official position of the Hungarian Government on whether they perceived a clear risk of serious breach by Hungary, and in which the government argue against the accusations of the Report. It is this complex document that forms the first and most comprehensive part of the empirical material.

The document is divided into two parts: (I.) Introduction and (II.) Annex to the Information Note. The introduction makes up page 1-6 of the document and explains the background to the report, as well as the Hungarian Government's general position on the initiation of Article 7 TEU. The Annex to the Information Note makes up page 7-131 and consists of detailed comments by the Hungarian Government addressed to the Members of the Council of the European Union. The Annex includes relevant provisions of the Hungarian legislation as well as explanatory notes and facts regarding different questions and accusations. The document is categorized into 12 different sections where each section starts with a review of the criticism and allegations of the European Parliament and follows by the arguments and answers of the

¹⁶ Köves, Nora. "The Sargentini Report- Its background and what it means for Hungary and for the EU." *Henrich Böll Stiftung*. 19 Sep. 2018. <https://www.boell.de/en/2018/09/19/sargentini-report-its-background-and-what-it-means-hungary-and-eu> (Retrieved 2020-02-04).

¹⁷ Sargentini, "Resolution 2017/2131(INL) of September 12, 2018", p. 5.

¹⁸ Hungarian Prime Minister's Office, "The official legal arguments of the Hungarian government", p. 1.

Hungarian Government.¹⁹

1.3.3 Statements by Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán

In order to achieve a broader scope of empirical material will the Official Legal Arguments by the Hungarian Prime Minister's Office be complemented with statements by the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán. The chosen statements were all published on the Hungarian Government's official website in September 2018 and translated by the Hungarian Government. The statements consist of European Parliament debates, international press conferences, plenary debates as well as interviews and speeches by the Prime Minister. To fulfill the aim of the thesis and provide answers to the research questions will this thesis examine lone those statements by Viktor Orbán that were published in direct conjunction with the adoption of the Sargentini Report. The reason behind this narrow time frame has to do with the interest of this thesis in examining the first and most immediate reactions and arguments of Viktor Orbán on the procedure. This narrow time frame could however also count as one of the limitations of this material, relative to the matter of representatively.

This part of the empirical material is delimited to solely include statements by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, meaning that statements from neither other politicians nor other political groups will be analyzed. This delimitation is among more motivated by the accessibility of these statements. It is challenging to gain access to interviews, speeches or other statements by Hungarian ministers other than Viktor Orbán, that these interviews would be available in English are even more unlikely. Instead are the statements by Viktor Orbán, together with the document by the Hungarian Prime Minister's Office in this thesis interpreted as representative of the Hungarian Government.

One of the biggest limitations of this empirical material has to do with the language barrier and the fact that several statements were originally held in Hungarian. When a text is being translated there is a risk that the narratives that would appear in the original text will not be visible in the English translation, something that may affect the study and its results. When a text is translated different words, phrases and expressions that are specific to one language may disappear, or are translated incorrectly. However, since the Official Legal Argument by

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 1-2.

the Hungarian Government was originally written and published in English does the language barrier only affect the statements by Viktor Orbán.

According to the authors Molly Andrews, Corinne Squire and Maria Tamboukou there is mainly one crucial difference between oral and written sources relative to narrative analysis. This difference comprises the fact that oral sources often contain doubts and corrections that may be of great significance, but that are removed in written sources.²⁰ Since this thesis only had the possibility to analyze the transcribed version of the statements have elements such as melody, tone, pauses and laughter, as well as any visual elements as eye movements, facial expressions and gestures not been possible to examine. However, gestures and expressions are often difficult to define and distinguish between different social and cultural situations.²¹

The advantage of analyzing press conferences and interviews in addition to more “formal” sources has to do with the fact that expressions and statements conducted during interviews and press conferences are often more spontaneous and straight-forward, nor does the speaker always follows a script. This could be compared with more formal documents, in which the language often is more proper and where every word is carefully considered. This implies that additional nuances to a particular matter may be captured when analyzing interviews or other oral sources. This contributes to yet an important factor behind complementing the empirical material with statements by Viktor Orbán.

1.4 Secondary Sources

The secondary sources of this research have been compiled into three different categories. The first category includes books, articles and other publications on the history and historical development of Hungary and East-Central Europe. Within this category have books such as: *Developments in Central and East European Politics* by Stephen White, Paul G. Lewis and Judy Bratt; *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* by Larry Wolf; and *The Enforcement of EU Law and Values: Ensuring*

²⁰ Boréus, Kristina and Bergström, Göran. *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. 4 ed. Studentlitteratur AB, 2018, p. 24.

²¹ Andrews, Molly; Squire, Corinne and Tamboukou, Maria. “Introduction: What Is Narrative Research?” In *Doing Narrative Research*, edited by Molly Andrews; Corinne Squire and Maria Tamboukou, 1-21. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2008, p. 12-13.

Member States' Compliance by Dimitry Kochenov and András Jakab been of great use as to grasp an understanding of the Hungarian historical past as well as the political shift after the Hungarian election in 2010.

The second category includes firsthand material from different institutions of the European Union, as well as EU-legislation comprising the Article 7 procedure, the Treaty on European Union as well as the Rule of Law framework of the European Commission. This category additionally includes books and other publications on the politics and establishment of the European Union, books such as the *European Union Politics*.²² The third and final category comprises books and research articles on nationalism, national identity and populism, all in line with the theoretical framework of the thesis.

1.5 Disposition of Research

The introductory chapter of this thesis has focused on the topic, aim, research questions and the primary and secondary sources of this thesis. Following chapter outlines and summarizes existing research and literature on this particular field. Thereafter, chapter three outlines the methodological and theoretical framework. The methodological framework consists of a joint narrative analysis combining Martha S. Feldman, Kaj Sköldbberg, Ruth Nicole Brown and Debra Horner's rhetorical approach to narrative analysis with William Labov's six-part model. The theoretical framework stems from theories on national identity, nationalism and populism and provides several viewpoints for understanding these concepts.

After an overview of the methodological and theoretical framework will this thesis begin to examine the arguments of the Hungarian Government and Viktor Orbán on the Article 7 TEU procedure. In chapter four, the main findings from this examination are presented. This follows by the fifth chapter, in which the main findings of the research are analyzed through the application of the theoretical frameworks of national identity, nationalism and populism. Finally, chapter six follows the analysis. In this chapter the main conclusions of the research are presented, followed by a discussion on the outcome of the thesis.

²² Cini, Michelle and Pérez-Solórzano Borragán, Nieves. *European Union Politics*. 5 ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

2 Existing Research

The perspectives and arguments of EU Member States on the violations of the fundamental values of the European Union is a research field that has received limited academic attention. Rather, much academic attention comprises the debate on the EU's Rule of Law framework, including Article 7 TEU and on the shortcomings that is this "nuclear option".²³ Accordingly, great amount of research has focused on the perspectives of the EU and not as much on the perspectives of Member States. Existing research has additionally examined how the EU acts and what consequences they implement in the event of infringement of EU law.

This thesis aims to fill that gap by analyzing the arguments of the Hungarian Government on the alleged violations of the fundamental values of the EU. By vocalizing the perspective of the Hungarian Government this thesis strives to contribute to the research field by providing a more inclusive picture regarding possible violations of EU's fundamental values, as well as on the Article 7 procedure. This research further strives to provide an important insight into the relation between the European Union and Hungary. By taking a step into this relatively unexplored research field the hopes are to contribute to the research field by providing new perspectives to the reasons and motivations behind EU violations. As to the theoretical approach, much existing research in this field has rooted from a political science approach. This thesis aims to contribute to the field by applying a humanist approach to this topic.

One of the explanations behind the limited amount of research in this field has arguable to do with the novelty of the area. Article 7 TEU was first included in the treaties of the EU in May 1999. Since then, the initiation of Article 7 has only occurred twice, 2017 against Poland and 2018 against Hungary. In regards to the fact that the Article 7 procedure was initiated first in 2018 has there been limited time for scholars to analyze and examine the arguments and motivations of Poland and Hungary behind those alleged violations.

Walter Rech, Professor and Researcher at University of Helsinki, Finland, has written about EU's action on the erosion of the Rule of Law, looking at the cases of Hungary and Poland. Rech emphasizes in his research how the political situation in Hungary and Poland has

²³ Rech, "Some remarks on the EU's action on the erosion of the rule of law in Poland and Hungary", p. 335.

contributed to a growing perception that the common values of the EU are being radically changed and sometimes even dismantled. The aim of the article is to provide a more accurate picture on the debate on liberal democracy and the Rule of Law framework of the EU, this by vocalizing the critical views of mainstream narratives. In the article Rech draws attention to a matter that has far been neglected in mainstream debates on Poland and Hungary, that is the question of the ambivalence of Rule of Law and democracy narratives as deployed by EU institution.²⁴ According to Rech it is the failure by European institutions to recognize its ambiguities that make liberal democratic discourses an easy target vulnerable to the rhetorical attacks by populist parties.²⁵ This thesis draws relevant perspectives from Rech's research as to the importance to vocalize the critical narratives on EU's Rule of Law framework.

Oliver Mader, Professor at King's College in London, England, argues in his research how national identity must not be constructed as means to undermine the application of EU law. Mader stresses how this is of relevance since the enforcement under Article 7 TEU may intervene with the internal matters of Member States. The research aims at relating the discussion about value content and enforcement with the legal function of the EU as a driving force of the European constitutionalisation process. Mader further explores the nature of values and foundational principles of EU law and how these values and foundational principles are interlinked amongst each other, and to what extent EU's legal order requires values homogeneity as a center of legal integration.²⁶ In his research Mader finds that for legal reasons a value crisis affects the entire EU and not only the Member State in question, and therefore calls for answers at the Union level.²⁷

As to the theoretical framework of this thesis, the eminent researchers of Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser and Cas Mudde have written a number of studies and articles on the matter. In their research, Mudde and Kaltwasser analyze, among more, current expressions of populism in Europe and Latin America.²⁸ Even though there exist a great debate about contemporary populism in Europe and Latin America, few cross-regional researches exist on this topic, a

²⁴ Ibid. p. 335.

²⁵ Ibid. p. 334.

²⁶ Mader, Oliver. "Enforcement of EU Values as a Political Endeavour: Constitutional Pluralism and Value Homogeneity in Times of Persistent Challenges to the Rule of Law." *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law* 11, no. 1 (2019): 133-170, DOI: 10.1007/s40803-018-00083-x, p. 133-135.

²⁷ Ibid. p. 165.

²⁸ Mudde, Cas and Kaltwasser, Cristóbal Rovira. "Exclusionary vs. Inclusionary Populism: Comparing Contemporary Europe and Latin America." *Government and Opposition* 48, no. 2 (2013):147-174, p. 147.

gap that Mudde and Kaltwasser aim to fill. The theoretical framework on populism applied by the authors in their research is similar to the populist framework of this thesis, elaborated further under the heading of *3.1 Theory*. The article of Mudde and Kaltwasser has thus been of great use to this research, as to the comparison of how other researchers have applied the populist framework.

In his article, Dr. Michael Toomey, Professor in Politics and International Relations at University of Reading, England, studies the relationship between nationalistic discourses and Hungary's illiberal turn from 2010 until 2015.²⁹ According to Toomey, political actors such as Viktor Orbán seemingly construct and manipulate historical myths for their own political purposes. In addition to allowing Orbán to create a shield against criticism from domestic and international actors, Toomey argues that interpretations of Hungarian history in narrative allow Orbán to create an exclusionary image of the Hungarian nationalism. This serves to legitimize Fidesz while at the same time denying other political parties the opportunity to stake claims to being "true representatives" of the Hungarian people.³⁰ While Toomey in his article examines how Viktor Orbán by the use of narratives surrounding Hungarian history creates an image of the Hungarian nationalism, will this thesis progress as to include other nationalist and populist concepts to the theoretical framework and thus to the analysis.

The Hungarian Political Scientist Gergely Egedy examines in his research the rise of conservatism in the post-communist Hungary. The article focuses on political conservatism in Hungary, with the aim of analyzing the dimensions of Hungarian conservatism, outlining its major strategies since 1990. According to Egedy, Hungarian conservatism can be classified either as patrician; which is center-right and identifies with the traditions of Western Europe, or mobilizing; which is the right-wing populism prevalent in Hungary. The evolution of three Hungarian parties and their ideological platforms are further examined in the article.³¹ Unlike the research conducted in this thesis, focuses Egedy more on the historical background of political conservatism and not as much on current nationalist narratives. Egedy's research has however been important to this thesis as to the historical background of Hungarian politics.

²⁹ Toomey, Michael. "History, Nationalism and Democracy: Myth and Narrative in Viktor Orbán's 'Illiberal Hungary'." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Central & East European Politics & International Relations* 26, no. 1 (2018): 87-108, DOI: 10.1177/2336825x1802600110, p. 87.

³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 101.

³¹ Egedy, Gergely. "Political Conservatism in Post-Communist Hungary." *Problems of Post-Communism* 56, no. 3 (2009): 42-53, DOI: 10.2753/PPC1075-8216560304, p. 42.

The aim of the research by Professor Bartosz M. Rydliński is to examine what Rydliński calls the new phenomenon in Central Europe, namely the illiberal shift. Rydliński focuses on the illiberal shift in Hungary and Poland since 1990 and emphasizes the illiberal matrix used by the Fidesz Government in Hungary and by the political party Law and Justice in Poland. According to Rydliński, the politics of Viktor Orbán and the Polish Law and Justice leader Jarosław Kaczyński can be understood to represent a new type of the so-called Visegrad-politics. This politics comprises open reluctance to receive refugees, being blunt critics of the European Union as well as the lack of respect towards fundamental values.³²

In his research, the Romanian Political Scientist Zsolt Enyedi examines how elitism can be integrated into an overall populist appeal by analyzing the ideologies of the Hungarian parties Fidesz and Jobbik.³³ Enyedi emphasizes how both parties exhibit features of illiberal elitism and paternalist populism while at the same time offering diverse responses to the challenges that are often confronted by authoritarian populist movement. In regards to the political parties being studied, Enyedi uncovers the existence of three distinct ideologies: ultra-nationalist; right-wing populism and; meta-nationalist and traditionalist.³⁴ The result of the research shows how several aspects of populism according to Enyedi apply to both parties, but that the demand for popular participation in decision-making and anti-elitism is only partially present. It is finally visualized how both parties support the institutionalization of hierarchical, state-dependent structures and the reduction of the participation of lower strata. As a conclusion, these features are seen to contradict the typical formula of populism and are according to Enyedi better conceived as a subtype of populism - paternalist populism.³⁵

As to the academic research on the Article 7 TEU procedure, the research on this topic is ample. In his article from 2019 the Spanish Professor and Researcher Carlos Closa examines how the European Commission's expectations on eventual compliance can explain its different behavior when dealing with Rule of Law crises in Poland and Hungary.³⁶ The article provides information on the European Commission's responses to Rule of Law violations in Poland and Hungary and draws conclusions regarding the limits of the EU enforcement

³² Rydliński, "Viktor Orbán – First among illiberals?", p. 95.

³³ Enyedi, Zsolt. "Paternalist populism and illiberal elitism in Central Europe." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 21, no. 1 (2016): 9-25, DOI: 10.1080/13569317.2016.1105402, p. 9.

³⁴ Ibid. p. 9.

³⁵ Ibid. p. 21.

³⁶ Closa, "The politics of guarding the Treaties: Commission scrutiny of rule of law compliance", p. 696.

system. According to Closa, one major problem is that the Commission relies primarily on domestic cooperation, something that can encourage governments to comply with the Rule of Law only symbolically or rhetorically.³⁷

Mark Dawson, Professor of European Law at the Hertie School of Governance, Germany and Elise Muir, Professor of European Law at the Maastricht Faculty of Law, the Netherlands, examine in their research the entry of the Orbán government in 2010 and the constitutional reforms that followed, as how the EU addressed the new violations to its legislation by the government. The discussion between the European Commission and Hungarian authorities, and the implications of the indirect pressure by the EU on Hungary regarding Rule of Law violations are further tackled. The authors conclude by manifesting how the situation in Hungary in 2010 illustrates the extent to which EU interventions for the protections of the Rule of Law and other fundamental rights heavily depends on the strengths and scope of a wide range of EU policies. According to the authors, although the EU in recent years has developed a solid fundamental rights mandate, even the most well established fundamental rights policies do not protect EU against domestic threats to democracy and Rule of Law.³⁸

Attila ÁGH, Professor in Political Science at the Budapest Corvinus University, Hungary, examines in his research how the division in the EU between the most developed countries and the East-Central European countries has deepened after the global crisis, something that has been manifested in the violations of the Rule of Law in Poland and Hungary. ÁGH terms the process of confrontation of EU legislation and values as De-Europeanization. In his research, ÁGH further analyzes in historical trajectory of the “Copenhagen Dilemma” and the “Juncker Paradox”, as both by their neglectance have encouraged the ECE autocratic regimes.³⁹ The “legal toolkit” of the EU, that is the infringement procedure and the Article 7 procedure, has not according to ÁGH been effective enough to enforce Rule of Law in ECE, something that the conflicts with Hungary and Poland have demonstrated. In order to achieve a EU without division between the most developed countries and the ECE countries, the EU needs to redesign its legal toolkit as part of its new integration strategy and the ECE have to

³⁷ Ibid. p. 711.

³⁸ Dawson, Mark and Muir, Elise. “Hungary and the *Indirect* Protection of the EU Fundamental Rights and the Rule of Law.” *German Law Journal* 14, no. 10 (2013): 1959-1980, p. 1978.

³⁹ ÁGH, Attila. ”Decline of Democracy in the Ece and the Core-Periphery Divide: Rule of Law Conflicts of Poland and Hungary with the EU.” *Journal of Comparative Politics* 11, no. 2 (2018): 30-48, p. 30.

overcome the current socio-political crisis have produced these populist regimes.⁴⁰

As to the focus on narratives and meaning-making through language, Adela Danaj, Lecturer in Political Science at European University of Tirana, Albania, Kornélia Lazányi, Dean and Professor in Business at Óbuda University, Hungary, and Svitlana Bilan, part of the Center of Sociological Research in Poland, examine how the political discourse in Hungary has changed over time and stress how populist rhetoric is widely present in the country's political discourse. By observing the political discourse in Hungary the study aims to examine what prevails in the messages that Prime Minister Viktor Orbán conveys to the Hungarian people. Through a thematic analysis the purpose is further to identify what concepts relative to the European Union gets more attention at the institutional level. In the article the researchers emphasize how the opposing of EU-policies by populist parties has contributed to mistrust in European institutions at local level.⁴¹ This study has been fruitful to this thesis as to its examination of the narratives identified in speeches by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán.

⁴⁰ Ibid. p. 31.

⁴¹ Danaj, Adela; Lazányi, Kornélia and Bilan, Svitlana. "Euro-scepticism and populism in Hungary: The analysis of the prime minister's discourse." *Journal of International Studies* 11, no. 1 (2018): 240-247, DOI: 10.14254/2071-8330.2018/11-1/18, p. 240-242.

3 Theory and Methodology

3.1 Theory

The thesis aims to examine how narratives of national identity, nationalism and populism are constructed in the arguments by the Hungarian Government as means of arguing against the alleged violations of EU's fundamental values, as demonstrated by the initiation of Article 7 TEU. The theoretical framework is divided into three sections. In the first section, National Identity, the concept of national identity as interpreted in this research is defined, followed by its theoretical understanding. In the second section, Theories of Nationalism, nationalism is briefly defined followed by three orientations for understanding nationalism. Finally, in the third part, Populism, the theoretical framework of Paul Taggart and Cas Mudde is presented.

The theoretical framework of national identity, nationalism and populism were chosen as to the presumption of existing research assessing that nationalism and populism constitutes the main ideologies on which the Orbán Government bases much of its politics, and which later gives rise to the Hungarian national identity. To this background, nationalist and populist narratives are expected to make up a large part of the arguments of the Hungarian Government. The aim with the theoretical framework is thus not to identify *if* narratives of national identity, nationalism and populism are included in the arguments of the Hungarian Government, but rather to provide a framework for identifying how and to what extent these narratives are constructed and expressed in the arguments of the Hungarian Government.

3.1.1 National Identity

According to the French Philosopher Étienne Balibar, identity, in particular a collective one is not something that is self-defined in itself, meaning that there exists no directly given identities.⁴² Rather, it is to be understood as a socially constructed identification in which the group is constantly identified relative to what is perceived as “the others”.⁴³ In other words,

⁴² Balibar, Étienne. *Politics and the Other Scene*. London & New York: Verso, 2002, p. 57.

⁴³ Stepanoska, Milena Apostolovska and Tasev, Hristina Runceva. “National Identity vs. European Identity: Partners or Rivals.” *Iustinianus Primus Law Review* 8, no. 2 (2017): 1-7, p. 1.

certain identification with or in contrast to a collective is required to be able to speak of a collective identity. National identity cannot thus be understood solely on the basis of one's own identification but is something that arises from specific situations and by external observers. The national identity defines who we are, both culturally and politically, and is constructed in contrast to those who we perceive that we are not, i.e. the cultural and political entities to which we do not belong. Who "the others" constitute depends on what is being examined and in what context.⁴⁴

According to the British historical sociologist Anthony D. Smith, the term "national identity" additionally implies some sense of political affiliation. The political community is comprised of common institutions and a code of rights and duties for all members living in the certain territory to which they identify with. The national identity therefore also includes some sense of affiliation with the laws and institutions of that territory. As the national identity may also include a political dimension, can "the others" further be a distinction between political groups or institutions where ideological differences can become an identification of the "national". Major societal and political changes, both locally and globally, can also lead to a changed attitude of "the others" and thus also change which "the others" are perceived as.⁴⁵

Klára Vlachová and Blanka Řeháková describe national identity as one of the most important types of collective identities in a world where the nation-state constitutes the basic cultural and political entity of people in general, thus various challenges that the nation faces have major implications for the overall national identity in that current nation.⁴⁶ A common narrative in the framework of national identity is further, according to the British author John Berger to portray one's own group or the nation as virtuous, morally exemplary and in a sacrificial position. Berger further emphasizes that through narratives, one aims to distinguish one's own group in a positive light and consequently to point out those rights that have been deprived of this group.⁴⁷ The multidimensional characteristic of the national identity is lastly its enduring force in modern life and politics that successfully connect the national identity

⁴⁴ Vlachová, Klára and Řeháková, Blanka. "Identity of non-self-evident nation: Czech national identity after the break-up of Czechoslovakia and before accession to the European Union." *Nations and Nationalism* 15, no. 2 (2009): 254-279, ASEN/Blackwell Publishing Ltd, p. 254.

⁴⁵ Stepanoska and Tasev, "National Identity vs. European Identity: Partners or Rivals", p. 1.

⁴⁶ Vlachová and Řeháková, "Identity of non-self-evident nation", p. 254.

⁴⁷ Berger, John. *About Looking*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009, p. 49.

with other powerful ideologies and movement's, such as nationalism and populism.⁴⁸

3.1.2 Theories of Nationalism

The concept on nationalism is a very broad, and can be describe both as an ideological view and as a political movement. Today nationalism is most often referred to as an ideology, the content of which is the idea of the nation's unique historical mission, the justification behind its emergence, its territorial anchoring, and its unrivalled cultural status. Nationalism as an ideology is accordingly a moral or normative principle, which puts forward ideas about what reality "should be like". It is an ideology that promotes the interest of a particular nation with the aim of gaining and maintaining the nation's self-governance over the certain territory for which the political elite believes to legitimately claim, or the so-called homeland.⁴⁹ As to existing research nationalism can be understood as one of the ideologies on which the Hungarian Government bases much of its politics and which later give rise to the Hungarian national identity. Nationalism is thus expected to make up a great part of the narratives surrounding Hungary's national identity. The theories of nationalism can be divided into three different orientations: primordialism, modernism and ethnosymbolism.⁵⁰

3.1.2.1 Primordialism

Primordialism is based on the belief that the nation is a biological and natural part of the human being and that nations have existed from time immemorial. It stresses the deep historical and cultural roots of nations.⁵¹ One's nationality is accordingly inherent and just as natural and biological as speech, sight or smell.⁵² The creation of the national identity based on primordial arguments make the distinction between one's own nation and "the other" even more distinct, this since there not only exists symbolic boundaries between the state and "the others" but also purely biological boundaries. The Turkish Political Scientist Umut Özkirimil

⁴⁸ Stepanoska and Tasev, "National Identity vs. European Identity: Partners or Rivals", p. 3.

⁴⁹ Vlachová and Řeháková, "Identity of non-self-evident nation", p. 257.

⁵⁰ Özkirimli, Umut. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, 2 ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, p. 7.

⁵¹ Coakley, John. "'Primordialism' in nationalism studies: theory or ideology?" *Nations and Nationalism* 24, no. 2 (2018): 327-347, DOI: 10.1111/nana.12349, p. 327.

⁵² Özkirimli, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, p. 49.

identifies four approaches of primordialism: the “nationalist”, “sociobiological”, “culturalist” and “perennialist” approach. The common denominator of these approaches is according to Özkirimli their belief in the antiquity and naturalness of nations.⁵³ Primordialists’ further plea to emotional and instinctive restraints as the ultimate explanations for national mobilization. They typically date the origin of the homeland back to remote epochs, treating them as emotional given.⁵⁴

The primordial view has however been disapproved by many recent studies on nationalism, deeming it as both outdated and as old-fashioned. The naturalness and antiquity of nations is rather describes as an argument used by nationalists to assert the right to a particular territory or to legitimate certain governmental actions.⁵⁵ According to the Spanish Researcher Daniele Conversi, nationalist leaders often have the power, tools and legally enforceable apparatus to impose the primordialist idea as the lone acceptable one.⁵⁶ One of the main criticisms of primordialism concerns the tendencies to take ethnic and national identities as given and as facts of nature.⁵⁷ This approach has thus been undermined in recent years, stressing the social constructed nature of identities and ethnic.⁵⁸

3.1.2.2 Modernism

Modernism emerged as a reaction to primordialism and to the older generations who saw nations as a natural feature of human society. Modernism arose in the 1960s with the beliefs that nations are inherent to the modern world and the revolution of modernity. For modernists, both the nation and nationalism are products of modern phenomenon such as capitalism, urbanization and industrialization. Modernists do not simply mean that nations and nationalism are historically novel phenomenon; they also claim that nationalism is a recent social phenomenon that needs the socio-economic structures of modern society to exist. According to modernism, nationalism is seen as a single-political doctrine, crucial for

⁵³ Ibid. p. 50.

⁵⁴ Leoussi, Athena S. and Grosby, Steven. *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture and Ethnicity in the Formation of Nations*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2007, p.15.

⁵⁵ Özkirimli, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, p. 49.

⁵⁶ Leoussi and Grosby, *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture and Ethnicity in the Formation of Nations*, p. 15.

⁵⁷ Özkirimli, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, p. 60.

⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 61.

the formation of nation states. There exist several directions of modernism, all of which has the belief in the modernity of the nation and nationalism as the common denominator.⁵⁹

Researchers focusing on political transformation, such as the growing roles of elites and their power struggles as well as the rise of the modern bureaucratic nation, have advocated one orientation of modernism trying to explain nationalism. According to this orientation, the premise of modernism is that the nation is a construct and that nationalism is the ideology that creates or strengthens this construct. John Breuilly, one of the scholars who espoused the political transformation approach refers to nationalism as “political movements seeking or exercising state power and justifying such actions with nationalist arguments.”⁶⁰ A nationalist argument, by turn, is according to Breuilly built on three assertions: (1) there exists a nation with an explicit and peculiar character; (2) the interests and values of this nation take priority over all other interests and values, and; (3) the nation must be as independent as possible.⁶¹ Modernism could thus, as asserted by Özkirimli, be seen as an approach inwrought by the common denominator of the modernity of the nation, as of the view on the nation as an instrumental construct which has been used in order to gain influence or power, either in the reinforcement of pre-existing collective identities, or in the creation of new ones.⁶²

3.1.2.3 Ethnosymbolism

In line with the political transformation approach, political leaders needs certain tools to be able to mobilize the people by pointing at specific traits, otherwise it may be difficult to achieve the success that is being sought. How can one define the nation and how can a distinction between “us” and “the others” be made? Ethnosymbolism may be the answer to these questions. The essence of ethnosymbolism is the importance it attaches to symbols that may bind a nation and thus serve as an identification of the nation. Ethnosymbolism stresses the important role of, by the elites selected, memories, symbols, values, traditions, heroes and ancestors in the formation and persistence of the modern nation state. It further puts great importance to the attachment to the claimed territory and the homeland in the formation and

⁵⁹ Ibid. p. 72.

⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 83.

⁶¹ Ibid. p. 83-84.

⁶² Ibid. p. 82.

persistence of the national identity.⁶³

According to ethnosymbolist theories, members of the nation are those who have been living for generations on a particular piece of territory and who have shared certain customs, habits and culture since childhood.⁶⁴ The territory of the homeland is however not located anywhere. It must be the “historical home” of the particular nation, a home where over several generations have lived. The homeland thus becomes a repository for historical memories, heritages and associations.⁶⁵ Ethnosymbolists are thus according to Özkirimil all guided by the common reverence for the past. For them, the emergence of contemporary nations cannot be understood without taking pre-existing ethnic ancestors into account, the lack of which is likely to generate a serious obstacle to “nation-building”.⁶⁶

Nationalism, in this regard, also involves the pursuit of symbolic goals such as education in the national language, having a TV channel in one’s own language as well as the protections of ancient traditions and sacred sites. Özkirimil emphasizes how modernist and primordialist theories of nationalism fail to illuminate these issues, as they are unable to comprehend the emotional power of the collective memory of a nation.⁶⁷

3.1.3 Populism

The theoretical framework has so far illustrated how we can understand national identity and nationalism from several different perspectives. Although primordialism, modernism and ethnosymbolism provide the narrator with rhetorical arguments, additional tools is needed in order to mobilize the people around the idea of nationalism. In their research, Paul Taggart and Andrea LP Pirro reflect what they perceive to be a wider trend in the study of populism, namely to move toward an ideological approach and within that approach adapt Dutch Political Scientist, Cas Mudde’s, definition of populism. The advantage of the approach by Mudde is that it moves towards a more detailed and circumscribes definition of populism.⁶⁸ As in the research of Taggart and Pirro, will this thesis also derive from Mudde’s definition

⁶³ Ibid. p. 143.

⁶⁴ Vlachová and Řeháková, “Identity of non-self-evident nation”, p. 255.

⁶⁵ Stepanoska and Tasev, “National Identity vs. European Identity: Partners or Rivals”, p. 2.

⁶⁶ Özkirimli, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, p. 148.

⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 143.

⁶⁸ Pirro, Andrea LP and Taggart, Paul. “The populist politics of Euroscepticism in times of crisis: A framework for analysis.” *Politics* 38, no. 3 (2018): 253–262, DOI: 10.177/0263395718770579, p. 255.

of populism, which states:

An ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite’, and which argues that politics should be an expression of the *volonté générale* (general will) of the people.⁶⁹

Populism as a political and ideological concept can be based on the definition by Mudde be summed up as various actors’ attempts to argue what “the pure people” mean to some form of governing elite or to political opponents. As asserted by Taggart and Pirro, the populist ideology divides society into two homogeneous groups: the “real people” versus the “corrupt elite”. Mudde’s definition is in line with multiple researchers of the “ideational” approach; meaning that they assume that populism most importantly is a set of ideas. The concept of populism is thus not only (but yet an important part) about attacking “the elite” and defending the interest of “the pure, the common people”. Populism is, as asserted by Mudde also about the ideas that all individuals of a certain community are able to unify their wills with the purpose of proclaiming popular sovereignty as the lone legitimate source of political power.⁷⁰

With basis in Mudde’s definition, Taggart and Pirro identifies four elements of populism: (1) the hostility towards elites and a rejection of the ‘establishment’ in general; (2) the valorization of the people that is associated with the importance of the state and of popular sovereignty; (3) the binary nature of the opposition between the people and the elites; (4) the general rejection of politics which is manifested in the idea that the general will of the people should be represented in politics and by implication, the charge that it currently is not.⁷¹

Exactly who make up “the people” and “the corrupt elite” is nothing that is set in stone. With an offspring from previous research “the elites” are however in this thesis interpreted as the European Union, while “the people” is regarded as the Hungarian citizens. Since the Hungarian Government multiple times has been identified and described as populist is this thesis not interested in examining if the government is or is not populist. It is rather interested in how these populist standpoints and the opposition between “the people” and “the elites” is constructed and expressed in the narratives of the Hungarian Government.

⁶⁹ Mudde and Kaltwasser, “Exclusionary vs. Inclusionary Populism: Comparing Contemporary Europe and Latin America”, p. 149-150.

⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 150-151.

⁷¹ Pirro and Taggart, “The populist politics of Euroscepticism in times of crisis”, p. 255-256.

3.2 Methodology: Narrative Analysis

In order to examine the arguments of the Hungarian Government on the alleged violations of EU's fundamental values will this thesis combine two approaches to the narrative analysis. The first approach derives from Martha S. Feldman, Kaj Sköldbberg, Ruth Nicole Brown and Debra Horner's (hereinafter: Feldman et al.) rhetorical approach to narrative analysis⁷², while the second approach is based on William Labov's six-part model.⁷³

The narrative analysis as methodological approach is relevant for this research due to several reasons. First of, narratives are a useful source of data as to the fact that individuals often make sense of the world they live in and their places in that world through narrative form. By telling their own story people communicate their ideas and present their understanding of both social and political relations. Further, through the events that the particular narrative includes, emphasizes and excludes, the narrator not only illustrates his version of the action but also provides an interpretation or evaluative commentary on that particular action.⁷⁴

Second, narratives and especially nationalist narratives have long been assumed created in order to give meaning to particular groups. In addition, narratives have been seen as political in how they affect our positions and our views on politics. Narratives are commonly used by nationalist politicians to assert the right to a specific area. In these cases, narratives are used to indicate a common origin or to distinguish one's own nation from others and accordingly define who belongs to a particular group of people, as emphasized within the theoretical framework. Narratives are in other words used as an approach among nationalist to legitimize certain actions and to strengthen the national identity. Yet, it is also important to be privy to the limitations of the narrative analysis. One of the greater limitations of the analysis is the potential difficulty in identifying what is and what is not a narrative and accordingly the consequences this entails for the research. Narrative approaches are further often subjective, meaning that different researchers may interpret and understand narratives in different ways.

⁷² Feldman, Martha S.; Sköldbberg, Kaj; Brown, Ruth Nicole and Horner, Debra. "Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14, no. 2 (2004): 147-170.

⁷³ Labov, William and Waletzky, Joshua. "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience." In *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts: Proceedings of the 1966 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*, edited by June Helm, 12-44. Seattle/London: University of Washington Press, 1967, p. 12-44.

⁷⁴ Feldman, et al., "Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis", p. 148.

3.2.2 Feldman's Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis

An important reason for employing the rhetorical approach to narrative analysis to this research is given the fact that narratives of national identity, nationalism and populism are continually produced through rhetoric.⁷⁵ Martha S. Feldman, Kaj Sköldberg, Ruth Nicole Brown and Debra Horner's rhetorical approach to narrative analysis is an approach that surfaces underlying logics and assumptions implicit in a story and functions as a methodical tool allowing the researcher to explore unstated and hidden features.⁷⁶ To fully grasp how narratives of nationalism, national identity and populism are constructed in the arguments by the Hungarian Government it is thus necessary to include the rhetorical approach to the methodological framework. Feldman's et al. rhetorical approach is particularly useful in this thesis as to its ability to reveal implicit and underlying narratives in texts.⁷⁷ Three concepts drawn from the studies of rhetoric and semiotics provide the basis for Feldman's et al. rhetorical approach, that is: **sylogisms, enthymemes, and oppositions.**⁷⁸

Sylogism: A syllogism is a rhetorical device important for identifying the implicit and the hidden meaning within a text. Syllogisms are a convincing form of arguments that often associates with deductive logic. It consists of a major and a minor premise that follows by a conclusion. The most common example of a syllogism is the following: "All humans are mortal. Socrates is human. Therefore, Socrates is mortal". Syllogisms are infrequently found within everyday speech, but much more visible in written texts.⁷⁹

Enthymeme: An enthymeme is referred to as an incomplete syllogism and as a common way to use syllogistic rhetoric in everyday speech. The difference between enthymemes and syllogisms is that in the enthymeme the recipient needs to fill in some parts of the syllogism, meaning that the enthymeme takes form of a syllogism where one part is missing. Usually, the missing part is the major premise, but could also be the minor premise or even the conclusion. D.G. Ellis used the following syllogism to demonstrate the use of enthymemes in

⁷⁵ Bruner, Lane M. "Rhetorical Theory and the Critique of National Identity Construction." *National Identities* 7, no. 3 (2005): 309-327, p. 309.

⁷⁶ Feldman, Martha S. and Almquist, Julka. "Analyzing the implicit in stories." In *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*, edited by James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium, 207-228. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2012, p. 208.

⁷⁷ Feldman, et al., "Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis", p. 151.

⁷⁸ Feldman and Almquist, "Analyzing the implicit in stories", p. 209.

⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 210.

everyday speech: “Democrats are liberals; my opponent is a democrat; therefore, my opponent is a liberal” (syllogism).⁸⁰ Expressed as an enthymeme the statement could have been as follow: “My opponent is a democrat and therefore a liberal.” This leaves it to the recipient to fill in the missing premise about the link between democrats and liberals.⁸¹

There are several good reasons to avoid syllogisms in everyday speech. The most obvious reason includes persuasion. According to the researchers, engaging the listener in completing the argument makes the argument more convincing. This means that if the recipient delivers one of the premises himself (enthymeme), then he is more likely to believe it. This is especially important in cases where the premise is either questionable or controversial.⁸²

Opposition: The final method for revealing underlying structures and the implicit in stories is to put attention to opposites in narrative. By using opposites the narrator can create a sense of what is right about a specific issue without talking about it, only by talking about what is wrong with the opposite. This means that elements of a story frequently have meaning based on what they implicitly stand in contrast with, in other words, what they are not. For example, a story of a good action might begin with a story of what constitutes a bad action. Trying to identify oppositions thus allows the researcher to uncover the meaning of key elements of the particular discourse; this by analyzing what the narrator implies is its opposite.⁸³

3.2.3 Labov’s Six-Part Model

As presented in previous section, Feldman’s et al. rhetorical approach highlights the underlying rhetoric and implicit meaning-making of a particular text. To gain a deeper understanding and to further capture the arguments of the Hungarian Government, will this thesis implement William Labov’s six-part model to the methodological framework. William Labov's narrative analysis provides the researcher with a method for performing a structural analysis of stories. It assumes that stories and narratives can be extracted and analyzed into numbered clauses. Each clause can then apply an element in Labov's six-part model.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Feldman, et al., “Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis”, p. 152.

⁸¹ Ibid. p. 152.

⁸² Feldman and Almquist, “Analyzing the implicit in stories”, p. 210.

⁸³ Feldman, et al., “Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis”, p. 151-155.

⁸⁴ Patterson, Wendy. “Narratives of Events: Labovian Narrative Analysis and its Limitations.” In *Doing*

Labov's six-part model originally consists of the following elements: abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, result and coda.⁸⁵ This thesis will however only include abstract, complicating action, evaluation and result to the methodological framework. The reason behind this delimitation has to do with the aim and research questions of the thesis, as well as the limitation of using Labov's model on governmental documents. The elements not included to the model of this thesis - orientation and coda - are both elements that focus on time, the location, the situation and the participants. It is consequently irrelevant for this thesis to examine these elements due to the fact that the main empirical material consists of a document by the Hungarian Prime Ministers Office, and not stories *per se*.

As to the categorization of these clauses Labov recommends the so-called "question method". This method is based on the idea that narratives can be understood as a series of answers to the underlying questions which all narratives address. The elements included in this thesis thus function to answer the following questions:

1. Abstract - what is the story about?
2. Complicating action - what happened then?
3. Evaluation - so what?
4. Results - what finally happened?

Abstract: Depending on the context in which the particular story is told, narrators may or may not provide a summary of the story to come. The abstract, if present, will be at, or very near, the beginning of the story, this since its main functions are to introduce the story.⁸⁶

Complicating action: The main body of narrative clauses usually comprises a series of events that may be termed as the complicating action.⁸⁷ Complicating action relates to the events within the particular text and typically follows a "then, and then" structure. This structure provides a linear representation of time, and allows different events to be related to one another. Complicating action respond to the question "and then what happened?"⁸⁸ The complicating action is often referred to as the spine of the story, which is the main reason

Narrative Research, edited by Molly Andrews, Corinne Squire and Maria Tamboukou, 23-40. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2008, p. 25.

⁸⁵ Ibid. p. 25.

⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 27.

⁸⁷ Labov and Waletzky, "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience", p. 32.

⁸⁸ Patterson, "Narratives of Events: Labovian Narrative Analysis and its Limitations", p. 28.

behind including this element in the methodological framework of this thesis.⁸⁹

Evaluation: The element of evaluation is describes as ‘the soul of the narrative’, expressing both the point of the story as well as how the narrator wants to be understood.⁹⁰ It is the evaluation element that conveys the story’s crucial point, and thereby justifies its telling.⁹¹ The evaluation reveals the narrator's perspective on the story or specific event being told. It answers to the question “so what?” and conveys the narrator’s experience of the action at the time that it took place as well as his or her feelings about the experience at the time of the telling.⁹²

Labov identifies in his research three types of evaluation: external evaluation, embedded evaluation and evaluative action. Labov describes the *external* evaluation as overt. This means that the narrator stands outside the story and tells the audience what the meaning really is, for example: "It was the worst feeling ever". The *embedded* evaluation rather preserves the dramatic continuity of the particular story, this as the narrator explains how she/he felt at the time: “I am sad” or “I was proud”. Finally, the *evaluative* action focuses on reporting actions that reveal emotions without the use of speech at the time, such as "I burst into tears".⁹³

Labov also classifies the evaluative elements into different types of devices: intensifiers, comparators and explicatives. *Intensifiers* involve expressive phonology, quantifiers and repetition. *Comparators* compare what occurred with what did not occur, but might have done. *Explicatives* explain why something happened, such as “We chose to not follow this recommendation since it opposes the values of the Hungarian state”.⁹⁴

Result: In the result (also referred to as the resolution) the narrator tells the recipient how the story ends.⁹⁵

⁸⁹ Labov and Waletzky, "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience", p. 32.

⁹⁰ Patterson, "Narratives of Events: Labovian Narrative Analysis and its Limitations", p. 29.

⁹¹ Labov and Waletzky, "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience", p. 33.

⁹² Ibid. p. 37.

⁹³ Ibid. p. 37-39.

⁹⁴ Ibid. p. 37-39.

⁹⁵ Ibid. p. 39.

4 Findings

The study is designed in accordance to Labov's six-part model and Feldman's et al. concepts of rhetorical analysis. A total of six elements will be examined from the narratives of each text. Each paragraph will also end with a quotation. The particular quotations retrieved from the texts are based on the statements that specifically highlight the main points of the texts and that best convey the responses of the Hungarian Government and Viktor Orbán on the initiation of Article 7 TEU. The section is divided into a total of 18 headings. The Official Arguments of the Hungarian Government is divided according to the 13 headings of the document, while the statements by Viktor Orbán are presented separately.

4.1 The Official Legal Arguments of the Hungarian Government

1) Introduction⁹⁶

Abstract: In the introductory chapter of the legal arguments of the Hungarian government the government rejects all accusations against Hungary made in the Sargentini Report and claims them as unjustified.

Complicating action: The European Parliament adopted the Sargentini report on September 11, 2018. As a next step the procedure continues in the Council of the European Union. In the end of the introductory chapter the governments invites all Member States to consider several critical guiding principles during the procedure in the Council.

Evaluation: The evaluation point comprises the Hungarian Government and their perception of the Report as legally non-existent and void. According to the government the report contains severe and serious allegations, which the government rejects. The findings lack and deny basic facts; they are misleading and give false interpretation of the situation in Hungary. According to the government, the procedure in the European Parliament was politically motivated and instead of perceptions, emotions and subjective assessments, the government calls on the Council to base its decision on facts, legal provisions and objective analysis.

⁹⁶ Hungarian Prime Minister's Office, "The official legal arguments of the Hungarian government", p. 1-6.

Opposition: unfounded allegations/founded allegations; be assessed against the same criteria /not being assessed against the same criteria; emotions/facts; doing the right thing/doing the wrong thing.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) By making unfounded accusations against a Member State, the confidence between the Member State and the European institution is seriously damaged (explicit). The European Parliament [European institution] is making unfounded accusations against Hungary [Member State] (explicit). Therefore, the confidence between Hungary and the European Parliament is seriously damaged (implicit).

2) Equality between Member States means that the same regulation should be assessed against the same criteria (explicit). The same regulation is not assessed against the same criteria (implicit). Therefore, there is not equality between Member States (implicit).

Result: It is the position of the government that none of the allegations of the report provides serious threat by Hungary of breaching the fundamental values of the EU.

Quote: “[...] in accordance with the free will of the Hungarian people and not as a set of principles which need to be enforced by external powers.”⁹⁷

2) Functioning of the Constitutional and Electoral System⁹⁸

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the alleged violations of the functioning of the constitutional and electoral system in Hungary.

Complicating action: The chapter starts with a paragraph on the Constitution-Making Process in Hungary followed by the Competences of the Hungarian Constitutional Court. This follows by Delineation of Single-Member Constituencies and ends with a paragraph on the National Consultation of “Let’s stop Brussels”.

Evaluation: According to the government, modifying details and reforming or adjusting certain rules do not make the Hungarian regulations contradictory to the values of the EU. Further, the voter turnout in the Hungarian election demonstrates the strong legitimacy of the Hungarian Government and it is therefore misleading to state the “voters” ability to make an informed choice as diminished. The final evaluation point comprises the opinion of the government on the importance to consider the opinions and priorities of each Member State.

⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 4.

⁹⁸ Ibid. p. 11-18.

Opposition: to respect/ to disrespect; benefit/disadvantage; good electoral system/bad electoral system, reform the politics/not reform the politics; halt the transfer of power/continue the transfer of power.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) The constitutional tradition of each Member State should be respected (explicit). Hungary is a Member State (implicit). Therefore, the constitutional traditions of Hungary should be respected (implicit).

2) Reducing the number of members in a parliament establish a more proportional electoral system (explicit). Hungary has reduced the numbers of members in the parliament (explicit). Therefore Hungary has established a more proportional electoral system (implicit).

3) To consider the opinions and priorities of each Member State is the right thing to do (explicit). Hungary considers the opinions and priorities of each Member State (implicit). Therefore, Hungary is doing the right thing (implicit).

Result: In conclusion, the functioning of the Hungarian constitutional system does not raise issues that are in conflict with the fundamental values of the European Union. Therefore it is not justified to mention the functioning of the constitutional and electoral system as a serious breach by Hungary on the values of the EU.

Quote: “Hungary is [...] urging to reform the politics of Brussels in order that we can live in a Europe that leads the world.”⁹⁹

3) Independence of the Judiciary and of other Institutions and the Rights of Judges¹⁰⁰

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the independency of the Hungarian judiciary and of other institutions, as well as the rights of judges.

Complicating action: The chapter starts with a section on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers in Hungary, followed by the New System of Administrative Courts. Thereafter follows a paragraph on the Compulsory Retirement of Judges, followed by the Violation of the Right to a Fair trial. The final paragraph comprises the Hungarian Prosecution Service.

Evaluation: According to the government, claiming that there is a problem with the independence of the Hungarian judiciary has resulted in an enormous damage to Hungary and to the EU, due to a loss of trust. The evaluation point further comprises the perspective of the

⁹⁹ Ibid. p. 17.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. p. 18-34.

government on the accusations as false and misleading and not based on factual data. Last, the Fundamental Law fully ensures the independence of courts and judges in Hungary.

Opposition: factual data/non-factual data; private interests /public interests; subjective/objective; independent judiciary/ dependent judiciary; ordinary courts/administrative courts.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) For a report to be accurate it must be based on factual data (explicit). The report is not based on factual data (explicit). Therefore, the report is not accurate (implicit).

Result: It is not justified to mention the independence of the judiciary in Hungary as a serious breach by Hungary on the values of the EU.

Quote: “[...] any statement of the report on the motivation of judges is inaccurate as not based on factual data”.¹⁰¹

4) Corruption and Conflicts of Interest¹⁰²

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the corruption and conflicts of interest in Hungary.

Complicating action: The chapter starts with a section on Conflicts of Interest of Members of the Hungarian Parliament, followed by Limited Monitoring of Campaign Spending. Thereafter follows a paragraph about the Withdrawal from the Open Government Partnership and a chapter on Public Procurement. The final paragraph comprises Effective Governance and Corruption.

Evaluation: According to the government the chapter of corruption and conflict of interests proves a deeply biased approach of those who drafted it. The evaluation point continues by the government stating that they are committed against corruption and that the Hungarian rules eliminating the conflict of interests are strict and comprehensive even in a European comparison. The current regulatory environment is much more detailed than in other Member States, and therefore corruption as such is a serious allegation against Hungary.

Opposition: hard fact/non-legitimate; right way to assess the situation/wrong way to assess the situation; detailed/non-detailed; strict/lenient; compatible/incompatible; before the accession/after the accession; being responsible/being irresponsible.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

¹⁰¹ Ibid. p. 26.

¹⁰² Ibid. p. 34-42.

1) Taking firm measures to prevent corruption is the responsible thing to do (implicit). Hungary is taking firm measures to prevent corruption (explicit). Therefore, Hungary is responsible (implicit).

2) Legitimate reports are based on hard facts (explicit). The report by the EP on corruption and conflicts of interest is not based on hard facts (explicit). Therefore the report by the EP on corruption and conflicts of interest is not legitimate (implicit).

Result: It is not justified to mention corruption and conflicts of interest as a serious violation by Hungary on the values of the EU.

Quote: “[...] the Hungarian rules on campaign financing are detailed and strict, and are corresponding or even exceeding the equivalent system of some other EU member states.”¹⁰³

5) Privacy and Data Protection¹⁰⁴

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the accusations of privacy and data protection in Hungary.

Complicating action: The chapter consists of two separate headings: Respect for Private Life and Legal Framework on Secret Surveillance for National Security Purposes.

Evaluation: The government emphasizes the reconciliation of data protection and national/public security requirements to be a global challenge all across the EU. The legal norms called into question by the EP in regards of privacy and data protection were in force already at the time of Hungary’s accession to the EU, and cannot therefore be regarded as reasons for launching an Article 7 procedure. Further, the Hungarian laws are integrated and provide the adequate level of protection.

Opposition: competence of the Member States/competence of the EU; current government/previous government; before 2010/after 2010.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) The national security legislation should be under the competences of each Member State (explicit). Hungary is a Member State (implicit). Therefore, the national security legislation should be under the competences of Hungary (implicit).

2) Protecting the national security requires great cautiousness and an integrated approach (explicit). Hungary holds great cautiousness and an integrated approach (implicit). Therefore,

¹⁰³ Ibid. p. 36.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. p. 42-44.

Hungary is protecting the national security (implicit).

Result: The Hungarian regulation is currently being examined to create an institutional framework for an independent verification of the collection of classified document. Therefore it is not justified to mention privacy and data protection as an argument for an initiation of Article 7 against Hungary.

Quote: “[...] the violation found did not result from specific provisions introduced in 2011 but from the background regulation as in force since 1996”.¹⁰⁵

6) Freedom of Expression¹⁰⁶

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the alleged violations against freedom of expression in Hungary.

Complicating action: The chapter begins with the headings of Media Legislation; Elections of the Members of the Media Council and; Freedom of Information. Follows does a paragraph on the Freedom of Media and of Association During the 8th April 2018 Elections in Hungary and finally a section about the Restrictions on Freedom of Opinion and Expression.

Evaluation: According to the government, the accusations on freedom of expression are completely unfounded or based on subjective perceptions. The government emphasizes how Hungary recognizes the importance of access to public information as means to provide for transparency in the government sector and states that the government is committed to promote and protect freedom and pluralism in the media.

Opposition: subjective arguments/objective arguments; to be committed/not to be committed.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Subjective, unfounded arguments equals bad arguments (implicit). The EP uses subjective and unfounded arguments (explicit). Therefore, the EP uses bad arguments (implicit).

Result: According to the government it is not justified to mention freedom of expression as an argument for requisition the Council to determine the existence of a clear risk of serious breach by Hungary on the values of the EU.

Quote: “[...] as a consequence the functioning and publications of privately owned media outlets and the development on the media market fall outside of the competences of the Hungarian Government.”¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. p. 43.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. p. 44-56.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. p. 44.

7) Academic Freedom¹⁰⁸

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the criticism of academic expression in Hungary.

Complicating action: The first part of the chapter comprises National Tertiary Education, followed by a paragraph on Negotiation with Foreign Higher Education Institutions and Disproportionate Restriction of Union and Non-Union Universities.

Evaluation: The government states that academic freedom is not restricted in Hungary and that the Hungarian rules were merely misinterpreted. The right of accreditation of academic freedom should fall exclusively within the competence of the state. Further, several Member States have stricter rules in many aspects than the Hungarian State. As to the decision that no social gender studies programme will be launched in Hungary, the government stresses that the decision in no way restricts the freedom of academic research.

Opposition: Hungary/another home country; Hungarian universities/foreign universities; Hungarian territory/foreign territory.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Every Member State should exclusive have the right of accreditation of academic programmes (explicit). Hungary is a Member State (implicit). Therefore Hungary should have the exclusive right of accreditation of academic programmes (implicit).

Result: The government concludes by declaring that it is non-justified to mention academic freedom in Hungary as a violation against the values of the EU.

Quote: “[...] the academic freedom is not restricted in Hungary, the clarification of the rules of operation of foreign universities in Hungary was merely misinterpreted.”¹⁰⁹

8) Freedom of Religion¹¹⁰

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the accusations of the freedom of religion in Hungary.

Complicating action: The chapter starts with a section about the Right to Freedom of Conscience and the Legal Status of Religion, followed by a section on Unconstitutional Deregistration of Recognized Churches. The last paragraph comprises the Violation of

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. p. 56-60.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid. p. 56.

¹¹⁰ Ibid. p. 60-65.

Freedom of Conscience and Religion.

Evaluation: According to the government the Fundamental Law provides both the individual and collective freedom of religion, confirming the institutionalized recognition and the organization of churches.

Opposition: historical churches/other religious communities; objective reasons/subjective reasons; faith-based communities/non faith-based communities; individual freedom of religion/collective freedom of religion.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Recognizing the rights of religious communities means confirming the basic freedoms of the right of thought, conscience and religion (explicit). Hungary is confirming the basic freedoms of the right of thought, conscience and religion (implicit). Therefore, Hungary is recognizing the rights of religious communities (explicit).

Result: The government consider in non-justified to mention freedom of religion as means for violating the fundamental values of the EU.

Quote: “The Fundamental Law provides both the individual and collective freedom of religion, confirming the institutionalized recognition and organization of churches.”¹¹¹

9) Freedom of Association¹¹²

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the right to freedom of association in Hungary.

Complicating action: The chapter starts with a section about NGOs and follows by a section on Interference with the Freedom of Association and Expression. Thereafter follows a section on the Transparency of Organizations Receiving Support from Abroad. The final section comprises the so-called “Stop-Soros” legislative package.

Evaluation: The government recognizes the vital contribution of NGOs to the promotion of common values in Hungary. NGOs play an important role in shaping public opinion and perception. The government stresses the right to freedom of association to be guaranteed by the Fundamental Law and in line with international standards. On illegal immigration the government states that the most important thing is to respond to the concerns of its citizens. Lastly, illegal immigration is described as a threat to Hungary’s national security.

¹¹¹ Ibid. p. 61.

¹¹² Ibid. p. 65-76.

Opposition: illegal immigration/legal immigration; protect/neglect; Hungarian citizens/human rights defenders; meet challenges/avoid challenges; internal security/external security.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Responding to the growing concerns of our citizens is the right thing to do (implicit). By implementing the legal package of combating illegal immigration we are responding to the growing concerns of our citizens (explicit). Therefore we are doing the right thing (implicit).

2) Illegal immigration can be met by adopting the so-called STOP Soros legislative package (explicit). Hungary has adopted the STOP Soros legislative package (explicit). Therefore, Hungary can meet illegal immigration (implicit).

Result: With basis in the arguments of the government, it is not justifies to mention freedom of association for requisition the Council to determine the existence of a clear risk of serious breach by Hungary on the values of the EU.

Quote: “[...] a growing concern among Hungarian voters, and citizens throughout Europe, that security, both internal and external, must be a top priority.”¹¹³

10. Right to Equal Treatment¹¹⁴

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the alleged violations against the right to equal treatment in Hungary.

Complicating action: The chapter starts with a paragraph on the Uneven Balance Between the Protection of Families and Women’s Rights. Follow does a section about the Protection of Female Victims of Domestic Violence and a section on the Working Conditions for Pregnant or Breastfeeding Workers. Follow is the Restrictive Definition of Discrimination and Family and finally the Inhuman Treatment of Persons with Disabilities.

Evaluation: The evaluation point comprises the rejection of the government on the artificial confrontation of families and women’s rights. The government is committed to encourage women to decide on their own lives and the Hungarian law provides strong protection for women. The government provides women with the freedom of choice whether they wish to have children. Finally, the government denounces violence against women in any form and is dedicated to rid society of abuse.

Opposition: effective measures/ineffective measures; young married couples/young non-

¹¹³ Ibid. p. 72.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. p. 77-84.

married couples; part-time employment/full-time employment; nursing mothers/non-nursing mothers; women raising kids/men raising kids; flexible employment /inflexible employment.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) To create a proper balance between family and work is the right thing to do (implicit). Hungary has taken a number of important and effective measures to create a proper balance between family and work (explicit). Therefore, Hungary is doing the right thing (implicit).

2) Equality between men and women in working life can be improved by providing women raising kids with more flexible employment options (explicit). Hungary is providing women raising kids with more flexible employment options (explicit). Therefore, Hungary is improving equality in working life (implicit).

Result: With basis in the arguments of the government, it is not justified to mention the right to equal treatment in Hungary as means for violation the values if the EU.

Quote: “The Hungarian Government denounces the violence against women in any form or shape, and is dedicated to rid society of abuse: in accordance with this objective, Hungarian law provides strong protection for women against violence.”¹¹⁵

11. Rights of Persons Belonging to Minorities, including Roma and Jews, and Protection against Hateful Statements against such Minorities¹¹⁶

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the right of persons belonging to minorities in Hungary.

Complicating action: The chapter starts with a paragraph on Racism, Intolerance, Anti-Gypsyism and Anti-Semitism. The second paragraph comprises Roma Discrimination and follows by a section on Segregated Education of Roma Children. Follow does a section on Violation of the Prohibition of Discrimination and a section on combatting Anti-Semitism.

Evaluation: Hungary is strongly committed to combat racism, anti-Gypsyism and any incitement to hatred. According to the government, zero tolerance of racism is provided by the Hungarian legislation and repeated univocally in the highest political statements. As to Roma discrimination the government states that they are deeply committed to achieve the integration of Roma in Hungary. On combatting anti-Semitism, the government considers the freedom of religion to all a value to be protected.

¹¹⁵ Ibid. p. 79.

¹¹⁶ Ibid. p. 84-103.

Opposition: segregation/anti-segregation; socialist government/ current government; inclusion/exclusion; positive change/negative change; responsible/irresponsible.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Integration of Roma can be met by designating responsible ministers, deadlines and available funds (explicit). Hungary has designated responsible ministers, deadlines and available funds (explicit). Therefore Hungary can meet the integration of Roma (implicit).

2) Extreme poverty can be met by involving the extremely poor in public work and training programmes (explicit). Hungary has involved the extremely poor in public work and training programmes (explicit). Therefore, Hungary can meet the extreme poverty (implicit).

Result: Relative to the arguments by the government it is not justified to mention the rights of persons belonging to minorities as a violation against EU's fundamental values.

Quote: "Hungary recognizes the nationalities living in its territory as part of the Hungarian political community and acknowledges them as a state-forming factor."¹¹⁷

12. Fundamental Rights of Migrants, Asylum Seekers and Refugees¹¹⁸

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the alleged violations of the fundamental rights of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees in Hungary.

Complicating action: The chapter begins with the heading Amending Asylum Law in Hungary/Abuses by Border Authorities. This follows by a paragraph on the Detention of Asylum Seekers and Migrants and on the Situation of Unaccompanied Minors. The following paragraph comprises Violation of the Applicants' Right to Liberty and Security as well as Mandatory Relocation of Asylum Seekers. The last headings are the Infringement Procedure Regarding Hungarian Asylum Legislation and finally, Detention of Asylum Applicants.

Evaluation: According to the government the accusations regarding the rights of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees are completely unfounded. As to the situation in transit zones the government do not agree that the transit zone is a place of deprivation of liberty, based on the fact that immigrants are free to leave in the direction of Serbia at any time. It is further completely inappropriate and false to propose the initiation of Article 7 TEU on the grounds that Hungary does not share the mainstream immigration policy in Europe. The government finally believes the admission of refugees to be up to each Member State alone.

¹¹⁷ Ibid. p. 88.

¹¹⁸ Ibid. p. 104-121.

Opposition: anti-immigration/pro-immigration; stop migration/manage migration; strict border control/"open door policy"; the Hungarian practice/other practices.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Strict border controls are the best way to stop immigration (implicit). Hungary has strict border controls (explicit). Therefore Hungary has the best way to stop immigration (implicit).

2) Establishing a national list of safe countries of origin and safe third countries is the necessary way to move forward (explicit). Hungary has established a national list of safe countries of origin and safe third countries (explicit). Therefore Hungary is doing the necessary thing to move forward (implicit).

Result: The government is of the firm opinion that none of the elements listed in this chapter justifies to request the procedure under Article 7 TEU from the Council.

Quote: "It is therefore our common duty and responsibility to protect our external borders and effectively stem the flows of illegal migration. The direction of the new initiatives at EU level follows the practice of Hungary already introduced in 2015."¹¹⁹

13. Economic and Social Rights¹²⁰

Abstract: The chapter comprises the arguments of the government on the alleged violations on economic and social rights as means for breach against the fundamental values of the EU.

Complicating action: The chapter starts with a paragraph on Criminalizing Homelessness in Hungary. Follows does a section on the Non-Compliance with the European Social Charter followed by Amendment of the Act on Strikes and the Rights of children. The last section comprises Adequacy and Coverage of Social Assistance and Unemployment Benefits.

Evaluation: According to the government, increasing economic growth, employment and a strong competitiveness are key priorities in Hungary. As to criminalizing homelessness, the government refuses the statement by the EP and states that the government strives to ensure accommodation for homeless people. When it comes to the amendment of the act on strikes the government deems the statement in the Sargentini Report as false and highly misleading.

Opposition: current government/previous government; to be committed/not to be committed; to meet the challenges/to avoid the challenges; responsibilities/guiltless.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

¹¹⁹ Ibid. p. 107.

¹²⁰ Ibid. p. 121-131.

1) To meet the challenges of providing a dignified living for all homelessness people, the state shall seek to provide accommodation for everyone without a shelter (explicit). Hungary seeks to provide accommodation for everyone without a shelter (explicit). Therefore Hungary can meet the challenges of providing a dignified living for all homelessness people (implicit).

2) Benefit dependency can be met by ensuring equal opportunities, create prospects for valuable work, self-sustainability and raise living standards (explicit). Hungary strives to ensure equal opportunities, create prospects for valuable work, self-sustainability and raise living standards (explicit), Therefore Hungary can meet benefit dependency (implicit).

Result: Relative to the argument of the government and as to the fact that economic and social policies should be exclusively Member State competences, it is not justified to mention economic and social rights as a reason for initiating the Article 7 procedure.

Quote: “In compliance with international requirements, it is the independent and impartial Hungarian court’s responsibility to decide in the case of fundamental right collision.”¹²¹

4.2 Statements by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán

1) “Address by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in the debate on the so-called ‘Sargentini Report’” – Viktor Orbán, 11 September 2018, Strasbourg¹²²

Abstract: Speech by Viktor Orbán at the plenary session of the European Parliament, defending Hungary against the accusation of the Sargentini Report.

Complicating action: The first complicating action comprises Orbán stating that he has come to the EP to defend its homeland. Follow does a section on how the EP is about to denounce a Hungary that has been a member of Europe’s Christian people for hundred years. Orbán further points at how the European Parliament is not about to denounce a government, but a country and a people. Finally Orbán stresses how he rejects the threats, blackmail, the slander and fraudulent accusations against Hungary.

Evaluation: Orbán constitutes the first evaluation point by stating that the Sargentini Report

¹²¹ Ibid. p. 128.

¹²² Hungarian Government. “Address by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in the debate on the so-called ‘Sargentini Report’”. 11 Sep. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/address-by-prime-minister-viktor-orban-in-the-debate-on-the-so-called-sargentini-report> (Retrieved 2020-02-24).

does not show any respect for the Hungarian people and that it is an affront to the honor of Hungary. The report applies double standards and is an abuse of power. According to Orbán, Hungary will continue to defend its borders, stop illegal immigration and defend its rights. Orbán lastly emphasizes how the Hungarian people have decided that their homeland will not become an immigrant country.

Opposition: vote in favor for the report/not vote in favor for the report; political questions/moral questions; exclude/include; defending Europe/not defending Europe; restore democracy/destroy democracy.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Every Member State has the right to decide on how to organize its life in its own country (explicit). Hungary is a Member State (implicit). Therefore Hungary has the right to decide on how to organize its life in its own country (implicit).

2) Stopping the entry of illegal immigrants means defending Hungary and defending Europe (implicit). Hungary has stopped the entry of illegal immigrants (explicit). Therefore Hungary is defending Hungary and defending Europe (explicit).

3) Silencing those with whom one disagrees means sinking low (explicit). The EP is silencing those with whom they disagree (implicit). Therefore, the EP is sinking low (implicit).

Result: Hungary stands ready for the elections of the European Parliament in May 2019. There the people will have the chance to decide the future of Europe and the opportunity to restore democracy to European politics.

Quote: “Hungary shall continue to defend its borders, stop illegal immigration and defend its rights – against you too, if necessary.”

2) “Prime Minister Viktor Orbán’s speech in Parliament before the start of daily business” – Viktor Orbán, 18 September 2018, Budapest.¹²³

Abstract: Speech by Viktor Orbán in the Hungarian Parliament before the start of daily business, talking predominantly about the Sargentini-report.

Complicating action: Orbán begins the speech talking about the Sargentini Report as an absurd collection of lies. He then raises the report in relation to immigration and follows up

¹²³ Hungarian Government. “Prime Minister Viktor Orbán’s speech in Parliament before the start of daily business.” 18 Sep. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-speech-in-parliament-before-the-start-of-daily-business> (Retrieved 2020-03-15).

by arguments on the Hungarian rights to defend its on borders.

Evaluation: Orbán describes the report as an absurd collection of lies and declares that the method of its adoption was a clear violation of EU's founding treaties. The reason behind what Orbán refers to as an attack against Hungary is the fact that the Hungarian people have decided that Hungary shall not become an immigrant country. Accordingly, it is not right to deprive Hungary of the right to defend its own borders, and for Brussels to seek to take control of Hungary's border defenses. Orbán lastly emphasizes that if Hungary want to mix with other cultures and civilizations, then they will discuss and decide on it on their own.

Opposition: defending European borders/opening European borders, doing the right thing/doing the wrong thing, stop migration/manage migration.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Defending the European borders is the right thing to do (explicit). Hungary is defending the European borders (explicit). Therefore Hungary is doing the right thing (implicit).

2) The Hungarian people voiced their unanimous will to reject the EU's mandatory resettlement quotas (explicit). We will do what the Hungarian people want us to do (implicit). Therefore, we are rejecting the mandatory resettlement quotas (explicit).

Result: Orbán concludes by stressing the fact that Hungary shall not surrender the right to defend its border and shall not yield an inch to anyone seeking to deprive that right.

Quote: "On this matter our view is clear: our country is not a transit building, and it is not a reception camp. If we want to mix with other cultures and civilizations, then we will discuss it and decide on it – although I would advise the Hungarian people against it."

3) "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on the Kossuth Radio Programme '180 Minutes'"

– Viktor Orbán, 14 September 2018, Budapest.¹²⁴

Abstract: The narrative consists of an interview with Viktor Orbán on the Hungarian radio programme "180 Minutes", two days after the adoption of the Sargentini Report. The main theme of the program is accordingly the Sargentini Report and Orbán's position towards it.

Complicating action: The first complicating action comprises Orbán's general assessment of the Report, followed by a discussion on the matter of sovereignty. This follows by a

¹²⁴ Hungarian Government. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on the Kossuth Radio Programme '180 Minutes'." 15 Sep. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-the-kossuth-radio-programme-180-minutes-20180915> (Retrieved 2020-02-24).

discussion on immigration and on the weight of defending the European borders and whose responsibility this is. Thereafter follows a discussion on the voting-process in the EP and a discussion relative to the fact that some Hungarian MEP voted against Hungary.

Evaluation: During the interview Orbán continuously expresses his dissatisfaction against the Report and points at the report as an attack not only against the government but against Hungary. Orbán however stresses the fact that the report is in the past and that the decision represents absolutely no danger at all to Hungary. According to Orbán the reason behind the Report is so that the EP can weaken Hungary's position before the "next battle".

Opposition: the past/the future; pro-immigration/anti-immigration; right thing to do/wrong thing to do; resisting/transforming; defend the Hungarian borders/ making Europe into an immigration continent; voting against Hungary/voting with Hungary; conservatives/radical right-wings; communist style/European style.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Not defending its borders is turning Europe into an immigration continent (explicit). The European Union is not defending its borders (explicit). Therefore, the European Union is turning Europe into an immigration continent (implicit).

2) Voting against Hungary means voting against a people of 10 millions and against human beings (explicit). The EP voted against Hungary (explicit). Therefore, the EP voted against a people of 10 millions and against human beings (implicit).

Result: Orbán concludes by aiming for, what he calls, the next battle: "The next battle will be this: who will defend Hungary's borders and [...] who will decide on whom we shall allow onto the territory of Hungary?"

Quote: "[...] Hungary must be stigmatized and Hungarian resistance must be weakened, because the name of the next battle to be fought will be how to take away the right of intransigent countries – of countries that are resisting immigration – to defend their borders.

4) **"Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's response to the debate in the Plenary session of the European Parliament"** – Viktor Orbán, 11 September 2018, Strasbourg.¹²⁵

Abstract: The statement comprises the response by Viktor Orbán in the debate at the plenary session of the European Parliament in Strasbourg.

¹²⁵ Hungarian Government. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's response to the debate in the Plenary session of the European Parliament." 12 Sep. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-response-to-the-debate-in-the-plenary-session-of-the-european-parliament> (Retrieved 2020-02-24).

Complicating action: Orbán begins by referring to Mr. Verhofstads, the leader of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Group (ALDE). This follows by a section on the alleged Hungarian corruption with references to the Central European University. Thereafter Orbán talks about anti-Semitism, migration and the European People's Party.

Evaluation: According to Orbán the problem with Mr. Verhofstads is that he hates the conservative Christians more than he loves Europe. Further, relative to those Hungarians who will vote against their own homeland, Orbán states that the problem with them is that they hate him more than they love their country. Orbán continues by denying all accusations on the Hungarian corruption. Finally, the Prime Minister expresses his feeling against the European People's Party (EPP), stating that they are in trouble, that they are weak.

Opposition: decrease of anti-Semitism/increase of anti-Semitism; being weak/being strong; to cooperate/not to cooperate; denouncing the Hungarian government/denouncing Hungary.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Not following one's own path means being weak (implicit). The European People's Party is not following their own path (explicit). Therefore, the European People's Party is weak (explicit).

Result: Orbán ends by stressing that everyone voting for the Sargentini Report does not want to denounce the Hungarian Government, but Hungary.

Quote: "And to those Hungarians who will be voting against their own homeland, all I can say is that the trouble with you is that you hate me more than you love your country."

5) "International Press Conference of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán" – Viktor Orbán, 11 September 2018, Strasbourg.¹²⁶

Abstract: Speech by Viktor Orbán at the international press conference after the plenary debate on the Sargentini Report on September 11, 2018.

Complicating action: The first complicating action comprises Orbán referring to the national elections held in Hungary a few months ago. During the election the Hungarian people got to decide on several important political issues. The narrative continues with Orbán stating how the EP is taking the task upon themselves of overruling the decisions of the Hungarian State.

¹²⁶ Hungarian Government. "International Press Conference of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán." 12 Sep. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/international-press-conference-of-prime-minister-viktor-orban20180912> (Retrieved 2020-02-24).

Evaluation: According to Orbán the first part of the debate on the Sargentini Report was its absurdity, while the second part comprised lot of patience. As to the discussion on border protection Orbán states that Hungary needs to protect the European borders, because those are our common borders. Orbán ends by stating that the European Parliament is forcing the government to implement what they perceive important in place of the people's decision.

Opposition: to cooperate/not to cooperate, the communist style of speaking/the European style of speaking, protect the European borders/let in immigrants.

Syllogisms/enthymemes:

1) Not receiving any immigrants means protecting the boarders of Europe (implicit). Hungary is not receiving any immigrants (explicit). Therefore Hungary is protecting the boarders of Europe (implicit).

2) Sermonizing, threat and exclusion is the communist style of speaking (explicit). The European Parliament used sermonizing, threat and exclusion in the plenary debate (explicit). Therefore, the European Parliament used the communist style of speaking (implicit).

Result: Orbán concludes by stating that he will always cooperate with all governments in order to jointly protect the borders of Europe.

Quote: “And now the European Parliament is taking upon itself the task of overruling the decision made by the people of Hungary, and forcing the Hungarian government to implement what they are attempting to impose on us in place of the people's decision.”

5 Analysis

In the findings of the research were the arguments and narratives used by the Hungarian Government and Prime Minister Viktor Orbán as means of arguing against the alleged violations of the fundamental values of the European Union identified. By applying the theoretical framework, the purpose of the analysis is to highlight how and to what extent narratives of national identity, nationalism and populism are constructed and expressed within those arguments. The analysis is divided into three separate headings: National Identity Narratives, Nationalist Narratives and Populist Narratives.

5.1 National Identity Narratives

Narratives of national identity have proven to be a common part in the arguments of the Hungarian Government and the narratives have emerged pervading throughout the research, most prominently in the context of immigration and the Hungarian self-determination. In line with the theoretical framework of national identity, the Hungarian Government frequently puts the Hungarian national identity in relation to what they perceive they are not. These narratives are visualized both in the Official Arguments of the Hungarian Government as in the statements by Viktor Orbán, predominantly in those arguments expressed relative to the European Union's immigration policy. By referring to immigrants in the context of "the others" the government distinguishes those belonging to the national identity with those who do not. One can further interpret these narratives as rhetorical tools by the government for the purpose of trying to form a unity between the Hungarian people and the national identity.

As the second enthymeme in the first statement by Viktor Orbán notes, according to Orbán, stopping the entry of illegal immigrants means defending Hungary and defending Europe. Here it is implied how Orbán do not consider immigrant as belonging neither to the Hungary identity nor to the European one, as immigrants in the narratives are referred to as something that one must to be protected from. This is best accomplished by strict border controls, something that is emphasized within the first enthymeme in the chapter on "Fundamental Rights of Migrants, Asylum Seekers and Refugees" in the Official Arguments of the Hungarian Government. Narratives of national identity relative to immigrants implied as "the others" also occur in the interview with Orbán on the Radio Programme "180 Minutes":

[...] what I can say is that there is a clear pro-immigration majority in today's European Parliament, who regard it as their historic mission to change the composition of Europe and implement population replacement, because they believe that it is a good and desirable thing.¹²⁷

The term “population replacement” in the statement implies a distinct reaffirmation and distinct division between the “European population” and immigrants. By stating that the pro-immigration majority of the European Parliament wants to change the “composition of Europe” and implement “population replacement” Orbán further implies that there exist one particular population and one composition of Europe, something that would change if the pro-immigration majority of today's European Parliament would decide. Immigrants are within this context hence implied as “the others” and as someone who do belong neither to Europe nor the European identity, as immigrants according to Orbán would change the composition of the European continent as it is today.

Similar narratives occur both in statement one and statement two by Viktor Orbán. Within the evaluation point of both statements Orbán emphasizes how the Hungarian people have decided that Hungary shall not become an “immigrant country”.¹²⁸ It is accordingly up to the Hungarian people themselves to decide upon who they want to live alongside and whom they do not want to live alongside, and not the EU. Similar arguments are also found in how Orbán emphasizes that if Hungary wants to mix with other cultures and civilizations, then they will discuss and decide on it:

They want to deprive Hungary of the right to defend its borders – in order to make migration possible. [...] If we want to mix with other cultures and civilizations, then we will discuss it and decide on it – although I would advise the Hungarian people against it. At all events, this decision is theirs, and theirs alone.¹²⁹

The quotation is an extract from Viktor Orbán's speech at the Hungarian Parliament in September 2018. Here it becomes evident how the EU is accused of undermining the policies of the government, and maybe even more importantly, undermining the will of the Hungarian people to live in a country free from immigrants. These narratives draw on nationalist ideas and raise the question of whether the EU should be able to decide on Hungary at all regarding

¹²⁷ Hungarian Government, “Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on the Kossuth Radio Programme ‘180 Minutes’.”

¹²⁸ Hungarian Government, “Address by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in the debate on the so-called ‘Sargentini Report’.”

¹²⁹ Hungarian Government, “Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's speech in Parliament before the start of daily business.”

immigration policy, exemplified by Orbán when stating that the decision is the Hungarian people's, and theirs alone. The use of the term "mix" in this quotation further implies that there is a difference between immigrants and the people of the European Union. By letting immigrants into their territory, the people of Europe would consequently mix with other peoples and other cultures. By referring to the cultural entities to which the Hungarian people do not belong it could be implied as Orbán attempting to strengthen the Hungarian national identity. The narrative in which Orbán states that he would advise the Hungarian people against mixing with other cultures and civilizations also comprises distinct narratives of the national identity as to the opposition with "the others".

As to EU's influence on Hungarian policy, the narratives comprises the attempts by the EU to force Hungary to accept refugees or change its legislation on various issues, something that opposes the will of the Hungarian people. The EU is in these narratives thus often linked to the negative effects of immigration and the government is often making immigration sound like a threat to the Hungarian people. A frequent argument in this context is to accuse the EU as the depriver of Hungarian rights, as they are both exceeding the rights of the Hungarian people and their sovereignty. Refugee-friendly actors, and actors with agendas that opposes the national interests of Hungary, such as EU and NGOs are in the arguments often described as hostile to the Hungarian people. These narratives have strong nationalists character in how they are used to prevent the EU from determining the composition of Hungary while at the same time strengthening Hungary's autonomy. This is further identified in the following statement where the Hungarian Government opposes the pro-immigrant forces of the EP:

I reject the threats, the blackmail, the slander and fraudulent accusations leveled against Hungary and the Hungarian People by the European Parliament's pro-immigration and pro-migrant forces. [...] Hungary should not bow to blackmail: Hungary shall continue to defend its borders, stop illegal immigration and defend its rights – against you too, if necessary.¹³⁰

Narratives of national identity also include a political affiliation, meaning that those who are perceived as the others can be a distinction between different political groups or institutions, where ideological differences can become an identification of the national. In order to legitimize the actions of Fidesz and to secure the power of the current government, references

¹³⁰ Hungarian Government, "Address by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in the debate on the so-called 'Sargentini Report'".

to opposition parties and past governments as “villains” and as the violators of fundamental rights are identified within the arguments of the Hungarian Government. In this context, “the others” are understood as the opposition parties of the EP as well as the former communist regime and the former Socialist government. In those narratives it is implied how the current government resembles the past governments as the violators of EU’s fundamental values, making them the “bad guys”. This is visualized in Chapter 11 of the Official Arguments:

Under the Socialist governments, a series of murders of Roma were committed in Hungary. The “Hungarian Guard” held marches, thus the European and Hungarian Roma were frightened. The current Government made it possible for the Roma to change their houses from Roma settlements to houses with gardens [...]¹³¹

This quotation is part of the response by the Hungarian Government on the accusations of the European Parliament under the heading entitled “Racism and intolerance, anti-Gypsyism and anti-Semitism”. What is interesting in this quotation is the attempt by the government to strengthen its confidence and legitimize its politics by connecting the discrimination of Roma to the time before the entry of the Orbán government, thus giving the Socialist Government the role of the “villain”. Another common narrative of the national identity is to portray one’s own group as virtuous, morally exemplary and in a sacrificial position. The group is within these narratives often depicted in a positive light and in regards to those rights and privileges that have been deprived of the group.¹³²

In the end of the above-mentioned quotation it is highlighted how the current government made it possible for the Roma to change their houses from Roma settlements to houses with gardens. The government is in this narrative and in line with narratives of national identity portrayed as heroes and as morally exemplary compared to the past Socialist government. The portrayal of the Hungarian Government as morally exemplary and virtuous is also common in the narratives of Viktor Orbán. Within his statements, Orbán repeatedly argues how Hungary, by not accepting any immigrants, is protecting the borders of Hungary and consequently the borders of Europe. In these narratives Orbán hence portrays Hungary as morally exemplary as to the protection of Europe.

A final narrative of national identity identified throughout the research is the comparison of

¹³¹ Hungarian Prime Minister’s Office, “The official legal arguments of the Hungarian government”, p. 85.

¹³² Berger, *About Looking*, p. 49.

the actions of the Hungarian Government with the actions of other EU Member States. In the 4th chapter of the Official Arguments by the Hungarian Government the following is stated:

[...] corresponding or even exceeding the equivalent system of some other EU member states. [...] the current regulatory environment is much more detailed and clearer than in several other Member States, and therefore corruption as such is a serious allegation against Hungary.¹³³

This quotation is part of the response by the Hungarian Government to the criticism regarding limited monitoring of campaign spending in Hungary. By referring to other Member States as performing worse than Hungary the government is portrayed as morally exemplary and in a positive light in regards to the fundamental values of the European Union, as seen in the following sentence: “corresponding or even exceeding the equivalent system of some other EU member states”. The government however also depicts itself in a sacrificial position by stressing the fact that several Member States are doing the same thing, or even worse than Hungary, yet it is still Hungary that stands before a possible Article 7 procedure.

5.2 Nationalist Narratives

Narratives of national identity and nationalism are to an extent similar in their composition, meaning that some nationalist narratives have already been analyzed under the heading of national identity narratives. Yet, in this heading will the construction of nationalist narratives of primordialism, ethnosymbolism and modernism in the arguments of the Hungarian Government be analyzed. Starting with the narratives of ethnosymbolism, the essence of ethnosymbolism is the importance it attaches to the role of memories, symbols, myth, values, traditions, heroes and ancestors in the formation and persistence of the nation. It further puts great importance to the attachment to the homeland and to the national territory.¹³⁴

Nationalist narratives stressing the attachment to the homeland and the territory of Hungary appear repeatedly in the arguments of the government and are constructed as in the following quotations: “I stand here now to defend my homeland”¹³⁵, “[...] the Hungarian people have

¹³³ Hungarian Prime Minister’s Office, “The official legal arguments of the Hungarian government”, p. 36.

¹³⁴ Özkirimli, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, p. 143.

¹³⁵ Hungarian Government, “Address by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in the debate on the so-called ‘Sargentini Report’”.

decided that our homeland will not become an immigrant country”¹³⁶ and “who will decide on who we should allow onto the territory of Hungary?”¹³⁷ When used as in these examples, references to the homeland and the territory of the nation have strong nationalist implications. In line with the theory of ethnosymbolism can the references to the homeland and to the Hungarian territory in these quotations be understood as an attempt by the government to bring together the nation, while simultaneously distinguishing those belonging to the nation with those not belonging to the nation. The correlation between the usages of the concept homeland in the context of immigration in the primary sources further proves this occurrence.

Another factor of ethnosymbolism is the importance it attaches to the historical and collective memory in the formation and persistence of the nation. What do these narratives mean for the Hungarian case and for the construction of their arguments? Initially, and as exemplified in the narratives of national identity, the Hungarian Government repeatedly refers to the past communist regime in their arguments. The past communist regime could be describes as a big part of the Hungarian national heritage and as something that has had a big impact on the formation of the nation. By referring to the past communist regime as something common to the past of all Hungarians, these narratives could further be interpreted as a rhetorical tool by the government in the attempts to unify the nation over their collective memory and thereby creating some sort of national support for their arguments. These narratives could also be understood in line with the theory of primordialism, in which the deep historical and cultural roots of the nation are stressed. Narratives of the homeland and the territory of Hungary also occur in the primary material in conjunction with nationalist symbols as heroes and patriots:

So what they want is nothing less than this: that – instead of our Hungarian sons, police officers and military personnel who have donned their uniforms, sworn an oath, and for whom their homeland is important – they will send mercenaries here from Brussels, from where they will be told how the Hungarian borders should be protected.¹³⁸

Orbán refers in this quotation to typical nationalist symbols as Hungarian sons, police officers and military personnel when talking about the protection of the Hungarian borders. These narratives could be seen in line with the theory of nationalism stating that political leaders often refer to symbols and traits in order to mobilize the people around a particular issue.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Hungarian Government, “Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on the Kossuth Radio Programme ‘180 Minutes’.”

¹³⁸ Ibid.

This is visualized in how Orbán within the above-mentioned quotation uses typical nationalist symbols in the attempt to mobilize the Hungarian people around the idea that the Hungarian sons, police officers and military personnel are the one that should protect the borders of Hungary and not the mercenaries from Brussels. By asserting that they have “donned their uniforms, swore an oath” and to which the homeland is important these symbols further come to serve as an identification of the nation, consolidating the arguments of the government.

The approach of primordialism is based on the belief that the nation is a biological part of humans and stresses the deep historical and cultural roots of nations.¹³⁹ Primordialists’ plea to emotional and instinctive restraints as the ultimate explanations for national mobilization, something identified throughout the research. Orbán exercises these narratives when stressing the important part Hungary played in the shaping of the “great continent of Europe”. These narratives also embrace a distinct primordialist approach in how they dates the origin of the homeland back to remote epochs and historical events, treating them as emotionally given:

Hungary which has been a member of the family of Europe’s Christian peoples for a thousand years; the Hungary which has contributed to the history of our great continent of Europe with its work and – when needed – with its blood. [...] the Hungary which rose and took up arms against the world’s largest army, against the Soviets, which made the highest sacrifice for freedom and democracy, and – when it was needed – opened its borders to its East German brothers and sisters in distress.¹⁴⁰

The quotation is part of the speech by Viktor Orbán in the debate on the Sargentini Report at the European Parliament. Orbán emphasizes during his speech how Hungary has contributed to the history of Europe with its work and its blood, and stresses how the Hungarian nation by taking up arms against the Soviets has made the highest sacrifice for freedom and democracy. By the use of expressions such as “blood” and “sacrifice for freedom and democracy” when referring to the European and Hungarian past, these periods are treated as emotionally given. Further, when referring to Hungary as a member of the “family of Europe’s Christian people” it could be implied that the Hungarian nation according to Orbán equals a Christian nation, meaning that the people of Hungary are of the Christian faith only. Here, the importance of the Christian faith in Hungary is accordingly emphasized. Orbán, in the beginning of the

¹³⁹ Özkirimli, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, p. 49.

¹⁴⁰ Hungarian Government, “Address by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in the debate on the so-called ‘Sargentini Report’”.

quotation also dates the Hungarian Christian heritage back to remote epochs when stating that Hungary has been part of the Christian family for “thousand years”.

Similar narratives are identified throughout the research and seen within the speech by Viktor Orbán at the international press conference after the debate in the European Parliament. There Orbán, on the same theme, declares: “We will be working to reform the European People’s Party to enable it to find its way back to the path marked out by the founders [...] and to the values, directions, courage and character which will ensure that the Christian approach [...] also has a party in European politics”.¹⁴¹ Here, Orbán again employs a distinct nationalist approach when referring to typical nationalist symbols such as heritage, values and characters when talking about the European People’s Party and the future work of reforming the party.

The last orientation of the nationalist approach is the orientation of modernism. According to the political transformation approach, a nationalist argument is built on three basic assertions: there exists a nation with an explicit and peculiar character; the interests and values of this nation take priority over all other interests and values and; the nation must be as independent as possible. Narratives stressing the importance of the Hungarian independence and which visualize the viewpoint that the interests and values of Hungary should be prioritized are identified throughout the empirical material. These narratives are significantly identified in the context of immigration, but also in the context of economic and social policies and national security legislation, areas that in the arguments are describes as exclusively Member State competences, and should thus fall exclusively within the competences of the state.

In the context of immigration the government repeatedly refers to the EU as the depriver of the Hungarian independence, while at the same time making a strong distinction between “us” and “them”. Viktor Orbán talks about immigration and border controls as follows: “But it is not right for them to try to deprive us of the right to defend out own borders, and for Brussels to seek to take control of Hungary’s border defenses instead of us”¹⁴² and “the Hungarian people have decide that our homeland will not become an immigrant country”.¹⁴³

¹⁴¹ Hungarian Government, “International Press Conference of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán.”

¹⁴² Hungarian Government, “Prime Minister Viktor Orbán’s speech in Parliament before the start of daily business.”

¹⁴³ Hungarian Government, “Address by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in the debate on the so-called ‘Sargentini Report’.”

Orbán emphasizes in these quotations the importance of the Hungarian values and interests in regards to immigration. The values and interests of the Hungarian state are here described to take priority over the values and interests of the European Union, and it is therefore not right of the Union to deprive Hungary the right to defend its own borders. By stating that the Hungarian people are the ones deciding that their country will not become an “immigrant country”, and not the EU, the importance of the Hungarian sovereignty is also emphasized. Since nationalist narratives in the context of immigration are common throughout the empirical material are similar narratives analyzed more profound in the heading of *5.1 National Identity Narratives* and *5.2 Populist Narratives*.

5.3 Populist Narratives

Populist narratives have proven to be a common part in the construction of the arguments by the Hungarian Government as to the alleged violations of EU’s fundamental values. One of the main focuses of the populist narrative is the opposition it holds between “the people” and “the elites” in regards to the performance of power. Populist narratives also uphold hostility towards “the elites” and a rejection of the “establishment” in general.¹⁴⁴ In the introductory chapter of the Official Arguments the Hungarian Government states the following:

Democracy, rule of law, market economy, respect for minorities are all values enshrined in the Fundamental Law of Hungary in accordance with the free will of the Hungarian people and not as a set of principles which need to be enforced by external powers.¹⁴⁵

What is interesting in this statement is the fact that the Hungarian Government puts the free will of the Hungarian people in opposition to the external powers, which in this case indicates the powers of the European Union. Similar narratives are common throughout the empirical material and used by the government in attempts to reduce the influence of EU on Hungarian policy, while at the same time making the EU appear as a negative force in Hungary. This particular quotation could further, in accordance with the theory of populism, be interpreted as hostility towards “the elites” and as a rejection of “the establishment” in general.

Another palpable element of the quotation is the phrase “free will of the Hungarian people”.

¹⁴⁴ Pirro and Taggart, “The populist politics of Euroscepticism in times of crisis”, p. 255-256.

¹⁴⁵ Hungarian Prime Minister’s Office, “The official legal arguments of the Hungarian government”, p. 4.

It can be understood as the will of the Hungarian people, according to the government, should be the only will represented in Hungarian politics, a premise that the EU should not overstep. The government further stresses the “unnecessary need” of the EU as the enforcer of fundamental rights, stating that these rights are already enshrined in accordance with the Hungarian people and enforced within the Fundamental Law. The statement could moreover, by the use of the phrase “external powers” be understood as an attempt by the government to diminish the influence and to halt the power of the EU on Hungarian national policy. The use of populist narratives in the attempt to halt the power and reduce the influence of the European Union appears in several chapters and statements throughout the primary sources, as in Chapter 2 of the Official Arguments by the government, where the following is stated:

The title of the consultation signals the intention to halt the transfer of national competences to Brussels, to stop the politics that is trying to extend beyond what is laid down in the Treaties.¹⁴⁶

This quotation is part of the response by the government on the accusations of the European Parliament regarding the Hungarian consultation “Let’s stop Brussels”. Here, the government stresses the importance to halt the transfer of national competences to Brussels and to stop the European politics that is trying to extend beyond what is laid down in the Treaties, thus undermining the will of the Hungarian people. By implying that some competences are better handled on national level it can be understood as the government is trying to defend and preserve the interest of the Hungarian people vis-à-vis the interests of the European Union, thereby the slogan “Let’s stop Brussels”. Henceforth, the government makes use of a distinct populist rhetoric when implicitly referring to the EU as an institution with excessive amount of power. At the International Press Conference after the debate in the European Parliament, Orbán says about the European Parliament the following:

[...] now the European Parliament is taking upon itself the task of overruling the decision made by the people of Hungary, and forcing the Hungarian government to implement what they are attempting to impose on us in place of the people’s decision.¹⁴⁷

A common trend throughout the empirical material is to accuse the EU of being a political opponent of Hungary. Orbán points at this in the above-mentioned statement when stressing the fact that the European Parliament is overruling the decision made by the people of

¹⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 17.

¹⁴⁷ Hungarian Government. “International Press Conference of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán.”

Hungary, consequently forcing the government to implement what the EP are attempting to impose in place of people's decisions. Orbán is making the European Parliament appear as a negative force to Hungarian politics and by overruling the decision of the general people the EP is portrayed as the villain and as the depriver of the Hungarian national rights. This could further be interpreted as a rhetorical tool in order to provide the government with additional powers while at the same time increasing the opposition against the EU at home.

Portraying the EU as the villain and as the depriver of the rights of the Hungarian people is most common in the context of immigration. In this context Orbán states the following: "As far as I see, pro-immigration forces have a single option left to them: they want to deprive Hungary of the right to defend its own borders".¹⁴⁸ Here are the pro-immigration forces of the EU portrayed as the depriver of the Hungarian rights to defend its own borders. Orbán further implies the populist dichotomy between "the people" and "the elites" in regard to EU's quota refugee policy at his speech in the Hungarian Parliament on September 18, 2018. In response to the EU's attempt to get all Member States to receive quota refugees Orbán states:

[...] millions of Hungarians voiced their unanimous will – we made it clear – that Hungary rejects mandatory resettlement quotas. And in this we were not alone: as a result of the clear stand we took, ever more European Member States share our position.¹⁴⁹

Not infrequently is the EU on the issues of migration described by Orbán as counteracting the will of the Hungarian people and infringing on the Hungarian sovereignty. Orbán has long opposed the EU quota refugee policy and the EU's ability to decide on Hungarian migration policy. In this statement Orbán demonstrates his unwillingness to accept the EU's mandatory resettlement quotas and makes it clear that it is Fidesz together with the Hungarian voters who decide on migration in Hungary, and not the EU. In the quotation Orbán thus clarifies that it is the Hungarian people who decide on those who are and who not welcomed to settle in the state of Hungary. The attempts by the European Union to get Hungary to accept refugees are thus portrayed as something that opposes the interests of the Hungarian people and its sovereignty. Thus, these narratives become populist both due to the fact that it defines who is welcome to Hungary and as it intends to strengthen the country's sovereignty.

¹⁴⁸ Hungarian Government, "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's speech in Parliament before the start of daily business."

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

An additional aspect of the above-mentioned statement is how Orbán refers to the rejection of the mandatory resettlement quotas, as basis of the general will of the people. By referring to the general will of the Hungarian people as the motivation behind the rejection of refugees Orbán is making the politics of the government seem like an expression of the general will of the Hungarian people. This could accordingly be interpreted as how the government in these narratives manage to depict itself as “of the people”, while the European Union in reverse is the one depicted as the real “elite”. This could thus be interpreted as a rhetorical tool in order to legitimize the actions of the government. In the second sentence of the quotation Orbán states how Hungary were not alone in this decision and that many European Member States shared their position – making the Hungarian state look like just one in the crowd.

The role of the government could thus be understood as to fulfill the wishes of the Hungarian people. These narratives could be interpreted as a way of clarifying how Fidesz advocates for the actions of the people and how the policy of the party is compatible with the interests of the people. By referring to the people as the “deciders” of Hungarian policies and the government as the “implementers” of these decisions, the government, by the motivation that they are answering to the will of the Hungarian people, legitimizes its actions. A final example of populist narratives in the arguments by Viktor Orbán is the references he gives to the oppositions between Hungary and the European Union as “battles”. This is evident in the interview on the Radio Programme “180 Minutes”, where Orbán states:

Up until now we have always stated that we – and only we – shall decide who we want to live alongside - So far we have been winning this battle. Now the name of the battle is this: who will decide on whom we should allow onto the territory of Hungary? They simply want to deprive us of the keys to the gate. This is the next battle we must fight.¹⁵⁰

By resemble the disagreement between Hungary and the EU as “battles” it could seem as there already is an infected conflict between the two and that we can expect further battles in the near future. By using expressions such as “so far we have been winning this battle” and “this is the next battle we must fight” it could be interpreted that these battles could either be won or lost, implying that there wont be a relationship between the EU and Hungary not infected by disagreements for a long time, something which once again proves the populist narrative of the binary nature of the opposition between “the people” and “the elites”.

¹⁵⁰ Hungarian Government, “Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on the Kossuth Radio Programme ‘180 Minutes’.”

6 Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to: (1) highlight the different arguments by which the Hungarian Government argues against the violations and alleged breach of the fundamental values of the European Union; (2) analyze how narratives of national identity, nationalism and populism are constructed and expressed in the arguments by the Hungarian Government; and (3) examine how these arguments and narratives distinguish over different contexts. This has been carried out by a joint narrative analysis combining Martha S. Feldman, Kaj Sköldböck, Ruth Nicole Brown and Debra Horner's rhetorical approach with William Labov's six-part model. Throughout the research have the following research questions been answered: *How and based on what arguments does the Hungarian Government argue against the European Parliament's initiation of the Article 7 TEU procedure against Hungary?* and *How and to what extent are the concepts of national identity, nationalism and populism constructed in the arguments of the Hungarian Government?*

The overall findings of this thesis have shown how the Hungarian Government, both implicit and explicit, utilizes multiple aspects of narratives of national identity, nationalism and populism as means of arguing against the alleged violations of the fundamental values of the European Union. The main narratives identified comprise narratives on the distinction between the Hungarian national identity and sovereignty and those implied as "the others". These narratives have emerged to constitute a general practice in the arguments of the Hungarian Government and Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, and have proven to be a big part in the construction of the arguments against the Article 7 TEU procedure. In those narratives on who is and who is not accepted onto the territory of Hungary, "the others" are implied as third country immigrants, while the European Union is implied as "the others" in regards to the "deciders" (the "real elites") of the Hungarian national policy.

Additional principal narratives identified throughout the research include symbols, memories, values and narratives stressing the attachment to the homeland and the claimed territory, as well as the nationalist narrative asserting the importance of the Hungarian sovereignty and self-determination. In terms of populism, one of the most prominent populist narratives identified throughout the research is the opposition between the Hungarian people, i.e. "the real people" versus "the elites". Consistently, the Orbán Government manages within these

narratives to depict itself as part of the Hungarian people, as of the “real people”, while the European Union is the one depicted as the real “elite”.

To regress to one of the aims of this thesis, how have the arguments and narratives been seen to distinguish over different contexts? The different contexts in this case are to be understood as the different categories of the empirical material. One of the most distinct differences comprises the practice of the elements of syllogisms and enthymemes in the narratives. In the statements by Viktor Orbán more enthymemes than syllogisms have appeared, all in line with the theory of Feldman. According to Feldman there are several good reasons to why political leaders often avoids syllogisms in everyday speech. The most palpable reason comprises persuasion. In the perspective of persuasion, engaging the audience in completing the argument makes the argument more convincing. This means that if the audience delivers one of the premises itself, then they presumably is more likely to believe it. This is common in cases where the premise is questionable or controversial, as often is the case in the statements of Viktor Orbán.¹⁵¹ This is among more evident in the first enthymeme of the 3rd statement, where the following is concluded: “Not defending its borders is turning Europe into an immigration continent (explicit). The European Union is not defending its borders (explicit). Therefore, the European Union is turning Europe into an immigration continent (implicit)”.

By leaving unspoken and controversial premises out of the argument, such as: “the European Union is turning Europe into an immigration continent”, the speaker ward off disagreement and controversial questioning. Feldman describes how part of the persuasive quality of the enthymeme is that the audience adds some of the information to the statement. This means that what the audience adds is what they are likely to believe. Thus, when controversial premises are explicit they are more likely to call on questions.¹⁵²

Another palpable disparity between the sources includes the narrative element of evaluation. While the language in the statements by Viktor Orbán is very free, the document comprising the official arguments of the government is more formal in its construction. This could have been expected as to the fact that the statements by Orbán originally are oral sources, while the document of the government is a written and more “official” source. Yet another factor that has had an important impact on the narratives visualizes in the study is the target audience to

¹⁵¹ Feldman and Almquist, “Analyzing the implicit in stories”, p. 210.

¹⁵² Feldman, et al., “Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis”, p. 152.

which the empirical material is directed. The target audience is the specific group of people that the narrative was made for. This is the group of people that the narrator had in mind when shaping the conventions and codes of the narrative, and therefore has an impact on the outcome of the narratives. While the document by the government is directed towards the European Council and other EU Member States, are the statements by Orbán directed both to the European Union, but maybe even more importantly, towards the Hungarian people.

The theory, methodology and primary sources of this research have throughout the thesis worked well. Before deciding upon the methodological approach, the Critical Discourse Analysis by the Dutchman Teun A. van Dijk as well as the more political science approach of “What’s the problem represented to be?” by Carol Bacchi were some of the possibilities. The main reason to why the methodological approach by Feldman et al. and Labov was finally chosen comprises the interest area of this thesis. The interest area of this thesis has been to analyze and examine the arguments and narratives of Viktor Orbán and the Hungarian Government, rather than various discourses.

One of the drawbacks of the chosen methodology concerns the different sorts of empirical material being examined. The model by Labov is not the ultimate approach for written and more formal sources, this since the approach was originally developed for oral and personal stories. However, since this thesis chose not to include the orientation and coda-aspect of the model, and instead included the concepts of the rhetorical approach, the methodology has come to work as desired. In spite of the drawbacks of the particular model, the model was still chosen as to the goal of having a model applicable both on the document by the government as on the statements by Viktor Orbán. The theoretical approach derived from theories on national identity, nationalism and populism has worked well relative to the analysis. The mix amongst these theoretical approaches has further worked well as for the purpose of attaining a deeper analysis of the construction of the arguments by the government. Still, for some researchers could this theoretical approach be adopted as too political for a humanist research, something that has been compensated by the methodological approach of the narrative analysis.

As to existing research, the research conducted in this thesis has contributed to the field as to a greater understanding of the Hungarian perspectives on the Article 7 initiation, as to a greater understanding of the disparity between the Hungarian Government and the European Union. Oliver Mader stresses in his research how national identity must not be constructed as

means to undermine the application of EU law. This is of relevance since the enforcement under Article 7 TEU may intervene with the internal matters of Member States. The findings of this research have shown how the Hungarian national identity veritably has come to be constructed as means to undermine EU law in the arguments of the government. The national values and interests of Hungary have also, throughout the research, been seen to intervene with the enforcement under Article 7. Likewise, Michael Toomey argues in his research how interpretations of Hungarian history within narratives allow Orbán to create an exclusionary image of the Hungarian nationalism, something that further serves to legitimize the actions of Fidesz in Hungarian politics.¹⁵³

The findings of this thesis agree with Toomey, but instead of using history in narratives to legitimize the actions of the government in Hungarian politics only, can we in this thesis see how these narratives are used to legitimize the actions of the government at the European arena as well, and in regards to the accusations of the European Parliament. This thesis also differs as it extends beyond the scope of Toomey's research as to included additional nationalist and populist narratives to the analysis. In accordance with existing research could the findings of this thesis also be classified into what Bartosz M. Rydliński refers to as the new "Visegrad-politics", this as the narratives identified comprises both open reluctance to receive refugees and being critics of the EU.

Finally has this thesis opened up for questions that may be of interest for future research in the field of European Studies. In the light of this thesis would it be interesting to conduct a similar study as this one, but instead of solely examining the perspectives of the Hungarian Government, also include the perspectives of the European Parliament, making it a comparative analysis. This research would have been of great importance as for a deeper understanding of the relationship between Hungary and the EU, as well as for the understanding of the actors' different perspectives on the fundamental values of the EU. This research would additionally be particular important as to the growing nationalism and Euroscepticism in Member States of the European Union in recent years.

Another interesting research would be to conduct a study on the Polish Article 7 procedure. It would in this context be interesting to do a comparative analysis, examining the Polish versus

¹⁵³ Toomey, "History, Nationalism and Democracy: Myth and Narrative in Viktor Orbán's 'Illiberal Hungary'", p. 87.

the Hungarian arguments on the alleged violations of the fundamental values. How would these arguments differ and resemble from each other and how would the construction of nationalist narratives be emphasized within those arguments? To build on the research conducted in this thesis would it additionally be interesting to examine the Article 7 procedure against Hungary today, over a year and a half after the initiation. What have changed in the arguments of the government and what is still the same? To reconnect to the introductory part of this thesis, what will the Article 7 procedure against Hungary and Poland mean for those Member States following the similar nationalist and populist development?

7 Bibliography

- ÁGH, Attila. "Decline of Democracy in the Ece and the Core-Periphery Divide: Rule of Law Conflicts of Poland and Hungary with the EU." *Journal of Comparative Politics* 11, no. 2 (2018): 30-48.
- Andrews, Molly, Squire, Corinne and Tamboukou, Maria. "Introduction: What Is Narrative Research?" In *Doing Narrative Research*, edited by Molly Andrews; Corinne Squire and Maria Tamboukou, 1-21. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2008.
- Balibar, Étienne. *Politics and the Other Scene*. London & New York: Verso, 2002.
- Berger, John. *About Looking*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.
- Boréus, Kristina and Bergström, Göran. *Textens mening och makt: metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. 4 ed. Studentlitteratur AB, 2018.
- Bruner, Lane M. "Rhetorical Theory and the Critique of National Identity Construction." *National Identities* 7, no. 3 (2005): 309-327.
- Cini, Michelle and Pérez-Solórzano Borrágán, Nieves. *European Union Politics*. 5 ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Closa, Carlos. "The politics of guarding the Treaties: Commission scrutiny of rule of law compliance." *Journal of European Public Policy* 26, no. 5 (2019): 696-716, DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2018.1477822.
- Coakley, John. "'Primordialism' in nationalism studies: theory or ideology?" *Nations and Nationalism* 24, no. 2 (2018): 327-347, DOI: 10.1111/nana.12349.
- Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union. 2008. OJ C115/13, Article 2.
- Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union. 2008. OJ C115/13, Article 7.
- Danaj, Adela; Lazányi, Kornélia and Bilan, Svitlana. "Euro scepticism and populism in Hungary: The analysis of the prime minister's discourse." *Journal of International Studies* 11, no. 1 (2018): 240-247, DOI: 10.14254/2071-8330.2018/11-1/18.
- Dawson, Mark and Muir, Elisa. "Hungary and the *Indirect* Protection of the EU Fundamental Rights and the Rule of Law." *German Law Journal* 14, no. 10 (2013): 1959-1980.
- Egedy, Gerfely. "Political Conservatism in Post-Communist Hungary." *Problems of Post-Communism* 56, no. 3 (2009): 42-53, DOI: 10.2753/PPC1075-8216560304.
- Enyedi, Zsolt. "Paternalist populism and illiberal elitism in Central Europe." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 21, no. 1 (2016): 9-25, DOI: 10.1080/13569317.2016.1105402.

European Commission. "Rule of Law Framework." https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/upholding-rule-law/rule-law/rule-law-framework_en (Retrieved 2020-03-15).

Feldman, Martha S. and Almquist, Julka. "Analyzing the implicit in stories." In *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*, edited by James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium, 207-228. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2012.

Feldman, Martha S.; Sköldböck, Kaj; Brown, Ruth Nicole; and Horner, Debra. "Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14, no. 2 (2004):147-170.

Füredi, Frank. *Populism and the European Cultural Wars: The Conflicts of Values between Hungary and the EU*. London and New York: Routledge, 2017.

Hungarian Government. "Address by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in the debate on the so-called 'Sargentini Report'". 11 Sep. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/address-by-prime-minister-viktor-orban-in-the-debate-on-the-so-called-sargentini-report> (Retrieved 2020-02-24).

Hungarian Government. "International Press Conference of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán." 12 Sep. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/international-press-conference-of-prime-minister-viktor-orban20180912> (Retrieved 2020-02-24).

Hungarian Government. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on the Kossuth Radio Programme '180 Minutes'." September 15, 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-the-kossuth-radio-programme-180-minutes-20180915> (Retrieved 2020-02-24).

Hungarian Government. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's response to the debate in the Plenary session of the European Parliament." 12 Sep. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-response-to-the-debate-in-the-plenary-session-of-the-european-parliament> (Retrieved 2020-02-24).

Hungarian Government. "Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's speech in Parliament before the start of daily business." 18 Sep. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-speech-in-parliament-before-the-start-of-daily-business> (Retrieved 2020-03-15).

Hungarian Prime Minister's Office. "The official legal arguments of the Hungarian government in the Article 7 procedure in the European Council refuting the accusations of the Sargentini report." 12 Nov. 2018. <https://www.kormany.hu/download/3/61/81000/The%20official%20legal%20arguments%20of%20the%20Hungarian%20government%20in%20the%20Article%207%20procedure%20in%20the%20European%20Council%20refuting%20the%20accusations%20of%20the%20Sargentini-report.pdf#!DocumentBrowse>, 1-131. (Retrieved 2020-02-04).

Kochenov, Dimitry and Jakab, András. *The enforcement of EU law and values: ensuring member states' compliance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Köves, Nora. "The Sargentini Report- Its background and what it means for Hungary and for the EU." *Henrich Böll Stiftung*. 19 Sep. 2018. <https://www.boell.de/en/2018/09/19/sargentini-report-its-background-and-what-it-means-hungary-and-eu> (Retrieved 2020-02-04).

Labov, William and Waletzky, Joshua. "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience." In *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts: Proceedings of the 1966 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*, edited by June Helm, 12-44. Seattle/London: University of Washington Press, 1967.

Laffan, Brigid. "The Future of EU." In *European Union Politics*, edited by Michelle Cini and Nieves Pérez-Solórzano Borragán, 380-389. 5 ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Leoussi, Athena S. and Grosby, Steven. *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture and Ethnicity in the Formation of Nations*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2007.

Mader, Oliver. "Enforcement of EU Values as a Political Endeavour: Constitutional Pluralism and Value Homogeneity in Times of Persistent Challenges to the Rule of Law." *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law* 11, no. 1 (2019): 133-170, DOI: 10.1007/s40803-018-00083-x.

Mudde, Cas and Kaltwasser, Cristóbal Rovira. "Exclusionary vs. Inclusionary Populism: Comparing Contemporary Europe and Latin America." *Government and Opposition* 48, no. 2 (2013):147-174.

Patterson, Wendy. "Narratives of Events: Labovian Narrative Analysis and its Limitations." In *Doing Narrative Research*, edited by Molly Andrews; Corinne Squire and Maria Tamboukou, 23-40. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2008.

Pirro, Andrea LP and Taggart, Paul. "The populist politics of Euroscepticism in times of crisis: A framework for analysis." *Politics* 38, no. 3 (2018): 253–262, DOI: 10.177/0263395718770579.

Rech, Walter. "Some remarks on the EU's action on the erosion of the rule of law in Poland and Hungary." *Journal of contemporary European Studies* 26, no. 3 (2018): 334-345, DOI: 10.1080/14782804.2018.1498770

Rydliński, Bartosz M. "Viktor Orbán – First among illiberals? Hungarian and Polish steps towards populist democracy." *Online Journal Modelling the New Europe* 6 (2018): 95-107, DOI: 10.24193/OJMNE.2018.26.07.

Sargentini, Judith. "Resolution 2017/2131(INL) of September 12, 2018 on a proposal calling on the Council to determine, pursuant to Article 7(1) of the Treaty on European Union, the existence of a clear risk of a serious breach by Hungary of the values on which the Union is founded." July 4, 2018. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2018-0250_EN.pdf (Retrieved 2020-03-12).

Stepanoska, Milena Apostolovska and Tasev, Hristina Runceva. "National Identity vs. European Identity: Partners or Rivals." *Iustinianus Primus Law Review* 8, no. 2 (2017): 1-7.

Szente, Zoltán. "Challenging the Basic Values - Problems in the Rule of Law in Hungary and the Failure of the EU to Tackle Them." In *The enforcement of EU law and values: ensuring member states' compliance*, edited by Dimitry Kochenov and András Jakab, 456-475. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Toomey, Michael. "History, Nationalism and Democracy: Myth and Narrative in Viktor Orbán's 'Illiberal Hungary'." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Central & East European Politics & International Relations* 26, no. 1 (2018): 87-108, DOI: 10.1177/2336825x1802600110.

Vlachová, Klára and Řeháková, Blanka. "Identity of non-self-evident nation: Czech national identity after the break-up of Czechoslovakia and before accession to the European Union." *Nations and Nationalism* 15, no. 2 (2009): 254-279, ASEN/Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

White, Stephen, Lewis, Paul G. and Batt, Judy. *Developments in Central and East European Politics*. 5 ed. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013.

Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Özkirimli, Umut. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, 2 ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.