

Hungarian Dynamics on Crimean Issues: Victor Orband and Fidesz's Party

Hadit Fikri Falah and Radityo Dharmaputra

International Relations Department, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Airlangga

Keywords: Crimea, Annexation, Rusia, Fidesz, Viktor Orban

Abstract: Hungary is known as one of the EU member states that have a fairly close geography with Ukraine. This becomes one of the determinants of why, in 2014 Hungary responded to what has happened in Ukraine related to the Crimean referendum. The crisis of Ukraine is a phenomenon that occurred in 2014 in Ukraine where the Crimean region wants a referendum to secede from Ukraine and join the Russian Federal. If we examined carefully, this phenomenon is quite controversial, because it looks explicitly there are interests from Russia who want the Crimea to become their territory. Then in response by the United States and European Union countries. Converted to the major EU countries such as Germany, France, and England. Hungary has its own approach in view of the Crimean crisis situation. President Viktor Orban as President of Hungary has a view on a unity by the political group around him like Fidesz. Marijek Breuning who saw there are three types of group dynamics: formalistic, competitive, and collegial. This will be comparable to the dynamics of interest groups and the inner circle of Viktor Orban in making decisions on the Crimean issue.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Chronology of Crimea Events and Hungarian Dynamics

The crisis of Ukraine first stems from the existence of different socio-political views in Ukraine. In 2013, Ukrainian President Victor Yanukovich refused to sign a free trade and cooperation agreement with the European Union and chose to accept Russian aid in the form of a US\$15 billion loan. In addition Russia also provides assistance in the form of gas price cuts against Ukraine by 30 percent. The decision made by Yanukovich is then, reaping protests from the Pro Western Ukrainian society which is referred to as the Euromaiden event. The protests took place in Kiev and continued until the beginning of 2014. The protests that took place in Kiev, then turned into violent protests and caused the killing of 77 demonstrators and 600 people injured (Smith, 2014). The social political split that occurred in Ukraine then continues in the discussion phase on the power-sharing deal in the Ukrainian government that is able to involve several state mediators in Europe. Although there has been intervention in the form of mediation from European

countries, this conflict continues to heat up and has not found the best solution. This can be seen from the case of the heating of civil conflict in Ukraine in 2014 or often known as the Donbass War. This war occurred in the territory of Eastern Ukraine which was a war between the forces of the Pro-Western Ukrainian government and the Donetsk and Luhansk independence fighters who were notabenenya Pro-Russian.

On February 23, 2014, the Ukrainian Anti-Government demonstrators held a demonstration in Kiev, they are fed up because there is no clarity from President Victor Yanukovich to solve this problem. This demonstration then culminated with the decline of President Victor Yanukovich from the seat of President of Ukraine (Fraser, 2006). Even though Russia declared it did not want to annex the Crimea into its federal territory, yet many odd things are related to Russia's political maneuver in relation to this issue. As the emergence of Pro-Russian society in Ukraine, the number of armed forces in the Crimea and so on. On March 6, 2014, there was a referendum policy in the Ukrainian Parliament, which substantiated about the Crimean accession of Ukraine. Basically this referendum was not approved by the governments of Ukraine, the United States, and the European Union. But this referendum

is still implemented by the Crimean society, and on March 16, 2014, 95.5% of Crimean people want accession from Ukraine, and want to be under the banner of Federal Russia. So on March 17, 2014, Crimea officially became a member of the Russian Federal (De Micco, 2014).

However, Russia is becoming the most highlighted country in terms of Crimean accession issues that look like annexation. It is evident from Russia's repudiation of an offer from the West in order to resolve the conflict in Ukraine together. The claim that Russia has an involvement in the Crimean secessionism can not be fully doubted because on March 11, 2014, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov stated that the referendum and declaration of independence by Crimean society is legal and valid (Wydra, 2005). In fact, the Russian Government fully acknowledges the outcome of the referendum and gives sovereignty over the independence of the Crimea. This is different from other authorities such as Ukraine, the United States and the European Union. So they firmly want to give an economic sanction against Russia. However, Russia considers the threat is only symbolic and sees the EU and the United States have no serious intention in facing Russia. Major EU countries such as Germany, France, and the UK (before Brexit) tend to lead to an economic approach linked to Crimean problems. But this is different from Hungary, which is more inclined to military and cultural policy in looking at the problems in the Crimea.

On March 1, 2014, the Hungarian Foreign Ministry stated that Hungary is concerned about the Crimean issue. Then Hungary with the Visegrad Four, which consists of Czech, Hungarian, Polish, and Slovak, has attempted to mediate between the Government of Ukraine and the Crimean Political Leaders, but this effort has not been effective (Smith, 2014). In the dynamics of the Crimean problem, Hungary has also experienced considerable criticism related to the inconsistency of Prime Minister Viktor Orban in viewing this issue. This is because there are other interests of political groups and interests that have an agenda in view of this problem.

1.2 Groups Level of Analysis: The Concept of Formalistic, Competitive, Collegial, and Groupthink

The state has various approaches to creating a foreign policy. According to George Modelski (1962) foreign policy is an activity system that is

carried by the people of the state with the aim to change and regulate the activities of other countries in the social environment. Meanwhile, according to Bernard Cohen and Scott Harris (1975) foreign policy is a goal, direction, or intention formulated by someone who has the authority then directed to a person who is in the international environment. It aims to create a change to the existing system, in accordance with the interests of a country. Foreign policy can take the form of various forms, whether it is official speech of the President, policy documents, referendum domestic, and so on. However, it should be realized that the foreign policies of a country, not only formulated by a President, but there are actors who have interests and influence to direct or assist the President in formulating foreign policy. These actors are a group consisting largely of expert staff, inner circles, or people with an interest in the foreign policy of a country.

Viewing, analyzing, and observing these actors are a focus of group level of analysis. At this level, the author is more focused and refers to subjects that surround the leaders of the state, such as Ministers, State Secretaries, Military Commanders and so on. In examining the level of group analysis, we need to know the concept of an ultimate decision unit, an authority capable of deciding the final decision in relation to the explanation of a country (Rosenau, 1987). According to Rosenau (1987) there are three types of authority entities capable of creating the ultimate decision unit, the first being a single predominant leader, an individual who has full power to determine which foreign policy a country will adopt, this type generally occurs in a country that embraces authoritarian leadership systems. Both are single or small groups, an authority composed of a set of individuals capable of realizing a foreign policy. In this type it prioritizes the nature of collectivity, interactive processes, and authoritative commitment. But in this type, there needs to be individuals who can manage the group in order to have productive and progressive decisions. Finally, multiple autonomous actors, groups of individuals who seek to coalesce between each other, to influence governance in formulating their foreign policy. In this type, multiple autonomous actors can not easily influence foreign policy, because they do not have such strong authority within government agencies (Rosenau, 1987).

In reviewing the group dynamics that occurred between Hungarian entities group related to the issue of cream. The author uses the concept of three forms of management initiated by Marijek Breuning in his article entitled Foreign Policy Analysis: A

Comparative Introduction in 2007. Breuning (2007) revealed that there are three types of management styles in group-level analysis. The first is formalistic, namely how and where the role of the main leader becomes very important to formulate a policy. There are four main features of a formalistic approach: hierarchy, delineated expertise, leader as an integrator, and tend to have problems with data validity. Second is the competitive form, in this form the leader still has full power to determine a foreign policy, but the conditions between groups are competitive and have high rivalitas tension, so that leaders can not do integration, but must choose a position against which group is considered to have progressiveness that matches his policy. In competitive types there are four main features, namely information bias, conflict between advisors, unhealthy competition, and creating creative solutions to an issue. Last is the collegial type, according to Breuning (2007), the collegial type is where the leader tries to be a median between two groups, and seeks to integrate disputes between the two groups by engaging in dialogue or open discussion. There are three main characteristics in this type of group, firstly the open and fair debates between advisors, empirical teamwork, and problem of mutual agreement.

Then there is the theory of group thinking, which is a theory coined by Irving J. Janis. Janis uses the term groupthink to denote a cohesive mode of thinking of a group of people, when the hard efforts of group members to reach a consensus. To achieve unanimity this group overrides its motivation for realistically assessing alternative actions, groupthink can be defined as a situation in the decision-making process that indicates the deterioration of mental efficiency and reality testing. Group members are often involved in a style of consideration where the search for consensus takes precedence over reason judgment. Groups that have similarities between their members and have good relationships with each other, tend to fail to realize the opposite opinion. They suppress conflict just so they can get along well, or when group members do not fully consider all the solutions. Here the groupthink seeks to abandon the individual's way of thinking and emphasize the group process. So the review of group phenomena more specifically lies in the poor decision-making process, and most likely will result in bad decisions with consequences that could harm groups. From this the author will use Marijek Breuning approach and groupthink domination in analyzing the process of foreign policy formulation conducted by Hungary in facing the Crimean issue.

1.3 Hungary: Leaders and Influential Groups

In 2014, Hungary was under the leadership of a political activist named Viktor Orban (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2014). Viktor Orban was a leader of the Fidesz party, at first Viktor Orban was a communist, but after going through and seeing Soviet atrocities in Hungary. Viktor realized that communism was a threat to Hungary itself. When he attended college at Eotvos Lorand University, he led a student organization called Fiatal Demokratak Szovetsege, which is a movement of young people who want democracy in Hungary. In 1989, the name of Viktor Orban became famous for his attention and marked a momentum that the burial of Imre Nagy became a symbol and turning point of the end of the era of communism in Hungary. In 1990, along with the end of the Cold War, a transition of the political system in Hungary that was originally under the auspices of Soviet communism turned into a country that upholds the values of Democracy. In accordance with elements of democracy, there are parties that form and create democracy, there are various political parties in Hungary like the Nationalist group adopted by the party Fidesz and Jobbik party (Sadeckim 2014). Conservative groups such as KDNP who embrace Christian values. Then there are classes of economism-liberalism like MLP, DK, and Parbeszed. Finally the environmentalism groups such as Egyutt and LMP. In Hungarian democracy it strongly supported all activities of anti-communism, it was seen from the joining of Hungary with NATO in 1999 and joined the EU in 2004.

Viktor Orban has an enormous influence on the political constellation in Hungary. This is because he has a pretty fantastic record in serving as leader in Hungary. Viktor Orban has been president of the Fidesz party since April 18, 1993, under his leadership Orban able to change the spectrum of the Fidesz party which tends to lead to radical liberalism, towards the center of the right-wing fundamentalist movement based on the principle of nationalism. Also in 1995 the Fidesz party became the most dominant party in Hungary by defeating the popularity of the Hungarian Democratic Forum which is also in the political right. Then in 1996 Orban was elected to the Hungarian National Committee of the New Atlantic Initiative, which was a Hungarian maneuver to improve relations with western countries. Orban was first elected Prime Minister in 1998, replacing Peter Boross who is the Prime Minister promoted by the Hungarian Democratic Forum. Orban succeeded in coalition

with the Hungarian Democratic Forum and became the youngest prime minister ever to take office in Hungary. Under the leadership of Viktor Orban, Fidesz became the dominant and moderate liberal party (Sadecki, 2014).

In 2010, Viktor Orban was re-elected as prime minister of Hungary. This indicates that Viktor Orban is a player on the political stage in Hungary. But within such a long period of leadership, some Hungarian societies saw that Viktor Orban's leadership began to lead to dictatorial form rather than autocracy (Balogh, 2016). According to the BBC (2014) Orban is judged to be very abusive in addressing issues that are in Hungary and the EU, Orban is also often employed as a leader with no integrity, where all promises are never materialized and tend to contradict his statements. So it can be formulated that the state of policy formulation process in Hungary is more directed to the form of single, predominant leader where Viktor Orban became the main pillar of all domestic and foreign political decisions in Hungary. But it needs to be examined more deeply that there are groups and individuals within the Viktor Orban who have a role as Hungarian political adviser.

In the case of Crimean annexation there are some important figures that must be underlined in this study. The first is Antal Rogan, the Minister of the Prime Minister's Cabinet Office, he is from the same party as Viktor Orban, Fidesz's party. Antal Rogan was previously a mayor in Belvaros-Lipotvaros district of Budapest five years from 2006 -2014. The second figure is Janos Lazar, a Minister of the Prime Minister's Office, he is also from Fidesz's party. Lazar has often been a political advisor to Viktor Orban in many ways, in the case of the Crimea, Lazarus advised the Orban to maintain a comprehensive relationship with Russia and the Visegrad Group. In addition to Csabe Hende who is the Minister of Defense Hungary (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2014), he is also a member of the Fidesz party. He served as defense minister when the Crimean crisis took place. Holistically the decision-maker groups of the Hungarian government are those of the Fidesz Party.

Despite contributions from the KDNP or Christian Democratic People's Party, the political situation of Fidesz's party remains the dominant party in Hungary. So the author formulated that there was a washing where Viktor Orban, who was a predominant leader, had an advisory groups, and the advisory groups were the Fidesz Party. Fidesz's party looks very collective and interactive in formulating and making a political counsel against

Viktor Orban, it is seen from Viktor Orban's policy towards Russia related to the Crimean crisis which is exactly the same as the position taken by the Fidesz Party, the Pro against Russia. In the European Union session of September 16, 2014 (the BBC, 2014), the EU made a voting-based policy to provide sanctions against Russia in connection with the Crimean crisis. Hungary chooses not to impose sanctions on Russia, as it will not be effective and will only make it difficult for the EU country itself. In addition Hungary also stressed to create a collective agreement with Ukraine. With this it can be concluded that parties such as MSZP, Jobbik, LMP, and have little power in creating a policy in Hungary. Because the Fidesz party directly monopolize the room. So it can be seen that there is no competitive style related to political policy in Hungary and collegial style can be realized if the Fidesz party encounter problems that can not be resolved independently (Votewatch, 2016).

In view of Hungarian political policy related to the crisis that occurred in Ukraine in 2014, we can reflect from the position of Hungary in the Parliament of the European Union. Hungary largely supports the existence of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement, as this could create a political balance against the Ukrainian government which suffered severe shocks following the Crimean referendum. All parties in Hungary agree on this except the Jobbik party, as they are the main opposition of the current Fidesz Party (Votewatch, 2016). Orban sees Jobbik's action as a betrayal of Hungary itself. But it should be realized that Viktor Orban is considered very accommodative of President Putin, so Trade Minister Tibor Szanyi suggested that there is a dialogue between the EU and Moscow. However this was rejected by the European Union, seeing Viktor Orban not yet able to determine his position clearly in view of the case, Orban is considered to be a Putin accommodator against Europe. The position of the Hungarian Government is very clear that Ukraine needs to be made a study in the European Union because this issue is very serious and needs to be resolved carefully. Viktor Orban (2014) also clearly states that "as the EU is the struggling with its internal problems the number of countries supporting Ukraine's accession has diminished. However, the V4 countries have remained friends of Ukraine ". Seeing that it was seen that the decision by Viktor Orban was the management of the decisions that Fidesz's party had brought. The Fidesz Party sees that the Hungarian Government should be pragmatic in dialogue with EU countries. But Peter Szijjarto,

Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, clearly says Hungary will not remove its position from the European Union, because the EU is a regionalism based on learning process so there needs to be consolidation and coalition.

According to Breuning (2007) in the dynamics of group-level analysis rankings, there needs to be clarity about the situation of the dominant group or referred to as single groups. In reviewing single mobility groups there are two things that must be considered, namely the ability of the leader in managing the group and the level of group loyalty to the leader. If they look to Viktor Orban and Fidesz, those two things are very inseparable. It is clear that Viktor Orban has a deterministic character as a decision maker, but it should be realized that there is a Fidesz party that also often gives Viktor Orban advice to formulate a foreign policy. Then if looking behaviorally, management style that occurs in the Hungarian government is more directed to the formalistic type, where Viktor Orban as a leader has a dominant determinant in formulating a foreign policy. In addition to the group of Viktor Orban party Fidesz tends to regard Viktor Orban as a synthesizer in the dynamics of Hungarian foreign policy. In addition, the relationship between Viktor Orban and the Fidesz party tends toward the hierarchical where Viktor Orban becomes a major milestone in Hungary.

Although the Hungarian community says that Viktor Orban is a new form of dictatorial tyranny, it does not affect the decision created by Viktor Orban in formulating a foreign policy. Viktor Orban only hears from Fidesz's party's suggestion to formulate and create foreign policy. It can be seen that the groupthink phenomenon put forward by Irving J. Janis (1982) that one mode of thinking of a group of people is cohesive, when the hard efforts of group members to reach consensus. Groupthink strives to achieve unanimity of the group by overriding its motivation for realistically assessing action alternatives, groupthink can be defined as a situation in the decision-making process that demonstrates the deterioration of mental efficiency and reality testing. Group members are often involved in a style of consideration where the search for consensus takes precedence over reason judgment. Groups that have similarities between their members and have good relationships with each other, tend to fail to realize the opposite opinion. They suppress conflict just so they can get along well, or when group members do not fully consider all the solutions.

From it can be drawn a common thread that happens in the Hungarian government is a

groupthink action based on the type of single, predominant leader and form of formalistic management. It is apparent that Fidesz's party became the dominant party in voting in the Hungarian government, because holistically, only the party's voice was heard only by decision-makers Viktor Orban. The Hungarian position of the Crimean crisis is pragmatic and very immature. Because Viktor Orban is the holder of the decision-maker hierarchy. Viktor Orban is holistically a Pro against Russia, but he also supports the Ukrainian government, due to geopolitical, economic, and so on. But if examined by the policies emerging from the Fidesz Party, Hungary tends to be pragmatic in which Hungary prefers the interests of Fidesz's party to dominate the Hungarian government's seat, as well as to create political stability with the EU.

2 CONCLUSION

From the writing above can be concluded that, the annexation of Crimea by Russia in 2014, led to various responses of various countries in the world. Particularly one of the European Union countries, Hungary. Hungary as part of the EU member sees the issue as an urgent issue and should be immediately consolidated. Indirectly what is happening in the Crimea is a political action undertaken by Russia, although Russia does not explicitly recognize it. Crisis in the Crimea is basically based on the interests of Russia to obtain energy resources in the Crimea. While in Hungary's point of view, joined as a member of the European Union and the Visegrad Group declared and committed to respect and recognize the independence, sovereignty and integrity of the territory of Ukraine internationally. Despite such a substitution, the installation in the field is very different. This is because the Hungarian government is controlled by Viktor Orban, who in fact is a member of the pro-Russian Fidesz party. In this study the author found interesting fact that the foreign policy formulated by the Hungarian government is always based on the interests of the Fidesz party and managed by Viktor Orban. It can be seen from the various policies announced by Hungary related to the crisis that occurred in the Crimea. Viktor Orban tends to be a reflection of Fidesz's party itself. Where the Fidesz party is pro-Russian in accordance with the nature of Viktor who is familiar with President Putin.

In this study, the author see that the phenomenon of foreign policy enactment enacted by the

Hungarian government can be aligned with the rank of group analysis. According to Rosenau (1987) in assessing the level of group analysis, there are three types of authority that need to be known, one of which is a single predominant leader. This is in accordance with Viktor Orbán's behavior which tends to be the ultimate decision maker in Hungarian foreign policy. Also in view of this phenomenon the author uses the concept approach of advisory management styles expressed by Breuning. There are basically three types of management styles in group analysis. First is formalistic, where leaders have a role in managing the dynamics of foreign policy formulating groups, this approach tends to emphasize the hierarchy and leader aspects as a syntheses in policy formulation. The second is a competitive form, in which the leader retains full power for a policy, but there is a competitive condition between the policy formulation group. Because each group brings its own interests to be made foreign policy of a country. Last is the collegial model that is a model in which the leader seeks to mediate among existing groups, with dialogue or open discussion. But the formalistic approach is the most appropriate model in explaining the Crimean crisis. It appears that there is not such a tight dispute between the groups in the realm of foreign policy formulation. This is because the group is homogeneous, i.e. there is only the Fidesz party as the dominant party that fills the seats of government. In addition, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, who also came from the same party, made Hungary's foreign policy always based on the interests of Fidesz party.

The author wants to argue that what happened in the Hungarian government is a new form of dictatorship, because indirectly Viktor Orbán becomes a leader who only hears information from one direction, so that the policy is no longer based on the common good aspect but rather the aspect interests of the group. The author sees the dynamics of the Crimean crisis making a benchmark against Hungary that the consistency of policy is a very important aspect, because after this phenomenon, Viktor Orbán is considered very conservative in taking a decision. This, if seen well by Fidesz's opposition party Jobbik, can be a very tough political battle in Hungary. The author also understands that in formulating foreign policy we must look at various aspects that basically can have a significant impact on the foreign policy itself. One of them is the group, where the President does not formulate the policy with the head and hands of a person, but there are advisory, inner-circle, and

groups that can give consideration and comprehensive formulation to create a foreign policy.

REFERENCES

- Balogh, Eva S. 2016. *How do Hungarians See Viktor Orbán's Political System and Its Corruption?*. [online]. Tersedia dalam <http://hungarianspectrum.org/2016/07/28/how-do-hungarians-see-viktor-Orbán's-political-system-and-its-corruption/>, diakses 3 Desember 2017.
- BBC.com. 2014. Ukraine Crisis: EU Ponders Russia Sanction Over Crimea Vote [ONLINE] Available at: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-26607466> [Accessed at 13 December 2017]
- Breuning, Marijke. 2007. *Foreign Policy Analysis: A Comparative Introduction*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan. Ch.4 (Advisors and Bureaucracies).
- De Micco, Pasquale. 2014. *A Cold Winter to Come? The EU Seeks Alternatives to Russian Gas*. European Parliament.
- Dewan Kemeterian Republik Otonomi Krimea. 2013. *Regional Profile: The Autonomous Republic of Crimea*.
- Fraser, Derek. 2006. *Taking Ukraine Seriously: Western and Russian Responses to the Orange Revolution*, University of Victoria.
- Hudson, Valerie M. 2014. *Foreign Policy Analysis 2nd Edition: Classic and Contemporary of South Florida*.
- Janis, Irving L. 1982. *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes. Second Edition*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2014. *Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerned about Crimean situation*. [online]. Government of Hungary, 1 Maret 2014. Available at <http://2010-2014.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-foreign-affairs/news/ministry-of-foreign-affairs-concerned-about-crimean-situation>, [Accessed at 13 December 2017].
- Modelska, George. 1962. *A Theory of Foreign Policy*.
- Orbán, Viktor. 2014. *Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's Speech at the 25th Bálványos Summer Free University and Student Camp*. Tusnádfürdő (Băile Tușnad), Romania, 26 Juli 2014. [online]. Available at <http://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-Orbán-s-speech-at-the-25th-balvanyos-summer-free-university-and-student-camp>, [Accessed 13 December 2017].
- Sadecki, Andrzej. 2014. *In a state of necessity How has Orbán changed Hungary*. Ośrodek Studiów Wschodnich im. Marka Karpia. Centre for Eastern Studies.
- Smith, Ben. 2014. *Sanctions Against Russia over Ukraine*. House of Commons.
- Votewatch. 2015. Position of the Hungarian Government and of the Hungarian parties in the EP on symbolic

European issues. [ONLINE] Available at:
<http://www.votewatch.eu/blog/report-comparing-positions-of-the-hungarian-government-and-the-hungarian-parties-in-the-ep-on-symbolic-european-issues/>. [Accessed 14 December 2017]

Wydra, Doris. 2004. "The Crimea Conundrum: The Tug of War Between Russia and Ukraine on the Questions of Autonomy and Self-Determination", dalam *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, 10: 111–130.

