

Date Printed: 11/03/2008

---

JTS Box Number: IFES\_5  
Tab Number: 19  
Document Title: The Movement Toward Democratization in  
Hungary: An Assessment of the Government  
Document Date: 1989  
Document Country: Hungary  
IFES ID: R01658



\* 8 B 7 6 4 0 3 F - 0 D 6 F - 4 6 1 8 - 8 C 7 6 - B 8 1 F B 3 5 7 2 4 9 A \*



**International Foundation for Electoral Systems**

1620 I STREET, N.W. • SUITE 611 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 • (202) 828-8507 • FAX (202) 452-0804

**The Movement Toward Democratization  
in Hungary: An Assessment of the  
Government of Hungary's Electoral System**

**December, 1989**

**Team Members**

Mr. Richard N. Bond  
Mrs. Ceci Cole McInturff  
Dr. Peter W. Schramm

***DO NOT REMOVE FROM  
IFES RESOURCE CENTER!***

*This report was made possible by a grant  
from the U.S. Agency for International Development*

*Any person or organization is welcome to quote information  
from this report if it is attributed to IFES.*

BOARD OF  
DIRECTORS

F. Clifton White  
Chairman

Charles Manatt  
Vice Chairman

Patricia Hutar  
Secretary

John C. White  
Treasurer

James M. Cannon

Richard M. Scammon

Robert C. Walker

Randal C. Teague  
Counsel

Richard W. Soudriette  
Director

THE MOVEMENT TOWARD DEMOCRATIZATION IN HUNGARY: AN ASSESSMENT OF  
THE GOVERNMENT OF HUNGARY'S ELECTORAL SYSTEM

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Background on Scope of Work
- III. Overview
  - A. Democracy
  - B. The Political Parties
  - C. Critical Areas For Free, Fair and Open Elections:
    - 1. Establishing an electoral commission and body of laws;
    - 2. Voter registry;
    - 3. Voting station procedures, and poll workers;
    - 4. Absentee ballots;
    - 5. Voting materials;
    - 6. Security, counting, reporting, and certification of votes;
    - 7. Systems management;
    - 8. Reapportionment;
    - 9. Political Financing
    - 10. Turnout and the 1990 Parliamentary Election Ballot;
    - 11. Voter education and motivation.
  - D. Coalition Potential
  - E. Discussion
    - 1. Fraud
    - 2. Ethnic Strife
    - 3. Selecting a President
    - 4. 1990 Parliamentary Dynamics
    - 5. Economics and Privatization
- IV. Future Needs and A.I.D. Investment
- V. Listing of Meeting Participants
- VI. Addendum, with selected translations
- VII. Project Team

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It was understandable but unfortunate that with world attention riveted on explosive excitement throughout Czechoslovakia the weekend of November 26, 1989, much of the world took less notice that nearby in Hungary a new, highly complex set of election rules were tested and an upset win scored by newly-emergent opposition parties.

That day's national referendum was the first free national election in the Eastern Bloc in decades, the first in Hungary in more than 40 years. The referendum effectively put off a scheduled presidential election, and was an upset: nearly 60% of Hungary's 7.8 million voters turned out only after overcoming an extremely complex ballot, mild attempts to rig the results otherwise, and mixed messages from three opposing sides.

Referendum turnout and results signaled very good things for democracy in Hungary. They also verified a number of impressions gained November 12-16 during our team meetings with all major political parties and a mix of individuals who represent the nation's past, current and likely future government:

\* Hungary's new election law is technically solid and fairly complex, but several items important to the overall electoral system are yet to be clarified:

- The precise formula by which the government will partially fund political parties;
- The precise role of the election high court to be named early in 1990;
- How Hungary's president is to be chosen;
- How fairly new parliamentary districts will be reapportioned;
- How effectively the extremely complex, three-tiered parliamentary election methods will be understood and accomplished by the general public;
- How fairly a small bloc of proportionally-awarded seats will actually be distributed based upon parliamentary election results in 1990.

\* The new system appears fairly fraud-free, but may remain subject to moderate government manipulation until a new, freely-elected parliament is seated.

\* Electoral information regarding details of the new law, both among the public and to a surprising degree among many party

activists, is low.

\* Financial resources, political savvy and initiative is heavily concentrated among a few of the existing parties, specifically SDS, FIDESZ, MDF, HSP.

\* Tremendous coalescing among the opposition parties is inevitable and already in the early stages. U.S. assistance should be invested broadly at this early stage, and not invested presuming the current lineup of parties is at all permanent.

\* The process will be accelerated and system strengthened if additional coalition-building and recruitment is undertaken by the parties in the agricultural, environmental, educational, labor and other constituency communities. A.I.D. assistance could play a role here.

\* After more than 40 years of communism, public attitudes are more complex, suspicious and lacking in confidence than the West may anticipate. The need for good, basic survey research benefitting all opposition parties prior to the parliamentary elections is acute.

\* The need for specific focus on media aggressiveness and objectivity is also needed starting immediately and throughout the parliamentary campaign cycle.

\* All U.S. assistance monetarily and otherwise to the parties and parts of the election machinery should be carefully "internationalized," as the issue of U.S. assistance versus control is sensitive and has the potential to become more so.

\* A primarily discussed political scenario for 1990: Parliamentary elections elect blocs of seats for SDS, MDF, FIDESZ, Christian Democrats, Smallholders, HSP in roughly that order, with very small numbers of seats scattered among a few other parties. Two primary working coalitions form in parliament between (1) MDF and HSP and splinters, and (2) SDS, FIDESZ, Smallholders and other splinters. Political differences will distinguish the two for the first year. By 1991 policy differences will begin to do so, either along a high road (whether to pursue pure or hybrid capitalism) or a low road (nationalism, antisemitism, neutrality).

## II. BACKGROUND

Given the enormity and pace of political reform in Hungary, the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) approved a grant to the International Foundation for Electoral Studies (IFES) for a comprehensive study of the new Hungarian electoral system.

A three-member election technical assessment team was sent to Hungary November 12-16, 1989, to investigate, study and report on the current situation.

Given the pace of change in Eastern Europe, the newness of the revised election law, and the near total inexperience of both government and emergent political party officials with free, multi-party elections, all information herein may adjust slightly with time and application. This is so despite the care that has been taken to ensure its accuracy.

Briefing for the team was conducted by State Department, AID, National Democratic Institute (NDI), and National Republican Institute for International Affairs (NRIIA) officials before departure. Upon arrival, Ambassador Mark Palmer and Deputy Political Officer Francisco Gonzalez briefed the team and assisted in development of a schedule that included:

- eight political parties
- a candidate for Parliament (December 9 by-election)
- a pollster
- government election officials on the national and local level
- national computer facilities and personnel
- local election officials, both in and outside of Budapest.

A number of important documents pertaining to the election structure were secured and have been or are being translated. Samples of key items are contained in the addendum to this report. The most important document is a copy of the revised Hungarian election law, released by the government on October 23, 1989. This document is currently being translated by a contract vendor through the U.S. Embassy in Budapest. The contact on the status of these materials is Political Officer Tom Lynch.

Upon return, team members Richard N. Bond and Ceci Cole McInturff were debriefed by State Department, A.I.D. and IFES officials. In addition, these team members briefed representatives of NDI and NRIIA on their way to Hungary as election observers for

the November 26 national referendum.

This report contains the following sections:

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Background on Scope of Work
- III. Overview
  - A. Democracy
  - B. Political Parties
  - C. Critical Areas for Free Elections
  - D. Coalition Potential
  - E. Discussion of Additional Key Factors
- IV. Future Needs and A.I.D. Investment
- V. Listing of Meeting Participants
- VI. Addendum, with Selected Translations
- VII. Project Team

Particular care has been taken to provide information helpful to future election observers. In addition, a number of suggestions are made with the hope of increasing U.S. involvement and encouragement in the creation of multi-party systems and free and fair elections not only in Hungary but throughout Eastern Europe.

### III. OVERVIEW

#### A. History of Democracy Post WWII in Hungary

Free elections held just after the war were won by non-communist parties. But their victory soon turned to dust through communist use of rank oppression, by then familiar to the U.S.S.R. under Stalin and which in Hungary came to be known as "salami tactics."

The death of Stalin brought further confusion and more oppression. As a result of a secret speech by his ultimate successor, Nikita Khrushchev, which appeared to offer an opening, the Revolution of 1956 occurred (and may be more clearly characterized as the Hungarian-Russian War of 1956).

This revolution was less a "democratic" revolution than a revolt against Soviet rule and oppression. But it failed, and Hungarian dictator Janos Kadar's hardline, pro-Soviet policies set in. Only in 1968 did any kind of reform possibilities become evident. Slowly, economic reorganization began allowing a larger measure of free enterprise. The changes were never theoretically articulated as superior-to-Socialism, but were seen as necessary conditions of ordinary economic and to some extent social well being. Such changes eventually resulted in Hungarians being better off than most other East European, Soviet-dominated countries, and hence, less interested in politics. They were easily governed as a result of being better off economically.

Various attempts at political reform continued to be made during the Kadar era but were never wholly successful. Periods of reform were always followed by a longer periods of retrenchment and backsliding. Those involved in these reform attempts of the late '60s and early '70s include Rezso Nyers and Imre Pozsgay.

As of May 1988 and the fractionated communist party congress which ushered in the post-Kadar era, the pace of Hungary's reform movement dramatically accelerated. In the year and a half since, during what the British Economist called "the quiet revolution", a number of rather significant things have happened. Karoly Grosz, the ringleader behind a 1988 coup against Kadar and leader of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party fell from grace. The country has come to be run by a collective presidency or "gang of four:" reformers Pozsgay and Nyers, Miklos, Nemeth, and hardliner Grosz. An August 1989 poll of party members ranked their popularity in that order. As it became more and more obvious that Grosz was not competent and unwilling to go very far toward reforms, he progressively was isolated and is today largely irrelevant.

The barbed wire fence between Austria and Hungary was dismantled, and virtually unrestricted travel to Austria was allowed (although the enthusiasm for this has waned because of new restrictions on the amount of dollars that may be taken out of the country). Last June, Imre Nagy, hero of the revolution of 1956, and his colleagues were reburied with great pomp and ceremony. This proved to be a great catharsis for the nation. The events of 1956 were no longer referred to as a "counterrevolution" but as a

"popular uprising" or people's revolution. Multi-party elections were agreed to. The communist party agreed to relinquish power if it lost an election. There was an agreement to hold parliamentary elections in 1990. On October 7, 1989, the HSWP was officially declared dead, and transformed itself into the Hungarian Socialist Party.

The framework for achieving these sprang from concern regarding Hungary's lack of economic progress. Various party documents of 1983-86 show the concerns: fear that Hungary would become isolated in the increasing internationalization of economies; fear about Hungary's 40% drop in share of world markets in the last decade; fear that if these trends continued, Hungary --which views itself as a civilized European nation with great potential -- would end up a lowly third world country.

Politically the situation was even more serious. Trust between people, and between the people and the government had worsened over the last 15 years. There was no moral foundation to society. Little held it together other than coercion. As the thinking about reforms became more serious, the connection between the economic and political problems became more and more obvious.

More public deliberations regarding needed reforms were made possible by what was happening in the Soviet Union, and Mikhail Gorbachev's not unfavorable comments on the various reforms taking place in Hungary. Since the USSR had the power (with over 60,000 Soviet troops in Hungary) to put a stop to the process, and since no clear political assistance from the West was to be expected (witness 1956), it was clear that the necessary conditions of any reform or revolution were dependent on Soviet actions, which now appeared less threatening.

The now-famous Round Table discussions started June 13, 1989, and began modestly enough with some eight opposition groups (not yet parties) participating, led by the Hungarian Democratic Forum, which Pozsgay had helped to set up, and nine groups representative of the ruling power regime. It is difficult to characterize the actual process in a geometric progression. Procedures were adopted by the parties involved by mutual consent, and seemingly unstoppable radical conclusions were reached at every turn. Agreements that were made, were made by all, with the consent of each. Each participant in the process technically could veto any aspect of the proceedings, but none did, with one arguable exception.

The Round Table agreements went to (the currently 70% communist) Parliament to be codified. And in turn, Parliament dutifully agreed to all the suggestions, only arguing about details of certain proposals. This was revolutionary in the context of other, more visible yet less substantial East European developments. What began as a necessary exercise in power sharing ends up in revolution: a change of regimes.

One of the critical elements in the process was an agreement to hold presidential elections before the parliamentary elections of 1990, and that the president be elected directly by the people. The argument seemed to be a good one: Hungary would not have a legitimate government (that is, a non-communist, multi-party government) until the people voted for members of Parliament, which would take time. In the meantime it would be useful to have at least a freely-elected president, with somewhat greater power than usual under such a system to oversee the transition.

The Association of Young Democrats and the Free Democrats did not veto the Round Table electoral agreement, favoring most of what was in it. But they refused to sign this presidential portion of it. They did not reveal to others their political strategy, but as others cried foul, these two groups (with the tacit approval of at least two other parties) held firm and took the unusual step of taking advantage of part of an earlier agreement by the Round Table that had become law, immediately collecting more than 100,000 signatures of eligible voters on a petition that called for a referendum on whether or not the president should be elected before or after parliamentary elections. Hence the November 26 referendum was called, and won by these so-called radical parties by some 6,000 votes. It is now up to the Parliament to be elected in March 1990 whether Hungary's president will be chosen by them or by the people.

Why did SDS and FIDESZ decide to do this, and why did the majority of the Hungarian people agree to it? The one word answer is Pozsgay, who they considered a shoo-in for president had the election been held prior to parliament's. Imre Pozsgay is the best known politician in the country with any semblance of trust among the people. Further, among all the other opposition groups there is no one person who has the standing that even approximates that of Pozsgay. This may seem odd, as Pozsgay had been a key player of the former ruling regime. While he was one of the prime movers behind the reform movement, and without him it could not have happened, it came this far because it got away from him. He never intended this much, has shown some regret that it has gotten out of hand, and to SDS, FIDESZ and others is not to be fully trusted. His preference is for significant reforms, but still within a fundamentally socialist context (both politically and economically).

The Round Table discussions ended on the 16th of September. Despite the final disagreement that led to the referendum it must be said that a great deal was accomplished: a new regime had been created, at least on paper, and ironically was waiting to be ratified by the still-communist Parliament. The ruling powers in effect voted themselves out of office, agreeing to allow the people, through legal procedures applicable to all parties, to select their own rulers.

Unsurprisingly under these tense conditions, new allegations abound. The HSP (and equally frequently the MDF), are concerned that things are moving too fast, and that the country may be on the brink of chaos. SDS and FIDESZ are saying the opposite, and claiming that there is a conspiracy between the HSP and MDF to stop the real revolution. They continue to remind the other parties that European unity is around the corner, and the country doesn't want to miss the train bound to the West.

The inchoate, albeit rhetorically powerful emphasis on "Magyarsag" (Hungarianess) by both the MDF and the HSP, will be a further cause of separation between them and the other parties, since SDS is less concerned with these so-called vital questions. And the fact that there are two million Hungarians in Romania (and another million elsewhere) will continue to be an issue that will cause dissension between the parties. This may also be the cause of larger problems, especially if Romania does not liberalize. The SDS and the other "radical" parties are not unaware of this issue, but by looking West hope to minimize the potential for mischief.

Unless the HSP and its shadow groups do not abide by the legislation, or win a majority in the parliamentary elections (both unlikely), the country in 1990 will become a parliamentary democracy. The only restrictions on its sphere of actions will be concern about the Soviet Union dissolving or falling back into a more hardline mode. These "geopolitical realities", as the Hungarians like to call them, are critical.

Perhaps equally important in the long run is what kind of relationship the new democratic parties will have with other democratic parties in the area of the world that used to be called Eastern Europe. These potential (and natural) relationships may become critical in the future, because it will emphasize to these always feuding nations that what they now have in common is more fundamental than past historical divisions.

### III. OVERVIEW

#### B. The Political Parties

To become an official political party in Hungary, a minimum of 10 persons must be acting together and have written a constitution or set of bylaws around which they choose to organize. The head judge of a Hungarian city registers such groups meeting these requirements as political parties. Fascist or anti-Semitic parties are expressly outlawed. Since summer 1989, more than 40 political parties have sprung up or been re-activated.

While as explained in the Executive Summary, financing, momentum and campaign savvy are presently concentrated among a handful of these parties, they are in great flux as members of the former regime's party apparatus filter into different camps and the public gets educated as to which party stands for what. The situation is very different from Poland's, for there is not yet identified any sole, Lech Walensa-like leader universally accepted across many groups and organizations.

Ultimately, informed circles believe partisan blocs will coalesce along three lines: (1) An HSP column, in whatever degree of reform HSP and its splinter evolve to [The Social Democrats when initially re-activated were in this column, but during emergence of the referendum issue moved into the third column]; (2) A Christian column, made up of MDF in whatever degree of reform it evolves to [Smallholders were here, until emergence of the referendum issue when it also moved into the third column]; and (3) A dissident/human rights column, which includes SDS, FIDESZ, the independent trade unions, Social Democrats and Smallholders. Other parties will fold into one of the three at some future point, experts believe.

But for now, the dynamic most greatly impacting the party structures as they develop is the breakdown of Hungary's communist party. It has splintered into one relatively large, reportedly well-monied and reform-oriented party re-dubbed Hungarian Socialist Party (HSP) and several other, smaller parties.

Incredibly in the face of all that has happened in Hungary and in the region, the hardliners who lost out to HSP reformer Imre Poszgay remain organized under the communist party's original name, Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (HSWP). But the former party's anti-reform public persona is passe, and there is a "purity test" of sorts ongoing among the opposition parties for which can establish the farthest distance from the erstwhile communists, both in membership and ideology.

A nationwide poll taken for one of Hungary's two television stations Nov. 25, the day prior to the referendum, found 61% of hypothetical voters saying they knew which party they would favor if parliamentary elections were held the next day; 37% of those who said they would vote if such elections were held didn't know which party they'd support. Voters indicated their party preferences as follows:

Don't Know	37%
MDF	17
HSP	13
SDS	10
Smallholders	9
Social Dems	5
HSWP	4
FIDESZ	3
All Others	2

For this report, we have limited in-depth information to those parties likely to play actual roles in upcoming parliamentary elections. Money, ideas, savvy and initiative is heavily concentrated among a few of these parties:

		\$ More	
		-	
		- HSP	
		- SDS	
		- MDF	
		- FIDESZ	
Energy/Initiative		-	More
Less		-	Energy/Initiative
	SMLHOLDERS	-	
	CHR DEMS	-	
	SOC DEMS	-	
		-	
		-	
		Less \$	

The Hungarian Socialist Party (HSP) was created mid-1989 of the former Hungarian communist party, HSWP. In its new state HSP claims 20,000 members, drastically down from the former party's membership tally of nearly 800,000. While some of the "missing members" have joined MDF or other parts of the opposition, many are believed to have dropped out of politics for now. Until the free parliamentary elections in 1990, HSP is the government party. Its nominal head and presidential candidate had the Jan. 7 election been held is Minister of State Imre Poszgay.

Formerly the HSWP received annual support from the government of \$16.6 million; a report from the office of Minister of Finance Laszlo Bekesi revealed it owned 2,884 buildings. With these

resources, the party favored top officials and furnished party headquarters and facilities well. Now as HSP, the party claims poverty, although our visit to their Budapest headquarters was to a clean, well lit modern building with a large spread of refreshments, appearing incongruous with that claim. We were unable to confirm specifically whether the law bars HSP from continuing to collect the balance of the \$16.6 million, after \$1.6 million of it is distributed among all other opposition parties as the new law dictates. HSP officials deny that they any longer receive government money, and say they voluntarily have given buildings to the Smallholders, Social Democrats and Christian Democrats.

Regardless, HSP's accumulated wealth will benefit it for some time. Opposition parties have repeatedly tried to force a serious public accounting of all the party owns as a prelude to forcing divestment and distribution of the funds. The SDS referendum petition called for an official public accounting of all former party assets, which the current communist-controlled Parliament then acted upon pre-referendum, directing Finance Minister Bekesi to issue such an accounting, which he quickly did. SDS believes it vastly undervalued the former party's worth. The issue is unlikely to be settled to SDS' satisfaction soon, however, as Parliament then altered the referendum question's wording on the Nov. 26 ballot regarding this: a yes vote was for acceptance of the Finance Minister's accounting; a no vote was against any additional accounting being done.

While on policy, HSP can be expected to support the pace and extent of reforms as pushed by Poszgay in the last year, it remains somewhat shellshocked at present and offers few policy proposals in its literature nor during the referendum beyond calls for a market economy.

Given the referendum's results HSP can be fairly described as under heavy challenge and likely to experience erosion of support between now and March 1990.

Other parties created at the split of HSWP into HSP and others include:

HSWP: Hardliners which kept the former party's name, and stand for a return to the way things were prior to 1989's reforms.  
Hungarian People's Party (HPP)  
Patriotic People's Front (PPF)  
Janos Kadar Society  
Ferenc Munnich Society  
Rally for the Renewal of HSWP  
Marxist Unity Platform, and others.

---

The distinction between the next two parties can be described as urban, democratic westernizers versus nationally-minded populists.

The Hungarian Democratic Forum (MDF) emerged quickly earlier this year as a movement, pulling together urban intellectuals and reformist communists (Pozsgay was an original founder) allied with several more rural, nationalistic and anti-communist groups and individuals. Now acting as a formal political party, it claims the largest membership of the opposition - between 20-40,000 - and was described pre-referendum as having the closest thing to a national organization with experienced campaign managers of all the opposition parties.

One deep divide between SDS and MDF involves nationalism. MDF is heir to the Hungarian tradition of populist nationalism. Its leaders believe that Hungary should not imitate the Western model but should seek a "third way" between capitalism and socialism. Its literature also suggests that the (often Jewish) intellectuals in SDS' leadership do not show sufficient concern for the fate of Hungarian minorities in neighboring Romania and Czechoslovakia (see Discussion: Ethnic Strife). This particular strain of MDF-SDS difference should not be overstated, but has deep roots, and could result in a particularly ugly clash.

Another divide between MDF and SDS involves the pace of change. As in Poland, where Solidarity went along with the election of Wojciech Jaruzelski to the presidency as a way of smoothing the transition from the communist regime and preventing an authoritarian backlash, so MDF was willing to view the referendum issue and prospective election of Pozsgay as president. SDS was not.

Economically, MDF urges consistent but cautious - as opposed to immediate - movement to capitalism combined with socialism. The party as we observed it has serious perception problems among the public regarding (1) its message, (2) its members' alleged selective support for individual and minority rights, and (3) its strategic tactical sense, at least as demonstrated during the referendum campaign.

1. MDF lacks a clear public message of "us vs. former communists," or "democracy now and a free economy." Many outstanding individuals are involved in MDF, but in our meetings with them, we observed an inability to succinctly state what the party stands for economically nor to define what a mix of capitalism and socialism would mean. MDF generally does not have the Western European focus of SDS, and its "third path" applies not only economically, but also politically: less parliamentary, pluralistic democracy; less free market economy; less international ties to the West, etc. Instead, it favors something in between. As a multi-party system of elections evolves, this lack of clarity in communicating what it stands for will be a key electoral weakness if not bolstered by specifics.

2. Nationally and in the localities, MDF reportedly demonstrates a higher tolerance than others for inclusion of former communist party members. It was widely repeated prior to the Nov.

26 referendum that MDF, which chaired the June-September roundtable sessions, had gone along with HSP's proposed one-time, direct public presidential election as part of a deal in which likely winner Poszgay would then name MDF head Josef Antal as Parliament's prime minister.

The HSP conspiracy theory was bolstered as MDF fielded a little-known presidential candidate to oppose Poszgay when the January election was still on. And it was bolstered again when a local Round Table in Debrecen ousted MDF from its membership for alleged collusion with the HSP.

MDF also increasingly is criticized for its tolerance of alleged anti-Semitism. Several top MDF officials reportedly have made overtly anti-Semitic statements publicly, and this is historically a well-known strain within the more nationalistic movements which MDF has embraced. (See Discussion: Ethnic Strife section.) While SDS is at work fueling these fires, ensuring that those unaware hear of this strain within some of MDF's leadership exists, it nonetheless remains important to be vigilant as in providing assistance so that no aid unintentionally appears to support such views.

3. Finally, MDF strategically erred when it changed tactics just before the referendum. Up until that time, confusion surrounding the presidential question was working in MDF's favor; many people said they did not see the utility in voting. However, late the week of Nov. 12, MDF changed tactics and openly urged a public boycott of the election it heretofore had called "of no consequence." This suddenly made it an issue, awarded it importance, made it appear something was at stake. Voters paid attention, and nearly 60% of them turned out, favoring SDS and scuttling the presidential election. In the Nov. 25 national survey referenced above, 70% of the self-identified MDF supporters said they intended to cast votes the next day despite their own party's boycott. The damage this does to MDF in an organizational and public perception sense cannot be underestimated.

Taken together, these weaknesses could be mortal. The party is very badly positioned as key issues emerging are whether you were or were not a communist, whether you do or do not want capitalism, and whether you will insist upon real privatization and not allow rigged joint ventures of state-owned operations in which former party officials are still favored. More than simply organizational help is needed here.

Given these facts and the referendum outcome, MDF may see its momentum decline, or many of its more liberal members to defect to SDS.

The Alliance of Free Democrats (SDS) is smaller in number with 10,000+ members, but in terms of political communication skill, technological savvy and momentum, has become the sparkplug for the opposition.

Led by philosophers such as Janos Kis and Gaspar Miklos Tamas, SDS includes prominent writers such as Gyorgy Konrad and Miklos Haraszti.

SDS was the first opposition entity to break from one part of the Round Table agreement on the issue of whether and when a direct presidential election would occur. Ultimately FIDESZ, Social Democrats and Smallholders joined it in pushing the referendum.

Its 80-page political program, published last spring, was noted for its depth and brilliance. SDS favors immediate free markets and full democracy - no socialism mix. It strongly believes former communists should be ousted from, not tolerated in, the new free government. Economically, SDS appears to be the party most closely positioned to American policy, defining the "liberal challenge of the future" not simply as establishing distinct executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, but as separating the economy from the state.

Despite its current apparent closeness domestically with principles held in the U.S., the belief in many circles is that a United Europe, which SDS wants Hungary to be a part of, will not necessarily have a smooth relationship with U.S. - especially if it is led by a united Germany. Because SDS is West European oriented, it can be expected to hold the "vices" (i.e., mistrust of U.S. intentions, more direct concern re:USSR) and virtues (democracy, etc.) endemic there. It certainly does not see itself as a U.S. clone or pawn.

Internationally, its platform is more radical than U.S. policy at present, demanding, for instance, immediate negotiations with the Soviets and establishment of a timetable for Hungary's departure from the Warsaw Pact.

Other planks of SDS' platform include: creation of a Social-Security-like system; liberalizing and scrapping much of Hungary's current red-tape-laden regulatory system; creating conditions so to legitimize and bring above board the black market; privatization of health services; and privatization of state-run enterprises, although here, too, SDS finds fault with what is being done currently (see Discussion: Economic/Privatization section). For SDS' platform, see Addendum II, part V, page 12.

But the real edge SDS most obviously demonstrates over other opposition parties is its level of campaign savvy, both in sensing the public pulse and in appearing ready - given the resources - to apply campaign technology. It has paid for at least one poll, and produced the nation's first political television ads (MDF and HSP reportedly followed suit). (In SDS ads, famous Hungarian performers and celebrities urge voters to turn out on Nov. 26, saying "For the first time, feel like a real European" and "Those who stay home vote for the past." The ads began Nov. 15 and played once or twice per day until Nov. 27; SDS spent about \$25,000 on them.) At this point in the democratization process, use of such

tools can have tremendous public impact in establishing party ideals and identification. SDS appreciates this fact, and is closer than the other parties we were exposed to to knowing the right things to ask for.

Its ability to begin utilizing such campaign technology and the appearance of its campaign headquarters indicates it is the best funded of all opposition groups, reportedly with great help from substantial U.S. and European funds, including the Soros Foundation in New York. The fact that it receives substantial foreign financial aid and engaged in "American-style electioneering" is a criticism more frequently lodged against SDS, reportedly at Poszgay/HSP urging, since the referendum.

Barring major scandal or national security setback which disrupts elections, SDS appears well-positioned to elect a major bloc of seats in the new Parliament, and could spearhead an eventual ruling coalition.

---

The Federation of Young Democrats (FIDESZ) is comprised of the under-35 crowd and with 5-10,000 members, and runs long on moral dedication and energy at the grassroots. In American terms it is a mixture of Sixties radicalism with a yuppie kind of liberated self interest. Many envision it as a youth arm of SDS, but there are in fact distinct differences.

FIDESZ has staked out a moral high ground, and sees itself as "more radical" than SDS, holding greater emphasis on civil and human rights than on economic policy, a moral force in politics as much as a political party. Its goal is to elect seats in Parliament and gain power, but its representatives insist it will not do so by accepting government money formerly given to the former communist party (conflicting with published reports that it has done so), allying itself with former oppressors, or by coming to embody the status quo itself.

FIDESZ representatives are bright, intense, and driven. While not as well financed as SDS, FIDESZ makes up for this with its core of students at the grassroots. Its members in the localities are actively recruiting parliamentary candidates (as is SDS) and in the multi-layered system of election monitoring under the new law which could allow each party in Hungary to place some 12,000 persons as election observers, FIDESZ proudly stated before the referendum that it would come close to mobilizing that many people around the country on Nov. 26. Given its high proportion of students, this appeared believable.

FIDESZ, too, reportedly is a major beneficiary of funds from outside the country, particularly the Soros Foundation in New York.

---

The next three parties are historically some of the oldest, and have been resurrected by many of the same leaders who ran them before 1947. The average age of the leadership is somewhere around 80. This is irksome for the youthful membership of these parties, but so far the veterans are holding onto the reins of power.

The Christian Democrats in Hungary are stronger by name I.D. than in actual party structure. This party, so well known elsewhere in Europe, is expected to have some tangible pulling power outside of Budapest in the upcoming parliamentary elections due to voters' familiarity with it elsewhere. However, as the party re-activated this summer, its former leaders - several of whom including the party head served in Hungary's last, free parliament - have reclaimed their rightful place and consistently pushed or kept out any younger, more energetic individuals who might represent the party's future.

Attempted discussions regarding the party's platform, its understanding of the new election law rules impacting it or of government financial aid available to it inevitably ended up as re-hashes of the 1948-49 uprising and the outrages that occurred after it. This is not to say that its leaders do not have something very compelling to say. Re-raising memories of 1948-49 and making a clean separation from those responsible for it is emerging as a salient Hungarian election theme.

But if this party is to ever constitute real opposition and gain seats in such a fluid, rapidly developing atmosphere, its historic leaders must share power more easily and attract others quickly.

The Smallholders Party, like the Christian Democrats, is expected to have substantial pull in districts outside of Budapest due to historical name I.D. of the party. But internally, the party appears totally without resources, so unaware of the new election rules that it has not sought the funding other parties have already obtained, when we visited it had only one copy of the first (and none of the following) set of election laws, and ultimately appears headed for folding into a larger coalition within Parliament rather than emerging as a strong force in and of itself.

The Smallholders, led by Tobor Partay, 85, recently purged Ivan Baba, a young and talented academic and journalist who had aspired to turn the old agrarian party into a more liberal grouping of the new Hungarian middle classes. Baba, with a group of similarly motivated computer whiz kids, has now turned his talents toward a new, major daily newspaper targeted as the future voice of the ultimate liberal movement in Hungary once party lines are more firmly established.

The Social Democrats were rarely mentioned in our discussions with political players in Hungary, and not at all visible. We were unable to meet with any of their representatives.

The Social Democrats' gerontocracy rid itself of Mihaly Bihary, the astute and highly respected dean of the Law School at Budapest University, who is in his 40s and who had hoped to become the party's leader.

However, given that the party was one of the four allied together pushing the referendum (a smart thing to do), given that it claims membership as large as MDF, and given that per Nov. 16 media reports the party had been allowed to collect more of its allotted government funds than FIDESZ has, we feel our assessment of the party is incomplete.

---

The October Party is a small group of individuals either dating back to or connected to those directly involved in the 1956 revolution. Much of its focus is upon the events at that time.



### III. OVERVIEW

#### C. Critical areas for free, fair and open elections:

##### 1. Establishing an Electoral Commission and Body of Laws

The 1989 roundtable agreements called for a National Electoral Commission to ultimately adjudicate disputes, and created a structure of local commissions below it to deal with issues arising locally.

Parliament (currently 70% representative of the former regime) named five individuals to the national commission: Chairman, Dr. Pal Kara, whose party affiliation is unknown; Dr. Mathe Gabor of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party; Dr. Adam Antol of the Hungarian Patriotic Peoples Front; Dr. Balsai Istvan of the Hungarian Democratic Forum; and Dr. Torgyan Jozsef of the Smallholders. These members oversaw the actual counting of votes in the November 26 referendum and for a December 9 by-election (called to fill the seat of Hungary's new ambassador to the U.S.). Each will serve a four-year term.

The size of the commission by law will grow prior to each subsequent election called. Once an election is called and date posted, each party fielding candidates in that upcoming election may name a representative to the commission. Those members will serve until an undefined period prior to the next election, when again all parties fielding candidates have the right to appoint or re-appoint one representative each to the commission.

[Given that members of the new parliament will serve four-year terms as well, this should effectively mean that all members of the National Electoral Commission will serve four-year terms, which will be staggered by six months or so, given the time elapsed between when the parliamentarily-named members and the party-chosen representatives were selected.]

Powers of the National Electoral Commission are absolute, for the moment. Its rulings are final, as Hungary's constitution does not give the country's national judiciary jurisdiction in election matters. In January 1990 a special national election high court is to be named by Parliament, to which National Electoral Commission disputes could be taken and presumably, decisions appealed.

Locally, the structure is similar. County Administrators (heretofore local government-appointed) appoint three persons to a Local Electoral Commission for each of the 11,013 polling places in the country. These local commission members also serve fixed terms of unverified length. Serving additionally on the local commission with these members are representatives of each party fielding candidates in any given election. Again, prior to the next election, all parties fielding candidates may appoint or re-appoint reps to the local commission.

Conclusion: While this system potentially allows for the national and most particularly local electoral commissions to become unmanageably large given that some 40 parties currently claim existence in Hungary, in fact no more than eight parties are likely to field candidates and therefore get the right to add members to the commissions.

The structure guards against one side controlling the commissions, and ensures that the national commission ultimately will be a key facet to ensuring free and fair elections.

Confirmation is needed that national commission decisions will be able to be appealed to the new election high court.

Meeting with Chairman Kara and all present and to-be named members of his commission is highly recommended for members of future U.S. election observer delegations.

2. A Voter Registry

Elections, including voter registration, are under the jurisdiction of the Interior Ministry. Dr. Tibor Csiba heads the Election Office at the Ministry, and also supervises the National Office of Population Records which maintains computerized records of Hungary's 7,853,962 voters.

Computerized records contain the voter's age, sex, residence and education level. In addition, each voter is assigned a nine-digit voter identification number and given a photo I.D. for life containing this number. Voter lists are broken down by 11,013 individual polling precincts and by 20 counties nationwide including Budapest, which is considered one county. Polling places per county, for example, are as follows:

<u>County</u>	<u># Polling Places</u>
Budapest	1,503
Baranya megye	602

Bacs-Kiskun megye	650
Bekes megye	468
Borsod-Abauj-Kempen megye	910
Csongrad megye	535
Fejer megye	407
Gyor-Sopron megye	444
Hajdu-Bihar megye	524
Heves megye	338
Komarom megye	339
Nograd megye	290
Pest megye	960
Somogy megye	463
Szabolcs-Szatmar megye	583
Szolnok megye	426
Tolna megye	321
Vas megye	382
Veszprem	412
Zala megye	456
	<hr/>
Total	11,013

A sample precinct voter list can be found in the addendum to this report.

Before each national or local election the government will mail out a voter notification postcard (see the attached report) to all eligible voters containing the voter's polling location and a sample ballot. The voter is requested to bring this card to the polls. However, failing to do so, the voter may present his national identity card and still be allowed to vote.

The Population Office also is charged with certifying the exact number of eligible voters by each election day. This

is crucial, because the new law declares elections valid based on certain turnout thresholds being met: 50% in parliamentary elections, 50% in referenda. What exact number of votes actually constitutes 50% is certified and not officially released until election night.

Conclusion: Dr. Csiba should be regarded as a key contact by future observer missions. Observers should check that the voter notification postcards have been mailed out and received in sufficient time pre-election, that at the polling place failure to bring the postcard does not preclude voting, and what number has been set as the certified number of the national electorate.

3. Voting Station Procedures and Poll Workers

Polls are open from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., but the hours can be expanded (but not narrowed) depending on local circumstances and if agreed to by the Local Electoral Commission.

At each of Hungary's 11,013 polling places, the Local Electoral Commission -- by law always a minimum of five persons -- is present to supervise the voting process.

The voter checks in at a registry table, presents the national identity card or voter identification postcard and is checked off on a master roster of voters listed alphabetically within the precinct. The voter is given a ballot and then proceeds behind a curtain to privately mark choices in pen (use of pencil invalidates the ballot).

The voter then seals the ballot in an envelope provided at the polling place and places it in an enclosed, locked ballot box. This box is not opened by anyone until the polls close.

Electioneering of any kind is prohibited inside the polling place. No one may accompany a voter behind the curtain for any reason.

Conclusion: Parliamentary election observers, in consultation with opposition parties, should target those polling places throughout Hungary where problems occurred during referendum voting or where this historically is considered a possibility. Traditionally these have been in the industrial northeastern districts. Election observers should give those special attention.

After the referendum, there were charges that 20-30% of the voter lists were out of date, and that turnout was actually 66%, far above the reported 58%. U.S. Embassy Political Officer Tom Lynch, however, said that the provision

allowing for walk-in voting upon presentation of national I.D. card even without presenting a voter notification card made up for nearly all such problems, and that turnout might have been suppressed only as much as 5%, due to outdated lists.

4. Absentee Ballots

Two types of absentee ballots may be cast. A "moving ballot" is used in cases where elderly, infirm or otherwise disabled voters notify local election officials that they cannot physically come and vote. Two election officials, as well as representatives of all parties fielding candidates in a district, go to the voter's residence and allow him to vote at home. Officials then carry the ballot back and place it in the main ballot box where it is indistinguishable from other ballots.

According to Interior Ministry officials, the number of such cases is extremely small.

The second type of absentee ballot is a more traditional form that allows a voter away from home to vote in the area of the country where he is on election day. This is used primarily by members of the military. Hungarians who are out of the country on election day at present are not dealt with by the new election law and have no legal way to cast votes.

Absentee ballots are counted locally at the same time as the actual votes cast at the polling place and also are indistinguishable from other ballots.

Conclusion: Although absentee use does not appear to be widespread, observers should insist on seeing both types of absentee balloting occur. During the November 26 referendum, some away-from-home university students allegedly were not allowed to vote, contrary to the new procedure.

5. Voting Materials

Basic Hungarian voting materials consist of:

A. Voter Notification Postcards - approximately 7.8 million will be mailed out for the upcoming national parliamentary election.

\* Referendum postcard (See this report's Addendum) contains voter name, address, identification number, placement number on the precinct voting list, and polling place. A sample ballot is reproduced on the back.

\* Parliamentary by-election postcard (See this

report's Addendum) contains similar information, but is perforated so that a separate nomination form for Parliament may be torn off. Candidates or parties then collect these cards from individual voters and submit them collectively to local elections officials for review and certification that the candidate has qualified for the ballot. To qualify, a candidate must submit at least 750 certified signatures of voters per election district (current district sizes vary; after reapportionment, each district will have 60,000 voters).

- B. Election notification posters - (Addendum II, Part II p. 1) are printed by the government and displayed locally to advertise the upcoming vote.
- C. Referendum petitions - (See this report's Addendum) are used to collect a minimum of 110,000 names of eligible voters in order to call a referendum.

Conclusion: The postcards mailed at government expense signal good intent to ensure the largest extent of public participation. Election observers should ensure that the voter notification postcards are indeed mailed and not distributed otherwise, as charges of school children being tasked with door-to-door distribution and mass amounts being dumped in trash cans as a result circulated after the referendum.

Also to be checked: that all correct voter information to be included is on the card, and that nominating cards uniformly indicate that each card must be signed by the voter in order to be considered valid.

#### 6. Security, and Counting, Reporting and Certification of Votes

Once the polls close, the ballot box is opened and the ballots and absentee ballots are counted. The local electoral commission participates in and monitors this process.

Individual precinct turnout totals and vote results are then recorded by hand on tally sheets (Addendum III p. 2) which are driven to the County Administrator's office as well as called in to there. (Copies of the tally sheets are allowed to be given to each party and candidate represented on the ballot once the polls close.) Results are keypunched and simultaneously entered into the national computer system.

These results are received by the national computer within the main Parliament Building in Budapest, where Dr. Pal Kara, Chairman of the National Electoral Commission, certifies and announces the results. Interior Ministry officials' goal was for unofficial results of the November 26 referendum to

be announced within 12 hours of the polls closing, and certified as official within 12 more hours. In fact, unofficial results were available sooner than this, and final results not certified much until later.

Conclusion: This system of counting, reporting and certifying votes is not likely to be speedy given the manual precinct aspects of paper ballots and the driving of tally sheets to the county before speedier county computerization takes over. However, it is likely to be a fairly secure system, given that all parties may have representatives present as votes are cast, counted, manually recorded, and inputted into computers, at the local, county and national levels. Claims that resulting glitches in the system during the Nov. 26 referendum were due to human error or unfamiliarity with the new rules should be given credibility, but less at any point after that "test run."

#### 7. Systems Management

Observers are told repeatedly in Hungary that Hungarians are noted for their prowess in computer technology.

Officials indicated the equipment used is all standard, IBM-compatible hardware. A special election software program was created by the government, and one official implied that the opposition had input in writing the software; we were not able to confirm this.

Conclusion: Those with more computer expertise should assess whether better system improvements are immediately obtainable in Hungary. Government has committed to purchase computers for coverage down to the precinct level, but no funds have as yet been identified for this expenditure. Meantime, the system as we observed it and as it reportedly performed in the referendum is adequate. More risk to the upcoming parliamentary elections' fairness, speed and security might be done by trying to add new computer capability in an unrealistically short amount of time.

Prior to parliamentary voting, a good investment would be a tour for senior Hungarian county and national election officials of several U.S. election boards to observe their procedures, equipment and facilities. IFES would be an appropriate organization to organize this kind of study team.

#### 8. Reapportionment

New parliamentary districts are to be drawn and certified as official by the Prime Minister's office at least three months prior to the 1990 parliamentary elections, under Hungary's new election law.

Each parliamentary district is to have 60,000 residents (not voters), with a 10% variance allowed to assist the reapportioners in complying with other parts of the law: that no rivers may be crossed by electoral district lines, and that ethnic communities are not split up into separate districts if at all possible. No specific percentages of ethnic vote per district are established in the law, however.

Draft lines are drawn by local county administrators, heretofore appointed by the government, ie: ruling regime. These draft plans had been submitted to Budapest as of our visit there Nov. 12-16. Local officials were awaiting certification and finalization of their work, but said the Interior Ministry elections office and Prime Minister's office had final say and could make changes to the draft lines. Local officials were aware of no appeal mechanism to the Prime Minister's Office decisions, but presumably such challenges would be considered by the National Electoral Commission chaired by Dr. Kara.

Conclusion: Confirmation that reapportionment plans have been finalized once the parliamentary election date is posted by the current Parliament is needed. Reviews of the final reapportionment plan's fairness should be obtained from all major opposition political parties as soon as possible thereafter.

#### 9. Political Financing

The new election law provides for a system of quasi-public financing for political parties and candidates, but details on timing and allocation formulas remain imprecise.

One feature of the plan diverts a modest portion of the former communist party's federal allocation to all opposition parties.

The law calls for three types of assistance:

- \* Party infrastructure funds - Formerly, the communist party received \$16.6 million from the Hungarian state budget for annual support. One-tenth of that money now is to be distributed annually among the opposition parties. (It remains unclear whether the newly-named Hungarian Socialist Party will still receive any or all of the remaining \$15 million.) Such monies would be used for opposition party organization, housing, printing, support, and other ongoing work.

For 1989, initial disbursements have been made

directly from the Prime Minister's office based upon unverified membership numbers submitted by certain, but not all of, the opposition parties. 1989 disbursements were reported in the media as follows:

---

# Members:	Party Name:	Will get:	Has Rec'd:
20,000	Hung. Dem. Forum	\$250,000	\$ 85,000
	Social Democrats	250,000	171,666
10-20,000	Hung. People's Party	166,666	50,000
5-10,000	Free Dems (SDS)	116,000	16,666
2-5,000	Young Dems. (FIDESZ)	66,666	16,666
2,000	Christian Dems	66,666	50,000

\*Source: Vilag newspaper, 11-16-89. Original chart lists figures in forints, and is (Section III p. 1) in addendum. This chart's monetary conversion based upon rate of 60 forints to the dollar.

---

However, interviews with individual parties made clear that not all party officials understand that they may apply for money now. Membership figures as listed in the above chart appear badly inflated in some cases. And there was no explanation available as to why certain parties were allowed to draw a greater percent of their allocation than others.

In the same week, representatives of the Smallholders party decried the fact that no money was yet available to them from the government, while the Christian Democrats expressed satisfaction that they had received funds and expected to receive more. The same day that FIDESZ told us it had not and would not accept such funds until a formula was adopted requiring proof of claimed party membership, newspapers reported that FIDESZ had accepted government money. Etc.

An additional \$1.6 million in 1990 infrastructure funds reportedly is scheduled to be disbursed early in the new year. And the new election law dictates that after the free parliamentary elections in 1990, a formula based upon each party's percent of national vote and percent of seats in parliament is to be devised. Parliament is widely expected to take up the how-to-disburse issue in December, which presumably would apply until the free elections in February-March.

- \* Party pre-election funds - There was some discussion, but little documentable evidence of, expected additional funds to be given by the government to the parties specifically for expenditure on the Parliamentary elections. Specifics of this need to be confirmed.
- \* Individual candidate funds - Approximately half (176 of the 386 members) of the new parliament will run as individual candidates not technically affiliated with party. All such candidates will be eligible for a \$1,000 grant from the government to spend on pre-election campaigning.

#### 10. Turnout and the 1990 Parliamentary Election Ballot

Turnout levels determine the validity of Hungarian national elections.

In national referenda, such as the one held November 26, a 50% turnout threshold of eligible voters must be reached in order for the results to count. If the turnout threshold is not met, the election is considered invalid, and votes cast are moot.

But in national parliamentary elections, including those upcoming in March 1990, a turnout threshold of 50% must be reached. If it is, candidates must receive 50% + 1 to win.

If the turnout threshold is not met, or if no candidate wins 50% + 1 votes, a runoff election is held within a short amount of time. Only candidates receiving 15% or more of the vote in the original election may participate in the runoff, unless fewer than three candidates in a given district did so. In such a case, to ensure that a minimum of three names are on the runoff ballot, the next highest candidate finish below 15% is added to the runoff ballot. Runoff required turnout threshold is much lower: 25%. The candidate garnering a plurality - the most runoff votes - wins.

[Note that Hungary's new election law stipulates different rules and turnout thresholds for direct, national presidential elections such as the one that would have been held January 7 had the November 26 referendum results been otherwise. See III E: Discussion: Selecting the President section.]

There will be 386 seats in Hungary's new Parliament, to be elected March 18 or shortly thereafter in 1990. Parliamentary election voters will indicate two preferences on their ballots, one name each from two candidate lists: individual candidates and party candidates. A third category

of winners will be chosen at the national level as votes are counted there, based upon national party percentages of votes received.

The new Parliament's 386 members, then, may be selected one of three ways:

\* 176 will be elected as individuals, having run on the ballot with no party affiliation listed and elected from 176 single-member districts. Given that only some \$1,000 in government funding is available to these candidates under the new election finance law, presumably individuals holding higher name recognition locally would opt for this method. History of overt partisan activity by these individuals is not barred - they may be in fact party members - although presumably party officeholders would not choose this route to run for Parliament.

\* 152 will be elected as party representatives from a separate, party candidate ballot in which party affiliation accompanies candidate name. These candidates will be elected from each of Hungary's 20 counties (19 counties plus Budapest, considered one county). The number of party seats per county is determined based upon county population. Local interviews with potential and actual candidates indicates that some joint endorsements will be made in certain districts, most particularly between SDS and FIDESZ. Rare would be the district in which all primary opposition parties fielded parliamentary candidates. In cases of joint endorsement, presumably one party would take the lead and have that candidate's name listed as identified with it, with no candidates affiliated with the other endorsing parties listed on that ballot. These candidates are funded by the political party to which they belong.

\* 58 will be selected through a complicated, national proportional party vote process.

All party list candidates receiving votes above a local district threshold may be considered.

Total national party vote is tallied. Based upon it, seats are awarded to each party on the basis of one for every 40,000 votes received nationally. The process by which winning parties select which of the qualifying candidates from the party candidate list take these seats is unclear.

Third, all votes left over after a party's votes-per-40,000 have been allocated are totalled and divided by the number of proportional seats nationally (58) plus one. The resulting number in percent is a threshold; parties receiving total national votes above it win an additional seat.

To be nominated for Parliament, as mentioned previously,

candidates collect 750 signed nomination cards from eligible voters within the district and turn them in to the local county administrator's office, which with the Interior Ministry's election office then certifies that all signatures are valid and places candidate's name on ballot.

While no formal joint-nominating agreements will be made among all opposition parties for the parliamentary elections, it is expected that frequently in the localities, SDS and FIDESZ will jointly recruit and endorse candidates, and that in districts where one of these parties already has endorsed a candidate, the other will not run one of its "stars." Also, an agreement is expected between SDS, the Smallholders and the Social Democrats that in districts where all field candidates and as a runoff occurs, the other two will pull their candidates and support the SDS candidate.

Conclusion: This complicated system of multiple candidate lists to be chosen from on a single ballot is the result of HSP desire for protection, knowing that its future candidates would run more strongly if not identified with the former regime, and the smaller, historical parties' belief that their own name identification will be a stronger suit with voters than individual candidate names out of the mainstream for decades. It must be confirmed, clarified and fully translated, however, before election observers are on the ground.

#### 11. Voter Education and Motivation

We discovered these primary forms of voter education:

- \* Voter notification postcards - If printed accurately, these will play a significant role in informing voters of basic election information, as well as providing for real ballot access in the parliamentary elections.
- \* Free media - Print and radio journalists are getting bolder by the day, but opposition party members believe television's objectivity is still suspect. (Ambassador Mark Palmer did disclose optimism that a new, truly independent television channel's operation is near to becoming a reality.)
- \* Paid media - SDS broadcast the first political television commercials seen in Hungary on behalf of the referendum. Introduction of paid media likely will go the farthest in motivating and educating Hungarian voters if continued access exists and production is responsible.
- \* Traditional campaigning - Campaign posters, printed leaflets, platforms and party congress materials are

most heavily relied upon at present to communicate from party to voter.

Such more traditional approaches are also taken in candidate campaigning. We joined SDS parliamentary candidate for the Dec. 9 by-election Miklas Gaspar Tamas as he campaigned one evening in a local pub. He sat quietly discussing issues and collecting signed nomination cards from voters at a table of approximately 10 chairs. Voters remained at seats around the table for an average 20 minutes each, then left, to be replaced by others who had come in and if not finding an available seat at Miklas' table, had gotten a beer and sat elsewhere until one opened. His estimate was that he saw some 80-100 voters that evening.

Even with the positive report on the democratization movement in Hungary that we offer, the electorate itself does not appear to be well informed. Prior to pollster Endre Hann stated that in polls taken after this fall's party congresses, voters were still unable to offer accurate information about the new parties, their leaders or their platforms. It is admittedly a confusing situation but retention was unusually low. (See results of Hann's Nov. 25 poll, referenced in Political Parties section.)

More disturbingly, various man-on-the-street and taxi driver discussions we conducted indicated deep-seated pessimism about politicians new and old, as well as about whether voting in even a free system is really likely to produce change. SDS predictions were that this attitude and confusion would equal insufficient turnout and render the referendum moot. This underscores the significance of the ultimate, near 60% turnout upset.

Conclusion: If possible, a way should be found to fund and air public service television spots designed to motivate Hungarians to vote. These spots would not endorse any candidate or point of view, but rather extol the benefits of free choice and self determination. There may be a role for academia in this effort as well. Most definitely, this concern also leads us to a recommendation for future investment in media "training" and coalitional assistance of some sort.

Since the current government has proven responsive to pressure tactics, election observer teams might be accompanied by teams of media representatives acting as ombudsmen/monitors from the West to observe and assess the media's quality, extent and evenhandedness of parliamentary election coverage.

An Hungarian version of Free and Responsible Media could be encouraged.

In future parliamentary procedural training for newly-elected representatives, introduction to the need for some sort of Freedom of Information act to codify the media's access to government and its documents should be included.

Regarding paid media, video cassettes of selected types of political television advertisements from the West should be prepared and sent to the opposition parties as soon as possible.

And more in-depth information regarding how much air time the government will offer on both radio and television to parties and candidates prior to the parliamentary election is needed.

### III. OVERVIEW

#### D. Coalition Potential

As Hungary's political parties master their nation's new electoral process and become more expert in mass communications and modern campaign technology, coalescing will begin among them. An ultimately smaller number of major parties will come to wield power based upon high numbers, both in membership and seats in Parliament, and from this arrangement democratic policymaking should be facilitated.

But the precise shapes such governing coalitions take, and to some extent which policy directions they pursue, will be impacted by the individual coalitions the parties form with separate groups of Hungarian voters early on - groups which credibly claim allegiance of some portion of the citizenry and/or represent issues which motivate measurable blocs of voters.

These groups offer something obvious to a political party: voters, potential contributors, distribution networks (through already-established newsletter, meeting, grapevine or other routes), already-identified leaders and activists, etc. The parties offer such groups a mechanism to achieve the group's issue goals, ie: involving members of the group in the party, electing members of that party to Parliament who share the group's issue goals, presumably then increasing chances that those goals will be reflected or protected in future Hungarian law.

At this early stage, Hungary's political parties are still arguing about proving their membership numbers, period, upon which depends the amount of government financial assistance received. But very rapidly, discussions and approaches likely are being made to such outside groups regarding forming coalitions with certain of the parties.

Advice to parties regarding how to most skillfully do so, and training to such groups regarding how to organize effectively within as well as outside of the political party structure to foster multi-party democratic processes are two types of assistance worth offering immediately in Hungary (see Future Needs section).

An example of the kinds of groups holding organizational potential in Hungary:

#### Environmentalists:

In at least two recent instances in Hungary, environmental organization successfully forced action: the suspension of the joint Hungarian-Czech-Austrian Gabcikovo-Nagymaros dam project, and suspension of bauxite coal mine pumping of water on Lake Heviz, which was dangerously lowering the lake's water level.

While economic factors played key roles also, organized citizen outrage ultimately forced relevant government ministries

to halt programs heretofore ordered by the state which were harming the environment, running over budget, and potentially costing jobs.

Given that young people and those better educated usually demonstrate higher environmental sensitivity in western polls, it could be that SDS and FIDESZ would most actively and successfully recruit members and voters using environmental policy goals as an attraction. However, given the extent of environmental neglect in East Bloc countries up to this point, those finding themselves environmentally active there could more broadly represent age and other groups.

The Helsinki Foundation recently sponsored an international environmental conference in Hungary, signaling recognition of the issue's importance and even the current Hungarian government's placing of priority upon paying attention to it, or appearing to.

The internationalization of efforts regarding global warming, clean air and water, and chemical/waste/pesticide regulation is rapidly increasing, however, and Hungary's developing parties all will have to address this in their platforms and overall messages.

#### Religion:

Hungary, many told us repeatedly, is no Poland. While the church has been a locus for opposition activity out in the countryside, the country is far more secular historically, and no religious figure has raised his or her political profile to national status nor limited church support to one party among the opposition.

Hungary is 67% Catholic, 20% Lutheran, and 5% Calvinist. Presumably church support would be strongest among the Smallholders and MDF given the rural bases of each, and possibly the Christian Democrats.

#### Labor:

There have been two umbrella organizations for labor, remnants of the four million member Central Council of Hungarian Trade Unions (heretofore dependent upon the former regime and HSWP), and the League of Independent Trade Unions, representing all those outside the Council.

Up to this point and under the old system, labor has not been especially strong. In the reform that has occurred in the past year politically, it has been the dissident movement as opposed to the workers at its forefront, unlike the case in Poland. But obviously great organizational potential nonetheless exists.

#### Education:

Teachers are among the first grappling with real effects of the political changes of the last year. In exchange work with the American Federation of Teachers and possibly others, work already has focused upon how to teach democracy, both in theory and practice.

As teachers organize themselves and as education - historically a strong issue in Hungary - develops into a political issue, their coalition potential to the parties will grow.

Women's/Consumer:

Recently, a leading Hungarian feminist returned to the country and discussion with U.S. Embassy staff indicated this would form an organizational core for some kind of political group for women. While not parallel to the women's movement or women's specific views on issues as distinct from men's and as charted by western survey research during the last several years per se, but again holds obvious potential.

Business:

The Association of Private Entrepreneurs, as well as other business groups at the local level, are already acting as candidate recruitment resources for the parties.

Youth:

FIDESZ most obviously would have an angle here, but all parties should work organizationally in this area, given that the younger voters' confidence in the new system is essential for its success in the longer term.

Agriculture:

Representing a faction within MDF and a few of the smaller parties at present, farmers will likely develop into a vocal and culturally important bloc regardless of actual numbers, and likely have reason to organize as government coops undergo transition and Hungary participates more fully in world markets.

An example of groups with ongoing exchange and organizational activity in Hungary and holding expansion potential:

American Federation of Teachers  
National Education Association  
Helsinki Foundation  
Carnegie Foundation  
Ford Foundation  
Hudson Institute  
German Marshall Fund  
Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.  
Radio Free Europe  
National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc.  
Business Roundtable  
American Farm Bureau  
National Grange  
Consumer Federation of America  
National Resources Defense Council  
Conservation Foundation  
Sierra Club  
Wildlife Federation  
AFL-CIO  
AFSCME  
Etc.

To further categorize and prioritize such U.S. groups holding coalition potential, an audit should quickly be undertaken, and

results of which utilized by IFES, A.I.D., and all recipients of  
its Eastern European electoral assistance funds.

### III. OVERVIEW

#### E. Discussion

Several items have been mentioned in this report which we felt merited additional fleshing out for more complete communication:

##### 1. Fraud:

In the Executive Summary we state:

The new system appears fairly fraud-free, but will remain subject to moderate government manipulation until a new, freely-elected parliament is seated.

Given the rules, procedures and machinery of this new process, and our intangible assessment of the individuals charged with administering and monitoring the process, likelihood of fraud is low. When and if it does occur, as in many other countries, it is most likely at the local level.

[There, a fascinating human dynamic exists. The very officials or apparachiks favored by the former communist party to which they owed their jobs are now responsible for carrying out free and fair elections that will result in the party's - and likely their own - replacement. Most we met went above and beyond to cooperate, candidly admitting job retention prospects looked less than secure. The opposition parties are properly watchful, however, for such officials in some localities whose "last act" may be to attempt to skew events against the opposition.]

In this pre-parliamentary election period, however, with Poszgay still heading government and 70% communist control of the current Parliament, there is some chance that the remaining items to be dealt with such as listed in the Executive Summary could be impacted to the opposition's detriment.

Events surrounding the recent referendum provide an example: Though choosing a parliamentary form of government, the Round Table acquiesced to a one-time direct election by the people for Hungary's first freely-elected president, and set an early date for it: January 7, 1990.

Some members of the opposition, fearing an easy win against disorganized opposition by Poszgay, called for the Nov. 26 referendum to decide the issue. It was an uphill attempt thanks to:

Parliamentary maneuvering: The ballot contained other popular questions: disband communist party workplace observers and militia, and account for vast party assets. Each was quickly accomplished and rendered moot by parliamentary action, lowering incentive to vote.

More maneuvering: Parliament then moved order of the ballot questions from their order on the referendum petition form. When done after flyers urging "vote yes on #1" have been printed, for instance, it costs your opposition more money and irritation.

More maneuvering: More seriously, "explanatory paragraphs" were added after each question on the ballot which had never been printed on the referendum petitions. Innocuous for the other now-moot questions, the paragraph following the already-confusing presidential question phrased the question whether a voter wished "to deprive himself" of voting directly for president, clearly skewed it in the government's favor: for January presidential elections.

Post-referendum allegations indicated other such efforts may have occurred. Reports were that voter notification cards listing polling place and sample ballot were not mailed but distributed by schoolchildren, that voter lists used in some precincts were "out of date" disallowing some voters to vote, and that university students were not allowed to vote absentee.

Shortly after the referendum, Poszgay created a seemingly democratically-composed Media Board of Governors to issue guidelines for news coverage for the increasingly open press. (As Minister of State, his job heretofore has covered this area.) All opposition parties could have had representatives on the Board, but with heavy HSP, HSP-splinter and MDF representation, SDS, FIDESZ and the Social Democrats have refused to participate believing the press should be free, not simply controlled by more parties. Thus the board is even more skewed to the detriment of free and unbiased coverage.

All the above examples demonstrate that though the "c" word has been banished, events can still be manipulated. As is being seen elsewhere in the region, communist parties change their names and sack older leaders for younger ones promising change, and the voters' dilemma becomes: how much to forget? In Hungary, some former HSWP members say they never really believed the doctrine, infuriating others in the opposition who suffered at their hands, such as SDS' Gaspar Miklos Tamas. While Poszgay rightly claims credit for pushing reform ahead of neighboring regimes, he and his appear to expect something for it, and aren't leaving without a struggle.

## 2. Ethnic strife and its electoral role:

Ironically, there are historic minority conflicts throughout Eastern Europe that remain relevant even during such a time of

upheaval for freedom. A Turkish minority is fleeing from Bulgaria just as the Soviet Union is at last conceding many minority demands. Tension rose between Czechoslovakia and Poland prior to the world-shaking events in both more recently when the Polish prime minister pointedly attended a Warsaw performance of a play by dissident writer Vaclav Havel, now a likely leader of his nation but at that time a thorn in the regime's side. Prague, meanwhile, began making life more difficult for Poles passing through its customs posts. The Soviet Union's Romanian-speaking Moldavians are making just the demands being made by Romania's two million Hungarians, forcibly annexed into Romania along with Transylvania.

Meantime Hungary and Czechoslovakia are at loggerheads over Hungary's decision to suspend the joint Gabcikovo-Nagymaros barrage project on ecological and economic grounds (see reference in Coalitions-Environmental section). Hungarian television then further infuriated first the Czechs by interviewing 1968 "Prague Spring" hero Alexander Dubcek and as well as Havel shortly after his release from prison, then the Romanians by interviewing ex-King Michael on the sensitive subject.

Without question the first and foremost of such ethnic issues to be dealt with in Hungary once a freely-elected government is in place will be the Hungarian-Romanian situation. Romanian-Hungarian relations are tense over the issue of how the Hungarian minority in Romania is treated, and by Hungary's acceptance of almost 20,000 Romanian citizens as political refugees. The issue, and the public furor accompanying it, was cited to us by MDF's Geza Jeszensky as the reason MDF's platform does not currently push too hard on the Warsaw Pact question. Fear of Romanian troops, and belief that membership in the Warsaw Pact will prevent Romania from attacking Hungary, was the justification given for MDF's urging discussions on, but no tangible action regarding, withdrawal from the Pact.

There are sizeable Hungarian minorities in all its neighbouring socialist countries, and moves by Hungary to raise the issue of human rights for them draw charges of foreign interference in internal affairs, chauvinism and worse.

Within Hungary, its own minorities historically have been subject to poor treatment. A freer political system may allow some of this to again rise to the surface, particularly as it relates to Gypsies and Jews. This problem is sensitive, but not infrequently discussed in Hungary, and has been reported in the western media:

"Former dissidents aren't worried about the Marxists anymore...they are more concerned about a rise of the demagogic right...Anti-Semitism and anti-gypsy prejudice are surfacing in ugly ways, despite efforts to reject what was long suppressed by the police state...About 100,000 Jews remain in Hungary, as does an endemic bigotry as imbedded as racism in America."

NEW YORK TIMES, 11/89

In specific, allegations that some MDF officials tolerate anti-Semitism have been made by SDS, which feels itself criticized for having a large proportion of Jewish members. Again quoting the New York Times to reiterate anecdotally what we were told by SDS and others:

"The group the Democratic Forum (MDF) had conducted an active campaign for a referendum boycott and centered its fire on the Free Democrats (SDS), with particular emphasis on the fact that several Free Democratic leaders are Jews."

NEW YORK TIMES, 11/89

"The Forum's campaign has brought into the open the group's antagonism toward the Free Democrats, with strong suggestions that for some of its (MDF) leaders the presence of many Jews among the Free Democrats is objectionable. In a statement issued on behalf of the Forum's presidium, the party's weekly declared, 'Whoever is a Hungarian will stay home along with us Nov. 26.'

"Privately, Free Democrat leaders speak angrily of the implicit exclusion from the national community of those who favor the referendum and denounce the narrowly defined nationalism that has marked the Forum's campaign as a revival of anti-Semitism. Publicly, they refuse to discuss it."

NEW YORK TIMES, 11/26/89

For its part, SDS' official literature states as one of its tenets that "We hold the conviction that the domestic minorities are entitled to guarantee of these same rights. We have a moral obligation to raise our voices for their rights as well. We defend Hungarian democracy and civil liberties when we condemn any public expression of anti-Gypsy and anti-Semitic sentiments. We seek to spread awareness that the Gypsy minority can free itself from its present position on the margin of Hungarian society only with the material and moral help of the majority. We also support the guarantee of full minority rights for Germans, Romanians, South Slavs, and Slovaks in Hungary."

In our discussions with SDS they acknowledged that progress has been made, specifically regarding anti-Semitism, and that MDF leaders "were no Glomp or Waldheim." But it remains a concern, particularly as SDS and MDF blocs are seated in the 1990 Parliament. Hopefully as more traditional political loyalties and organizing are established, the economic and foreign issues facing new Members will focus them on the high road rather than on such divisions with the capacity to halt Western enthusiasm and limit assistance to them.

### 3. Selecting Hungary's president:

Given the results of the November 26 referendum, it will be up to the new Parliament elected in March 1990 to select Hungary's new president. While conventional wisdom holds that Parliament will do so itself similar to the European model, we were told that what

exact formula Parliament is to use to do so is either unclear or not yet decided. National, direct elections as had been proposed for January 7 prior to the referendum remain a possibility, we were told, although this is not expected. But on the in-case that such a scenario takes place in the future, following are the electoral rules in current Hungarian law governing such presidential elections:

- Candidates for president may be nominated by collecting 50,000 nominating forms, each signed by an eligible Hungarian voter. (So confident that the referendum would not achieve required turnout and that the Jan. 7 presidential election would take place was Dr. Tibor Csiba, head of the Interior Ministry's election office, that he mentioned that as of Nov. 13, 800,000 of the forms had already been printed and were ready to be distributed to all local election (county administrators') offices.

- In a presidential election by the public, a 67% turnout threshold must be met in order to render the election's results valid. If sufficient turnout is met, any candidate earning more than 50% of the vote is elected.

If sufficient turnout is not achieved, or if no candidate earns above 50%, a runoff is held in which a 50% turnout threshold must be met in order to render the election's results valid. All candidates on the original election ballot earning 15% or more in that election may appear on the runoff ballot. If the runoff's turnout threshold is met, the candidate winning the highest number of votes wins. If the runoff turnout threshold is not met, it is up to Parliament to decide on dates for new elections or pick the president itself.

#### 4. Nature of Hungary's 1990 parliamentary dynamics:

We state in the Executive Summary that a primary political scenario for 1990 is that:

...Political differences will distinguish the two for the first year. By 1991 policy differences will begin to do so...

By political differences, we mean that in the next few years, SDS and FIDESZ in particular, as well as with the Smallholders, Christian Democrats, and the Social Democrats will likely remain natural allies due to coming this far relatively together, certainly now given the referendum success. It is unlikely to be ordinary policy disagreements that will make or break ruling majorities. Rather, it will be trust in one another's basic philosophies, tendencies, inclinations and view of history that will drive them in the upcoming parliamentary elections and sessions, and perhaps into a few years after that.

"The parties," says SDS' Gaspar Miklos Tamas, "are still tribes where the bonds of loyalty because of shared experience are more important than new ideological ... divides."

5. Political impact of economy and privatization issue:

Hungary's economy is relatively stronger than others in the region, and that bodes well for future free elections. Despite its \$18 billion foreign debt, an essentially worthless currency in the forint and scarce capital, due to Hungary's more reform-minded communism of the last few years fewer people appear as poor. "We've been pink, not red," one put it. Now with 100% foreign ownership allowed and foreigners flooding Budapest to do deals, voters have sufficient incentive to be patient with newly-elected leaders during initial pain as a sluggish, state-run economy becomes free. This is not a small factor, and makes Hungary's odds in favor of ultimate free electoral success higher than, say, Poland's.

However, one economically-related issue, regarding privatization, holds real potency politically and came up in formal and informal conversation frequently: the phenomena of the former regime's elite being protected and emerging from new economic and political freedoms as "legitimate" entrepreneurial owners of what the regime formerly assigned them to run.

This is listed as the way, rather than militarily, that members of the former regime will fight change, becoming "parachutists" who descend on civilian institutions and gain good salaries and shares, thus preserving their elite status. It is said to be the nomenklatura's price for accepting a market economy. There is suspicion and outrage over erstwhile HSWP loyalists being enabled to start out in such a "new" enterprises with the lion's share of the stock certificates. A party or candidate able to address that anger, or propose how to prevent this situation, would meet with rapid success.

This issue was key to SDS' argument against allowing the January 7 presidential election, which would have essentially ceded a strong independent executive to the HSP and presumably allowed former HSWP apparatchiks to cash in on their waning power, transforming themselves into "entrepreneurs" by becoming general managers of newly privatized state companies and buying shares at ridiculously low prices.

# Hungarians Hold Their First Free Election in 42 Years, Ignoring a Call for a Boycott

Continued From Page 1

us" and had no intention of voting. Two opposition parties, backed by other groups, forced the referendum through a petition drive, saying the ruling Socialist Party would have an unfair advantage if the election is held while it has the Government machinery in its hands. But arguing that the president's powers are sufficiently limited, the party believed to be the largest opposition group, the Democratic Forum, does with the Government on this issue. The Socialist Party, which changed its name from the Communist Party last month, has charged that its opponents want to deprive Hungarians of the opportunity to choose their president directly. It added to the ballots a statement noting that under an election law that will take effect with the election of Parliament next year, the legis-

lature, not the public, will elect the president.

Opponents reject this view, saying the new Parliament would be free to decide how the President is chosen.

The referendum was a result of negotiations concluded in September between the ruling party and eight opposition groups.

In an agreement signed by six of the eight, transitional measures were established to guide Hungary's passage from a one-party state to a multiparty parliamentary system. The opposition groups that signed said they would have preferred parliamentary elections first but that they did not want to block agreement over the issue.

### 3 Other Issues Academic

In a petition drive centered on the four issues on the ballot today, the two dissenting opposition groups — the Alliance of Free Democrats and the Association of Young Democrats, which aspire to Western-style democracy — gathered more than twice the 100,000 signatures that make a referendum

mandatory.

The three other issues raised in addition to the election question have been overtaken by events. They are abolition of the workers' militia, an armed branch of the ruling party; the disbanding of party organizations at workplaces, and a demand for an accounting by the ruling party of the assets it acquired in four decades of unlimited access to state property and funds.

Parliament has since voted to disband the militia and ban party organizing at work, and the party has promised an accounting of its assets. The sponsors of the referendum maintained their demands, nonetheless, with the aim of making their fulfillment irreversible.

The referendum campaign was marked by virtual silence on the part of the ruling party, many of whose officials favored a boycott, and active electioneering by the two groups that initiated the referendum.

They, in turn, were vigorously attacked by the Democratic Forum,

whose program is conservative and nationalist. In campaigning strongly for a boycott, it has strengthened suspicions among other opposition groups that it shares short-term goals with the Socialists.

These goals are said to be the election of Imre Pozsgay, the ruling party's candidate for president, and the formation of a coalition government after parliamentary elections, probably under a Democratic Forum prime minister. He is thought likely to be Jozsef Antall, the Forum's chairman.

### 30,000 Rejoin New Party

Public-opinion polls suggest that the Socialist Party and the Forum would each receive about 20 percent of the vote for Parliament if elections were held now. The new Socialist Party is said to have maintained the support of about 30,000 of the old Communist Party's 720,000 members; the Democratic Forum claims about 20,000 members.

The Forum has entered its own presidential candidate, Lajos Fur, a little-known historian. But opposition

groups point out that Mr. Pozsgay and many Forum leaders have maintained good relations since Mr. Pozsgay brought the Communist Party's greetings to a gathering of intellectuals in 1987 that in effect turned into the Forum's founding meeting. Mr. Pozsgay's presence gave legitimacy to the dissidents' gathering.

The Forum's campaign has brought into the open the group's antagonism toward the Free Democrats, with strong suggestions that for some of its leaders the presence of many Jews among the Free Democrats is objectionable. In a statement issued on behalf of the Forum's presidium, the party's weekly declared, "Whoever is a Hungarian will stay home along with us Nov. 26."

Privately, Free Democrat leaders speak angrily of the implicit exclusion from the national community of those who favor the referendum and denounce the narrowly defined nationalism that has marked the Forum's campaign as a revival of anti-Semitism. Publicly, they refuse to discuss it.

## Hungarians Hold First Free Vote In 42 Years, Shunning a Boycott

By HENRY KAMM  
Special to The New York Times

BUDAPEST, Nov. 26 — In the first free national vote in 42 years of Communist rule, Hungarians went to the polls today for a referendum on when a presidential election will be held.

Contrary to pessimistic forecasts, they did so in sufficient numbers to make the referendum valid, insuring the failure of the ruling party's silent boycott of the referendum. The vote was forced by some of the country's new opposition groups, although it was opposed by others.

Initial though inconclusive returns had a majority of voters upholding the ruling party's plan to hold the presidential election on Jan. 7 while it still has the reins of Government. Opponents of the plan want the election held after free multiparty elections for Parliament next spring.

By mid-evening, a heavy snow began to fall in Budapest and the northeast of the country, delaying the delivery of ballot boxes to counting centers. Participation of at least half of Hun-

gary's 7.8 million voters was to make the referendum valid. Hours after most polling closed, the national election commission announced that an estimated 60 percent of eligible voters took part.

Election officials said many were unfamiliar with voting procedures and asked how to fill out ballots. After four decades of one-party rule by the Communists, some asked what answers to give to questions on the timing of the election and other issues.

Parliament Election In Spring  
"We wanted to take into our hands the possibility to decide people's future," Imre Loper printer, told The Associated after voting. But others were about the referendum, and one played man said many people had considered the referendum.

Continued on Page A11, Column 1

# Hungarians Spurn Ruling Party's Timetable, Rejecting a January Vote for President

Continued From Page 1

party in an effort to remain in power despite the unpopularity of Communists in Hungarian society.

"We can be certain that the number of yes votes was higher than the no votes," Mr. Pozsgay said at a news conference. A yes vote was in favor of delaying the presidential election.

The mechanics of the referendum were complicated. The most important question the voters were asked to decide was whether the presidential election proposed for Jan. 7 should proceed.

More than half of those eligible to vote actually voted, as they did, the referendum would be valid. A turnout of less than 50 percent, regardless of how those voting cast their ballots, would have meant that the referendum was null and that the election would be held as scheduled in January.

Once it was clear that enough people had voted to validate the referendum, the question then became whether they would confirm the election date anyway or vote it down, in effect delaying the choice of a President until after parliament is elected.

## 'An Enormous Victory'

The cancellation of the Jan. 7 election works in favor of the opposition and against the Government and its candidate, Mr. Pozsgay. If Mr. Pozsgay had been able to run in January, he

would have had the advantages of incumbency of the Government and party officials.

Now the choice of President appears to go to the Parliament, once it is elected. Most of the opposition feels that this will make it more difficult for Mr. Pozsgay to win, easier for the opposition to field and elect its own candidate.

As Mr. Pozsgay conceded defeat, the official count still showed the no votes ahead with 50.2 percent of those counted. But the Hungarian state radio said that in the final count the yeses would carry by a few thousand.

"It's an enormous victory," said Miklos Haraszti, a leader of the Alliance of Free Democrats, the party that had imposed the referendum on the Government.

The Free Democrats, supported by three other parties, opposed the Government's schedule on the ground that it was undemocratic to choose so important an official while the ruling party still controlled all essential offices and such vital political advantages as access to state-run television and most of the press.

The new Socialist Party had called for a no vote on the ground that under the present rules all Hungarians would be entitled to vote for the new office. Once the new Parliament is seated, a new law specifies that it elects the President.

Mr. Haraszti said that the Free Democrats and the three parties that

## 'An enormous victory,' says an opposition leader.

joined them in urging a yes vote were ready to accommodate the almost equal number of Hungarians who voted no on Sunday. He said his party would agree to a new law for direct presidential elections even after a new Parliament was in place.

The condition, he said, is that the President will have largely formal powers, similar to those of the office in West Germany and Austria. Mr. Pozsgay said he would not be interested in the presidency if its powers were merely formal, but added that he did not favor a presidency with arbitrary powers.

Making the best of the defeat, the State Minister said, "While in eastern and central Europe hundreds of thousands of people are marching in the streets to express their opinions, Hungarians are going to the ballot box to express their political will."

Mr. Pozsgay, a longtime Communist leader who is believed to be the party's most popular leader, had been widely expected to use the interim between election in January and the seating of Parliament to endow the presidency, a new and vaguely defined office, with

considerable power.

Mr. Haraszti said that Andras Kery, head of the State Population Registration Office, put the margin of victory of the yes votes at no more than 6,000 to 7,000. The turnout was a surprisingly high 58.2 percent of the 7.8 million people eligible to vote.

The referendum defeat and the turnout constitute a major setback for the ruling party. It had opposed calling the referendum and waged only a lukewarm campaign, with some party officials saying privately that they favored a boycott. The fate of the former Communist Party has declined sharply since it reconstituted itself as socialist last month.

The transformation, which its leaders had expected to bring new vigor into the ranks, has had the opposite effect. Of the 720,000 Communist Party members, only about 30,000 have so far accepted the leadership's call to join the new party. The hard-line group that is keeping the old Communist Party alive is believed to have more members than the party that still governs Hungary.

Mr. Pozsgay, in conceding, admitted a belief in the party that its representation in Parliament will not be strong enough to elect the President. Before the referendum, senior party officials said 30 percent of the national vote was its maximum hope while 20 percent seemed more probable.

Another loser in the referendum was

the conservative opposition party that until Sunday had been assumed to be the most potent and been expected to do at least as well as the new socialists in the parliamentary races. The group, the Democratic Forum, had conducted an active campaign for a referendum boycott and centered its fire on the Free Democrats, with particular emphasis on the fact that several Free Democratic leaders are Jews.

The referendum was the last chapter in a series of negotiations concluded in September between the Communist and their allies and eight opposition parties to set the rules for the transition from a one-party regime to multiparty parliamentary government.

The Free Democrats and the Association of Young Democrats refused to sign largely because of what they viewed as the undemocratic sequence of elections. The Free Democrats succeeded in collecting more than double the 100,000 signatures required to force a referendum in the first petition campaign ever held in Hungary.

In the campaign, they and the Young Democrats were joined by the Independent Smallholders Party and the largest of several groups using social democratic in their names. Despite their small numbers — the Free Democrats have about 4,000 members — the surprising referendum success is viewed as having greatly strengthened the four parties' chances in the coming parliamentary campaign.

## Welcome To Politics

BUDAPEST

**H**ungarians say proudly, and rightly, that they have gone furthest toward political reform in Eastern Europe. There will be truly free elections by spring, without the restrictions Solidarity had to accept in Poland.

Parties of assorted tendencies have formed, dozens. The Communist Party dissolved itself. Some 5 percent of its members joined the new Socialist Party; others plan to revive the old party in dogged loyalty to a dying faith. "A Communist Party has to be allowed," says hard-liner Robert Ribarszky with unintended irony. "Otherwise it wouldn't be democratic."

Former dissidents aren't worried about the Marxists anymore. If things go really wrong in the difficult process of transformation and there is social upheaval, they are more concerned about a rise of the demagogic far right.

And yet there is no euphoria. Everybody is for democracy, political pluralism, free markets, a mixed economy, some private property. There is no more police harassment. The press and the church are free. But there is more exaltation and excitement about the new Hungary outside than within.

Hungary had the first and last proper election of Soviet-occupied Europe in November 1945, as pledged in the Yalta agreement. Communists did badly, and Stalin concluded that it must never be allowed again where Moscow could prevent it. Now Moscow has removed its objection, the process is peaceful and the mood is slightly glum confusion, with plenty of bickering and backbiting among former comrades whether they were on top or in the repressed opposition. An old joke is revived that when two Hungarians get together, they insist on going in three directions. The opposition to the old regime cannot pull itself together.

Peter Togyessy of the Free Democrats, who are dominated by Budapest intellectuals, notes that "the party-state has collapsed." So the rivalry now is among the non-Communists.

The most popular party is the well-organized Democratic Forum, an um-

aged to supplant former local Communist committees even in many rural areas. Its president, Josef Antall, says about the same, criticizing the Free Democrats and their allies for being too inflexible in demanding dramatic change, for rejecting the idea of a coalition with ex-Communists.

The immediate issues are too complicated and short term to report. There is to be a referendum this month to see if a president should be directly elected before parliamentary elections, or later by Parliament. The Forum has called a boycott, an unhappy way to start a democratic era; but Free Democrats have a poor, too obviously tactical case for voting yes.

Hungarian politicians have learned, or remembered, the tricks and quarrels of electoral politics very fast. No wonder the voters are bewildered.

Nobody is saying "Read my lips," but neither is anybody giving a reasonable account of the inevitable sacrifices ahead in moving the economy to productive growth and "Europeanization," everybody's goal. The future is painted in haze, and the past is so overwhelmingly past that promising not to continue is no longer saying much.

Acting President Matyas Szuros, one of three or possibly four ex-Communist candidates for president if the referendum fails, which is likely, offers a generous welfare program to be financed by cuts in defense (without upsetting the Warsaw Pact) and bureaucracy (without too much unemployment). Imre Pozsgay, the affable, energetic ex-Communist reformer, considers his record of upsetting the regime from within sufficient not to require addressing what next.

The widespread assumption is that a newly elected government will be a coalition, tilted center-left or center-right, probably with Mr. Antall as Prime Minister. But the real issues are blurred, and the big fights are about personalities and ambitions, both among and within the parties.

Some leaders are emphasizing nationalism, which has a certain populist appeal with uncertain implications. Anti-Semitism and anti-gypsy prejudice are surfacing in ugly ways, despite efforts to reject what was long suppressed by the police state.

"You want pluralism and free expression, you get that too," says Endre Aczel, editor of TV News, which has been snidely called "the Jewish kingdom." There is a revival of Jewish pride and open celebration of Jewish cultural heritage, equally suppressed in the past, he notes. "That is the other side." About 100,000 Jews remain in Hungary, as does an endemic bigotry as imbedded as racism in America.

After all, democratic politics don't come easy, especially in a terrible economic situation. It's the only way, but it's not all flowers and light of the first freedom.



## WHO ARE THE FREE DEMOCRATS ?

Szabad Demokraták Szövetsége (SZDSZ)

Alliance of Free Democrats

WE ARE THE PARTY OF FREEDOM AND SOLIDARITY. Following the traditions of European and Hungarian liberalism, we fight for the freedom of the individual, for human and civil rights, for the restriction of state power and for a modern market economy. We also connect ourselves to the traditions of social democracy. We fight for the right of the workers to form independent organizations to defend their interests and for a society which seeks to secure a dignified life for every individual. We fight for a country in which neither state power, nor market forces are allowed to damage or destroy a healthy natural environment.

WE ARE UNYIELDING OPPONENTS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY STATE. The communist system that was introduced after 1947 is not to be reformed, but must be replaced. We are radicals but not extremists. We reject all violence, threats of political blackmail and any attempt to create confusion and chaos. In the interest of this peaceful revolution, we remain ready to negotiate with those in possession of power. But we are not ready to accept an agreement that serves the survival of communist power.

WE OPPOSE ANY FORM OF DICTATORSHIP, be it the totalitarian regime of the left or of the right, or an authoritarian regime. We stand opposed not only to a dictator whose power is based on the army, but also to a dictator whose power rests on popular acclaim. We stand equally opposed to any continuation of forty years of communist dictatorship, and also to any revival of the rigidly hierarchical Hungary of interwar authoritarianism. We want instead a modern liberal democracy in which majority rule rests on representative parliament and minority rights are guaranteed by the rule of law.

WE WANT HUNGARY TO JOIN WITH EUROPE COMPLETELY. We challenge the idea that our backwardness by Western standards is anything to be preserved. We reject the illusion that the particular Hungarian past points to a "third road" that makes no connection to "Western" liberalism or "Eastern" socialism. We want to proceed along the path of the worthiest Hungarian traditions established by the great 1944

reformers. Along with Eotvos and Deak, Széchenyi and Kossuth we believe that Hungarian advance is possible only by rising to Western standards.

WE FIGHT FOR THE FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL. The very word freedom is defined by individual rights: The rights of the individual versus state power, the rights of the worker versus the employer, the rights of the entrepreneur versus bureaucracy, and the rights of the minority versus the majority. Only individuals guaranteed these rights can form a free society. It is this principle that sets us apart from socialist or communist collectivism to the left of us and national-Christian-conservative collectivism to the right of us.

WE SEE OURSELVES AS PART OF THE ENTIRE HUNGARIAN NATION. We feel strong solidarity with Hungarians outside Hungary's borders. We reject the dangerous illusion that those borders can be revised. We fight instead for a future in which borders do not separate Hungarian minorities in other countries from Hungarians at home. We fight for the individual and collective rights of minority Hungarians abroad, we fight for their rights to cultivate freely their language, culture and historical traditions.

WE HOLD THE CONVICTION THAT THE DOMESTIC MINORITIES ARE ENTITLED TO GUARANTEE OF THESE SAME RIGHTS. We have a moral obligation to raise our voices for their rights as well. We defend Hungarian democracy and civil liberties when we condemn any public expression of anti-Gypsy and anti-Semitic sentiments. We seek to spread awareness that the Gypsy minority can free itself from its present position on the margin of Hungarian society only with the material and moral help of the majority. We also support the guarantee of full minority rights for Germans, Rumanians, South Slavs, and Slovaks in Hungary.

WE STAND FOR THE FULL SEPARATION OF STATE AND CHURCH. All forms of state supervision over any religious institution is to be abolished. The practice of religion, both individually and collectively, is the exclusive province of the believers themselves. At the same time, the convictions of non-believers are to be respected as their private province. We favour the reopening of church schools and more generally, we favour free access to religious education. At the same time, we oppose the teaching of religion as a compulsory subject in secular schools. Churches should be free to participate in political life, but they should not be able to act as part of the state.

WE AFFIRM TOLERANCE IN POLITICS, CULTURE, EDUCATION AND IN THE CONDUCT OF EVERYDAY LIFE. As everywhere in the modern world, a great variety of views and lifestyles exist side by side in Hungarian society. The state has no right to force any one of these views or styles on its citizens. But citizens themselves are also obliged to respect this variety, in particular, views and styles they do not share. We resist any attempt by any group, even the majority, to force its own moral convictions on others by law.

WE WANT A MODERN MARKET ECONOMY. The crisis and the continuing decline of the Hungarian economy cannot be countered with limited reforms. The economy based on state ownership and direction from above has proved to be a failure. It is essential to recognize and allow the development of private property, in its widest variety ranging from individually owned enterprises to cooperatives and shareholding corporations, and to companies and banks operating according to the rule of the market. The market mechanism should be allowed to decide which enterprises and forms of organizations will predominate. The state should not take upon itself anymore supervision of economic affairs than in any developed market economy.

WE ADVOCATE FREE TRADE UNIONS AND A SOLID SYSTEM OF SOCIAL WELFARE. Even the best market economy cannot automatically eliminate the vulnerability of wage-earners and old-age pensioners. Therefore we support the creation of strong organizations to represent these interests, the idea of workers' participation, and a system of social insurance operating on market principles, as well as state assistance to those most in need. Any economy based on the principle of performance can achieve balanced development only if market standards are combined with an effective social policy based on the principle of solidarity.

WE WANT AN ECONOMY OPEN TO THE WORLD MARKET. Further isolation would only lead us to further decline. The reason for our indebtedness lies not in our having opened up to the world economy, but in the incapacity of the communist system to adapt to international competition, and in the fact that the communist leaders prolonged the agony by irresponsibly negotiating further loans. We should not fear foreign capital, but rather the inability of our state economy to revive itself.

WE WANT AN INDEPENDENT AND NEUTRAL HUNGARY. We realize that it would be unwise to declare our neutrality in a unilateral fashion. But we believe that Hungary will be able to

withdraw from the Warsaw pact by means of multilateral negotiations before the two military blocs are actually dissolved and Soviet troops will be withdrawn. As a political party, we seek correct relations to the representatives of the Soviet Union and other East-European states. But the allies of our party are the democratic movements of the region, alongside of whom we have been fighting for freedom, independence, human rights and peaceful international relations for more than a decade.

WE SEEK ALLIANCE WITH EVERY POLITICAL ELEMENT THAT FAVOURS LIBERAL DEMOCRACY AND A MODERN MARKET ECONOMY. We see FIDESZ as such a movement, and find similar trends in other parties as well. Till democracy has been completed, we seek cooperation with every element in the opposition, even those with whom we might, in the future, disagree. We value highly and we wish to enhance further the good relations between the local organizations of the Alliance of Free Democrats and the Hungarian Democratic Forum, and we will make every effort to normalize relations between the leaders of the two organizations.

OUR RELATIONS WITH THE SUCCESSOR TO THE FORMER COMMUNIST PARTY WILL DEPEND ON THE UNAMBIGUOUS SEPARATION OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST PARTY FROM THE PRIVILEGES OF THE STATE PARTY. There is no way that we are prepared to participate in a coalition with the HSP in the first government after the elections. In our judgement, both the integrity and the stability of the transformation demand that the HSP retreat into opposition. We emphasize that we do not demand the HSP's withdrawal from political life, but only from the positions previously held by the communists within the state. Therefore, whether in a governing majority, or in opposition, the Free Democrats will always raise their voice against any kind of political exclusion and witchhunt. Those rights which we have now achieved will serve to protect the access of all parties to the democratic process.

The October 1989 convention of the SZDSZ elected an eleven member executive board:

Gábor DEMSZKY  
Miklós HARASZTI  
János KIS  
Ferenc KOSZEG  
Bálint MAGYAR  
Imre MECS  
Iván PETO  
László RAJK

Miklós SZABÓ  
Gáspár Miklós TAMAS  
Péter TÖLGYESSY

Szabad Demokraták Szövetsége  
Budapest, IX.  
Ráday utca 23.

phone: (361) 118 7733  
(361) 118 4788

fax: (361) 118 7944



#### IV. FUTURE NEEDS AND AID INVESTMENT

It is an understatement to say Eastern Europe is changing fast. Given this reality, after one week of intense assessment in Hungary and concentrated follow up discussions with experts here and there, our recommendations are based upon three beliefs:

1. Hungary should be recognized as a laboratory for democracy, as it is so far ahead procedurally of the rest of the region.
2. There is no going back to a communist regime for Hungary, but it is its promising economy that makes this most true, not simply its still-shifting new political system. A.I.D. assistance to parties and government election officials which fosters free, multi-party system development is, in fact, tangible work toward stabilizing Hungary's economy.
3. The U.S. should, therefore, continue to encourage Hungary's progress and protect it by carefully providing various forms of broadly-invested and well-coordinated assistance there to further the development of strong opposition parties.

---

Based upon these above tenets, our recommendations to IFES and A.I.D. are that the following areas be encouraged and/or funded regarding Hungary:

1. Better coordination of funds spent to directly aid the political parties is needed, and the evenness of such aid should be ensured.

Today's opposition political parties are tomorrow's ruling coalitions. But it is far from clear who will coalesce with whom. Rather than pick sides or assist too selectively too soon, A.I.D. should do all it can to ensure that assistance it funds is spread across all of the most promising parties.

Optimal results will be achieved if direct assistance to these parties is comprehensive for all, covering organization, communications, advertising, polling, coalition-building and voter contact in each party's case. And such multiple-discipline assistance should be provided by bipartisan teams of professionals from this country in each party's case. Real effort should be made to coordinate with other international political professionals undertaking such per-party assistance.

This implicitly would mean ensuring that the two U.S. party institutes - when expending A.I.D. funds - work more closely together and that someone within or for A.I.D. coordinate their activity regarding aid to parties in Hungary (see #10). Any long-term assignment of certain opposition parties to one institute or the other can limit assistance too narrowly prematurely and, given the very different fields of emphasis within the two (very fine) institutes, provide very different and uneven assistance.

2. Prior to the parliamentary elections, a delegation of national and local Hungarian election officials should be hosted in this country for a several-stop tour of the more exemplary boards of elections for technical fact finding.

Observing several of the best operations in this country, which each use varied methods and machinery to record votes, would be extremely helpful. We received expressions of interest in this when the topic was raised by us along with Political Officer Tom Lynch at the Office of Population Records. IFES could appropriately coordinate such an effort.

3. Coalitions - such as agricultural, environmental, educational, youth, labor, business, women's and consumer groups - need cultivation and would measurably assist formation and solidification of Hungarian opposition parties at this stage.

Such coalitions are of immense benefit in a multi-party system and have already begun to emerge as discussed earlier in this report. Any agency in the U.S. government that appropriately can distribute funds for training in constituency/coalition building programs should be directed to do so promptly.

To facilitate this, an immediate audit is needed of such groups existing or beginning to organize and with political potential on the ground in Hungary, as well as exchange activity ongoing with related groups in this country. Preliminary findings of such an audit should identify a target group of coalitions for particular emphasis between the end of January and the March 1990 parliamentary elections.

4. There is real need for rapid organization of exposure for Hungarian print and broadcast media to free media values and the press-government adversarial relationship prior to the parliamentary elections. And at election time, a special media assessment or observer team should be dispatched to provide pressure for fair, open coverage by the Hungarian media, particularly in light of recent developments.

This is suggested in the context of something that would have tangible and positive impact on development of multiple political parties in Hungary. Particularly as long as their resources remain as limited as they are, opposition parties must develop the media as a primary communication tool. And as long as the Hungarian

public remains wary of politics and of the ability of achieve change through voting, the media must become much more of an educational tool regarding democracy.

At least between now and the March 1990 elections, fewer meetings here with famous columnists, and more hands-on discussions in Hungary between Hungarian reporters and editors and a mixture of international press representatives, both national and local, as well as academic media specialists, is recommended. Such seminars should cover media ethics, conflicts of interest, the workings of democratic government, economic coverage, a primer on Hungary's new electoral system, and an assessment of newsroom and publishing technology's status.

Recent developments only heighten this need. As mentioned previously, since the referendum Poszgay created a media Board of Governors to guide the emerging free media in what is and is not proper coverage. As Minister of State, Poszgay has for some years has been responsible for overseeing the media so this action appears appropriate, and appears democratically-constructed: the board is made up of multi-party representatives, although numerous parties participating are reportedly favorable toward the former regime. SDS, FIDESZ and the Social Democrats have refused to participate. There was great criticism was Poszgay announced the board, but he has not given in. This has been described by Hungarian journalists and SDS activists as "the last power struggle" in the face of HSP's referendum loss.

Therefore such media "training" and election monitoring prior to the 1990 elections would provide valuable counter-pressure to any remaining intimidation or vestiges of self censorship by the Hungarian press.

5. Voter motivation efforts should receive assistance before the parliamentary election.

The referendum's turnout tells two stories: At nearly 60%, it was a triumph over government and even SDS expectations that enough voters to render the results valid overcame a confusing and largely already-dealt-with ballot and voted. But fully 40% of Hungarians, when given their first nationwide chance in more than 40 years to cast a free vote, didn't. And nearly 40% when polled Nov. 25 expressed no preference among the existing political parties.

A not infrequently-heard sentiment among Hungarians we met with formally and informally is that after decades of required proof of "voting" communist to get pay checks, promotions and avoid harassment, the new politicians promising change and urging voting were not necessarily to be trusted. The public is doubtful voting will make a difference.

To deal with this lack-of-trust factor and encourage turnout, we recommend identification or creation of an Hungarian entity with sufficient generic credibility (similar to our League of Women Voters) to produce a "Pro-Democracy, Pro-Voting" educational campaign centered around public service television spots.

We also recommend direct assistance to targeted opposition parties for survey research into not only party identification and vote intention questions, but also deeper probing into public attitudes and policy preferences.

Both could be determinants in maintaining public trust at a critical time of coalescing among an already-confusing number of new parties and the parliamentary election.

6. Because of the short time frame between now and the March 1990 parliamentary elections, there should be less emphasis on bringing Hungarian officials to the United States and more on sending international election specialists there to provide technical assistance on an as-needed basis.

Following the March 1990 elections, emphasis should be placed on offering those Hungarians in charge of the election process the opportunity to meet other elections officials from other countries and to observe the elections processes in those countries, including the United States. Such exchanges would give Hungarians the opportunity to learn and assess other electoral systems and adapt information that might be applicable to Hungary. Exchange visits also offer Hungarian election officials the chance to establish contact with their professional peers in other countries.

7. A high-level international election observer team should be sent to observe Hungary's parliamentary elections, and be on the ground for a time period sufficient to have become familiar with procedures and mechanics prior to actual voting.

The U.S. might act as impetus for such a team. Presuming that other western nations will be sending observers of their own, a real effort at coordination is needed. At most visible times and in exposure to Hungarian media, observers should be shown to be working together and fairly described as "international," not strictly American.

There is a sensitivity about the West, period, and the U.S. particularly, attempting to control or take advantage of the electoral and economic liberalization ongoing in Hungary. We should be sensitive to it.

Prior to dispatch of such a delegation, answers to the following must have been clarified:

- The precise formula by which the government partially funds political parties;
- The precise role of the election high court named early in 1990;
- How fairly new parliamentary districts were reapportioned;
- Identification of which former election districts experienced vote counting discrepancies during the referendum voting.

Such a delegation should consider Dr. Pal Kara, National Electoral Commission Chairman, and Dr. Tibor Csiba, head of the Interior Ministry's election office, as key contacts. And in carrying out its duties, it should be sensitive to the following:

- How effectively the extremely complex, three-tiered parliamentary election process has come to be understood by the general public;
- How fairly the 58 proportionally awarded seats are distributed;
- Whether the government's primary voter notification tool - postcards - were actually mailed and contained all designated information;
- Whether absentee ballots were accepted on university campuses, and whether out-of-country voters had an absentee option.

8. Training for newly-elected members of Hungary's Parliament in 1990.

This need is obvious, and others more expert in such programs can deal with it in more detail. But from an electoral standpoint, we urge that such training in parliamentary procedure and the rules of democracy include a portion on:

- Media: how to deal with it, the proper government-press adversarial relationship, varying press mores regarding acceptable ethics of public service, and press perception of official versus campaign duties. Also, introduction to the need for a FOIA-type statute at some point would be appropriate.

We would also recommend that while likely offered in an academic setting such training be well balanced between the actual and the theoretical, and use some of the West's best national and local officeholders and staff. This training should, again, be international and not strictly American-provided.

9. Electoral assessment reports should be prepared during the first quarter of 1990 for East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania to evaluate and advise A.I.D. on election procedures being considered and emerging opposition and coalition groups.

Our team should have been in Hungary most profitably some months earlier, for instance. A.I.D. will be better able to make the most efficient presence and investment decisions on where, when and how it can have the most pro-democracy and economic stability impact if reports on these nations are done earlier into the process.

We are further convinced of the need for such assessments as we watch events in the region unfold since our trip to Hungary. Events mirror what we saw there: Round Tables are organized, all opposition parties are not non-communist and early identification of party roots becomes essential, erstwhile communist organizations change their names and appoint reformist leaders, free elections are called for. But as the case of Hungary demonstrates clearly, the more important parts of the book begin here with the writing of the rules, which can appear free and fair but if subjected to hands-on election expertise may in fact operate otherwise and without question, have substantial impact upon other reforms, particularly economic.

10. A longer-term mechanism for coordinating democratic assistance to the region should be established, with A.I.D. acting as impetus for and a primary player in such a mechanism.

Events in the region have outpaced traditional assistance mechanisms. Emerging movements in the region have training and infrastructure needs not being currently addressed and which can measurably speed progress toward democracy if met properly and soon.

[Specifically, such needs include training ...

... of political party officials in candidate identification and recruitment, list development and voter contact (mail and phone), basic computer demographics, polling, paid and earned media, and party fundraising;

...of candidates, campaign managers and campaign workers in issue identification and message development, basic debate training, campaign organization, grassroots organizational techniques, coalition building, paid and earned media, polling, and individual fundraising;

... and such infrastructure needs as computer hardware and software; sample lists, mail, ads, polls, campaign brochures, press kits and other literature/paraphernalia; and as-needed and as-requested funds for typewriters, phones, fax machines, copying machines, tables and chairs, portable microphones and loudspeakers, tape recorders, paper, ink, basic graphics prototypes, videocameras and videotape, index cards, paper and envelopes suitable for printing, basic office supplies, etc. ]

A mechanism needs to be established within the guidelines for organizing consultative groups. Such a group should consist of representatives of the Department of State, A.I.D., IFES and the Democratic and Republican institutes at minimum, as well as be open to other such groups based upon certain established foreign electoral and private sector assistance criteria.

Such a consultative group would provide advisory input to A.I.D. regarding electoral assistance needed in the Eastern European region, ultimately defined as including Poland, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Romania and the constituent republics of the Soviet Union. The group would also provide advisory counsel to A.I.D. on prioritizing and assigning implementation of democratic training and assistance programs to the region, ensuring coordination of such activity.

Obviously the party institutes and other participating groups could undertake individual activity funded independently, but for all such assistance performed with U.S. Government funds, such work would be assigned in bipartisan fashion, and with the benefit of the consultative group's advice.

As democratic governments are achieved within the region and new civil authorities need help constructing legislative bodies, municipal governments and other intermediary bodies upon which a democracy relies for coherence and transmission of the public's desires and needs, the group would also evaluate and recommend how such longer-term democratic developments needs be met.

The speed with which change is occurring in Eastern Europe requires that such continuous review of democracy assistance be performed and assigned and the intended free, fair results are produced.



Meetings prior to departure:

Participants from U.S.:

Tom Melia, Project Manager, NDI

Keith Schuette, President, NRIIA

Rob Henderson, Vice President, NRIIA

Professor Ivan Volyges, University of Nebraska

Participants from Hungary:

Gyongyver Bardos, Political activist, local organizer,  
Hungarian Democratic Forum (MDF)

Andorr Komlos, Member of the Politburo, Independent  
Smallholders Party

Levente Levay, Campaign Manager, Free Democrats' Association  
(SDS)

Miklos Lukats, Member of National Organizing Committee,  
Christian Democratic People's Party

Zoltan Matuska, Campaign Manager, Young Democrat's Association  
(FIDESZ)

Ferenc Santha (Mozsi), Member of National Board, Hungarian  
People's Party

Lajos Posze, Campaign manager, Hungarian Democratic Forum  
(MDF)

Tibor Varga, Member of National Board, Hungarian Social  
Democratic Party

Meetings while in Hungary:

Monday, November 12:

Ambassador Mark Palmer

Francisco Gonzalez, Deputy Political Officer

Tuesday, November 13:

Mr. Istvan Prepeliczay, Secretary General, Smallholder's Party

Dr. Tibor Csiba, Head of Election Office, Ministry of Interior

Dr. Pal Kara, Chairman of the National Election Commission

Wednesday, November 14:

Mr. Istvan Somogyvari, Deputy Dir., International Affairs Department, Justice Ministry

Mr. Sandor Keresztes, President of Christian Democratic Party

Dr. Dezso Avarkeszi, County Administrator for the 5th precinct, 14th district, Budapest technical setup of by-elections

Thursday, November 15:

Mr. Tibor Vidos, Secretary General, Alliance of Free Democrats (SDS)

Mr. Peter Tolgyessy, Alliance of Free Democrats (SZDSZ)

Mr. Gaspar Miklos Tamas, SDS Candidate in December 9 By-election

Mr. Csaba Varga, Campaign Manager, Hungarian People's Party

Tour of elections computer facilities with Dr. Csiba

Ambassador Palmer for debriefing

Mr. Endre Hann, Median opinion poll company

Geza Jeszensky, Director of International Relations, Hungarian Democratic Forum

Friday, November 16:

Trip to local election committee arranged by Dr. Csiba

Istvan Kukorelli, People's Patriotic Front Headquarters

Tams Tirts, FIDESZ Campaign Manager

REFERENDUM

SDS Referendum Platform.....1A  
Translation.....1B

Referendum Ballot.....2A  
Translation.....2B

ELECTION MATERIALS

Sample Vote List.....3A

Local Election Unit Vote Tally (front).....4A  
Translation.....4B

Local Election Unit Vote Tally (back).....5A  
Translation.....5B

Breakdown of the Number of All Three Categories  
of Parliamentary Seats per County.....6A  
Translation.....6B

Breakdown of Polling Places per County.....7A  
Translation.....7B

Vote Notification Card for December 9 Election (front).....8A  
Translation.....8B

Vote Notification Card for December 9 Election (back).....9A  
Translation.....9B

We, the undersigned Hungarian citizens, wish that a national vote decide the following questions:

1. Should the party organizations be removed from the workplace;
2. Should the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party account for its assets, both property and liquid;
3. Should the president be elected only after the Parliamentary elections;
4. Should the Workers Guard be disbanded.

Name (Printed)	Personal ID Number	Address	Signature
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			

## REFERENDUM BALLOT

1. Should the Presidential election take place only after the Parliamentary elections?  
(If you vote YES you will be supporting that Parliamentary should elect the President, and not the people (or inhabitants). If you vote NO you will be in support of the President being directly elected by the people.)  
 Yes  No
  
2. Should the Party organizations be removed from the workplace?  
(In this question the Parliament has decided that in the workplace the parties should not operate. Your YES vote will strengthen the decision of the Parliament, and a NO vote will support the parties' ability to operate in the workplace.)  
 Yes  No
  
3. Should the HSWP account for its assets?  
(The Parliament in October accepted this. Your YES vote will strengthen the accounting, and a NO vote will negate the accounting.)  
 Yes  No
  
4. Should the Workers Guard be disbanded? (or Militia)  
(The Parliament in October has disbanded the Workers Guard without legal successor; the carrying out of the law has started. Your YES vote will strengthen the decision of the Parliament, a NO vote will support the reinstitution of the Workers Guard.)

# NÉPSZAVAZÁS

## AZ ÁLLAMPOLGÁRI KEZDEMÉNYEZÉSRE ELRENDELTE KÉRDÉSEKBE

..... megye, főváros  
 ..... község, nagyközség  
 ..... város, megyei város  
 ..... fővárosi kerület

Kiűltő: szavazatszámoló bizottság

--	--	--

sorszámú szavazókör

Kettő példányban kell elkészíteni

## Szavazási jegyzőkönyv

Készült 1989. ....-n ..... község, nagyközség  
 ..... város, megyei város  
 ..... fővárosi kerület  
 ..... utca ..... szám alatt, a ..... sorszámú szavazókör helyiségében

### Jelen vannak

..... a szavazatszámoló bizottság elnöke  
 ..... a szavazatszámoló bizottság tagja  
 ..... a szavazatszámoló bizottság tagja

A szavazatszámoló bizottság a szavazás megkezdése előtt megállapította, hogy az urna üres és ennek megállapítása után az urnát lepecsételte.

A szavazás ..... órakor kezdődött. A szavazás ..... órakor befejeződött és az ellenőrző lap az urnában volt.

- A szavazatszámoló bizottságnak a szavazás ideje alatt hozott intézkedései, illetőleg határozatai:
- A szavazatszámoló bizottságnak a szavazási eredmény megállapításával kapcsolatos határozata ellen bejelentett kifogások és a fővárosi/megyei választási bizottság döntései:
- A szavazás közben előfordult fontosabb események, valamint a szavazatszámoló bizottság elnökének a rend fenntartása érdekében tett intézkedései:
- A szavazatszámoló bizottság egyéb észrevételei:
  - a választók nyilvántartásában szavazóként megjelöltek száma: .....
  - a választók nyilvántartásában szavazóként megjelöltek száma és a szavazólapok közötti különbség: .....
- Az a)–d) pontokhoz tartozó szöveges részt külön lapra kell írni, amelyet a szavazatszámoló bizottság tagjai aláírnak.  
 (E jegyzőkönyvhöz tartozó külön lapok száma: .....)



PEOPLES' VOTE

THE CITIZENS' INITIATIVE DECREE QUESTIONS

.....county  
.....city

To be filled out by  
election commission

Complete with two copies

Voters Report

Preparer, 1989.....County  
.....Street.....Precinct #

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

(Translation to  
come from  
Embassy)

The voting started at \_\_o'clock. The voting ended at \_\_o'clock.  
The control sheet was in the ballot box.

- 
- a) (Translation to come from Embassy)
  - b) " "
  - c) " "
  - d) " "

Voting District Number	No. of Potential Voting Before Election	No. of Voters at the End of Vote	Total Votes	Certified Votes	(Trans. to come from Embassy)	No. Voting W/out I.D.	Defaced Ballots
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H

Referendum Ballot Questions:	Invalid		No. of Valid Votes	
	Votes	Valid	Yes	No

1. Should the Presidential election take place after the parliamentary election?	J	K	L	M

2. Should party workers be removed from the workplace?	J	K	L	M

3. Should the HSWP account for its assets?	J	K	L	M

4. Should the party militia be abolished?	J	K	L	M

You must have agreement:  
 Between "yes" & "no" (L&M) & valid (K)  
 Columns J & K must agree with column O (# of votes)

One precinct tally sheet must get to the city election commission, the other stays with the ballot in a closed envelope in the ballot box and delivered to the council executive.

Date.....1989.....

.....  
 Secretary ..... Chairman  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 Member

County	No. of Single Member Districts	No. of Seats From Party List	# County	No. Proportional Seats per County
1. Budapest	32	28	1. Budapest	8
2. Baranya	7	6	2. Baranya	2
3. Bacs-kuskun	10	8	3. Bacs-kiskun	2
4. Bekes	7	6	4. Bekes	2
5. Borsod- Abauj-Zemplen	13	11	5. Borsod- Abauj-Kempen	3
6. Csongrad	7	6	6. Csongrad	2
7. Fejer	7	6	7. Fejer	2
8. Gyor-Sopron	7	6	8. Gyor-Sopron	2
9. Hajdu-Bihar	9	8	9. Hajdu-Bihar	2
10. Heves	6	5	10. Heves	2
11. Komarom	5	5	11. Komarom	2
12. Nograd	4	4	12. Nograd	2
13. Pest	16	14	13. Pest	4
14. Somogy	6	5	14. Somogy	2
15. Szabolcs- Szatmar	10	9	15. Szabolcs Szatmar	2
16. Szolnok	8	6	16. Szolnok	2
17. Tolna	5	4	17. Tolna	2
18. Vas	5	4	18. Vas	2
19. Veszprem	7	6	19. Veszprem	2
20. Zala	5	5	20. Zala	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>152</b>		

Number of voting districts (polling places) in the national referendum according to counties:

Budapest	1,503
Baranya megye	602
Bacs-Kiskun megye	650
Bekes megye	468
Borsod-Abauj-Kempen megye	910
Csongrad megye	535
Fejer megye	407
Gyor-Sopron megye	444
Hajdu-Bihar megye	524
Heves megye	338
Komarom megye	339
Nograd megye	290
Pest megye	960
Somogy megye	463
Szabolcs-Szatmar megye	583
Szolnok megye	426
Tolna megye	321
Vas megye	382
Veszprem	412
Zala megye	456
Total	<hr/> 11,013

NOTIFICATION

National I.D.#: 13205160288

478 BT1730J2789

DEAR VOTER!

According to election law, we notify you that Budapest voting district 114, precinct 041, serial number 496 (translation to come).

(Translation to come) KIOSZ PALFFY BYORGY U.27  
" " 1989.DECEMBER 9.

"	"	LENDVAY LASZLO		
"	"	1055 BUDAPEST	05	
		PALFFY GYORGY UTCA		
		22-24	4	5

Please return this nominating ticket to the Local Electoral Council either by mail, phone, or in person.

NOMINATING TICKET

Name:LENDVAY LASZLO  
Address:1055 BUDAPEST 05  
PALFFY GYORGY UTCA  
22-24 4 5

Voting Serial: 496 District: 041

on 1989,December 9.

I nominate the following:

..... name of party ..... name of candidate
--

OR

..... name of independent candidate
--

Only fill out one box, if both are filled out, then the ticket is invalid.

.....  
Signature

Vote from 6-18 hours, and please bring this notification with you.

Place "+" in the box next to the candidate's name.

To nominate someone you have to fill out the card and return it.

The nomination is done freely by the voter, and is not obligatory. According to election law the voter may support either an independent candidate or a party candidate, only in the district in which he lives.

The name of the candidate should be written in the appropriate box.

After filling out the card, tear off at the perforation, and give it to either the independent candidate, or the party representative, whom you choose to support.

In order to have an unstained election, a lost or destroyed card may not be replaced.

# BOND DONATELLI

I N C O R P O R A T E D

Richard N. Bond

Richard N. Bond, 38, is Chairman of Bond Donatelli, Inc., a Washington based corporate and political consulting firm.

He most recently served as Deputy Campaign Manager and National Political Director for George Bush's successful Presidential Campaign.

Since 1983, Bond's political activities included serving as President of the political relations firm, Bond and Company.

Prior to forming Bond and Company, Inc., he was Deputy Chief of Staff to Vice President George Bush and Deputy Chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Bond has held numerous political and governmental positions since 1972. From 1979 to 1981 he was a key aide to George Bush, serving as Bush's campaign manager in the successful Iowa and Connecticut primary campaigns, and later in the number two position on the Vice President's White House staff.

During the fall election in 1980, Bond served as campaign manager to U.S. Senator Charles McC. Mathias (R-MD) in his successful re-election bid.

In 1978, Bond worked as press secretary to New York Congressman Bill Green. In 1976, he served as New England Field Representative for the Republican National Committee and campaign manager to Fred Koory in Arizona's Third Congressional District.

Earlier, Bond served as media assistant to the Nassau County Executive in New York and was active in various state and local campaigns.

In addition to his political background, Bond served as a crew member on the sailing yacht "Dragon" during a 1977-78 world circumnavigation voyage.

Bond has a Bachelors Degree in English and Philosophy from Fordham University in New York.

He resides with his wife and two sons on Shelter Island, New York.

# BOND DONATELLI

I N C O R P O R A T E D

CECI COLE MCINTURFF

Executive Vice President Ceci Cole McInturff is a former journalist and senior Republican political operative who for the last three years has provided strategic and issues management advice to foreign and domestic corporate clients.

Former Special Assistant to the President for Political and Intergovernmental Affairs during Ronald Reagan's second term, she coordinated policy and long-term planning issues for two White House offices. Earlier, she served as the White House liaison to the nation's State Legislators, following state trends on issues and regulations.

In 1988 she served as National Director of Voter Coalitions for Bush-Quayle 88, directing a 40-person, half-million dollar effort to organize key electoral blocs in target states. In 1979-80, she served as the Bush For President campaign's Assistant Director of Communications, instituting a nationwide local press operation and handling media directly in four key primary or caucus states.

She is former Communications Director for the National Republican Senatorial Committee, the \$90 million arm of the national GOP focusing solely on races for the U.S. Senate, and former press secretary to the campaign of Congressman Frank Wolf (R-VA) and to Sen. William Armstrong (R-CO).

A former reporter for the Associated Press and the Public Broadcasting System, since 1987 she served as a Vice President with Hill & Knowlton, Inc., and The Government Research Corporation, managing the latter's French client base.

A former guest lecturer/panelist on political advertising at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, Mrs. Cole McInturff attended the University of Florida's College of Journalism and Communications. She is a professional associate of the University of Hawaii's East-West Center, served as one of the two American representatives at the East-West Center's New Generation ASEAN seminar in 1988, and was a U.S. Delegate to Japan in 1987 for the American Council of Young Political Leaders.

PETER W. SCHRAMM  
Ashbrook Center for Public Affairs  
Ashland University  
Ashland, OH 44805  
(419)289-5411

PERSONAL: Born: December 23, 1946  
Married, four children

EDUCATION:

- Ph.D. Department of Government, CLAREMONT GRADUATE SCHOOL, 1980  
Major Fields: Political Theory, American Government,  
International Relations, Philosophy
- M.A. International History, THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND  
POLITICAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, 1977
- M.A. Government, CLAREMONT GRADUATE SCHOOL, 1973
- B.A. History, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE, 1971

RECORD OF EMPLOYMENT:

- July 1988 - present Coordinator of special programs & publications,  
John M. Ashbrook Center for Public Affairs;  
and Associate Professor of Political Science,  
Ashland University, Ashland, Ohio
- 1986 - 1988 Director, Center for International Education,  
U.S. Department of Education (also Acting  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Higher Education,  
Jan-June '88 and Acting Assistant Secretary for  
Postsecondary Education, as needed)
- 1981 - 1986 President and Chairman of the Board of Directors,  
The Claremont Institute for the Study of States-  
manship and Political Philosophy
- 1984 - 1986 Assistant Professor of Political Science,  
California State University, San Bernardino
- 1982 - 1985 Visiting Assistant Professor of Political  
Science, Claremont McKenna College
- 1980 Visiting Lecturer of Political Science, Loyola  
Marymount University, Los Angeles
- 1977 - 1981 Western Director, Intercollegiate Studies  
Institute
- 1976 - 1977 Instructor of Political Science, Arkansas  
State University

COURSES TAUGHT:

American Political Theory, Classical Political Theory, Modern Political Theory, Contemporary Political Theory, Modern Presidency, Congress, Political Parties, Municipal Government, American Government, Introduction to Political Science, Constitutional Law, Bill of Rights, Judicial Process, Political Socialization, Comparative Political Systems, Political Journalism, and Political Theory of the Civil War

EDUCATION RELATED ACTIVITIES:

1989 - Member, Board of Directors, Tokyo International College

1988 - 1991 Member, National Advisory Board for International Programs, U.S. Department of Education, and Chairman (1989-1990)

1978 - 1986 Chairman, Board of Directors, Public Research Syndicated

1981 - 1986 Member, Board of Editorial Advisors, Grand Strategy: Countercurrents

1983 - 1986 Publisher, and member of the Editorial Board, The Claremont Review of Books

1981 - 1986 Member, Governing Council of the Alumni Association, Claremont Graduate School (two terms)

FELLOWSHIPS:

1985 Earhart Foundation Research Grant (summer)

1974 - 1975 Earhart Fellow

1973 - 1974 Richard M. Weaver Fellow

1972 - 1975 Alexander Hadden Fellow

PUBLICATIONS:

"The Week of Living Dangerously: Reflections on the Philippine Elections," article syndicated to sixty metropolitan newspapers (PRS), February 19, 1986

"After the vote in the Philippines: What one American Observer Saw," Los Angeles Herald Examiner, February 16, 1986 (Sunday)

Editor (with Dennis J. Mahoney) and co-author, The 1984 Election and the Future of American Politics, Carolina Academic Press, 1986

"Incumbency and Non-partisanship in the Congressional Elections," chapter for the above volume

Editor (with Thomas B. Silver) and co-author, Natural Right and Political Right, Carolina Academic Press, 1984

"The Great Machiavellian Deed? Reconsideration of Frederick II's Invasion of Silesia," chapter for the above volume

"Soviet Policy, Staying till the Crayfish Whistle," Grand Strategy, Vol. 2, No. 2, January 15, 1982

Reviews in: The Claremont Review of Books, Claremont Journal of Public Affairs, Military Review, The Academic Reviewer, Religion and Society, Nineteenth Century Fiction

Numerous articles on political issue for newspapers syndicated through Public Research Syndicated

#### PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Chairman, panel on "Global Democracy?" at the annual meeting at the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, September 1, 1989

Participant, Liberty Fund Symposium on "Churchill and Liberty", September 14-17, 1989 in San Diego

Participant, Liberty Fund Symposium on the Federalist Papers, January 12-15, 1989 at Claremont, California.

"The U.S. Constitution: The View from Abroad," lecture delivered to the Constitutional Teachers Institute, UCLA, sponsored by the California State Department of Education, August 14, 1987

Participant, Executive Seminar on "U.S. Foreign Policy," sponsored by the Office of Personnel Management, Kings Point, New York, May 4-15, 1987

"American Higher Education: The View from the Founding," Lecture delivered to a conference on "Higher Education Systems in the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, and the United States," sponsored by the Institute for the Study of German American Relations and the Center for Advanced Studies, University of Virginia, April 9, 1987

Member, International Delegation to Observe the Philippine Elections, sponsored by the National Republican and National Democratic Institutes for International Affairs, February 3-10, 1986

Moderator, Panel, "The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution," conference on "To Secure the Blessings of Liberty: First Principles of the Constitution," at the University of Dallas, October 18-19, 1985

Participant, "The Future of the Nation-State," conference sponsored by the Robert M. Hutchins Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, University of California, Santa Barbara, June 6, 1985

Moderator, panel on "Academia," conference on "The Totalitarian Threat to Democracy," sponsored by the National Republican Institute for International Affairs, Washington, D.C., May 3, 1985

Chairman, Panel, "Are the slavery Provisions of the Constitution Consistent with the Concept of Liberty and Equality," annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans, August 30, 1985

Program Development Panel, National Endowment for the Humanities, July 1982

Discussant, Panel, "Can Liberal Political Philosophy Cope with the Problem of Ethnic Difference," annual meeting of the APSA, Denver, September 3, 1982

"Self-Interested Man and Citizen: Alexis de Tocqueville's Clarification of the Problem," paper delivered to the annual meeting of the Arkansas Political Science Association, Hot Springs, Arkansas, February 1977

"Conscience and Nature in Shakespeare's Richard III," paper delivered to the annual meeting of the Arkansas Philological Association, Little Rock, November 1976

"Frederick the Great on Glory and the Common Good," paper delivered to the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Seattle, March 1975

LECTURES:

I have given lectures sponsored by a variety of academic and civic institutions, including: University of Portland, University of Dallas, Oklahoma State University, University of Oregon, Stanford University, Norwich University, University of Houston, Joint National Committee for Languages, Modern Language Association, American Association of Junior and Community Colleges, Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, Freedoms Foundation, Heritage Foundation, and the Ohio Council for Economic Education.

LANGUAGES:

Hungarian, Spanish, German, French (reading), Ancient Greek (elementary)

TRAVEL:

Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Germany, Austria, Italy, Yugoslavia, Spain, Hungary, India, Egypt, Mexico, Philippines, Pakistan

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:

National Association of Scholars  
The Philadelphia Society  
Pi Sigma Alpha (Political Science Honor Society)  
American Political Science Association

REFERENCES:

Available upon request