

2026 Hungary Parliamentary Elections



Răzvan Ceuca

2026 Hungary Parliamentary Elections

Răzvan Ceuca

2026

Author: Răzvan Ceuca, Expert on international relations, New Strategy Center

© **New Strategy Center**

Cover: Parliament of Hungary, AI-generated

About New Strategy Center

New Strategy Center is a Romanian think tank specializing in foreign, defence and security policy, a non-partisan, non-governmental organisation. New Strategy Center operates at three main levels: providing analytical inputs and expert advice to decision-makers; holding regular debates, both inhouse and public, on subjects of topical interest; expanding external outreach through partnerships with similar institutions or organisations all over the world, joint policy papers and international conferences. The Balkans and the Black Sea space are priority areas of interest for New Strategy Center.

Disclaimer: This text contains the personal opinions and perspective of the author and does not necessarily reflect the views of the New Strategy Center.

Executive Summary

The April 2026 Hungarian parliamentary elections represent a critical juncture for the nation's democratic integrity and its Euro-Atlantic alignment. After sixteen years of Fidesz-led governance, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's illiberal model faces unprecedented pressure from Péter Magyar and the Tisza Party. This policy study assesses the institutional, thematic, and geopolitical dynamics defining this highly contested cycle. Domestically, the incumbent regime's hegemony—historically sustained by institutional capture and structural electoral asymmetries—is increasingly strained by economic stagnation and recent societal controversies. To counter this vulnerability, Fidesz has adopted a security-focused campaign, framing the opposition as a destabilizing proxy for external actors. In contrast, Tisza advocates for an orderly transition, state modernization, and institutional transparency, strategically appealing to disillusioned right-leaning voters by avoiding radical ideological shifts. Internationally, the electoral result will fundamentally determine Budapest's operational role within the European Union and NATO. A continued Fidesz mandate suggests sustained obstructionism in Brussels, ongoing transactional diplomacy with Eastern powers, and further domestic polarization. Conversely, an opposition triumph would initiate a pragmatic reintegration into the Western mainstream, prioritizing the release of frozen cohesion funds and the stabilization of regional alliances. Nevertheless, the study cautions that any potential victory of opposition will face

formidable systemic hurdles. The profound entrenchment of partisan loyalists across Hungary's regulatory and judicial apparatus, coupled with an electoral framework engineered to magnify incumbent advantages, guarantees that dismantling the established political equilibrium will require protracted effort and immense political stamina.

Introduction: The Hungarian Electoral Landscape of 2026

Hungary's parliamentary elections of April 12, 2026 are significant not simply as another electoral cycle, but as a potential inflection point for the country's domestic political order and its place within the Euro-Atlantic community.¹ After more than 15 years of uninterrupted rule under Viktor Orbán and Fidesz since 2010², the vote is widely understood as a referendum on the durability of Hungary's "illiberal" governing model³, the institutional changes that have reshaped political competition⁴, and Hungary's increasingly contentious relationship with both the European Union (EU) and NATO.⁵

If Orbán remains in office after the 2026 election, he will consolidate one of the longest continuous premierships in post-communist Europe. His political longevity has not rested solely on electoral popularity, but also on the creation of a highly centralized political system that fuses party, state, and ideological messaging. Since returning to power in 2010 with a constitutional supermajority, Orbán has pursued what he explicitly termed an "illiberal state", prioritizing sovereignty, executive control, and national-conservative identity over liberal

pluralism and institutional restraint.⁶ This long incumbency matters because it has produced a new equilibrium in Hungarian politics. Fidesz has built a durable coalition by combining welfare nationalism, anti-immigration politics, cultural conservatism, and a narrative of national protection against external interference—whether from Brussels, liberal NGOs, or foreign capital.⁷ Specifically, Fidesz maintains its enduring political hegemony through a synergistic application of institutional state capture and sustained extra-parliamentary mobilization. Initially, the party secured a robust grassroots foundation by strategically cultivating the "Civic Circles Movement" to conquer right-wing civil society and mobilize the educated conservative middle class through identity-centric and nationalist narratives. Upon assuming office, the regime entrenched its dominance by systematically weakening democratic checks and balances—manipulating electoral frameworks, capturing the judiciary, and suppressing independent NGOs—while concurrently deploying state resources to continuously patronize its allied civic networks.⁸ In policy terms, the 2026 election therefore tests whether this model remains electorally sustainable amid inflationary pressures, governance fatigue, and mounting international isolation.

The deeper significance of the 2026 election lies in the fact that it is being held in a political system fundamentally transformed since 2010. Scholars broadly agree that Hungary has undergone a process of autocratization or transition toward electoral autocracy, in which elections still occur and opposition parties still exist, but the playing field is structurally skewed in favor of the incumbent.

This transformation has occurred through several mechanisms.⁹ First, the 2011 Fundamental Law and subsequent constitutional amendments enabled the governing majority to entrench political preferences into the constitutional order. Second, electoral law reforms, including district redesign and compensation rules, increased the systemic advantage of Fidesz. Third, institutional checks were weakened through the political capture or politicization of the judiciary, regulatory bodies, and public administration. Finally, media pluralism has narrowed substantially as pro-government ownership networks and state advertising have tilted the information environment.¹⁰ These developments mean that the 2026 election is not simply about alternation in office; it is also about whether meaningful democratic competition remains possible under current institutional conditions. Even if opposition forces perform strongly, the election will be interpreted internationally as a measure of whether Hungary's post-2010 institutional architecture still allows for effective political accountability.

The 2026 elections also matter because Hungary has become one of the most difficult internal challengers to consensus within both the EU and, to a lesser extent, NATO. Hungary remains formally committed to both organizations and continues to benefit materially and strategically from membership. Yet under Orbán, Fidesz has increasingly framed EU integration in adversarial terms, presenting Brussels as a threat to national sovereignty while selectively relying on EU funds and market access. This tension has been especially visible in rule-of-law disputes, judicial independence concerns, corruption conditionality, and media freedom.¹¹

Hungary has become a central test case for whether the EU can discipline democratic backsliding from within. Thus, the 2026 election will be read in Brussels not only as a domestic Hungarian event, but as an indicator of whether illiberal governance inside the Union is becoming normalized or politically reversible. Within NATO, Hungary's position is more nuanced. Budapest has not questioned formal alliance membership, and it has continued defense modernization, including the Zrínyi 2026 military development program.¹² However, Orbán's government has frequently complicated allied cohesion, especially regarding Russia, Ukraine, sanctions, and strategic messaging after 2022. Hungary's balancing rhetoric—officially loyal to the alliance while often politically diverging from mainstream Western positions—has generated concerns about its reliability as an internal ally. For that reason, the 2026 election is significant beyond Hungary itself. It will signal whether Budapest continues along a path of selective Euro-Atlantic alignment combined with internal illiberal consolidation, or whether electoral pressure produces a recalibration toward deeper democratic and strategic convergence with its allies.

The Significance of the 2026 Parliamentary Elections

The April 12, 2026, parliamentary elections are decisive for Hungary, simultaneously testing regime durability, institutional fairness, and geopolitical orientation. Representing the most serious challenge to Viktor Orbán's 16-year rule and his "illiberal" governance model, this vote is a referendum on the system's resilience. The challenge is unusually credible due to the rise of Péter Magyar and the Tisza

party, who have transformed a fragmented opposition into a viable alternative amidst economic stagnation and corruption fatigue.¹³ However, public sentiment alone will not dictate the outcome. Hungary's electoral architecture systematically favors the incumbent through single-member districts, winner compensation, and a mixed-member majoritarian logic that converts narrow vote margins into disproportionate majorities.¹⁴ Consequently, the election serves as a stress test for political accountability under a structurally asymmetrical system, particularly following the 2024 constituency revisions and renewed gerrymandering allegations.¹⁵ Beyond Hungary itself, the vote carries broader European significance because it will shape Budapest's future relationship with the European Union, including rule-of-law disputes, access to frozen EU funds, and Hungary's ability either to obstruct or facilitate common European positions on Ukraine, sanctions, migration, and strategic coordination. More broadly still, the election will be read across Europe as an indicator of whether Orbánism remains a durable model for nationalist-populist and sovereigntist forces, or whether even a heavily entrenched illiberal governing system can become electorally vulnerable under sufficient political and socio-economic pressure. For these reasons, the 2026 election is decisive not only for determining who governs Hungary, but for clarifying the future trajectory of the Hungarian state, its democratic quality, and its place within the European political order.¹⁶

For the 2026 parliamentary elections, Hungarian voters face the narrowest electoral field since the democratic transition, choosing from just five national party lists: the Fidesz–KDNP alliance, the Tisza Party, the Democratic Coalition (DK), Our Homeland Movement

(Mi Hazánk), and the Hungarian Two-Tailed Dog Party (MKKP).¹⁷ Governing continuously since 2010, the Fidesz–KDNP alliance remains the dominant force, contesting all 106 constituencies with a list led by Prime Minister Viktor Orbán. Seeking to deflect from domestic economic grievances, Fidesz centers its campaign on a "war versus peace" narrative, casting Ukraine and "Brussels" as threats.¹⁸ The party frames itself as the ultimate defender of sovereignty and the guarantor of low energy prices via Russian cooperation.¹⁹ Fidesz has again declined to publish a formal manifesto, relying on its record—a strategy critics argue actively limits democratic accountability.²⁰



Figure 1. Viktor Orbán, the incumbent Prime Minister of Hungary - Source: Shutterstock

The Tisza Party represents a profound shift in Hungarian politics. Rapidly rising under Péter Magyar since early 2024, Tisza now contests all 106 districts and frequently ties or leads in polls. To project governing credibility, Tisza published a detailed 240-page socio-economic platform.²¹ While heavily focused on domestic issues, the party maintains strategic ambiguity on foreign policy to minimize vulnerabilities, though it signals a desire to repair EU relations and gradually

reduce dependence on Russia.²² Rapidly rising since early 2024, Magyar leveraged his background as a former Fidesz insider to expose regime vulnerabilities, successfully mobilizing hundreds of thousands in unprecedented street protests. This defector status granted him unique credibility to challenge Orbán.²³



Figure 2. Péter Magyar, leader of the Tisza party and primary challenger to Viktor Orbán in the 2026 Hungarian parliamentary elections
Source: Shutterstock

Another opposition actor facing significant electoral uncertainty is the Democratic Coalition (DK), led by Klára Dobrev. Despite rebranding efforts, DK is polling precariously near the 5 percent parliamentary threshold. Failing to secure representation would be a devastating setback for one of the most established left-wing opponents to the current governance model.²⁴

Led by László Toroczkai, Mi Hazánk comfortably polls between 5 and 8 percent. While pitching itself as a "third force" outside the Fidesz–Tisza binary, the party frequently aligns with the governing majority in parliament. Bolstered by favorable state media visibility, it maintains a highly disciplined core electorate.²⁵ Following local victories in 2024, the Two-Tailed Dog Party (MKKP) is hovering near the entry threshold but faces severe procedural hurdles.

With 39 of its constituency candidate registrations under formal appeal, the party risks losing its national list. MKKP alleges coordinated obstruction, while critics counter that Fidesz-aligned actors initially facilitated MKKP's signature drive to strategically fragment the opposition vote.²⁶

The Hungarian Electoral System and Institutional Architecture

Considering the significance of the upcoming elections for Viktor Orbán's rule, it is essential to examine Hungary's intricate electoral system and its impact on the April 12 results. Prior to 2014, Hungary utilized a highly complex blended electoral system, which facilitated the election of the National Assembly six times following the 1990 democratic transition. Broadly inspired by the German model, this hybrid framework allowed voters to cast two ballots—one for an individual constituency candidate and another for a proportional party list. Over time, however, demographic shifts and internal migration caused significant disparities in constituency sizes, prompting valid concerns regarding equal political representation.²⁷ Over time, demographic shifts led to significant constituency disparities.²⁸

Following Fidesz's 2010 victory, the party leveraged its constitutional supermajority to overhaul this framework. Parliament was downsized from 386 to 199 seats, streamlining the previous three-tier system into a two-tier structure. Currently, 106 seats are decided in single-member districts (SMDs) via plurality rule, while 93 seats are allocated proportionally from a single nationwide constituency. This reform eliminated regional lists and dramatically

strengthened the majoritarian component. Crucially, the reform introduced a novel "winner compensation" mechanism. This specific rule transfers not only the unused votes of losing candidates but also the surplus votes of winning candidates to the national list, systematically amplifying the advantage of the dominant party. Furthermore, the shift from a two-round system to a single-round plurality vote allowed candidates to secure victory without an absolute majority.²⁹ This revised framework was first applied in the 2014 general elections and remained in force for the 2018 and 2022 cycles. In the 2022 elections, which saw an overall voter turnout of 69.59%, the system's majoritarian tendencies were starkly evident. The Fidesz–KDNP alliance secured 135 parliamentary mandates, maintaining a powerful supermajority. Meanwhile, the united opposition bloc won 57 seats, and the Our Homeland (Mi Hazánk) movement secured 6 seats.³⁰

The most recent structural adjustment arrived via Act LXXIX of 2024, introduced in preparation for the 2026 vote. The legislation redrew the 106 SMDs, reducing Budapest's constituencies from 18 to 16 while increasing Pest County's from 12 to 14. Officially framed as a necessary technical correction for demographic shifts, the redesign has provoked sustained scrutiny.³¹ The premises of such a change was to strengthen the grip on power for Fidesz, which is facing a remarkable opposition in the capital city. Budapest remains an anti-Fidesz stronghold due to a stark demographic divide, where the capital's voters lean toward liberal, secular values and possess greater economic independence from the state. This polarization is structurally reinforced by Fidesz's reliance on rural patronage networks and the opposition's disproportionate concentration of political campaigning within urban centers.³² Furthermore, since defeating

Fidesz incumbent István Tarlós in the 2019 municipal elections, the Mayor of Budapest Gergely Karácsony has positioned the municipal administration as a prominent institutional counterweight and vocal critic of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's government.³³ International bodies, including the Venice Commission, alongside domestic critics, warn that the boundary adjustments exceed demographic correction, effectively introducing partisan advantages into the map.³⁴ Analysts have highlighted patterns commonly associated with gerrymandering, specifically the strategic fragmentation and concentration of opposition-leaning voters to dilute their overall electoral influence.³⁵

Ultimately, these features dictate that the 2026 parliamentary elections will be shaped heavily by an institutional logic that rewards territorial efficiency, electoral discipline, and constituency-level dominance. Hungary's single-round contests, winner-compensation mechanism, and contested redistricting practices create structural incentives that distinctly favor the largest political force. Because narrow differences in popular support often translate into disproportionate parliamentary majorities, the 2026 election will be decided as much by shifting public sentiment as by the ability to avoid vote fragmentation. Crucially, rather than relying on a formal opposition coalition, this outcome will hinge on the strategic withdrawal of candidates from smaller parties to clear single-member districts for the independently running Tisza party.³⁶

The Main Themes of the Electoral Campaign

Hungary's 2026 parliamentary election campaign revolves around overlapping domestic and geopolitical issues that transcend ordinary electoral competition. The central themes—economic stagnation, European Union relations, the war in Ukraine, and Russian energy dependence—are politically salient because they directly impact household welfare, state capacity, and Hungary's international standing. Approaching the April 12 vote, these themes reveal that the campaign tests not merely partisan preferences, but the fundamental sustainability of the governing model established by Viktor Orbán in 2010. Beyond structural issues, Fidesz's hegemonic grip was severely weakened by pivotal domestic crises that undermined its core ideological pillars. The explosive Szolo Street child abuse scandal directly contradicted the party's self-proclaimed status as the ultimate defender of the traditional family. This moral fracture catalyzed massive civic mobilization, most notably transforming the 2025 Budapest Pride, amidst fierce legal battles over assembly rights, into a massive anti-government protest that drew hundreds of thousands to the streets, exposing the regime's growing vulnerability.³⁷

Economic performance has emerged as the primary axis of political contestation. Following a prolonged period of growth driven by foreign direct investment and EU funds, Hungary's economy entered a phase characterized by structural vulnerabilities. While inflation peaked at 25.7% in early 2023, it has since cooled; however, underlying weaknesses like subdued domestic consumption, fluctuating real wages, and persistent fiscal deficits remain.³⁸

The Fidesz government framed its economic strategy around state-led interventions, including price caps on basic goods and targeted household subsidies designed to shield voters from external shocks. While politically popular, these measures generated trade-offs in fiscal sustainability and market distortions. Conversely, opposition forces, led by Péter Magyar's Tisza Party, have capitalized on these concerns by demanding structural reforms, improved absorption of EU funds, and a recalibration of state-market relations to boost eroded competitiveness.³⁹ This economic debate has shifted from short-term crisis management toward long-term productivity and integration into European value chains, functioning as a decisive factor for urban and middle-class voters.

Hungary's relationship with the European Union constitutes another defining electoral theme. Over the past decade, tensions between Budapest and Brussels have intensified over rule-of-law conditionality, media freedom, and judicial independence. Crucially, the European Commission's decision to freeze approximately €21 billion in cohesion and recovery funds under the conditionality mechanism has reinforced the domestic salience of this conflict, linking governance standards directly to tangible economic outcomes.⁴⁰ The governing party has adopted a sovereigntist narrative, portraying EU pressure as an infringement on national autonomy. This resonates with conservative voters skeptical of deeper European integration. Conversely, opposition actors emphasize the strategic necessity of restoring trust with EU institutions, arguing that Hungary's economic convergence relies entirely on full access to European financial instruments. The debate centers not on EU

membership—which retains over 70% public approval—but on the terms and depth of that integration.⁴¹

The ongoing war in Ukraine represents a third major theme. Hungary's positioning remains distinct within NATO and the EU, combining formal institutional alignment with a highly cautious approach toward Kyiv. The Orbán government has consistently advocated for immediate ceasefire negotiations, prohibited the transit of lethal weapons through its territory, and opposed EU military assistance packages.⁴² Fidesz frames this as a "pro-peace" strategy to avoid escalation and protect the roughly 150,000 ethnic Hungarians in western Ukraine. Opposition parties strongly criticize this stance, arguing it severely undermines Hungary's credibility within Euro-Atlantic structures and isolates Budapest from regional allies like Poland. They advocate for explicit alignment with mainstream NATO policies. Consequently, the war serves as a proxy for broader questions about Hungary's geopolitical orientation, highlighting a stark choice between a Western-aligned trajectory and a transactional, multi-vector foreign policy.⁴³

Closely linked to its geopolitical stance is Hungary's energy policy. The country remains heavily dependent on Russian imports, relying on Moscow for approximately 80% to 85% of its natural gas and the majority of its crude oil.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the expansion of the Paks nuclear power plant (Paks II) is being financed and constructed by Russia's Rosatom.⁴⁵ The government defends this long-term orientation as a pragmatic necessity for energy affordability and supply security, frequently seeking exemptions from EU sanctions on Russian hydrocarbons. Opposition actors challenge this strategy, arguing for the rapid diversification of

energy sources, increased investment in renewables, and closer alignment with the EU's REPowerEU objectives. They contend that continued reliance on Russia creates severe strategic vulnerabilities. Energy policy thus operates at the critical intersection of economic stability and national security, reflecting a broader tension between short-term cost considerations and long-term strategic resilience within the European framework.⁴⁶

The Dynamics of the Electoral Campaign

The 2026 Hungarian parliamentary campaign is increasingly shaped by a contest over credibility, stability, and political risk, rather than by sharply opposed ideological projects. As public frustration with economic stagnation, governance fatigue, and institutional erosion grows, both Fidesz and Tisza are orienting their strategies toward the same pivotal electoral terrain: undecided and risk-sensitive voters. Yet they are doing so through contrasting political logics. Fidesz is seeking to frame the election as a choice between continuity and uncertainty, while Tisza is attempting to present change as orderly, governable, and strategically reassuring. The result is a campaign centered less on grand programmatic polarization than on who can more convincingly claim to offer stability in a moment of political and geopolitical unease.⁴⁷

For the April 12 parliamentary elections, Fidesz's electoral strategy pivots from mobilizing optimism to capitalizing on voter risk aversion and political cynicism. Amidst economic stagnation and public fatigue, the incumbent regime seeks to frame the election

not as a referendum on governance quality, but as a choice where the "known devil" is demonstrably safer than untested alternatives. By fostering an environment of normalized distrust and moral equivalence, Fidesz intentionally undermines the opposition's promises of ethical renewal, making political change appear inherently destabilizing. Consequently, Péter Magyar and the Tisza party face the structural vulnerability of entrapment within Fidesz's hegemonic campaign agenda, which is heavily centered on sovereignty, migration, and national security. By forcing Tisza into a reactive posture—compelling it to prove it is neither "pro-war" nor subservient to Brussels—Fidesz aims to dilute the opposition's distinctiveness and frame it as an unreliable, riskier imitation of the incumbent. Ultimately, the election's outcome will hinge less on the electorate's profound dissatisfaction with the government and more on the opposition's capacity to convincingly project systemic democratic change as a credible, secure, and low-risk alternative to continued Fidesz rule.⁴⁸



Figure 3. A pro-Fidesz campaign poster. Notably, instead of promoting the ruling party's candidates for the 2026 parliamentary elections, it focuses on portraying political figures such as Volodymyr Zelensky, Ursula von der Leyen, and Péter Magyar as "the other evil"

Source: Shutterstock

Conversely, Tisza positions itself as a credible, stabilizing force capable of delivering orderly change. Rather than advocating radical rupture, the party emphasizes managed transition, state modernization, and robust anti-corruption measures, while explicitly signaling continuity in areas where voters fear severe disruption. Its foreign policy platform reflects this reassurance strategy: Tisza proposes pragmatic, functional reintegration into the Western institutional mainstream — particularly within the EU and NATO — without presenting it as a severe ideological realignment. This involves a less confrontational approach toward Brussels, a gradual reduction of reliance on Russia, and a departure from Hungary's recent spoiler role in European decision-making. However, this broad, flexible agenda risks generating strategic ambiguity on highly divisive geopolitical issues. Critically, Tisza is not a polar opposite to Fidesz. Magyar actively courts right-leaning voters by echoing the incumbent's cultural conservatism, including strict stances on migration and traditional values. Consequently, a Tisza victory would likely yield significant continuity in domestic social policies, reflecting a change in democratic governance rather than a fundamental ideological shift.⁴⁹ Ultimately, Tisza's electoral success hinges not merely on mobilizing a skeptical opposition electorate, but critically on its demonstrated capacity to siphon off segments of the disillusioned Fidesz voter base, convincing both demographics that systematic democratic reform constitutes a significantly safer and more reliable trajectory than incumbent continuity.⁵⁰

Parallel investigations highlight coordinated bot-like activity driving sensationalist narratives, including entirely fabricated security threats, which displace substantive governance debates with fear-based framing.⁵¹ These sophisticated information attacks systematically target opposition actors, falsely portraying them as incompetent or externally controlled, while synthetic amplification mechanisms artificially boost manipulated content across various popular online platforms.⁵² This volatile environment was further intensified following investigative reporting by journalist Szabolcs Panyi, who alleged direct links between the Orbán government, covert Russian financial transfers, and the domestic use of state security apparatuses against critical media. This revelation prompted a retaliatory disinformation campaign that seemingly reinforced public perceptions of systemic electoral manipulation and authoritarian overreach rather than effectively containing the severe political fallout.⁵³ These orchestrated influence campaigns are not deployed arbitrarily; they reflect profound concern within the governing camp regarding an increasingly unfavorable electoral landscape. Recent national polling underscores this structural vulnerability, revealing that the opposition Tisza party currently commands 51% percent of voting intentions, compared to just 39% percent for the incumbent Fidesz alliance.⁵⁴ Furthermore, recent public opinion data indicates significant institutional skepticism among the Hungarian electorate. Over 50% of respondents express apprehension regarding potential electoral irregularities during the April 12 proceedings, while approximately 80% suspect the presence of clandestine foreign interference.⁵⁵ Ultimately, these complex dynamics illustrate that the pivotal Hungarian election is being heavily

contested not just through standard institutional channels, but within a manipulated digital space where narrative dominance, targeted propaganda, and emotional mobilization may prove as decisive as traditional political engagement or policy debates.

Furthermore, this domestically manipulated environment is increasingly compounded by overt transnational political interference designed to bolster the incumbent regime. Facing an unprecedented electoral threat, the Orbán government has actively leveraged its international networks to project strength, drawing direct electoral interventions from foreign leaders. Most notably, this includes the high-profile U.S. Vice President JD Vance's scheduled visit to Budapest just days before the April election to explicitly support Orbán's campaign.⁵⁶ This transatlantic backing is reinforced by coordinated endorsements from prominent global nationalist figures, including Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and French National Rally leader Marine Le Pen, both of whom have publicly rallied behind the incumbent to frame his reelection as an imperative for the broader international conservative movement.⁵⁷

Last but not least, the external diaspora vote serves as a critical structural component of Fidesz's electoral advantage ahead of the April 12 elections.⁵⁸ While ethnic Hungarians in Slovakia are barred from voting due to dual citizenship prohibitions, Orbán strategically prioritizes his EU-level alliance with Prime Minister Robert Fico—particularly critical since losing Poland's Law and Justice party as a reliable veto partner—over minority advocacy.⁵⁹ Conversely, Fidesz has

successfully institutionalized the political loyalty of ethnic Hungarians in Romania (Transylvania) and Serbia (Vojvodina) through transnational patronage networks, financial subsidies, and the cultivation of dual identity.⁶⁰ This regional monopoly effectively neutralizes opposition and far-right incursions, as evidenced by the recent failure of rival political recruitment in Serbia due to Fidesz's entrenched local alliances.⁶¹ In Transylvania, this dominance remains uniquely robust: following a 90.8% vote share for the Fidesz-KDNP alliance in 2022⁶², a November 2025 SoDiSo Research poll indicates that over 90% of this demographic (encompassing 311,000 Romanian Hungarian voters) continues to support the ruling faction.⁶³ However, the integrity of this voting bloc faces mounting scrutiny. Ultimately, despite these systemic vulnerabilities and democratic controversies, this highly disciplined, cross-border electorate historically secures few decisive parliamentary mandates for the incumbent, mathematically reinforcing Fidesz's majoritarian grip within an increasingly contested political environment.

Possible Electoral Scenarios

A comprehensive, scenario-based assessment is essential for understanding the complex future trajectories of the Hungarian state and its role in the international order.

The first major scenario envisions a decisive opposition victory culminating in a government led by Péter Magyar and the Tisza Party. Realizing this unprecedented political realignment requires a sustained, robust national polling advantage and the highly efficient translation of opposition votes into single-member district victories, successfully

overcoming the electoral system's inherent majoritarian bias. Under this transformative outcome, Hungary would likely pursue a gradual but definitive normalization of relations with the European Union. This strategic pivot includes urgent, comprehensive efforts to finally unlock frozen cohesion funds, restore rule-of-law credibility, and significantly reduce obstructionism in European Council decision-making. Geopolitically, this scenario implies a remarkably more cooperative and constructive posture toward Ukraine, characterized by heavily reduced veto usage, enhanced sectoral cooperation, and strict alignment with broader Western security objectives. However, the structural constraints facing a new administration would remain formidable. A new Tisza-led government would instantly inherit a deeply embedded institutional apparatus entirely populated with entrenched Fidesz appointees, ranging from the powerful Chief Prosecutor to the strategically crucial Media Council. These deeply rooted loyalists would systematically attempt to severely limit the pace, scope, and overall effectiveness of domestic democratic reform, ensuring that dismantling the illiberal state remains an agonizingly slow, legally fraught, and highly contested process.

The second major scenario involves Fidesz retaining its tight grip on power under conditions of intensified political competition and competitive authoritarian escalation. Even in the face of declining popular support and severe economic headwinds—such as persistent inflation and failing public services—the governing party could successfully convert a remarkably narrow vote share into a highly functional parliamentary majority. This is directly facilitated by systemic electoral

advantages, heavily gerrymandered districts, and disproportionate winner-compensation mechanisms. The incumbent regime would further consolidate anxious, risk-averse voters by framing the critical election exclusively around external geopolitical threats and national sovereignty. This specific outcome would ultimately result in broad policy continuity, coupled with unprecedented domestic polarization, as a strengthened opposition exerts unrelenting pressure within the public sphere. Internationally, this scenario formally guarantees that Hungary maintains its well-established role as a selective spoiler. Budapest would stubbornly continue to weaponize its veto power over critical foreign policy initiatives, engaging in highly transactional bargaining to extract valuable financial concessions while simultaneously frustrating broader continental integration and deepening its divergent geopolitical path.

A third plausible electoral scenario points toward a deeply fragmented opposition plurality without governability, ultimately producing an agonizingly complex parliamentary deadlock. In such a highly volatile case, the Tisza Party could successfully win the national popular vote but fundamentally fail to secure an absolute parliamentary majority. This particular risk becomes uniquely acute if smaller, highly ideological radical formations—most notably the far-right Our Homeland Movement (Mi Hazánk)—successfully surpass the national electoral threshold, enter the legislature, and effectively act as powerful, transactional kingmakers. This unprecedented institutional fragmentation could inevitably lead to painfully prolonged coalition negotiations, profound legislative friction, and deep political instability operating at the highest levels of government. Under these severely constrained conditions, there is a distinct

possibility of Fidesz successfully retaining significant informal legislative influence through tactical alliances or highly partisan presidential maneuvering systematically designed to actively disrupt the newly formed opposition's legislative agenda. The broader, long-term implications for the European Union and the ongoing conflict in Ukraine would be distinctly negative. Extended decision-making delays in Budapest, combined with fierce, uncompromising nationalist competition for domestic political survival, could significantly intensify bureaucratic obstructionism, severely complicate regional security coordination, and substantially amplify aggressive anti-Ukrainian rhetoric during an exceptionally critical geopolitical and economic juncture.

Finally, a fourth and arguably most extreme scenario involves aggressive constitutional engineering or profound procedural disruption, whereby the incumbent governing party fundamentally alters foundational institutional rules to artificially preserve executive control. Facing an unprecedented, objectively perceived regime vulnerability and the historically unique prospect of losing its long-held political monopoly, Fidesz could strategically deploy drastic measures that entirely transcend traditional electoral competition. This perilous pathway could encompass late-stage, sweeping constitutional amendments, sudden legislative shifts toward a highly centralized, virtually unchecked executive model, or even the extraordinary, emergency-based postponement of the national parliamentary elections altogether under the deliberate pretext of fabricated national security imperatives. While absolutely guaranteed to be politically explosive and fiercely contested

both domestically and internationally, such a drastic strategy directly reflects the stark reality that entrenched, deeply rooted regime survival instincts inevitably supersede standard democratic norms. Enacting these severely draconian measures would rapidly trigger a profound legitimacy crisis across the European continent, further eroding Hungary's already dangerously fragile democratic standing, accelerating formal Article proceedings against Budapest, and immediately exposing the severe limits of existing European Union rule-of-law enforcement mechanisms in decisively containing an increasingly desperate, cornered administration determined to strictly maintain absolute political hegemony regardless of diplomatic or institutional costs.⁶⁴



Figure 4. Protest on the Széchenyi Chain Bridge in Budapest against child abuse. The banner depicts a crying child being gagged by an orange, associated with the ruling Fidesz party, with the text "Hands off the children!"

Source: mannin, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tk55icAPOQA&t=4m19s>

Implications for the EU and NATO

The foreign and security policy divergence between Fidesz and Tisza carries profound implications for Hungary's standing within the European Union and NATO. Under Fidesz, Budapest has positioned itself as a selectively cooperative, sovereignty-focused member state, actively challenging the trajectory of European integration. Since co-founding the Patriots for Europe group, Fidesz has aggressively advocated for an intergovernmental EU. It has fiercely resisted mainstream Brussels positions on migration, Russia, and the rule of law, repeatedly utilizing the European Council veto to delay collective action. Within NATO, Fidesz acknowledges the alliance as foundational to national security but insists on wide discretion regarding military engagement. This produces a posture of formal loyalty mixed with strategic obstruction, notably demonstrated by the delayed ratification of Finnish and Swedish accession. Conversely, Tisza frames its EU and NATO policy through the lens of urgent strategic reintegration. Its primary objectives include rebuilding trust with the European Commission, unlocking approximately €18 billion in frozen cohesion funds, and restoring predictability to Hungary's alliance commitments. However, Tisza is not an explicitly federalist alternative. On sensitive issues like migration, it maintains a cautious, conservative line to avoid alienating right-leaning voters. Ultimately, a Tisza victory promises systemic normalization rather than ideological rupture, making Budapest significantly more manageable for Western partners while retaining measured national assertiveness.

A profound dividing line between Fidesz and Tisza lies in their strategic approaches to the United States, Russia, and China. Fidesz operates on a broader strategy of foreign policy balancing, designed to maximize maneuverability and reduce reliance on any single Western power. Consequently, relations with Washington have been highly contingent on the sitting administration. Following Donald Trump's return to the White House, Orbán leveraged deep Republican ties to position Hungary as the administration's premier political partner within the EU. Regarding Russia, Fidesz prioritizes energy dependence and strategic pragmatism. Despite the war, Budapest maintains extensive cooperation with Moscow in natural gas, oil, and nuclear energy expansion, routinely seeking exemptions from European sanctions. Similarly, China remains central to the government's "Opening to the East" strategy. Fidesz promotes Hungary as the primary hub for Chinese infrastructure and battery manufacturing investments in Central Europe. Tisza proposes a more explicitly Euro-Atlantic orientation. Toward the United States, Magyar emphasizes stable, institutionalized bilateral relations insulated from partisan shifts in Washington. Regarding Moscow, Tisza supports gradual alignment with mainstream European policies, advocating a review of agreements with Russian entities and a phased reduction of energy dependence by 2035, though this timeline trails the EU's 2027 REPowerEU target. On China, Tisza favors selective continuity but insists on enforcing stringent transparency, rigorous parliamentary scrutiny, and adherence to strict EU regulatory standards, fundamentally re-embedding Hungary's external partnerships within a Western framework.⁶⁵

Ukraine represents the starkest foreign policy fault line in Hungarian politics and a heavily

instrumentalized issue in the campaign. Fidesz formally recognizes Ukrainian sovereignty but pursues a policy of minimal strategic solidarity. Budapest has consistently blocked EU financial aid, opposed military assistance, and heavily leveraged the grievances of the Transcarpathian Hungarian minority. Furthermore, Fidesz uses Ukraine as a central domestic campaign theme, portraying Kyiv as a severe threat to Hungary's economic and energy stability, while framing Tisza as a dangerous pro-war proxy. By contrast, Tisza situates its support for Ukraine strictly within the framework of European solidarity. While Magyar deliberately avoids endorsing direct Hungarian military involvement to mitigate domestic political vulnerabilities, his party opposes confrontational veto tactics in Brussels. Regarding Ukraine's eventual EU accession, Tisza supports the principle but emphasizes strict conditionality and proposes a binding national referendum. Practically, a Tisza government would swiftly de-escalate outright obstructionism, normalize bilateral diplomatic relations with Kyiv, and separate legitimate minority rights disputes from broader European security imperatives.

This divergence also carries critical implications for the Visegrád Group and broader Central European cooperation. Under Orbán, the V4 was primarily weaponized as a bloc instrument to coordinate regional resistance against Brussels, particularly concerning migration and rule-of-law disputes. While this facilitated tight Hungarian-Polish coordination between 2015 and 2021, V4 cohesion collapsed after 2022 due to irreconcilable positions on Russian aggression. Fidesz clearly prioritized its energy and diplomatic flexibility with Moscow

over maintaining regional unity. Tisza, however, points toward a selective revival of these regional formats. Rather than treating the V4 as an antagonistic alternative to the European Union, Magyar's party views it as a complementary framework best utilized for practical coordination in infrastructure development and energy security. This approach would necessitate an immediate diplomatic reset with Warsaw and Prague, aiming to restore highly functional, pragmatic relations. Under Tisza's proposed model, Central European cooperation would become significantly less ideologically confrontational, transforming into a stabilizing force that is fundamentally compatible with the broader logic of sustained European integration.⁶⁶

Conclusions

The outcome of Hungary's 2026 elections remains highly contingent on the interplay between structural electoral asymmetries, volatile campaign dynamics, and immense geopolitical pressures. The campaign has fundamentally become a contest over credibility and risk management, rather than pure ideological polarization. Fidesz strategically frames the election as a choice between continuity and the uncertainty of change, targeting risk-averse voters by portraying external actors like Ukraine and "Brussels" as threats. Conversely, the Tisza Party presents itself as a stabilizing force promising orderly change, state modernization, and a pragmatic departure from Hungary's role as a European spoiler.

Because the electoral system's majoritarian tendencies can convert narrow vote margins into disproportionate parliamentary majorities, multiple scenarios remain plausible. A clear

Tisza victory would likely lead to systemic normalization, a more cooperative posture toward Ukraine, and efforts to repair trust with the European Commission. However, structural constraints, such as deeply embedded Fidesz appointees in state institutions, would limit the pace of reform. Alternatively, Fidesz could retain power by converting a narrow vote share into a functional majority through systemic advantages like the winner-compensation mechanism. This would guarantee continued domestic polarization and embolden Budapest's resistance against mainstream EU policies and support for Ukraine. Other scenarios include a crippling parliamentary

deadlock, or even democratic backsliding through electoral manipulation and foreign-backed information operations.

The 2026 vote will definitively shape Hungary's internal democratic quality and external geopolitical orientation. A victory for the incumbent would consolidate an illiberal model and reaffirm a multi-vector foreign policy balancing between the West, Russia, and China. Conversely, an opposition triumph promises a return to Euro-Atlantic conformity, making Budapest more manageable for its allies while still retaining measured national assertiveness. Ultimately, the election will signal whether illiberal governance inside the EU is becoming normalized or if it is politically reversible.

Endnotes

1. Marton Gellert, “A New Tone in Hungary?,” German Marshall Fund, March 31, 2026, <https://www.gmfus.org/news/new-tone-hungary>.
2. Zselyke Csaky, “Can Hungary’s Opposition Win and Restore Democracy?” (Centre for European Reform, January 21, 2026), https://www.cer.eu/sites/default/files/ZC_hungarian_opposition_21.1.26.pdf.
3. Ruzha Smilova, “Conceptual Space for Illiberal Democracy,” *Politics and Governance* 13 (2025): 1–19.
4. Yusuke Ishikawa, “Hungary’s Electoral System: Constructing a System Favorable to the Governing Party and Its Future Prospects,” Yusuke Ishikawa, Yusuke. ‘Hungary’s Electoral System: Constructing a System Favorable to the Governing Party and Its Future Prospects.’ Institute of Geoeconomics, October 20, 2025, <https://instituteofgeoeconomics.org/en/research/hungarys-electoral-system-constructing-a-system-favorable-to-the-governing-party-and-its-future-prospects/>.
5. European Parliament, “Outcome of the Meetings of EU Leaders, 19 March 2026” (European Parliamentary Research Service, 2026), [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2026/774741/EPRS_BRI\(2026\)774741_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2026/774741/EPRS_BRI(2026)774741_EN.pdf).
6. Viktor Orbán, “Prime Minister Viktor Orbán’s Speech at the 25th Bálványos Summer Free University and Student Camp,” Website of the Hungarian Government, July 26, 2016, <https://2015-2019.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-speech-at-the-25th-balvanyos-summer-free-university-and-student-camp>.
7. Csaba Tóth, “Democratic Decline and the Rise of Illiberal Citizenship in Hungary,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 2026, 1–21.
8. Béla Greskovits, “Rebuilding the Hungarian Right through Conquering Civil Society: The Civic Circles Movement,” *East European Politics* 36, no. 2 (2020): 247–66, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21599165.2020.1718657>.
9. Attila Ágh, “The Transformation of the Hungarian Party System. From Democratic Chaos to Electoral Autocracy,” *Südosteuropa. Zeitschrift Für Politik Und Gesellschaft* 2, no. 2015 (2015): 201–22; Gabriella Ilonszki, “From Democracy to Personalist Electoral Autocracy: The Case of Hungary,” *Politics & Policy* 53, no. 4 (2025).
10. Robert Csehi, *The Politics of Populism in Hungary*, 1st ed. (Routledge, 2023).
11. European Commission, “Questions and Answers on Hungary: Rule of Law and EU Funding” (Bruxelles, December 13, 2023), https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/it/qanda_23_6466.
12. Olivér Balogh, “The Hungarian Governmental Defence and Military Development Program ‘Zrínyi 2026’ as a Response to the New Threats in the Region,” *Studia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego* 9, no. 15 (2019): 245–259.
13. Donatienne Ruy and Maria Snegovaya, “What Is at Stake in Hungary’s Election?,” Center for Strategic and International Studies, March 11, 2026, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/what-stake-hungarys-election>; Krisztina Than, “What’s at Stake in Hungary’s Parliamentary Election?,” Reuters, March 25, 2026, <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/whats-stake-hungarys-parliamentary-election-2026-03-25/>.

14. Zoltán Kovács and György Vida, “Geography of the New Electoral System and Changing Voting Patterns in Hungary,” *Acta Geobalcanica* 1, no. 2 (2015): 55–64, <https://doi.org/10.18509/agb.2015.06>; Pavel Maškarinec and Jakub Charvát, “On the Way to Limited Competitiveness: Political Consequences of the 2011 Electoral Reform in Hungary,” *Swiss Political Science Review* 29, no. 1 (2023): 37–57, <https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12535>.
15. Flora Palvölgyi, “Hungary’s Electoral System: Reforms, Gerrymandering, and Strategic Voting in 2026,” *Global Affairs and Strategic Studies*, March 27, 2026, <https://en.unav.edu/en/web/global-affairs/hungary-s-electoral-system-reforms-gerrymandering-and-strategic-voting-in-2026>.
16. Nathalie Tocci, “Hungary’s Election Looms – so Does the Far Right Challenge to Europe’s Unity,” Chatham House, March 16, 2026, <https://www.chathamhouse.org/publications/the-world-today/2026-03/hungarys-election-looms-so-does-far-right-challenge-europes>.
17. Daily News, “Hungary Election 2026: One Month to Go – Rules, New Map and Who’s on the Ballot,” *Daily News Hungary*, March 12, 2026.
18. Daily News.
19. Ilona Gizińska, “OSW Update. Hungary Election, No. 3,” Center for Eastern Studies, March 11, 2026, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/osw-commentary/2026-03-11/osw-update-hungary-election-no-3>.
20. Daily News, “Hungary Election 2026: One Month to Go – Rules, New Map and Who’s on the Ballot.”
21. Daily News.
22. Gizińska, “OSW Update. Hungary Election, No. 3.”
23. Justin Spike, “Hundreds of Thousands of Hungarians Attend Rival Rallies in Budapest as Orbán Faces Election Test,” Associated Press, October 24, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/hungary-orban-magyar-rallies-4b1eeb4211506ad595ab104419645e34>; Justin Spike, “A Youth-Led Push for Change Threatens Orbán’s 16-Year Rule in Hungary’s Elections,” *The Washington Post*, March 30, 2026, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2026/03/30/hungary-election-youth-voters-orban/952467a6-2bf6-11f1-aac2-f56b5ccad184_story.html.
24. Daily News, “Hungary Election 2026: One Month to Go – Rules, New Map and Who’s on the Ballot.”
25. Daily News.
26. Daily News.
27. Hungarian National Assembly, “Electing Members of the National Assembly,” accessed March 19, 2026, <https://www.parlament.hu/web/house-of-the-national-assembly/election-of-the-members-of-parliament>.
28. Zoltán Kovács and György Vida, “Geography of the New Electoral System and Changing Voting Patterns in Hungary,” *Acta Geobalcanica* 1, no. 2 (2015): 55–64.
29. Pavel Maškarinec and Jakub Charvát, “On the Way to Limited Competitiveness: Political Consequences of the 2011 Electoral Reform in Hungary,” *Swiss Political Science Review* 29, no. 1 (2023): 37–57.
30. Hungarian National Assembly, “Electing Members of the National Assembly.”
31. European Commission For Democracy Through Law, “Act LXXIX of 2024 Amending Certain Laws Relating to Elections and Related Acts with Amendments” (2025), [https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdf=CDL-REF\(2025\)016-e](https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdf=CDL-REF(2025)016-e).

32. Szegő Iván Miklós, “Why Is Budapest an Island, along with Bratislava and Warsaw?,” 24.Hu, January 11, 2024, <https://24.hu/kulfold/2024/01/11/rural-and-urban-voters-patterns-cee-capitals/>.
33. Agence France-Presse in Budapest, “Blow for Hungary PM Orbán as Opposition Wins Budapest Mayoral Race,” *The Guardian*, October 14, 2019, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/oct/13/opposition-parties-candidate-wins-budapest-mayoral-race>.
34. European Commission For Democracy Through Law, “OPINION ON ACT LXXIX OF 2024 AMENDING CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO ELECTIONS” (2025), <https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDL-AD%282025%29018-e>.
35. Kovalcsik Tamás, “Szoros Eredménynél Kezd El Igazán a Kormánypártoknak Dolgozni Az Új Választókerületi Térkép,” *Telex*, November 21, 2024, <https://telex.hu/valasztasi-foldrajz/2024/11/21/uj-oroszaggyulesi-valasztokeruletek-eredmenyek-hatas-terkep>.
36. Ruy and Snegovaya, “What Is at Stake in Hungary’s Election?”
37. News Agencies, “Hungarian Protesters Demand PM Viktor Orban Quit over Child Abuse Scandals,” *Al Jazeera*, December 13, 2025, <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/12/13/hungary-protesters-demand-pm-viktor-orban-quits-over-child-abuse-cases>.
38. Hungarian Central Statistical Office (KSH), “Consumer Prices, December 2023 and Year 2023,” January 12, 2024, [https://www.ksh.hu/en/first-releases/far/efar2312.html#:~:text=In 2023 compared to previous,on average among pensioner households.&text=a\) The Hungarian Central Statistical,of Summary tables \(Stadat\)](https://www.ksh.hu/en/first-releases/far/efar2312.html#:~:text=In 2023 compared to previous,on average among pensioner households.&text=a) The Hungarian Central Statistical,of Summary tables (Stadat)).
39. Gizińska, “OSW Update. Hungary Election, No. 3.”
40. Council of the European Union, “Rule of Law Conditionality Mechanism: Council Decides to Suspend €6.3 Billion given Only Partial Remedial Action by Hungary,” December 12, 2022, <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2022/12/12/rule-of-law-conditionality-mechanism/>.
41. Ewan Jones, “Hungarians Have More Trust in EU than in Their Own EU-Bashing Government,” *TVP World*, December 13, 2025, <https://tvpworld.com/90532689/hungarian-publics-trust-in-eu-higher-than-in-own-government>.
42. Andrea Schmidt and Viktor Glied, “Pragmatic Foreign Policy of Hungary in the Shadow of the Russian–Ukrainian War,” *Eastern Journal of European Studies* 15, no. SI (2025): 247–67.
43. Bohdan Ustymenko, “Ukraine’s Transcarpathia: The Other Center of Tension in the Heart of Europe,” *Eurasia Daily Monitor* Volume 19, no. 76 (2022), <https://www.ecoi.net/de/dokument/2073663.html#:~:text=In an interview with the,to work through the deadlock>.
44. International Trade Administration, “Hungary Country Commercial Guide,” February 12, 2026, <https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/hungary-energy#:~:text=Russia provides most of Hungary’s,and more sustainable energy sources>.
45. World Nuclear News, “First Concrete Poured for Hungary’s Paks II Nuclear Project,” *World Nuclear News*, February 5, 2026, <https://www.world-nuclear-news.org/articles/first-concrete-poured-for-hungarys-paks-ii-nuclear-project>.
46. Muhammad Imran Javed and Ashfaq Ahmed, “Russian Influence on Europe’s Energy Security. A Geopolitical Analysis,” *Journal of Political Stability Archive* 4, no. 1 (2026): 761–80.

47. Tibor Kovacs, “Hogyan Akarja Megnyerni a Fidesz a Választásokat? – A „két Ördög”-Forgatókönyv,” Index, February 11, 2026, <https://index.hu/velemeney/2026/02/11/hogyan-akarja-megnyeri-a-fidesz-a-valasztasokat-a-ket-ordog-forgatokonyv/>.
48. Kovacs.
49. Stuart Dowell, “How Péter Magyar Is Reverse Engineering Orbánism for Electoral Victory,” TVP, February 27, 2026, <https://tvpworld.com/91828780/tizas-magyar-reengineering-orbanism-in-hungary-election-fight>.
50. BTI, “Hungary Country Report 2026,” BTI Transformation Index, 2026, <https://bti-project.org/en/reports/country-report/HUN>.
51. Eva Hartog, “Pro-Kremlin Bots Cry ‘Murder’ Ahead of Hungary Vote,” Politico, March 26, 2026, <https://www.politico.eu/article/pro-kremlin-bots-cry-murder-ahead-of-hungary-vote/>.
52. Olha Kovalchuk and Stanislav Pohorilov, “Hungarian Opposition Reveals Details of Disinformation Campaign Allegedly Prepared by Russian Political Strategists,” Ukrainska Pravda, March 10, 2026, <https://www.pravda.com.ua/eng/news/2026/03/10/8024797/>.
53. Maria Țaga, “Viktor Orbán Se Îndreaptă Spre Înrângere. Săptămâna Care a Zguduit Politica Din Ungaria: Corupție, Spionaj Și Banii Rușilor,” Adevărul, March 29, 2026, <https://adevarul.ro/stiri-externe/europa/viktor-orban-se-indreapta-spre-infrangere-2518813.html>.
54. Politico, “Hungary — National Parliament Voting Intention,” Politico, 2026, <https://www.politico.eu/europe-poll-of-polls/hungary/>.
55. F. Szabó Kata, “Elkészült a Felmérés, a Magyarok Több Mint Fele Választási Csalástól Tart Április 12-ÉN, Ötből Négyen Titkos Külföldi Beavatkozásra Gyanakszanak,” Népszava, April 4, 2026, https://nepszava.hu/3317645_valasztas-2026-csalas-kulfoldi-beavatkozás-felmeres-publicus-intezet.
56. Humeyra Pamuk and Jonathan Landay, “Vance Due to Visit Hungary on April 7-8 Ahead of Key Election, Say Sources,” Reuters, March 25, 2026, <https://www.reuters.com/world/vance-due-visit-hungary-april-7-8-ahead-key-election-say-sources-2026-03-25/>.
57. Flora Garamvolgyi and Jon Henley, “Viktor Orbán Celebrated by Europe’s Far Right before Hungary Election,” The Guardian, March 23, 2026, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2026/mar/23/viktor-orban-celebrated-europe-far-right-hungary-election>; Lazar Berman, “Netanyahu Praises Hungary’s Viktor Orbán Ahead of Elections,” The Times of Israel, March 22, 2026, https://www.timesofisrael.com/liveblog_entry/netanyahu-praises-hungarys-viktor-orban-ahead-of-elections/.
58. Hungary Today, “Viktor Orbán Urges Hungarians Abroad to Vote, Stresses Unity amid ‘Era of Danger,’” Hungary Today, March 12, 2026, <https://hungarytoday.hu/viktor-orban-urges-hungarians-abroad-to-vote-stresses-unity-amid-era-of-danger/>.
59. Peter Techet, “How Hungary’s Election Campaign Spilled across Borders,” Kyiv Independent, March 31, 2026, <https://kyivindependent.com/how-hungarys-election-campaign-spilled-across-borders/>.
60. István Pataky, “Hogyan Szavaznak Az Erdélyi Magyarok? – Helyi Kötődés, Erős Nemzettudat (INTERJÚ),” Maszol, January 23, 2026, <https://maszol.ro/belfold/Helyi-kotodes-mellett-eros-nemzettudat-Hogyan-szavaznak-az-erdelyi-magyarokINTERJU>; Tamás Kiss, “Schimbare de Regim În Ungaria? Maghiarii Din Transilvania Și Miza Alegerilor Parlamentare Din 12 Aprilie 2026,” Contributors, April 1, 2026, <https://www.contributors.ro/schimbare-de-regim-in-ungaria-maghiarii-din-transilvania-si-miza-alegerilor-parlamentare-din-12-aprilie-2026/>.

61. Marc Roscoe Loustau, "Hungarian Far-Right Recruitment in Serbia's Vojvodina: Not Going to Plan," *Balkan Insight*, March 24, 2026, <https://balkaninsight.com/2026/03/24/hungarian-far-right-recruitment-in-serbias-vojvodina-not-going-to-plan/rd/>.
62. Hungary Today, "Over 90 Pc of Romanian Hungarians Supporting Fidesz," *Hun*, March 22, 2022, <https://hungarytoday.hu/poll-election-90-pc-romanian-hungarians-supporting-fidesz/>.
63. Zsolt Kovács, "Mit Várnak Az Erdélyi Magyarok? – Antal Árpád a Válságról, Hazatérésről És a Magyarországi Választásokról," *Maszol*, December 21, 2025, <https://maszol.ro/belfold/Mit-varnak-az-erdelyi-magyarok-Antal-Arpad-a-valsagrol-hazateresrol-es-magyarorszagi-valasztasokrol>.
64. Klara Lindström and Daniel Hegedüs, "Hungary's 2026 Elections: Scenarios and Implications for the EU and Ukraine," *SCEEUS Commentary* (Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm Centre for Eastern European Studies, 2026); Péter Tchet and Sebastian Schäffer, "Scenarios for the 2026 Hungarian Parliamentary Elections" (Vienna, Austria: Institut für den Donauraum und Mitteleuropa, 2026); Dorota Vandakova, "2026 Hungarian Inflection Point: Tisza's Challenge and the Future of EU Cohesion," *Bloomsbury Intelligence and Security Institute*, March 23, 2026, <https://bisi.org.uk/reports/2026-hungarian-inflection-point-tizas-challenge-and-the-future-of-eu-cohesion>.
65. Anita Komuves and Krisztina Than, "Viktor Orbán's Challenger Sees Strong EU, NATO Ties, 'pragmatic' Approach to Russia," *Reuters*, January 9, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/viktor-orbans-challenger-sees-strong-eu-nato-ties-pragmatic-approach-russia-2025-01-09/>.
66. Gizińska, "OSW Update. Hungary Election, No. 3"; Arslan Suleymanov, "What Will Happen to V4 After Hungary's Vote of Destiny?," *Visegrad Insight*, March 31, 2026, <https://visegradinsight.eu/elections-in-hungary-prognosis-visegrad-four-cooperation/>.

Follow us on social media:

 NSC_Romania

 New Strategy Center - NSC

 office@newstrategycenter.ro

 <https://newstrategycenter.ro/en/home/>

 New Strategy Center