



Education as a matter of security in Hungary

– a case study of official statements by prime minister Viktor Orbán in 2017

Swedish Defence University

Political sciences, profile crisis management and security politics

Advanced course spring 2019: bachelor's thesis (15 ECTS)

Supervisors: thank you to the staff at Swedish Defence University

Author: Jana Hilding

Word count: 11,019

Date: 2019-08-30

Abstract

This paper examines the securitization of education in Hungary during 2017 according to the statements of prime minister Viktor Orbán in official speeches published on the Hungarian government's website. This quantitative examination combines the methods of discourse analysis, taking off from the works of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, partially extended with the comments of Marianne Winther Jørgensen and Louise Phillips, with the Copenhagen School's dictum on securitization being performed through a *speech act*. It is argued that securitization can be used in examining the sudden changes in the Amendments to the Law on National Higher Education (education policy), a combination which is not a traditional proceeding in security research. The findings of the paper show on one hand Hungary's shifting role within the European Union (EU) as a more, respectively less, independent member depending on the topic being discussed, and on the other that the principal referent objects in a security discourse is the Hungarian nation, with Central European University (CEU) as the particular target to the changes, essentially being accused to be part of an illegal network sponsored by George Soros with the aim to facilitate illegal migration (sic!), which from a securitization move perspective therefore legitimizes immediate action by the Hungarian government.

Keywords: education, Copenhagen school, Central European University, discourse analysis, EU, Hungary, securitization, Viktor Orbán

Table of contents

1. Introduction	4
1.1 Research problem.....	4
1.2 Aim, scope and research questions.....	5
1.3 Method.....	7
1.4 Material.....	8
1.5 Validity and reliability.....	9
1.6 Outline.....	10
2. Background	10
3. Theoretical frame	12
3.1 Security – and securitization.....	13
3.2 Securitization as a speech act, ontology and education.....	16
3.3 Hungary and the EU.....	17
4. Analysis	18
January 2017.....	18
February 2017.....	19
March 2017.....	20
April 2017.....	21
July 2017.....	26
October 2017.....	27
December 2017.....	27
5. Results and discussion	28
6. Conclusion	30
6.1 Further research.....	31
7. Reference list	32
7.1 Digital sources.....	33

1. Introduction

While education is traditionally not part of the widened security agenda as education is not about survival (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:21), research shows that education indeed can be used for security purposes (Gearon 2019).

In the case of Hungary, which has been labeled an "illiberal democracy" by prime minister Victor Orbán, a label which today is synonymous with antidemocracy¹ (Bozóki & Hegedűs 2018) due to changes such as the increasement of power of the prime minister and lessening the power of the parliament (Albright 2018:184), significant changes in education that can be connected to securitization have been made. One of these changes means that only the schoolbooks for first and second grades that are preferred by regime are funded by the government. Another change is that the process of centralizing public administration and education has created serious confusion regarding competencies (Hegedűs 2016:4). A third change is the new amendments on the 2011 Law on National Higher Education, adopted in 2017. The critics deem the amendments to be formulated particularly to force The Central European University (CEU) out of the country starting in 2017, an event referred to as Lex CEU (The Orange Files 2017). In the views of European Commission, this amendment has violated EU law guaranteeing the fundamental rights and freedoms, including the right of academic freedom and the right to education (The Orange Files 2017).

These antidemocratic moves in Hungarian legislature affecting education call for a closer examination.

1.1 Research problem

In this thesis it is argued that the announced changes in education – needed and forthcoming – particularly targeting Central European University, are securitized by prime minister Orbán in his speeches during 2017. In so doing, Orbán is creating the narrative of an "us" that needs to be protected from "them", creating a particular image of Hungary and its needs in terms of security.

According to the Copenhagen School, merely making the claim that something is a security issue, that very issue becomes *securitized* (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:26). This *securitizing move* legitimizes the breaking of rules because of a stated imminence (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:25), which is articulated through what in language theory is

¹ Orbán's own explanation of this label differs from this. One such example is his statement that "illiberal democracy is when someone other than the liberals have won" (Kormany 2017p).

called a *speech act* (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:26). The Copenhagen School states further that the success of the securitization depends on the audience: the securitization can only be viewed as accepted, and hence, successful, if it is accepted by the audience. The process of securitization, however, is not claimed to be smooth and without riots, as we shall see below, and makes it interesting to see how the securitization of education has been expressed in the case of Hungary and to what extent it has been successful. Moreover, there are other difficulties in this. It is possible that the audience that is reacting to the events could have been bigger and could have created a bigger response, but as staff and students from the university, as of 2019, have been encouraged to not get too much involved in demonstrations which can be connected to CEU in order to preserve the university further (Foer 2019), the audience of 2017, too, might not have accepted the claims made by Orbán, but not displayed this unacceptance fully. Unheard voices is a problem in the examination, and is also one of the pitfalls in the Copenhagen school theory (Hansen 2000).

”Security” is a documented rich object for critique and takes off from Western thoughts (Burgess 2019:95). Though mainly examining the speeches of prime minister Viktor Orbán and examining statements mainly by one voice, on a bigger scale, this thesis is a contribution to research on connections between education and securitization.

1.2 Aim, scope and research questions

The aim of this thesis is to examine the speeches by Hungary’s prime minister Viktor Orbán from 2017, showing how Orbán relates education in Hungary to security, which, according to the Copenhagen School theory of securitization, validates drastic changes in the education legislation. It has been noted that some of the legislative changes are targeting CEU in particular (Central European University n.d.), with the major changes starting in 2017. Therefore, 2017 has been selected as the most relevant year for examination. The dates and content of Orbán’s speeches are further noted in reference to the following reactions by the audience:

Date	Event
April 10 th , 2017	The amendments to Hungary’s national higher education legislation become the law. CEU strongly disagrees and commits to pursuing all legal remedies.

April 16 th and "onwards", 2017	Hungarian authors make the 24th Budapest book festival into a demonstration of solidarity. Hungarian celebrities from various fields speak out in the favour of CEU
April 26 th , 2017	European Commission concludes the law is not compatible with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and takes legal action against Hungary and announces infringement proceedings
April 27 th , 2017	The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe calls on Hungary to stop implementation of the National Higher Education Act amendments
May 17 th , 2017	The Hungarian government tells CEU that it will not negotiate with the University. European Parliament passes a resolution calling for repeal of lex CEU
May 21 st , 2017	Thousands marched in Budapest and Hungary in support of CEU
October 13 th , 2017	The Hungarian government announces a one-year extension to lex CEU, leaving CEU's case unresolved

Table 1.1. Time line of selected events regarding the reactions to the changes in the Law on National Higher Education, which directly affects Central European University (Central European University n.d.).

This issue of education being securitized is addressed by replying to the following questions:

- 1) How is education securitized in Hungary in relation to the people of Hungary and the EU?
- 2) What is this securitization a consequence of?
- 3) What consequences are there for Hungary when education is securitized?
- 4) Is the securitization successful, according to the Copenhagen school theory?

To be able to identify the different parts of securitization, the following set of questions are used as guidelines:

Who are the referent objects,
Who are the securitizing actors,
Who are the functional actors,
Who is the audience?

1.3 Method

A discourse analysis is both a theory and a method (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017). Therefore, in this thesis, the examination of prime minister Victor Orban's speeches will partly be analysed using social constructivist discourse theory as presented by Enerst Laclau and Chantal Mouffe with additional comments by Marianne Winther Jørgensen and Louise Phillips. The discourse analysis offers analytical tools to discern particular messages and make them more perceptible, distinguish what issues are being generated and how authority is being argued in a variety of ways (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:176, 181). This includes repetition (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:180) and the creation of identities (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:177).

The second part of the analysis implements the term *speech act* as presented by the Copenhagen School, where the speech act, in written or oral form, is central in bringing an issue into the domain of security (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:26). For the securitization to be successful, the audience needs to accept the claimed emergency, and thus permits extraordinary changes to be made, including breaking rules (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:25). In addition to this, this study will be taking into use Marianne Winther Jørgensen's and Louise Phillips' (2017) additional comments to the theories of post-Marxist political thinkers Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe.

In discourse analysis, method and theory are interlinked, making it both a method and a theory simultaneously, and welcomes additional combinations of perspectives for a widening of understanding of an action or a phenomena (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:10). A discourse, then, is "a certain way of talking about and understanding the world" (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:7). This is also the core of constructivism (sometimes dubbed constructionism), which is based on the idea that meanings and social phenomena are being constructed and upheld by social actors (Bryman 2012:33), and in philosopher Michel Foucault's view, social phenomena are expressed with the language ordered in a particular way that give objects and phenomena meaning (Bryman 2012:528). With the structure of discourse being an *articulatory practice* with which social relations can be created and

maintained (Laclau & Mouffe 2008:147), the aim of the discourse theory is to unravel which *myths* about the society that are implied in speeches and in actions, the myth designating the understanding of a given situation (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:47) through the "representations of reality" we express with a language (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:15). This combined analysis of a discourse does not strive to find hidden reasons or what "actually" hides behind the utterance(s) in question (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:28; Bryman 2012:530)

While critics may claim that as discourse continues to change with time and motives, and therefore can be too volatile to examine, we are to be reminded of that our understandings of events and our ways to imagine the world need to be reproduced time and time again to keep any practice alive, which is particularly true for national discourse (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:162). Politics in discourse theory is understood in a broad sense, as a social reality where the organisation is a result of political processes and is according to Laclau and Mouffe a practice where the society is incessantly changed and constructed, included or excluded (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:43). The nation is so seen as a homogenous unit, composed of a common culture, language and history (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:163)

Some discourses are so well-established that alternative alignments are in danger of being overlooked. These "natural" discourses are called *objective* by Laclau and Mouffe (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:43). As this objectiveness appears to be unchangeable and self-evident – we have forgotten that this, too, is politics – it equals ideology (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:44, 45). This shows the connection between power, politics and objectivity. In discourse theory, *power* is what brings the society forward (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017: 44, 45).

1.4 Material

The material used for analysis is the speeches by and interviews with prime minister Viktor Orbán, which are available in fulltext on the Hungarian government website translated to English (www.kormany.hu). Each speech and interview is specified with the date and time it was held, with an addition about the location for where the speech took place. The topics of the speeches can be assumed to specify the audience, bearing names such as "prime minister Viktor Orbán's speech at the 30th Bálványos Summer Open University and Student Camp". While the speeches and interviews available stretch from 6th of June 2014 till the most recent speech given, currently July 30th 2019, the selection for the analysis of securitization of

education has been made based on three criterias:

1) the available text contains one of the words "education", "school", "student" or "university" within a context of education or security and

2) are selected based on relevant discourse, so excluding the mere statement of number of schools, honorable mentions of scholarships or issues not connected to the topics at all, such as children and nursery homes.

The last criterion, 3), was the range of time, which was narrowed to range from January 1st 2017, the year when the change in the education policy began to affect the Central European University, to December 31st 2017.

The selection of the material carries some disadvantages. It can be easily observed that not all of prime minister's speeches and interviews are made available, which on one hand both leaves out key speeches or key interviews and are excerpts of a longer-ranging discourse (for instance, throughout the duration of term of office), but on the other, shows what image of the prime minister and what kind of answers the government seemingly wants to display and in this way keep a particular, national discourse. Furthermore, the interviews on the government's website are carried out by state-controlled media, such as the Kossuth Rádió, which could indicate that some questions are being orchestrated in advance and eliminates a more thorough questioning (Central European University, n.d.)

1.5 Validity and reliability

The reliability of the study, meaning that this study can be replicated independently using the same material and repeating the steps of this research as explained (Bryman 2012:46, 47), is expected to be high as all the steps follow the principles of intersubjectivity as they are transparent and presented, ranging from the selection of material and the use particular key words to the application of the selected theories (Theorell & Svensson 2013:54).

Two kinds of validity – meaning, the conclusions of research (Bryman 2012:47) – are applicable to this study, most importantly *internal validity*, as it deals on one hand with consistency, that there is a match between the ideas and the presented results (Bryman 2012:390), and on the other, causality: any research is in the risk zone of having made findings that by chance coincide with the research question but in fact depend on other, unnoticed, factors (Bryman 2012:48). *External validity* deals with the possibility that the results of the research can be applied in other fields (Bryman 2012:48), or that a study similar to this can be made with similar results (Bryman 2012:390). This examination is not necessarily sensible to the setting of context, which can be a problem in research (Bryman 2012:393) and shall be

possible to replicate for example using other speech acts by the members of the Fidesz government on security, the nation and education. However, the researcher's role in presenting assimilated knowledge in a particular way, including the order in which the information occurs, therefore playing a significant part in the research, is acknowledged (Bryman 2012:394).

Mason's notion of validity, to actually measure and identify in accordance with what I claim to measure and identify, has remained a strict guideline for this thesis (Bryman 2012:389, 390).

1.6 Outline

This thesis is structured as follows: a brief overview of the recent events regarding Hungary and education reforms is given, followed by a presentation of the aim, research problem, choice of material and some academic reflection upon the validity and reliability of this study. After this follows a brief introduction about education and the EU, succeeded by the analysis. The thesis ends with a discussion of results and a conclusion. Previous research is continuously included throughout the thesis.

2. Background

In a now wide-spread article in *The Atlantic*, journalist Franklin Foer summarizes the situation on education in Hungary (Foer 2019). Foer states that Hungary's universities previously offered some of the best programs in postcommunist Europe. With Orbán's government, public universities are now tightly controlled: research funding is limited to the decisions of "an Orbán loyalist", reversing the previous system, when research funding was granted by an independent body of academics. Upon Foer's visit to Hungary, a pro-government website encourages university students to name professors who have made "unasked-for left-wing political opinions", and "a regime-friendly weekly published an 'enemies list' that included the names of dozens of academics, 'mercenaries' purportedly working on behalf of a foreign cabal" (Foer 2019). Foer makes the drastic statement that "Like Pol Pot or Josef Stalin, Orbán dreams of liquidating the intelligentsia, draining the public of education" (Foer 2019).

Orbán's party, Fidesz, has been argued to have fewer supporters than it appears, as the participation in the election is low, a total of 61 % in 2014, with 27 % voting for Fidesz (Lewenhagen 2018). 2014 was also the first time Orbán used the label "illiberal democracy" for Hungary (Lewenhagen 2018).

Central European University, accredited in both the United States and Hungary, is a private university founded in 1991 by George Soros, who is Hungarian by birth, and who intended the university to be a leading example of an open society and a way up from the lack of higher education during the communism, "to counteract the possibility of a regional brain drain" (Foer 2019). In April 2017, the Hungarian parliament passed a law setting conditions that threatened to render CEU's continued presence in the country illegal (Central European University, n.d.). Political analyst Péter Kréko explains in the interview that people have started to leave the country, do not vote in Hungary, and do not even participate in protests. "They will transfer money home, but they don't vote here. They don't go to protests" (Foer 2019). Nor could the CEU protest when the amendments were passed, which otherwise would have worsened the situation. Besides the effects on CEU, the age at which compulsory education ends has been changed from 18 to 16, which has been incentives for young Hungarians to quit school earlier. The curricula issued by the government includes patriotic education (Foer 2019).

The content of education, though regulated in regard to access by the Convention on the Rights of the child is not specified, nor is education on higher levels. Education is "autonomous" by a state. Circumstances surrounding education and the society structure in which education is incorporated, however, educational opportunities are in practice not equal, making it a part of structural inequality or "social fracture", in the words of Girling (Girling 20014:2). Prominent sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Alain Touraine have brought forward theories about educational capital, a structure in which a scholarly degree paves way for elitistic positions in society (Girling 20014:2²). Bourdieu and Touraine draw attention to the educational system, which – though not solely – makes part of the wider debate of "politics of change" as well as "politics of order" (Girling 20014:5). Examples of the effects of education on a society (or state) is when mass education made it possible (Girling 20014:10). Touraine points out education as the agency of socialisation which is passed on to the new members of a society (Girling 2004:23). A lack of education leads to insecurity as it causes unemployment, but struggling children also turn their insecurities to teachers and classmates through violence and bullying (Girling 20014:25). Educational institutions play a significant role in reproducing cultural capital and the structure of social space (Girling 2014:42).

3. Theoretical frame

² A note shall be made on that late Bourdieu himself, as well as Touraine, have critically read Girling's assesment of the theories on structural domination and symbolic power (Bourdieu) and crisis of modernity (Touraine).

A discourse is "a certain way of talking about and understanding the world" – and is never neutral (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:7). This is also the core of constructivism (sometimes referred to as constructionism), which is based on the idea that meanings and social phenomena are being constructed and upheld by social actors³ (Bryman 2012:33), and in philosopher Michel Foucault's view, expressed with the language ordered in a particular way that give objects and phenomena meaning (Bryman 2012:528). Using discourse theory is suitable for research on the processes of communication, in the society as a whole but also within organisations (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:7). There is no particular emphasis of the excerpts analysed to be natural every-day conversations (Bryman 2012:528). It is with the language that we create "representations of reality" (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:15) and can, even though temporarily, determine the undetermined (Bryman 2012:34).

At the same time, the structure of discourse is an *articulatory practice* with which social relations can be created and maintained (Laclau & Mouffe 2008:147). The aim of the discourse theory is to unravel which *myths* about the society that are implied in speeches and in actions, the myth designating (a sometimes subconscious) understanding of a given situation (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:47). This is performed by analysing the text, without seeking to find hidden reasons or what "actually" hides behind the utterance(s) in question (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:28; Bryman 2012:530). The analysis of discourse is facilitated by the common assumption within this very field that the particular qualities of a text set the boundaries for how the text shall be understood (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:23). The discourse theory also examines how discourse can limit our actions (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:28). Such an example is the Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser's presumption that when we accept the positions of subject that are designated us, for example recognizing ourselves as voters, women or students when addressed to as such, this acceptance makes us ideological subjects (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:22) – and we act accordingly.

In discourse analysis, the society is regarded as a unit that is never complete (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:46). The discourse analysis carries a social constructivist point of view (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:9), where, as explained by Vivien Burr, the attitude of the researcher is critical towards what we know about the world and what we take for granted, as our understanding of our surrounding world using pre-defined categories. Such a category is what we see as "the nation", which is homogeneous in culture, a common

³ The terminology constructivism has as of lately also carried a reference to the viewpoint of social reality, as presented by the researchers (Bryman 2012:33). This notion is not used here.

language and a history (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:163), but for the "national" to remain as this homogeneous, or other, understanding, it must repeatedly be spoken of that way and repeatedly be produced (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:162). This can be analysed using the *deixis*, where a reference needs a context to be fully understood. In a national discourse, "we" could mean the country where this discourse (speech) takes place, and the reference "abroad" on one hand states there is a division of the world and on the other, the relation of the the speaker or the audience has to this division (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:170).

Another important part in discourse theory and the social constructivism is the *contingency*, meaning that our views and understanding of identities are not static, as they *could* have been different and *can* change over time (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:11). This is important, taking into consideration that the meaning of the same word or a reference can alter between discourses (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:18). Discourses affect each other, which is in the discourse theory described as a *discourse battle* (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:13). Moreover, Laclau and Mouffe point out that if there are always several ongoing discourses simultaneously, leading to one person being assigned several labels at once and these labels overlap too much, the subject is *overdetermined* (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:49).

Bourdieu summaries that language in itself both carries official definitions of the official language itself, for example of a political unit, and furthermore, this language "imposes itself of the whole population as the only legitimate language" (Bourdieu 1994:5).

3.1 Security – and securitization

Security is about survival (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:21) and is defined by how we interpret existential threats (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:21, 23). This means that the domain of security is non-static, as it depends fully on time and context (Balzacq 2016:496). *Securitization* is the political move that frames something as urgent enough for ordinary rules of politics to not be applicable in that particular area, allowing for drastical changes to take place as a consequence (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:23). This follows the line of Pierre Bourdieu's thoughts that a politician speaks in the name of and presents the electorates, which makes securitization another form of exercising political control and embodies the speech act – "to say is to do" (Bourdieu 1994:190).

With the ending of the Cold war in 1991, the conditions of which used to dominate attitudes to and understandings of security mainly from realist and neorealist perspectives

where the military aspects and use of force occupy a major place, the conceptions of security began to encompass other kinds of threats and it became possible to also rethink international security, now focussing on solving other kinds of imminent dilemmas, such as environmental issues (Roe 2016:216) or transnational crime (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde1998:2). The armed forces no longer had the main task to defend the state (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde1998:22) – nor was security bound to the armed forces or concerned one sector only (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998: vii).

The widening of the concept of security has been proposed by, among others, Jessica Tuchman Matthews and Barry Buzan, therefore even referred to as "wideners" (Roe 2016:216). Concerns that have arisen with the changed circumstances and the meaning of security are both of interest for the academia and for states as well as various organisations, who rely much on policies in their work, and to date, with both the traditionalist view and the view of security as widened co-exist parallelly (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde1998:1), naturally, there are complaints about the meaning of security being too edulcorated (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde1998:2). As traditionalist Stephen Walt points out, a too wide approach to security aggravates findings to solutions of (security) problems (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde1998:3, 4), and existential threats are harder to pin down in more complex sectors (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde1998:22). In the words of Bellamy and McDonald, we can even observe cases of "death by economics", when curable and preventable diseases still cause deaths (Persaud 2016:140), for example due to underfinanced infrastructure. The recognition of the central challenges to human security intertwined with non-military problems also is central to the security agenda is at times referred to as *soft security* (Cottey 2007:32, 45) and we do in fact talk about social security when we talk about the welfare state (Girling 2004:3). The first official security strategy document by the EU was adopted in December 2003 and included soft security, listing poverty, state failure, disease, dependence on transport, energy and information infrastructure and organized crime (Cottey 2007:45).

Barry Buzan, Jaap de Wilde and Ole Waever, known as The Copenhagen School, offer such a "widened theory" of security of which three parts are applied in this thesis. These parts from the Copenhagen Theory are the *speech act*, the three components that together form a *successful securitization* and the *units of security analysis*.

The *speech act*, first time introduced by J. Austin in 1955 (Shmelov & Shmelova 2002:17), is language theory terminology (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde1998:26). The linguists Shmelov & Shmelova (2002:18) offer excellent examples of possible categorizations of speech: to

congratulate, to write an application, or, securitize issues and actors to produce a national identity (Behnke 2006).

The audience plays a big role in securitization as a speech act in the eyes of The Copenhagen School. An issue is only securitized when the audience agrees with this move. This agreement of legitimization, however, is not stated to be solely smooth and without debate (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:25). A fully successful securitization has to tick the three boxes of having presented existential threats, taken emergency action and have effects on interunit relations as a result of changing the rules (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:26). To identify such securitization, The Copenhagen School uses three distinctions of security: *referent objects* ("things that are seen to existentially threatened and that have a legitimate claim to survival"), *securitizing actors* (for example a state och a non-governmental organization that declares something, this being the referent object, to be existentially threatened) and *functional actors* (any actor who can affect the dynamics of a sector) (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:36). In this study, the recurring securitizing actor is the Hungarian prime minister and therefore remains at large static.

Lene Hansen (2000) points out two large obstacles in the Copenhagen School theory. She underscores the importance of not overlooking what is *not* being said, as some vulnerable groups can not or are not permitted to speak, and hence, are not heard. Hansen also underscores the importance of not only considering security for groups, but also for individuals, elegantly showing how the problems of one individual indeed can become a vital issue for a group.

Securitization is the kind of politization where the issues at stake are considered so important, that extreme measurements, such as making decisions that are not a common political procedure, are required to settle this very matter (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:23, 24). We might not be aware of an emerging threat, and speaking about a particular something, pointing it out as the threat to a so-called referent object, is a *securitizing move*, but, in the view of The Copenhagen School, this is only true when the audience accepts this definition by a legitimized speaker security is about survival (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:25).

As securitization theory also intersects with speech act theory, researchers have explored questions such as - what is the nature and criteria of audience acceptance? "Which challenges does the possibility of multiple audiences raise for the theory?" "What are the functions and types of acceptance by the audience?" (Balzacq 2016:499).

3.2 Securitization as a speech act, ontology and education

”The speech act”, first time introduced by G. Austin in 1955 (Shmelov & Shmelova 2002:17), is on one hand to speak about a matter, and on the other, a possibility to classify it. The linguists Shmelov & Shmelova (2002:18) offer excellent examples of possible categorizations of speech, which also can be expressed in written form: to *apologise*, to *write an application*, to *congratulate*. Political scientists Jaap de Wilde, Barry Buzan and Olle Weaver, together forming the Copenhagen School, have also introduced the speech act as a *securitization move*, which can serve for states to take immediate actions outside of the frame of democracy processes. According to Behnke, this is done repeatedly: ”states continuously securitize issues and actors to produce a national identity” (Behnke 2006). Finally, propaganda studies have to a large extent investigated the same questions, although they have drawn on different sets of sources, such as framing and ‘symbolic politics’. None of these approaches ever used the specific term “securitization”. Yet, the processes examined by all of them are similar to those on which securitization theory focuses (Balzacq 2016:496).

As Balzacq et al. demonstrate, scholars have proposed a distinction of several possible audiences that can be made, as the recipients of a speech act can be divided in groups, but it is difficult to track which of them form the *enabling audience*, which in the end will be the part of composed groups of the audience addressed, which empowers the securitizing actor or any other appropriate authority to act (Balzac et al 2016:500). The audience can actually fulfil two different functions, namely, providing moral support and supplying the securitizing actor with a formal mandate (such as a vote by the legislature), without which no policy to address the threat would be possible. Roe underlines that the then prime minister Tony Blair did not receive the moral support of one audience (i.e. public opinion) but nonetheless secured the formal agreement of another audience (i.e. the Parliament) (Balzac et al 2016:500).

Here, I would like to highlight two factors. The first factor is that researchers on security tend to not include time as part of the sanctioning of a securitization move. Balzacq et al (2016:500) bring loosely up the audience voting for such a mandate that the securitization move addresses – which indicates either voting for a particular question of security, or voting for a party or a member of a party during elections a mandate period later, which, in turn, on one hand shows that the effects of a speech act can last over a long period of time (with time intervals or on a continuum throughout the mandate period), or that it is not connected to time, but rather the recipients’ understanding and agreement of an issue’s transformation into a question of security. The agreement or disagreement with the definition that the speech act encompasses/presents could be highly political, addressing the question in particular within a

window frame of opportunity, but could also be evolving together with the language itself, slowly taking on more meanings and associations in line with the security backdrop presented. The second factor is speech acts following one another, and the relation to them from the audience.

Ciută and Wilkinson argue that there is no ‘logic’ of security per se but rather different articulations of security depending upon the context in which a security issue emerges. Thus, it remains to be determined whether different meanings of security necessarily entail different logics (Balzacq et al 2016:503).

In a national discourse, we can find which groups and subgroups are upheld, being created through, which representatives these groups are given legacy (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:176) and who is positioned as “us” or “them” (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:178). Identities being defined and assigned is a social process, which can be accepted or rejected (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:172).

The discourse theory, besides unravelling the myths of our society (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:47), also examines how discourse can limit our actions (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:28). Such an example is the Marxist philosopher Louise Althusser’s presumption that when we accept the positions of subject that are designated for us, for example recognizing ourselves as voters, women or students when addressed to as such, this acceptance makes us ideological subjects (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:22) – and we act accordingly.

3.3 Hungary and the EU

The EU fulfils three different functions in relation to Hungary, serving as:

- (1) a systemic constraint;
- (2) a supporter; and
- (3) a legitimizer of the regime (Bozóki & Hegedűs 2018:1178).

The European Commission turned out to have lacked the political and legal tools to effectively confront the Hungarian government over the dismantling of liberal democracy and liberal constitutionalism (Bozóki & Hegedűs 2018:1178), though Hungary’s obligations are under EU treaties, to protect fundamental human rights and civil liberties (Bozóki & Hegedűs 2018:1179).

Regarding Hungary’s position on the democracy scale, many maintained that the regime could be considered democratic, as long as it guaranteed free elections (Bozóki & Hegedűs 2018:1174). Furthermore, Bozóki & Hegedűs (2018:1174) highlight that for Hungary, EU

simultaneously functions as *regime sustaining*, *regime legitimizing* and *regime constraining*.

4. Analysis

January 2017

Prime minister Viktor Orbán’s speech at the Lámfalussy Conference, January 23rd 2017

”The next path leading to success, and one on which we have a great many battles ahead, is the establishment of a dual training system. This means bringing an education system that is far removed from European economic reality closer to that economic reality. The aim is to ensure that at the end of their studies students do not discover that, while the knowledge we have given our children may well be fine, noble and valuable in theory, in reality it is utterly useless. Europe’s school and higher education systems suffer in this regard. The only way to solve this problem is by descending somewhat from our refined intellectual heights, and bringing the school and training system closer to the oil and sweat of the real economy.”

(Kormany 2017a)

Establishing a dual training system is stated to be a *battle* for the people’s best, the opponent(s) unnamed. The statement of the necessity of an alteration of the education system in schools as well as universities and their equivalents to provide jobs and get rid of unemployment is a heads-up. Orbán positions Hungary outside of ”European reality” and into an ”economic reality”, with the EU education system is stated to not suffice for the needs of the Hungarian people and lack reality, further insinuating that changes to the educational system in Hungary will be made. This appears as a potentially successful securitizing move, as long as the audience shares the alarm in this message.

Prime minister Viktor Orbán’s speech at the Lámfalussy Conference, January 23 rd 2017	
Referent objects	Hungarians
Securitizing actors	The Hungarian state
Functional actors	Schools, educational body, EU, EU’s educational body
Targeted audience	”Ladies and gentlemen”; jobtakers

February 2017

Prime minister Viktor Orbán's State of the Nation Address, February 10th 2017

"But in the meantime are we raising [the children] to love their homeland, to be patriotic and to have a patriotic frame of mind? Will Hungary be their shared passion, as it is ours? Will they too have a sense of national justice, which is fuelled by patriotism? Will they understand that the only way we can avoid being the slaves of other peoples – and the only way we can remain an independent nation – is if, first and foremost, we declare ourselves to be Hungarian? These are all things that we should take care to teach children in school, because it is only through this that our children can understand what links and binds us together. And I must admit that today I do not yet see any guarantee of this." (Kormany 2017b)

Translating – curriculum in schools must be made nationalistic in a near future to not lose Hungarian values and understanding of history, or this understanding that unites the Hungarian people will be lost, essentially dissolving Hungary as the nation known to the world today. This can happen faster than we think.

"The people of the West feel that the history of their generation and future generations could indeed be at an end. And this is not exaggeration or poetic licence. Can they continue the way of life they inherited from their parents, or will something change forever without their consent – and indeed against their will? Will they have the right to their own culture? Will they be able to protect Europe's non-material, intellectual assets? <...> And will there be security without the threat of terrorism, and will life in big cities be free of fear? Regardless of the prosperity and affluence of today, within the European Union the future is now casting a shadow on the present. That shadow is a long, dark one. And this isn't being pointed out by envious Eastern Europeans or ludicrous old Soviet propaganda. This is different: Western Europeans are saying all this about themselves, about their own situations and their own future." (Kormany 2017b)

According to Orbán, there are unknown, imminent threats awaiting in the near future which could erase the cultural heritage and knowledge altogether, which the Hungarians and the Europeans should prepare for. Though the polemic is clear, the message would have been on the pathway to a securitization move if the source of the shadows was stated more precisely. The audience is left to guess who is to blame and for what.

Prime minister Viktor Orbán's State of the Nation Address, February 10 th 2017	
Referent objects	Children, future Hungarian citizens
Securitizing actors	Soviet, Eastern Europeans, The Hungarian state
Functional actors	People of the West, generations, EU
Audience	Parents, grandparents, voters

Mars 2017

Prime minister Viktor Orbán on Kossuth Radio's programme "180 Minutes", March 31st 2017

"[Journalist:]...newspapers are asking why the Hungarian government wants to have the CEU closed down.

[Orbán:] Well, fraud is fraud – whoever commits it. There was an inspection; every four to five years we conduct comprehensive inspections of teaching institutions, and we found that there are irregularities in the operation of several universities – including George Soros's university. And in Hungary one cannot be above the law – even if you're a billionaire. This university must also observe the laws.

<...>

[Journalist]: Will you also have talks with the CEU?

[Orbán:] The CEU simply has to comply with the law. We don't need to have talks with it <...> ...in this situation Hungarian universities have good reason to complain. The situation that this unclear legal state of affairs made possible is far from fair. If a Hungarian university operates in Hungary, it issues a degree: a Hungarian degree. And that's that. Compared with this, there's a university operating in Hungary which issues two degrees: a Hungarian one and an American one. This is not fair on Hungarian universities. There is competition among universities as well, and it's inexplicable why we should place our own universities at a disadvantage. Seen from the other angle, it's unfair to provide an advantage for foreign universities. We need a clear and fair situation." (Kormany 2017c)

It is unusual that the CEU was not contacted after the stated inspection. That a law was issued shortly after the inspection shows that what was found during the inspection was a serious issue. No communication taking place between the university and the government is remarkable and the fast law amendment indicates a securization move.

”[Journalist]: A degree issued by the Central European University is in practice also valid in the United States. It’s not another degree.

[Orbán:] <...> No, this is about two different things. They issue two degrees: a degree which is valid in Hungary and a degree which is valid in the United States.

<...>

[Journalist]: <...> Democrat politicians have already indicated that this won’t end well.

[Orbán:] Hungary is a sovereign country. Hungary is a country which supports knowledge at all times, and it doesn’t tolerate fraud.

[Journalist]: Do you think that what’s happening at the CEU is fraud?

[Orbán:] But of course...” (Kormany 2017c)

CEU is stated to be a fraud, which damages CEU’s reputation further. What the stated fraud is based on is not made clear and loses impact as the prime minister shows a lack of knowledge about how degrees are issued at universities. Moreover, as the CEU was founded in 1991, the several inspections that should have had taken place should have detected any legal problems and reported them to the university, not issue a law amendment targeting this particular university.

April 2017

Easter interview with prime minister Viktor Orbán in Hungarian daily Magyar

Idők, April 15th 2017

”[Orban]: We would have no conflicts if we didn’t continually strive for an independent national existence. Neither would we have conflicts if we were to accept the dictates of Brussels or other political and financial centres – or if we accepted Hungarian or American billionaires telling us how things should be in our country. <...>...the question is whether or not there is national independence. Therefore the front is as wide as is required for the protection of national independence. Today we live in times in which international politics is a battlefield. The independence and freedom of European nations are at stake. And standing at the centre of this battlefield is migration. The Soros university, the transparency of international lobbying organisations and financial stability all emerge as secondary battlefields in the present dry run for the election campaign. There is no denying that everything would be easier if we adopted the status of a slave nation.

[Journalist]: Aren't you concerned that the Soros university issue could disrupt this unity? Many intellectuals on the right have expressed their disapproval.

[Orbán]: The different views formed on the Soros university do not affect the overwhelming majority and unity which rejects migration and the Soros-style network which hides behind it.” (Kormany 2017e)

Here, Orbán expresses the view that the EU dictates what Hungary should do, which he sees as part of an ongoing battle regarding a nation's independency and not of interest for Hungary, even though it is a EU member with particular obligations which here seem overlooked. This battle, as presented by Orbán, is parallel with the influence from Soros. Essentially, this battle is about power – gaining votes in the next elections. Orbán undermines CEU's staff and students as actors with opinions that differ from what he states to be the majority, and does hence not accept those with connections to CEU as an audience. Expressed by Orbán, the audience is everybody else, who in practice is not affected by the amendments. The members of the majority are, however, not made clear – voters in Hungary, statesmen, or other.

”[Orban]: However, the university is a sensitive issue related to intellect and learning, and this hits a nerve with both students and teachers. <...> barely ten per cent of the students studying in the Soros institution are Hungarian. <...> everyone will eventually realise that this is not about closing universities, but about applying the laws equally to every Hungarian university. <...> I do not believe that the civic intelligentsia would be happy to be allied with people whom the impending legislation will clearly show to be operating with foreign funding, serving foreign interests, and following instructions from abroad. All this is about the fact that – through his organisations in Hungary, and hidden from the public gaze – George Soros is spending endless amounts of money to support illegal immigration. To pursue his interests he pays a number of lobbying organisations operating in the guise of civil society. He maintains a regular network, with its own promoters, its own media, hundreds of people, and its own university. He wants to keep the pressure on Hungary: the country which expects even the likes of George Soros to observe its laws. <...> We want to protect Hungary, and so we must also commit ourselves to this struggle.” (Kormany 2017e)

This is a severe accusation which is not backed by facts. CEU is stated to be a disguise and part of a network with the aim to bring immigrants to Hungary. Regardless of whether this is

done legally or not, bringing immigrants to Hungary is presented as a direct threat to the nation. The move of eliminating CEU and George Soros' influence on Hungary is assumed to demonstrate the power and independence of others by the nation, with the voters, EU and the surrounding world as the audience. Moreover, there is an insinuation made that it is a threat, or something not necessarily positive, that the majority studying at the "Soros universities" are not Hungarian. All the statements combined, in addition to that sanctions against CEU already have begun, continue a securitizing move that has begun before.

Easter interview with prime minister Viktor Orbán in Hungarian daily Magyar Idők, April 15 th 2017	
Referent objects	Hungarian universities, Hungarian law, independence and freedom of European nations
Securitizing actors	The Hungarian state (we), the legislators (we)
Functional actors	George Soros, Hungarian universities, "Soros network"
Audience	Exchange students, CEU staff, George Soros

Prime minister Viktor Orbán's address at the opening ceremony of the 10th Szakma Sztár Festival, April 25th 2017

"Dear Students, <...> Education without specific qualifications does not give you much chance of success. <...> I can reassure you that we shall not give the job opportunities offered by Hungary either to guest workers or to migrants. You will always come first, and everyone else can only come after you. We, together with your parents, want your decisions on your careers to lead you to secure futures. We would like you to gain qualifications in areas where you can find jobs – qualifications that will provide you with a decent living, here in Hungary. In other words, we want you to gain qualifications which provide security and dignity, and which help you to reach even higher..." (Kormany 2017q)

Education – but a particular kind – is stated to provide security in itself, and the Hungarian state enhances this security by offering jobs primarily to Hungarian citizens. Here, a decision is embedded in security at first sight, but it also directs the audience to make the "right

move”, indicating that some career paths are not desirable, and that there is a particular, bright, future the youth can achieve together.

Prime minister Viktor Orbán’s address at the opening ceremony of the 10th Szakma Sztár Festival, April 25 th 2017	
Referent objects	Forthcoming students
Securitizing actors	The Hungarian state (we), the legislators + parents (we)
Functional actors	
Audience	Students, parents, grandparents, children

Prime minister Viktor Orbán’s speech in the European Parliament, April 26th 2017

”The news has spread that the Hungarian government – using the power of law – has closed the Budapest-based private university of American financial speculator George Soros. The rector of this university wrote the following to the lecturers and the students of the institution, I quote: ‘We would like to emphasize that the existence of the Central European University is not threatened by anything, the university will continue to operate under any circumstances.’ <...>. The situation is absurd. It is like when someone is accused of murder and convicted, while the victim of the alleged crime is alive and well. <...>The reality is that the small amendment adopted by the Hungarian National Assembly affects 28 foreign universities operating in Hungary, and does nothing but unifies the rules that apply to them, closes the possibility of speculations and abuses, demands transparency, and eliminates the privileged position these institutions enjoyed over European universities. <...> It is my duty as Prime Minister of Hungary, the leader of an EU member state to ensure that European and Hungarian universities are not in a disadvantage compared to their competitors outside the EU...” (Kormany 2017n)

The CEU is equated with an alleged murderer, which implies how severe this issue is in Orbán’s view. The other 28 foreign universities mentioned, supposedly also affected by the changes, are surprisingly silent on the matter, and have not been covered by international media or mentioned by the CEU. Orbán’s statement is that the amendment has no connection to EU legislation or duties by Hungary as a EU member – however, the indicated incentive is that both Hungarian and Europeans universities should not be

in disadvantage, alledging that the challenges are mutual and could require co-operation.

Prime minister Viktor Orbán on Kossuth Radio's "180 Minutes" programme,

April 28th 2017

[Orbán]: The Commission has announced that it's planning to launch procedures <...> on the higher education legislation. This is a strange story, as earlier they tried to sound the alarm to half the world, claiming that this is about academic freedom; but looking at the latest events, I see that this whole thing has been reduced to a financial issue <...> The other, weightier, issue is our legislation on migrants, which has been targeted by the Commission, George Soros and NGOs. They want Hungary to dismantle the fence, to change its legislation, and to let in illegal migrants; or, even if we don't let everyone in, to at least provide freedom of movement within Hungary for people appealing against rejection of their entry applications <...> Today the least I can say is that the affairs of George Soros's university in Hungary are not transparent, and its legal arrangements are not transparent either; and so we would like a very clear, transparent and simple situation. <...> [George Soros] <...> has used this talent to attack several national currencies, in the process destroying the lives of millions of people – both in Europe and outside Europe. <...> The underlying ideal of the European Union is not financial speculation. The European Union's fundamental ideal is the social market economy. <...> I am shocked – not as the Prime Minister of Hungary, but as a voter in the European Union – that the leaders of the EU should treat a financial speculator with such affection, honour and acclaim in full sight of the whole of Europe. <...> ...this whole affair has been further inflamed by the case of the two Bangladeshi or Pakistani men, when it emerged that a system has been built up here which will facilitate the continual siphoning off of funds from the Hungarian budget <...> – who have since disappeared. We have no idea where they are, but regardless of this proceedings were launched against Hungary. <...> If things continue like this, tens of thousands will scalp us: they will keep dipping into our pockets in an attempt to make off with the Hungarian people's money. We cannot predict the future extent of this. <...> Behind these we have revealed that in fact one can see a networked operation at work. One of the reasons we want to enact a separate law on so-called "NGOs" engaged in activities such as these is because we want to see them, we want to learn about them and we want to find out who funds them" (Kormany 2017i).

This appears to be the first time that Orbán brings up the complex relation between financier George Soros and Hungary in more detail, which somewhat unexpectedly boils down to illegal immigration, making the Hungarian nation the referent objects to protect from the unknown threat the immigrants are here set to represent. Other referent objects are the Hungarian taxpayers, their money and the potentially vulnerable financial instruments. Soros is presented as a threat to the euro, EU and Hungary. The "two unknown men" with uncertain nationality and their assumed illegal activities is a vague statement. If it had been as serious as Orbán tries to make it sound, a thorough police investigation would have been announced. The assumption that Soros has a plan to bring immigrants to the people supposedly stems from Soros' publication in Wall Street Journal in 2016, informing that he had earmarked 500 million US dollars to help migrants who find their way to Europe (Lewenhagen 2018). This makes it easy for the Fidesz government to create a scapegoat.

July 2017

Viktor Orbán's speech at the 28th Bálványos Summer Open University and Student Camp, July 22nd 2017

"Of course one could also argue that communities coming to us from different cultures can be re-educated. But we must see – and Bishop Tőkés also spoke about this – that now the Muslim communities coming to Europe see their own culture, their own faith, their own lifestyles and their own principles as stronger and more valuable than ours. So, whether we like it or not, in terms of respect for life, optimism, commitment, the subordination of individual interests and ideals, today Muslim communities are stronger than Christian communities. Why would anyone want to adopt a culture that appears to be weaker than their own strong culture? They won't, and they never will! Therefore re-education and integration based on re-education cannot succeed." (Kormany 2017s).

This is an unusual statement – that is not possible to transmit cultural values, and that education on non-Christian cultures is a waste of time.

October 2017

Interview with prime minister Viktor Orbán in the newspaper Bihari Napló, October 4th

2017

”We must create a standardised system of education in the Hungarian language, from crèche all the way to university, including a standardised vocational training system. <...> The Hungarian government has two tasks. One of them is to stand up for the rights of Hungarian minority communities at international forums and in bilateral relations. We must make sure our voice is heard whenever we believe that minority rights are being curtailed. One such unfortunate incident is the case of the school in Marosvásárhely, which from a Hungarian viewpoint can only be seen as a hostile, anti-Hungarian move by the authorities. It’s hard to comprehend who would be disadvantaged by Catholic Hungarian children attending a Catholic Hungarian school. At the same time, extremely slow progress is being made on the assertion of a minority right which is also a universal right in terms of freedom of religion” (Kormany 2017m).

December 2017

Interview with prime pinister Viktor Orbán on Echo TV’s “Daily News” [“Napi aktuális”] Programme, December 7th 2017

”...all of George Soros’s problems with Hungary lead us to the issue of immigration. CEU is the university of our fellow Hungarian citizen, George Soros; he is the one financing the civil society organisations, paying them and guaranteeing their operation – and, I think, he is also the one issuing directions. This whole immigration issue is part of his programme, part of his plan. <...> So if I look at the issues of CEU, civil society organisations and immigration, these all lead back to George Soros. And then this whole story leads to his plan: a plan to establish a Europe with a mixed population” (Kormany 2017k).

The ”problems” with George Soros have not been stated, nor why they appear to be in connection, even though this discourse is used to revive the topic of immigration. Closing CEU seems to be a codeword for something entirely different – if Soros is a wealthy man, he can easily find other ways to achieve his goals and the CEU can be left out. ”A Europe with a mixed population” is meant to sound like something unwanted, but essentially states a fact about different people living in Europe today. The audience is fragmented and the securitization move can not be regarded as successful.

Interview with prime minister Viktor Orbán on Echo TV’s “Daily News” [“Napi

aktuális”] Programme, December 7 th 2017	
Referent objects	Hungary as a nation
Securitizing actors	Civil society organisations
Functional actors	Immigrants, immigration, international students, George Soros, CEU, a Europe with a mixed population
Audience	Fragmented, nationalists

Taking the position of the audience in general, it shall be mentioned that though the message is rather clear in text or in an academically cut-out and framed milieu like this thesis, each message of the speeches can not be assumed to be heard or understood fully for practical reasons. With some of the formulations being rather cryptic, which is not unlikely a tactical move, and unknowingly of other speeches by Orbán, taking a stand and agree or disagree with the arguing of securitization can be difficult for the audience.

5. Results and discussion

In sum, the selected qualitative method showed that in 2017, the Hungarian prime minister Viktor Orbán securitized *immigration* repeatedly in his speeches, using three discernible patterns.

One of the ways to securitize immigration was by the means of education (sic!). The Central European University (CEU), situated in Hungary, founded and still supported by financier George Soros, was accused by prime minister Viktor Orbán to be the secret face of an illegal network and on one hand to bring immigrants to Hungary illegally and to provide illegal financial instruments on the other, which siphoned tax payers' money out of the country. To limit CEU, amendments to the Law on National Higher Education were made with unusual haste. The accusations, however, have not been observed to be backed with evidence. Striving for the EU to support the most visible action in Orbán's battle against Soros – the amendments to the Law on National Higher Education – Orbán also warned the European Union for Soros when alluding to a protection of the euro, based on the common knowledge that Soros is known for having made his fortune buy shortening the British pound in 1992 (www.forbes.com). Along with the amendments which might lead to the conclusion that international students are not welcome in Hungary, the Hungarian government offers scholarships to international students and has ongoing exchange programs with Egypt, Vietnam and Georgia. It is of particular interest that Egypt, at large a Muslim culture, of

which Orbán repeatedly speaks of in rather adversarial tone, is part of the collaboration. This pending state of belonging of Hungary as a nation is also expressed in relation to the European Union and European identity. In Orbán's rhetorics, Hungary is independent and placed outside of the European Union on the issue of CEU, but becomes anew a rather active full member in discussions on migration. These simultaneous contradictions of viewpoints, with prime minister Orbán recreating and restating who is to be part of "us" and "them" in new constellations (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:178), shows that he is exercising control of the national image and national discourse, and so falls in line with assumptions of social constructivism, where ideas and views are continuously in change (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2017:11), which in turn underlines that domain of security to be fully depending on time and context (2016:496).

The third way observed of sustaining from accepting migrants into Hungary was the contended need to strengthen the future of Hungary and to not forget its cultural heritage through a reinforced family policy, which encourages for more Hungarian children to be born. The plead is addressing young women, offering those with one child a discount of 50 % on the student loan, while young mothers with two children get the student loan written off entirely. As a prolongation of the need to maintain Hungary's language, it was also noted that Hungary supports Hungarian minorities in Slovakia by a financial agreement to teach Hungarian.

Having initially assumed the argumentation by Jackson that a change in policy could be used as an indicator of securitization (Balzacq 2016:499) and used discourse theory combined with the Copenhagen School Theory as theory and method, this has indeed been proven the case. However, critics may argue that the results from this study are already known to Hungarian citizens – and that this study is in the risk zone for causality (Bryman 2012:48), as the presented results offer nothing new and that they do not match fully with the initial idea (Bryman 2012:390). On the other hand, a non-traditional kind of framework of security and education together has been tested, and the study offers a summary of the events from a full year with the referent objects (the Hungarian nation, tax payers, (unborn) children) and securitizing actors (Viktor Orbán, the Hungarian state) pointed out. Moreover, the case of amendments to the Law on National Higher Education remains of interest is proven by the fact that the CEU case still is ongoing today and remains complicated (Foer 2019).

6. Conclusion

In this thesis, it has been argued that the changes in the education legislation have been

securitized in the speeches of prime minister Viktor Orbán according to the Copenhagen school theory of securitization. This securitization is stated to be expressed as a *speech act*, and has been analyzed combining this theoretical framework with discourse theory being the method. The questions asked were:

- 1) *How is education securitized in Hungary in relation to the people of Hungary and the EU?*
- 2) *What is this securitization a consequence of?*
- 3) *What consequences are there for Hungary when education is securitized?*
- 4) *Is the securitization successful, according to the Copenhagen school theory?*

To answer these questions, the speeches by prime minister Victor Orbán from 2017 were searched for the words "education", "children", "student", "school" and "university". The surrounding body of these texts was qualitatively examined to verify the implications and justify the relevance of context, resulting in leaving out neutral statements such as number of enrolled students or awarded scholarships. The dates of these speeches were also correlated to the major events regarding Central European University (CEU) during 2017, as reported on CEU's website.

Answering question 1), education in Hungary is securitized through speech acts (statements), with prime minister Viktor Orbán targeting different parts of education and using education as a means to argue against immigration. Foremost, he is arguing the importance of the survival of Hungary as a nation and culture. He is also arguing that the Hungarian people are in the need of a particular education and that immigrants with a different religion "cannot be re-educated" (Kormany 2017s). Orbán also states that universities must not facilitate immigration to Hungary, which he claims is true for CEU and its founder George Soros.

Answering question 2), the securitization of education could be understood as a clear stand on anti-immigration policy. The consequences for Hungary when education is being securitized, answering question 3), is that the "illiberal democracy" continues to flourish. The audience not accepting the securitization moves could be regarded as voters disagreeing with a political move – which normally would make a politician to change the decision or even resign. This has not proven to be the case in Hungary, even though the CEU timeline has shown that some legislative changes had, as of October 2017, been postponed.

Depending on the degree of sovereignty Orbán chooses to highlight, he positions Hungary differently. He places Hungary outside the EU to show what is lacking in relation to Hungary's needs of education and that this is something EU can not fulfill. When arguing for

new rules that should be applied to universities in terms of fair competition, he talks of Hungary and the EU as close, interdependent members.

If a securitization has been fully successful, Orbán must have presented existential threats, taken emergency action and as a result of changing the rules, the actions should have had effects on interunit relations (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:26). Answering question 4), this has proven to be the case on a national level. In Orbán's speeches existential threats are repeatedly expressed in relation to the survival of the nation. Orbán creates an "us" and "them" in several combinations. The "us" that is claimed to be in need of protection is Hungary as a nation, Hungarian children, current and prospective Hungarian students, the Hungarian culture and the Hungarian universities. The adversary parties understood as the threat to Hungary as a nation, "them", are CEU (though a partly Hungarian-based university), particular immigrants, immigrants in general and groups with a hidden agenda to facilitate immigration or steal Hungarian taxpayers' money – "so-called NGO's" (Kormany 2017i). As initially mentioned in this thesis, interviews with staff and students at CEU show that for a longer survival, it has been thought as better to keep a low profile and not have the name of CEU connected to protests or demonstrations (Foer 2019). Not objecting to the changes louder, for example insisting on the resignation of the prime minister, makes the securitization accepted, even though it is a temporary strategy. Internationally, however, as of 2017, the changes in legislation on higher education has made the European Commission to announce that it is planning to launch procedures. This is briefly mentioned in Orbán's speeches. His speeches from April 15th, April 25th, April 26th and April 28th are in fact in part correlated with the timeline of events presented by CEU (Central European University n.d.), which shows that he is continuing to securitize the changes in education when the audience disagrees. For the securitization to be successful, the audience needs to accept the claimed emergency, and thus permits extraordinary changes to be made, including breaking rules (Buzan, Weaver & de Wilde 1998:25); one can then claim, by observing Orbán's statements, that he is continuing to break the rules and the securitization is still ongoing and is mainly successful.

6.1 Further research

While discourse analysis remains a well-used tool and method in the realm of political sciences, it would be fruitful to make more quantitative studies with interviews and compare the applied laws with perceptions of security based on what citizens can share when offered hidden identities, not fearing any suppression from the government.

7. Reference list

Aradau, Claudia & Huysmans, Jef, 2014. Critical methods in International Relations: The politics of techniques, devices and acts, *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 20:3, pp. 596–619

Balzacq, Thierry, Léonard, Sarah and Ruzicka, Jan, 2016. "Securitization" revisited: theory and cases, *International Relations*, vol. 30:4, pp. 494–531

Behnke, Andreas, 2006. 'No Way Out: Desecuritization, Emancipation and the Eternal Return of the Political – A Reply to Aradau', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, vol. 9(1), pp. 62–69

Bozóki, András & Hegedűs, Dániel, 2018. An externally constrained hybrid regime: Hungary in the European Union, *Democratization*, 25:7, 1173-1189

Bourdieu, Pierre, 1994. *Language and Symbolic Power*, Polity Press, Cornwall

Bryman, Alan, 2012. *Social Research Methods*, 4th edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Buzan, Barry; Weaver, Olle; Jaap, de Wilde, 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Lynne Rienner Pub

Cotter, Andrew, 2007. *Security in the New Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan, China

Gearon, Liam Francis, 2019. Religion, Education, Security, *Religions*. <https://www-mdpi-com.ezp.sub.su.se/2077-1444/10/5/330/htm> (2019-08-29)

Hansen, Lene, 2000. The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School, *Journal of International Studies*, vol. 29(2), pp. 285-306

Laclau, Ernesto, and Mouffe, Chantal, 2008. *Hegemonin och den socialistiska strategin*, Vertigo förlag, Stockholm

Persaud, Randolph B., 2016, Human Security, in Collins, Alan (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies, 4th edition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Roe, P., 2016, Societal Security, in Collins, Alan (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies, 4th ed.*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Shmelev, Aleksei and Shmeleva, Elena. 2002. *Русский анекдот: текст и речевой жанр* [Russki anekdot: tekst i rechevoj zhanr], Языки славянской культуры, Studia Philologica. Series Minor, Moskva.

Teorell, Jan & Svensson, Torsten, 2013. *Att fråga och att svara*, Liber, 2013, China

Winther Jørgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise, 2017. *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*, Studentlitteratur, Poland

7.1 Digital sources

Central European University, n.d. *Timeline of events*.

<https://www.ceu.edu/istandwithceu/timeline-events> (2019-08-07)

Convention on the Rights the of child, 1989.

<https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/ProfessionalInterest/crc.pdf> (2019-07-21)

Eur-lex, n.d. *Copenhagen criteria*, [https://eur-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/accession_criteria_copenhagen.html)

[lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/accession_criteria_copenhagen.html](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/accession_criteria_copenhagen.html) (2019-08-03)

Foe, Franklin, 2019. Victor Orbán's war on intellect. *The Atlantic*.

<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2019/06/george-soros-viktor-orban-ceu/588070/> (2019-06-21)

Forbes 2019, <https://www.forbes.com/profile/george-soros/#4cd8e3d2024c> (2019-08-12)

Hegedüs, Dániel, Freedom House 2016,

https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/NIT2016_Hungary_0.pdf (2019-07-20)

Kormany 2017a, *Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's speech at the Lámfalussy Conference*, <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-speech-at-the-lamfalussy-conference> (2019-06-15)

Kormany 2017 b, *Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's State of the Nation Address*, 10 February 2017, <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-state-of-the-nation-address-20170214> (2019-06-15)

Kormany 2017c, *Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on Kossuth Radio's programme "180 Minutes"*, 31 March 2017 <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-kossuth-radio-s-programme-180-minutes20170331> (2019-06-15)

Kormany 2017e, *Easter interview with Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in Hungarian daily Magyar Idők*, 15 April 2017, <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/easter-interview-with-prime-minister-viktor-orban-in-hungarian-daily-magyar-idok> (2019-06-15)

Kormany 2017i, *Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on Kossuth Radio's "180 Minutes" programme*, 28 April 2017, <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-kossuth-radio-s-180-minutes-programme-20170428> (2019-06-20)

Kormany 2017k, *Interview with Prime Minister Viktor Orbán on Echo TV's "Daily News" ["Napi aktuális"] Programme*, 7 December 2017 <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/interview-with-prime-minister-viktor-orban-on-echo-tv-s-daily-news-napi-aktualis-programme> (2019-08-08)

Kormany 2017m, *Interview with Prime Minister Viktor Orbán in the newspaper Bihari Napló*, 4 October 2017, <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/interview-with-prime-minister-viktor-orban-in-the-newspaper-bihari-naplo> (2019-

08-08)

Kormany 2017n, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's speech in the European Parliament, 26 April 2017, <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-speech-in-the-european-parliament20170426> (2019-08-10)

Kormany 2017p, *Viktor Orbán's reply in the European Parliament*, <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/viktor-orban-s-reply-in-the-european-parliament>

Kormany 2017q, *Prime Minister Viktor Orbán's address at the opening ceremony of the 10th Szakma Sztár Festival, 25 April 2017* <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/prime-minister-viktor-orban-s-address-at-the-opening-ceremony-of-the-10th-szakma-sztar-festival> (2019-08-09)

Kormany 2017s, *Viktor Orbán's speech at the 28th Bálványos Summer Open University and Student Camp, 22 July 2017* <https://www.kormany.hu/en/the-prime-minister/the-prime-minister-s-speeches/viktor-orban-s-speech-at-the-28th-balvanyos-summer-open-university-and-student-camp>

Lewenhagen, Jan, 2018. *Orbanisering pågår i Ungern, Fokus*, <https://www.fokus.se/2018/03/orbanisering-pagar/> (2019-07-20)

Schultz, Teri, 2018. *Could Hungary lose its Eu voting rights?, Deutsche Welle*, <https://www.dw.com/en/could-hungary-lose-its-eu-voting-rights/a-45429748> (2018-09-10), (2019-08-11)

The Guardian, 2015. *EU chief warns Hungary over return of death penalty comments* <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/apr/30/eu-jean-claude-juncker-viktor-orban-hungary-death-penalty-return> (2019-08-01)

The Orange Files, 2017. <https://theorangefiles.hu/?s=education&submit=Search> (2019-08-05)