



Detailed analysis of the report by the OSCE on the Hungarian parliamentary elections

Following its previous fast analysis, the Center for Fundamental Rights prepared a detailed analysis of the report by the OSCE on the Hungarian elections, issued on July 10th, 2014. As we have already indicated earlier, the report contains several inaccuracies and mistakes. These may partly come from misinformation, or from the incomplete knowledge of the regulations. Thus, claiming discrimination with regards to voters abroad is based on misunderstanding the effect of “winner compensation” on the election results. Some claims are based on factual mistakes, such as the length of the presidential period which is 5 years instead of 4, as written in the report. In our present analysis we point out the 10 most serious mistakes of the OSCE report, attaching the respective laws and regulations that were ignored or misunderstood by those who prepared the report. It is important to mention, that the OSCE report contains numerous criticisms, which are not corroborated by legal arguments. Our task is not to confirm or confute these criticisms. This time, as previously, we have only analyzed the legal aspects of the report and corrected the factual mistakes.

Contrary to criticisms of the OSCE report:

- The Parliament adopted the election laws after broad political debates, far before the elections
- The „winner-compensation” did not distort the result of the election.
- The Constitutional Court can use and invoke its previous decisions in the future as well.
- The borders of the constituencies were not changed significantly shortly before the elections.
- Nobody had the chance to manipulate the electoral register of the Hungarian voters without a residence in Hungary
- The new regulation did not discriminate the citizens who voted abroad
- The system of postal voting is safe and fits the European standards
- It is possible to erase datas referring to ethnic affiliation of the voters by request of an ethnic minority voter
- The independence of the National Electoral Committee (NVB) has been increased, compare to the former committee (OVB).
- The requirement of the balanced public informing is properly regulated