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Abstract

Focusing mostly on the Hungarian sociological literature and on statistics our report summarizes the sociological characteristics of migration and the civic participation of migrants in contemporary Hungary.

Concerning the conditions of immigrant participation, key events and demographic developments (e.g. the small number of immigrants compared to other EU countries, and the dominance of ethnic Hungarians from neighbouring countries), major migration-related issues of the public discourse (xenophobia and Diaspora politics), as well as the institutional setting of immigration and civic participation are described.

Although immigrant civic participation could not be identified as a major political or social issue in contemporary Hungary, articles in relation to this issue (mainly relying on structured interviews conducted with immigrants, and in a very few cases also use press content analysis, national NGO registers or survey techniques) have been collected and briefly summarized in the paper with special attention to the two largest immigrant groups: the ethnic Hungarians from the neighbouring countries and the Chinese.

Preserving culture and maintaining cultural or national identity as well as religious activities formulate the main field of civic participation: almost every immigrant community discussed in the literature had an organization of these kinds. Other types of activities are pursued by special immigrant communities depending on the special needs and capacities of the relevant groups: powerful political activism in form of lobby groups is typical of the Chinese community; economic associations for mutual aid or interest representation appeared among Transylvanian Hungarians and the Chinese; human rights associations are established or maintained mainly by African immigrants.

Chinese formulate the most active group of the migrants in the civic society; however their impact upon the host society is minimal, that is activities are more or less restricted to their own community.

The same is true in case of the two largest refugee groups, i.e. the Africans and Afghans. In both cases the chance of civic activity is very low since other network forms, cultural and career patterns dominate the groups.

Apart from small groups of intellectuals, the largest group of immigrants, i.e. ethnic Hungarians from the neighboring non-EU countries seem to be inactive in the civil society. Compared to the level of civic activity of the majority the migrants’ activity is significantly lower.

The relation between migrant and majority organizations is relevant only on the field of refugee integration. A few but visible refugee self-help groups – mostly with the help of the Hungarian branch of UNHCR – play some role in the integration of the small number of refugees in Hungary. However, this role is restricted mostly to some cultural activities. Although articles discussing the present situation were not available, several papers published in the early and late 1990s revealed some examples of a close relationship between certain migrant and mainstream society organizations.

The most relevant issues of the field to be dealt with, also the major research gaps, are identified as the lack of relations between the Chinese community and civil organizations of the majority society, and the role of quasi-diasporic situation of ethnic Hungarian migrants in restricting their civic activism.
Part I: Understanding the conditions for immigrant participation

1. Key events and demographic developments in the migration history of Hungary

To have a general picture of the contemporary history of migration in Hungary the starting point should be the rapidly changing situation of Hungary in the world system of migration (Salt, 1989). At the turn of the XIX. century Hungary was an “emigration country”, sending millions of poor young males (mostly from the fringes of the Monarchy) to the U.S. (Zolberg, 1989, Tilly, 1990). Then came the period of the two world wars and World War I and especially II were followed by large scale (and as shown later often forced) resettlement movements. During the following four decades Communism made Hungary a closed country.

The claim that Hungary during Comminism was a closed country is based upon the fact that between 1949 and 1989 there was practically no immigration to Hungary, except for two politically motivated ones, i.e. Greek and Chilean communists were given asylum in the early 1950s and 1970s. Concerning the other direction, mass emigration occurred only once (after the lost revolution in 1956 about 200,000 persons left the country).

In 1988-89 a quasi refugee regime emerged in Hungary. The term “quasi” refers to the fact that between 1949 and 1989 Hungary did not sign the Geneva Convention, consequently though the Constitution contained the concept of asylum formally no asylum seeker could get refugee status. However, both the media and politicians called the migrants refugees, which can be explained by the political context only: the overwhelming part of the quasi-refugees in the period1 were ethnic Hungarians fleeing from the still-communist Romania2. While the total population of Hungary during the period was about ten million3, the annual number of immigrants between 1988 and 1991 was ranging from 23,000 to 37,000, and about 80% of them were ethnic Hungarians from Romania, Ukraine and Yugoslavia.

1 And this was unchanged until very recently. In 1990 96% of the „refugees” were from Romania. Due to the war in Yugoslavia the proportion of refugees from this region has increased to 45% in 1991 and was between 77% and 91% during 1992-1997. Since than Afghans constitute the largest group among refugees (Time series … (2003).
3 Th exact size of the population (in thousands) was 10,421 in 1989 and 10,142 in 2003 (Bukodi et al, 2004 p. 34)
The volume (flow data)\textsuperscript{4} and \textquotedblleft ethnic\textquotedblright\textsuperscript{5} composition of the various types of migrants in the 1990s can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 The annual volume of immigration, granted working permits and naturalization (absolute numbers) and the proportion of Romanian, Slovakian, Ukrainian and Yugoslavian citizens among them (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immigration (in thousands)\textsuperscript{6}</th>
<th>From Romania, Slovakia Ukraine and Yugoslavia (%)</th>
<th>Working permits (granted) (in thousands)\textsuperscript{7}</th>
<th>From Romania, Slovakia Ukraine and Yugoslavia (%)</th>
<th>Naturalization (in thousands)</th>
<th>From Romania, Slovakia Ukraine and Yugoslavia (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The data show that during the whole period refugees are overwhelmingly, immigrants and temporary workers are mostly from ethnic Hungarian communities across the borders of contemporary Hungary.

From various sources focusing on illegal migrants, we know that most of them are weekly or monthly commuters from the neighboring countries, working in the seasonal sectors (agriculture, construction) of informal economy (Sik 1999, Sik 2002) and tourist traders working on the open-air markets (Czakó-Sik, 1997).

\textsuperscript{4} The volume refers to those who were registered by the Hungarian authorities during the period proper. It should be considered as flow data since the immigrants might have left the next day of their registration.

\textsuperscript{5} The quotation mark refers to the fact that the statistics contain information only about the citizenship of the immigrant but all migrant and migration potential surveys confirm that immigrants and potential migrants coming from neighboring countries are overwhelmingly ethnic Hungarians.

\textsuperscript{6} The term immigrant refers to those who were given Hungarian residence permit valid at least for one year.

\textsuperscript{7} The term work permit refer to those who applied and were given a permit which allowed them to work legally at least for three months.
Table 2 The proportion of the ten most numerous groups by their country of origin within the form of migration proper (in 2000, rank order and % (in brackets))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Immigration</th>
<th>Working permits (granted)</th>
<th>Naturalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>20,184</td>
<td>40,203</td>
<td>5,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td>1 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>9 (1)</td>
<td>9 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>8 (1)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (14)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>9 (1)</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>8 (1)</td>
<td>8 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xxx = not among the most numerous first ten countries of origin
- = alternatively covered by the term “former Soviet Union” or Russia and Ukraine
Source: Authors’ computation from Time series …. (2003)

In all three types of immigrant groups migrants from Romania constitute by far the largest group. They are followed by migrants from Yugoslavia, Ukraine (in case of work permits hidden within the outdated but in labour statistics obviously stubborn term of “former Soviet Union”), and Slovakia. Among the immigrants Chinese, Germans, Russians and USA citizens, and among the work permits Chinese and Vietnamese are represented on small scale (above 1 percent) as well.

The most recent (stock) data do not show any change in the volume and composition of migrants by an aggregated form of their country of origin. Table 3 shows that

- the volume of the stock of immigrants in Hungary somewhat increased between 1995 and 2000, which was followed by a faster decrease between 2000 and 2003
- concerning the proportions of different groups in the total number of immigrants, the ratio of ethnic Hungarian immigration has increased further at the expense of Chinese and post-Soviet immigrants.
Table 3: The major groups of immigrants by citizenship on January 1, 1995, 2000, and 2003 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Soviet countries</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 15</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Yugoslavia</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The number of work permits has increased as well: between 2001 and 2003 the annual number of permits has risen from 30,000 to almost 50,000. (Munkaerőpiaci Tükör, 2003). The overwhelming part of this stock is again from Romania; according to the data this ratio has increased in 2001-2002 (Table 4).

Table 4: The volume and composition by the aggregated form of the country of origin of those work permits were given on June 30, 2001 and 2002 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU 15</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accession countries</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European countries</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European countries</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hárs et al, 2004

To sum it up, the proportion of immigrants, foreign workers and refugees is small in contemporary Hungary. As we can see in Table 5, showing the proportion of foreigners in two OECD member accession countries and in those EU 15 countries with similar size to Hungary, the proportion of foreigners in contemporary Hungary is lower than anywhere else except for Slovakia; the proportion decreased between 1995 and 2000, which is the case only in two other countries (Netherlands and Belgium).
Table 5 The proportion of foreigners in the population and the rate of change (2000/1995, %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD, 2002 from Hárs et al, 2004

Concerning the composition of the migrants and foreign workers in Hungary, it is dominated by citizens from the neighbouring countries who are likely to be ethnic Hungarians. There are only two non-European migrant groups in Hungary: the Chinese and the Afghans, the former mostly immigrants, the latter refugees.

For comparative analysis the term „foreign born population” in contemporary Hungary would be misleading. The most recent figure of the foreign born population is the data from the 1996 micro-census. According to this data roughly 300,000 residents of Hungary were born abroad (Juhász 1997). The reason why this figure is useless for comparison is that while in general a foreign birthplace indicates the person is an immigrant in Hungary – as well as in other countries in Central Europe – the birthplace of many of those born abroad is foreign only because of the present structure of the international border. Often at the time they were born the place of their birth was within Hungary. Consequently a large proportion of the currently foreign born population consists of elderly people who once upon a time migrated within Hungary which due to historical accidents makes them a foreign born today8.

2. Major issues discussed with relation to immigration

Migration related discourses in contemporary Hungary occur most often in the context of the shrinking volume of the Hungarian population, and of border control and security, especially in regard with the need for illegal foreign workers on the labour market.

The demographic issue received political and public attention with hysterical overtones in 2000 when a report, containing an analysis and policy recommendations on migration

8 Such historical events were the changes of borders following the Trianon peace treaty, the border revisions made during the Second World War, the annexations, withdrawals, and subsequent changes of population. Other historical events, such as World War II and the 1956 revolution, also influence the limited value of the concept of foreign born population. About 6,000 of those living in Hungary with permanent residence permits were actually born in present day Hungary. They left Hungary, acquired citizenship elsewhere, and have recently returned.
prepared by Hablicsek and Tóth. It came in the wake of the United Nations study on “replacement migration” in Europe, which suggested that Europe would have to absorb 159 million immigrants if it was to maintain sustainable demographic trends. The release of the report and the Prime Minister’s subsequent comment that Hungary should be able to draw on a pool of hundreds of thousands or even 1.5 million potential ethnic Hungarian workers from neighbouring countries was the first instance in which migration as an option of population aroused significant public debate. Following the report, the government established a Population Committee to study ways to confirm what it saw as negative population trends. The committee, which had a subcommittee on migration received the mandate to develop a population strategy.

As to the labour market related discourse of migration, in December 2001 despite the objections by governments of neighbouring countries, Hungary gave special status to the Hungarians across the borders. The government argued that this treaty provided a further means to legalise currently illegal labour (Hegyesi and Melegh 2002).

The issue of illegal foreign labour was used by the then-opposition Socialist Party as a dangerous threat in their 2002 election campaign. Socialist leaders, according to press reports, said that the government wanted to “unleash millions of Romanian workers” – which for an ordinary Hungarian is a substitute for Gypsies – on the Hungarian job market. To allay critics’ fears, the government made the work permit procedure more bureaucratic and the number of work permits would not exceed the average of registered vacancies in the previous year. The work permit quota for 2002 was 81,000, and it was not fully used. In reality less than 200 work permits have been issued under their provisions until mid-2002.

In the field of health, which is suffering from a shortage of doctors, and especially nurses and other personnel due to low wages, a more substantive debate on migrant labour has taken place. Some hospitals directly recruit nurses in Romania and the Ukraine, and even contribute to their training there. Out of 40,000 doctors in Hungary, 2,400 are immigrants. According to the Hungarian Chamber of Physicians, these doctors fill positions for which there were no Hungarian applicants. However, other organisations such as the Specialist Practitioners’ Defence League and the Institute for Basic Care have warned that many foreign physicians are unlicensed or do not speak Hungarian (Oltalomkeresők 2002). However, major employers’ organisations have not spoken out on the migration issue.

In order to understand the context of current migration debates, we should focus our analysis to two relevant conclusions based on the previous chapter:
- The contemporary Hungarian society is an ethnically homogeneous society, and
- the small group of immigrants are overwhelmingly ethnic Hungarians from the neighboring countries.

The main topics related to migration in contemporary Hungary (xenophobia and Diaspora-politics) are related to these characteristics of the Hungarian society.

Homogeneity and closedness are partly the explanation of the stable and relatively high level of xenophobia which has increased sharply after the fall of Communism.

---

9 This statement was interpreted by the Hungarian press as an encouragement to immigration, but the Prime Minister later clarified that he had in mind Hungarians abroad as an economic resource for the “mother country” (Melegh 2002).
From time to time the social causes of xenophobia, and its relation to anti-semitism and anti-gypsy attitudes, the political aspects of the spread of such values are debated in the media as well as in the Parliament.

As to the most recent xenophobia related news in the most widely read Hungarian daily (Népszabadság, 12th February) 39% of the Hungarians claim that free movements of Hungarians to the other EU countries is disadvantageous and 47% of them consider the increasing possibility of EU citizens to settle down in Hungary as a disadvantage. Moreover, 82% of the Hungarian population would forbid foreigners to buy Hungarian land.

The fact that – except for the small group of refugees – all types of foreigners in Hungary arrived mostly from the neighboring countries, a great majority of whom is **ethnic Hungarian**, explains the importance – and from time to time, its heated character – of the ongoing debates on **Diaspora-politics**.

The currently most discussed issue related to the Diasporic nature of the Hungarian migration processes is the **referendum** on December 5, 2004 to give a Hungarian citizenship (i.e. double citizenship) for all ethnic Hungarian living outside the borders of Hungary through a modification of the Act on Hungarian Citizenship. The debate around this topic covers (in an extremely overpoliticized, thus distorted way) all relevant aspects of migration such as:

---


12 Hungarian is the person who claim the so called „document of Hungarianness” (or as is officially called “Hungarian National Identity Card”) and identifies oneself with the Hungarian nation (in a cultural sense).
- Will the Hungarian communities in the neighboring countries disappear as a consequence of the rapidly increasing immigration, or on the contrary, they will be strengthened since people with Hungarian citizenship will be forced less to emigrate?
- Will the members of the Hungarian communities invade the Hungarian labour market – as the results of migration potential researches suggest (Örkény, 2003) – or labour migration to Hungary will be significantly less since with a Hungarian passport the majority of those ready to take the risk of illegal work will move to the West?
- Will the double citizenship change the Diaspora-politics of Hungary and in what forms will those changes influence the migration regime in Hungary and in the neighboring countries?

The referendum on double citizenship failed, i.e. either for the “yes” or for the “no” alternative voted less than 25% of the eligible voters. Consequently the Parliament is not obliged to pass a new law giving Hungarian citizenship to all members of the quasi-diaspora. However, the issue remains on the top agenda of both national and diasporic politics, influencing migration policy to a great extent.

3. The institutional and legal setting of immigrant' participation

As we saw in Chapter 1, the overwhelming part of the foreigners in contemporary are from the neighboring countries and mostly from ethnic Hungarian background. In Chapter 2 we demonstrated that the dominant discourse in Hungary regarding foreigners is focused very much on issues related to Diaspora which again are closely related to the Hungarian community just on the other side of the border. Consequently, it is not surprising that the institutional and legal setting of immigrants’ participation is overlapping with Diaspora-like issues as well.

The status of ethnic Hungarians living in countries adjacent to Hungary has always been part of the discussion on immigration legislation. The Hungarian governments between 1990 and 2002 maintained that they aimed at encouraging ethnic Hungarians to remain in the lands of their birth, and initiated no active immigration or resettlement policy of co-ethnics akin to Germany’s. Unlike the German case, Hungary’s policy toward co-ethnics abroad has, thus, developed not as immigration policy, but as a policy of shaping national identity (Tóth 2000, Hegyesi and Melegh 2002). The Hungarian immigration and naturalisation system has often been criticised for being indifferent towards ethnic Hungarians who “return to their motherland” despite certain benefits for ethnic Hungarians and persons of Hungarian ancestry in the immigration and naturalisation process. The so-called Status Law, ostensibly intended to be a set of legal instruments to support ethnic Hungarians in neighbouring countries, stirred domestic political debates in 2001 and 2002, resulting among others in a set of proposed measures regulating seasonal employment in Hungary.

In connection with the diasporic characteristic of Hungarian migration, policy debates have been related to two interconnected major topics:
- the “Status Law” and its implementation;
- the double citizenship debate.

Ethnic Hungarians from neighbouring countries (except those from Austria, due to objections by the EU which do not allow discrimination between citizens of member states)
enjoy limited privileges within the quota. According to the so-called “Status Law” (Act No. LXII of 2001), ethnic Hungarians as members of a “kin-minority” can apply for “Hungarian National Identity Card”. Holders of such cards are entitled to apply for work permits in Hungary for three months each year under a simplified procedure, which means that Employment Offices do not need to certify the unavailability of qualified Hungarian citizens for the jobs they are applying for. In December 2001, after objections by governments of neighbouring countries to the draft on the basis that Hungary cannot discriminate between the citizens of another country based on their ethnicity, Hungary extended the same provision to all Romanian citizens in a separate treaty (but not to citizens of other countries). The government argued that this treaty provided a further means to legalise currently illegal labour (Hegyesi and Melegh 2002).

In reality, because of the limited scope of benefits provided both in the “Status Law” and in the treaty, both failed to have any impact on migration in one way or another. Less than 200 work permits have been issued under their provisions to this day which compared to the total of approximately 20,000 work permits per year (see in Chapter1) is negligible. According both experts and media this is due to the fact that the procedure to get such a permit is extremely slow and bureaucratic.

In the field of health, which is suffering from a shortage of doctors, and especially nurses and other personnel due to low wages, a more substantive debate on migrant labour has taken place. Some hospitals directly recruit nurses in Romania and the Ukraine, and even contribute to their training there (Oltalomkeresők 2001). Out of 40,000 doctors in Hungary, 2,400 are immigrants. According to the Hungarian Chamber of Physicians, these doctors fill positions for which there were no Hungarian applicants. However, other organisations such as the Specialist Practitioners’ Defence League and the Institute for Basic Care have warned that many foreign physicians are unlicensed or do not speak Hungarian. However, major employers’ organisations have not spoken out on the migration issue.

The relevance of Diaspora politics in contemporary Hungary is well illustrated by the existence of two special bodies: the Office for Hungarians across Living the Border and the Standing Hungarian Conference:

- The Office for Hungarians Living across the Border was established in 1992 to carry out government policy; the Office first located within the Prime Minister’s Office was integrated in 1998 into the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- As an institution of dialogue among the representatives of the Government, the parties in the Parliament and Hungarian communities of the Diaspora, the Standing Hungarian Conference was set up in 1999. The body comprising numerous sub-committees plays a vague political role: the Parliament only ‘welcomes its establishment’ and calls upon the Government ‘to give a yearly report on its operation and execution of the political proposals of the Conference concerning Hungarians across the border’. Thus the Government has a wide room for manoeuvre to exchange views, to reconcile divergent opinions, to find political consensus or to maintain the veneer officially. According to the Government’s interpretation, the main national task is to develop the connection between the Hungarians living beyond the borders and the mother country, in the fields of education, culture, economy, health care, welfare, local governmental and regional relations in order to ‘remain resident in the homeland, yet preserve national identity’. For these reasons, working committees of the Conference were also formed on citizenship and European
integration issues. The state secretary (deputy secretary) of the competent ministry chairs all of the committees, while expert members are appointed by the Office for Hungarians Living across the Border. Parties in the Parliament, representative organisations of Hungarian communities across the border and the World Alliance of Hungarians as an NGO, may delegate the other members of the committees. This organ produces proposals but their relevance, the decision-making procedure and publicity has not been defined. In this way, the Conference may be considered as a shadow or a substitute body of genuine negotiation, discourse or compromise-making. However it is enough to legitimise the actual Diaspora policy.

The constitutional basis of contemporary diaspora-politics is far from new: it is based on the constitution from 1949. Here Article 6 (3) declares that „The Republic of Hungary bears a sense of responsibility for the fate of Hungarians living outside its borders and shall promote and foster their relations with Hungary.”

As to the general legal framework of immigration,

- Hungary acceded to all of universal and regional conventions (1951 Geneva Convention and 1967 New York Protocol, ECHR, CE Prevention of Torture, UN Torture, UN Covenants) that belong to the acquis. They were embodied into the Hungarian legal system (especially into the Chapter XII of the Constitution), and inserted to existing training programmes for officials, officers, advocates, procurators and judges working in this field.

- Numerous provisions that can be found in bilateral agreements concluded Hungary with European states referring to substance of the acquis or to autonomous rules relating to migratory movements such as the agreements on border regime made with neighbours, readmission of nationals and third country nationals who passed illegally the border, on visa free travel with about 60 states, on cultural exchange, and on employment, vocational training or retraining of workers in some European states. These contracts provide lawful entry, residence and certain activities of nationals on mutual base.

- Right for repatriation and free movement (travel out from Hungary) is regulated in the Constitution as basic rights of nationals and lawfully residing foreigners in Hungary. This right can be limited in accordance with international law in statute adopted by qualified (two-third) majority of votes. (Art.58 and 69(2) by amendment of Constitution in 1989)

- The Act on Entry, Residence in and Immigration to Hungary (No.86 of 1993, hereinafter: Alien Act), further on its executive decrees issued by the Cabinet (No. 64/1994), Minister of the Interior (No. 9/1994), Minister of Justice (No.1/1995) and Minister of Foreign Affairs (No.1/1994) as well as Minister of the Finance (No.11/1994) regulate the general policing rules on foreigners. These provisions cover on requirements of lawful entry and residence in Hungary, issuing the visa and identity documents of various groups of foreigners.
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13 Since 20th August of 1949 the Constitution was amended 43 times up till late 1999. The recent huge reform of the constitutional system was published on 23rd October 1989 published in Act XXXI. The cited provision was also inserted to the text of the Act XXXI of 1989.

14 The following description is based on Tóth, n.d.
The Act on Hungarian Citizenship (LV of 1993) and its executive decree issued by the Cabinet (No. 125/1993) is considered as major pillar of immigration policy. Although there are some benefits for ethnic Hungarians, recognised refugees and family unification in naturalisation proceedings, the acquire of citizenship is based on individual and difficult efforts of the applicant made for social, linguistic and economic integration in practice regardless roots, qualification, age, and occupation. Multiple nationality is allowed and citizenship is provided for stateless or abandoned child born in Hungary by law. However, neither first nor second generation of immigrant can obtain citizenship automatically or in benefited way. Without benefit acquiring citizenship takes 12-13 years after lawful arrival in Hungary.

The issue of immigrants civic participation is not a relevant issue in contemporary Hungary, its direct legal regulation practically does not exist. This means that neither restriction nor encouraging conditions can be identified. The general framework is the legal structure of NGO activity which is fully EU compatible (Tóth, 2003, Tóth, 2004). A good example of this relaxed but not exactly encouraging attitude is that though Hungary did not sign the European Council’s Convention on the role of foreigners in local politics (ETS. 144) neither is this forbidden therefore there was one case when a migrant attended in the local election in 2002 due to the suffrage of settled migrants in local elections.

Another aspect of the institutional setting of migrants’ public (but not civic) activity is their role in politics and in the state organisations. This aspect can be understood again within the context of the large Hungarian Diaspora (those who left Hungary as emigrants, mostly in 1956) and the even larger quasi-Diaspora (ethnic Hungarians in the neighboring countries).

The former dissidents either never lost their Hungarian citizenship or could be renaturalised on individual basis after the fall of Communism. Consequently during the first years of post-Communism there were several cases of ethnic Hungarians living in various EU countries to play relevant role in politics.

As to ethnic Hungarians from the neighboring countries during Communism they migrated to Hungary mostly by using the channel of fake marriage or applying for Hungarian citizenship. They used to be active in the underground civil movements or as intellectuals and later some of them became active politicians as well.

Finally, in relation with Hungarian Diaspora politics ethnic Hungarians living in the neighboring countries have important role in Hungarian political and civic life as well. There is a so called Magyar Állandó Értekezlet (Hungarian Standing Conference) which covers all Hungarian Parliamentary parties as well as representatives of Hungarian parties in the Parliaments in all neighboring countries. This institution has a major role in defining Hungarian Diaspora politics. Moreover some representatives of these organizations are also very active in Hungarian politics and civic activities.

As the most recent example of this three leading figures of the Hungarian parties in Romania, Slovakia, and Yugoslavia challenged the Prime Minister of Hungary to discuss
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15 According to the Hungarian constitution those who were born Hungarian cannot leave it behind and cannot be excluded except under special conditions.
the role of the Hungarian government in the double citizenship referendum and the debate was on prime time TV.

Part II: Active Civic Participation of Third Country Immigrants

Literature related to the areas of active civic participation of immigrants in Hungary focuses on four major types of immigrant groups. First, asylum seekers and refugees as well as temporary residents (often having courses at the university) mainly from African countries forming the clientele of (and sometime volunteering for) self-established human rights organizations are in the center of scholarly research. These organizations having the double aim of providing legal support and other help for their clients on one hand, and improving intercultural understanding and fight against racism and discrimination on the other will be described in the first section of Part II. Grey literature that informs us about numerous human rights organizations and organizations aiming to unite certain African ethnic groups will also be cited.

Secondly, literature on the Chinese, who form the biggest immigrant population after the Hungarians from across the border will be summarized. The literature covers numerous aspects of the community formation of the Chinese in Hungary, and makes it possible to reconstruct the entire process of organizational development since their first arrival at the end of the 1980s.

The third section is dedicated to the vibrant civic life of immigrants in a South-Eastern Hungarian border town, Szeged. Due to the city’s proximity to the Romanian and Serbian borders, as well as hosting one of Hungary’s biggest universities and certain industrial complexes, a great diversity of ethnic groups have developed in Szeged in the last four decades. The establishment of their minority organizations, as well as the very special phenomenon of their cooperation will be analyzed in the chapter.

Finally, in the fourth section Hungarian immigrants from across the borders, referred to as quasi-Diaspora migrants, will be characterized partly focusing on the process of establishing their own organizations and to provide self-help in settling in Hungary, partly to their activity to preserve their Transylvanian roots, social capital and culture.

Refugees, asylum seekers and Third-World migrants: self-help and human rights organisations

One of the most important organizations dealing with migrants from the third world is Martin Luther King Association (MLKA) (Szabó, n.d., and Szabó, 1997). MLKA was founded in 1991 by foreign students from Africa and their Hungarian supporters as a reaction to the spreading of the skinhead movement. The original goals of the association was to defend foreign students against racist attacks and against bureaucratic or xenophobic reactions of governmental organization (especially on behalf of the police). Later on the organisation extended its activity to various new fields such as refugee integration and
spreading of multicultural values via education and training as well as lobbying for the human rights of foreigners. At its peak the association had 200 members, half of them Hungarian, the other half foreign students, and relied profoundly on the work of volunteers including Hungarian human rights activists.

As to the ideological background MLKA follows Western European and US patterns (volunteering, field work orientedness, etc.) which goes back to the civil rights movements of the sixties. MLKA’s organizational stability stems from its double based organizational structure: it is primarily a charity organization with prestigious, mobile and educated upper class members (who are regularly active though only for a relatively short period of time); secondarily it is a human rights organization with a professional or semi-professional educated core, joining the Hungarian and international antiracist and human rights networks. The MLKA’s internal democracy is burdened with its fast changing membership and increasing professionalization.

Concerning the organizational environment, in the period of 1990-1994 the alliance of MLKA was formed by the opposition parties (at that time the ruling Christian Democratic party of Hungary formed a rather antiliberal and xenophobe government) This situation changed radically in 1994, when the Socio-Liberal coalition came into power. This change caused a shift in MLKA’s activities: leaving the extraparliamentary arena, it abandoned its reactive behaviour (documenting attacks, helping victims, appealing to the public) and started to act as a lobby group, also providing legal service and other help for foreigners.

In its forms of action, MLKA follows an institutional strategy (intermediary and demonstrative actions, without direct-coercive forms); however, light violence as self-defense (street fighting with skinheads) occurred several times during the analysed period.

On the concrete activities recently conducted within the frames of MLKO, the Who is Who… booklet provides the following information:

- MLKO’s lawyer activists help to obtain residence permits, monitor refugee camps situations, or cooperate with the authorities concerning translation services,
- as to the cultural activities, a school programme taking aim at elementary and high school pupils was created in order to increase sensitivity of students toward the problems of prejudice, intolerance and racism;
- a club concentrating on cultural communication was also brought to life helping mixed-couples and families meet and discuss their problems, and organize recreational activities together on a monthly basis.

The second most active refugee self-help group, The Mahatma Gandhi Human Rights Organization (MGHRO), was founded in 1992, aiming to protect human rights of refugees and asylum seekers, provides legal assistance for 100-150 foreigners in several ways (it maintains an office for legal services, monitors refugee camps, and if necessary, sends there
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16 Who is Who in the Hungarian Asylum System (2003). The recently published booklet gives a rough overview about the activity pattern of migrants on the field of refugee policy in contemporary Hungary. The booklet consists of a brief description, including aims and activities as well as practical information (availability), of all organizations related to the Hungarian asylum system. The scope of the brochure is to contribute to better information sharing among refugee assistant organizations, refugee-receiving municipalities and schools in Hungary aiming to help refugees and asylum seekers.
legal representatives). Another scope of MGHRO is cultural: it aims to integrate its clients into the Hungarian society and promote a better understanding of non-European cultures in the host society; this is carried out by organizing various types of cultural activities such as education programmes for refugees, media campaigns, visits to Hungarian prisons, fielding a football team, or summer holidays for refugee families. (Who is Who…, 2003)

In an anthropological analysis of the African Diaspora the author while characterizing the emergence and the limits of an African community in contemporary Budapest, mentions MGHRO as an organization playing an important role in supporting African migrants who otherwise face the lack of solidarity, and often a strong resistance on the part of the host society (Olomoofe, 2001). Describing the simplifying and hostile Hungarian discourse on the Africans in Hungary, the author analyses the paradoxical process of community formation among Africans in Budapest. According to Olomoofe (2001):

“For various reasons – ascription by an unfriendly majority population and shared experiences of contact with Hungarian institutions that are central to their ability to remain in Hungary – Black Africans in Budapest are being pressed together into a shared social field. This field is characterised by a – mainly sexual – “subculture”. Blacks are conscious of its problematic nature as the shared identity and experiences that inform it are rather accidental. Yet this shared identity is likely to remain important as long as they keep hitting a “brick wall” when they seek the support of wider Hungarian society. The people from the Hungarian mainstream think that they have no obligation to these people and view the compassionate efforts of NGOs in the field as meddlesome and ill-conceived.” (Olomoofe, 2001, p. 69)

The third most important human rights oriented organization, the Centre for Defense of Human Rights (MEJOK) was set up in 1993 by a former activist of MLKA in order to organize legal or other help, networking and fund-raising for its minority or foreign clients (Szabó, 1997). Since the very beginning special emphasis was placed on fight against unlawful measures and discrimination against racial minorities and foreigners. MEJOK established a European East-East network for human rights activists of post–communist countries. In contrast to MLKA, MEJOK has never tried to mobilize a large constituency rather it aims to provide legal assistance by semi-professionals and professionals. Together with Helsinki Committee, MEJOK established in 1994 the Human Rights Legal Counseling Office for migrants and other people with human rights problems under the Helsinki Charter and the European Convention of Human Rights. MEJOK has had good relationship with several refugee reception centers in Hungary, which allows for MEJOK to employ its clients whom it represents as volunteers in the MEJOK office in Budapest. (Olomoofe, 2001) Due to its effectiveness in legal services as well as the director’s knowledge of Pidgin-English, MEJOK was extremely popular among African asylum seekers in Hungary. However, relying on Máté Szabó’s findings, as a result of its media based and politically supported successes MEJOK had to face mixed reactions on the part of authorities as well as on the part of other NGO activists on the field. Despite this fact, the leader of MEJOK in 1996 regarded his relationship with other organizations as balanced, and hoped to develop networking and cooperation with them. In the same way as MLKA, MEJOK had increasingly gained recognition by the authorities during the 1990’s. (Roditi-Rowlands, n.d.). The organization’s membership strongly overlapped with the black members of a congregation of a church in Budapest. As it is often the case with newly formed, financially dependent, organizationally weak organizations working in the challenging (often even dangerous) field of human rights, MEJOK was very vulnerable to the prestige and commitment of its leader. As a consequence, the departure of the establishing president of
MEJOK left the organization with a decreasing visibility, declining role in the field and evaporating influence in the field of lobbying.

According to Szabó’s comparative analysis of the period 1987-1996, a shift in activities of human rights organisations dealing with refugee, migrant and minority issues may be recognized (Szabó, 1997). The four dominant trends are

- the shifting emphasis from protest towards services, education and networking;
- the persistent need for professional workers even in professional organizations;
- continuous emphasis on political involvement and policy making at the expense of fieldwork;
- increasing dependence on Western financial resources, networks and know-how.

Apart from the Centre for Defense of Human Rights, the Mahatma Gandhi Human Rights Organization and Martin Luther King Association, several other NGOs dealing with refugees and asylum seekers such as the Refugee and Disaster Preparedness – Disaster Response Service of the Hungarian Red Cross, or the Oltalom Charity Association employ third-world migrants in their offices. (Who ..., 2003, Roditi-Rowlands, n.d.)

Several other NGO’s founded and headed by third-world immigrants can be identified based on the homepage of the Africa-Asia Forum Association (AAF). The Forum itself was established in the spring of 2000 as a non-profit association dedicated to the promotion of mutual understanding and growth between Africans and Asians in the host community of Hungary and the international community. The main goals of AAF consist of accelerating the creation of civil societies through empowerment and unification; promotion of cultural exchange for interaction and understanding; bridging gaps between persons and institutions through the upliftment of the disadvantaged and marginalized people; social integration of third-world immigrants.

The activities of AAF consist of organizing multicultural activities, promoting human rights, setting up charity works and development programmes and improving international relations. The forum organizes exhibitions, seminars and research; and also provides translation facilities in African and Asian languages. A current project is a three year charity program with the aim of collecting fairly used computers in working conditions, from various institutions, offices, companies and private persons to be distributed to elementary schools in developing countries of Africa and Asia.

With the aim of contributing to the strengthening of the civil society, a free website was created; it collects, processes and disseminates information on several NGOs and events related to the topic. The page became a medium for accessibility and fluid interaction between these continents and the host community.
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17 The research was based on content analysis of leading Hungarian weeklies and dailies from 1989-1995, statistical reports on NGOs in Hungary and standardized interviews conducted with a leader, a rank and file member and a non-conformist member of each organization included in the study.

18 http://www.africa-asia.power.tc/English/
The AAF established cooperation with related Hungarian ministries and mayors and embassies, networks for human rights, development and culture, foundations, schools and other educational bodies and international organizations. AAF has five permanent members and fifty volunteers as staff. Its financing is based on donations, projects and trading. In order to generate fund internally for the association and reduce the burden of regularly depending on external support an arts gallery was established, a business outlet that was strongly related to the goal of the mission of AAF. The gallery was also formally commissioned in 2004 by the Nigerian Ambassador of Hungary. The collection of items displayed for sales in the gallery consists of paintings, sculptural works in metal, wood and brass, textiles, renting of musical instruments and costumes, gift items, African literature translated into Hungarian. The gallery also operates an English language film club.

Liberty House Foundation (LHF) was founded in 2000 as a human-rights organisation with the aim of assisting the under-privileged, oppressed and deprived in the society. Its main goal is to protect the tenets of human rights and contribute to the realisation of a just and civil society. As a vital center for information and guideline, LHF directs and provides support for persons facing political and social problems and creates a ground for societal integration. The foundation organizes visits and renders assistance to inmates in camps and prisons and provides accommodation in urgent cases; it operates a 24 hours hotline telephone service where all members of the public can resort to assistance; LHF also has several newspaper columns where human rights issues are discussed. According to the AAF homepage, the organization hopes to run a multi-cultural community centre where computer, educational and social programmes shall be frequently organised.

Albert Schweitzer Association for Refugees (ASAR) officially registered in 1997 was formed by ten mandate refugees under the protection of United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), Budapest. The association was created with the aim of influencing Hungarian refugee politics through dialogues with the Hungarian government, with embassies in Hungary, international organizations and the press; also by strengthening the unity of refugees. The exact cause of its founding was the Hungarian government signing the refugee convention of 1956 on geographical reservation, having unbearable consequences on future refugees of Hungary. The objectives of the association are interest representation for refugees living within the territories of the Hungarian Republic; helping asylum seekers apply for refugee status, improving their condition in refugee camps; form an information center for refugee authorities and other organizations; help in organizing vocational training and apprenticeship for refugees and help in refugees' job seeking. The organization also has cultural aims: to help the understanding and peaceful co-operation of the refugees and the Hungarian society at large, fight against racism and any form of discrimination. Among the organizational goals pursued by ASAR are cooperation with other NGO's in areas of common interest; organizing and participating in seminars, conferences and learning; as a non-profit organization developing projects and other ways of raising fund to the effective running of the association.

The homepage of the Africa-Asia Forum Association also tells us about the Urhobo Progressive Union, Hungary. The Union founded in 1999 aims to function as a forum for cultural awareness, unity and joint realisation of aspirations for the Hungarian resident
members of the twenty-two clans which make up the Urhobo, the fifth largest ethnic group in Nigeria.
The Union organises cultural activities where people of diverse cultures are invited to partake in the experience of cultural exchange. It also promotes the activities and well-being of members.

The AAF homepage also informs us about the Edo Community, Hungary. Objectives of the union is to bring all the indigenes of Edo State of Nigeria together, and to promote cooperation, understanding, and solidarity amongst them; to act as a forum for bringing awareness among members; to promote Edo socio-cultural identity; and to integrate members of the association into the Hungarian society. The Union aims to pursue its activities based on the principles of freedom, equality, justice and democracy, and cordial relationship between the union and the host country.

**The Chinese community**

The Chinese community in Hungary is the single migrant group that has been continuously monitored since the beginning of the 1990s, therefore based on research findings the exact process of community formation of Chinese immigrants is possible to reconstruct.

The Hungarian Chinese Association (HCA) was founded in 1992 with the aim of helping Hungarian Chinese, moderating business competitiveness within the community, maintaining a good relationship with the People’s Republic of China (PRC), and representing the Chinese towards Hungarian authorities (Nyíri, 1994a)\(^1\). Despite traditional competitiveness and dissension typical of the Chinese, HCA succeeded in creating unprecedented business cooperation among the Chinese in Hungary; the establishment of joint ventures, and the opening of a Chinese trade center are its most spectacular results. In the course of time, through several changes in the leadership of the community the organization became increasingly subordinate to the PRC. In the meantime, HCA established ties with the host society as well: building connections with local organizations, (such as the Hungarian Chamber of Commerce, or the Hungarian-Chinese Friendship Organization), organizing fund drives for the Hungarian poor, creating a - mainly business oriented - information center for Hungarian–Chinese mutual orientation, as well as promoting Hungarian-Chinese sports events were all signs of the HCA’s willingness to acculturation into the Hungarian society. Besides its political and business related goals, HCA also intended – with small success - to take over functions of traditional lineage and native-place organizations. High standard recreational activities, such as cultural or sports events were also associated with HCA in the respective period; these consisted of inviting Chinese theatre companies, organizing karaoke nights, founding a Chinese library, or organizing soccer or billiard teams.

Apart from the HCA, the organization Section of Chinese in Hungary of The ’56 Friends’ Society was also active in the respective period; it pursued the goals of integrating Chinese
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\(^1\)A socio-cultural analysis of Chinese in Hungary in the period 1989-1993 is provided in the article, based on data from a two year long participant observation and the processing of available written materials, such as press or books. Both the community (structure, hierarchy, conflicts, culture), and the conditions of reception (society, labour market, police) are described.
into the Hungarian society and the Chinese Christian Church, running also Hungarian language courses, as the only religious community of the Chinese in Hungary.

Based on the results of a research conducted in 1994 that was a direct continuation of fieldwork carried out by Nyíri in 1992-1993 we can get a picture on the development of the Chinese organizations (Nyíri 1994b). As a result of the rapid improvement of material well-being of Chinese immigrants, and a relative decrease in pressure from immigration authorities, the disintegration trend observed in the 1992-1993 research was entirely reversed by the time of this second study. The integration and acculturation of the community went hand in hand with the stabilization of the Hungarian Chinese Association (HCA) as a clan-like traditional Chinese organization: as a moral leader it effectively solved everyday problems and conflicts with the Hungarian side; as a cultural and welfare leader it organized fund drives, published newspapers, promoted the establishment of a Chinese-Hungarian bilingual school. The political role of HCA also strengthened by 1994: HCA consolidated its position with the People’s Republic of China and with the Chinese communities of Europe; moreover, showing a strong demand for legal and political emancipation, a good relationship was built with the new Hungarian government. Its double legitimacy based on political and moral resources meant the emergence of a non-traditional organization with a more universal claim, which made HCA an unprecedented example in the history of the Chinese diasporic movements.

A study carried out in 1995 sheds light on a special phenomenon born in the period 1992-1995 (Nyíri 1996). The first organization, the Hungarian Chinese Association (HCA) claiming to represent all of the Chinese in Hungary intended to gain its legitimacy from two different sources: primarily the HCA’s strong loyalty towards the People’s Republic of China, expressed in spectacular connections with and subordination to the Chinese government, secondarily the takeover of social functions of traditional Chinese diasporic organizations provide a political and moral base of legitimacy. The other centre of the community at this time was the Association for the Promotion of Chinese-Hungarian Friendship, a more open, less orthodox organization urging the integration of the Hungarian Chinese into the Hungarian society.

Both centres had their own newspapers and economic influence, and were in close connection with a growing number of traditional and non-traditional, smaller and less influential organisations. Being a non-traditional community, institutionalization produced certain pluralism among the Chinese in Hungary, which was understood, despite the bipolarization, as a new phase of the Hungarian Chinese community on its path to maturity.

The role Hungary played in integrating the Chinese community into the broader society is also revealed in a research. (Nyíri, 1997) Despite the beneficial effects Chinese trade had on the Hungarian economy, the lack of governmental policies for the Chinese community, inadvertent interventions by general migration legislation, and ignorance and unconcern characterized the Hungarian relation and attitude towards the Chinese; the trend seemed to be reversed around the end of the period. Relationships with the Hungarian authorities have been initiated by several Chinese organizations (in forms of cultural events and activities, later lobbying for better business opportunities), however their real purpose and integrative power was often questioned as primary loyalty towards mainland China dominated the ideology of most influential organizations. Organizations aiming to integrate into the Hungarian society at a more intense level were defeated and ceased by HCA, strictly loyal to the Chinese government.
As a conclusion of his research, Nyíri suggests crucial strategic steps Hungary should take in order to contribute to the integration of the Chinese into the Hungarian society. These are as follows: development of a new discourse on minorities by scholars and policymakers, reformed Alien Regulation Law, predictable immigration policy, good investment environment, effective police work in protection of Chinese, and provision of proper educational facilities. Franchise and eligibility at least on the local level would assure a source of legitimacy, alternative of strong connections with the People’s Republic of China often impeding integration. (Nyíri, 1997)

The role and responsibility of Hungarian authorities are also emphasized by Krisztina Keresztély: focusing her case study on the problems of the Chinese community in Budapest, and referring largely on the findings of Nyíri, the author concludes that problems could be effectively solved only on the level of the Budapest City local government. (Keresztély, 1998)

The research carried out by Nyíri in 1999 investigates further the relationship of Hungarian authorities and the Chinese organizations (Nyíri, 1999). The author claims that because of its lack of conscious policy toward Chinese immigrants, by 1999 the Hungarian government missed the chance to stabilize a highly educated, economically adaptable community with easy access to capital. Chinese organizations did initiate cooperation with Hungarian organizations or individual functionaries; the importance of these relations increased after a crisis occurred in the Hungarian clothing sector. Though HCA organized several Chinese cultural events for the benefit of governmental organizations and donated funds for the police, the fact that the Hungarian authorities failed to find solutions for crucial problems of Chinese immigrants, and the lack of interest on the part of Hungarian authorities for Chinese associations promoting the integration of Chinese, the volume of the Chinese community in Hungary is shrinking. This trend again contributed to the strengthening of HCA’s hegemony over the field of Chinese Hungarian political self-expression.

The dominance of HCA resulted that opposed to the numerous Western European Chinese communities defining their identity through the members’ common native places within China (quiaoxiang identity), the discourse of belonging of the Hungarian Chinese community in 1999 clearly rested on the ideological model of a pan-Chinese cultural community; all Chinese organizations in Hungary, especially the Hungarian Chinese Association claimed their legitimacy on the basis of this pan-Chinese identity. Accordingly, the HCA maintained close ties with other European Chinese communities and the People’s Republic of China: the HCA’s ex-president headed the strongly pro-PRC Alliance of European Chinese Organizations, and hold important positions in Chinese state institutions.

The development of such a pan-Chinese identity within the Chinese community in Hungary as well as the encounter of Chinese and Hungarian cultures resulted in the recognition of a special trend, called by Nyíri as parallel globalisation. (Nyíri, 2002) Two parallel processes are visible: the Chinese effectively join in and make use of the general globalization trends; in the meantime an alternative globalization process emerged based on a pan-Chinese identity discourse which defines migrants as part of a global majority having its center in
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20 The article describes the general legislative framework regulating the relationship between foreigners and local governments in Hungary, and as an illustration, a case study is provided focusing on the problems of the Chinese immigrant community.
The Hungarian Chinese Association is described as a pioneer of this Chinese parallel globalization.

A special aspect of the parallel globalization trends is the question of proselytism as an active practice of shaping other people's identities. (Nyíri, 2003) Specifically, the research looks at the identity discourse promoted by ethnic Chinese evangelicals and compares it to that of Jehovah's Witnesses. Both Christian churches proselytise among contemporary transnational migrants from the People's Republic of China (PRC) in Europe, each making use of a sophisticated organisation adapted to the transnational practices of these migrants. Yet while evangelicals promote a transnational ethnic identity quite compatible with the secular discourse of the global Chinese migrant, Jehovah's Witnesses promote an anti-secular, non-ethnic cosmopolitanism. As a result, global Chinese evangelical ties more easily become part of global migratory and business networks.

**A border town as a multi-ethnic city**

The strengthening of internal and international migration parallel with the spread of the idea of multiculturalism resulted in an enormous increase in the number of non-Hungarian speaker residents of Szeged in the period 1960-1990. (Rátkai, 1997) According to census data, in 1960 500 persons were of non-Hungarian nationality, and the same number of persons were non-Hungarian speakers; by 1990 this number grew to 2153 and 1904 respectively, while in 1999 the estimated number of non-Hungarian population was already 2-3% of the population of Szeged, i.e. approximately 10,000 persons. Table 6 summarises census data available on minorities, their estimated population size in 1996, as well as the source of their migration both internally and internationally. It can be clearly seen that for most of the minorities (except for the Greek, Slovak and German) both internal and international migration contributed to the emergence of their respective communities. The number of community organizations and community events associated with 11 ethnic groups increased simultaneously in the last four decades, which made Szeged one of Hungary’s most significant multicultural cities.

Although Serbian and Romanian associations have existed for a long time (since the 1980s) in Szeged, and the two local minority governments were also established in 1994 and 1995, the immigrants of the 1990s did not intend to join these ethnic organizations. (Rátkai, 1999)

The Polish and the Arab communities (counting 60-80, and 80-100 members consecutively) emerged in the last 40 years exclusively as a result of individual immigration. The Polish Club created in 1975 became part of the Bem József Polish Cultural Association in 1992, and successfully used the facilities offered by the Polish school in Budapest as well as the Polish Institute.
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21 The paper is based on fieldwork among Chinese evangelical organisations and Jehovah's Witnesses in Italy, Hungary, Russia, and the United Kingdom, supplemented with interviews in the United States (the headquarters of many Chinese evangelical organisations) and a survey of printed and online resources used in proselytising.

22 As the Arab community established its first organization only in 1997, they are not included in the Table.
Table 6: The population of minorities in Szeged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>2000-4000</td>
<td>Great Hungarian Plain, North-Hungary, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Budapest, Fejér County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td>Budapest, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>235**</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>Southern regions of the Great Hungarian Plain, former GDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53**</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td>Budapest, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>200-900</td>
<td>Békés County, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>200-500</td>
<td>Southern regions of the Great Hungarian Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>200-800</td>
<td>Southern regions of the Great Hungarian Plain, Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Budapest, Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Budapest, Vietnam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Language as vernacular, or most important language after vernacular
**Only vernacular

As a result of separation from Arab student organizations, the Hungarian Arab Association of Csongrád County was established in 1997. As opposed to Arab student communities being organized on the basis of the country of origin, the association collected its members from 11 countries; being religiously neutral its basic goals consisted of preserving Arab language and culture, and integrating the community into the broader society.

Vietnamese coming to Hungary as university students or textile workers around 1990, together with their families created their local organization named the Hungarian Vietnamese Association of Csongrád County in 1997. The association was the first branch-organization of the Hungarian Vietnamese association which was established outside the capital city.

The Russian and the Ukrainian, who arrived to Szeged in the previous four decades as students or workers, started to organize their community in 1984 by founding the Association of Soviet and Hungarian Culture with 100 members. By the transition the problem of Russian-Ukrainian double identity emerged resulting in the foundation of Hungarian Russian Association of Csongrád County, and the Hungarian Ukrainian Cultural Association in 1996.
Table 7 shows the membership of international and internal migrant as well as native minority organizations in the period 1989-1996. (Rátkai, 1997)

Table 7 Membership in various minority organizations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Information received from the respective organizations: Serbian: Local Serb Community of Szeged; German: Association of Germans of Csongrád County in Szeged; Slovak: Hungarian Slovac Association of Szeged, later Slovac Association of Szeged; Polish: Bem József Polish Cultural Association - Branch in Szeged; Romanian: Cultural Association of Romanians in Szeged; Vietnamese: Hungarian Vietnamese Cultural and Lobby Association – Szeged Branch; Greek: Cultural Association of Hungarian Greeks of Csongrád County; Russian: Russian Association of Csongrád County; Roma: Democratic Alliance of Hungarian Roma – Szeged Branch; Ukrainian: Hungarian Ukrainian Cultural Association.

Concerning the general development of these organizations in the 1970s and 1980s the Patriotic Popular Front (the only national organisation outside of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party during the four decades of Communism) supported the loose, club-like organizations in form of providing them legality or accommodation. The first, 15 years long section in the organizational development ended in 1989, when the mentor organization was dissolved. The painful process of adaptation to a market-economy environment, detained by the 1993 minority law, had not been finished by 1997; the continuously increasing membership fee still did not cover the expenses of maintaining a community house, or fulfilling educational-cultural needs of the communities.

The aims of all of the organizations are to preserve ethnic identity, language and culture. With the scope of common interest representation, 7 associations, 3 local branches of national organizations and 6 minority self-governments together created in 1995 the Minority Council in Szeged, the first organization in Hungary uniting all local ethnic organizations. Although their relationship had never been free of problems, the difficulties were always overcome.

According to Rátkai’s 1997 findings, the Intercultural Complementary School, maintained partially by ethnic NGOs, provides native language education from kindergarten up to the high-school level; it offers week-end classes in science and humanities for students intending to enroll to native-language high-schools or universities abroad. The Polish, Russian, Vietnamese and Arab communities already established kindergarten-groups and complementary school-type activities with native language or bilingual education. The aim of the teachers is to improve the knowledge of students related to their own culture and native language, on a level that does overload the students.
Although, as opposed to other fields of politics, these organizations keep minority politics in the center of their interest, they keep themselves away from Hungarian political parties. However, as a result of their fast organizational development they already became political actors: the Serbian and Slovakian minority governments received 5000 votes each at the 1994 local elections, the votes received mainly of sympathizers.

Minority associations in Szeged mainly congregate their members without basic facilities: they have no accommodation for their activities. Despite the limited conditions, the civic participation of ethnic organizations was on the rise at the time of the research, showing that ethnic communities in Szeged were on the path of ethnic emancipation. Although the members of the host society in the majority welcomed the ethnic activism, there also occurred xenophobic and racist manifestations on the part of Hungarian residents.

**Quasi-Diaspora migrants**

Analysing the sociological characteristics of ethnic Hungarians migrating to Hungary from across the borders we found the basic characteristics of diasporic behaviour:

- Their strong sense of being Hungarian reinforced by their Transylvanian identity results in a disdainful attitude to the sense of Hungarian nationhood they encounter in the host country on the one hand, and in an increasing, identity-shaping appreciation for the culture and community that they left behind in the country of origin on the other. This Transylvanian identity is made up of elements such as pride felt over the historical success of the Transylvanian principality, religious tolerance, a cultural supremacy over the native Hungarian population of Hungary, the dignity of resisting Romanian oppression, and a sense of superiority to Romanians.

It is also a question what it means to be Transylvanian in this respect: there are opinions in which the perception of "Transylvanianhood" as a general element of identity only exists among those living in Hungary, while "back home" identity is a function of smaller units instead.\(^{23}\) What is meant by this is not simply the fact that each historically distinct region, town and village has its own, more or less distinct, identity, but also that constantly emerging old-new local identities can exist side by side.

- The identities of Hungarians from Transylvania settled in Hungary are shaped in the interaction of individual decisions, governmental Diaspora-policies and domestic minority-policies. That there is room for rational considerations as well as emotional elements in this process is exemplified by a wittylly bitter proposition made by the Association of Transylvanian Hungarians. (The organisation of Transylvanian intellectuals living in Hungary was founded in 1988) The mock-suggestion, which concerns the politics of identity, would advise Transylvanian-born Hungarians to choose another identity for themselves because their associations could receive considerable support from the country's minority-policies, unfriendly towards a Transylvanian identity, like organisations of Romanian, Armenian or Gypsy communities.

\(^{23}\)Similarly, a Chinese identity is only characteristic of the Chinese Diaspora, whereas the Chinese of China will far sooner identify with a particular province. The power of a "Pan-Chinese" identity stems partly form the "lowest common denominator" and partly a product of China's Diaspora-policies. (Nyiri, 1997). Further, this is the identity-element which is meaningful for the foreigner, which is why it provides the individual living in Diaspora with a “usable” identity.
- Needless to say, the identity-politics of the Diaspora are greatly affected by the public perception of the given community in the host country. Complaints by young Transylvanians that 'Hungary is the only country in the world where Hungarians from Transylvania are not Hungarians' cannot be dismissed as wholly groundless. Nor can the recurrent complaint dismissed as unfounded according to which those who have lived in Hungary since 1989 are called Romanians (Szakáts 1996).

- As part of the Diaspora-consciousness, a nostalgic yearning for the "homeland" in Transylvania has not disappeared in a decade spent in Hungary; another aspect of the sociological concept of Diaspora is the fact that maintaining ties with those left home is an integral part of the life of Transylvanians in Hungary (Szakáts 1996). There are several examples to support the claim that the Diaspora of Transylvanians in this country forms a "transnational-community- in-miniature" living now here, now in Romania, thus reaping the economic and cultural benefits of its transitional position.

In sum, we can establish that there is no consensus of expert opinion concerning the question whether or not ethnic Hungarians migrating to Hungary from abroad can be regarded as a Diaspora, but there is no such powerful resistance against this proposition as seen in connection with the previous issue. In terms of its sociological features, this community can be regarded as a Diaspora. No doubt, this is a unique kind of Diaspora, because of its closeness to the host community on the one hand, and the peculiarities of the historical-political-economic relations between the sending and the host countries on the other. (such as the peculiar legislative mechanisms regulating migration to Hungary in the country of origin, or the changes in identity-policies induced by the relocation of borders and the intermeshed networks of informal economic connections)

Civil organizations related to Hungarians across the borders (including migrants to Hungary) form an increasing and well defined group among other NGOs. Table 8 shows their number in the period 1995-2000.

Table 8 The number of NGOs specialized on activities related to Hungarians across the borders, 1995–2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of NGOs preserving ties between Hungarians in Hungary and Hungarians across the borders</th>
<th>Number of NGOs supporting Hungarians across the borders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Data not published yet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NGOs in Hungary, Hungarian Central Statistical Office, 1995-2000

Although an increasing trend can be clearly observed in the number of such NGOs in the second half of the 1990s, not much is known about their exact working, structure and control bodies. The assumption, however, is that a large part of these NGOs are closely connected to Hungarian political parties and consequently have important role in Diaspora politics.
Among the very few studies investigating the civil organizations of the quasi-Diaspora Hungarians from across the borders the first one (Czakó, 1992)\(^{24}\) analyses how local community organizations helping Romanian refugees, established either by Hungarians or the refugees themselves, developed in the period 1988-1992. According to their members, supporters and scope of activity the organizations can be classified into three major groups. Apolitical organizations founded by Transylvanians of Hungarian nationality, aiming to preserve Transylvanian Hungarian culture and traditions, were supported by organizations connected to the former socialist system. Their helping activities consisted of providing information on Hungarian society for the newcomers, also enabling refugees to keep in contact with their families left behind. The second group, aided by alternative churches and the Hungarian political opposition, based its activities on the idea of human rights: refugees of Hungarian or Romanian nationality or Gypsies were equally helped in labour exchange, and the purchase of building plots; a movement organized by refugees of Romanian nationality (Romania Liberal) was also given support. Organizations of the third type were established by refugees, mainly intellectuals, who formed house-building associations or foundations in order to get access to official house-building subsidies.

The enormous change in migration causes as well as in public opinion after 1989 implied a heavy shift in the activities of all three types of organizations. The increasing shortage of resources (both financial and human) resulted in the decline of several organizations, but the processes of economization and professionalization (especially in labour market services), and to a lesser extent, politicization offered possible means of stabilization.

All of these associations and foundations needed support from outer organizations in order to become official and survive in the examined period. According to the author, assuring organizational autonomy among these circumstances was the task of the major actors of political capitalism.

Another article informs us about an important self-help type quasi-diasporic organisation, the Transylvanian Hungarian Congregation. (Szakáts, 1996)\(^{25}\) The Congregation was founded in 1987-1988 as the ecumenical religious community of Transylvanian Hungarians. Its gatherings, attended by more than 80% of the sample, provided moral, social as well as economical (accommodation, labour) assistance for the congregation members.

According to the interviews, the numerous Transylvanian Hungarian organizations pursue three types of activities: they fulfill moral and psychological needs; provide pragmatic assistance in administration both with problems in Hungary and problems related to maintaining Transylvanian relationships; and organize contact with famous Transylvanian personalities (writers, painters etc). All of these organizations help their members integrate

---

\(^{24}\) The article relies on qualitative analysis of interviews with organizations helping Romanian refugees, conducted in two consecutive years (around the first parliamentary elections, and one year later); the foundations and associations, which do not represent all Hungarian refugee organizations, were collected using the snowball-method.

\(^{25}\) The article is based on a chapter from the author’s PhD dissertation. The essay analyses the relationship of Transylvanian Hungarians with the host as well as the sending society from a multiple perspective. A chapter is dedicated for Transylvanian Hungarian communities and organizations. The article relies on a survey conducted in 1993 with a sample of 400 persons (arrived to Hungary between 1987 and 1992), created by snowball method.
into the host society and strengthen the sense of security on one hand; preserve Transylvanian ties and Transylvanian values in everyday life as well as maintain a continuous atmosphere of nostalgia on the other. Interview data suggests a slight decrease in the need for the organizations’ activities compared to the end of the eighties; however, the knowledge that the organization exists still largely contributes to the migrants’ sense of security.

The latest study related to the field focuses on the Association of the Transylvanian Hungarians. (Bujdosó, 1997) An interview with the leader of the Association forms the base of the research. The organization was founded in 1988 by the Transylvanian members of a congregation nearby Budapest; at first it fulfilled cultural and social needs of its members, later on it became a mediator between the Hungarian refugee authorities and the Transylvanian refugees. In 1997 the main goal of the association was to promote integration into the Hungarian society without assimilation. Concerning the practical operation of the association in the year 1997, it was open three hours a day; cultural and social programmes were organized on several days of the week; the activities were accommodated by a downtown community center in Budapest.

**Prominent migrants in the civic society**

Due to the fact that – except for the Chinese - there are only a small number of non-ethnic Hungarian migrants in Hungary, it is not surprising that the selected famous migrants are both Hungarians from abroad.

**Gáspár Miklós Tamás**

Graduated from Babes-Bolyai University (Cluj, Romania) in 1972. Having got into problems with the Romanian authorities he emigrated to Hungary. Due to political reasons he was fired from the ELTE University where he taught philosophy. He was an active samizdat writer. After the fall of Communism he was elected to be a member of the Parliament (of the liberal party SZDSZ). Recently he does not belong to any party and is the deputy chairman of an anti-globalisation, antiprivatisation NGO (ATTAC, home page: www.attac.hu) as well as regular guest in various political discussion on TV.

**András Bíró**

Born in Sofia (Bulgaria), emigrated from Hungary in 1956, spent about three decades in asylum. He used to work as an U.N. employee in various African and South-American countries. After moving back to Hungary (1986) he founded Autonómia Foundation (1990), an NGO helping the Roma, and was active to set up a radio for the Roma community and the Tolerance Award. For these activities he was awarded the alternative Nobel price (1995).

---

26 The article has two purposes: primarily it aims to examine to what extent Transylvanian Hungarian refugees, who arrived in the late 1980s, integrated into the Hungarian society; secondarily, analyzing the role the Hungarian asylum system played in this process, it draws lessons for future refugee programs. The article relies on 20 interviews conducted with Transylvanian refugees and their families chosen for the study by snowball-method.
Part III: Conclusions

Preserving culture and maintaining cultural or national identity formulate the main field of civic activities: it was listed among the major goals of almost every civic organization or movement discussed in the literature. Religious associations (churches, congregations) could also be found in the major immigrant groups such as Transylvanian Hungarians, Chinese or Africans in Budapest. Other kinds of activities were pursued only by certain immigrant communities depending on the special needs and capacities of the relevant groups: powerful political activism in form of lobby groups is typical of the Chinese community; economic associations for mutual aid or interest representation appeared among Transylvanian Hungarians (the former) or the Chinese (the latter); human rights associations are established or maintained mainly by African immigrants. (a)

As a consequence of the poor research coverage of immigrants’ civic participation in Hungary it is difficult to compare the level of activism in different immigrant groups. Due to the traditional Chinese values and the continuous attempt to maintain close ties with mainland China, Chinese formulate the most active group of the migrants in the civic society; however their impact upon the host society is minimal, that is activities are more or less restricted to their own community.

The same is true in case of the two largest refugee groups, i.e. the Africans and Afghans (Marton, 2001, Olomoofe, 2001). The first group consists of mostly young and independent males, the latter large families. In both cases the chance of civic activity is very low since other network forms, cultural and career patterns dominate the groups.

Apart from small groups of intellectuals, the largest group of immigrants, i.e. ethnic Hungarians from the neighboring non-EU countries seem to be inactive in the civil society. (b)

Compared to the level of civic activity of the majority the migrants’ activity (despite of a wide set of instruments of participation in decision-preparatory process and suffrage of settled migrants in particular in local level) is significantly lower. Not that the aforementioned would be that high. According to the 2003 results of a project comparing the nonprofit sector of 35 developed, developing and transformation countries, the nonprofit sector of Central and Eastern Europe including Hungary is considerably lower than that of Western countries or even the developing regions such as Africa or South America. The ratio of employees of the sector (including paid employees and volunteers) compared to the economically active population is 1.1% in Hungary; the same ratio is 3.8% in Italy, that was the lowest among the 14 developed countries involved in the study. 27 (b)

The relation between migrant and majority organizations is relevant only on the field of refugee integration. A few but visible refugee self-help groups – mostly with the help of the Hungarian branch of UNHCR – play some role in the integration of the small number of refugees in Hungary. However, this role is restricted mostly to some cultural activities such

as football games between refugees and Hungarians, attending at the Refugee Day celebrations, children’s club organized by Menedék (Association for helping migrants). Although articles discussing the present situation were not available, several papers published in the early and late 1990s revealed examples of a close relationship between certain migrant and mainstream society organizations: before the transition, the existence of cultural and economic quasi-disapora migrant organizations was facilitated by Hungarian legal organizations; in the mid-1990s the MLKA human rights organization developed a good relationship and cooperation with the socio-liberal coalition and thus became a lobby group; in the mid-1990s, immigrant organizations of Szeged city developed a strong cooperation with minority local governments of the city. (b)

The most relevant issues of the field to be dealt with are as follows:
- the lack of relations between the Chinese community and civil organizations of the majority society since this separation might cause on the long run increasing hostility between Chinese and Hungarians,
- the role of quasi-diasporic situation in restricting the civic activity of ethnic Hungarian migrants.

The major research gaps are as follows:
- To what extent is it correct to describe the situation of the ethnic Hungarians from across the border as quasi-diaspora?
- What role the quasi-diasporic relations between ethnic Hungarians from across the border and their homeland have on Hungary’s and their neighbor’s politics?
- To what extent is it true that Diaspora-related NGOs are active in both local, national and international politics?
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We could identify neither institution nor researcher focusing on this issue.

2. Immigration
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The three leading institutions and their prominent researchers of the field are the Nonprofit Kutatócsoport Egyesület, the Political Science Department of the Faculty of Law at the ELTE University and the Faculty of Law at the University of Szeged.

Association for Non-profit Research (Nonprofit Kutatócsoport Egyesület)
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