

ANDREW CARTWRIGHT, ENDRE SIK, SARA SVENSSON

Social Capital and the Integration of Minorities and Immigrants in Hungary

© Central European University

The views in this report are the authors' own and do not necessarily reflect those of the Center for Policy Studies, Central European University nor the Open Society Institute.

CENTER FOR POLICY STUDIES
CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY

Nádor utca 9
H-1051 Budapest, Hungary

cps@ceu.hu
<http://cps.ceu.hu>

This paper is one of a series of policy briefs produced by the Center for Policy Studies/Central European University for the Social Capital and Social Policy Network. Supported by the European Commission's Directorate General for Employment and Social Affairs, and led by the London School of Economics, social science researchers from nine countries contributes national monitoring reports and specific policy briefs for annual Social Situation Report. The final amalgamated reports can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_situation/index_en.htm

As a contribution to the 2007 Report, the terms of reference for this paper were to produce "a short report on the integration of migrant groups and minorities through civil society engagement" while also identifying "examples of social innovation and good practice."

Typesetting • Judit Csikós

ABSTRACT

The paper argues that the integration of immigrants has not been a particularly strong public policy issue in Hungary. Although national institutions have been encouraged by European policy-makers to introduce policies supportive of integration, practical action is low key on both the government and the civic side. The very low numbers of non-ethnic-Hungarian immigration and the manageable numbers of immigration of ethnic Hungarians from neighboring countries is the main reason for this. A second dimension though in the Hungarian case, is that for many, the issue of greater minority integration is a Roma question. In this regard, there are many signs of both greater public/civic activity as well as trends auguring greater exclusion. Evaluating the importance of social capital for fostering greater integration is not without controversy. Minority self-governance offers some political representation and can act as an important bonding and bridging resource, but where socio-economic problems are as great as they are for the Roma, such institutions are insufficient.

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
1. Refugees, Neighbours and Chinese Immigrants in Hungary	4
2. National Policy on Migration, Integration and Civic Society Involvement	6
3. National Policy towards Historic Minorities	8
4. Best Practices and the Europeanisation Problem	9
5. Conclusions	11
6. Tables	12

Introduction

Hungary is a relatively mono-ethnic country with only a small percentage of its population having either an immigrant status or being counted as one of the thirteen national minorities. For the latter group, the only minority of any significant size is the Roma and the limited national discourse concerning minority integration tends to be concerned with their situation. Other immigrant groups include small numbers of refugees from Afghanistan, Iraq and parts of Africa, ethnic Hungarians from the neighbouring countries, Chinese immigrants and foreign expatriate groups from western, northern Europe, and the US.¹

The importance of social capital for minority integration resides in its availability and its mix of both bonding and bridging forms of capital. As has been shown repeatedly in the migrant literature, immigrant social networks can be useful in finding accommodation and work, dealing with officialdom as well as providing general social support to help newcomers adjust and adapt. It is clear that certain minority groups are better endowed with active support networks that facilitate integration, for instance, the Chinese immigrants in Budapest and the recent waves of young western European migrants. Other newcomers can face difficulties finding those who speak their same language or who come from similar backgrounds. One of the main NGOs dealing with refugees said that significant numbers of refugees coming to Hungary are single young males who often have few ties to the host or immigrant populations. The actual numbers of refugees has been very small, the Office of Immigration and Nationality believe that there are currently around 2000 people living in Hungary who either have been granted refugee status or have ‘subsidiary forms of protection’.² Despite such low numbers, there have been recent initiatives to develop a more strategic approach to minority integration. So far, this discourse has focused mainly on the needs of refugees, but it has also been widened to include third party nationals from outside the EU.

1. Refugees, Neighbours and Chinese Immigrants in Hungary

In 2006, there were 155,000 foreign-born immigrants in Hungary, representing about 1.5% of the population.³ In the same year there were 2117 asylum applications claims filed but only 99 were recognised as refugees, with a further 99 being given permission to stay.⁴ Even during the Balkan wars the numbers of refugees in Hungary was very low compared with some of the main European recipient countries like Germany or Sweden. EU accession has had some impact on the number of refugee claims; in 2004 and 2005 the numbers decreased, whilst there was a slight rise in 2006.⁵ Expert opinion on the

1 This latter group tends not to be included in public discussions of minority integration. Usually connected to multinational business, further education, and almost always located in the capital city, the presence of these groups so far has not warranted much state or civil action. We include them in this study because there are signs that increasing numbers of EU citizens are staying for longer periods in Hungary, that they are buying property, establishing businesses, and bringing up families, but also because their networks can be considered social capital resources that might be useful for both newcomers and indigenous civil society.

2 See the recent White Paper, ‘For the Integration of Refugees, Persons under Subsidiary Protection, and other Third Country Nationals Residing Legally in Hungary,’ Office of Immigration and Nationality, Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement, Center for International and European Economic Law, Transition Facility Project 2005/2006 Hungarian-Greek Twinning project. Budapest, 2006

3 Központi Statisztikai Hivatal (2006), “Magyar statisztikai zsebkönyv 2005” (KSH, Budapest).

4 Since 2000, 31,494 persons have sought asylum in Hungary, but only 998 have been recognized as refugees and 3,417 received permission to stay. Part of the explanation for the low acceptance rate is that many of those seeking asylum leave Hungary before their claim has been dealt with.

5 See the tables at the end of this report

longer-term impact on the number of refugees is divided. The UNHCR argued that EU membership would lead to an increase in the number of applicants.⁶ However, some civic groups in Hungary have doubted this pointing to the relative disadvantages of claiming asylum in Hungary as opposed to other parts of the EU.⁷

The dominant form of immigration into the country has been ethnic Hungarians from neighbouring countries migrating to Hungary for work, study or for reasons of familial reunion. Almost two thirds of the immigrants entering the country between 1988 and 2002 were from these neighbouring countries and over 90 percent of these were of Hungarian ethnicity.⁸ The impact of accession has led to a drop in the numbers coming from Serbia and Ukraine, but an increase in the numbers of ethnic Hungarians from Romania. Although these immigrants have linguistic and cultural advantages and some social networks they can draw upon, their experience of Hungarian life can still be difficult. A recent research report highlighted how Romanian workers of Hungarian ethnicity can experience similar negative attitudes that are faced by other migrants. Jon Fox argued that

“They faced the same sort of economic hardships, humiliations, and diminution of status faced by migrants everywhere. Hungarians in Hungary did not see the migrants as their long-lost ethnic brethren, but as poor Romanians threatening to take their jobs; the migrants came to see themselves as ethno-nationally distinct from their hosts of the same name.”⁹

One of the largest third country nationals present in Hungary are the approximately ten thousand Chinese immigrants who arrived in the past fifteen years. Based mainly in the capital, Budapest, the Chinese community has been relatively successfully integrated into the economic and social life with the establishment of professional, cultural organisations, with their own newspapers and most recently, with the creation of a bilingual school in Budapest.¹⁰ One of the leading experts on Chinese migrants in Hungary, Pal Nyiri, emphasises how much of their social capital was obtained before coming to Hungary and that it increased on route, since they had

“a track record of internal migration at the time of leaving China. They have either worked, studied, traded, or extensively travelled away from their birthplaces ... Many had relatively high income and social status as private entrepreneurs, employees of state enterprises, party-state cadres or the children of these; ... In other words, they were upwardly mobile.”¹¹

This upward mobility continued in Hungary and was “often achieved by investing and multiplying social capital .. without acculturation – even at the level of learning the local language – having to occur.”¹² For some commentators, this approach has militated against their greater integration, for example, whilst many Chinese children learn some Hungarian when they are older, they also go to schools where the emphasis is on acquiring good English and fostering a ‘transnational perspective’. The picture is by no means static and the recent opening of the first bilingual Chinese-Hungarian primary

6 Andrea Szobolits (UNHCR), ‘Asylum in Hungary: Crisis averted but challenges emerging’, <http://www.unhcr.org/news/NEWS/428b09714.html> (Accessed January 24, 2007)

7 The Dublin convention is available at <http://europa.eu.int/infonet/library/a/97c25401/en.htm> (Accessed January 24, 2007)

8 Gödri Irén és Tóth Pál Péter Bevándorlás és beilleszkedés. A szomszédos országokból Magyarországra irányuló bevándorlás az ezredfordulón Központi Statisztikai Hivatal Népeségstudományi Kutató Intézet, Budapest, 2005. Summary in Hungarian at: http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/hun/hirlevel/0510/hir10510_cikk_fokusz.html (Accessed January 24, 2007)

9 Jon E. Fox (2004). “From National Inclusion to European Exclusion: State, National And Europe In Ethnic Hungarian Migration to Hungary”, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies (University of California) Working Paper Series (No. 101), San Diego, page 5.

10 For example, the Hungarian Chinese Association was founded in 1992. For more see Pal Nyiri, *New Chinese Migrants in Europe: The case of the Chinese community in Hungary*, Ashgate, Aldershot, 1999, page 99

11 *ibid* page 119

12 *ibid* page 123

school shows greater steps towards a more settled and integrated presence in the country.¹³

2. National Policy on Migration, Integration and Civic Society Involvement

Both officials and NGOs concede that Hungary lacks a coherent strategy for the integration of third country minorities. A recent study found that the majority of the school officials that were interviewed admitted that their schools were not prepared for receiving migrant children.¹⁴ In determining which school or which class a foreign child goes into, the most important factor is their proficiency in the Hungarian language.

“The lack of institutionalised practices for intercultural education means that methods are often improvised to handle the situations. Some teachers tend to devalue the insults that foreign students experience while at school, regarding it only as a normal form of rivalry among the classmates.”

Foreign students with a weak knowledge of Hungarian are often placed in classes well below their age range. Afghan teenage refugees, for example, found themselves in classes with children five to six years younger than themselves.¹⁵

However, there are signs of significant policy developments. The Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement is currently preparing a Strategy for Migration that will be made public in late spring 2007. Furthermore, following the issue of a White Paper in 2006, an Integration Act is scheduled for the second half of 2007.

The main reasons offered for introducing these measures were that, as what turned out to be the case in other European countries, the present situation of low-migration to Hungary might change rapidly. Secondly, the White Paper argued that all EU countries should take steps to promote social inclusion, that efforts to promote greater integration might offset problems that might arise from marginalisation and that, finally, integration made good economic sense in both its contribution to the economy and reducing reliance on public services.¹⁶ The White Paper suggests that better integration can be achieved through assuring that public services such as housing, health and education were better prepared to receive third country nationals, that specially trained mentors could act as guides and providing local support, that there should be combined language and vocational training programs and that there should be ongoing efforts to ensure the better integration of children into schools. The main responsible agency for the integration of refugees and third country nationals would be the Ministry of Justice.¹⁷

According to the latest results of the Central European Opinion Research Group, February 2005,

13 On the school's homepage, it states that all subjects are provided in Hungarian to prepare its students for further studies in Hungary, but that Chinese culture is learned in Chinese <http://www.magyar-kinai.sulinet.hu/hun/pedagogiai-program/index.html> (Accessed January 24, 2007)

14 Margit Feischmidt and Pál Nyíri (eds.) “Nem kívánt gyerekek? Külföldi gyerekek magyar iskolákban” (Unwanted children? Migrants in Hungary's public education system. Budapest: Centre for International Migration and Refugee Studies, Institute for Political Sciences, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Sík Kiadó, Budapest: 2006.

15 Marton, Klára (2001), “In what ways are the Afghans different?”, in Nyíri, P., Tóth, J., Fullerton, M (eds.), *Diasporas and Politics*. Centre for Migration and Refugee Studies, Budapest, p 27-41.

16 Despite this, the Ministry in charge did concede that there was no rush to introduce the new laws and measures. Email to the authors from Éva Kamarás, Migration Department, Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement, February 12, 2007

17 There was some critical comment on the proposals. The Hungarian Associations for Migrants, for example, argued that integration matters should be handled by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs rather than the Ministry of Justice. They also criticized the lack of clarity and setting out of responsibilities in the mentor program. See Menedék. A Menedék Egyesület észrevételei a magyarországi menekültek és befogadottak beilleszkedéséről szóló „Fehér könyv” tervezetével kapcsolatban, November 2006 (Provided by the author)

most Hungarian respondents think that their home-country does not need immigrants.¹⁸ At the same time, in the Eurobarometer, Hungary came fifth in the EU 25 with over 70 percent saying that foreigners enrich the national culture.¹⁹ Like other capitals in central Europe, since the early 1990s, Budapest has attracted tens of thousand of often younger immigrants, from northern, western Europe and the US.²⁰ Some arrive on work permits for limited periods, others come for more open-ended visits. Although their variety makes generalisation difficult, there is fairly high visibility of these groups, and there is some evidence of self-organisation such as own-language newspapers, cultural centres organised social groups, business and professional associations. Such networks function as efficient introducing agencies. There are also increasing numbers of private companies that offer ‘settling in’ services. There are some indications of bridging networks between these ‘expat’ networks and the majority Hungarian population, for instance, sporting organisations and philanthropic activities. However, to date, the integration of these groups has not been a significant issue for public policy or indigenous civic action.

There are only a very few Hungarian NGOs that deal explicitly with refugees.²¹ The leading group is Menedek, the Hungarian Association for Migrants, which was founded in 1995. The association concentrates principally on individual counselling and runs a limited number of projects that aim at strengthening migrant communities.²² The Association for Volunteering, “Onkentes” has also been active, promoting opportunities for greater refugee participation through volunteering. Its recent strategy document argued that

“international examples show that relevant volunteer programs can be an efficient tool for integration, such programs in which the majority society can take part just as the refugees and immigrants.”²³

The UNHCR has also been an important local actor in promoting the development of existing integration strategies and the adoption of new coherent integration schemes.²⁴ Their message as well as other indigenous NGOs, has been that contemporary political discourse has been too focused on the some distant future when Hungary might find itself with significant numbers of immigrants.

“Because these discussions focus so intently on the future, they often leave unexplored issues pertaining to migrants who already reside and work here.”²⁵

3. National Policy towards Historic Minorities

18 Central European Opinion Research Group, February 2005 omnibus, for more information see the website <http://www.ceorg-europe.org/topics.html> (Accessed February 15, 2007)

19 European Commission Directorate General Communication (2007). Special Eurobarometer 263. “Discrimination in the European Union.” Available at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_263_sum_en.pdf (Accessed February 20, 2007)

20 According to the Office of Immigration and Nationality, there were 24, 888 registered EU citizens living in Hungary as of December 31, 2006. This represents a huge increase in numbers. In 2002, for example, there were only 11,500 persons from other EU countries. See <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Profiles/display.cfm?ID=181> (Accessed February 15, 2007)

21 Ministry of Labor and Employment in Hungary (2005). Hungarian NGO projects for Raising the Employment Level. Budapest, page 7.

22 Interview with Menedek Director Andras Kovats, January 22, 2007.

23 <http://www.onkentes.hu> (Accessed February 15, 2007)

24 Andrea Szobolits (UNHCR), “Asylum in Hungary: Crisis averted but challenges emerging”, <http://www.unhcr.org/news/NEWS/428b09714.html> (Accessed January 24, 2007)

25 Margit Feischmidt and Pál Nyíri (eds.) “Nem kívánt gyerekek? Külföldi gyerekek magyar iskolákban” (Unwanted children? Migrants in Hungary’s public education system.) Budapest: Centre for International Migration and Refugee Studies, Institute for Political Sciences, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Sík Kiadó, Budapest: 2006.

State policies towards national and ethnic minorities in Hungary can be seen as a potential end point for other less established minorities in Hungary. In 1993, thirteen national and ethnic groups were officially recognised and they were granted the right to establish self-governments. These institutions were set up to deal mainly with cultural and educational issues but also to help enforce minority rights and represent the groups' interests to the state and society.²⁶ Minority self-government can be established in any settlement where at least 30 persons have declared their affiliation to a minority community. The local self-government must consist of 5 members and local governments must provide financial conditions for it to operate, with office space and utilities as set out in the law.²⁷ The law only covers minorities that are "historical" and "recognized", and since the inception of the law, the groups recognised have been the Bulgarian, Roma, Greek, Croatian, Polish, German, Armenian, Romanian, Ruthenian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovenian and Ukrainian minority groups.

In the 1990 census, 2% of the population declared they had a minority affiliation, this grew to 3% in the last 2001 census when asked about belonging to any of the thirteen listed national and ethnic minorities. Whilst self-governments can further integration and encourage greater civil engagement, greater social and economic integration through the self-governments has mainly been a characteristic action for the Roma minority. For the other minorities, self-governance is more a means for preserving cultural identities.²⁸

Due to funding problems and perhaps an over-emphasis on cultural activities, self-governments have sometimes been causes for disappointment. There have been certain problems with voting procedures. Before 2005, any Hungarian citizen was entitled to vote in elections for the minority governments, leading to situations whereby the minority self-government was actually chosen by the majority.²⁹ Good working relations with local government and the presence of external networks have seen as the key components for the success of self-governments, particularly amongst the German minorities and some Roma settlements.

Roma integration received much attention in the EU accession talks, and Hungary invested in numerous institutional innovations, strategic plans and dedicated programmes. According to some outside commentators, the Hungarian government and civil society has been more active than any other country in the region. However, the situation for the Roma minority has not improved in several areas and in others, it has gotten worse.³⁰ There is no space in this report to go into the complexities and causes, there are increasing numbers of substantive qualitative and quantitative studies on the situation of the Roma in central Europe.³¹ However, the rise in residential segregation has been increasingly referred to as a good indicator of the progress of both social inclusion and exclusion: settlements with a majority of Roma have increased from 540 in 1993 to 637 in 2003. Roma only areas are concentrated in the North-East and South-West parts of Hungary. In their 2003 study, which followed up on 1990 and 1971 studies, Kemeny and Janky found that overall segregation levels have remained unchanged,

26 The Act is available in English at <http://www.szmm.gov.hu/main.php?folderID=1414> (Accessed February 15, 2007)

27 A summary in English of the revisions of the law is available at <http://www.szmm.gov.hu/main.php?folderID=1414> (Accessed February 15, 2007)

28 For further discussion, see the collection edited by Kinga Gal (2002), 'Minority Governance in Europe', published by the Local Government and Public Reform Initiative in co-operation with the European Center for Minority Issues, Budapest. Available at http://lgi.osi.hu/publications_datasheet.php?id=213 (Accessed February 20, 2007)

29 To address some of these grievances the law was modified in 2005 to allow only registered minority persons to vote and to integrate the legal provisions concerning minorities in a clearer structure. For the elections in fall 2006, 200,000 persons registered themselves in the minority election register.

30 Dena Ringold, Mitchell Ohrenstein, Erika Wilkens (2005). Roma in an Expanding Europe. Breaking the Poverty Cycle. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Washington D.C. Can be downloaded at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTROMA/Resources/roma_in_expanding_europe.pdf

31 See for example the bibliography contained in the workshop report 'The Roma in Hungary: Socio-economic status, human rights protection, and migratory dynamics,' prepared by Angéla Kóczé, Center for Policy Studies, Central European University and available at <http://cps.ceu.hu/reports.php>

that fewer live in materially sub-standard special Roma settlements, but that more than half the Roma live in neighbourhoods where all or most of the neighbours are Roma.³²

The majority of substantive state programmes aimed at improving conditions for the Roma are organised under the Second National Development Plan, and in particular, the third priority “Renewal of society”.³³ The key targets identified are pre-school and primary education, combating residential segregation and developing those, especially rural areas, that suffer from multiple deprivation characterised by redundant heavy industry, high levels of unemployment and strong discrimination. An analysis of the bids accepted for project funding in the second NDP in 2006 shows that a significant number are concerned with the Roma.³⁴

4. Best Practices and the Europeanisation Problem

Significant bridging actions and networks between minorities are relatively rare in Hungary. Especially amongst the poorer in-coming groups, there are strong signs of a need to differentiate themselves from both other poorer immigrant and minority groups. For example, studies on ethnic Hungarians from Transylvania and refugees from Afghanistan have shown how newcomers try to avoid being placed, both physically and symbolically, in the same group as the Roma.³⁵

We have tried to argue that the character of minority integration in Hungary encompasses concerns that are different to countries with relatively long traditions of in-migration, such as the UK, or more recent experiences of large in-migration such as Spain and Italy. Some Hungarian NGOs argued that the best practice discourse tends to overly focus on the situation of minority integration in other parts of Europe. Larger funders were especially interested in promoting networking between migrant groups and the host country. This is despite the fact that the refugee community in Hungary is over-represented with single relatively young males from a wide array of countries. It has been the experience of the Hungarian Association of Refugees, for instance, that these people are less interested in community building and co-operation rather than dealing with their own individual problems.³⁶ A Europeanisation of migration discourse has meant that stakeholders translate European problems directly into a Hungarian context, with little articulation of the particular East-Central European context. The European debate on political participation of migrants, for example, has less relevance than addressing the impact of EU enlargement on relations with Hungarians in Ukraine or Serbia.

Despite these reservations towards identifying best practices, the following are some examples of projects that have been recommended as best practices by competent organisations unconnected to the lead institutions.

- Menedek: Alternative labour market skills education and practical work opportunities for Hungarian refugees granted refugee status”.

This was a two-year-project that was sponsored by the Human Resources Development Operative Program, finishing in January 2007. The goal was to create a model program that combined an educational

32 Kemeny Istvan, Janky Bela, Lengyel Gabriella (2004). “A Magyarországi Cigányság 1971-2003” Gondolat Kiadó, MTA Etnikai-Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet, Budapest.

33 The New Hungary Development Plan 2007-2013, Employment and Growth. Budapest, 2006. Can be downloaded in English at <http://www.nfu.gov.hu/index.nfh?r=&v=&l=&d=&mf=&p=umftartalom> (Accessed February 20, 2007)

34 Other historical minorities are absent from these lists, except when 18 million HUF was given to the Croatian local self-government in Molnar, which has applied for a project strengthening Croatian minority social worker’s and NGO’s resources and network development, to the benefit of the underprivileged part of the minority. HEFOP 2.2.1-06/1 – 2006.07-0027/4.0

35 Fox recorded instances where “Wallachian Gypsy!” was shouted at Hungarians from Romania whilst Klara Marton was told of incidents of Afghans being called Gypsy in schools.

36 Interview with Menedek Director Andras Kovats, January 22, 2007

and practical program to aid social and labour integration. Twenty refugees took part in a 15-month combined vocational training and language course. During the program these previously unemployed persons received a stipend, at the end 11 of the group found legal employment, whereas previous studies had found employment rates of only 30 percent amongst settled refugees.³⁷ The UNHCR, Budapest rated the project a potential best practice for other countries.³⁸ One issue is the relatively high costs of the project - over 70 million HUF (about 270,000 Euro), although its status as a pilot means that future costs of similar projects could be reduced.

- Awakening in the East Public Foundation: “Awakening the East”

Listed by the Ministry of Employment and Labour as a best practice and showcased in a pamphlet on NGO-involvement, the aim is to give a second chance to Roma youth who have not finished primary education. The program has a 90% success rate in terms of participants passing their final examination for a primary school certificate.

- Autonomia Foundation: “Poverty and Ethnicity”

The Foundation supports programs that mobilises the resources of the Roma community. In an external evaluation of seven foundations working on labour projects for Roma, this foundation was one of two who were rated as having “elements of good practice” in them, for instance long-term (more than one year) focusing and less administrative burdens.³⁹ In general, this study showed the negative record of many labor market programs, with little transparency, and questionable evaluations and in some cases, fostering dependency.

- Bagamer Association of Roma Leaders / Autonomia Foundation: Bagamer Horseradish Agricultural Program for Roma.

A 2005 World Bank study on Roma in Central and Eastern Europe, identified this project most favourably of the Hungarian projects. The local association of Roma Leaders obtained a grant from Autonomia Foundation to lend poor Roma families money to cultivate horseradish and eventually use the profit for land purchases. Half the grant needed to be repaid after harvest. In the first phase of the project in the late 1990s, 18 out of 19 families managed to repay the loan. Despite certain criticisms of the small scale and the methods for identifying beneficiaries, the project remained viable. Given favourable market conditions, success requires a fortuitous combination of circumstances, including enthusiastic leadership, a profound knowledge of the production process, conducive environmental conditions, and a sponsor that is ready to take risks.”⁴⁰

5. Conclusions

At present, minority integration is not a strong public policy issue in Hungary. The very small numbers of refugees has meant that both government and civic action are small scale, although as we have shown, there are signs of greater interest in integration policies. One danger is that current European discourse on integration focuses disproportionately on problems experienced in certain member states and that the resulting programmes have less relevance for the needs of new member states. At the same time, the increasing numbers of EU citizens choosing to settle in Hungary, in particular, in Budapest

37 Anna Balogi, András Kovács, and Dávid Simon (2006). Final Study on the Findings of the “Empirical Research into the Social Integration of Refugees”, Budapest, page 20.

38 Melita H Sunjic, spokesperson for UNHCR Budapest, interviewed by Budapest Sun, article accessible at <http://www.budapestsun.com/cikk.php?id=25760> (Accessed February 14, 2007)

39 Fleck Gábor, Messing Vera: Roma foglalkoztatási programok értékelése. Jelentés. November 2005

40 Dena Ringold, Mitchell Ohrenstein, Erika Wilkens (2005). Roma in an Expanding Europe. Breaking the Poverty Cycle. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Washington D.C.

might be significant. Their rights as EU citizens, their economic power and level of self-organisation creates a significant lobby which may help foster greater public, private and civic actions in favour of easier or deeper integration. A question is whether such benefits will be restricted solely to EU passport holders.

A second conclusion would be that for most Hungarians, greater minority integration is a Roma question, and here there are signs of both greater public/civic activity and greater exclusion. On this issue, assessing the importance of social capital for fostering greater integration is controversial. Certain patterns relating to educational or residential segregation, for example, have contributory actions from both the Roma and non-Roma communities. Undoubtedly there are different contexts of choice, but it would be a mistake to ignore the differentiation created by the differing uses of social capital. While minority self-governance offers some political representation and can act as an important bridging resource, where the social and economic problems are as great as they are for the Roma, such institutions are insufficient. One big question for the future is what impact of structural funds will have and whether they can radically improve at least the economic integration of the Roma in Hungary.

1. Tables

Table 1: Registered and recognised refugees in Hungary over the last five years, asylum grant number according to the Office for Immigration and Citizenship

Year	Registered refugees	Recognized refugees¹
2001	9 554	174
2002	6 412	104
2003	2 401	178
2004	1 600	149
2005	1 609	97
2006	2 117	99

Source: Bevandorlasi es Allampolgarsagi Hivatal at http://www.bevandorlas.hu/statisztikak_HUN_26.xls (2007.01.10)

Table 2: Citizenship of recognized refugees

Citizenship	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Iraq	46	33	13	5	15
Afghanistan	10	28	19	7	5
Serbia-Montenegro	9	19	18	7	0
Palestine	5	2	12	1	1
Iran	3	9	20	10	6
Other	31	87	67	67	72
Total	104	178	149	97	99

Source: http://www.bevandorlas.hu/statisztikak_HUN_26.xls

Table 3: D-type visa

Citizenship	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Romania	4,829	19,359	29,914	18,458	19,141
Ukraine	3,392	6,336	6,756	4,011	4,770
America	963	1,139	1,238	1,165	1338
Serbia-Montenegro	852	1,077	1,507	1,329	1552
Russia	459	467	400	412	695
China	196	384	912	777	1440
Other	6,691	13,772	7,406	4,559	5,584
Total	17,382	42,534	48,133	30,711	34,520

Source: http://www.bevandorlas.hu/statisztikak_HUN_25.xls

Table 4: The size and composition of the national ethnic minorities by three alternative methods (without Hungarian)

Recognised ethnic Groups	Nationality	Mother tongue	Spoken language
N	314 060	135 788	166 366
GYPSEY (Roma, Beas, Romani)	60.51	35.85	32.05
GERMAN	19.82	24.89	31.88
SLOVAKIAN	5.63	8.70	10.85
CROATIAN	4.97	10.56	8.89
RUMANIAN	2.55	6.25	4.94
UKRANIAN	1.61	3.60	2.72
POLISH	1.61	3.60	2.72
SERBIAN	1.22	2.50	2.52
SLOVENIAN	0.97	2.35	1.87
GREEK	0.80	1.41	1.19
BULGARIAN	0.43	0.96	0.67
RUSIN	0.35	0.82	0.64
ARMENIAN	0.20	0.22	0.18
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: Census 2001, data available at the Hungarian Statistical Office website <http://www.nepszamlalas.hu/hun/index.html>

The 2001 census used four questions to approach this topic: Nationality – “To which of these nationalities do you think you belong?”: Cultural identification – “With which of these nationalities’ cultural values and traditions do you feel affinity?”: Mother tongue – “What is your mother tongue?” and Spoken language – “In which language do you speak with family members or friends?”

(Footnotes)

1 Iraq, Afghanistan and Serbia were the three major origin countries of those receiving refugee status.