

*Pál Péter Tóth*

## **One Decade\***

(International Migration Affecting Hungary between  
1990 and 2000)

About two decades ago few people would have imagined that the system, which aimed at creating a world free of exploitation and promising material and intellectual progress, would collapse as the 20th century came to a close. Due to this transformation and parallel to the elimination of the Bolshevik-type power and political structure and institutional system, fundamental changes took place in the countries under the Soviet sphere of influence such as Hungary. The paper seeks to explore one aspect of these changes: the evolution of international migration in Hungary between 1990 and 2000 and its possible development in the near future.

However, this objective, due to deficiencies and the professional and methodological problems in this field, cannot be fully accomplished. The great migration wave that bore down on the country in the early 1990s and required quick arrangements, made it impossible for the institutions of international migration to develop gradually in accordance with the changing circumstances and for a staff of new attitude and qualification to take their place. Several problems also arise due to the inaccuracy of the migration data we have: the measuring of international migration and the gathering of related data is a more complex task than the investigation of other demographic factors. It covers both the movements of foreigners who arrive in Hungary and return home or travel to a third country, and that of Hungarians staying long-term abroad and than coming home.

### **1. International migration of Hungarian citizens between 1990 and 2000**

Following 1990, it was a legitimate demand that, parallel to the national research on foreign citizens who immigrate to Hungary, the migration of Hungarian citizens should also be examined. However, even though the attitude towards migration has changed, we still have no yearly data on the number of Hungarians who leave the country or return home.<sup>1</sup> Very few declare officially that they leave and we only

\* The study was prepared in the framework of National Research and Development Programme (NKFP) research project No. 5/0088/2002.

<sup>1</sup> According to Par. 2 of Article 26 of Act LXVI of 1992 on the Registration of Personal Data and Addresses of Citizens, the person who "leaves the territory of the Republic of Hungary with the intent of settling abroad or stays abroad for more than three months, shall make declaration on t

## Conditions of Minorities

know the number of those who renounce their Hungarian citizenship.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, it is impossible to assess the number of those who stay long-term abroad or who return home in a given year, since we only know about those who officially report their transfer. For this reason, we attempted to explore the international migration of Hungarian citizens with the help of foreign sources.<sup>3</sup>

From among the countries of Europe, Hungarians primarily emigrated to Austria and Germany prior to World War II. Besides these two, Holland, France, England and Italy, and, overseas, the USA and Canada were other important destination countries. The figures of the late 20th century indicate that these countries continue to attract Hungarian migrants. In the past years, more than 80 percent of Hungarian citizens registered abroad lived in Germany. It was followed by Austria, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Italy, and Holland. Even Belgium received between 720 and 1020 Hungarian immigrants per year during the 1990s. Their number is much lower in rest of the countries (*Table 1*).

Table 1.

Number of Hungarian nationals registered in European countries,  
1990–1999

Countries	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
	Registered Hungarians living in Europe									
	% N = 36 437	% N = 24 183	% N = 64 741	% N = 74 358	% N = 75 169	% N = 73 563	% N = 73 104	% N = 72 862	% N = 69 279	% N = 62 656
Austria	n. a.	43.65	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Azerbaijan	n. a.	n. a.	0.01	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Belgium	n. a.	3.11	n. a.	0.97	0.98	n. a.	1.22	1.30	1.39	1.63
Denmark	n. a.	n. a.	0.45	0.39	0.40	0.45	0.46	0.54	0.53	0.60
Finland	n. a.	1.27	0.58	0.52	0.51	0.55	0.57	0.56	0.66	0.81
France	7.92	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Germany	86.80	n. a.	87.12	82.62	82.74	78.84	79.33	77.88	80.41	83.04
Greece	2.43	n. a.	1.42	1.28	0.75	0.73	0.75	0.80	0.83	n. a.
Holland	n. a.	4.29	n. a.	1.59	1.65	1.54	1.55	1.60	1.84	2.24

<sup>2</sup> From among the Hungarian citizens who resided abroad for longer periods between 1990 and 2000 altogether 6,785 reported this to the mayor's office. The greatest number of declarations on intended emigration was submitted in 1990. The number of declarations fell in the years that followed, increased again after 1995, but following 1998 became negligible again (with only 332 declarations submitted in 2000).

<sup>3</sup> The figures on Hungarians who arrive in various countries with the intent to settle there will be examined with the help of the publication *Recent demographic developments in Europe 1999*. Council of Europe Publishing, 1992–1999. The handbook only includes data that were sent to the EU by the individual states. Accordingly, data is not or only sporadically available on the former Socialist countries and Austria. This is especially disturbing in the case of Austria where 1991 was not the only year when the number of Hungarian citizens exceeded 10,000.

## Conditions of Minorities

Countries	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
	Registered Hungarians living in Europe									
	% N = 36 437	% N = 24 183	% N = 64 741	% N = 74 358	% N = 75 169	% N = 73 563	% N = 73 104	% N = 72 862	% N = 69 279	% N = 62 656
Iceland	n. a.	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05	n. a.	0.06	0.07
Italy	2.73	4.76	2.25	1.81	2.62	2.70	2.95	3.26	3.81	n. a.
Liechtenstein	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Norway	n. a.	0.96	0.34	0.29	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.30	0.33	0.38
Portugal	0.10	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.15
Romania	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.04
San Marino	n. a.	0.00	n. a.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Slovenia	n. a.	0.22	0.09	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.07
Spain	n. a.	0.78	0.43	0.29	n. a.	0.28	0.30	0.32	0.43	0.57
Sweden	n. a.	13.05	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	4.38	4.17	4.04	4.22	4.71
Switzerland	n. a.	19.53	7.27	6.09	5.86	5.69	5.41	5.07	5.26	5.68
UK	n. a.	8.27	n. a.	4.03	3.99	4.35	2.74	4.12	n. a.	n. a.
<b>Europe total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

n. a.: No data is available in the source.

\* The Hungarians living in East Germany numbered 13,424 on 1 January 1990.

Source: Recent demographic developments in Europe. Council of Europe Publishing, 1992–1999.

The number of Hungarians registered abroad, after the instability of 1990 and 1991 – with moderate fluctuation between 1992 and 1999 – has been stable and balanced. Their number, after the figure of 64,741 in 1992, first increased significantly, by nearly 13 percent and then, by slightly more than 1 percent, rose above 75,000. After this peak in 1995, their number gradually decreased. Only the years 1998 and 1999 indicate considerable drops of nearly 10 percent. The changes were basically caused by the shifts in the number of Hungarians registered in Germany.

The figures on Hungarians immigrating into European countries are in *Table 2*. Not only the data of several countries (e.g. Austria, France, Italy, etc.) but also data on several years are missing in this case as well. Germany was the number one destination country. The proportion of Hungarians migrating there ranged from 84 to 95 percent. Their number was nearly 30,000 in 1993. Following that peak, the number of Hungarian immigrants to Germany dropped by more than 50 percent by 1998. In the meanwhile, the number of Hungarians immigrating to Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, Sweden, Romania, and, to a lesser extent, Finland, Poland, and Slovakia, hardly changed from one year to another. The number of those who migrated to Canada and the US (data from 1991) was far below that of the immigrants who chose Germany.

## Conditions of Minorities

Table 2

Number of Hungarians migrating to European countries, Israel, Canada, and the USA,  
1991–1998

Destination countries	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
	Number of immigrant Hungarians							
	% N = 20,971	% N = 1,346	% N = 30,049	% N = 27,768	% N = 21,350	% N = 22,293	% N = 19,927	% N = 14,249
Belarus	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.04
Belgium	0.05	7.28	0.42	n. a.	n. a.	0.74	1.03	1.49
Canada	3.54	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Croatia	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Czech Republic	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.09	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Denmark	0.57	5.94	0.42	0.55	0.50	0.83	0.81	1.24
Estonia	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	n. a.	0.02
Finland	0.45	4.46	0.06	0.14	0.10	0.19	0.27	0.58
Germany	79.89	n. a.	95.35	89.50	92.75	87.41	89.75	80.35
Greece	n. a.	n. a.	0.24	0.28	0.60	0.51	n. a.	n. a.
Holland	1.11	22.73	0.87	0.81	1.42	2.06	2.76	3.94
Iceland	0.04	0.30	0.04	0.03	n. a.	0.04	0.04	0.06
Israel	1.10	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Latvia	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.01	0.00	n. a.	n. a.	0.02
Lithuania	0.31	0.74	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	0.03	0.01
Luxembourg	0.15	3.64	0.13	0.21	0.30	0.36	0.35	0.48
Macedonia	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	0.01	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Moldavia	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Norway	0.14	2.82	0.18	0.17	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Poland	0.15	2.82	0.18	0.06	0.12	0.17	0.19	0.24
Romania	n. a.	7.88	0.30	0.22	1.31	0.46	1.76	2.92
Russia	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.01	0.00	n. a.	0.61
San Marino	0.01	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	n. a.	n. a.
Slovakia	n. a.	3.57	0.15	0.13	0.17	n. a.	0.19	0.22
Slovenia	n. a.	n. a.	0.01	0.01	n. a.	0.01	0.01	0.02
Spain	n. a.	n. a.	0.04	0.07	0.07	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Sweden	1.61	15.08	0.50	0.70	1.01	0.98	1.13	1.13
Switzerland	2.13	22.73	1.10	1.08	1.17	1.16	1.71	2.50
Ukraine	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.90	0.44	0.43	n. a.	n. a.
United Kingdom	1.43	n. a.	n. a.	5.04	n. a.	4.49	4.13	n. a.
USA	7.31	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

n. a.: No data is available in the source.

Source: Recent demographic developments in Europe 1999. Council of Europe Publishing, 1992–1999.

## Conditions of Minorities

The number of Hungarians who emigrated from European countries during the examined period shows considerable fluctuations (*Table 3*). In 1992, the number of emigrant Hungarians was nearly 50 percent lower as compared to 1991, while, in 1993, it grew almost fivefold as compared to 1992. In the years that followed, this number dropped from over 30,000 to 25,000 by 1996 and then, by 1998, to 18,000. As it was mentioned above, we have no information on what was the next destination of these migrants.

Table 3.

**Number of Hungarians emigrating form European countries, 1991–1998**

Country	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
	Number of emigrant Hungarians							
	% N = 9,919	% N = 5,508	% N = 26,433	% N = 30,638	% N = 26,328	% N = 25,124	% N = 20,307	% N = 18,207
Armenia	3.38	n. a.	1.27	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Belgium	n. a.	1.09	0.32	n. a.	n. a.	0.35	0.69	0.63
Croatia	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.01	n. a.	n. a.
Denmark	0.67	1.09	0.39	0.42	0.28	0.38	0.47	0.62
Estonia	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	n. a.	0.03	0.01	n. a.	n. a.
Finland	0.19	1.16	0.12	0.13	0.08	0.12	0.14	0.24
Germany	90.54	n. a.	81.82	83.55	85.56	76.97	89.39	83.92
Holland	1.05	3.01	0.69	0.45	0.67	0.94	1.13	1.52
Iceland	0.09	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.01	n. a.	0.04	n. a.
Latvia	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	n. a.	n. a.	0.01	0.03
Lithuania	0.03	0.11	0.00	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Luxembourg	0.08	0.15	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.11	0.35
Moldavia	n. a.	n. a.	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	n. a.
Norway	0.34	0.71	0.10	0.14	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Poland	0.15	0.16	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.03
Romania	n. a.	85.80	13.90	5.79	9.53	5.91	6.32	6.94
Russia	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.12	0.12	0.09	0.58
Slovakia	n. a.	0.33	0.05	0.03	0.03	n. a.	0.07	0.11
Slovenia	0.02	n. a.	0.02	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	0.01	n. a.
Sweden	0.78	2.11	0.35	0.60	0.52	0.49	0.67	0.37
Switzerland	2.68	4.27	0.82	0.77	0.65	0.91	0.81	1.38
Ukraine	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	2.76	2.43	2.55	n. a.	n. a.
United Kingdom	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.	5.22	n. a.	11.14	3.27	n. a.
<b>Europe total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

n. a.: No data is available in the source.

Source: Recent demographic developments in Europe 1999. Council of Europe Publishing, 1992–1999.

---

Conditions of Minorities

In 1998, a total of 14,249 Hungarian immigrants were registered in European countries (See *Table 2*). The number of migrants exceeded this by 3,958 in 1998. Both the place of origin of the Hungarians immigrating to the individual countries and the destination of those migrating on from among them is unknown. For this reason, it is impossible to establish the number of those who arrived from or left to Hungary and, naturally, we do not know the reasons of their immigration and further migration either. However, we can legitimately infer from other sources that, under the changed political circumstances, a part of those who emigrate from Western European countries returns to Hungary after having reached retirement age.

Overall, the migration data on Hungarian citizens indicate that Germany is preferred to other EU countries as a destination country. According to the situation on 1 January 1998, 55,700 Hungarian citizens lived there. One year later their number was only 52,029. The proportion of Hungarian citizens among the total number of foreigners living in Germany is a negligible 0.7 percent.<sup>4</sup> In 1998, 14,036 Hungarian citizens arrived in Germany. Considering that 12,805 Hungarian citizens emigrated from there in the same year, we receive a net migration of 1,231 to Germany for 1998. From among the foreigners living in Germany, 278,662 were granted citizenship in 1997, among them 911 Hungarian citizens. In 1998, the number of new Germany citizens increased to 291,331 but with only 652 Hungarian citizens being among them.<sup>5</sup>

In light of the data above, the curve of the Hungarian population registered on January 1 in European countries between 1990 and 1999 is like the segment of a slightly one-sided hill. As compared with 1990, their number grew by 26 percent by 1996 and then, until the end of the decade it gradually decreased again. Due to this drop, the total number of Hungarian citizens in the countries included in the table did not reach 63,000 on 1 January 1999. Furthermore, it is likely that, at the same date, the overall number of Hungarian migrants did not exceed 80,000 even if we add the Hungarian immigrants to Austria, Italy and Germany.<sup>6</sup> *In conclusion, based on the data gathered so far, one could assert that about 100,000 Hungarian citizens lived in the various countries of the world at the end of the 20th century.*

Let us now consider those who renounced their Hungarian citizenship (*Table 4*). It might be surprising to see that the transition to democracy and market economy did not bring about a change in the number of these people in the past years. Between 1960 and 2000 the number of those who renounced their Hungarian citizenship remained more or less the same from year to year. Following 1990, just as before, about 1,000 people renounced their Hungarian citizenship every year.

---

<sup>4</sup> The number of foreigners residing in Germany on 31 December 1998 was 7,319,500. One year later, on 31 December 1999 their number was 7,343,600.

<sup>5</sup> Statisches Bundesamt. Stat. Jahrbuch 2000. 65., 66., 80., 82.

<sup>6</sup> According to the data of *Arbeitsmarktservice Österreich*, the number of Hungarians employed in Austria was 9,632 in 1995, 9,164 in 1996, 8,865 in 1997, and 8,675 in 1998.

## Conditions of Minorities

Table 4.

Number of people who renounced their Hungarian citizenship,  
1990–2000<sup>7</sup>

Year	Number of people
1990	1,184
1991	436
1992	1,148
1993	2,084
1994	1,688
1995	1,413
1996	1,022
1997	887
1998	850
1999	778
2000	748
<b>1990–2000</b>	<b>12,238</b>

## 2. Foreign citizens staying long-term in Hungary between 1990 and 2000

From more than 150 countries of the world a total of 232,417 persons immigrated to Hungary between 1990 and 2000 (in the largest number in 1990 and the smallest in 1994). Following 1994, the number of immigrants increased from year to year with their numbers exceeding 20,000 in the last two years of the 1990s. During the same period 101,243 foreigners left the country. During the decade nearly 100,000 people were granted Hungarian citizenship: part of them arrived in Hungary before 1990, others during the examined period. People of refugee status numbered 5,208.

The data contained in *Table 5* are fundamental for migration research during the examined period. They reveal the number and proportion of total arrivals (immigrants and people of other status) and total departures (immigrants and people of other status) by country groups.<sup>8</sup> Among the arrivals and departures the citizens of neighbouring countries predominate. Furthermore, the number of those who leave the country for some reason is significant as compared to the arrivals. It is conspicuous that while in the case of neighbouring countries the proportion of departures in relation to the arrivals is 32.6 percent, it is close to or greater than 70 percent in the case of the other country groups.

<sup>7</sup> See: Tóth, Pál Péter, A nemzetközi vándormozgalom népességszám ot befolyásoló szerepéről [On the Impact of International Migration on the Population]. In: Schengen. A magyar–magyar kapcsolatok az Unió vízrendszer árnyékában. Budapest: Lucidus Kiadó, p. 203.

<sup>8</sup> We will refer to immigrant and other status foreign citizens arriving in and leaving the country as *arrivals* and *departures*.

## Conditions of Minorities

Table 5.

Number and proportion of arrivals and departures (foreign citizens)  
between 1990 and 2000

Groups of Countries	Arrivals		Departures	
	Number	%	Number	%
Neighbouring Countries	162,357	69.9	52,977	52.3
EU Member States	21,625	9.3	14,509	14.3
America	6,027	2.6	4,293	4.2
Other Countries	42,401	18.2	29,464	29.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>232,417</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>101,243</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Naturally, the net values of the migration affecting Hungary in the 1990s can be but partially established on the basis of the data above. Nevertheless, these figures are noteworthy. The balance of all arrivals and all departures is +131,174, and the balance is also positive in the case of every individual country group (ranging between +67.4 percent with respect to the citizens of neighbouring countries and +28.8 percent with respect to those of North American countries).

The percentage/year values of the arrivals indicate European predominance (Table 6). Their proportion exceeded 80 percent of all the arrivals, especially in the first half of the 1990s. It reached the lowest value in 1996–1997 (71.4 percent) but then it returned on the growth path and amounted to 85.5 percent by 2000. Looking at the examined years as a whole, 83.1 percent of all arrivals came from some European country with 69 percent from the neighbouring countries, 8.1 percent from the EU Member States, and 6 percent from other European countries. Only 3 percent came from the American continents, 12.3 percent arrived as citizens of Asian countries, and 1.2 percent came from Africa. Accordingly, altogether 16.5 percent of the arrivals came from outside Europe. (The proportion of people of unknown citizenship was 0.4 percent.)

Table 6.

Distribution of arriving foreign citizens by citizenship, 1990–2000

Country	Year of Entry											Immigration average (1990–2000)	Total
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000		
Austria	111	124	69	55	92	136	144	154	130	156	156	121	1,327
Belgium	17	33	20	19	27	27	23	33	28	32	47	28	306
Denmark	10	6	8	19	13	11	8	11	13	9	22	12	130
Finland	22	27	14	18	23	52	47	36	84	147	132	55	602



## Conditions of Minorities

Country	Year of Entry											Immigration average (1990-2000)	Total
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000		
France	73	60	73	79	91	110	173	189	181	195	188	128	1,412
Germany	533	439	312	314	427	443	579	641	677	820	785	543	5,970
Great-Britain	149	160	151	116	153	198	188	208	183	174	149	166	1,829
Greece	222	326	202	216	271	198	186	163	68	66	66	180	1,984
Holland	41	44	60	49	56	69	113	104	91	80	88	72	795
Ireland	8	4	6	10	10	12	17	13	12	13	22	12	127
Italy	54	81	66	73	82	80	88	73	77	95	99	79	868
Luxembourg	-	-	-	1	2	2	2	1	-	-	1	1	9
Portugal	9	3	1	1	4	7	6	3	8	5	5	5	52
Spain	16	17	8	4	23	17	16	14	12	17	16	15	160
Sweden	78	73	56	57	73	53	74	79	75	77	66	69	761
<b>EU Total</b>	<b>1,343</b>	<b>1,397</b>	<b>1,046</b>	<b>1,031</b>	<b>1,347</b>	<b>1,415</b>	<b>1,664</b>	<b>1,722</b>	<b>1,639</b>	<b>1,886</b>	<b>1,842</b>	<b>1,485</b>	<b>16,332</b>
Croatia	-	-	162	169	159	219	155	173	311	189	168	155	1,705
Romania	29,617	10,940	6,489	6,068	4,272	5,101	4,161	3,979	5,504	7,845	8,894	8,443	92,870
Slovakia	-	-	26	141	155	233	277	268	403	594	1,034	285	3,131
Ukraine	-	-	1,149	1,223	1,392	1,324	1,426	1,390	1,766	2,420	2,427	1,320	14,517
Yugoslavia	426	4,030	3,201	4,976	2,294	1,301	870	836	1,490	2,490	1,777	2,154	23,691
<b>Neighbouring c. Total</b>	<b>30,043</b>	<b>14,970</b>	<b>11,027</b>	<b>12,577</b>	<b>8,272</b>	<b>8,178</b>	<b>6,889</b>	<b>6,646</b>	<b>9,474</b>	<b>13,538</b>	<b>14,300</b>	<b>12,356</b>	<b>135,914</b>
Norway	17	13	2	19	54	128	112	110	120	145	181	82	901
Poland	760	191	240	238	257	307	221	199	152	62	75	246	2,702
Russia	-	-	373	322	368	525	517	371	504	431	311	338	3,722
Switzerland	24	36	32	37	39	32	42	57	53	79	75	46	506
Turkey	137	156	82	75	74	126	136	122	97	93	92	108	1,190
Other European	1,966	2,242	380	141	172	244	231	263	306	455	385	617	6,785
<b>Other European Total</b>	<b>2,904</b>	<b>2,638</b>	<b>1,109</b>	<b>832</b>	<b>964</b>	<b>1,362</b>	<b>1,259</b>	<b>1,122</b>	<b>1,232</b>	<b>1,265</b>	<b>1,119</b>	<b>1,437</b>	<b>15,806</b>
<b>Europe Total</b>	<b>34,290</b>	<b>19,005</b>	<b>13,182</b>	<b>14,440</b>	<b>10,583</b>	<b>10,955</b>	<b>9,812</b>	<b>9,490</b>	<b>12,345</b>	<b>16,689</b>	<b>17,261</b>	<b>15,277</b>	<b>168,052</b>
China	658	2,067	348	488	521	1,206	1,781	1,740	1,282	1,185	1,066	1,122	12,342
Israel	146	162	68	82	77	176	193	163	175	215	217	152	1,674
Japan	63	107	76	45	88	93	61	95	135	145	163	97	1,071
Mongolia	46	55	194	120	51	77	178	250	316	290	118	154	1,695
Syria	131	81	43	51	71	92	88	94	58	69	45	75	823
Vietnam	135	113	100	143	109	142	309	366	517	378	199	228	2,511
Other Asian	511	391	493	447	478	415	399	347	448	345	409	426	4,683
<b>Asia Total</b>	<b>1,690</b>	<b>2,976</b>	<b>1,322</b>	<b>1,376</b>	<b>1,395</b>	<b>2,201</b>	<b>3,009</b>	<b>3,055</b>	<b>2,931</b>	<b>2,627</b>	<b>2,217</b>	<b>2,254</b>	<b>24,799</b>
Canada	66	56	70	39	58	59	73	54	60	77	48	60	660
United States	460	431	347	319	444	469	525	411	444	441	365	423	4,656

## Conditions of Minorities

Country	Year of Entry											Immigration average (1990-2000)	Total
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000		
Other American	113	97	48	38	52	56	53	41	55	69	71	63	693
<b>America Total</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>6,009</b>
Libya	78	53	42	50	67	98	131	67	34	41	34	63	695
Other African	428	243	117	144	170	119	99	129	121	124	123	165	1,817
<b>Africa Total</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>2,512</b>
<b>Non-Europe Total</b>	<b>2,835</b>	<b>3,856</b>	<b>1,946</b>	<b>1,966</b>	<b>2,186</b>	<b>3,002</b>	<b>3,890</b>	<b>3,757</b>	<b>3,645</b>	<b>3,379</b>	<b>2,858</b>	<b>3,029</b>	<b>33,320</b>
Other and Unknown	117	113	67	66	55	51	32	36	62	83	65	68	747
<b>Total</b>	<b>37,242</b>	<b>22,974</b>	<b>15,195</b>	<b>16,472</b>	<b>12,824</b>	<b>14,008</b>	<b>13,734</b>	<b>13,283</b>	<b>16,052</b>	<b>20,151</b>	<b>20,184</b>	<b>18,374</b>	<b>202,119</b>

Table 6/a

## Distribution of arriving foreign citizens by citizenship, 1990-2000

Country	Year of Entry											Total
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	
Austria	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.2	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
Belgium	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Denmark	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
Finland	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.3
France	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.7
Germany	1.4	1.9	2.1	1.9	3.3	3.2	4.2	4.8	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.0
Great-Britain	0.4	0.7	1.0	0.7	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.9
Greece	0.6	1.4	1.3	1.3	2.1	1.4	1.4	1.2	0.4	0.3	0.3	1.0
Holland	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4
Ireland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Italy	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4
Luxembourg	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	0.0	0.0
Portugal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Spain	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Sweden	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4
<b>EU Total</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>8.1</b>
Croatia	-	-	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.6	1.1	1.3	1.9	0.9	0.8	0.8
Romania	79.5	47.6	42.7	36.8	33.3	36.4	30.3	30.0	34.3	38.9	44.1	45.9

## Conditions of Minorities

Country	Year of Entry											Total
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	
Slovakia	–	–	0.2	0.9	1.2	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.9	5.1	1.5
Ukraine	–	–	7.6	7.4	10.9	9.5	10.4	10.5	11.0	12.0	12.0	7.2
Yugoslavia	1.1	17.5	21.1	30.2	17.9	9.3	6.3	6.3	9.3	12.4	8.8	11.7
<b>Neighbouring c. Total</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>65.2</b>	<b>72.6</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>64.5</b>	<b>58.4</b>	<b>50.2</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>70.8</b>	<b>67.2</b>
Italy	–	–	2.5	2.0	2.9	3.7	3.8	2.8	3.1	2.1	1.5	1.8
Norway	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.4
Poland	2.0	0.8	1.6	1.4	2.0	2.2	1.6	1.5	0.9	0.3	0.4	1.3
Switzerland	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3
Turkey	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.6
Other European	5.3	9.8	2.5	0.9	1.3	1.7	1.7	2.0	1.9	2.3	1.9	3.4
<b>Other European Total</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>7.8</b>
<b>Europe Total</b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>86.8</b>	<b>87.7</b>	<b>82.5</b>	<b>78.2</b>	<b>71.4</b>	<b>71.4</b>	<b>76.9</b>	<b>82.8</b>	<b>85.5</b>	<b>83.1</b>
China	1.8	9.0	2.3	3.0	4.1	8.6	13.0	13.1	8.0	5.9	5.3	6.1
Israel	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.8
Japan	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.5
Mongolia	0.1	0.2	1.3	0.7	0.4	0.5	1.3	1.9	2.0	1.4	0.6	0.8
Syria	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.4
Vietnam	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.8	1.0	2.2	2.8	3.2	1.9	1.0	1.2
Other Asian	1.4	1.7	3.2	2.7	3.7	3.0	2.9	2.6	2.8	1.7	2.0	2.3
<b>Asia Total</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>12.3</b>
Canada	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.3
United States	1.2	1.9	2.3	1.9	3.5	3.3	3.8	3.1	2.8	2.2	1.8	2.3
Other American	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3
<b>America Total</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>3.0</b>
Libya	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
Other African	1.1	1.1	0.8	0.9	1.3	0.8	0.7	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.9
<b>Africa Total</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.2</b>
<b>Non-Europe Total</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>22.7</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>16.5</b>
<b>Other and Unknown</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

During the examined period, among all foreign arrivals, immigrants numbered nearly 15 percent less than those of some other status (*Table 7*).

There is a significant difference between the immigrants and those of some other status. A part of those who stay here long-term, if they comply with the conditions set out in the laws and regulations, may receive immigrant status. Most of them aim at receiving Hungarian citizenship, which necessarily involves employ-

## Conditions of Minorities

ment and a new way of living. As opposed to immigrants, this *element* of aspiring for Hungarian citizenship is missing from the life strategy of those foreign citizens who hold some other status. Among them we can find owners of institutions, companies, banks, plants and firms of mixed ownership and foreign interest, and a part of those who work in the country as foreign employees for shorter or longer periods. The missing *element* of aspiring for Hungarian citizenship is also seen in the fact that the proportion of arrivals from EU Member States and North America is significantly higher (18.2 percent) among those of other status than among the immigrants (2.2 percent). Due to geographic proximity and other reasons discussed above, the proportion of the citizens of neighbouring countries is also high among those of other status but not so considerably as among immigrants. Another significant difference is that while 59.6 percent of the immigrants were former citizens of Romania, their proportion was less than 30 percent among those of other status.

Table 7.

**The number of foreign citizens of immigrant  
and other status and their proportion in relation to the number of all arrivals,  
1990–2000**

Country Group	Arrivals Total	Immigrant		Other Status	
		Number	%	Number	%
Neighbouring countries	162,357	95,886	59.1	66,471	40.9
EU Member States	21,625	2,617	12.1	19,008	87.9
America	6,034	371	6.2	5,663	93.8
Other Countries	42,401	8,346	19.7	34,055	80.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>232,417</b>	<b>107,220</b>	<b>46.1</b>	<b>125,197</b>	<b>53.9</b>

The proportion of arrivals of other status fluctuated significantly by country groups. However, there is a clear difference between arrivals from the neighbouring states and the rest of the world in this case as well. This is manifest, first, in the fact that the proportion of immigrants vs. other status individuals arriving from neighbouring countries is 51.9 percent and 40.9 percent respectively. And, second, in the fact that 96.6 percent of all immigrants are arrivals from neighbouring states. However, this is not the full story. According to the data, the majority of foreign citizens of other status who arrive here to stay long-term are also citizens of the neighbouring countries. The reason is that former Hungarian citizens and their descendants, that is, people who consider themselves ethnic Hungarians also live in these countries, in territories annexed to them following WWI and WWII. Due to the changed political circumstances, it was therefore natural that a part of those who emigrated from the neighbouring countries chose Hungary, the mother country, as their destination.

As indicated above, 69.9 percent (162,357 people) of the foreigners entering Hungary during the examined period arrived from the neighbouring countries,

---

Conditions of Minorities

with the overwhelming majority of them being Hungarian.<sup>9</sup> This means that, contrary to the typical pattern, most of the immigrants to Hungary belong to the same ethnic population, speak the same language, and cherish the same culture and traditions that the majority population. Accordingly, the majority of the immigrants arrive not to an unknown state of different language, culture and history but, in a way, migrate to a different spot within their former “homeland”. This is a fundamental characteristic of international migration directed to Hungary.

Among the neighbouring countries, as it is well known, Romania holds the largest ethnic Hungarian community.<sup>10</sup> This is manifest in the proportions of those arriving from the neighbouring states: 62 percent of them used to be Romanian citizens. They are followed by those from the former Soviet Union (17.7 percent), the former Yugoslavia (17.5 percent), and the former Czechoslovakia (2.8 percent). The proportion of those from Romania is significant even when they are compared with the number of total arrivals. Their predominance was most evident in 1990, when they made up 76.6 percent of all arrivals. After that their proportion decreased – primarily due to the increasing number of those arriving from Yugoslavia because of the war –, but it still ranged between 32 percent (in 1997) and 46.9 percent (in 1991).

After the low point in 1997, the proportion of those arriving from Romania in relation to the number of all arrivals increased again and it reached 43.3 percent in 2000. We can expect the same trend to continue and it is quite probable that the ethnic Hungarian immigrants coming from Romania will remain the largest group of foreign citizens entering Hungary.

The ratio of the sexes is balanced among the arrivals and the foreigners staying in Hungary but, in both cases, there has been a gradual increase in the proportion of women. In the first half of the decade, there were more men among them. Following 1995, the 7–10 percent advantage of men eroded and, as a result, their proportion was only 1.6 percent greater than that of women in 2000. This was due to the higher proportion of males among the arrivals coming from non-neighbouring countries – the proportion of women among those coming from neighbouring countries is 1.6 percent greater than that of men (in other words, their male-female ratio is 49.2–50.8 percent). This basically corresponds to the male-female ratio of those arriving from Romania. Examining the male-female ratio of the foreigners living in Hungary, the gradual decrease of the males resulted in a 2.6 percent majority of women by 2001. This means that, while the male-female ratio was 1000 to 728 among the foreigners living in Hungary at the beginning of the 1990s, it was 1,000 to 886 in 1995, 1,000 to 936 in 2000, and 1,000 to 1,054 in 2001.

---

<sup>9</sup> In the study we regard Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union, all disintegrating in the 1990s, as “unified”.

<sup>10</sup> According to the 2001–2002 censuses, 520,528 ethnic Hungarians were living in Slovakia (2001), 40,583 in Austria (2001), 16,596 in Croatia (2001), 6,243 in Slovenia (2002), 293,207 in Serbia and Montenegro (2002), 151,516 in Ukraine (2002), and 1,434,377 in Romania (2002).

---

Conditions of Minorities

There is a significant, 9 percent difference between the two groups of arrivals (immigrant and other status) with respect to the male-female ratio: the share of men among the immigrants is 47.4 percent and, among those of other status, is 56.4 percent.

The distribution of arrivals by age is favourable. The share of the 0–19 age group is 24.3 percent, that of the 20–59 age group is 66.8, and those above 60 make up 8.9 percent of the arrivals. The largest group, 63.9 percent of the total, consisted of people between 15 and 39. In the breakdown by sex, this same age group formed the majority again: 64 percent of all men and 63.6 percent of all women belonged to this group. Among men the 30–39 age group stands out with 21 percent, among women the 20–24 age group with 20.4 percent. Among all the arrivals the 30–39 age group has the largest share with 19.3 percent. The distribution by age for men and women is different in the case of arrivals from neighbouring countries and those from EU Member States. In these cases the proportion of the various age groups – with the exception of the 40–49 and 50–59 groups – was above 10 percent. For example, in 1990, the 0–14 and 60+ age groups made up 28.2 percent and 18.8 percent of the arrivals respectively. These proportions dropped to 4–8 percent by the mid-1990s but then took an upturn again. The proportion of those in the 60+ age group increased primarily among those arriving from Romania and Ukraine. Since those in this age group generally do not migrate by themselves, we can talk about a “practice” of secondary migration: they migrate to follow their children. Although the 0–14 age group only made up 7.7 percent of all the arrivals in 2000, the proportion for the next age groups was 10 percent or more. The proportion of those above 50 has been increasing since 1997. As compared to the mid-1990s, their proportion doubled and exceeded the 11 percent of all arrivals in the last two years of the decade. Examining the distribution of the arrivals by sex and age, we find each year that the proportion of women was higher than that of men until the age 24. Between 25 and 49 men dominated, while the share of women was greater by a few percentage points among the 50+ group. The mean age of arrivals has been fluctuating in function of the shifts described above. The mean age of men has been above 30 since 1992 and that of women since 1993. The mean age of men rose above 33 in 1994 and that of women in 1996. The mean age was 33.3 years in 2000.

The age structure of immigrants is slightly different from that of all arrivals: the proportion of young people is higher among them (26 percent of the immigrants belong to the 0–19 age group and, from this, the share of those between 0 and 14 is 17.2 percent). The 60+ age group makes up 12.1 percent and the 20–59 age group 61.9 percent of the immigrant arrivals. Among immigrants the proportion of the 20–29 age group is the highest with 29.6 percent. In the case of both sexes, and also when taken together, most people belong to those between 20 and 24. In so far as the age distribution of male immigrants is concerned, we could hardly get better proportions than these. Among them the share of the 0–19 age group is 26.7 percent, that of the 20–59 is 61.6 percent, and that of the

---

Conditions of Minorities

60+ is 11.7 percent. Although the proportion of the young is slightly higher (by 0.7 percent) and that of the old is slightly lower (by 0.4 percent) than in the case of all the immigrants, this does not significantly influence the age distribution of all the immigrants. As compared with men, the proportion of women is 1.4 percent lower under the age of 19, and 0.7 percent higher above the age 60. These figures, together with those that indicate the increasing proportion of women in the total population, indicate the deterioration of the population's distribution by age.

When the age distribution of immigrants and that of the arrivals of other status is compared, we find that among these latter the proportion of younger people is higher (23.8 percent), and that of the older is lower (5.3). This means that the proportion of those in the 20–59 age group can exceed 70 percent among them – as opposed to the 61.9 percent of the immigrants. In the case of the arrivals of other status the age groups with a ratio over 10 percent expand especially among the men. 68.2 percent of men and 68.1 percent of women belong to the 15–39 age group. However, if only men's age distribution is examined among the arrivals of other status, the proportion of the 0–19 age group is 21.4 percent, and that of the 60+ age group is only 4.3 percent. The proportion of the economically active age group is 74.3 percent. All in all, the age distribution of the arrivals of other status is more favourable than that of the immigrants, which can be explained by the fundamental difference in the purpose of their migration.

The distribution of entering foreign citizens by family status is known only for the period between 1995 and 2000. Consequently we only analyse the data of 97,412 people. The most important trend of the examined 6 years is that the proportion of unmarried people increased both among men and women. The proportion of unmarried men increased from 46.5 percent in 1995 to over 52 percent. In the case of women, the proportion of the unmarried went from 42.5 percent to 48.1 percent by the end of the decade. Parallel to this, the proportion of married men dropped significantly from 50.7 percent to 44.4 percent and that of married women from 49.5 to 45.3 percent. The proportion of widows and the divorced stagnated with the difference that generally there are six times more widows than widowers and the proportion of divorced men is also much lower than that of divorced women. (Table 8).

Table 8 contains the data on the distribution of foreign arrivals by sex and profession. In the case of men the proportion of construction industry workers, in the case of women the proportion of students is the highest. When the two sexes are considered together, students dominate by 19.5 percent. This is especially so when we also add the university and college students (3.4 percent). Students are followed by *industrial and construction industry professions* (15.4 percent) and *professions requiring higher education qualification* (11.4 percent), the *unemployed* (7.9 percent) and *professions not requiring special skills* (6.8 percent). *Agricultural and sylvicultural professions* (0.4 percent), *machine operators, mechanics, drivers* (0.8 percent), *university and college students* (3.4 percent), and *homemakers* (3.8 percent) are present in small proportions.

# 7 MINORITIES RESEARCH

## Conditions of Minorities

Table 8.

Distribution of foreign arrivals by sex and profession

Profession	Men	Women	Together
Legislators, administrative and business executives	8.9	3.7	6.5
Professions requiring higher education qualification	11.4	11.3	11.4
Other professions requiring higher or secondary education qualification	4.5	5.9	5.1
Office and management professions	5.1	6.8	5.9
Services	5.1	5.8	5.4
Agricultural and sylvicultural professions	0.4	0.2	0.4
Industrial and construction industry professions	20.4	9.6	15.4
Machine operators, mechanics, drivers	1.3	0.1	0.8
Professions not requiring special skills	7.2	6.2	6.8
Unemployed	4.8	11.5	7.9
Homemakers	1.5	6.3	3.8
Retired	4.9	6.6	5.7
University and college students	3.4	3.4	3.4
Other student	19.1	20.0	19.5
Unknown	1.7	2.1	1.9

When certain units at the professions' list are merged, besides the clear predominance of the *unemployed, dependant* category (34.6 percent), the joint proportion of *professions requiring higher education qualification* and *industrial and construction industry professions* also becomes significant (41.7 percent). Beyond them, the categories of *legislators, administrative and business executives* and the *professions not requiring special skills* also have a share over 6 percent each year. It is to note that the proportion of *agricultural and sylvicultural professions* is below 0.5 percent. The proportion of the *unemployed, dependant* category is high and includes 50.3 percent of the women and 34.8 of the men. Within the *unemployed, dependant* category, *homemakers* constitute 3.8 percent, the *retired* 5.7 percent and the *students* in primary, secondary and tertiary education 19.5 percent.

Let us look at the distribution of professions that account for the lowest proportions by sex. With the exception of the *homemakers* and the *legislators, administrative and business executives*, we can find the same professions in the case of both sexes, though not in the same order: *agricultural and sylvicultural professions, machine operators, mechanics, drivers, university and college students*, and unknown. The *homemaker* category does not figure in the case of men, and the category of *legislators, administrative and business executives* is not among women's professions. Apart from these two, the other proportions coincide. Looking at the most frequent professions, they follow each other in a different order. Among men *industrial and construction industry professions* are first followed by *other students*, among women *other students* comes first followed by *unem-*



---

Conditions of Minorities

ployed. Professions requiring higher education qualification come third in the case of both sexes. This is followed by *legislators, administrative and business executives* and *professions not requiring special skills* in the case of men and by *industrial and construction industry professions* and *office and management professions* in the case of women. All those taken together who have a profession that presumably required a university or a college degree constitute 28.2 percent of men and 24.3 percent of women, which are rather significant values for both sexes. The proportion of the retired began to increase after 1998 and, after having been around 5–6 percent, it was close to 9 percent in 2000. This trend is expected to continue in the following years and, together with the similar processes in Hungary, further damage the ability of the working population to support the others.

Naturally, the patterns of distribution by profession among immigrants do not significantly differ from that of the all arrivals although there are characteristic shifts in their case. Among immigrants, the proportion of *professions requiring higher education qualification* plus the *professions requiring higher or secondary education qualification* make up 21.7 percent. The *industrial and engineering industry professions* have a share of 15.8 percent and the *unemployed, dependant* category 44.6 percent. Primarily students (among them primary school students) and retired people belong in the latter category. *Office and management professions* make up 5.9 percent and the people working in the *tertiary sector* 4.9 percent. The proportion of those in the *agricultural and sylvicultural professions* is insignificant: 0.5 percent. Looking at the professions' distribution by sex, the greatest shift concerns the *unemployed* and the *industrial and construction industry professions*. 49.7 percent of women and 39.1 percent of men belong in these categories. In *industrial and construction industry professions* the proportion of men is 22.6 percent, that of women is 9.6 percent.

Among the people of other status the proportion of *professions requiring higher education qualification* plus the *professions requiring higher or secondary education qualification* make up 18.4 percent. The *industrial and engineering industry professions* have a share of 14 percent and the *unemployed, dependant* category 40.2 percent. The 8.2 percent of *legislators, administrative and business executives* is also significant. The male-female ratio in the case of these categories is as follows: there are much less men in the *unemployed, dependant* category, while their proportion is moderately higher among *legislators, administrative and business executives*. Among the people of other status, as compared to men, the proportion of women is considerable in the *unemployed, dependant* category (52.5 percent). It is a plausible explanation that many of them stay in Hungary as wives of men of similar status. The difference in the proportion of men and women is also significant in *senior professions requiring higher education qualification*: it is 24.4 percent to 1.7 percent, respectively.

There are characteristic differences in the territorial distribution of immigrants and people of other status. While the majority of the latter (58.4 percent) settled in Central Hungary, the proportion of immigrants does not reach this percentage in

## 7 MINORITIES RESEARCH

---

### Conditions of Minorities

any of the regions. Their presence is relevant in Central Hungary and in the Southern Great Plain, although their combined proportion in these two regions is still only 55.6 percent. The divergence in the territorial distribution of the two groups can be explained by their substantially different place at the labour market: the presence of the overwhelming majority of the people of other status is clearly connected to the areas more developed in terms of industry, services, and commercial activity.

#### 3. Foreign citizens who remigrate or migrate on

Between 1990 and 2000, a total of 101,243 foreign citizens (43.6 percent of the arrivals) left Hungary and returned home or migrated on to a third country. Some of them arrived during the examined period, others before that. Their decision to migrate on is a natural phenomenon. We have no information on how these two groups (immigrants, those of other status) related to each other and, based on the data available, the reason of their departure cannot be established either. As mentioned above, the two groups of arrivals entered the country with different, easily discernible objectives in mind. This difference had an impact on how many decided to migrate on from the two groups. According to the data, there is a clear and definite difference between the remigration or further migration of the immigrants and the people of other status. Among the immigrants, only 1.1 percent gave up their original plans. With the exception of the citizens of EU Member States (13.3 percent of them migrated on), the number and proportion of those who changed their original plans is negligible (though it is to note that the number of people of immigrant status was insignificant among the citizens of Asian, African and American countries). Those were the most persevering in sticking to their plans who arrived from the neighbouring countries: only 0.7 percent gave up their goals. This cannot be by chance. We pointed out above that most of them were ethnic Hungarians and migrated to Hungary to become Hungarian citizens. The majority of immigrant status terminations were registered between 1990 and 1997 and concerned primarily German (326) and Romanian (697) citizens. In the case of Romanian citizens this means that only 1.1 percent of them changed their plans during the 1990s.

In the case of immigrants it is to be pointed out that 24.8 percent of those who remigrated from among them belonged in the 0–19 age group, and 7.6 percent to the 60+ age group (their proportion is similar among immigrants). In the case of the young people the difference is not significant, it is only 2.8 percent, but it is 18.1 percent in the case of the elderly. Although this increases the mean age of the population, it does not cause problems because the number of those who migrate on from among the immigrants is negligible.

Those who remigrate have a more proportionate distribution by profession as compared with the whole of the immigrant group (with the exception of the category of *legislators, administrative and business executives*). Their distribution by region had a balanced pattern in the country (ranging from 9.7 to 15 percent), except in the Central Hungarian region, from where 29.9 percent of all immigrants left.

## Conditions of Minorities

Based on the remigration and further migration data of foreign citizens of other status, they seem a very mobile group as compared with the immigrants. Nearly 80 percent of them left Hungary during the examined period (*Table 9*). There is no information on how many of them arrived before or during this period. Their mobility, as against the immigrant group, is independent of the country groups. The greatest difference (11.6 percent) is seen between the citizens of EU member states and the other countries of the world. It is conspicuous that the migration pattern of people of other status arriving from the neighbouring countries is not different from that of the other country groups. This indicates that a part of the citizens of the neighbouring countries arrive not with a long-term strategy of settling and moving here but with that of being employed in Hungary. The reasons why 80 percent of the people of other status remigrated or migrated on between 1990 and 2000 were: the unpredictability of the transformation of the structure of Hungary's economy, the instability of the transition, the changing demand of the labour market and its quick, fundamental transformation.

*Table 9.*

**Arrivals of other status and the number and proportion of those who migrate on, 1990–2000**

Country group	People of other status	Departures from among the people of other status	
	Number	Number	%
Neighbouring countries	66,471	52,279	78.6
EU Member States	19,008	14,161	74.5
America	5,663	4,285	75.7
Other countries	34,055	29,315	86.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>125,197</b>	<b>100,084</b>	<b>79.9</b>

The distribution of the departing people of other status by age leads us to the same conclusions as in the case of the immigrants. Among those who left, the 0–19 age group had a share of 4.6 percent, which is 15.2 percent less than in the case of the people of other status category, while the 60+ age group had a share of 43.2 percent, which is 22 percent more than their proportion among all foreign citizens of some other status. The distribution of the departing people of other status by profession is similar to that of the arrivals of similar status, and the territorial distribution of the two groups is much the same as well.

#### 4. Foreigners living in Hungary

The data on foreigners staying in Hungary is analysed next. Their number, irrespective of when they arrived – is always indicated as of 1 January. That is, we examine those foreigners who stayed in Hungary in the year preceding it.

## Conditions of Minorities

According to the data of 1 January 1993, 123,184 foreign citizens stayed in Hungary in 1992 (*Table 10*). We have no data on the number of foreigners living here from earlier years, so 1992 will be considered the base year. The number of foreigners staying here increased by 5.8 percent by 1993 and the increase continued over the years but its pace slowed down. With the exception of one year, 1997, when the rate of increase was 3.9 percent, the number of foreigners grew by 1.2 to 1.7 percent per year. The total increase between 1992 and 1999 was 19.6 percent, with the number of foreigners living in Hungary exceeding 150,000 by 1999. However, in 2000, their number dropped by 28 percent (–43,097 people) in relation to 1999. The explanation of this significant difference is that everybody whose residence permit expired as of 1 January 2001 was deleted from the database. Accordingly, after 1 January 2001 only the people holding a valid residence permit figured in the database. They numbered 110,028 people.<sup>11</sup>

*Table 10.*

**Number of foreign citizens living in Hungary and their distribution by sex, 1993–2001**

Year	Number of foreign citizens			Distribution of foreign citizens (%)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1993	71,287	51,897	123,184	57.9	42.1	100.0
1994	69,256	61,454	130,710	53.0	47.0	100.0
1995	73,210	64,891	138,101	53.0	47.0	100.0
1996	74,382	65,572	139,954	53.1	46.9	100.0
1997	77,476	65,030	142,506	54.4	45.6	100.0
1998	79,295	68,968	148,263	53.5	46.5	100.0
1999	77,834	72,411	150,245	51.8	48.2	100.0
2000	79,101	74,024	153,125	51.7	48.3	100.0
2001	53,578	56,450	110,028	48.7	51.3	100.0

The citizens of neighbouring countries predominated every year the category of foreigners staying in Hungary. Their proportion fluctuated between 58 and 62 percent. At the same time, the proportion of the citizens of EU Member States was between 4.8 and 11.7. 1997 was a turning point as regards the presence of EU citizens in Hungary: their proportion jumped from 5–7 percent to 10–11 percent. Among the foreign citizens staying in Hungary, the citizens of Asian countries made up the largest chunk of the people arriving from countries outside Europe (*Table 11*). In 1996, their total proportion exceeded 10 percent of all the foreigners staying in Hungary. Their proportion rose above 12 percent in 1997 and has remained there ever since. The proportion of the citizens of American and African countries is not significant: it never exceeded 3 percent and 2 percent, respectively.

<sup>11</sup> Nobody examined what happened to the deleted 43,097 people. Most of them probably had left the country but there might have been others who had not been deleted before due to some administrative mistake. Others might have stayed on in Hungary without having their residence permit extended.

## Conditions of Minorities

Table 11.

Distribution of foreign citizens living in Hungary by citizenship,  
1995–2001

Country	Year of residence						
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Austria	616	694	872	1,031	990	1,053	694
Belgium	113	143	174	196	214	221	113
Denmark	41	62	77	82	100	104	41
Finland	100	134	187	224	253	303	243
France	364	443	611	771	956	1,036	511
Germany	2,289	3,087	3,505	8,985	9,396	9,631	7,493
Great Britain	631	760	955	1,140	1,317	1,378	624
Greece	1,362	1,588	1,810	1,972	1,925	1,903	710
Holland	191	264	374	472	568	585	324
Ireland	22	37	61	77	92	97	38
Italy	514	568	655	734	752	793	542
Luxembourg	3	5	6	8	7	7	5
Portugal	28	31	39	40	45	50	22
Spain	54	79	96	106	112	119	64
Sweden	319	383	469	530	604	627	299
<b>EU Total</b>	<b>6,647</b>	<b>8,278</b>	<b>9,891</b>	<b>16,368</b>	<b>17,331</b>	<b>17,907</b>	<b>11,723</b>
Croatia	305	532	688	995	1,069	1,162	917
Romania	68,439	65,705	61,579	62,130	57,357	57,343	41,561
Slovakia	231	461	600	1,110	1,571	1,717	1,576
Ukraine	3,501	4,432	5,625	7,733	9,898	11,016	8,947
Yugoslavia	6,213	15,492	14,884	14,116	9,916	10,943	8,623
<b>Neighbouring c. Total</b>	<b>78,689</b>	<b>86,622</b>	<b>83,376</b>	<b>86,084</b>	<b>79,811</b>	<b>82,181</b>	<b>61,624</b>
Norway	77	172	310	411	521	573	607
Poland	4,628	4,521	4,297	4,471	4,386	4,144	2,279
Russia	277	1,124	1,708	2,624	2,809	3,002	1,893
Switzerland	186	211	265	306	373	422	330
Turkey	483	560	660	760	791	820	455
Other European	31,930	20,923	20,051	12,927	18,062	16,735	14,286
<b>Other European c. Total</b>	<b>37,581</b>	<b>27,511</b>	<b>27,291</b>	<b>21,499</b>	<b>26,942</b>	<b>25,696</b>	<b>19,850</b>
<b>Europe Total</b>	<b>122,917</b>	<b>122,411</b>	<b>120,558</b>	<b>123,951</b>	<b>124,084</b>	<b>125,784</b>	<b>93,197</b>
China	3,469	4,276	6,639	7,809	8,306	8,861	5,819
Israel	518	619	890	1,030	1,177	1,186	781
Japan	314	394	479	547	656	706	431
Mongolia	528	562	700	864	1,071	1,227	738
Syria	679	703	821	894	909	906	583

## 7

## MINORITIES RESEARCH

## Conditions of Minorities

Country	Year of residence						
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Vietnam	1,276	1,323	1,596	1,839	2,193	2,447	1,893
Other Asian	2,851	3,542	3,879	3,731	3,931	3,993	2,358
<b>Asia Total</b>	<b>9,635</b>	<b>11,419</b>	<b>15,004</b>	<b>16,714</b>	<b>18,243</b>	<b>19,326</b>	<b>12,603</b>
Canada	277	329	390	452	475	507	235
United States	1,700	2,008	2,420	2,835	3,132	3,261	1,636
Other American	918	860	912	923	905	909	617
<b>America Total</b>	<b>2,895</b>	<b>3,197</b>	<b>3,722</b>	<b>4,210</b>	<b>4,512</b>	<b>4,677</b>	<b>2,488</b>
Libya	402	484	654	720	721	694	204
Other African	1,679	1,726	1,834	1,939	1,873	1,865	1,029
<b>Africa Total</b>	<b>2,081</b>	<b>2,210</b>	<b>2,488</b>	<b>2,659</b>	<b>2,594</b>	<b>2,559</b>	<b>1,233</b>
<b>Non-Europe Total</b>	<b>14,611</b>	<b>16,826</b>	<b>21,214</b>	<b>23,583</b>	<b>25,349</b>	<b>26,562</b>	<b>16,324</b>
<b>Other and Unknown</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>812</b>	<b>779</b>	<b>507</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>138,101</b>	<b>139,954</b>	<b>142,506</b>	<b>148,263</b>	<b>150,245</b>	<b>153,125</b>	<b>110,028</b>

Table 11/a

Distribution of foreign citizens living in Hungary by citizenship,  
1995–2001 (%)

Country	Year of residence						
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Austria	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6
Belgium	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Denmark	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Finland	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
France	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.5
Germany	1.7	2.2	2.5	6.1	6.3	6.3	6.8
Great Britain	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.6
Greece	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	0.6
Holland	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3
Ireland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Italy	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Luxembourg	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Portugal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Spain	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Sweden	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3
<b>EU Total</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>10.7</b>
Croatia	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8
Yugoslavia	4.5	11.1	10.4	9.5	6.6	7.1	7.8
Romania	49.6	46.9	43.2	41.9	38.2	37.4	37.8

## Conditions of Minorities

Country	Year of residence						
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Slovakia	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.4
Ukraine	2.5	3.2	3.9	5.2	6.6	7.2	8.1
<b>Neighbouring c. Total</b>	<b>57.0</b>	<b>61.9</b>	<b>58.5</b>	<b>58.1</b>	<b>53.1</b>	<b>53.7</b>	<b>56.0</b>
Norway	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.6
Poland	3.4	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.1
Russia	0.2	0.8	1.2	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.7
Switzerland	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3
Turkey	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4
Other European	23.1	14.9	14.1	8.7	12.0	10.9	13.0
<b>Other European c. Total</b>	<b>27.2</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>18.0</b>
<b>Europe Total</b>	<b>89.0</b>	<b>87.5</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>82.6</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>84.7</b>
China	2.5	3.1	4.7	5.3	5.5	5.8	5.3
Israel	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.7
Japan	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4
Mongolia	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.7
Syria	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5
Vietnam	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.7
Other Asian	2.1	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.1
<b>Asia Total</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>12.6</b>	<b>11.5</b>
Canada	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2
United States	1.2	1.4	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.1	1.5
Other American	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
<b>America Total</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>
Libya	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.2
Other African	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2	0.9
<b>Africa Total</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.1</b>
<b>Non-Europe Total</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>14.8</b>
<b>Other and Unknown</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

At first, the distribution of foreigners living in Hungary by sex showed a clear prevalence of men. In 1992, their proportion was nearly 58 percent with that of women being slightly more than 42 percent. With the exception of the last two years, the predominance of men endured, although to a decreasing proportion. In the early 1990s the difference was greater than 15 percent, it dropped to 7 percent by 1997 and to 3.4 percent by 1999. After that, their proportion not only balanced but also tipped toward women by 2000, who were in a majority by 2.6 percent that year. Resulting from these changes, the male-female ratio among the foreigners living in Hungary went from 1,000 to 728 to 1,000 to 1,054 by the end of the decade.

## 7 MINORITIES RESEARCH

---

### Conditions of Minorities

Looking at the distribution of foreigners living in Hungary by sex, not in general but by country groups, the period between 1994 and 1996 indicates male predominance among the citizens of the EU Member States. After that, the proportion of women exceeded that of men although by 1–2 percent only. In the case of the neighbouring countries, 1998 was the turning point in this respect. As of 1 January 1999, the male-female ratio was basically balanced, but women became the majority by 2000. When looking at the distribution of those arriving from Asian countries by sex, a completely different picture opens up. In their case we can see a twofold or somewhat higher male predominance in each of the years. This is even more like this in the case of the citizens of African countries: the number of men was four or five times higher than that of women. There was male prevalence among the citizens of American countries as well but, apart from the last two years, its extent was not significant.

The age composition is another important demographic characteristic of the group of foreigners living in Hungary. The changes of the group's age structure cannot be examined in the years of the early 1990s, as we only have data for the years between 1995 and 2000. The data of 1996 significantly deviate from the years before and the years after both for men and women. The reason is unknown.

The most numerous groups among the foreigners living in Hungary were age groups 30–39 and 40–49 followed by age group 25–29. Among men the proportion of the 30–39 group was always 3–5 percent larger than among women. In the 40+ age group women were always in a slight majority (by 1–2 percent). All these taken together make the age structure of foreign women staying in Hungary older than that of men's.

The territorial distribution of foreign citizens living in Hungary is uneven. Nearly 50 percent of them live in Central Hungary, with their proportion fluctuating between 45 percent (in 1994 and 2000) and 53 percent (1999). The Southern Great Plain is the second most popular area among them. Their proportion here exceeded 19 percent of all foreigners in the first three years and then stabilised around 14–15 percent. Their proportion is lowest in Western Transdanubia with 4.5–5.7 percent. It is 2–2.5 percent more than that in Northern Hungary. Their proportion was higher by a similar extent in Central Transdanubia and the Northern Great Plains.

The exceptionally high proportion of foreigners in Central Hungary is due primarily to their great number in the capital. Csongrád is the only county that runs close to Pest county. Every year about 42–43 of foreign citizens staying in Hungary were living in Budapest. The capital was followed by Szeged, Nyíregyháza, Debrecen, Kecskemét, Tatabánya, Székesfehérvár, Hódmezővásárhely, and Zalaegerszeg. In these county-rank towns the Hungarian-foreigner ratio fluctuated between 1,000 to 38 (in Szeged) and 1,000 to 9 (in Zalaegerszeg).

Although we have no accurate and comprehensive data on work permits, it is important to survey the data we do have just to get an idea about them. Without touching upon the problems related to these data, it should be pointed out, first, that there is a contradiction between the data on migration trends and those on work permits. Second, it is easy to see that the range of countries the citizens of which



## Conditions of Minorities

received a work permit is rather narrow. Furthermore, among them, the proportion of Polish, Chinese and even Romanian citizens seems disproportionately low. Third, the most conspicuous fact is that according to the data available, nobody (asked for) received a work permit from among the citizens of EU Member States and the US between 1994 and 2000 (*Table 12*). Nevertheless, the number of work permits issued increased with every year. The reason of the drop in 1996 is unknown. If we consider the data of 1994 and 1995 only to be informative and take 1996 as the base year, then the number of permits issued increased by 16.3 percent in 1997. This percentage halved in 1998, but then, in 1999, darted to 22.9 percent in relation to 1998. This trend, though at a slower pace, continued in 2000. Most permits were issued to Romanian citizens each year. Not counting those belonging to *other* countries, the citizens of the former Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia followed.

As regards the number of work permits, the citizens of Slovakia and China came 4th and 5th. In the last year of the decade the ranks turned out different. Romanian citizens remained first with 49.2 percent of those having a work permit. They were followed by the *other* countries category (14.8 percent), the former Soviet Union (14.4 percent), Slovakia (8.7 percent), China (5.9 percent), and the former Yugoslavia (4 percent). Looking at the territorial distribution of issued or extended work permits, in conformity with the territorial distribution of foreign citizens living in Hungary, Central Hungary predominated. In 1994, 62.4 percent of the work permits were issued or extended in Central Hungary. It was followed by Central Transdanubia, Western Transdanubia, the Southern Great Plain, and Southern Transdanubia. These data, despite the deficiencies, provide information not only on the territorial distribution of foreigners holding a work permit but also on the proportions of work done by legally employed foreigners.

Table 12.

**Number of work permits issued and extensions authorised by citizenship, 1994–2000**

Country	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
	Number						
China	476	982	544	773	1,190	1,739	2,374
Czech Republic	15	26	25	28	47	68	81
Poland	1,411	2,163	1,252	1,449	1,057	641	357
Romania	10,803	13,171	9,218	10,909	11,862	16,982	19,774
Slovakia	753	859	696	1,140	803	1,254	3,508
Soviet	3,044	2,930	3,047	3,852	3,544	4,896	5,783
Vietnam	117	141	115	229	324	465	764
Yugoslavia	2,206	1,623	1,044	1,192	1,114	1,431	1,602
Other	5,931	4,190	4,355	4,672	6,369	6,662	5,960
<b>Total</b>	<b>24,756</b>	<b>26,085</b>	<b>20,296</b>	<b>24,244</b>	<b>26,310</b>	<b>34,138</b>	<b>40,203</b>

# 7 MINORITIES RESEARCH

## Conditions of Minorities

Country	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
	%						
China	1.9	3.8	2.7	3.2	4.5	5.1	5.9
Czech Republic	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
Poland	5.7	8.3	6.2	6.0	4.0	1.9	0.9
Romania	43.6	50.5	45.4	45.0	45.1	49.7	49.2
Slovakia	3.0	3.3	3.4	4.7	3.1	3.7	8.7
Soviet	12.3	11.2	15.0	15.9	13.5	14.3	14.4
Vietnam	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.4	1.9
Yugoslavia	8.9	6.2	5.1	4.9	4.2	4.2	4.0
Other	24.0	16.1	21.5	19.3	24.2	19.5	14.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### 5. Prospects of the near future

Following the transition to democracy and market economy, several factors – together and at the same time – influenced the developments of the migration processes affecting Hungary: the consequences of modern history, the anti-migration policy of the recent past, Hungary's accession to the European Union, and the circumstances created by a globalising world economy. Beyond these, the following factors will clearly have an impact on the development of migration processes in Hungary in the coming decades:

- I the pressure deriving from the population decrease and ageing population;
- I the migration endeavours of the ethnic Hungarians living in the neighbouring countries (let us not forget that, should need arise, we would have to ensure that they find refuge in the country);
- I more intensive connections with the processes of globalisation and, parallel to this, the labour force demand of the economy that is expected to contribute to the increase in the number of the participants both of long-term and temporary migration processes;
- I the return of a part of those or the descendants of those who left Hungary following WWII, but especially in 1956–57 and the subsequent decades.

Yet, due to the country's particular situation, it is impossible to see how the number of those who come here as temporary migrants will develop in proportion to the number of those who come from the neighbouring countries to settle here. The migration data of the past decade indicate that Hungary is not only a destination country for the ethnic Hungarians living in the neighbouring countries but it is both a destination and transit country for the citizens of several countries of the world. Yet, no research has been conducted to reinforce this statement, which otherwise seems obvious and, to a certain extent, can even be supported by facts. Namely, we have no information on the proportion of those – within the

---

## Conditions of Minorities

individual country groups – who consider their stay in Hungary as a temporary stop in their migration to Western Europe or overseas, and, among the departures, we do not know the proportion of those who return home permanently or temporarily or move on from Hungary to Western Europe or overseas. This question is even more clearly manifest as regards the new citizens of the country. However, currently we have no information on how many of those who were granted Hungarian citizenship after 1990 considered Hungary a transit country and live today in a different country of the world.

It is difficult to predict the consequences of the efforts that seek to connect Hungary into the international flow of workforce more expressly. One of the developments of the next decade will probably be that, subject to this process, it will become clear as to what extent Hungary will become an emissive and a recipient country. The extent of population decrease in Hungary and the ageing of the population structure will also become clear in the next two decades, and we will see what remedial population policy measures will be introduced in order to stop these processes. Should this take place, the attitude to the migration of ethnic Hungarians living in the neighbouring countries into Hungary will have to become clear-cut in Hungary. These factors, the unresolved internal tensions of the Central and Eastern European countries, and other, unforeseeable events, make it impossible to see whether the volume of international migration affecting Hungary will remain at its present level or will significantly increase. In lack of accurate migration data, it can only be assumed that we cannot count on positive net migration balance in the longer run. It is an intriguing question as to how and to what extent the country's EU accession will influence the number of foreigners living in Hungary, their citizenship, and composition by sex, age and profession.

The migration data of the 1990s reveals that it would be urgent to clarify Hungary's ideas in relation to the migration of the ethnic Hungarians living in the neighbouring countries. There is a question that cannot be ignored: should we promote the emigration of these people in order to solve the population and workforce problems of Hungary, or should we tone down or curb their emigration efforts? It is problematic, however, whether we can reject the application of those ethnic Hungarian Austrian, Romanian, Croatian, Ukrainian, Serb, Slovak, and Slovene citizens who or whose parents or grandparents found themselves in a minority situation and became citizens of other countries against their will, due to the decision of the Great Powers? Considering all this, it is impossible to ignore the (future) consequences that the immigration of ethnic Hungarians to Hungary will have on the present and the future of the Hungarian communities of the neighbouring countries.

The actual contents and specific character of the present stage of international migration are mostly indiscernible as yet for several reasons: in part, because of the dysfunctional consequences of the migration of the recent past; and, in part, because the foundation of the European Union and its enlargement create completely new conditions for the migration of the European citizens. The 9/11

## Conditions of Minorities

terrorist attacks against New York and Washington had a peculiar impact on these processes: even the countries characterised by liberal immigration policies tightened the conditions of international migration. At the same time, the fight against terrorism, and the wars in Afghanistan, Kashmir, Israel, etc. resulted in the migration of masses. However, besides this, the demands of globalisation, especially the increasing demand for temporary migration, also have an influence entailing an expanding migration process and the liberalisation of its conditions. Besides all this, it is not clear how the present population decrease of the Western European countries and their ageing populations will affect the migration process.

We can conclude that, during the next decade, the following factors will be crucial as regards the developments of international migration: the overpopulation of the most undeveloped countries; the migration pressure of the population of these countries; the growing income inequalities in the various countries; the workforce demand of the globalising world economy; and the population decrease in the industrialised countries. There are various ways to react to these challenges: either by relaxing the conditions of international migration or by further tightening the current framework. However, one must not forget that both solutions – even temporary ones – involve not only advantages but also a series of social problems in both the emissive and recipient countries.