



**International Relations
Multidisciplinary
Doctoral School**

COLLECTION OF THE THESES

Tamás Szabó

**Hungarian–Romanian inter-state relations and the impact of RMDSZ from
the regime change to the adoption of the simplified naturalisation
procedure**

Ph.D. dissertation

Supervisor:

Dr. Csaba János Békés, DSc
Professor, Corvinus University of Budapest

Budapest, 2019

Institute of International Studies

COLLECTION OF THE THESES

Tamás Szabó

**Hungarian–Romanian inter-state relations and the impact of RMDSZ from
the regime change to the adoption of the simplified naturalisation
procedure**

Ph.D. dissertation

Supervisor:

Dr. Csaba János Békés, DSc
Professor, Corvinus University of Budapest

© Tamás Szabó

Contents

1. Research antecedents and justification of the topic	2
2. Methods employed.....	3
3. The results of the thesis	6
3.1. The theories of international relations as a framework for the interpretation of inter-state relations.....	10
3.2. The operators of Hungarian-Romanian relationships.....	11
3.3. Limits characteristic to ethnic parties in the assertion of foreign policy interest, their possible role in inter-state relations	12
3.4. European fora and the world of norms	14
3.5. The missing links of reconciliation	14
3.6. Alternatives and perspectives	15
4. Appendix.....	17
5. References.....	17
5.1. Primary Sources.....	17
5.2. Books, book chapters, journal articles.....	20
6. Publications in the Field.....	26

1. Research antecedents and justification of the topic

After the fall of Communism, one of the objectives of Central and Eastern European countries upon regaining their effective sovereignty was to establish the independence and autonomy of their foreign policy (Kiss J. 2004, pp. 45–78), by which – overtly or implicitly – national interests and nation-building strategies were also formulated. These developments resulted in significant changes inasmuch as inter-state relations and minority-majority relationships are concerned, which – for the future – on the one hand, would have involved the acceptance of minority rights by the majority and the possibility of consolidating the minority institutional system and, on the other hand, due to certain events from the Balkans, the possibility of conflict escalation was also a potential factor. Although many people took into consideration the possibility of conflict with regard to Hungarian-Romanian relationships, the forecasts proved inaccurate and inter-state relationships saw impressive progress. Moreover, after 1996, the Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in Romania (RMDSZ) representing Hungarians from Transylvania acceded to government on several occasions.

Bearing in mind the challenges faced by Central and Eastern European countries and by European countries in a broader sense, as well as the global and regional changes of the last quarter of a century, I chose the analysis of Hungarian-Romanian inter-state relations and

the impact of RMDSZ after the regime change as the topic of my dissertation. Within this system of relationships, which was also influenced by European fora and other non-state actors¹, I paid particular attention to those debates and decisions that were relevant from the point of view of national policies and decisive from both the point of view inter-state relationships and Hungarians from Transylvania.

It was the negotiations for the basic treaty between the two states that first revealed the different concepts, the ideas that seem insurmountable gaps, which were due to different interpretations of sovereignty and territorial integrity on the one hand and the protection of national minority on the other hand. Although for the Hungarian side the issue of belonging to the Hungarian nation had also arisen during this debate, it all peaked in the debates on the Hungarian Status Law, which concerned the cultural extension of national boundaries. The ensuing reactions led to serious debates in inter-state relations as for the role of kin-states and, ultimately, they prepared the introduction of the simplified naturalisation procedure, which established a legal relationship between Hungary and Hungarians living abroad.

In my thesis I have tried to reveal the interests behind these decisions, the lobbying possibilities of the actors involved, as well as the possible consequences.

2. Methods employed

The main claim of my thesis is that the normalisation of Hungarian-Romanian relationships and the institutional settlement of majority–minority relationships may not be considered a consequence of a historical reconciliation between Romania and Hungary, but the result of Romania's commitment to Western European integration and of the RMDSZ being co-opted into the government.

Romania has successfully convinced the international community that minority rights are safeguarded according to the highest European standards. Efforts in this direction have been confirmed on several occasions by international organizations and the representatives of Western countries by stating that the Romanian system of minority protection represents best practice.² Based on this, it may be asserted that the impressive foreign representation of

¹ The triadic nexus introduced by Brubaker (national minority, nationalising state and external national homeland) is a basic starting point from the point of view of my research, which – as we shall see in the following – will be joined by European fora and several state and non-state actors.

² Of the European fora, the High Commissioner on National Minorities (Marx van der Stoep) was the first to acknowledge Romanian minority policies when in the summer of 1993 – preceding the admission of members to the Council of Europe – he had met with the members of the National Minority Council. Different institutions of the EU and the Council of Europe had also acknowledged Romanian minority policies during the period of integration. Most recently, it was the president of the Venice Committee, Gianni Buquicchio who praised the results of Romanian minority regime at the conference for the celebration of the 20th anniversary of signing the

Romania's minority policy is one of the most significant achievements of the Romanian foreign policy: while it has successfully convinced its Western partners and the European fora that minority rights are granted in an exemplary manner in Romania, at the level of domestic politics it has applied significant restrictions to the implementation of minority rights and, what is more, the legitimacy of most of these rights are continuously challenged by the majority.

The other claim of my thesis refers to the possible roles of the organisation representing Hungarians from Transylvania in the Romanian parliament, i.e. the RMDSZ, at the level of inter-state relations. Based on the dominant state centric conception that still governs international relations, as well as on the provisions of international law, the RMDSZ, as ethnic party, is a factor that is uninterpretable in the sense that it is an actor without legal standing. Consequently, we may come to the conclusion that the RMDSZ is not a significant factor in inter-state relations either. However, if we place the focus of our analysis on the evolution of the relationship between the two countries and on the possible roles of the RMDSZ, the statement above needs to be nuanced. Although the RMDSZ did not participate as a negotiating party in the evolution of Hungarian–Romanian relationships, it had contributed – with a consultative role – to the evolution of inter-state relations on numerous occasions. Moreover, it often played the role of initiator and intermediary in the settlement of disputes on the agenda and it informed the European fora and Western European states about the situation of Hungarians from Transylvania.

To support my claims, I have formulated several research questions which I try to answer in my thesis:

(1) How suitable are the available theoretical frames to the interpretation of the evolution of bilateral relations, including the evolution of Hungarian-Romanian relations after 1989? My assumption is that neither the theory of international relations (here we may speak about a competition between different schools), nor other related social science has successfully elaborated precise theories that could offer satisfactory explanations for or forecast the evolution of inter-state relations.

(2) Which are the actors and institutions that have shaped inter-state relations during the last quarter of a century? Who are those who run inter-state relations and by what mechanisms? To put it differently, I was mainly interested in the „world of operators”, the positions of those who participate in decision-making, as well as the mechanisms of decision-making.

(3) What is the role and what are the lobbying possibilities of a minority community and its political representation, i.e. the RMDSZ in our case, in foreign policy, including bilateral

relations from the perspective of the current international order whose exclusive actors are nation states? To what extent could the RMDSZ contribute to the evolution of inter-state relations and what were the strategies employed for the achievement of these objectives?

(4) To what extent can we talk about historical understanding, reconciliation and an approach between the two nations in the long term when the participation of Hungarians from Transylvania, their legitimate political representation is not included in the process of settling Hungarian-Romanian relations or in drafting the most important bilateral agreements and documents that have a direct or indirect bearing on the Hungarian minority?

During the elaboration of my thesis, I apply several research methods and procedures to support my claims and to answer the research questions formulated. When outlining the events from the diplomatic history of the two states, I apply the historical exploratory method for analysing the period until the initiation of negotiations on the Status Law: and based on the documents related to foreign affairs found and systematised, I have elaborated the chronology of negotiations for the three cases, which represents a rich material concerning the most important debates and rounds of negotiations and it has been a crucial source of information when overviewing processes and analysing decisions.

At the same time, the three decisions have allowed the elaboration of case studies in which the negotiating power and lobbying possibilities of Hungary, Romania, the RMDSZ, the European fora, as well as other state and non-state actors may be easily identified and evaluated. In my analysis, I consider that the role of European fora is decisive given that the sets of requirements and normative models they convey have influenced the strategies applied by different actors and, as result, standpoints have changed, arguments have been modified and, ultimately, inter-state relationships have improved.

Therefore, I interpret the evolution of inter-state relations within the extended quadratic nexus: besides overviewing Hungarian-Romanian inter-state relations and the impact of RMDSZ, I pay special attention to the role of European fora and to certain Western states that have significantly influenced Hungary and Romania, as well as interethnic relations in Romania.

The empirical part of my thesis is made up of the debate on the basic treaty, the Status Law and dual citizenship and of the case studies on the simplified naturalisation procedure. First, I overviewed the antecedents and I explored the process leading to decision-making, its internal policy, neighbourhood policy and European context. The shaping of negotiating positions, confronting the actors' interests (debates) made up the second part of the case studies. In these two phases of the analysis, I used the negotiation chronology of the case as a

starting point, but I also used the relevant scientific literature, as well as different semi-structured interviews with politicians who had actively taken part in these processes.

Monitoring parliamentary debates and analysing the content of parliamentary debates by means of the MAXQDA computer software represented another scene of the debates during negotiations. I considered parliamentary parties as analytical units, but on occasion I also cited from the speeches of individual deputies. When analysing the debates, I took into account the following aspects and dimensions: (1) the main aim of the debate; (2) the decision-making process; (3) the content of the document adopted; and finally (4) the effects of the decision.

In the case studies I considered it important to set apart the different levels of analysis, which I performed on the basis of Kenneth Waltz's (2001) and David J. Singer's (1961) work.³ Internal political circumstances represented the first level of the analysis, where the relationships between a minority and the government on the one hand and the balance of power between the parliamentary parties on the other hand are relevant. On the second level, I evaluated bilateral relations: here, high-level meetings and expert meetings played a key role. European fora, the United States of America and other Western European countries, as well as non-state actors (non-governmental organizations, foundations), whose representatives – although in different ways – had an impact on the evolution of inter-state and majority-minority relations on several occasions, have appeared on the third, international level.

3. The results of the thesis

Before overviewing the results and conclusions of the thesis, I will briefly present the most important steps of my research. In the first part of my dissertation (chapter I), during the study of the specialty literature concerning the relationships between Hungary and Romania, the RMDSZ, European fora and Western states, I focused on the analysis of basic questions, on the research methodology and on the analysis of the conclusions drawn. During this overview, I pointed out that during the regime change – due to the changes in the region, to developments in domestic and external politics – the authors presented envisioned a strong dimension of conflict in Hungarian-Romanian inter-state relations, but due to the impact of several internal and external factors, this „increased” state of conflict had resulted in changes

³ In the literature concerning international relations, the issue of the levels of analysis has already emerged as a very important question already in the 1950-ies. The first experiment was carried out by Kenneth N. Waltz, who tried to find explanations for the breaking out of the war by separating analytical levels. Based on Waltz's research, in his study published in the periodical entitled *World Politics*, David J. Singer distinguished two levels: on the one hand, the level of the international system (*system*) and, on the other hand, the level of nation-states (*sub-system*) – the latter one included the level of individuals as well.

in the actors' behaviour (Linden 2000; Iordachi 2001; Milton– O'Neil 2002; cited by Salat 2009, 2013) and in a spectacular institutionalisation of Romanian minority regime (Salat–Novák 2015).

In the analysis of Hungarian-Romanian relations, I proceeded from the Hungarian constitutional principle of the responsibility for Hungarians living outside the borders of Hungary, which had merged with the objectives of the Hungarian foreign policy (Jeszenszky 2012, 2015, p. 59), the national policy objectives of Hungarian governments in power and the dilemmas of subsidy policies (Bárdi–Misovicz 2010), as well as with the institutionalisation process of Hungarian-Hungarian relationships (Kántor 2014).

As for the relationships between Hungary, Romania and European fora (CoE, OSCE, NATO, EU), I emphasised that they monitored the creation of a democratic institutional system in the states of this region through their presence after the regime change and, by „fluttering” the perspective of integration, they formulated such normative values, expectations and policy recommendations that were able to modify domestic and external policy objectives in both states and, ultimately, they contributed to the co-operation of the two parties (McMahon 2007; Kelley 2004; Kemp 2001; Zellner 1999; Horváth 2002).

The creation of the theoretical framework represents the next (II.) chapter of my thesis and it is made up of three components. First, I outline the processes that have determined the regime changes in Central and Eastern European states (chapter II.1) and I emphasise that after the regime change the process of renationalisation (Dunay 1995; Tálás 2008), trans-nationalisation (Kiss 2009, 52, 154; Risse 2013) and European integration (Europeanisation and conditionality) has fundamentally determined the evolution of relationships between Central and Eastern European states, including the relationships between Hungary and Romania (Epstein–Sedelmeier 2008; Schimmelfennig 2005).

In the second part of the theoretical framework (chapter II.2), I look at my research from the point of view of theories on international relations. Following a critical analysis of Ronald Linden's (2000) study, I focus on the brief presentation of the four schools (Realism, Liberal institutionalism, Social-constructivism and the English School) and I analyse the way in which relationships between actors may be interpreted in my thesis from the perspective of principal theories of IR.

The third component of the theoretical framework (chapter II.3) is represented by the presentation of three models (two-level games, spiral model, triadic nexus), which provide further explanations concerning the strategies of the parties, as well as for the evaluation of the activity of actors who participate in lobbying and influence decision-making. The critical analysis of these three models reveals, however, that in itself none of the models is able to

offer satisfactory explanation for the evaluation of the processes and lobbying strategies studied. In my opinion, the model of the two level game (Putnam, 1988) is too state centric and the author pays little attention to relationships between actors, while state institutions have a secondary role (Checkel 2000, p. 1339) in the „spiral model” (Risse–Sikkink 1999) and the authors fail to take into account the possibility of setback (Jetschke–Liese 2013, pp. 33–34). Furthermore, the triadic nexus elaborated by Rogers Brubaker (Brubaker 1996, 2006) did not consider the role of European fora as decisive. Starting from this revelation, I consider that the norm shall be the introduction of the quadratic nexus already employed in the literature (Smith 2002) which has proved adequate for the analysis of relationships between Hungary, Romania, the RMDSZ and European fora.

Although my thesis may not be considered a historical work, I have felt the need to briefly present the history of Hungary, Romania and Hungarians from Transylvania. In chapter IV.1., I try to overview the relationships between the parties starting with the end of the '70-ies and to illustrate the decisive developments and events that have led to a lowest point in the relationship between the two countries. Chapter IV.2. analyses the changing relationships between the countries from the regime change to the beginning of negotiations for the Hungarian-Romanian basic treaty – now under changed circumstances. One of the determining characteristics of this period is that the promising developments following the regime change quickly change and result in estrangement and a significant deterioration in relations. “Returning to Europe” represents a new impetus for these relationships.

The empirical part of my thesis (chapters V-VII) consists of three cases studies, the debates related to the negotiations of the Hungarian-Romanian basic treaty, the Status Law and the issue of dual citizenship (the introduction of the simplified naturalisation procedure). For each decision, I emphasised that the disputes that emerge on the agenda of the two states may not be considered separate issues that only appear in relation to the two states in a given period. In the all three cases, i.e. the basic treaty, the Status Law and the simplified naturalisation process, we may speak about a European trend in which the attitude of the two states is rather that of followers than initiators when they take certain steps in compliance with the European practice – except for internal and external political motivations – in the interest of kin-minorities living abroad.⁴

The analysis of the Hungarian-Romanian basic treaty was carried out based on primary sources, i.e. the declassified documents of the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

⁴ The approximately one hundred basic treaties signed between the states of the region, the ten Status Laws, as well as the dual citizenship for the transborder ethnic communities introduced by most European states served as such models for Hungary and Romania that the parties did not call into question. Moreover, the European examples have become permanent elements of reference both in diplomatic negotiations and parliamentary debates.

In chapter V.2., I pointed out that the debates between the parties were centred around safeguarding minority rights and the inviolability of state frontiers, while debates between parliamentary parties were dominated by other issues (chapter V.3.). The position of Western actors intervening in the debates spanning over several years, especially the intervention of the United States of America and its position concerning collective rights had decisively contributed to agreement. Although this has initiated favourable processes both in inter-state relations and in majority–minority relationships (the co-optation of the RMDSZ in the ruling coalition), it continued to validate the primacy of stability over the protection of minority rights.

I processed the debate on the Law on Hungarians Living in Neighbouring States (Status Law) in chapter VI and I reconstructed the debates – first at the level of domestic politics, then at the level of inter-state relations, and finally before European fora – that emerged during the elaboration and then the adoption of the law (chapter V.2). Although the recommendations of the Venice Committee on the preferential treatment granted by kin-states had a decisive role in the dispute between the two states, the inter-state dispute was settled by agreement between the two parties, with mediation of the RMDSZ.

In the second part of 2004, the debate over dual citizenship had fundamentally divided the parliamentary parties and prevailingly it could be interpreted as an internal political debate, i.e. as a political battle between parties (Bárdi 2004, p. 52; Waterbury 2010, pp. 123–27). In chapter VII.2., I emphasised that the question of dual citizenship in inter-state relations, i.e. the simplified naturalisation procedure introduced in 2010 and the granting of the right to vote did not lead to significant debates between the parties because their citizenship policies are similar. In chapter VII.4., I evaluated the consequences of introducing the simplified naturalisation procedure as a reinterpretation of Hungarian-Hungarian relationships and I emphasised that – although the introduction of the simplified naturalisation procedure was very much expected, which was also shown by the great number of applicants⁵ – there was no consensus between Hungarian politicians from outside Hungary and experts in social sciences about its likely consequences. Taking into consideration the opinions of experts and politicians expressed in issue no. 3-4/2013 of the periodical *Magyar Kisebbség* (Hungarian Minority), I have come to the conclusion that, in spite of the decision makers' original concept and good intentions, the introduction of the simplified naturalisation procedure entails several risks and may result in the acceleration of certain irreversible processes, besides some changes that may be considered positive. The public law relationship established between the Hungarian state and Hungarians from abroad shifted the traditional

⁵ In March 2018, the number of dual citizens was above one million

national political approach – in which the idea of community, the representation of community interests or minority protection had been decisive – in the direction of protecting individual and civic rights.⁶

Conclusions

3.1. The theories of international relations as a framework for the interpretation of inter-state relations

I interpreted Hungarian-Romanian relations and the impact of RMDSZ from the perspective of four decisive perspectives in international relations (Realism, Liberal institutionalism, Constructivism, the English School) and I pointed out that in itself none of the theoretical trends was able to offer satisfactory explanation for the analysis of post 1989 developments. The explaining power of these theories has increased after the combination of individual paradigms and their mutual complementation. Depending on the period or dispute analysed, there is evidence to suggest the dominant position of one theoretical trend (more convincing explanation) over the other in this interpretative framework with several centres of gravity.

The literature of IR indicates the power struggle of states as one of the basic characteristics of realism that renders state actors to follow strategies that contribute to their power within the system or at least to maintain their relative power over neighbouring states. It is not surprising that, in the Communist bloc, researchers preoccupied with the region interpreted the confrontation between the two states, the emphasis on Hungary's responsibility, as well as the situation of the Hungarian minority from Romania as factors bearing a significant potential of conflict inasmuch as Hungarian-Romanian inter-state relations were concerned. The possibility of conflict, however, had decreased due to the impact of several simultaneous and mutually reinforcing factors (co-operation in the field of defence, economy and culture, objectives related to integration etc.) and the emphasis in inter-state relations shifted to co-operation on different levels.

Although the explaining force of the realist theory has decreased due to the lack of conflict, it may be still identified: on the one hand, on a discursive level, in inter-state and parliamentary debates, and on the other hand, a latent strategy may be identified in both Hungary's and Romania's foreign policy advocacy which has served to maintain the relative power of the state and to strengthen their position within the given regional conditions.

The foundations of co-operation and stability were laid during the negotiation and signing of the basic treaty, of which the parties expected to increase their relative power. At

⁶ Salat sees this change as follows: „Consequently, the essence of the process may also be formulated in the sense that the main direction of national policy has caused the segments of the nation separated from Hungary to move from the path of fighting for acceptance as independent political community to the path of diaspora” (Salat 2013, p. 231)

this time, the European organizations and Western states became involved actively in the debates, making even recourse to different instruments for exerting pressure. The agreement between the parties and the declarative adoption of norms has increased the explaining force of liberal institutionalism and of constructivism also.

After signing the Hungarian-Romanian basic treaty, relationships improved, but the debates about the Status Law had put to the test the institutional framework of co-operation. The stakes of diplomatic negotiations and the necessity of reaching an agreement were largely determined by the commitment of the parties and by the following of Western patterns on the one hand and the active participation of European fora and a strong increase in the importance of their role in the debates on the other hand. The agreement about the law reflected the tendency to accept and institutionalise European norms, which forecast a slow and very limited modification of behavioural patterns – as for example the implementation of minority rights in Romania.

The inclination of the parties to co-operation in the debates about the Status law confirms the theory of liberal institutionalism, which is substantially complemented – as a result of the self-defining debate about the Hungarian nation (who may be considered a member of the Hungarian nation) – by constructivism and the interpretations provided by the English school. The main topics that emerged in the debates about dual citizenship and touched upon basic economic and social issues, but mostly upon questions related to the self-identification of the Hungarian nation, revealed the changes that the concept of nation – not by far definite – was exposed to due to internal political factors and global issues. The English school provided guidelines for the interpretation of these processes, emphasising the “less definite and less complete” character of state actors who have previously been considered unitary. Based on this, the debates that are important from the point of view national policies suggest that the Status Law and the dual citizenship have closed an important era in national policy. However, new developments shall also be taken into account when dealing with nation building.

3.2. The operators of Hungarian-Romanian relationships

The analysis of debates at inter-state level has outlined the actors and institutions that have a decisive role in foreign policy decision-making and maintain diplomatic relationships. In both states, the prime-minister and the minister of foreign affairs, as well as the different ministries and, owing to the Romanian political system, the president of the state – who has influenced the evolution of the debate on several occasions – are decisive actors in the “world of operators”. The institutions participating – besides implementation – in the preparation of

decision-making (the Hungarian Standing Conference (MÁÉRT), the departments functioning within the ministries for foreign affairs, the Office for Hungarian Minorities Abroad (HTMH) have also played an important role in shaping foreign policy. These last two institutions employed several experts who participated in drafting the documents, laws and strategies. While the head of the International Law Department led the negotiations related to the basic treaty, the representative of the Office for Hungarian Minorities Abroad was also a permanent member of the delegation. The Office had also played a decisive role in drafting the Status Law and, until its abolition, it performed a continuous co-ordination activity between the government and Hungarian organisations from abroad.

In the case studies analysed I pointed out that the intensive debates from the national parliaments represented an important arena for the decisions taken from the point of view of Hungarians from abroad, but besides shaping the agenda and influencing the public opinion, the opposition was not able to enforce its will against the government's position, therefore the debates did not have an impact on foreign policy decision-making.

The analysis of the role and competencies of the institutions that have a decisive role in the functioning of inter-state relations – especially the different, many times contradictory positions of the political parties – has revealed that states may hardly be represented as unitary actors. The conflicts between institutions and parties, as well as the participation of decision-makers in political games at several levels have outlined the intricate ways of interest reconciliation and they have pointed out that consensus behind national interests is rarely as unanimous as experts and analysts assume. The analysis of actors participating in decision-making and of the decision-making process has validated the idea questioned by liberal institutionalism, i.e. the portrayal of the state as a black box. In the case studies I revealed that, in spite of several “mysteries” surrounding decision-making processes, the relationships between actors and the basic mechanism are for the most part discernible.

3.3. Limits characteristic to ethnic parties in the assertion of foreign policy interest, their possible role in inter-state relations

In the analysis of Hungarian-Romanian relations, I attached great importance to the possibilities of the RMDSZ regarding the assertion of domestic and foreign policy interests, which have been largely determined by the Romanian internal political and the larger European environment.

During the consolidation of Romanian democracy, the possibility of asserting foreign policy interests emerged as the only available strategy for the Alliance as a result of which RMDSZ representatives – bypassing Romanian state institutions – informed the European fora about the situation of the Hungarian minority from Transylvania on several occasions,

drawing attention to the anomalies of Romanian minority policies. The limits of asserting foreign policy interests have been revealed relatively quickly, already during the negotiations related to the basic treaty, on the one hand because the Alliance could not participate as a negotiating party in expert meetings and, on the other hand, because the foreign policy coalition building based on personal networks and enjoying the powerful help and support of the Hungarian diplomacy could not achieve major success in foreign policy, i.e. the reflection and settlement of the issues concerning the Hungarian minority from Transylvania in international politics.

The signing of the basic treaty and the changes in Romanian internal politics have opened up the way for the RMDSZ to join to the government, which has led the Alliance to make a significant change in its strategy and to re-evaluate domestic political bargains concluded with the Romanian party. However, this change of strategy may not be attributed to a conscious decision of the RMDSZ. On the one hand, this decision was based on an otherwise less emphasised demand of the Romanian partners, namely that renunciation to the assertion of foreign policy interests represented one of the basic requirements of participation in the government, which practically meant that the Alliance was not going to put on the agenda of European fora the issues concerning the Hungarian minority from Transylvania. On the other hand, this change of strategy is a consequence of developments in foreign policy as the European fora present in the region have considered that co-operation and specific accommodation strategies represent the key to the settlement of majority–minority relationships and to avoiding conflict, which, on the one hand, ensured stability and, on the other hand, opened up new dimensions in the co-operation with the majority through the participation of the RMDSZ in the government.

However, the conflict resolution strategy of the European fora did not take into consideration the specific needs of Hungarians from Transylvania, the ideas related to different forms of autonomy; therefore the primacy of stability had gradually outweighed legal entitlements. Therefore, from the point of view of the Hungarian minority, the strategies and policy proposals encouraged by the West did not take into account the long-term negative consequences that were due to the dominant position of the majority nation on the one hand and to the limited lobbying possibilities of the RMDSZ on the other hand.

One important conclusion of the thesis is that in the period following the regime change, the Alliance had continuously advocated for co-operation with the representatives of both the Romanian and the Hungarian government and by its mediation work – which was rarely praised by the parties in public – it had contributed to the development of inter-state relations and to the improvement of inter-ethnic relations. The Alliance was able to decisively

determine and shape inter-state relations when, as a result of domestic coalition building, its role had increased and this position was accepted and viewed as legitimate by both parties. This position had its obvious limitations, namely it could not mean a party with an equal rank that had the right to participate in negotiations, but it provided the opportunity for RMDSZ politicians to express their position, to formulate their proposals to both parties and to mediate between the representatives of the two parties in critical moments.

3.4. European fora and the world of norms

In my thesis, I specifically emphasised the role of European fora and I argued that they had a decisive role in the evolution of inter-state relations and to the position of RMDSZ in the Romanian political field. I pointed out this for the first time when I overviewed the literature and I analysed the relationships between the parties within the framework of the quadratic nexus, while in individual case studies I underlined the strategies of European fora, as well as the attempts to adopt European norms and practices. During the case studies analysed – especially in the debate about the basic treaty and the Status Law – the finding from the specialty literature according to which states aspiring for membership manifested behaviour that was in compliance with the norms when they perceived the presence of and pressure from European fora, while on the other hand – besides normative incentives – the conditions of accession were also clear. If the European fora were not active in the given states (for ex. in Romania between 1990-1993) and they did not make the conditions of accession very clear, normative incentives (declarations, recommendations, meetings) had not produced the expected results. In the first part of the '90-ies, Romania offered a graphic example of how the government – guided by domestic policy strategies – tried to prevent the incorporation of European norms into the Romanian legislation.

By validating the primacy of conflict resolution against the successful settlement of the situation of minorities, the European fora and Western countries have delimited the democratic framework for the assertion of minority interests within which minority communities are able to assert their interests in the long term. Nation state strategies supporting a peaceful, conflict free majority–minority cohabitation and, on occasion, the participation of minorities in decision-making forecast the reproduction and ultimately the dominance of the titular nation, which minority communities will hardly be able to modify.

3.5. The missing links of reconciliation

The less expressed recognition that the RMDSZ could not have put through its participation in inter-state negotiations has certainly contributed to the RMDSZ's change of strategy.

Although the Hungarian party had supported the involvement of the Alliance into the workings of the basic treaty on several occasions, due to its multiple rejections by the Romanian party, the RMDSZ could not show up as a negotiating party, which proved decisive from the point of view of the assertion of its interests. Basically, the refusal of the Romanian party – which was repeated during the debates on the Status Law – calls into question the historical reconciliation between the two states. In my opinion, when the Romanian party refers to reconciliation, it only accepts a superficial version of this process which is limited to traditional diplomatic relations and economic, cultural and scientific co-operation.

However, in order to speak about historical reconciliation as something real, significant steps would be required in the next period. The most important question in this respect – which has been repeatedly emphasised by the RMDSZ – is to ensure the formal participation of Hungarians from Transylvania at the conclusion of inter-state agreements that affect them. I consider that, in the long term, steps into this direction could greatly contribute to the deepening of relations between the two states and to putting confidence-building between the two parties on sound footing. The chances of reconciliation would be significantly increased if this process was also accompanied by cultural reconciliation (Iordachi 2001) and if reconciliation extended to a closer and more intensive co-operation between the elites, as well as to the establishment of an institutional structure that operates youth exchange programs (Salat 2004).

3.6. Alternatives and perspectives

Theoretically, the future evolution of Hungarian-Romanian inter-state relations and of the nexuses of Hungarians from Transylvania could have several potential outcomes. When outlining the alternatives, three factors shall be taken into consideration based on the developments from the last quarter of a century. Following Western models and the relationships with European fora, especially with the EU and NATO, as well as the different attempts of the two states to strengthen their position as member states – have proven decisive in the evolution of inter-state relations. The other factor may be linked to the evolution of Hungarian national policies and its consequences. One important claim of the comparison between the case studies is represented by the changes in Hungarian national policy, namely that – based on the traditional principle of responsibility and on minority protection mechanisms – Hungary, as kin-state, has put the protection of individual rights and the establishment of a public law relationship by extending Hungarian citizenship to the forefront instead of the protection of Hungarian minority communities from abroad (basic treaty, Status

Law), which has been qualified as a significant development by experts in the field and social scientists.⁷

Taking into consideration the influence of European fora and Hungarian national policy, several alternatives emerge from the current situation of inter-state relations. First, one has to take into account that (1) the current situation, i.e. the status quo will persist, if we consider that – instead of traditional diplomatic contacts – no substantial, thorough changes have taken place in the relationships between the two states during the last years and no debates have emerged between the parties (no countermeasures have been taken after granting Hungarian citizenship to a large number of individuals) in questions that entail a significant potential for conflict. In this position, the actors focus on preserving their own position, thus it is difficult to imagine that significant changes are likely to occur in inter-state relations and in the situation of Hungarians from Transylvania.

(2) Conversely, if nation state reflexes continue to become stronger within the EU, as we have seen in the case of the economic crisis and, more recently, in the case of the migration crisis, the potential for inter-state relations to deepen or for initiatives that would increase the chances of steps in the direction of historical reconciliation is low. In Romania, this alternative consolidates the idea of the nation state in the long term, which is not favourable to the mid-term and long term survival of Hungarians from Romania, leading to a gradual marginalisation of the Hungarian minority, to giving up the existing positions and, ultimately, the slow erosion of the Hungarian institutional system.

Finally, the last alternative (3) entails the deepening of the relationships between the two states if decision-makers respond to challenges affecting the EU with closer integration. As a result, it is possible that issues that the parties have kept circumventing due to their inherent strains to be put on the agenda of inter-state relations. By increasing the intensity of relationships and by involving the representatives of the Hungarian community in the negotiations, the framework conditions – that, on the one hand, bring us closer to the historical reconciliation and, on the other hand, could open up the way for the institutionalisation of political bargains between the majority and the minority, while there is reasonable chance that they could prepare the initiatives that are very important to the Hungarian community and that aim, among other things, the institutional reform of the Romanian state – are set.

⁷ For details see issue no. 3-4/2013 entitled „Állampolgárság-politika, nemzetdiskurzusok” (Citizenship policies, national discourses) of the periodical *Magyar Kisebbség* (Hungarian Minority)

4. Appendix

Chronologies

Hungarian–Romanian bilateral agreements and international treaties in force (1990–2017)

Basic treaties in Europe (map)

Tables

5. References

5.1. Primary Sources

Archival Sources

Hungarian National Archives (National Archives of Hungary MOL), declassified documents (TÜK-iratok), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Hungary, XIX-J-1-j, 1989–1995, Romania.

Interviews

József Bálint-Pataki, head of the Government Office for Hungarian Minorities Abroad (2002–2005), Budapest, May 1, 2019.

Géza Jeszenszky, lecturer (CUB), former minister for Foreign Affairs (1990–1994), Budapest, 29 April, 2019.

Béla Markó, president of the RMDSZ between 1993 and 2011, Marosvásárhely/Târgu-Mureş, 25 February, 2019.

Zsolt Németh, member of the National Assembly (FIDESZ), Committee on Foreign Affairs, chairman, Budapest, 29 April, 2019

István Székely, executive vice-president of the RMDSZ, social organization department, Kolozsvár/Cluj-Napoca, 13 February, 2019.

István Szent-Iványi, founding member of the SZDSZ, Secretary of State at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1994–1997), Budapest, 30. April, 2019

Loránt Vincze, president of the FUEN, international secretary of the RMDSZ, Kolozsvár/Cluj-Napoca, 27 February, 2019.

Memoirs, diaries, interviews, collected speeches

Dinu, Marcel (2009): *42 ani de diplomație. Ambasador sub patru președinți*. București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu - C. H. Beck.

Hodicska Tibor (2014): *Négyszemközt Ceaușescuval*. Budapest - Csíkszereda: PONT Kiadó, Pallas-Akadémia Kiadó.

Horn Gyula (1991): *Cölöpök*. Budapest: Móra Ferenc Könyvkiadó.

——— (1999): *Azok a kilencvenes évek*. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó.

Király Károly (2013): *Nyílt kártyákkal I*. Pécs: Sétatér Alapítvány.

Markó Béla (2000): *A feledékeny Európa: beszédek, előadások, interjúk (1990–1999)*. Marosvásárhely: Mentor Kiadó.

- Năstase, Adrian (2006): *România după Malta. 875 de zile la Externe (vol.1 - vol.10)*. 2. Kötet, București: Fundația Europeană Titulescu.
- Severin, Adrian–Andreescu, Gabriel (2000): *Locurile unde se construiește Europa. Adrian Severin in dialog cu Gabriel Andreescu*. Iași: Polirom.

Documents, laws, statements

- „2001. évi LXII. törvény a szomszédos államokban élő magyarokról”. 2001. Magyar Közlöny.
<http://www.magyarkozlony.hu/dokumentumok/68f117ae4b7f3160046ce3d9a74fca32195c456d/megtekintes>. Accessed 1 February 2018.
- „A Külügyminisztérium nyilatkozata Románia Kormányának a magyar kedvezménytörvénnyel kapcsolatos 2001. október 29-i nyilatkozatával összefüggésben”. 2001. In: *Magyar Külpolitikai Évkönyv*. Budapest: Külügyminisztérium.
- „A Magyar Állandó Értekezlet V. ülésének zárónyilatkozata”. 2002. In: *Magyar külpolitikai évkönyv*.
- „A magyar-magyar csúcstalálkozó közös nyilatkozata”. 1996. *Magyar Kisebbség* vol. 5, no. 1(15).
- „A Nemzeti Megmentési Front nyilatkozata a romániai nemzeti kisebbségek jogairól (január 6.)”. *Romániai Magyar Szó*, 7 January 1990, no. 1–2.
- „A Romániai Magyar Demokrata Szövetség Elnökségének nyilatkozata, 20 March 1990.” In: *Húszéves az RMDSZ 1989-2009: Eseménynaptár, dokumentumok*, 394–95. Kolozsvár: RMDSZ Elnöki Hivatal–Ügyvezető Elnökség.
- „A szomszédos államokban élő magyarokról szóló törvényjavaslat általános vitája.” Országgyűlés, 19 April 2001.
https://www.parlament.hu/internet/plsql/ogy_naplo.naplo_fadat_aktus?p_ckl=36&p_u ln=202&p_felsz=1&p_felszig=39&p_aktus=2. Accessed 18 March 2018.
- „A Szövetségi Képviselők Tanácsának határozata a magyar–román alapszerződés kérdésében, Marosvásárhely, 26 February 1995.” In: *Húszéves az RMDSZ 1989-2009: Eseménynaptár, dokumentumok*. Kolozsvár: RMDSZ Elnöki Hivatal–Ügyvezető Elnökség.
- „Abandonarea Transilvaniei. Moțiunii cu privire la consecințele asupra siguranței naționale a României pe care le are aplicarea Memorandumului de înțelegere între Guvernul României și Guvernul Republicii Ungare privind Legea maghiarilor din statele vecine Ungariei și chestiuni legate de cooperarea bilaterală, semnat la 22 decembrie”, 2002.
- „Agenda 2000: Commission Opinion on Hungary’s Application for Membership of the European Union”. 1997. European Commission.
- „Agenda 2000: Commission Opinion on Romania’s Application for Membership of the European Union”. 1997. European Commission.
- „Az RMDSZ állásfoglalása a magyar–román alapszerződés tárgyában. 26 August 1994.” In: *Húszéves az RMDSZ 1989-2009: Eseménynaptár, dokumentumok*. Kolozsvár: RMDSZ Elnöki Hivatal–Ügyvezető Elnökség.
- „Balladur terv”. 1993. http://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/83dcbde9-a916-478c-a977-b1116ed83c56/publishable_en.pdf. Accessed 3 November 2017.
- „Camera Deputatilor: Proiectul de Lege pentru ratificarea Tratatului de înțelegere, cooperare și bună vecinătate între România și Republica Ungară, semnat la Timișoara la data de 16 septembrie 1996”. Chamber of Deputies, 3 October 1996.
<http://www.cameradeputatilor.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=591&idm=3&idl=1>. Accessed 26 November 2017.

- „Dr. Horn Gyulának, Az MSZP elnöksége tagjának, a Magyar Köztársaság Külügyminiszterének Nyilatkozata romániai látogatása után”. 1989. In: *Magyar külpolitikai évkönyv*. Budapest: Külügyminisztérium Dokumentációs Főosztálya.
- „Egyetértési Nyilatkozat a Magyar Köztársaság Kormánya és Románia Kormánya között A szomszédos államokban élő magyarokról szóló törvényről és s kétoldalú együttműködés egyéb kérdéseiről”. 2001. In: *Magyar Külpolitikai Évkönyv*. Budapest: Külügyminisztérium.
- Ekéus, Rolf (2001): „Sovereignty, Responsibility, and National Minorities: Statement by OSCE Minorities Commissioner”. OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. <http://www.osce.org/hcnm/53936>. Accessed 10 February 2018.
- „Etnikumközi kapcsolatok barométere”, 2000–2003. Etnokulturális Kisebbségek Forrásközpontja. http://www.edrc.ro/projects.jsp?project_id=19. Accessed 16 March 2018.
- European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission) (2001): „The Official Position of the Romanian Government on the Law on Hungarians Living in Neighbouring Countries”.
- „Hotărâre pentru aprobarea Protocolului dintre Guvernul României și Guvernul Republicii Ungare privind crearea Comisiei mixte interguvernamentale de colaborare și parteneriat activ între România și Republica Ungară, semnat la Budapesta la 12 martie 1997”. Publicat în Monitorul Oficial nr. 100 din data: 06/26/97.
- Húszéves az RMDSZ 1989-2009: Eseménynaptár, dokumentumok*. 2009. Kolozsvár: RMDSZ Elnöki Hivatal–Ügyvezető Elnökség.
- IRES (2011): „Barometrul relațiilor interetnice în România”. <http://www.ires.com.ro/articol/144/barometrul-relatiilor-interetnice-in-romania>. Accessed 10 June 2018.
- „Jelentés a nemzeti kisebbségek számára az anyaállamok által biztosított kedvezményes bánásmódról. Jóváhagyta a Velencei Bizottság 48. Plenáris Ülése”. 2001. <http://adattar.adatbank.transindex.ro/nemzetkozi/velence.htm>. Accessed 16 February 2016.
- „Képviselőházi vita jegyzőkönyve. Debaterea Proiectului de Lege privind aprobarea Ordonanței de urgență a Guvernului nr.36/2009 pentru modificarea și completarea Legii cetățeniei române nr.21/1991”. Chamber of Deputies, 26 October 2009. <http://www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=6716&idm=5>. Accessed 24 May 2018.
- „Képviselőházi vita. Stenograma ședinței Camerei Deputaților din 3 octombrie 1996. Proiectul de Lege pentru ratificarea Tratatului de înțelegere, cooperare și bună vecinătate între România și Republica Ungară, semnat la Timișoara la data de 16 septembrie 1996”. <http://www.cameradeputatilor.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=591&idm=3&idl=1>. Accessed 15 March 2016.
- „Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation”. 1997. <https://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1997/p97-081e.htm>. Accessed 3 December 2017.
- „Magyar külpolitika az uniós elnökség után”. 2011. Külügyminisztérium. http://eu.kormany.hu/download/4/c6/20000/kulpolitikai_strategia_20111219.pdf. Accessed 21 February 2016.
- „Megállapodás a Magyar Köztársaság Kormánya és Románia Kormánya között (Bucharest, 23 September 2003)”. In: *Magyar Külpolitikai Évkönyv*, Budapest: Külügyminisztérium.
- NATO (1995): „Study on NATO Enlargement”. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_24733.htm. Accessed 2 February 2015.

- „Országgyűlési napló. 197. ülésnap a Magyar Köztársaság és Románia között kötendő Alapszerződés ügyében”. Országgyűlés, 3 Szeptember 1996.
<http://www.parlament.hu/naplo35/197/197tart.htm>. Accessed 26 November 2016.
- „Paper Containing the Position of the Hungarian Government in Relation to the Act on Hungarians Living in Neighbouring Countries”. 2001. European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission).
- „Preferential Treatment of National Minorities by their Kin-State: Collection of Laws”. 2001. European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission).
[http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/?pdf=CDL\(2001\)096-e](http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/?pdf=CDL(2001)096-e). Accessed 20 January 2018.
- „Protocol of the IV Meeting of the Joint Committee on National Minorities of the Joint Intergovernmental Commission on Cooperation and Active Partnership between Romania and Hungary”. 2001.
- „Regulamentul de funcționare a Comisiei mixte interguvernamentale de colaborare și parteneriat activ între România și Republica Ungară”. 1997.
- „RMDSZ Újratervezés CD-ROM”. 2015.
- „Szenátusi vita jegyzőkönyve. Debaterea și adoptarea Proiectului de lege privind aprobarea Ordonanței de urgență a Guvernului nr. 36/2009 pentru modificarea și completarea Legii cetățeniei române nr. 21/1991 (L121/2009)”. Senate, 9 June 2009.
<http://www.cdep.ro/pls/steno/steno.stenograma?ids=6669&idm=12>. Accessed 24 May 2018.
- „Szerződés a Magyar Köztársaság és Románia között a megértésről, az együttműködésről és a jószomszédságról és a vonatkozó nemzetközi dokumentumok”. 1997, Magyar Köztársaság: Miniszterelnöki Hivatal.
- Udvardy Frigyes: „A romániai magyar kisebbség történeti kronológiája, 1990-2009.”
<http://udvardy.adatbank.transindex.ro>. Accessed 20 January 2014.
- „U.S. Department of State: Daily Press Briefing”. 1996. U.S. Department of State. Federal Depository Library at the Richard J. Daley Library.
http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/briefing/daily_briefings/1996/9607/960717db.html. Accessed 24 November 2017.

5.2. Books, book chapters, journal articles

- „A nemzeti kisebbségek helyzete: A magyarok”. *Magyar Kisebbség* XIII. évf., (2008/1–2): 20–51.
- Állampolgárság-politika, nemzetdiskurzusok”. 2013. *Magyar Kisebbség* XVIII (3-4. 69-70).
- Andreescu, Gabriel (2001): *Pages from the Romanian–Hungarian Reconciliation, 1989–1999: The Role of Civic Organizations*. Washington, D.C: International Human Rights Internship Program.
- Arp, Björn (2008): *International Norms and Standards for the Protection of National Minorities: Bilateral and Multilateral Texts with Commentary*. Leiden - Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Bakk, Miklós (1999): „Az RMDSZ mint az erdélyi magyarság önmeghatározási kerete”. *REGIO. Kisebbség, Kultúra, Politika, Társadalom*, 2: 81–116.
- Bárdi, Nándor (2004a.): »A mumusok és a kék madár« Mi történt? Miről beszél(t)ünk? Györgyi Annamária interjúja Bárdi Nándorral”. *Regio - Kisebbség, politika, társadalom*, 4: 51–84.
- Bárdi, Nándor–Misovicz, Tibor (2010): „A kisebbségi magyar közösségek támogatásának politikája”. In: Botond Bitskey (ed.): *Határon túli magyarság a 21. században: Konferencia-sorozat a Sándor-palotában*. Budapest: Köztársasági Elnöki Hivatal.

- Bauböck, Rainer (2007): „Stakeholder Citizenship and Transnational Political Participation: A Normative Evaluation of External Voting”. *Fordham Law Review* 75 (5): 2393–2447.
- Bauböck, Rainer–Perchinig, Bernhard–Sievers, Wiebke (eds.) 2009: *Citizenship Policies in the New Europe*. Expanded and updated ed. IMISCOE Research. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Békés, Csaba (2004): *Európából Európába. Magyarország konfliktusok keresztüztében, 1945–1990*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.
- Bíró, Anna-Mária (1996): „The international relations of the DAHR 1989–1996”. *Berghof Occasional Paper*, no. 5. http://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Papers/Occasional_Papers/boc5e.pdf. Accessed 21 February 2015.
- Bíró, Gáspár (1999): „Bilateral Treaties between Hungary and Its Neighbors after 1989”. In: Romsics Ignác–Király K. Béla (eds.): *Geopolitics in the Danube Region: Hungarian Reconciliation Efforts, 1848-1998*, Budapest: Central European University Press, 347–87.
- Bognár, Zoltán (2006): „Romániai magyar autonómiakoncepciók. Az 1989 és 2006 között kidolgozott törvénytervezetek”. In: Törzsök Erika (ed.): *Autonómia, liberalizmus, szociáldemokrácia*, Budapest: Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, 85–117.
- Brubaker, Rogers (1996): *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge–New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (2006a): *Nacionalizmus új keretek között*. Budapest: L’Harmattan - Atelier.
- (2006b) „Nemzeti kisebbségek, nemzetiesítő államok és anyaországok az új Európában”. *Regio–Kisebbség, politika, társadalom*, 3: 3–30.
- Bull, Hedley (2002): *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buquicchio, Gianni (2016): „The International Conference “20 Years of Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities – 20 Years of Inter-culturalism, Cultural Diversity, Tolerance, Integration” Cluj-Napoca, 30 April 2015”. *Romanian Journal of International Law* June–December (16): 14–19.
- Buzan, Barry (2014): *An Introduction to the English School of International Relations. The Societal Approach*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. (2000): „Book review: Thomas Risse–Stephen Ropp–Kathryn Sikkink (eds.): *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press”. *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (10): 1337–43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414000033010004>.
- Chiriac, Marian (2005): „O lege pentru (același) status quo? Raport privind efectele aplicării Legii pentru maghiarii din statele vecine Ungariei”. In: *Provocările diversității: politici publice privind minoritățile naționale și religioase în România*, 59–91. Seria Diversitate etnoculturală în România. Cluj: Centrul de Resurse pentru Diversitate Etnoculturală.
- Collyer, Michael (2014): „A Geography of Extra-Territorial Citizenship: Explanations of External Voting”. *Migration Studies* 2 (1): 55–72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mns008>.
- Culic, Irina (2013): „Az állampolgárság visszaállításától a kedvezményes (vissza)honosításig: a kettős állampolgárság politikájának kiterjedése Romániában 1989 után”. *Magyar Kisebbség* 18 (3-4.(69-70)): 96–128.
- Csergő, Zsuzsa–Goldgeier, James M. (2004) „Nationalist Strategies and European Integration”. *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (01): 21–37. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759270400060X>.
- Csigó, Péter–Kovács, Éva (2000): „Európai integráció vagy/és kisebbségpolitika? A magyar–román alapszerződés sajtóvitája”. In: Sík Endre–Tóth Judith (eds.): *Diskurzusok a*

- vándorlásról*. Budapest: Nemzetközi Migrációs és Menekültügy Kutatóközpont, 252–279.
- Dumbrava, Costica (2014b): *Nationality, Citizenship and Ethno-Cultural Belonging*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137382085>.
- Dunay, Pál (1995): „Whence the threat to peace in Europe”. In: *A Lasting Peace in Central Europe?*, Challiot Papers 20. Institute for Security Studies, Western European Union.
- Dunne, Tim (2013): „The English School”. In: Dunne, Tim–Kurki, Milja–Smith, Steve (eds.): *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. Third edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Durandin, Catherine–Petre, Zoe (2010): *România post 1989*. Iași: Institutul European.
- Ellis, Andrew–Wall, Alan (eds.) 2007: *Voting from Abroad: The International IDEA Handbook*. International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance–Instituto Federal Electoral (Mexico). Stockholm, Sweden – Mexico City, Mexico, International IDEA, Federal Electoral Institute of Mexico.
- Epstein, Rachel A.– Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2008): „Beyond Conditionality: International Institutions in Postcommunist Europe after Enlargement”. *Journal of European Public Policy* 15 (6): 795–805. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760802196465>.
- Finnemore, Martha–Sikkink, Kathryn (1998): „International Norm Dynamics and Political Change”. *International Organization* 42 (4): 887–917. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550789>.
- Földes, György (2007): *Magyarország, Románia és a nemzeti kérdés 1956-1989*. Budapest: Napvilág Kiadó.
- Gál, Kinga (1999): „Bilateral Agreements in Central and Eastern Europe: A New Inter-State Framework for Minority Protection?” *European Centre for Minority Issues Working Papers* No. 4.
- Galbreath, David (2003): „The Politics of European Integration and Minority Rights in Estonia and Latvia”. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 4 (1): 35–53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15705850308438852>.
- Galbreath, David–McEvoy, Joanne (2010): „European Integration and the Geopolitics of National Minorities”. *Ethnopolitics* 9 (3–4): 357–77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449051003791700>.
- Geoană, Mircea (1997): „Romania: Euro-Atlantic Integration and Economic Reform”. *Fordham International Law Journal* 21 (1): 12.
- Horváth, István (2002): „Facilitating Conflict Transformation: Implementation of the Recommendations of the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities to Romania, 1993-2001”. *CORE Working Paper* 8. <http://edoc.vifapol.de/opus/volltexte/2008/603/>. Accessed on 1 February 2015.
- Ieda, Osamu–Kántor Zoltán–Majtényi Balázs–Vizi Balázs–Halász István (eds.): *Beyond Sovereignty: From Status Law to Transnational Citizenship?* Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 255–79.
- Iordachi, Constantin (2001): „The Romanian-Hungarian Reconciliation Process, 1994–2001: From Conflict to Cooperation.” *Romanian Journal of Political Science* 1 (3–4).
- Iordachi, Constantin–Leonescu, Ștefan–Toderiță, Alexandra–Silaghi, Claudiu–Ghinea, Cristian (eds.) 2012: *Redobândirea cetățeniei române: perspective istorice, comparative și aplicate*. București: Curtea Veche.
- Ivan, Ruxandra (2010): „Relațiile dintre România și Ungaria, 1990–2006”. In: Motoc Iulia–Cioculescu, Șerban Filip (eds.): *Manual de analiză a politicii externe*. Iași: Polirom, 394–417.
- Jenne, Erin K. (2007): *Ethnic Bargaining: The Paradox of Minority Empowerment*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Jeszenszky, Géza (2005a): „Antall József, a nemzetpolitikus”. *Valóság* XLVIII (1, január).
- (2015): *Kísérlet a trianoni trauma orvoslására. Magyarország szomszédsági politikája a rendszerváltozás éveiben*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

- (2012): „Antall a külpolitikus”. *Magyar Szemle*, Új folyam XXI., no. 3-4.
- Kántor, Zoltán (2014): *A nemzet intézményesülése a rendszerváltás utáni Magyarországon*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Kántor, Zoltán–Vizi, Balázs–Majtényi, Balázs–Halász, István–Ieda, Osamu (eds.): *The Hungarian Status Law: Nation Building and/or Minority Protection*. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 328–49.
- Kelley, Judith G. (2004): *Ethnic Politics in Europe: The Power of Norms and Incentives*. Princeton University Press.
- Kemp, Walter (2001): *Quiet Diplomacy in Action: The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities*. Leiden - Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Kiss, J. László (2004): „A kádárizmustól az EU-tagságig: a magyar külpolitika metamorfózisa”. In: Kiss J. László–Gazdag Ferenc (eds): *Magyar külpolitika a 20. században*. Budapest: Zrínyi Kiadó, 45–78.
- (2009): *Változó utak a külpolitika elméletében és elemzésében*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Kiss, Tamás (2013): „Nemzetdiskurzusok hálójában. Az állampolgárság-politika, mint a magyar nemzetre vonatkozó klasszifikációs küzdelem epizódja és eszköze”. *Magyar Kisebbség* XVIII (34 (69-70)): 7–95.
- Kiss, Tamás–Barna, Gergő–Székely, István Gergő (2013) „A társadalomépítéstől a klientúra-építésig. Az RMDSZ és a magyar választók közötti kapcsolódás átalakulása”. *Magyar Kisebbség* XVIII. (68.) (2): 7–40.
- Kovács, Mária M. (2006): „The Politics of Dual Citizenship in Hungary”. *Citizenship Studies* 10 (4): 431–51. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020600858088>.
- Lantschner, Emma– Medda-Windischer, Roberta (2001): „Protection of Minorities through Bilateral Agreements in South Eastern Europe”. In: *European Yearbook of Minority Issues*, I: 534–61. The Hague; New York: Kluwer Law International.
- Linden, Ronald H. (2000): „Putting on Their Sunday Best: Romania, Hungary, and the Puzzle of Peace”. *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (1): 121–145. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/0020-8833.00151>.
- Linklater, Andrew (1998): *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2007): „Citizenship and Sovereignty in the Post-Westphalian State”. In: *Critical Theory and World Politics: Citizenship, Sovereignty and Humanity*, 90–108. London: Routledge.
- Lőrincz, Csaba (2008): „A szomszédos államokban élő magyarokat megillető egyes kedvezményekről szóló törvény koncepciója”. *Pro Minoritate*, 2: 32–39.
- Marton, Péter (2013): *A külpolitika elemzése. Fogalmak és módszerek a külpolitika forrásainak feltárására*. Budapest: Antall József Tudásközpont.
- McGarry, John–Keating, Michael (eds.) 2006: *European Integration and the Nationalities Question*. London–New York: Routledge.
- McMahon, Patrice C. (2007): *Taming Ethnic Hatred: Ethnic Cooperation and Transnational Networks in Eastern Europe*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Medianu, Narcisa (2002): „Analysing Political Exchanges between Minority and Majority Leaders in Romania”. *Global Review of Ethnopolitics* 1 (4): 28–41. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14718800208405111>.
- Meleşcanu, Teodor (1993): „Security in Central Europe: A positive-sum game”. *NATO Review* 41 (5): 12–18.
- Mihailescu, Mihaela (2005): „Dampening the Powder Keg: Understanding Interethnic Cooperation in Post-Communist Romania (1990–96)”. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 11 (1): 25–59. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537110590927647>.
- Milton, Andrew K.–O’Neil, Patrick H. (2002): „The Conservative Peace: An Institutional Explanation of Post-Cold War Stability”. *International Politics* 39 (3): 293–310. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ip.8897454>.

- Năstase, Adrian–Miga-Beșteliu, Raluca–Aurescu, Bogdan–Donciu, Irina (eds.) 2002: *Protecting Minorities in the Future Europe. Between Political Interest and International Law*. București: Regia Autonomă „Monitorul Oficial”.
- Nelson, Daniel (1992): „In: the Wake of Revolution: Eastern Europe in the 1990s”. *European Security* 1 (1): 84–100. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839208407070>.
- Nye Jr, Joseph S.–Keohane, Robert O. (eds.) 1971a: „Transnational Relations and World Politics”. *International Organization* Vol. 25, No. 3,: 329–758.
- Papadimitriou, Dimitris–Phinnemore, David (2008): *Romania and the European Union: From Marginalisation to Membership*. Europe and the nation state 12. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Pogonyi, Szabolcs (2017): *Extra-Territorial Ethnic Politics, Discourses and Identities in Hungary*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Putnam, Robert D. (1988): „Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games”. *International Organization* 42 (3): 427–460. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027697>.
- Risse, Thomas (2013): „Transnational Actors and World Politics”. In: Carlsnaes, Walter –Risse-Kappen, Thomas–Simmons, Beth A. (eds.): *Handbook of international relations*. Second edition, Los Angeles: SAGE, 426–52.
- Risse, Thomas–Sikkink, Kathryn (1999): „The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms into Domestic Practices: Introduction”. In: Risse-Kappen, Thomas– Ropp, Steve C.–Sikkink, Kathryn (eds.): *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*. Cambridge Studies in International Relations, vol. 66. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Saideman, Stephen M.–Ayres, R. William (2008): *For Kin or Country: Xenophobia, Nationalism, and War*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Salat, Levente (2013a): „A Rapprochement without Reconciliation: Romanian–Hungarian Relations in the Post-Communist Era”. In: Blomqvist, Anders–Iordachi, Constantin–Balázs, Trencsényi (eds.): *Hungary and Romania beyond National Narratives: Comparisons and Entanglements*. Oxford: Peter Lang AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 655–90.
- (2004) „A román–magyar kapcsolatok alakulásának kilátásai és a francia–német megbékélési modell”. In: Salat, Levente–Smaranda, Enache (eds.): *Relațiile româno-maghiare și modelul de reconciliere franco-german =: A román-magyar kapcsolatok és a francia-német megbékélési model = Romanian-Hungarian relations and the French-German reconciliation*. Seria Diversitate etnoculturală în România 9. Cluj: Liga Pro Europa : Centrul de Resurse pentru Diversitate Etnoculturală.
- (2009): „A román–magyar kapcsolatok”. *Budapesti Könyvszemle-BUKSZ*, 4. sz., 347–352.
- (2011): „A politikai közösség kérdése a többség-kisebbség viszonyának a nézőpontjából”. *Magyar Kisebbség* XVI (3-4(61-62)): 159–90.
- (2013b): „A könnyített honosítás látható és várható következményeiről. Válaszok a Magyar Kisebbség kérdéseire”. *Magyar Kisebbség* XVIII (3-4(69-70)): 226–40.
- Salat, Levente– Novák, Csaba Zoltán (2015): „Ethnicity, Nationalism, and the Minority Regime”. In: Stan, Lavinia–Vance, Diane (eds.): *Post-Communist Romania at Twenty-Five: Linking Past, Present, and Future*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 63–83.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank (2005): „Strategic calculation and international socialization: Membership incentives, party constellations, and sustained compliance in Central and Eastern Europe”. *International Organization* 59 (04): 827–860. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818305050290>.
- Schöpflin, George–Poulton, Hugh (1990): *Romania's Ethnic Hungarians*. London: Minority Rights Group.

- Sevel, Okszana (2011): „Diaszpóra-törvények a poszt-kommunista térségben. Túl a jón és rosszon, avagy meghaladható-e a polgári/etnikai nacionalizmus dichotómiája”. *Pro Minoritate*, Spring: 3–37.
- Singer, David J. (1961): „The level-of-analysis problem in international relations”. *World Politics* 14 (01): 77–92.
- Smith, David J. (2002): „Framing the National Question in Central and Eastern Europe: A Quadratic Nexus?” *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics* 2 (1): 3–16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14718800208405119>.
- Szabó, Tamás (2014): „Magyarország, Románia és az RMDSZ kapcsolatrendszere az alapszerződés aláírásának időszakában (1992-1996)”. *Külgügyi Szemle*, 4: 77–108.
- (2015a): „A magyar–román alapszerződés parlamenti vitája. Összehasonlító elemzés”. *Többlet* 3: 96–136.
- (2015b): „Az RMDSZ külpolitikájának intézményesülése”. *Magyar Kisebbség* XX (1-2 (75-76)): 117–46.
- Székely, István Gergő–Horváth, István (2014): „Diversity Recognition and Minority Representation in Central and Southeast Europe: A Comparative Analysis”. *Nationalities Papers* 42 (3): 426–48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2014.916660>.
- Szokai, Imre–Tabajdi, Csaba (1988): „Mai politikánk és a nemzetiségi kérdés”. In: Bárdi Nándor–Éger György (eds.) 1999: *Útkeresés és integráció. Határon túli magyar érdekvédelmi szervezetek dokumentumai 1989-2000*. Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány, 647–59.
- Tálas, Péter (2008): „Az aszimmetrikus szlovák–magyar viszonyról”. *Nemzet és Biztonság* 1 (11): 73–80.
- Toró, Tibor (2013): „A romániai magyar nyilvánosság alakulásának diskurzusa politikai filozófiai megközelítésben”. Ph.D. thesis, Babeş–Bolyai University Cluj/Kolozsvár.
- Tóth, Judit (2014): „A honosítás jogintézményének alakulása az elmúlt húsz évben”. *Regio–Kisebbség–Kultúra–Politika–Társadalom* 22 (1): 74–90. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17355/rkkpt.v22i1.6>.
- Verdery, Katherine (1991): *National Ideology under Socialism. Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceauşescu's Romania*. California: California University Press.
- Vermeersch, Peter (2004): „Minority Policy in Central Europe: Exploring the Impact of the EU's Enlargement Strategy”. *Global Review of Ethnopolitics* 3 (2): 3–19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14718800408405162>.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979): *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Waterbury, Myra A. (2010): *Between State and Nation: Diaspora Politics and Kin-state Nationalism in Hungary*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- (2014): „Making Citizens Beyond the Borders: Nonresident Ethnic Citizenship in Post-Communist Europe”. *Problems of Post-Communism* 61 (4): 36–49. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2753/PPC1075-8216610403>.
- Wendt, Alexander (1992): „Anarchy is what States make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics”. *International Organization* 46 (02): 391–425. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027764>.
- Zaharia, Dragoş (2014): *Politica externa a Romaniei de la izolare la inceperea negocierilor de aderare la Uniunea Europeana*. Târgovişte: Cetatea de Scaun.
- Zellner, Wolfgang (1999): „On the Effectiveness of the OSCE Minority Regime”. *Comparative Case Studies on Implementation of the Recommendations of the High Commissioner on National Minorities of the OSCE, Hamburg*. <http://ifsh.de/pdf/publikationen/hb/hb111e.pdf>. Accessed 3 March 2017.
- Zellner, Wolfgang–Dunay Pál (1998): *Ungarns Ausenpolitik 1990-1997: zwischen Westintegration, Nachbarschafts-und Minderheitenpolitik*. 118. köt, Baden–Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.

Newspapers, chronologies

Krónika, Kolozsvár

Romániai Magyar Szó, Bukarest

Szabadság, Kolozsvár

Udvardy Frigyes: A romániai magyar kisebbség történeti kronológiája,

(<http://udvardy.adatbank.transindex.ro/>).

MTI Hírárchívum 1988-2017”, (<http://archiv1988-2005.mti.hu/Pages/HirSearch.aspx>).

Kuszálík Péter: Az RMDSZ tizenöt éve a sajtó tükrében c. kronológiája,

(<http://rmdszkronologia.adatbank.transindex.ro>).

Databases:

International Monetary Fund, Datasets:

<http://www.imf.org/external/datamapper/datasets/WEO/1>.

CIA: The World Factbook: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/resources/the-world-factbook/>.

Global Citizenship Observatory (GLOBALCIT), 2017: <http://globalcit.eu/acquisition-citizenship/>.

Központi Választási Hivatal (National Election Office), 1998:

<http://www.valasztas.hu/ujweb/index.htm>.

SIPRI Military Expenditure Database (1949-2017): <https://www.sipri.org/databases/milex>.

6. Publications in the Field

1. Szabó, Tamás (2015): A magyar–román alapszerződés parlamenti vitája. Összehasonlító elemzés. *Többllet 3.*: 96–136.
2. Szabó, Tamás (2015): Az RMDSZ külpolitikájának intézményesülése. *Magyar Kisebbség*, XX, (1-2 (75-76)): 117–146.
3. Toró, Tibor – Szabó, Tamás (2015): A romániai magyar politikatudomány helyzete a 2002–2013-as periódusban – szakterületi szintézis. In: Péntek János – Salat Levente – Szikszai Mária (eds.): *Magyar tudományosság Romániában 2002–2013 között*. Ábel Kiadó: Kolozsvár, vol. 2, 335–388.
4. Szabó, Tamás (2014): Magyar–román államközi viszony és az RMDSZ kapcsolatai az alapszerződés tárgyalásának időszakában 1992–1996. In: Fedinec Csilla – Szoták Szilvia (eds): *Közösség és identitás a Kárpát-medencében. Határhelyzetek VII*. Balassi Intézet Márton Áron Szakkollégium, Budapest, 385–411.
5. Szabó, Tamás (2014): Magyarország, Románia és az RMDSZ kapcsolatai az alapszerződés tárgyalásának időszakában. *Külügyi Szemle 4*: 77–108.
6. Szabó, Tamás (2015): Az RMDSZ külpolitikájának kronológiája (1989–1996). *Magyar Kisebbség XX*, (1-2 (75-76)): 147–220.