Doctoral School of International Relations and Political Science

Thesis Summary of the Ph. D. Dissertation of

Ágnes Vass

The practice of extraterritorial citizenship in Hungary

Discourses and interpretations in diaspora and minority communities

Supervisor:

Dr. Erzsébet Kaponyi, Professor Emerita

Corvinus University of Budapest

Budapest, 2022

Table of Contents

1. The objectives of the thesis

The thesis examines the effects of extraterritorial citizenship on identity constructions and sense of belonging after the adoption of the Hungarian Citizenship Act, amended in 2010[1], through empirical research among members of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia and the Hungarian diaspora community in Western Canada. The aim of the research is to examine the phenomenon of extraterritorial citizenship on micro and macro level. On micro level, the research explores the attitude of members of the selected communities towards the extra-territorial Hungarian citizenship[2] that has become available to them after 2010, as well as the possibility[3] of external voting. The thesis examines the individual motivations behind the acceptance or rejection of Hungarian citizenship through simplified naturalization, and whether they exercise/ would exercise their right to participate in Hungarian parliamentary elections. The aim of the thesis is to understand how multiple citizenship, as membership in more than one political community, is represented in the identity constructions and everyday lives[4] of the participants. Examining

[1] The qualitative research was carried out between 2013 and 2016 in Slovakia and Canada.
[2] Act XLIV of 2010 amending Act LV of 1993 on Hungarian Citizenship. Source: https://bit.ly/2ROFZSa; Accessed: 12 March 2016. According to this law, "a non-Hungarian citizen whose ancestor was a Hungarian citizen or who can prove his/her Hungarian origin and his/her Hungarian language skills may apply for preferential naturalization."
[3] Act CCIII of 2011 on the Election of Members of Parliament. Source: https://bit.ly/2RWhqT5. Accessed: 5 January 2016. This allows voters not resident in Hungary to vote for one party list in Hungarian parliamentary elections. The Act CXIII of 2018 amending certain acts related to elections, which states that "A Hungarian citizen who (a) is a voter not having permanent residence in Hungary and (b) has a permanent residence outside the territory of the European Union is also a voter in the election of members of the European Parliament." (1. §). Source: https://bit.ly/3fWpYS8. Accessed: 7 September 2018.
[4] Brubaker, Rogers; Cooper, Frederick (2000): Beyond „identity". Theory and Society, Vol. 29., No. 1., pp. 5-8.

everyday social and individual experiences and interpretations, the thesis seeks to answer why (or why not) people take up Hungarian citizenship and how they interpret their multiple ties and attachments.[5]

We are looking for the answer to the question what identity (if any) is associated with Hungarian citizenship, which can be applied for by free choice (i.e. not by birth), through simplified naturalization, when the individual does not live in Hungary or, in some cases, has never been to Hungary. In the course of the research, we also examined whether a sense of community is created by the acceptance of Hungarian citizenship through simplified naturalization among those who take advantage of this opportunity in the examined diaspora and minority communities.

By examining the impact of the 2010 amendment of the Hungarian Citizenship Act in minority and diaspora communities, the paper seeks to answer the macro-level question of how the concept of citizenship and the relationship between the state and its citizens in the 21st century European Union is changing. Citizenship is thus understood as a membership in a political community and by analyzing the qualitative research findings, the dissertation aims to go beyond the political and legal discourse to interpret the meaning of citizenship and the phenomenon of multiple citizenship through everyday practices, minority and diaspora identity constructions.

The literature on dual nationality is very rich, but the issue has mainly been examined in the context of migration and multiculturalism. [6] The Hungarian Citizenship Act, as amended in 2010, addresses not only those who have left Hungary for one reason or another, but also those whose ancestors became citizens of another state not due migration of the individual but the migration of the borders – the change of their citizenship is a result of a political decision[7] and not of the decision made by the individual. The relationship between Hungarian minority and diaspora communities and Hungary, the historical, social and legal contexts of the so called Hungarian national policy/

[5] Fox, John E.; Miller-Idriss, Cynthia (2008): Everyday Nationhood. Ethnicities, Vol. 8., No. 4., pp. 536-563.
[6] For further reference, see: Soysal, Yasmine (1994): Limits of citizenship. Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe. Chicago: University Press of Chicago; Brand, Laurie A. (2006): Citizens Abroad. Emigration and the State in the Middle East and North Africa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Joppke, Christian (2010): Citizenship and Immigration. Cambridge: Polity Press, Cambridge; Bauböck, R.; Rundell, J. (eds.) (2018): Blurred Boundaries – Migration, Ethnicity, Citizenship. London: Routlege.
[7] Treaty of Trianon, Trianon, 4 June 1920. Promulgated by Act XXXIII of 1921 on the North American United States, British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, Belgium, China, Cuba, Greece, Nicaragua, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Serbo-Croatian-Slovenian State, Siam and Czechoslovakia, on the 4th day of June 1920 signed at Trianon. Source: https://bit.ly/34vKBzk. Accessed: 2 August 2015.

kin-state politics/diaspora relations are also comprehensively analyzed questions[8], while the effects of the Citizenship Act amended in 2010 have been studied only rarely, and these studies[9] also tend to analyze the issue in theoretical contexts, primarily from the perspective of the state, and in national policy contexts. In case of studies of extra-territorial citizenship, a few research is dealing with the phenomenon from the perspective of the citizen and examines the policies of the kin-state in the region (including the citizenship policies offered by the kin-state) from the bottom-up perspective, in everyday contexts or at the level of the individual.[10]

[8] On the relations between Hungary and the Hungarian minority communities living in the neighboring states of Hungary see: Bárdi Nándor (2003): Hungary and the Hungarians Living Abroad: A Historical Outline. Regio, VI., pp. 121-138.; Bárdi Nándor (2004): Tény és való. Pozsony: Kalligram; Szarka László (2004): Kisebbségi léthelyzetek – Közösségi alternatívák; Budapest: Lucidus Kiadó; Kántor Zoltán (szerk.) (2002): A státustörvény – előzmények és következmények; Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány; Kántor Zoltán (szerk.) (2002): A státustörvény. Dokumentumok, tanulmányok, publicisztika. Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány.; Tóth Judit (2004): Státusjogok. Budapest: Lucidus Kiadó.; Kántor Z., Majtényi B., Osamu I., Vizi B., Halász I. (eds.) (2004): The Hungarian Status Law: Nation Building and/or Minority Protection. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University; Osamu, Idea (ed.) (2006): Beyond Sovereignty: From Status Law to Transnational Citizenship? Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University; Vizi Balázs (2006): A nemzetpolitika feltételrendszere az uniós tagság körülményei között. Magyar kisebbség: nemzetpolitikai szemle. 10. évf., 41-42. sz. pp. 39-65.; Kántor Zoltán (2014): Hungary's Kin-State Politics, 2010 – 2014, Minority Research, pp. 23-32.; Waterbury, Myra A. (2010): Between State and the Nation. Diaspora Politics and Kin-State Nationalism in Hungary. Palgrave Macmillan, New York: St. Martin's PressLLC; Pogonyi, Szabolcs (2017): Extra-Territorial Ethnic Politics, Discourses and Identities in Hungary. Cham: Springer International Publishing. A diaszpóra politikát illetően lásd: Herner-Kovács, Eszter (2014): Nation Building Extended: Hungarian Diaspora Politics. Minority Studies, No. 17., pp. 55-67.; Kovács, Eszter (2020): Direct and indirect political remittances of the transnational engagement of Hungarian kin-minorities and diaspora communities. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, Vol. 46., No. 6., pp.1146-1165.; Papp, Z. Attila; Kovács, Eszter; Kováts, András (2020): Magyar diaszpóra és az anyaország: Diaszporizáció és diaszpórapolitika. In: Kovách, Imre (szerk.): Mobilitás és integráció a magyar társadalomban. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó, pp. 295- 324.; Kovács, Eszter (2018): Magyar diaszpórapolitika 1990 után az állam és a diaszpóra perspektívájából. Doctoral Thesis, Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Politikaelméleti Doktori Iskola; Niessen, James P. (2013): Documenting the Hungarian Heritage of the U.S.: Efforts at Home and Abroad. Slavic and East European Information Resources, Vol. 14., No.4., pp. 234-241.; Gazsó, Dániel (2020): Otthon és itthon. A magyar diaszpóra és anyaországa. Doctoral Thesis, Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Politikaelméleti Doktori Iskola; Papp, Z. Attila (2010): A nyugati magyar diaszpóra és szervezeti élete néhány demográfiai, társadalmi jellemzője. Kisebbségkutatás, Vol. 19., No. 4., pp. 621-638.; Papp, Z. Attila (2008): Beszédből világ. Elemzések, adatok amerikai magyarokról. Budapest: Magyar Külügyi Intézet.

[9] See: Ganczer Mónika (2011): A határon túli magyarok kettős állampolgárságának nemzetközi jogi és belső jogi aspektusai: a kollektív elvesztéstől a könnyített megszerzésig. Kül-Világ, VIII. évf.,1- 2. szám, pp. 64–81.; Ganczer Mónika (2014): Sarkalatos átalakulások: az állampolgársági jog átalakulása. MTA Law Working Papers, 2014/63.; Kántor Zoltán (2014): A nemzet intézményesülése a rendszerváltás utáni Magyarországon. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó; M. Kovács, Mária; Tóth, Judit (2009): Kin-state responsibility and ethnic citizenship: The Hungarian case. In: Bauböck, R., Perchining, B., Sievers, W. (eds.): Citizenship Policies in the New Europe, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 151–176.; Pogonyi, Szabolcs (2011): Dual citizenship and sovereignty. Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity, Vol. 39., No. 5., pp. 685-704.

[10] The analyzation of the effects of the amended Hungarian Citizenship Act from the bottom-up perspective was made by Szabolcs Pogonyi, whose research was carried out at the same time as ours, but his methodology differs from the one used in this thesis. See: Pogonyi (2017). Similar bottom-up research in the Romanian-Moldavian and Ukrainian-Russian context was made by Eleanor Knott. Knott, Eleanor (2015): Kin-states and kin majorities from the bottom-up: developing a model of nested integration in Crimea & Moldova. PhD thesis, The London School of Economics and Political Science. For similar research in the context of the Bulgarian-Macedonian relations consult: Neofotistos,

This thesis aims to enrich this part of the literature by applying a methodology that has not been very common in Hungarian citizenship research before.

1.1 Research questions

This dissertation aims to fill a gap in research on citizenship outside the field by examining individual associations and attitudes.[11] Using the chosen methodology, the research analyses the meaning and role of citizenship(s) through the experiences, discourses, opinions and everyday practices of people living in diaspora and minority communities.[12] In the research, citizenship is understood as full and equal membership in a self-governing community, which, in addition to rights, duties and benefits, also includes values such as belonging to something or the opportunity to participate in the functioning of a society.[13]

The aim of the dissertation is to answer the following questions through the results of the qualitative research carried out:

1. How did Hungarians living in minority communities in the neighboring countries around Hungary and in diaspora receive the introduction of simplified naturalization?
2. How are interpretations and discourses developed in relation to existing Slovak and Canadian citizenship and Hungarian citizenship? How do they understand their already existing Slovak and Canadian citizenship and the possibility of simplified naturalization?
3. What are the individual motivations behind the acceptance/rejection of Hungarian citizenship through simplified naturalization?
4. Does a kind of group identity based on the "new" citizenship develop among those who become Hungarian citizens through simplified naturalization, if so, to what extent? Does

Vasiliki P. (2009): Bulgarian passports, Macedonian Identity: The invention of EU citizenship in the Republic of Macedonia. Anthropology Today, No. 25., Vol. 4., pp. 37–53.

[11] Joppke, Christian (2007a): Transformation of Citizenship: Status, Rights, Identity. Citizenship Studies, Vol 11., No. 1., pp. 44.

[12] Nyers, Peter (2007): Introduction: Why Citizenship Studies, Citizenship Studies, Vol. 11., No. 1., pp.: 1–4.; Isin, Engin F.; Turner, Bryan S. (2007): Investigating Citizenship: An Agenda for Citizenship Studies, Citizenship Studies, Vol. 11., No. 1., pp.: 5–17.; Bauböck, Rainer (2010a): Cold Constellations and Hot Identities: Political Theory Questions about Transnationalism and Diaspora. In: Bauböck, R.; Faist, T. (eds.): Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 295–322.

[13] Bellamy, Richard (2008): Evaluating Union Citizenship: Belonging, Rights and Participation Within the EU. Citizenship Studies, Vol. 12., No. 6., pp. 597–611.

the acquisition of Hungarian citizenship override or rewrite existing group boundaries, or does it create new ones between those who have and those who have not taken advantage of this opportunity?

5. What does the possibility of external voting rights mean for people living in diaspora and minority communities?
6. How is the relationship between the state and the community it governs changing in the 21st century through the practice of extraterritorial citizenship?
7. On the basis of the research we have conducted, what conclusions can be drawn about existing scholarship on citizenship and how does the dissertation contribute to the development of citizenship studies?

The qualitative research for this dissertation investigates the following hypotheses formulated on the basis of theoretical approaches:

In the discourse on simplified naturalization, arguments have emerged that the extension of citizenship could lead to the diazotization of minority communities living in the neighboring countries around Hungary.[14] Through empirical research in minority and diaspora communities, the dissertation examines that:

1. Extra-territorial citizenship does not result in the diazotization of minority communities beyond the borders.

According to political communication, the introduction of simplified naturalization means the virtual unification of the Hungarian nation. The paper departures from the assumption that after the regime change the dichotomy in the understanding of the concept of the "Hungarian nation" was in fact institutionalized by the introduction of citizenship without residence and the extension of the right to vote.[15]

In this context, we examine the claim that:

2. the extension of citizenship and the granting external voting right deepens the dichotomy that has existed in national politics since the fall of communism: the Hungarian nation is

[14] For more on this, see chapter four of this thesis.
[15] Bárdi Nándor (2017): Álságos állítások a magyar etnopolitikában. A külhoni magyarok és a budapesti kormányzatok magyarságpolitikája. In: Jakab A., Urbán L. (szerk.): Hegymenet. Társadalmi és politikai kihívások Magyarországon. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, pp. 149-150.

both a community of Hungarians living in Hungary based on citizenship and a community of Hungarians living in other parts of the world in (ethno-)cultural terms. This issue has not been resolved by the amendment of the Citizenship Act, but rather might create fault lines within the members of Hungarian minority and diaspora communities based on who takes Hungarian citizenship and who does not. [16]

In the context of the impact of multiple citizenship on identity, attitudes and attachments, the research also examines a question that arises in almost all research on the relationship between citizenship and identity: why does someone become a dual citizen?

The literature on the motivations behind taking up a second citizenship can be divided into two main strands: one strand argues that individuals usually take up a second citizenship in order to strengthen their identity and their ties with the state. [17] According to another part of the literature, however, the acquisition of a second citizenship is primarily instrumental, i.e. it serves a purpose that is not identity reinforcement, but more pragmatic. [18] In partial contrast, it is assumed that these two motivations can reinforce and/or complement each other. In this context, the hypothesis investigated by the research is that:

3. in addition to the reinforcement of identity, applying for a second citizenship may also be motivated by instrumental motives, i.e. by some purpose, one does not exclude the other, and in fact, these two motives may reinforce and/or complement each other.

In the case of the national policy programs after 2010 (including the possibility of citizenship outside the territory), the central role of the Hungarian government in relations with Hungarian communities (minorities and diaspora) living beyond the border has been strengthened. Analysis of the post-2010 Hungarian citizenship practice supports the theory that the extension of citizenship outside the territory is (also) supporting the given state to convince individuals to help

[16] Bauer Tamás (2013): Cukor a sebbe. Magyar Kisebbség: Nemzetpolitikai Szemle, 18. évf., 69-70. sz., p. 171.
[17] See: Vasiljevic (2014) – in the case of the former Yugoslavia, the research examines the reasons why members of minority communities living in the territory of another state take up citizenship of their mother country, and concludes that the main motivation is to strengthen their identity. As we will see in the chapter on multiple citizenship, this issue also arises in the case of countries that support immigration.
[18] Research closely related to our topic suggests that taking up a second citizenship serves either a pragmatic purpose (e.g. EU citizenship) or an "exit plan", a "Plan B" in case things go badly in the home country. This perception is also reflected in the Hungarian discourse. See the relevant sections of the chapter on multiple citizenship and the analysis of the discourse on "dual citizenship" in Hungary.

to achieve the state's aims, such as winning elections or receiving the support of diaspora communities in order to achieve it's aim in foreign politics or international relations.[19]

4. By guaranteeing simplified naturalization and external voting rights, the kin-state may aim to create governmentality of the diaspora and minority communities living on the territory of other states.

For those claiming Hungarian citizenship in a diaspora or minority community, the meaning of Hungarian citizenship becomes context-dependent, a context that is always determined by everyday practices and individual life situations. Minority or diaspora identities are not rewritten by the acquisition of citizenship, because the people living in these communities do not behave primarily as Hungarian citizens in terms of everyday practices and life situations after acquiring citizenship, but continue their daily lives in the state where they live and prosper geographically. Starting from this assumption, we argue that Hungarian citizenship becomes important primarily symbolically, but in practice, neither the acquisition of Hungarian citizenship nor the extension of the right to vote in Hungarian elections will lead to the development of a Hungarian citizenship identity, which would rewrite everyday actions and attitudes. In other words, with regard to the fourth research question in the above list, we assume that the acquisition of citizenship does not lead to the development of Hungarian citizenship, and that there is no community of Hungarian and non-Hungarian citizens among diaspora and minority Hungarians. In this context, the hypothesis under examination is:

5. The extension of citizenship and voting rights does not rewrite minority or diaspora identity at the level of everyday life, so no citizenship identity is formed.

According to the literature, with the extension of the right to vote, extra-territorial citizenship can no longer be considered "quasi-citizenship", because it allows the individual to participate in the decisions of the community. In our research, we argue that this kind of citizenship identity is not, or only to a very small extent, developed in the people concerned. The assumption is that the acquisition of extra-territorial citizenship and the extension of the right to vote do not rewrite everyday practices and the identity constructions that are activated in these practices among the

[19] Hobsbawm, Eric; Ranger, Terence (1983): The Invention of Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

members of the communities we study, because they are more strongly influenced by the real, daily lived "local conditions". In this regard, we argue that:

6. the external right to vote creates a sense of responsibility for individuals who acquire citizenship through simplified naturalization and thus feel obliged to participate in elections, even if they do not live in the territory of the state. [20]

In order to answer these questions, the first part of the thesis outlines the most important findings of citizenship studies, thus creating a theoretical framework for the research. The second part then presents the results of the empirical research. The third part of the paper compares these to confirm or refute the claims made and answer the questions asked.

2. Research methodology

In order to confirm or refute the hypotheses and to answer the questions, two main methodologies were used. The first part of the thesis examines citizenship research through the literature in order to provide a theoretical framework for the empirical research presented in the second part of the thesis. The first part of the thesis therefore examines the theoretical discourse that has emerged in the literature on the practice of extra-territorial citizenship. In addition to the review and presentation of international legal documents (primary source analysis), a review of national and international literature (secondary source analysis) will be carried out. The second part of the thesis presents and analyses the empirical research. In order to achieve our research objectives, we conducted focus group discussions with Hungarians living in the diaspora and in minority communities.

2.1 Summary of the empirical research

The formulated hypotheses and research questions ask about both individual and group processes. For example, the question of why someone should or should not take Hungarian citizenship through simplified naturalization is an individual decision. At the same time, the question of whether a citizenship-based identity, group consciousness or citizenship consciousness is formed among those who acquire citizenship through simplified naturalization can be examined by looking at the processes within a given community examining group ties and group identity of the

[20] Based on Blais' argumentation, see: Blais, André (2000): To Vote or Not to Vote? The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 93-95

individual. To explore these dimensions simultaneously and in parallel, we organized focus group discussions in two Canadian states (Edmonton and Calgary in Alberta and Victoria and Nanaimo in British Columbia), in cities in Southern, Central and Eastern Slovakia (Velky Meder/Nagymegyer, Komárno/Komárom, Rimavská Sobota/Rimaszombat and Kosice/Kassa), and in Budapest with Hungarians from Slovakia living there.

Focus group discussion, or group interview, is a social science research method in which participants in a group of up to 10-12 people at a time talk to each other about a specific topic, coordinated by a moderator. The moderator's role is to structure and summarize the discussion and to ensure that participants have as equal a say as possible in the discussion, while motivating them to participate and express their views freely. For this research, we chose focus groups rather than interviews or questionnaires, for several reasons. The focus group allowed us to observe different ideas, narratives, opinions and individual attitudes within a group, reflecting and reacting to each other. The conversations reveal individual opinions, group positions, internal fault lines, and the issues and topics where there are differences between participants. This methodology also makes it possible to collect, analyze and compare large amounts of information in a short period of time and with a larger number of subjects at the same time.

It also has the advantage of expressing ideas in a much more realistic conversational situation than, for example, in an interview. In a focus group, the interviewees talk not only to the interviewer but also to each other. Where appropriate, they also ask each other questions, thereby broadening the discourse and introducing into the conversation topics that the interviewer may not have thought of through the interaction of the participants. As they react not only to the interviewer, but also to each other, discourses unfold that would not necessarily occur in a classical interview. In our view, these chains of reactions, arguments and counter-arguments, constitute a research material that could not be captured to the same extent by any other research method. This methodology has proved to be the most effective way to explore individual and group attachments and identity elements simultaneously, based on the way participants express them to each other, discuss them between each other.

2.2 Presentation of the selected case studies

The possibility of acquiring Hungarian citizenship through simplified naturalization affects both Hungarians living beyond the borders and diaspora Hungarians, and legally puts them in the same

category, so we considered it important to examine the issue from the perspective of the both groups. [21] For this purpose, we chose the Hungarian community in Slovakia and the diaspora Hungarians living in Canada. The Hungarian community in Slovakia is in a special position compared to other Hungarian communities living beyond the border in several respects. Firstly, Slovakia was the only state to take legal action in response to the amendment of the Hungarian Citizenship Act. According to this law, Slovakia does not tolerate the practice of multiple citizenship and anyone who takes up the citizenship of another state loses their Slovak citizenship. We also chose the Hungarian community in Slovakia because Slovakia joined the European Union together with Hungary and there is very little difference between the passports of the two countries. Nevertheless, according to the available statistics, more than a thousand people have taken Hungarian citizenship while retaining Slovak citizenship, so they are deliberately 'hiding' dual citizens, which is in fact a violation of the law. The Hungarian community in Slovakia is also of interest to us because, compared to other cross-border communities, assimilation and switch of languages are the biggest problems, along with a steady population decline.[22] In this context, we were also curious about the meaning and significance of Hungarian citizenship without a Hungarian address in Slovakia for Hungarians in terms of identity. We also considered it important to understand to what extent the Slovak citizenship "counter-law" has affected what citizenship of the state of the territory means to them and how this has affected their relationship with the state.

Canada is the second largest country in the world, where the Hungarian communities live far apart due to the vast distances, so organizing the community is a challenge for its members. Despite this, Hungarian groups are active at regional or national level, but have received little attention in Hungarian diaspora research.[23] Canada is an immigration-based and supportive country, which allows a wide range of ethnic groups to live their own culture and traditions in everyday life.

[21] The research was originally carried out by the Institute for Minority Studies, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, led by Attila Papp Z. In addition to the focus group discussions made in Kosice/Kassa and Velky Meder/Nagymegyer, further interviews were done in Transylvania, in which the author has also participated. The present thesis compares the results of the discussions made in Slovakia and Canada.

[22] According to 2011 census data, the proportion of Hungarians in Slovakia has decreased to 8.5% of the total population of Slovakia. Also, according to the census data, out of 458,467 Slovak citizens who identify themselves as Hungarians, 472,212 claim to speak Hungarian in their homes. Data source: Őry Péter et al (2014): A szlovákiai magyar közösség megmaradásának és gyarapodásának, valamint Dél-Szlovákia gazdasági felzárkóztatásának intézményi feltételei. Magyar Közösség Pártja. Source: https://bit.ly/3c6ZxIl. Accessed: 3 September 2019.

[23] See those works that are focusing on the history of Hungarian migration to Canada: Münz, Rainer; Ohlinger, Rainer (2003): Diasporas and Ethnic Migrants. Germany, Israel and Post-Soviet Successor States in Comparative Perspective. London: Frank Cass Publishers; Dreisziger, Nándor F. (1990): Immigrant Fortunes and Misfortunes in Canada in the

The Hungarians living here - or their ancestors - left Hungary or the country where they were born for one reason or another, whether of their own free will or under duress. We have chosen diaspora communities as the object of our investigation because these communities include not only those of Hungarian origin who were born in present-day Hungary, but also those who emigrated to Canada from the Hungarian minority communities in the neighboring countries around Hungary. In their case, multiple minority attitudes can be observed, since they were members of a minority community in their country of origin, and in Canada they experience/maintain/rediscover their Hungarianness as members of the Hungarian diaspora community.

Another factor in the choice of the two communities was the comparability of the results in the context that while Slovakia is a nation-state where nation-building is still incomplete[24], Canada is a liberal, immigration-based state with a richer tradition of multiple citizenship. We found it worthwhile to compare the issue and to understand how the different social, legal and political contexts in which our participants were socialized influence the construction and interpretation of the concept of citizenship and the attitude towards the kin-state.

2.3 Data collection and analysis

Data collection took place in two countries. Four focus group discussions were conducted in October 2013, February 2014 and March 2014 in Slovakia, in the cities of Velky Meder/Nagymegyer, Komárno/Komárom, Kosice/Kassa and Rimavská Sobota/Rimaszombat. In selecting the locations, careful attention was taken to include people from Hungarian-majority and mixed-ethnicity settlements. One focus group discussion took place in Budapest with Hungarians from Slovakia who have been living in Hungary for a longer period of time, but have family in Slovakia and who themselves travel home frequently or consider Slovakia to be their home. Four focus group discussions were conducted in the autumn of 2015 and in the spring and summer of

1920. Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XVII., No. 1., pp. 29-32.; Dreisziger, Nándor F. (2000): Rose-Gardens of Ice-Floes: A Century of the Hungarian Diaspora in Canada. Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies, Vol. 6., No. 2., pp. 239-258.; Adam, Christopher; Egervari Tibor; Laczko, Leslie; Young, Judy (2010): The 1956 Hungarian Revolution: Hungarian and Canadian Perspective. International Canadian Studies Series, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press; Hidas, Peter I. (2007): Canada and the Hungarian Jewish Refugees, 1956-57. East European Jewish Affairs, Vol. 37., No. 1., pp. 75-89.; Keyserlingk, Robert H. (ed.) (1993): Breaking Ground: The 1956 Hungarian Refugee Movement to Canada. Toronto: York Lanes Press; Vardy, Steven Bela (1993): Hungarian National Consciousness and the Question of Dual and Multiple Identity. Hungarian Studies Review, Vol. XX., No. 1-2., pp. 53-70.

[24] Culic (2003), p. 58.

2016 in Edmonton, Calgary, Nanaimo and Victoria in Western Canada, Alberta and British Columbia.

In most cases, personal contact was the most important starting point in the selection of interviewees. Firstly, we approached someone who was an active member of the local community and who, after consultation, recruited participants according to the criteria we had set. In most cases, the moderator did not know the participants personally and had not met them before.

In general, the aim was to make the groups as heterogeneous as possible, and it was important that each group included people who had taken Hungarian citizenship after 2010, and also people who had not taken Hungarian citizenship but could. It was also a criterion that participants identify themselves as Hungarian or identify themselves as belonging to the Hungarian community, but no language requirement was set. There were some groups in both countries where participants did not speak Hungarian well, in which case we either translated the question or they could answer in the language they preferred. The aim was also to ensure that all generations were represented as much as possible. In terms of education, we also aimed for heterogeneity, so that the majority of the groups had a mix of graduates and non-diploma interviewees. We also made sure that there were interviewees with mixed ties, i.e., either educated in Slovak schools, or with a parent/spouse who is Slovak or Canadian, or who is a second or third generation immigrant. In the diaspora, we have also paid special attention to the presence of young people, especially where there is a smaller Hungarian community - i.e., older people are represented, as well as those who have arrived in recent years or who may still be living in the country without Canadian citizenship. The moderator asked the same questions to all groups, taking into account the characteristics of the community (this was particularly important in Canada, where there were large differences between Hungarian communities in terms of how actively they participated in programs promoted by Hungary).

In all cases, the interviews were conducted anonymously, with the knowledge and consent of the participants, and audio recordings were made, which were then transcribed and coded using text analysis software (atlas.ti). This allowed for a more objective evaluation, so that we did not rely on preconceptions and theoretical assumptions for the evaluation, but rather on the codes and contexts created with the help of the software. During the discussion, we encountered several difficulties stemming from the methodology, which we managed to overcome. One of the main challenges in Slovakia was precisely the issue of existing Hungarian citizenship, since the Slovak

state prohibits multiple citizenship, we could not ask participants to "confess" to having taken Hungarian citizenship for the sake of the interview in front of people they did not know. Thus, we addressed this issue with differently worded questions (see more detailed analysis below).

Another major difficulty was the attitude towards the research and the moderator. In many cases, the moderator in Slovakia was perceived as an outsider who, coming from Hungary, knows little about their daily life and tries to learn as much as possible about Hungarians in Slovakia. There were several focus groups where the "you in Hungary - we in Felvidék" form of comparison came up several times when discussing certain issues. In the diaspora communities, the interest was received with reservations in several places, and there were groups where the invitation to the discussion was interpreted as another initiative of the Hungarian government, despite the fact that we had indicated in advance that the research was necessary for a doctoral dissertation. There were also some groups where the author of the thesis had to "prove" her research intentions and political independence by sending her previous studies. The "outsider" approach was to the moderator's advantage during the discussion, as she could ask the participants to elaborate on a question, or to explain certain contexts in more detail, on the grounds that she did not live there and did not have an insight into everyday life.

At the beginning of the interviews, clarifying the intention, presenting the research and explaining the details played an important role in easing reservations and gradually opening up to the interviewer and to each other. The recording of the interview was only started after everyone had acknowledged that the research was for a thesis, that the audio recordings would not be disclosed to third parties, that the interview would be anonymous, that only the municipality would be identified, that no information about them would be disclosed, and that everyone had given verbal consent to the audio recording. It was also important to make it clear that there are no right or wrong answers to the questions asked, only answers and opinions, and that our aim is not to qualify but to understand. The aim was also to create a spontaneous atmosphere and not to make the participants feel under pressure to give serious, thoughtful and considered answers. This was helped by the questions in the first rounds, which did not immediately ask about citizenship.

The questions were set up in such a way that by the time we got to the main topic, we had already discussed some of the larger themes of identity and community, self-definition and attitudes, so we came to the citizenship question having already covered other elements important to their

identity. Participants were not informed in advance about the questions and the exact topics, so that they did not have time to prepare and think about the answers in advance. We gave them the information in advance that the research was about Hungarian identity and "being Hungarian" and that we wanted to know their opinions and perceptions, but we did not tell them the exact questions in advance. No other aids (projector, paper) were used during the interview, participants were not given group tasks and there were no questions that they were given time to think about before answering. We structured the discussion in this way because we wanted to encourage spontaneity and emergent discourse. There were no topics or questions that participants declined to answer.

2.3.1 Structure of discussions

The discussion itself is divided into six main themes. In the first round, we focused on introducing ourselves and getting to know each other better. This not only helped to loosen the group atmosphere, but also allowed the interviewer to observe how the participants introduced themselves, what groups and communities they defined themselves as belonging to. The second major theme was their own national identity and the definition of their community. The third theme was attitudes. We were interested in how they relate to the majority and Hungarian society, what they think about Hungary and how they relate to their own territorial state. This last topic was introduced with a question that was usually unexpected, asking how the interviewees defined their country and where they felt at home.

We then turned to the topic of citizenship, where we first wanted to find out what the concept of citizenship (without the adjective) meant to the participants. Then we interpreted the meanings of citizenship given by the territorial state, and then we turned to the meanings of citizenship by simplified naturalization offered by the Hungarian state. This was followed by the topic of external voting rights. As a final question, we returned to their own communities and asked participants about their future, opportunities and challenges. In brief, the questions were structured as follows:

Self-definition and belonging to a group

1. Anticipation (Self-definition and belonging to a group) Briefly introduce themselves, mention all the things/activities they consider important, that define who they are. Describing the immediate groups to which they belong, of which they are members and which influence their

weekly/daily schedule; what are the larger/general communities or groups which, while not necessarily influencing their daily lives, do influence their lives and how they define themselves.

Who is Hungarian?

2. What does it mean to be Hungarian? Who is Hungarian? What role does Hungarian language play in this? When they think of being Hungarian, what is the first thing that comes to mind? What feelings do they have? What does it take to be considered Hungarian? Are there any preconditions, and if so, what are they?

3. Hungarian from Felvidék versus Hungarian from Slovakia? Is there a Canadian diaspora? How can we describe it?

Approaches

4 (Relationship to the majority society) Is there a difference between Slovaks/Canadians and Hungarians living there? If so, what are they? How could you express this?

5. Are there differences between Hungarians in Slovakia/Canada and Hungarians in Hungary? If so, how can these differences be expressed?

6. Why is it important for Hungary to support Hungarians across the border/across the sea? How are these initiatives reflected in the lives of their own communities?

7. Where is home? What is the homeland?

Citizenship

8. What does citizenship mean? How could you define it in your own words? Who is a good citizen?

9. What does Slovak/Canadian citizenship mean to them? What does it mean to them to be a citizen of Slovakia/Canada? What did it mean to become a Canadian citizen (if not born there)?

10. What is the purpose of simplified naturalisation? Is it important to have Hungarian citizenship? Does it contribute to the survival of Hungary as a community? Does it have an impact on everyday life?

11. Why did you take Hungarian citizenship? Why did you not take Hungarian citizenship? Do you plan to take Hungarian citizenship?

12. What do you think about the amendment of the Slovak Citizenship Act?

Voting rights

13. Does it make any difference that Hungarian citizenship comes with the right to vote? Is it important for a citizen not living in Hungary to vote in parliamentary elections in Hungary?

14. If you had the opportunity, would you vote? How do you find out who you would vote for?

15. What do you think will be the fate of Hungarians in Canada/Slovakia in the next period?

16. How do you see your own Hungarian community in 10 years?

The quotes highlighted in the dissertation are provided as evidence of our conclusions, without claiming completeness. We have sought to be as scientific and impartial as possible in order to obtain as objective a picture as possible when examining the questions set out above. This, however, required the researcher's identity to be placed in the background, so that the opinions presented here are as transparent as possible and free of personal preferences and sympathies. During the interviews we were guided by scientific curiosity and interest, which is why the selection of the quotations presented in this dissertation was also guided by the need to illustrate and substantiate them.

3. Research results

The dissertation addresses the question of the reception of Hungarian citizenship through simplified naturalization and how this is interpreted by those who are the "target group" of this possibility. We sought answers to the meanings participants attach to citizenship, how they define their original citizenship and their relationship to these states. Through a bottom-up approach, our aim was to examine the theoretical claims made in the literature on multiple/extraterritorial citizenship, as well as on the issue of external voting rights. From a macro perspective, our aim was to understand how the relationship between the state and the citizen is changing in the 21st century European Union and what conclusions can be drawn about the practice of extraterritorial

citizenship in Hungary. The conclusions of the paper will be drawn on the basis of the way the hypotheses were formulated, and then the questions posed at the beginning of the paper will be answered, summarizing the main findings.

Our qualitative research does not confirm the first hypothesis, that the differences between members of two communities with different socio-economic-political parameters would be "levelled out" by the citizenship offered by the mother country. We have found that the assumption that the extension of Hungarian citizenship will lead to the diasporisation of communities is not borne out. The characteristics of the individual communities, the challenges they face in their daily lives and their attitudes towards them are not transformed by the fact that the possibility of acquiring Hungarian citizenship has become a given. Despite the fact that similar issues emerged in the discussions, acceptance of Hungarian citizenship does not result in a change of attachment whereby individuals leave their original minority/ diaspora community, shedding the elements of identity that stem from being a minority/ diaspora member. Based on the interviews, it can be concluded that the specific socio-political situation, the different historical background and community structure are not transformed by the fact that the community members include people with Hungarian citizenship.

The assertion that the introduction of simplified naturalization institutionalized the dual approach to the meaning of the Hungarian nation that emerged after the change of regime has been confirmed. The dilemma of how exactly Hungarian citizenship is related to Hungarian identity, or to the fact that someone declares themselves Hungarian, and how to decide whether or not it is necessary to take up Hungarian citizenship, was raised in all focus groups. When participants were asked about who they consider to be Hungarian, the importance of citizenship did not play a role in defining this at all. When asked about what the Hungarian citizenships that can be acquired through simplified naturalization mean to them, they defined it primarily as "proof" or "recognition" of belonging to Hungary, adding that those who do not have it but declare themselves Hungarian are as much a part of the nation as those who acquire citizenship. But citizenship is still a proof of national belonging, a kind of multiple consciousness. In all groups, this duality is present: citizenship recognizes someone's Hungarian identity, but anyone who does not take it can be considered part of the nation, provided they declare themselves Hungarian. Based on the responses and discussions, we cannot conclude whether participants perceive taking up citizenship

as a "proof" of belonging to the nation or as establishing a legal relationship with a particular state and its community of citizens. In several conversations, the concepts of nation and state are confused, as is the meaning of exactly what ties citizenship creates. At the same time, however, there is a constant construction of the boundary between 'us' and 'them', on the basis of which participants, whether living in the diaspora or in a minority community, distinguish themselves from Hungarians in Hungary.

When we asked participants about the reasons behind taking up citizenship, the two main motivations that we have examined in the literature as either-or options emerged simultaneously: pragmatic and symbolic reasons. On this basis, some research has also classified countries into two broad groups, according to where more people take up citizenship for symbolic reasons and where more people take up citizenship for pragmatic reasons. For the majority of respondents, both in diaspora and minority communities, the symbolic content of Hungarian citizenship was the dominant motivating factor, but in most cases pragmatic reasons, such as the benefits of travel or learning, also came to the fore. However, in the Slovakian interviews, although the majority of respondents there also recognized the symbolic meaning of citizenship, most did not consider it sufficient to take it up. For them, the territorial meaning of citizenship and the existence of a real relationship between the state and the individual were more important: taking Hungarian citizenship is meaningful if the individual lives there, as it makes his/her daily life easier in the other country.

The motivation for applying for citizenship by simplified naturalization is not primarily or exclusively the experience of belonging to a nation, but individual strategies based on the instrumental advantages that citizenship can provide. When asked about the reasons for taking up Hungarian citizenship without living in the country, some of the respondents stated that the reason was that it was a proof of their nationality. At the same time, some of the respondents saw it as an opportunity and considered the advantages or disadvantages of obtaining a Hungarian passport when applying. In the diaspora, this question was clearly linked to travel opportunities, i.e. respondents (also) took into account the fact that having Hungarian EU citizenship would make it easier for them to travel within the EU and to other parts of the world. In our interviews in Slovakia, we also observed this interpretation of citizenship, but from the opposite perspective: they do not need Hungarian citizenship and with it a Hungarian passport, because it gives them equal benefits

as their existing Slovak citizenship. At the same time, this consideration also takes into account the disadvantages of taking up Hungarian citizenship: if a Hungarian from Slovakia takes up Hungarian citizenship, he loses his Slovak citizenship and thus also the rights that go with it, such as the right to vote. It can therefore be concluded that the two motives, which are separated in the literature, can appear simultaneously and complementarily. Although symbolic belonging is the first reason given for admission in most cases, it is followed in most cases by ideas that compare the 'value' of Hungarian citizenship, i.e. the advantages and disadvantages of admission. The discourse that unfolds in the two different communities differs here: in the diaspora, the advantages of travel and the opportunities that come with an EU passport are highlighted, whereas in the minority community, these are given with a Slovak passport. The disadvantages they would face if they were to take up Hungarian citizenship are more prominent here.

The claim that extending citizenship to non-resident Hungarians living abroad with Hungarian ancestors has served the purpose of creating governmentality has been confirmed in the diaspora and has not been confirmed in conversations with Hungarians in Slovakia. According to the diaspora interviews, the extension of citizenship and voting rights tries to create the possibility of governmentality outside the borders of the state through the individual's sense of belonging to the nation. This is indicated when diaspora participants point out that it may not be possible to speak of a unified diaspora for their locally organized communities. The participants' responses suggest that the Hungarian government wants to organize dispersed local communities with different needs from the top down, with central coordination in Budapest, but with varying results - see for example the questions around the Diaspora Council's Canadian representatives and the way they spoke about the Diaspora Council itself. This is also reflected in the conversations where participants themselves expressed that there are efforts coming from Budapest to unify and connect the life of their communities, but in several places, it was also interpreted as a question of whether there is a "united Hungarian diaspora in Canada" in the context of long distances and small, ageing Hungarian communities.

At the same time, the discussions across the border suggest that, as an autonomous community with an institutional system and political representation, the Hungarian state's aspirations are felt differently - they are not felt as intensely by our participants from Slovakia as they are by the diaspora. In the course of some of the interviews, they suggest that the export of Hungarian

political fragmentation across the border is having a detrimental effect within the community (as they put it, being a 'grand magyar' is becoming fashionable; those who claim to be Hungarian also claim to be right-wing; the term 'Hungarian from Upland' comes from Hungary), but they do not report feeling that they are trying to interfere from the outside in the organization of their own community, as they put it in Canada. The second, or non-native, citizenship is essentially based on an individual choice, the individual is free to decide whether or not to take up the option of citizenship. In this sense, the Hungarian practice of citizenship and post-2010 national policy can be seen as an individualization of nationalism, because it does not seek to bind territory to the nation, it does not encourage people living in other states to move back, but rather binds the individual to the nation in a virtual space independent of geographical space. The Hungarian state "recognizes" the national identity and belonging of those who take up citizenship through simplified naturalization. This is not only the claim of political communication, but also of the people we interviewed, regardless of whether they spoke about it in diaspora or in a minority community.

The interviews show that a new form of citizenship is emerging, in which citizenship is separated from territory and denotes a sense of belonging to a nation. However, this new kind of virtual state-ethnic relationship does not, according to our results, override the identity factors that make diaspora communities and minority communities what they are, as we indicated in the justification of the first hypothesis. Simplified naturalization creates the concept of a global nation, but extraterritorial citizenship does not overwrite everyday identity constructions and differences arising from the different socio-political contexts in which Hungarians live in the world. In these identity constructs, the territory, the everyday life lived there, the way of life and social relations established in the country play an important role. Although the meaning of citizenship is supplemented by the formalization of a metaphorical state-nation-unity bond, at the individual level, territory remains an important factor in everyday practices, or rather the fact of where an individual lives his or her everyday life, where his or her life takes place. This was also demonstrated in the discussions when, for example, the interpretation of the Slovak citizenship highlighted the fact that it is through the right to vote that they can most effectively build and represent their community, or when participants discussed the fact that Slovak citizenship, although a legal relationship, enables them to create their well-being in Slovakia and to live their daily lives in the territory they perceive as home.

For the diaspora members, the same became clear when Canadian citizenship was linked to the reasons and circumstances of their emigration - where they could start a new life. Or, the importance of attachment to the territory came through everyday expressions such as when they talked about how, although Hungary is everything, it is good to go home to Canada after two weeks in Hungary. While citizenship may mean membership in a nation, everyday life is not virtual, but takes place in a real territory, in real, not symbolic, relationships. At the same time, we did not find that a new citizenship identity emerged for those who took Hungarian citizenship, overriding the constructs of original citizenship. Primarily, a symbolic sense of belonging is formed or strengthened by taking up Hungarian citizenship, but, at least according to the interviews, this is not linked to a sense of Hungarian citizenship. By this we mean that all of them associate Hungarian citizenship with the meaning of symbolic belonging to the nation and the benefits of the passport, and do not talk about their legal relationship with the Hungarian state, as many do, for example, when interpreting their original citizenship. The other important conclusion, which refutes our fifth hypothesis, is that the use of simplified naturalization is based on an individual decision, which may in some cases reflect a need to express a sense of belonging to Hungary, but this is at the individual, not the group, level. It is primarily in the diaspora that this becomes apparent: the fact that they are Hungarians and declare themselves Hungarian is a group experience; the fact that there are also those among them who have Hungarian citizenship is primarily an individual matter. It is not on the basis of citizenship that these communities are organized, either in the diaspora or in a minority. In other words, they feel part of the Hungarian nation on the basis of their nationality and not on the basis of their citizenship.

Voting rights extended beyond borders has been one of the most controversial issues in both communities. Our hypothesis was essentially based on Blais' assumption that voters often perceive voting as an obligation for some reason. In this context, we were interested in how the 'addressed' understand the extended external right to vote and what discourse is emerging on this issue. The claim that the right to vote is perceived as an obligation by those entitled to vote was confirmed by the interviews. Those who had taken up citizenship felt that once they had received this recognition, they owed it to the Hungarian government to exercise this right. Another interpretation was the concept of a 'thankful vote', which meant that the gesture of extending citizenship should be rewarded with a vote - not only by voting, but also by who they vote for in the elections. To a greater extent in minority communities, and to a lesser extent in diaspora communities, but there

has also emerged a perception of the right to vote that, because they do not live in the territory of the state, voting would be tantamount to 'having a say in someone else's business'. Thus, in addition to obligation and gratitude, the right to vote was also understood as a moral issue, but one that, unlike interpretations of citizenship, was closely linked to the existence of an actual relationship between the state and the individual. The right to vote did not always mean that an individual voted on what should happen on the territory of the state. There were conversations in both minority and diaspora contexts where it was clear that participants also linked voting to the future of the nation. When they vote from abroad, they are voting not only on what should happen to Hungarians inside Hungary, but also on what should happen to the Hungarian community outside Hungary. This provides an example of the transformation of the understanding of the demos as explained in the theoretical section: votes cast within a community with a government do not determine the everyday life of the community of the nation-state that is bound to the territory, but also affect those outside its borders. In this interpretation, elections are not only issues within the territory of Hungary, but also on issues affecting the nation, or rather the world nation. However, this was only a small proportion of the conversation, and the statistics suggest the same, as both the 2014 and 2018 parliamentary elections had low turnout rates of non-resident Hungarians abroad. However, this issue requires longer-term investigation and research, as there is currently almost no information available on who cast their vote in this way and what their reasons for voting were.

The research shows that citizenship remains an important mean of shaping identity and drawing community boundaries, and in this respect its importance is not diminishing, but rather transforming into a manifestation of it. This can also be seen from the way participants defined their existing original citizenship and the meaning of Hungarian citizenship. Although different meanings emerged for their pre-existing citizenship in the diaspora as a minority, the impact of citizenship on identity was evident in both cases. Participants who were Canadian citizens in the diaspora described their Canadian citizenship as being associated with a sense of gratitude, arrival, making a home, and belonging somewhere. Participants who also held citizenship of one of Hungary's neighboring countries described their citizenship as a marker of their minority origin, of belonging to a minority. In the interviews in Slovakia, Slovak citizenship is a given fact, a relationship with the state where they live, but primarily an emotionally empty, or at least neutral, relationship. At the same time, it gives them the rights and opportunities they need for their daily lives in the territory they define as home. In a minority community, the sense of Slovak citizenship

is interpreted in terms of difference from the majority and a sense of being an outsider - the tension between nationality and citizenship. The research did not aim to resolve the dilemmas, tensions or possibly conflicts that emerged in the discussions of the different interpretations of citizenship, but they do not confirm the diminishing importance of citizenship as a means of defining identity.

Accepting Hungarian citizenship in the diaspora has also given them a sense of European ancestry, which enables them to distinguish themselves from Canadian citizens of other origins. In the case of those who migrated to Canada from across the border, the Hungarian passport distinguished them from the majority in their country of origin in the first place: from the moment they obtained a Hungarian passport, they were no longer "Romanians", "Serbs" or "Ukrainians", but Hungarians - it was officially recognized that they were not "only" different from the majority society of their country of origin because of their nationality or mother tongue, but were now certified Hungarians. In minority communities, Hungarian citizenship has become a symbol of being closer to Hungarians in Hungary, where they can shed the perception that they are considered 'Slovak' because of their original citizenship.

The motivations behind the acceptance or rejection of Hungarian citizenship through simple naturalization are the same in the diaspora and in minority communities, but different in approach, as our interviews show. While people in the diaspora take up Hungarian citizenship because of its symbolic meaning and practical benefits, in the minority community the importance of the symbolic meaning is apparent, but precisely because of the practical benefits guaranteed by Slovak citizenship by default, the symbolic value does not seem to be a sufficient reason for individuals to take it up, especially if they do not move to Hungary. In minority communities, symbolic meaning alone is not a motivation for the majority to take up citizenship. It only makes sense to take up citizenship if the individual is able to enjoy the practical benefits of citizenship, and this only happens if the individual lives or works in Hungary. Accepting Hungarian citizenship is not sufficient to maintain, strengthen and pass on identity; it is necessary to work on a daily basis within a minority community to maintain and pass on this identity.

In relation to the external right to vote, most people in both communities linked it to the moral issue of 'having a say in other people's affairs', which stems from the fact that they do not live in the country and therefore do not have the right to vote there. Among those who had taken up Hungarian citizenship, there were those in all groups who felt at the same time that this should be

rewarded, i.e. they should participate in the next elections and that this gratitude should be expressed by voting. The majority of those belonging to this group vote not on the basis of party platforms, or being informed about Hungarian public life, but primarily (or exclusively) on the basis of which party gave them the opportunity to take up Hungarian citizenship. The discussion of the right to vote also raises the question of how the relationship between the state and the community it governs will change in the 21st century as states increasingly use the possibility of extraterritorial citizenship and the right to vote. The significance and reality of extraterritorial citizenship is context-dependent. While its symbolic significance cannot be questioned, this symbolic meaning does not override the reality of everyday life.

The meaning of citizenship and the community of citizens with a government have been linked in Hungarian practice to the question of belonging to the nation and their de-territorialisation is taking place, but primarily in a virtual way. In fact, our research shows that everyday minority or diaspora practices are not overwritten by the fact that the individual also has a primarily symbolic citizenship. The emergence of a civic identity linked to Hungarian citizenship does not emerge from the interviews, either in diaspora or in minority communities. Even if one accepts the approach that, with the extension of the right to vote, citizenship outside the territory is no longer 'just' 'quasi-citizenship', since the individual can now participate in shaping the future of the community. While it unfolds in a conversation that those who vote also vote on the nation, and therefore those who do not live in Hungary also have a say in what happens there, this is not the case for the majority. It can be concluded that, in addition to the symbolic meaning, Hungarian citizenship becomes a reality when the individual travels and uses his/her Hungarian passport (this tends to occur in the diaspora) or moves to Hungary and takes up a job there (this tends to occur in minority communities). The fact that citizenship and voting rights are extended to people living outside the territory of the state does not automatically mean that the individuals thus 'addressed', granted citizenship and voting rights will have a citizenship identity/consciousness, will define themselves as such. As we have seen from the discussion, it emerges that at the individual level it is often not clear what someone who takes up Hungarian citizenship actually means. What emerges is rather its symbolic significance, its emotional importance, which has an impact primarily on the individual's national self-definition ("officially a member of the Hungarian nation" type of formulations and arguments) and not on his or her identity as a citizen - symbolically belonging to the Hungarian nation and being tied to the Hungarian state, but in the interpretation of this, the fact

that he or she does not live there is strongly reflected. Theoretically, the extension of citizenship and voting rights extends the community with a government beyond the state borders, but at the level of everyday life, we see that this does not rewrite the functioning of diaspora and minority communities at either the individual or community level.

In practice, therefore, the extension of citizenship and the right to vote does not in itself create a "community of the governed", which could only be achieved if citizenship identity and consciousness are not primarily symbolic but actual, i.e. through the granting of real rights and obligations. Among these rights and obligations, there are some that can be guaranteed independently of borders (e.g. the right to vote), but most of them cannot be guaranteed precisely because of the fact of being outside the territory. Thus citizenship, together with the right to vote, remains symbolic, virtual and context-dependent at the level of everyday life. In this sense, the community of the governed is theoretically transformed to include people who do not live on the territory of the state, but it is not guaranteed that these 'new' citizens will actively exercise the rights conferred by citizenship, in particular, if the significance of citizenship outside the territory thus acquired is 'exhausted' in terms of affirming identity and a sense of belonging, or in terms of casting a vote out of gratitude/vengeance/commitment, while the experience of acquiring citizenship is 'fresh' and these feelings are present. The strengthening of identity through citizenship outside the territory does not result in the development of a citizenship identity, since the elements that actually define the individual's everyday life do not cease to exist once his or her identity and nationality have been confirmed by citizenship. The importance of Hungarian citizenship and the right to vote emerge first and foremost after these events, and primarily in a symbolic sense. As regards the relationship between the state and the individual, in addition to the conclusions set out above, another important element emerges from the research. Citizenship itself, regardless of where an individual lives geographically or whether he or she has a 'de facto' relationship with the state, remains a relationship or legal bond between the individual and the state, and not between the minority/diaspora community and the state. Citizenship itself therefore institutionalises an individual relationship between individual and state, not between individual communities and the state. This 'property' of citizenship, as our research suggests, at the level of everyday life, is not overwritten by the fact that citizenship becomes extraterritorial. It is this individuality whereby the transnational extension of citizenship does not automatically imply the emergence of a citizenship identity or consciousness, nor does it imply that, in the case of multiple

citizenship, the individual will consciously 'live' all his or her citizenships, will behave as a citizen in all his or her citizenships. For the latter to emerge, at least according to our research, real, actual and permanent interactions between the state, the individual and the community belonging to the state (i.e. living primarily there) are necessary. As long as these interactions are primarily symbolic and temporary, the experience of citizenship itself, and the meanings and behaviors associated with it, remain symbolic and temporary. This does not, however, entail the formation of an identity or consciousness of citizenship, nor of a group consciousness based on it.

Main sources:

Adamoski, Robert; Chunn, Dorothy; Menzies, Robert (2013): Contesting Canadian Citizenship –

Historical Readings. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Agarin, Timofey; Karolewski, Pawel (2015): Extraterritorial Citizenship in Postcommunist Europe. Rowman and Littlefield; London.

Anderson, Benedict (1998): The spectre of comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia and the world. London: Verso.

Anderson, Benedict (1983): Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso.

Arendt, Hannah (1993): The Origins of Totalitarianism. Harcourt: New York.

Barbour, Rosaline (2018): Doing Focus Groups. London: Sage Publications

Bárdi Nándor (2004): Tény és való. Pozsony: Kalligram.

Bárdi Nándor (2004): Magyarország és a határon túli magyarok (1948-1989). In: Bárdi N., Fedinec Cs.,

Szarka L. (szerk.): Kisebbségi magyar közösségek a 20. században. Gondolat, Budapest, pp. 296–305.

Bárdi Nándor (2003): Hungary and the Hungarains Living Abroad: A Historical Outline. Regio, VI., pp. 121-138.

Bauböck, Rainer; Rundell, John (eds.) (2018): Blurred Boundaries – Migration, Ethnicity, Citizenship. Routlege; London.

Bauböck, Rainer; Perchinig, Bernhard; Sievers, Wiebke (eds.): Citizenship policies in the New Europe. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Bauböck, Rainer (2017): Political Boundaries and Democratic Membership. In: Shachar, A.; Bauböck,

R; Bloemraad, I.; Vink, M. (eds.): The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 60–82.

Bauböck, Rainer (2010b): Studying Citizenship Constellations. Journal of Ethnic and Migration

Studies. Vol. 36., No. 5., pp. 847–859.

Bauböck, Rainer (2009): The rights and duties of external citizenship. Citizenship Studies, Vol. 13., No. 5., pp. 475–499.

Bauböck, Rainer (2007a): Stakeholder Citizenship and Transnational Political Participation: A Normative Evaluation of External Voting. Fordham Law Review, Vol. 75., No 5., pp. 2393–2447.

Benhabib, Seyla; Shapiro, Ian; Petranovich, Danilo (eds.) (2007): Identities, Affiliations, and Allegiances. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blais, André (2000): To Vote or Not to Vote? The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.

Borbándi Gyula (1996): Emigráció és Magyarország. Nyugati magyarok a változások éveiben 1985-1995, Basel – Budapest: Európai Protestáns Magyar Szabadegyetem.

Brubaker, Rogers (1992a): Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany. Harvard University Press; Cambridge.

Brubaker, Rogers (1996): Nationalism Reframed. Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brubaker, Rogers (2004b): Ethnicity without groups. Cambridge: Harward University Press.

Cohen, Robin (1997): Global Diasporas. An Introduction. Seattle: University of Washington.

Cook-Martín, David (2013): The Scramble for Citizens: Dual Nationality and State Competition for Immigrants. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Cordell, Karl; Wolff, Stefan (2007): Germany as a kin state: The development and implementation of a norm-consistent external minority policy towards Central and Eastern Europe. Nationalities Papers, Vol. 35., No. 2., pp. 289-315.

Cserny Ákos (szerk): Határtalan választások. Tanulmányok a külhoni állampolgárok választása témakörében. NKE Szolgáltató Kft.; Budapest.

Deets, Stephen (2008): The Hungarian Status Law and the Spectre of Neo-medievalism in Europe. Ethnopolitics, Vol. 7, No. 2-3., pp. 195 – 215.

Delanty, Gerard (2000): Citizenship in a Global Age: Society, Culture, Politics. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Don Chapman (2015): The Lost Canadians: A Struggle for Citizenship Rights, Equality, and Identity.Vancouver: Pugwash Publishing.

Dumbrava, Costica (2014a): Nationality, Citizenship and Ethno-cultural Belonging. Preferential Membership Policies in Europe. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Faist, Thomas (2007): Dual Citizenship in Europe. Ashgate; Hampshire.

Fox, John E.; Miller-Idriss, Cynthia (2008): Everyday Nationhood. Ethnicities, Vol. 8., No. 4., pp. 536-563.

Gamlen, Alan (2014): Diaspora Institutions and Diaspora- Governance. International Migration Review, Vol. 48. No. 1., pp. 180-217.

Ganczer Mónika (2014): Sarkalatos átalakulások: az állampolgársági jog átalakulása. MTA Law Working Papers, 2014/63. pp. 1-16.

Gazsó, Dániel (2020): Otthon és itthon. A magyar diaszpóra és anyaországa. Doktori értekezés, Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Politikaelméleti Doktori Iskola.Forrás: https://bit.ly/3c3juzy. Hozzáférés: 2021. január 3.

Gellner, Ernst (1994): The condition of liberty: civil society and its rivals. New York: Penguin Press.

Goodman, Sara Wallace (2014): Immigration and Membership Politics in Western Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, Ron (ed.): The Essential Trudeau. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Habermas, Jürgen (1996): Citizenship and national identity, between facts and norms. MIT Press.

Halász Iván (2014): A külhoni szavazás története és jelene: pro és kontra érvek, pp. 38. In: Cserny Ákos (szerk): Határtalan választások. Tanulmányok a külhoni állampolgárok választása témakörében. Budapest: NKE Szolgáltató Kft.

Halász Iván (2009): Állampolgárság, migráció és integráció. A modern politikai közösségek dilemmái az Európai Unióban. Budapest: MTA Jogtudományi Intézet, pp. 21-25.

Hopkins, Nick; Blackwood, Leda (2011): Everyday Citizenship: Identity and Recognition. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, Vol. 21., No 3., pp. 215-227.

Horváth, Enikő (2008): Mandating Identity: Citizenship, Kinship Laws and Plural Nationality in the European Union. Alphen aan den Rijn, Kluwer Law International.

Howard, Marc M. (2009): The Politics of Citizenship in Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobson, David (1996): Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Jakab A., Urbán L. (szerk.): Hegymenet. Társadalmi és politikai kihívások Magyarországon. Osiris Kiadó, Budapest.

Joppke, Christian (2010): Citizenship and Immigration. Cambridge: Polity Press, Cambridge.

Joppke, Christian (2003): Citizenship between De and Re-Ethnicization. European Journal of Sociology, Vol. 44., No. 3., pp. 435 – 442.

Kántor Zoltán, Majtényi Balázs, Osamu Ieda, Vizi Balázs, Halász Iván (eds.) (2004): The Hungarian Status Law: Nation Building and/or Minority Protection. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University.

Kántor Zoltán (szerk.) (2002): A státustörvény. Dokumentumok, tanulmányok, publicisztika. Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány.

Kántor Zoltán (szerk.) (2002): A státustörvény – előzmények és következmények; Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány.

Kántor Zoltán (2014): A nemzet intézményesülése a rendszerváltás utáni Magyarországon. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Kaplan, William (ed.): Belonging – The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship. Montreal &Kingston: McGill – Queen's University Press.

Kasapovic, Mirjana (2012): Voting Rights, Electoral Systems, and Political Representation of Diaspora in Croatia. East European Politics and Societies and Cultures, Vol. 26., No. 4., pp. 777-791.

Kastoryano, Riva (2005): Citizenship, nationhood, and non-territoriality: Transnational participation in Europe. PS: Political Science and Politics, Vol. 38., No. 4., pp: 693-696.

Kelley, Ninette; Trebilcock Michael J. (2010): The Making of the Mosaic: A History of Canadian Immigration Policy. 2nd ed., Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Knott, Eleanor (2017a): Quasi-citizenship as a category of practice: analyzing engagement with Russia's Compatriot policy in Crimea. Citizenship Studies, Vol. 21, No. 1., pp. 116-135.

Knott, Eleanor (2017b): The extra-territorial paradox of voting: the duty to vote in extra-territorial elections. Democratization, Vol. 24., No. 2., pp. 325-346.

Kostakopoulou, Dora (2008): The Future Governance of Citizenship. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kovács, Eszter (2020): Direct and indirect political remittances of the transnational engagement of Hungarian kin-minorities and diaspora communities. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, Vol. 46., No. 6.; pp.1146-1165.

Laurence, Jonathan; Goodliffe, Gabriel (2013): The French Debate on National Identity and the Sarkozy Presidency: A Retrospective. The International Spectator: Italian Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 48., No. 1., pp. 34-47.

M. Kovács Mária, Tóth Judit (2009): Kin-state responsibility and ethnic citizenship: The Hungarian case. In: Bauböck, R., Perchining, B., Sievers, W. (eds.): Citizenship Policies in the New Europe. Amsterdam University Press; Amsterdam; pp. 151-176.

Marshall, Thomas (1950): Citizenship and Social Class. University Press Cambridge, Cambridge.

Miller, David (1988): The Ethical Significance of Nationality. Ethics, Vol. 98., No. 4, pp. 647 – 662.

Ong, Aihwa (1999): Flexible citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality. Durham: Duke University Press.

Osamu, Idea (ed.) (2006): Beyond Sovereignty: From Status Law to Transnational Citizenship? Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University.

Papp Z. Attila (2017): Trickster Logics in the Hungarian Dual-Citizenship Offer. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, Vol. 23, No. 1., pp. 18-32.

Papp, Z. Attivala (2010): A nyugati magyar diaszpóra és szervezeti élete néhány demográfiai, társadalmi jellemzője. Kisebbségkutatás, Vol. 19., No. 4., pp. 621-638.

Papp, Z. Attila (2008): Beszédből világ. Elemzések, adatok amerikai magyarokról. Budapest: Magyar Külügyi Intézet.

Pogonyi, Szabolcs (2018): The passport as means of identity management: making and unmaking ethnic boundaries through citizenship. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies. Vol 45., Issue 6., pp. 975-993.

Pogonyi, Szabolcs (2017): Extra-Territorial Ethnic Politics, Discourses and Identities in Hungary. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Pogonyi, Szabolcs (2011): Dual citizenship and Sovereignty. Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity, Vol. 39., pp. 685-704.

Ragazzi, Francesco (2009): Governing Diasporas. International Political Sociology, Vol. 3., pp. 378–397.

Ragazzi, Francesco; Balalovska, Kristina (2011): Diaspora politics and post-territorial citizenship in Croatia, Serbia and Macedonia. CITSEE Working Paper 2011/18.

Salat Levente (2013): A könnyített honosítás látható és várható következményeiről. Válaszok a Magyar Kisebbség kérdéseire. Magyar Kisebbség, 69-70. sz., 18. évf. pp. 226 – 240.

Shachar, Ayelet (2009): The Birthright Lottery: Citizenship and Global Inequality. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Smith, Antony (1991): National Identity. London: Penguine Books.

Soysal, Yasmine (1994): Limits of citizenship. Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe.Chicago: University Press of Chicago.

Spiro, Peter J. (2016): At Home In Two Countries: The Past and Future of Dual Citizenship. New York University Press; New York.

Spiro, Peter J. (2008): Beyond Citizenship. American Identity After Globalization. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spiro, Peter J. (2006): Perfecting Political Diaspora. New York University Law Review, Vol. 81., No. 19., pp 101-125.

Stokes-DuPass, Nicole; Fruja, Ramona (2016): Citizenship, Belonging and Nation-States in the TwentyFirst Century. Palgrave Macmillan; Hampshire.

Szarka László; Tóth Norbert; Kántor Zoltán (2009) (szerk.): Etnopolitikai modellek a gyakorlatban. Budapest: MTA kisebbségkutató Intézet – Gondolat Kiadó.

Szarka László, Vizi Balázs, Majtényi Balázs, Kántor Zoltán (szerk.): Nemzetfogalmak és etnopolitikai modellek Kelet-Közép-Európában. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.

Torpey, John C. (2000): The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship, and the State. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Tóth Judit (2004): Státusjogok. Budapest: Lucidus Kiadó.

Tóth Judit (2000): A diaszpóra a jogszabályok tükrében. In: Sík E., Tóth J. (szerk.): Diskurzusok a vándorlásról. Budapest: MSZH Nyomda, pp. 185-217.

Vizi Balázs (2006b): The evaluation of the status law in the EU. Osamu, Idea (ed.) (2006): Beyond Sovereignty: From Status Law to Transnational Citizenship? Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, pp. 89-107.

Waterbury, Myra (2014): Making Citizens Beyond the Borders. Nonresident Ethnic Citizenship in PostCommunist Europe. Problems of Post-Communism, Vol. 61., No. 4., pp. 36-49.

Waterbury, Myra A. (2010): Between State and the Nation. Diaspora Politics and Kin-State Nationalism in Hungary. Palgrave Macmillan, New York: St. Martin's PressLLC

Weil, Patrick (2001): Access to Citizenship: A Comparison of Twenty-Five Nationality Laws. In: Aleinikoff, A. T.; Klusmeyer, D. (2001): Citizenship Today. Global Perspectives and Practices. Harrisonburg: R. R. Donnelley and Sons, pp. 17-34.

Weiner, Myron (1971): The Macedonian Syndrome: An Historical Model of International Relations and Political Development, World Politics, Vol. 23., No 4., pp. 665-683.

Winter, Elke (2014): (Im)Possible Citizens: Canada's 'Citizenship Bonanza' and its Boundaries. Citizenship Studies, Vol. 18., No. 1., pp. 46-62.

Winter, Elke; Previsic, Ivana (2019): The politics of un-belonging: Lessons from Canada's experiment with citizenship revocation. Citizenship Studies, Vol. 23., No. 4., pp. 338-355.