

THESIS ARTICLE

Gabriella Hermann

**Solidarity overseas:
Hungarian American advocacy efforts for Hungarians in Romania during the Cold War era**

Doctoral dissertation

Supervisors:

Dr. Csaba Békés, Ph.D., D.Sc.

Professor, Corvinus University of Budapest
Research Professor, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Dr. Péter Marton, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, Corvinus University of Budapest

Budapest, 2022

Institute of International Studies

THESIS ARTICLE

Gabriella Hermann

Solidarity overseas:

Hungarian American advocacy efforts for Hungarians in Romania during the Cold War era

című Ph.D. értekezéséhez

Témavezetők:

Dr. Békés Csaba, Ph.D., D.Sc.

Egyetemi tanár, BCE TK NTI
Tudományos tanácsadó, MTA TK PTI

Dr. Marton Péter, Ph.D.

Egyetemi docens, BCE TK NTI

© Gabriella Hermann
Budapest, 2022

Table of contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Precedents of the research and justification of the research topic..... | 2 |
| 2. Theoretical framework and used methods..... | 4 |
| 2.1. <i>Research questions, hypothesis, basic definitions, and theoretical framework.....</i> | 4 |
| 2.2. <i>Research methods used in specific parts of the dissertation.....</i> | 6 |
| 3. Conclusions, research results..... | 8 |
| 3.1. <i>The history of the identity layers, organizations and political needs of the American Hungarian diaspora.....</i> | 8 |
| 3.2. <i>The effectiveness of the American Hungarian advocacy work for Hungarians in Romania.....</i> | 15 |
| 3.3. <i>Results of the dissertation: proof of hypothesis, answers to research questions and novelties.....</i> | 20 |
| 3.4. <i>Novelties of the dissertation.....</i> | 24 |
| 4. Literature review..... | 26 |
| 4.1. <i>Most important primary sources.....</i> | 26 |
| 4.1.1. <i>Most used archival sources.....</i> | 26 |
| 4.1.2. <i>Most cited interviews, conferences, lectures and personal statements.....</i> | 26 |
| 4.1.3. <i>Most used journals, brochures, publications and internet databases.....</i> | 26 |
| 4.2. <i>Most important secondary sources.....</i> | 27 |
| 4.2.1. <i>History of the Cold War.....</i> | 27 |
| 4.2.2. <i>Diaszpóra-elmélet, általános és etnikai lobbi.....</i> | 27 |
| 4.2.3. <i>American Hungarian Diaspora.....</i> | 28 |
| 5. List of own publications..... | 29 |
| 5.1. <i>Studies and reviews published in Hungarian speaking peerreviewed journals.....</i> | 29 |
| 5.2. <i>Books and book chapters published in foreign language.....</i> | 29 |
| 5.3. <i>Other types of publications published in foreign language.....</i> | 29 |

1. Precedents of the research and justification of the research topic

The author started her research on the advocacy activities in the U.S. for Hungarians in Romania in the framework of her thesis written at the Department of International Studies at Corvinus University of Budapest in 2010, based on the legacy of Béla Teleki, the former leader of the American Transylvanian Association (ATF), an organization active since the 1950s. The legacy was kept at the Manuscript Collection of the National Széchenyi Library and was still being settled at that time. (Hermann, 2012). There were several arguments in favor of expanding the topic and processing the research data in the form of a doctoral dissertation. The most compelling argument was that the history of the advocacy activities of the successor organization of ATF, the Hungarian Human Rights Foundation (HHRF), was also being unexplored.

The author carried out research in the United States several times to shed light on the U.S. side of advocacy activities. In 2014, within the framework of the Kőrösi Csoma Sándor Program, she participated in the partial settlement of the HHRF's document collection and its preparation for digitization. She also had the opportunity to research in the U.S. National Archives (NARA), and then in 2019 she had the opportunity to explore several U.S. archives with the Visiting Student Research fellowship funded by the Fulbright Commission. Thus, in addition to the National Archives, she could research in the Presidential Archives Ford and Carter, and she also had access to the American Hungarian Foundation and Museum in New Jersey, the largest archive of American Hungarians. In addition, the author has conducted research in the archives of the Hungarian Museum in Cleveland, the United Nations Archives in New York, and the Manuscripts of the New York Public Library and the Library of Congress. In Hungary, in addition to the Emigration Collection of the Library in Lakitelek and the National Széchenyi Library, she carried out research at the Hungarian National Archives, the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security (HAHSS) and other smaller collections such

as the legacy of the former HHRF member, Bulcsu Veress. These – especially the archives of the HAHSS – were relatively less useful from the point of view of the processing of the topic, but there were important lessons to be learnt from them. The fact that the document collection of HHRF was digitized, and that the partial processing of it has begun by a smaller research group, in which the author participated, has reinforced the necessity of the historical processing of the topic. And several other legacies unearthed since then have argued that it would be worthwhile to process the topic in the form of the most comparative case studies. Organization legacies that were processed by the author during the research phase have supported the fact that the topic is worth to be explored in depth in the form of comparative case studies.

Regarding the topic of the dissertation, it explores a period of history of the American Hungarian diaspora community during the Cold War, which is a neglected era of both international relations' history and a neglected area of the various theoretical approaches of international relations. The author examines the history and dynamics of the activities of the American Hungarian diaspora groups who advocated for the Hungarian minority in Romania towards the Western governments during the era of the Cold War. The author uses several methods applied in international relations' theory to depict this complex topic. With regards to the exploration of the primary sources and investigation methods, the dissertation also seeks to shed new light on the history of the political activity of the American Hungarians, and thus on the image of the Hungarians in Romania during the Cold War and on Hungarian-Hungarian relations. In addition, the author seeks to contribute to the expansion of the range of historical works on Hungarians in Romania that focus on the independent capacity of Hungarians in Romania instead of focusing on the history of suffering, in an effort to highlight the lessons learned from the approaches and methods appropriate for self-advocacy. According to the prevailing public perception, the history of the Hungarians living in the so-called kin states of Hungary, including Hungarians in Romania, is especially “one of a long history of suffering beginning from the Treaty of Trianon to the present day”. However, the minority itself and its members, even in a situation as limited as Ceaușescu's Romania, sought its place in world politics, it adapted or confronted, had valuable assets and resources that it used. Thus as a result, leaders who remained at home and were in need of emigration were not only suffering subjects of the events, but also had ideas and made decisions and actively implemented them.

On the one hand, these stories, examined at the level of international relations, shed light on the fact how diaspora politicians of a relatively small nation can influence political decisions without the support of the home country, and how they can take advantage of the gathered information to advise policy-makers on issues relevant to the host country without claiming any needs with regards to it. The so-called On the other hand, the Hungarian side of “American-type lobbying” can provide many lessons in the current situation of the Hungarians in Romania. On the other hand, the Hungarian side of the so-called “American-type lobbying” can also provide many lessons with regards to the current situation of the Hungarians in Romania. The micro-histories of the advocacy activities for the Hungarian minority community in Romania are a miniaturized model and a parable of its current situation of the correlation between Hungarian civic interest representation and the national mentality both in Hungary and abroad. The lessons of the dissertation shed light on key areas, on the limitations and the real opportunities of our self-assertion.

2. Theoretical framework and used methods

2.1. Research questions, hypothesis, basic definitions, and theoretical framework

The dissertation strives to answer research questions regarding the historical antecedents, the main issues and results of the advocacy activities of the Hungarian American diaspora policy during the Cold War, the underlying philosophy, individual background, national identity and the effectiveness of the related strategies and tools of the organizations' leaders, as well as the concept of success and failure of advocacy. seeks to answer questions about its effectiveness. In addition, the dissertation also tries to prove the main assumption that in the period of the Cold War, in addition to American geopolitical interests, those American Hungarian diaspora political actors also contributed to the development of the American-Romanian relations system and the American legal background that determined it who were able to adapt to the American political structure and who were considered useful by actors in the political system of the host country. Accordingly, on the one hand, the author examines the political system of the host country (USA) in which the political actors of the Hungarian American diaspora community operated and whose activities were utilized by the political system; on the other hand, it scrutinizes bilateral relations and their legal background, which have been influenced by these actors.

In the theoretical framework of the dissertation, the author uses neoliberal and constructivist approaches to answer and prove all this. While the issues related to the reasons behind the political actions of the diaspora are depicted from a constructivist perspective, the dissertation analyzes the impact of advocacy from a liberal perspective. In the course of her research, the author focuses on the examination of the advocacy activities of diaspora communities in her own right and conducts a comparative analysis of them. In this, on the one hand, the author attempts to combine bottom-up (personal motivations, experiences, needs, values, ideas, complex contexts of interpersonal interactions) and top-down (political activities of interest groups and state decision-making bodies, global currents) approaches of the phenomena related to diaspora. On the other hand, with regard to diaspora-related issues, the author considers the observation and presentation of both the macro- (thus the evolution of its collective identity in relation to different waves of emigration and the host and home countries) and micro-level phenomena (the condensation of the effects of the macro-level phenomena at individual levels and their impact on the political demands of the diaspora leaders).

The concepts and theoretical framework used in the dissertation were developed closely related to these perspectives. The author develops the theoretical framework from a concept of the diaspora that also considers the historically developed, passively given conditions of diaspora communities and the active commitment of their members expressed by various philanthropic actions towards their home country. Therefore, the concept of diaspora used in the dissertation includes communities in whose collective memory their own migratory origin is taken into account, who are characterized by geographical dispersion, who are integrated into the mainstream society of their host country, and who have some form of connection to their home country. In addition to the first generation of emigrants, this category includes other generations who are actively committed to both their home and host countries. While for the first generations this belonging to the diaspora community is automatic, the commitment and the awareness of their origins related to their home country implemented in various

practical forms, the conscious taking on of “moral deeds” towards their host country is especially important for the subsequent generations to become members of a diaspora community. Consequently, the dissertation is inspired by approaches of diaspora lobbying that regard the activities of organizations acting on behalf of diasporas and their leadership as independent actors. According to these approaches, a diaspora politician is said to be a cosmopolitan who integrates many of the emerging political communities in the international arena and whose unique position cannot be filled in by any other agency. Furthermore, these approaches regard the diaspora politicians’ advocacy activities, that is, diasporic lobbying on the one hand as the willingness of the diaspora member to pursue such a policy in the host country, representing the interests of his homeland, and, on the other hand, as the direct and indirect relationship of the diaspora lobbyist with the host and the home countries’ political actors. This tripartite system of relations shapes the political commitment of the diaspora and the infrastructure that sustains its activity. This can be called “diasporic globalization”, in which many other actors also play an important role, including minority groups outside the home country, other diaspora groups in the host country, intergovernmental, international, and regional institutions and organizations, grassroots movements and non-governmental organizations.

As diaspora politicians operate in this complex international space, their political goals and demands are influenced by a great number of factors, as shown in the figure below. According to this, the political needs of diaspora communities are influenced by the quality and the intensity of the diaspora’s relationship with international organizations, the host and home countries and their political system, opportunity structures, institutional channels, local political context. Furthermore, the diaspora’s political needs are also influenced by the support, the granting or the lack of resources of both sides, as well as a number of characteristics related to the given conditions of the diaspora (such as how they got to the host country, how long they have been there, which generation is pursuing advocacy activities, what is the structural, socio-economic position of the diaspora in the host country) and the diaspora communities themselves, their own collective identity that is reflected in the political organizations of the diaspora.

This hybrid identity lives with and through differences, and not in spite of them, which is also influenced by a number of factors: the experience gained in the host country (especially the processes of socialization and integration) and a number of demographic characteristics, partly given by the characteristics given by the home country (like the origin of the diaspora, generational components and religious affiliation), as well as its relationship with both countries, generational differences and policies. Because of these factors, identity is constantly changing, which is why its reorganization is never over, as it is constantly regenerating through experiences of trial and error, exchanges with similar ethnic groups in the host country, diaspora groups in other countries and ongoing contacts with the host country. As a result, diaspora members can develop different competencies that allow them to navigate in often very different cultural norms and to activate other competencies in another norm system, if the situation requires it. The identity of diaspora elite is a crucial factor to consider during the examination of advocacy activities because it is closely related to the social capital and mobilization capacity of diaspora communities, thus it also indirectly affects the efficiency of advocacy.

The dissertation approaches the success of the advocacy expressed by diasporas not only in terms of the ethnic lobbying literature, i.e. in terms of the success of achieving their goals (which usually means changing the results of political decision-making in the host country or engaging in a decision-making process), but also from the point of view of the literature on transnational groups, which, in addition to examining diasporas as independent actors, also takes into account the host side of diaspora lobbying and the criteria of the governments of the host country. As the literature of transnational phenomena points out, on the one hand, that the measure of success is not necessarily the fact that the diaspora groups can have effect on the political decisions, but the fact that the two parties listen to each other can also be defined as a success. On the other hand, transnational literature also calls the attention to the fact that governments, opposition leaders and civil society organizations are well aware of the fact that transnational mobilization through the activation of diaspora network is a common and very effective way to seek influence. Host country governments can also explicitly encourage diaspora mobilization and take advantage of the opportunities inherent in ethnic advocacy that is generated and often use diaspora groups for their political, economic and security goals in the diasporas' home countries. Due to the relative power divergence, however, the interests represented by the diaspora groups will only be heard at all in case it is in the interest of the host countries to make use of the opportunities offered by the given advocacy activity.

Regarding the utility of diaspora activities, Nadeida K. Marinova (2017) draws attention to the fact that the most important factors are the following: firstly that the home country is in the interest of the diaspora's host country, secondly, the degree of coincidence of the foreign policy goals of the diaspora and the host country, thirdly, the personal or political connection between the diaspora members and their home countries, and finally, the ability of diaspora members to express their social capital in the host country, their ability to move around actively and effectively in the political life of the host country. In her view, all of these are necessary conditions for the diaspora to be used by the host country for mutually beneficial foreign policy purposes. While the first two factors must be present in any case for this to happen, the second two factors are a condition that falls into a continuum and is present with varying degrees of strength.

However, the fact of exploitation by the host country does not in itself automatically mean that ethnic advocacy objectives are met. While it will certainly be the government of the host country that sets the direction for the dynamics of the interaction, the advocacy strategies, tactics and methods chosen by diaspora politicians ("cold" and "hot" tactics, indirect and direct methods, monitoring legislation and building coalitions with other key actors) in both the legislature and the executive, at the right time and place, is essential to achieve the goals set by diaspora lobbyists, which must be taken into account during such an analysis.

2.2. Research methods used in specific parts of the dissertation

In the theoretical approach of the dissertation, the analysis of the impact of advocacy activities of the American Hungarian diaspora is highlighted from a neoliberal point of view (the second half of the dissertation), while the issues related to the background reasons of the form and content of diaspora political activities are depicted from constructivist point of view (first half of the dissertation).

The first part of the dissertation presents the theoretical and historical context of the advocacy activities of the American Hungarian diaspora. To answer research question regarding the antecedents of ethnic advocacy, the author tries to provide an answer by outlining the layers of American Hungarian collective identity, the history of their political activism, their views about Hungarian minorities living in the neighboring countries of Hungary and census statistics. To answer these questions, the author has organized and analyzed secondary sources. Furthermore, to answer research questions related to individual American Hungarian diaspora organizations, the author uses the method of ethno-history used in political anthropology. For this purpose, she analyzes both primary (archival) and secondary (results of previous research), presenting several characteristics related to the organizations engaged in advocacy activities for Hungarians in Romania. Thus, the dissertation explores where organizations are located between different waves of emigration, what experiences they brought from the motherland, which generation they belong to, and how this influenced what political demands they articulated, what goals they set, what type of advocacy strategies and tactics they chose. It also details the life history and socialization of the founders of the organizations, and the extent to which they were able to turn the cultural capital they accumulated into social relations and financial capital, thereby being able to mobilize a large population of American Hungarians.

Then, following the principles of the classical historical method, the dissertation presents the antecedents of American advocacy activities for Hungarians living in the neighboring countries of Hungary contextualizing it in the international political space. Afterwards the author depicts the Cold War history of its political advocacy specifically for the Hungarian minority in Romania. This general historical part is divided into three separate sub-periods (1948-1968, 1969-1980, 1981-1989), in which the superpower relations, the policy of the United States in Eastern Europe, the current development of American-Romanian bilateral relations, the Hungarian Romanian relations, the policy towards nationalities of the Romanian regime and its effects on the Hungarian community. For this part, the author also uses primary sources (primarily the organizations' own archival materials) and secondary sources (historical works and the literature on the Hungarian diaspora).

The second part of the dissertation lists comparative case studies of advocacy and presents cases with direct results and cases ending with failures in two different parts. The chapters are written with the structured focused comparative method. In the selection and processing of the advocacy cases it was important for the author to include the full spectrum, i.e., to include cases ending both successes and failures. This is because many cases do not reach the final stage, and because we can get a full picture of the complex world of advocacy activities by processing case studies of both outcomes. In presenting comparative studies, the author mostly uses primary sources: in addition to processing the organizations' own archival materials and other related archival materials and memoirs, U.S. presidential archival documents are presented in this topic for the first time.

In evaluating the outcome of each case study, the chapters take into account the political perspectives of the host country, the home country, and the diaspora organizations on the one hand, and use and combine several methods to measure the success of advocacy activities on the other. A number of methods have been elaborated in the lobbying literature to measure the efficacy of advocacy activities, including three different approaches developed by Andreas Dür in relation to lobbying in the European Union (examining the fulfillment

of lobbying goals, “interviewing” lobbyists and following the lobbying process). The dissertation uses from these methods these three approaches and strives their combination to put in practice. In presenting this, the author uses archival sources (organizations’ own materials, presidential archival materials) primarily, as well as various interviews and memoirs.

After the historical description and analysis of each case, the dissertation discusses the strategies used in the given case in each chapter, the background of their choice, and then the evaluation of success and the background of success and failure based on given specific aspects. On the one hand, the author examines the extent to which the positions and advocacy activities of the diasporas as a whole can be *utilized* from the point of view of the host country, on the other hand, it also analyses the fulfillment of the four-factor conditions of utilization developed in the theoretical part.

The second aspect of the author’s examination was how effectively the organizations were able to consistently represent their own political needs they articulated whereas achieving also their own goals. In addition, in each case the author also analyzed the tools, tactics, and strategies used by organizations and their leaders; and the extent to which the circumstances and factors considered necessary by the literature for successful lobbying were typical in each lobbying case.

3. Conclusions, research results

3.1. The history of the identity layers, organizations and political needs of the American Hungarian diaspora

The first part of the dissertation states that while Hungarian politics tried to use American Hungarian diaspora organizations for revision purposes between the two world wars, it forgot about its Hungarian kin living in the neighboring countries after the Second World War and followed the activities of American Hungarian diaspora organizations with great suspicion: first it sought to disintegrate and later to neutralize them. For the Hungarian diaspora communities, however, despite all fault-lines between them, it was the greatest cohesion force: the fate of Hungarian minorities living in the neighboring countries of Hungary, and especially that of Hungarians living in Romania, was one that had such a unifying force that no other issue related to Hungarians was able to have an effect on them.

In all of this, there were significant differences between the radical and moderate representatives of the first- and second-generation organizations on the one hand and the first-generation organizations on the other. Of the latter, second-generation organizations were undoubtedly the most effective. There were significant differences between the organizations in terms of their choice of instruments, their ability to form alliances and their embeddedness in the international system. In addition, there were large differences in their resilience and openness to different political decision-making processes, depending on their background, what identity they represented and their abilities to process the victims’ awareness of the Romanian-Hungarian intergroup conflict.

Organizations of the second generation also openly admitted that Romanians were undoubtedly also attacked before the First World War and between the two world wars, but this does not mean that the discriminatory measures applied by the Romanian regime against the Hungarian minorities were justified. For this reason, unlike the more radical organizations of the first generation, they condemned national self-

determination based on nationalist discourse. Their opinion was on the one hand that this can only be decided only by those affected in a free country, on the other hand that the stressing of such a demand would have sentenced the Hungarian minority to a penitentiary on the international sphere as a destabilizing factor in the region. Therefore, they focused specifically on human rights violations, in connection with which they sought to build the widest possible contacts with all actors who were receptive to it. However, contrary to the more moderate organizations of the first generation were not afraid to use “hotter” tactics in their advocacy activities if necessary, although they did not try to “overuse” these tools.

The historical review chapters of the dissertation show how the previously mentioned factors affected the advocacy activities of the organizations, and how differently the leaders of the organizations reacted to the effects arising from these factors at the individual level, which is why they acted significantly differently.

Although the organization of the American Hungarian diaspora has already begun at the turning point of the 19-20th centuries, the lobbying activities for especially the Hungarian minorities living in the neighboring countries of Hungary started during the First World War that did not bring much success. The Horthy regime wanted to make use of the patriotism of the American Hungarian communities during the First World War and between the two world wars mostly because of foreign policy and economic purposes of Hungarian political leaders. Although the proportion of left-wing and Jewish organizations criticizing Horthy’s Hungary among American Hungarian organizations has increased since the 1920s and American Hungarians gradually began to open up to local American affairs, strongly supporting the Democratic Party, local organizations and their umbrella organization, the American Hungarian Association (AHF), continued to be controlled by those who put the fulfillment of Hungarian national interests first.

Between the two world wars, the relationship between the Hungarian government and the American Hungarians took on a strongly propagandistic character, in which the government used the network of American Hungarians for revisionist purposes. The goal of advocacy efforts was to enforce revisionist demands internationally, which were channeled into the U.S. State Department through the AHF. During this period, the various congresses organized with the aims to unite Hungarians living in the diaspora, initiated by the Horthy regime did not create either the effectiveness of the protection of interests nor the expected national unity, instead they deepened the dividing line between “national” and left-wing emigration. In addition, the regime conducted propagandistic image-building activities in the U.S. to raise awareness among the American public about the injustices of World War I, which were as ineffective as their lobbying activities.

After the outbreak of World War II, the state of war between the host and the home countries put the American Hungarian diaspora in an extremely difficult position: they had to fight to ensure their loyalty to the United States. Although the goals of the Hungarian government were not supported by American politicians and the public, the position represented by the AHF did not change during World War II, and this did not prevent its leaders from continuing their fruitless activities until the end of the war. The regime sought to organize the country’s protrusion of war, in which it dedicated an important role to Tibor Eckhardt, but which ultimately ended in failure.

After World War II, the U.S. “degraded” the Eastern European region due to its deterrence policy and the

“bloc approach” to Eastern European states, therefore the U.S.-Romanian relations also deteriorated dramatically. The establishment of mutual trade relations took place only in October 1956, after the settlement of Romania’s membership in the United Nations in 1955. This year also marked a turning point in the history of Eastern European advocacy in the U.S. and U.S. foreign policy in several ways. On the one hand, the main goal of American foreign policy from now on was to stabilize the region, and on the other hand, Eastern Europe was increasingly seen as a region made up of different regions, and it was recognized that supporting individual nation states could weaken the united Soviet bloc. Thirdly, the policy of liberation has been replaced by a strategy of “slow transformation” and a closer economic relationship with the US in order to abandon the “bloc approach” and to make alienate satellite states from Moscow. Due to this, the US began to perceive the economically independent Romania as a target for such relations.

Romania’s accession to the United Nations in 1955, followed by the withdrawal of Soviet troops in 1958, paved the way for the opening of bilateral US-Romanian relations. Thus, after the conclusion of the American-Romanian Conventions on the Settlement of Property and War Damage in 1960, several cultural and technical exchange agreements were concluded between the two countries.

The political activism of American Hungarians was inward-looking until the 1960s. This is due, on the one hand, to the fact that the Hungarian diaspora was underrepresented at both national and local levels, even in regions which had high Hungarian population rate, and on the other hand that the protection of interests of Hungarians in Romania seemed relatively secure in the first decades of the socialist system. Therefore, ethnic lobbying specifically for the Hungarian minority in Romania could not unfold until the end of the 1950s, only in the following decade. Organizations founded exclusively for this purpose by first-generation political emigrants were formed and reorganized in the mid-1950s and 1960s. The American Transylvanian Association (ATF) established in 1952, the Transylvanian Committee (TC) established in 1959, the Movement for the Protection of Transylvania that separated itself from the New York branch of the American Hungarian Federation (AHF) in 1965, and the revived AHF itself were the four organizations that were most active in this regard. From 1965, the first three organizations formally cooperated and carried out their actions together under the name of the Transylvanian Management Committee (EIB).

The Romanian party leadership tried to squeeze out from the Hungarian foreign policy, which was forced into a very defensive political course after 1956, the acceptance of Romanian domestic political measures affecting the Hungarian minority in Romania and to direct back the contact between Hungarians and the Hungarian minority in Romania in a framework that could be controlled and consented by the Romanian authorities. Since members of the Hungarian minority in Romania were increasingly exposed to political persecution and imprisonment, news about this alarmed Hungarian communities in the United States, which on the one hand gave new impetus to the formation of advocacy organizations and on the other hand old organizations became much more active in minority affairs.

In addition, the Hungarian revolution of 1956 also meant another supply in the American diaspora as it set off another wave of emigration. As a result, a younger generation with a social background other than political emigrants arrived in the United States, creating a new situation in Hungarian policies striving to

neutralize emigration, as most of them were no longer considered enemies by the Hungarian government. Due to this, the strategy of related to the the emigration changed: it became much more proactive and was executed through strategic planning.

The Hungarian freedom fight also brought a change in the policy of the United States in Eastern Europe. The American foreign policy of the 1960s was marked by the gradual opening of trade to satellite states. Both Kennedy and Johnson were characterized by a liberal trade policy and an intention to engage in trade relations with Soviet satellite states, but the anti-communist majority in Congress was still in significant opposition to the expansion of East-West trade at the time. Nevertheless, American-Romanian trade relations began to develop significantly, culminating in the June 1964 American-Romanian Trade Agreement during the Johnson administration.

At the same time, after Brezhnev came to power, the Romanian president, Gheorghiu-Dej, further strengthened his aspirations for independence, and Ceaușescu, who replaced him in 1965, continued the political line begun by her predecessor. In September of that year, it was agreed with the Soviets that Hungarian claims for Transylvania would not be taken into account in exchange for Soviet claims for Bessarabia. The Hungarian advocacy efforts to defend the interests of Hungarians in Romania during this period were hindered by several factors: on the one hand, due to the fact that Romania was increasingly viewed positively in the eyes of western countries because of its stand-off from the overrun of the Prague Spring executed by the Warsaw Pact. On the other hand, US-Romanian trade relations were rapidly expanding they expanded at a very rapid pace, benefiting many U.S. business interests. Meanwhile, although Hungary had intended to thematize the issue of nationality in bilateral Hungarian-Romanian relations in a moderate and non-public way since the late 1960s, this could not be done due to the Romanian party's refusing behavior. Romania's main goal since the mid-1960s has been to create a unified nation-state and to establish a framework for an increasingly neo-Stalinist system. However, as the Kádár regime came under increasing pressure from the mid-1960s to thematize the issue of minorities, these conflicts of interest became more and more spectacular in bilateral relations in the early 1970s and led to conflicts over them.

In the early 1960s, the most important case represented by American Hungarians gained relevance in connection with the Hungarian issue at the UN. The most important goal of the more moderate first-generation American Hungarian diaspora organizations was the release of Hungarian prisoners and political detainees who were arrested after the Hungarian freedom fight of 1956 in Romania. In addition, from 1964 to 1965, the organizations tried to find every opportunity to draw the attention of the staff of the State Department's offices to the persecution of Hungarians in Romania. The organizations changed their strategy from 1965 onwards and decided to support the expansion of US-Romanian trade relations in exchange for the legal protection of Hungarians in Romania, so their focus was on advocating the executive branch and linking the fulfilment of human rights conditions on further US-Romanian trade negotiations. Therefore, the Hungarian American organizations sought at the Congress to make submitted and voted resolutions related to minority rights, and they also achieved that several Congressmen and Senators spoke up in favor of the protection of minorities. Although the U.S. government refused to link the improvement of human rights indicators to trade concessions,

pressure from the anti-communist majority of the two chambers of Congress contributed to the fact that Romania did not receive its Most Favored Nation status until 1975. Although ethnic organizations knocked “open doors” during this period with their advocacy activities, they were unable to make significant changes in U.S. policy toward Soviet satellite countries.

Liberal trade policies with satellite states continued to play a key role in the Eastern European politics of the United States after Nixon came to power, and as the State Department no longer treated these countries as a monolithic entity, it made the politics of differentiation official, and since then Romania, which played a key role in the U.S.-China-Vietnam relations, has received increasingly special treatment in foreign and trade policy. After the adoption of the 1972 US-Soviet trade agreement due to D tente, the Most Favored Nation status granted to the Soviet Union, was amended by the President’s congressional opposition, Senator Jackson and Congressman Vanik, on the condition that Moscow grants free emigration to minorities of Jewish origin, a condition which the Kremlin firmly rejected in 1974, paved the way for Romania for being granted the MFN status. This was finally granted to the country in 1975. By this time, the country had joined all major international economic institutions: the IMF and the World Bank in 1970, and the GATT in 1971.

From then on, advocacy activities for defending Hungarians in Romania was essentially focused on participating in hearings before the relevant congressional subcommittees regarding the Most Favored Nation status, which was extended every year, on the abolition of the status and concentrated on submitting and voting resolutions to change the conditions attached to it. In the meantime, however, a fault line broke out between the organizations engaged in advocacy activities for the Hungarians in Romania, thanks to which the Transylvanian World Federation (WHO) was established in 1974. In the meantime, however, a fault line emerged between the organisations involved in advocacy for Hungarians in Romania, which led to the creation of the World Transylvanian Association (WTA) in 1974. In 1975, the lobbyist Zolt n Sz z, acting on behalf of the AHF, successfully lobbied Congress to add the guarantee of free emigration and family reunification to the requirement of the extension of MFN status. The leader of ATF, B la Teleki, tried to compensate the lobby actions, believing it to be detrimental to Hungarians. Furthermore, from 1975 onwards, Zolt n Sz z testified every year on behalf of the AMSZ in the Congress Trade Subcommittee, and in 1976 he took part in a mission to investigate the situation of Hungarians in Romania, which was not a forward-looking mission in terms of advocacy. His trip was hailed as a success by the Romanian secret service as an attempt at "positive influence", although hundred was not happy with his trip. The Romanian secret service successfully thought of his journey as an attempt of “positive influence” on the State Department regarding the situation of the Hungarian minority in Romani, although Sz z were not satisfied with his journey. And in 1976, the second generation of Hungarian Americans began to organize their advocacy in this direction: after a demonstration and a newspaper ad, they formed an ad hoc organization, the *Committee for Human Rights in Romania* (CHRR), which also made its way to the annual congressional testimony and gave written and oral testimony, and sought to expand its contacts in Congress and the White House, as well as the State Department.

The news of the collective violations against the Hungarians in Romania coming out to the West at that time coincided with the surprising general interest in Eastern Europe in the US and the 1976 US presidential

election, as Jimmy Carter won the votes of many Eastern Europeans who were disappointed with the Nixon-Ford administration's conciliatory policy with the Soviet bloc. As a result, the political role of the diasporas in Eastern Europe has constantly changed, and their votes have become much more valuable. However, because they had no access to the political elite of the US State Department and focused their lobbying activities only on Congress, they were not organised to take full advantage of the lobbying opportunities offered by the US democratic system until the second half of the 1970s. However, because they had no access to the U.S. State Department's political elite and focused only on Congress in their lobbying activities, they were not at the organizational level to take full advantage of the lobbying opportunities offered by the U.S. democratic system until the second half of the 1970s. Although Carter embraced human rights at the propaganda level, and set up a number of new institutions and positions related to human rights, which provided a basis for members of Congress concerned about human rights to pursue activities in this direction, and contributed to the sensitization of the State Department apparatus in this direction, his policy towards Eastern European countries did not change from that of his predecessor. The congressional debate on the extension of MFN status did not take place until 1979, mainly because most members of Congress felt that the procedure it entailed could provide a framework for a regular review of the human rights situation in Romania, and because the US government had also taken a very strong position on the development of bilateral trade relations.

As the Hungarian minority came under increasing pressure in the 1970s, relations between the Hungarian cadre and cultural elite and the Romanian Communist Party were broken. Some retreated into complete passivity, others took their protests abroad, and still others opted for open resistance. The latter included Károly Király, the first secretary of the former Covasna County Party Committee. The CHRR smuggled letters from Király about the discriminatory practices of the Romanian regime in 1977 and then published them in the West. In 1978 the organization played an important role in enabling journalists to interview him. In the same year, during Ceaușescu's visit to the United States, members of the organization staged a demonstration in New York while the Romanian dictator was questioned by several politicians and journalists over his treatment of the Hungarian minority, after which the Romanian president did not travel to the United States again. Meanwhile, the more moderate diaspora organizations have formed a new collaboration to coordinate their actions, the *Coordinating Committee of Transylvanian Organizations in North America*. The first tangible result of the advocacy activities of diaspora organizations in relation to the MFN status was in 1979: the supporter of CHRR Congressman Richard Schulze submitted a House Resolution to abolish the status, and the subject was debated in Congress for the first time. Furthermore, also in 1980 it was the first time that the American delegation made an official statement about the Hungarian minority at a Helsinki Conference held in Madrid. Despite his harsh rhetoric, Reagan did not change his policy towards Eastern Europe after coming to power, nor did he dismantle the existing human rights institutions. The established US trade policy towards Romania continued, although State Department officials and the White House also began to monitor the human rights situation there more closely. By the 1980s, the growing Romanian public debt led to an increasingly clear homogenisation of Romanian national politics, which in turn narrowed the cultural space of the nationality. By the 1980s the growing Romanian public debt led to increasingly clearly stated homogenization efforts in Romanian politics,

resulting in a narrowing of the cultural spaces of minorities. Because of this, the Hungarian cultural elite in Romania went into opposition and was forced to publish a samizdat magazine called Counterpoints, and then to distribute it abroad. CHRR also played a significant role in reducing the police atrocities affecting the editors and in spreading their position in the West, for which the conferences held by the countries who participated in the Helsinki Convention proved to be a particularly suitable forum. The organization also played a key role in the financing of the *Transylvanian Hungarian News Agency*, established in Budapest after the defection of its founder, the former co-editor of Counterpoints in 1983, and in the dissemination of the news compiled by him abroad.

CHRR, which changed its name to the Hungarian Human Rights Foundation (HHRF) in 1984, incorporated the news of the deprivation of human rights in Romania to the West into its testimony and used it for the orientation and information of the US State Department and the Deputy Secretary of State for Human Rights. The news agency also played a crucial role in the professional preparation and regular briefing of a number of congressional members on fact-finding trips to Romania. Meanwhile, in addition to protesting against the extension of the most favored nation status of Romani, the Transylvanian World Federation embraced the national self-determination of the Hungarian minority since 1982. Although it has failed to reconcile with the State Department in this regard, it still could carry out several successful lobbying actions.

The advocacy work of the HHRF had its first real breakthrough in 1985, when the organization managed to get more information about the situation of Hungarians in Romania at the Budapest Cultural Forum and to mention the Hungarian minority for the first time, and when the American delegation mentioned the case of the Hungarian minority in its annual country report on Romania. This coincided with the resignation of the US Ambassador in Bucharest, David Funderburk, and publicized the rigid attitude of State Department employees towards the situation in Romania in the Western press, as well as the growing public outcry over the religious persecution of neo-Protestant denominations, which became public after the visit of three members of Congress to Romania this year. In the same year, the issue of converting the Bibles donated to the Hungarian Reformed denominations by Western countries to toilet paper was revealed by the ally of HHRF, Sándor Havadtóty, a Reformed pastor. There have also been articles in leading Western journals about the scandal, which has also contributed to the already increasingly condemning international public opinion about the human rights situation in Romania.

The growing human rights violations have coincided with several other important international developments. On the one hand, as Reagan prioritized the missionary role of the U.S. in international politics over a balance-of-power policy, and as the political and economic decline of Eastern European states threatened with a crisis that Americans believed to be avoided by democratizing dictatorial regimes and by turning centralized regimes into capitalist countries, a very important turning point occurred in U.S. Eastern European politics. The Americans thought that the best way to resolve the economic and political situation was to strengthen economic relations with the satellite states, which was the case with most Eastern European countries, with the exception of Romania (with which trade relations had been declining by this time) before the regime change. On the other hand, Gorbachev announced his reforms at this time, which the Romanian party

leadership firmly rejected and refused to put into practice. Third, due to Moscow's reforms and increasing negotiating power with the Americans, there increasingly less need for Romania's international political role for the interventions for the Americans. In addition, the Romanian regime's relations with Hungary deteriorated dramatically, and the Hungarian diplomacy saw the Hungarian-Romanian "mini-war" increasingly less resolvable through bilateral negotiations, which is why the Hungarian government tried to advance the issue of Hungarians in Romania before international forums. Due to the deteriorating human rights and religious situation, the international perception of the Romanian regime has become increasingly negative, the White House's perception has become more radical, and the willingness of American business circles to invest in Romania has gradually diminished. The Americans tried in vain to exert pressure in bilateral negotiations, in which, thanks to American Hungarian diaspora organisations, the deprivation of human rights of the Hungarian minority was also regularly discussed. This eventually led to an amendment to the conditions of the Romanian MFN status by both Houses of the US legislature in 1987. Although most of the resolutions needed to abolish the status were proposed by members of Congress belonging to the neo-Protestant denominations, the activities of Hungarian American diaspora organizations, especially the HHRF, clearly played an irreplaceable role in securing the votes needed to enact these proposals into law. Although most of the resolutions required for the abolition of the status were submitted by members of Congress belonging to neo-Protestant denominations, the activities of American Hungarian diaspora organizations, especially the HHRF, played a clearly irreplaceable role in obtaining the votes necessary to enact these laws. Knowing that he could not, and would not, meet these new conditions, the Romanian President renounced the most-favoured-nation status in February 1988. This was officially abolished by Reagan that summer and was not extended from the following year on.

In the meantime, the Hungarian government also became more and more open to the cause of Hungarians beyond its borders, and increasingly open to its diaspora overseas, but it had no influence on the Hungarian cause in Romania, as the Romanian regime remained radical: the systematization of local administrations grew in scale, against which Hungarian diaspora organizations organized international protests, but the situation was not resolved until the Romanian Revolution.

By 1988, the Romanian regime had become the last state in the region, not only in the eyes of the Americans but also in Western European countries, as a result of which the Bush administration welcomed the fall of the Romanian regime and the revolution, and provided valuable aid to Romania before holding free elections. Furthermore also thanks to the lobbying activities of the HHRF, American government circles also received László Tőkés.

3.2. The effectiveness of the American Hungarian advocacy work for Hungarians in Romania

The parts of the dissertation presenting the advocacy cases highlight the differences between the basic philosophy, lobbying strategies and tactics of each organization. The common feature of the two cases with a direct result is that in both cases the conditions of utilization mentioned by Nadeida K. Marinova (2017) were met. However, there was a big difference in their ability to achieve the political goals they set: while the ATF could claim only partial and temporary results, the HHRF's goal of raising the human rights of the Hungarian

minority in Romania in bilateral US-Romanian relations was not only met but they also were capable of keeping it alive, and thanks to their contacts in Congress, they also contributed to the abolition of Romania's most-favored-nation status. It was the combination of close cooperation with the executive and lobbying in the legislature that was able to bring long-term results for the representation of Hungarians in Romania. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that, in addition to the fact that American policy in Eastern Europe was changing, other factors completely independent of the HHRF also contributed to this success. The outrage in the House of Representatives over atrocities against neo-Protestant sects, Romania's deteriorating economic situation, and its declining attractiveness to investors have contributed at least as much to the change in political direction as the slow transformation of superpower relations and atmosphere.

A common feature of the three unsuccessful case studies from the point of view of the respective organizations' objectives, was that although congressional actions were carried out using highly effective methods, with a number of partial results (especially in the case of TWF and CHRR), none of them were successful, since the precondition of the utilization of the mutual cooperation between the Hungarian diaspora and the US executive in these periods was either not yet met (as in the case of the previous lobbying of the ATF and CHRR), or in these areas it was no longer met (as in the case of the lobbying of the TWF). However, there was a difference in the intensity of lobbying, the range of actors reached, and the extent to which policy makers were reached at all. While the ATF had almost no success in the 1960s and the TWF in the 1980s, CHRR was able to establish cooperation with officials from the Human Rights Department of the State Department and to keep them informed of human rights violations on a regular basis. However, this was not enough for the change, which, according to its interview with Funderburk's former US ambassador to Bucharest in 1985, was largely due to the staff of the U.S. State Department's Department of European Affairs, who were not as open to contact as the colleagues working at the Human Rights Department. Furthermore it was also due to the superpower balance that remained unchanged during this period, which at that time still favored a policy of discrimination among satellite states against Romania.

The dissertation also examines the factors and characteristics mentioned in the ethnic lobby literature and draws further conclusions about the implementation of the goals set by the diaspora. In general, in connection with the Hungarians in the United States, it can be said that its geographical dispersion is favorable in terms of advocacy, even if it weighs less than other nations of Central European descent. Furthermore, while American Hungarians can be found in almost all states in the United States, and in the 1970s about half a million American citizens declared Hungarian as their mother tongue, the proportion of Romanian-speaking native speakers in the United States was much smaller, which also explains the question of the situation of the Hungarian minorities in Romania had such an incentive effect on the Hungarian diaspora, while the Romanian diaspora was not able to act as an independent factor of Bucharest and to react to the events.

It should also be noted with general validity that during the Cold War, the opposing lobby (in this case both business interests and the official lobbying apparatus of the Romanian state) was extremely strong and organized. In addition, despite its fragmentation, diversity and stratification, the American Hungarian diaspora was united by the issue of Hungarians living in the neighboring countries of Hungary that no other question was

able to do. However, not all organizations have been able to make effective use of this factor in their advocacy activities: there are significant differences between the advocacy styles of organizations founded by first- and second-generation American Hungarians. Whichever period we examine, the thematization of the issue was eased by the fact that the collective trauma of the Treaty of Trianon and its consequences were symbolic for the entire American Hungarian diaspora. Furthermore the atrocities committed by neighboring countries and the common “enemy image” has also reinforced the unifying factor. However, the way in which each organization responded: constructively and openly to the international political context and in cooperation with other minority organizations, or destructively and exclusively focusing on the image of the enemy, refusing to cooperate with other organizations, depended largely on the organizations’ leaders’ previous life history, socialization and on the basic philosophy that developed as a result of the leaders of these organizations.

The activities of the *American Transylvanian Association* (ATF), one of the first generation American organizations, in cooperation with the *American Hungarian Federation* (AHF) were in many respects pioneering. For the first time, congressional representatives were contacted specifically regarding the issue of Hungarians in Romania. The members of the ATF were mostly born in historical Transylvania, then socialized in the circles of the Hungarians living in the minority and held active political, journalistic, expert or other public role roles, did not graduate from Western universities. They rarely were able to obtain a position in their original professions after their migration to Western European countries and the USA, so their integration into the majority society could not been fully achieved. Because they were aware of the life and problems of the Hungarians living in the minority, and had a very extensive network of contacts with whom they were constantly keeping in touch, therefore they chose a more moderate path in their advocacy activities because of their concerns about their well-being. The size of the membership of their own organization was not significant, and they tried to operate as a member organization of the AHF, to influence American policy through them.

While in the first phase of the ATF’s advocacy activities, they were knocking on open doors due to the importance of the Hungarian issue in the UN. During the second period of their activities, they were especially in need of the support and cooperation of members of the Congress. The first achievement that they reached with the support and mediation of the United Nations in 1963-64, was largely due to the propaganda value attributed to the Hungarian issue by the U.S. government and to the goals of trade liberalization with Romanians that began with Kennedy’s presidential election. The lobbying activities of the ATF were characterized by political neutrality: while in 1963-64 they formed co-operation with a number of left-wing and liberal organizations regardless of party affiliation, they also co-operated with Republican and Democratic representatives in their lobbying activities in Congress from 1964-65 onwards. As for their demands, they were willing to make political compromises, but they did not use them in their direct lobbying activities: it was much harder to find the bargains that made Congress members willing to support an issue, so they relied mostly on members with large American Hungarian constituencies. As a result, in many cases, they have lost support for congressional members who would otherwise have supported the fight for human rights for other reasons, such as Ed Koch, Member of Congress (NY, D) from 1969 with whom only the organization founded by second-generation Hungarians, the CHRR has been able to build relationships since 1976. In addition, although they

had direct access to a number of policy-makers through the UN, they did not develop strategic partnerships with them and did not find, or found it difficult the common ground with the help of which they would have been able to open the door for cooperation with policy-makers. Although they sought to formulate their position in accordance with American national interests, they were less able to present it as professionally as the members of the CHRR whose members were socialized in an American environment.

Their internal group coherence was very high, but they they became embroiled in ideological clashes organisations, like those founded by political emigrants after the Second World War, and were not open to cooperation with them, as they considered them to be too radical in their choice of instruments, politically unrealistic in their demands, or simply uninformed. They did not compensate this by cooperation with other similar minority organisations. Being a closed organization that sought to make an impact through an umbrella organization, its ability to mobilize was negligible, and it sought to keep in touch with those of Hungarian descent living in the diaspora mostly its their regularly published journal, but their goal with this was rather to provide regular and authentic data from Romania, to provide information about its advocacy activities and to maintain a sense of belonging. Their relations with the media were weak and their economic and financial strength was negligible. Their social capital, on the other hand, was very large among the former aristocracy. However, all of this was irrelevant to the operation of the organization because their basic philosophy did not allow them to use this their own purposes: in the initial phase, they worked through other human rights organizations. From the second half of the seventies onwards they channeled their support to the second generation of Hungarian Americans, to the CHRR / HHRF, so they were those who benefited the most from the ATF's social and economic capital.

The members of the Transylvanian World Federation (TWF), another organization founded by first-generation American Hungarians, had no or negligible American socialization. Although their lobbyist graduated from American universities and wrote his doctorate on the history of Transylvania and lectured at several universities, he did not compile the materials needed for advocacy in accordance with the American mentality and did not put the message he wanted to convey in the American national interest. None of his contacts had experience of the realities of the political life of the Hungarian minority between the two world wars. The network with the Hungarians in Romania was extremely limited, and he also maintained contacts with radical groups.

The advocacy activities carried out by the lobbyist Zoltán Száz, whom they invited, followed a completely different strategy from the ATF from the second half of the period examined. After the ideological divisions between the two groups in the mid-1970s formed a deep divide in the struggle for the human rights of the Hungarians in Romania, the TWF pursued its own goals. The size of the organization was large throughout the United States, recruiting mostly from first-generation, highly right-wing organizations in the most densely populated areas of the American Hungarian diaspora, such as Cleveland. Although they were well organized, their internal group cohesion was strong, and the above-mentioned fractures and the lack of willingness to cooperate with more moderate organizations left their mark on the effectiveness of their advocacy work in many ways. At the same time, when needed, they were able to mobilize many American Hungarians through radio

interviews and calls to persuade congressional members directly, despite the fact that their effectiveness was far behind that of CHRR, which was active during the same period, and in many cases made the latter organization's work very difficult.

The political goals represented by the TWF explicitly required the support of Congress, but in this they knew much less political compromises than the CHRR. They cooperated with congressional members independently of the parties, and sought to establish strategic links with them and other interested groups, mainly Christian organizations. Their work in Congress was very effective and they were almost able to get adopted several house resolutions. However, their relationship with members of the executive branch were not deep enough: although the TWF lobbyist also had a number of extensive contacts in the State Department's Department of Foreign Affairs for European Affairs, as he was unable to articulate his message in line with the US foreign policy, he was unable to represent the issue so that it can reach its goal. The economic and financial strength of the organization was great: the issue was extremely important for István Zolcsák, the founder and financier of the organization, so he sacrificed a lot of capital after reaching an agreement with lobbyist Zoltán Száz and realizing that territorial claims were unacceptable in the international political context, therefore they began to support cultural autonomy in the early 1980s. The organisation's relations with the media were applied mostly through Zoltán Száz, who published a number of newspaper articles in various newspapers and scientific journals, the importance and balance of which was acknowledged even by the president of the highly critical ATF, Béla Teleki. Represented by the Commission on Human Rights in Romania (CHRR) / Hungarian Human Rights Foundation (HHRF), second-generation Hungarian Americans, with a few exceptions, were born already in emigration, were socialized in the U.S., and graduated from or pursued their studies at leading American universities, therefore their level of assimilation was sufficient enough to be able to represent the American mentality. At the same time, they did not forget about their own roots: other places for their upbringing were the American Hungarian organizations, especially the Scouts, where they gained a wide network of contacts. In this respect, it is important to mention the Hungarian Communion of Friends, whose annual conference, ITT-OTT (Here-There), was an important venue for the birth of a new diaspora awareness in the late 1960s and early 1970s. CHRR also had an extensive network of contacts in its homeland: with the democratic opposition in Hungary and some members of the government, as well as with the leaders of the Hungarian minority in Romania, and when they were ousted from the Romanian political power, they maintained an extensive network. Although the organization had no direct contact, it was also indirectly connected with many Hungarians in Romania through its own news service, founded in 1983, the *Transylvanian Hungarian News Agency*.

Compared to the first generation organizations, CHRR also developed an extensive network of contacts in the Hungarian diaspora in the United States, thanks to which they were able to mobilize diaspora communities much more effectively in the ways described earlier, which was essential for the success of advocacy activities. In addition, the case initiated by the organization required the participation of the US Congress in both phases of the advocacy activity under investigation. To help them with this, they were able to put the question of the Hungarian minority on a basis that was in line with the American national interest. They also had a strong sense

of cohesion and built up a strong organisational leadership, with only one key person leaving for financial reasons. They built relationships in Congress regardless of party affiliation: they regularly negotiated with both Democratic and Republican Representatives and Senators, to whom they were willing to make political compromises in the course of their advocacy: they supported certain Representatives who were willing to support their cause. The organisation's progressive relationship with various officials in the executive branch, in particular the Deputy Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs and the current members of delegations to the US Helsinki Council and advisers around the current US President, as well as with officials of the Romanian Foreign Office meant the appropriate degree of access to the executive branch. It has also developed significant cooperation with other minority and human rights organizations. Furthermore, they were also able to neutralize the activities of opposing, extremist Hungarian organizations. Although they struggled with funding problems throughout their operation, they always managed to raise enough funds for their activities to pay the current amount. Their financial problems were solved only thanks to the connections of the head of the ATF, in the mid-eighties, so neither the weakness of the opposing lobby nor the economic and financial strength could be classified among their strengths. Their relationships with the media were extremely effective. In the first half of the period in question, in the 1970s, contacts with the written press and, from the 1980s, the electronic press were established and publications got out regularly, but personal contacts were also frequently maintained with the press: not only their own materials were posted, but they also helped journalists to provide credible information, correct misinformation. Furthermore, they also conducted interviews with Hungarian minority leaders or members of the democratic opposition.

3.3. Results of the dissertation: proof of hypothesis, answers to research questions and novelties

After having evaluated the results of the analysis of the case studies, the author considers the main hypothesis of the dissertation to be proven. According to this, *during the Cold War in addition to American geopolitical interests, the American Hungarian diaspora organizations that were able to adapt to the political structure also contributed to the development of the American-Romanian relations system and the American legal background that determined it.*

During the Cold War, U.S. policy in Eastern Europe depended heavily on superpower conditions. This Eastern European policy initially treated the region as a single bloc, and from the 1960s onwards it gradually opened up to treat the satellite states differently from each other and from the Soviet Union, in which Romania had a special role to play. This was particularly evident in the trade policy first initiated by President Kennedy, which has made the normalization of bilateral relations increasingly important. The Romanian amnesty and reconciliation with society played a very important role in this. In addition, the Hungarian issue held alive at the United Nations at that time had important propaganda value for American foreign policy. For these reasons, it can be assumed that the issue of Hungarian political prisoners brought to the surface by the Hungarian diaspora organizations during the American-Romanian trade relations was raised in the bilateral negotiations. In this way, the information provided by the diaspora organization proved useful to the U.S. executive.

However, after President Johnson treated the country as a test state and, following Nixon's presidency

after its absence from the Prague spring, Romania received an increasingly important role in mediating the different areas of American foreign policy, therefore the U.S. became more and more interested in developing bilateral trade relations. Subsequently, the US Foreign Service treated the Hungarian minority involved in Romanian-Hungarian relations as a historical conflict inherited from the region, and therefore denied Romanian discriminatory measures against them, and did not attach much importance to the complaints made by representatives of related Hungarian organizations.

This only began to change slowly during Carter's time, when the human rights institutional system that still defines the US foreign policy regime began to recover, and thanks to the OSCE follow-up conferences launched after the Helsinki Process, the international human rights regime has developed to the point when the international public considered the human rights of national and religious minorities to be increasingly important. The then active American Hungarian diaspora organizations managed to build close ties with foreign officials working in the newly established system of human rights institutions and to gradually gain the support of the majority of Congress over the decades, but this was not enough to influence US-Romanian relations.

All of this began to change in the 1980s due to Reagan's more idealistic foreign policy direction, the appreciation of the Eastern European region due to changing superpower conditions, the declining importance of Romania's foreign policy and deteriorating human rights performance, and the declining bilateral US foreign trade deficit. These factors eventually led to a change in the terms of the most-favored-nation status by Congress and the resignation of the Romanian dictator of this status of the country. The American Hungarian diaspora organizations, especially during the Carter and Reagan periods of the HHRF, made significant contributions to raise the number of human rights violations raised during bilateral relations and to raise them in various international forums following the introduction of Gorbachev's reform policy and the failure of bilateral Romanian-Hungarian talks. The Hungarian government was also increasingly supportive regarding this.

Due to the result of the combination of close co-operation with the executive, the information and activities it makes available, and a number of factors related to the American political system and the Hungarian diaspora in the 1970s and 1980s, furthermore the successful lobby activities in the legislature due to the organizations' hard work, some of the ethnic advocacy groups representing the Hungarian minority in Romania were able to indirectly influence the legal background of American trade policy and thus the American-Romanian relationship. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that in addition to the changing superpower conditions and the changes in US Eastern European policy, other factors, have contributed to this success. Factors that were entirely independent from the activities of the organizations and that forwarded the issue they represented in a totally different way. In the 1960s, the international importance of the Hungarian issue and the need for reconciliation with Romania's own citizens, as well as the country's improving economic situation and expanding US trade relations, were the independent factors that contributed to the success of the diaspora advocacy. In the 1980s, however, quite different external factors were needed for the advocacy efforts of the American Hungarian diaspora organizations to be able to successfully attain their goals. On the one hand, due to superpower relations, conservative Christian views in the United States have gained increasing ground in public opinion. As a result, the public opinion and members of Congress became increasingly outraged by reports of

atrocities against neo-Protestant churches in Romania. On the other hand, a number of domestic political factors in Romania also contributed to this breakthrough. In addition to the deterioration of Romania's bilateral foreign trade balance with the U.S. in favor of the former, the country's economic indicators were deteriorating at the time, leading to a decline in the interest of American investors and a significant increase in the Eastern European country's international political isolation. These eventually led to the bankruptcy of the regime's independence in foreign policy, to the radicalization of its dictatorial means, and to an increasingly homogeneous national policy.

The dissertation found the following answers to the *research questions* mentioned in the introduction:

- We need to distinguish the usefulness of a given advocacy organization in terms of its utilization by the executive power of the diaspora's host country from the diaspora's ability to achieve the objectives of its advocacy activities, which is most, but not exclusively, related to its impact on the legislative branch.
- The Hungarian cases show that, with regard to the protection of the interests of the Hungarian minority in Romania, the lobbying activities that could be utilized from the point of view of the American executive began in the 1960s, with little success. In terms of the impact of these lobbying activities, more serious breakthroughs did not occur until the late 1980s. The reason for this delay is, on the one hand, that the protection of the interests of Hungarians living in the neighboring countries of Hungary was controlled by the Hungarian government between the two world wars and during the Second World War and that the advocacy activities did not have an independent social base up until this time due to the lack of political self-awareness and activity of newly established Hungarians, that was mostly backward-thinking and nostalgic. This has begun slowly to change until after the Second World War and after the emigration of the emigrant wave of the Hungarian freedom fighters of 1956 from the 1960s onwards, when the degree of political activation and assimilation was sufficient enough for the diaspora society to be used for independent political action by the leaders of diaspora organizations, and not to be governed top-down by a centralized force. Furthermore, for the development of professionalism in advocacy it was needed that the members belonging to the second generation of the diaspora to activate themselves and their development of a new kind of diaspora awareness.
- The objectives, strategies and tactics chosen by and the mobilization and capital raising abilities exerted by the advocacy groups are greatly influenced by the life history, social background, philosophy and attitude of the members active in the organization. According to the author, the analysis of these facts is at least as important for understanding advocacy activities as the strategies and tactics themselves. Although this may seem obvious and predetermined in many cases due to external circumstances, the activities of successful lobbying organizations show that with proper information, time and energy, these self-advocacy and lobbying techniques can be refined and improved if active members prove to be open to it.
- It can also be stated that the increasingly successful and efficient advocacy activity was the result of a multi-generational learning process, which is highly related to the change in the basic philosophy behind the organizations and the life history background of the individuals involved. While first-generation diaspora organizations either took a more moderate inward-looking line and sought to express from the background, or take extreme positions with more radical means, diaspora organizations founded by second-generation

American Hungarians were able to formulate in accordance with the national interests and mentality of the host country, and eventually find and use any more radical tools in case they were needed. Their participation in the civil rights movement that followed the Vietnam War also played an important role in this, as well as the fact that, unlike the first generation, they no longer had a nostalgic desire for the motherland, in this case to the historical territory of Transylvania, and also the fact that they had a dual identity, but they considered themselves American citizens. It is also important to note that in a political environment very unfamiliar to them, the experience of the more moderate members of the first generation, especially the head of the ATF, has made a significant contribution to the success of the second generation.

- Regarding the success of advocacy activities, the assumption made by Østergaard-Nielsen (2003) that “success” or “failure” is not an appropriate measure of the effectiveness of an advocacy activity seems to be supported. There are cases where the objectives on which a particular diaspora organization is working on are not achieved, but in the process there are a number of events that contribute to the achievement of the objective later. In addition, there are cases where, in the absence of adequate information, an organization sets a goal that does not serve the long-term interests of the community it seeks to protect. For this reason, although it seems that they have achieved their goal, their advocacy activities cannot be said to be useful or successful for the community to be protected at all.

- Cases leading to the effective implementation of objectives have shown that a number of factors are essential in order to reverse a seemingly unchangeable situation. This should include the ability to work with other nationalities, ethnic groups and the ability to be utilized by policy makers, flexibility, the provision of information and evidence based on persistent and tenacious background work, focus on the present situation, emphasizing individual responsibility, and the abilities to show solidarity with other ethnic groups, demonstration of unity and mobilization skills.

- Cases justifying the inability to achieve the objectives show that neither the exclusive approach based on nationalism, nor the exclusive victim consciousness, the attitude of the other ethnic group as perpetrator, nor the cramped attachment to the past and future hopes, or other similar organizations or their representatives, neither a rebellious attitude towards political decision-makers, nor a lack of provision of adequate information about the community to be represented, or a lack of social mobilization can lead to results.

- The case studies also supports the argument stated in diaspora and ethnic lobby literature (Brinkerhoff, 2009) that higher financial capital does not necessarily lead to greater results and success. An organization with small financial capital can also carry out highly effective advocacy activities if it is able to convert the cultural capital it has previously accumulated into social capital of adequate quality, thereby producing higher financial capital in the long run, which is essential for its operation. On the other hand, organizations with large financial capital do not always have the right cultural capital to achieve the goals behind their advocacy activities, or even in the absence of adequate cultural capital, they may not be able to realistically see the goals they envision and the potentially harmful effect on a given ethnic group they represented.

- In addition, the statement mentioned by Nadejda K. Marinova (2017) seems also to be proved in the dissertation. According to this, the organizational size is much less significant than the extensive network of

contacts. The case studies examined by the author support the statement that diaspora politicians can also be active, not just organizations if they have an extensive network of contacts.

3.4. *Novelties of the dissertation*

- Approaching the concept of the American diaspora in a slightly different way, the dissertation separates its passive endowments and active aspects. By active aspect the author means the activities of diaspora organizations in “moral deeds”, which is very important for the self-organization and diasporization of the diaspora, and for which a conscious decision is important to belong to the diaspora community, which requires further research (see below).
- Another methodological novelty of the dissertation is that it uses a constructivist approach in the analysis of advocacy activities and uses an ethno-historical method to explore the underlying national perceptions and philosophies. And these methodological approaches also shed light on a number of factors related to effectiveness.
- In addition to the traditional approach to the ethnic lobby literature, the dissertation uses other perspectives, during which the author’s historical research seems to support the opinion expressed in Nadejda K. Marinova’s book (2017) that those diaspora organizations are able to come forward that are considered by the host state to be utilized. The nature of the utilization (information, networking or other) is always decided by the host state’s criteria, and the fact of utilization does not necessarily mean that it benefits the minority community to be protected, as in the case of the successful implementation of advocacy objectives mentioned above.
- The methodological novelty of the dissertation is also the less applied approach in historical research, the combined use of structured focused comparative case studies and the combination of the tools of lobby measurement (goal achievement measurement, process tracking and survey). The dissertation analyzes the individual cases in a uniformed way, along the questions combined from the theoretical literature. This leads to a number of important conclusions regarding the proof of the hypothesis and shows the differences more systematically than a simple chronological presentation of events would have done.
- The novelty of the historical part of the dissertation is the fact that the author conducted a relatively neglected field for writing her dissertation and presents basic research revealing Hungarian and American primary sources that were previously unknown to Hungarian historiography. In presenting all this, the author also approaches the secondary literature in the dissertation from a point of view that has not been done so far during the processing.

The dissertation shows that when examining the advocacy activities of the diaspora, it is necessary to combine neoliberal and constructivist perspectives in order to get a complete picture of the subject under study.

On the one hand, from the *constructivist* point of view, the dissertation sheds light on the collective identity layers of the American Hungarian diaspora, which led to their political activation, and reveals which layers of emigration could be mostly activated in the era. On the other hand, the individual identities of American Hungarian diaspora politicians reveal the factors behind the individual life history brought from the issuing country that influenced their political needs during the period. The historical review chapters also shed

light on the international political factors that also influenced their political activity and shaped their demands.

Furthermore, regarding the effectiveness of diaspora lobbying in this context, the dissertation also sheds light on one hand in terms of usability for the host country and on the other hand to achieve the goals of diaspora politicians from a *neoliberal* approach. While the ethnic lobby literature focuses more on the legislature, many authors have pointed out that it is not enough to negotiate and put pressure on those involved in the legislature by various means, but to bring a case to a truly serious results, the position and information represented by the lobbyist or the organization should also be useful to the executive. However, a breakthrough in legislation occurs in vain if the suggested policy is opposed or disagreed by the executive, or if it is not useful to it. The case studies presented in the dissertation support this hypothesis in several ways.

In the light of all this, the dissertation points out firstly that the Hungarian minority in Romania was not alone during the Cold War: its struggle for human rights was supported by the activities of many American Hungarian organizations. Secondly, the author also points out that the issue of Hungarians living in the neighboring countries of Hungary (especially Hungarians in Romania) was an issue for the American Hungarian diaspora that was unifying factor which could not be reached by any other type of issue. However, there were large differences in implementation between the first and second generation, as well as the more moderate and radical organizations of the first generation. Thirdly, the micro-histories of the case studies, examined at the level of international relations, support the ability of diaspora politicians of a relatively small nation to influence policy decisions without the support of the issuing country, using the information gathered by them to advise policy makers on issues relevant to that the host country would have a special need for this. Examining the political activities of the American Hungarian diaspora groups, we can conclude that those who were most able to attract the attention of the political decision-makers of the host country were those who fit into human rights discourse, sought laws that could be in the interest of the host country, built comprehensive alliances, were able to put aside of the more radical, nationalist elements of the advocacy community and could realize the real opportunities and real interests of the community they represent.

The fourth important conclusion of the dissertation is that in this process the representatives of the minority community were present as actors who played active role in the course of events and did not suffer from those events that were the subject of these advocacy activities. The reason behind this was that the advocacy activities of the American Hungarian diaspora politicians and the American population mobilized by them would not have been possible to carry out without the active participation of the Hungarian minority members. This also confirms that the minority Hungarians, even in these extremely difficult situations, had the qualities and resources necessary to remain not only a suffering subject but also an active shaper of the events.

The decades-long activity of the American Hungarian diaspora in connection with Hungarians living in the neighboring countries of Hungary finally points out that, contrary to popular belief, the Hungarians are able to activate their hidden resources and act united to mobilize masses in historical moments, despite all the fault lines between them. As the example of the HHRF demonstrates, mobilization and breakthroughs are indeed possible if action on these issues is a moral responsibility with solidarity and cooperation with the “other” at all times is coupled with the awareness, perseverance and opportunity needed in a given political situation, with

flexible reactivity and openness.

4. Literature review

4.1. Most important primary sources

4.1.1. Most used archival sources

Carter Presidential Library and Museum, National Archives, Atlanta, GA, USA

Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library and Museum, National Archives, Ann-Arbor, MI, USA

HHRF Archive, American Hungarian Library and Historical Society, Magyar Ház, 215 E 82nd Str., New York City, NY, 10028, USA.

ILHR, International League for Human Rights 1948-1990, New York City Public Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division, Stephen A. Schwarzman Building, MssCol 1518, New York City, NY, USA

Teleki. Legacy of Béla Teleki. Szechenyi Országos Széchenyi Könyvtár, Kézirattár, FOND 580

Teleki, unsettled. Unsettled archives of the legacy of Béla Teleki. American Hungarian Library and Historical Society, Magyar Ház, 215 E 82nd Str., New York City, NY, 10028, USA

4.1.2. Most cited interviews, conferences, lectures and personal statements

Interview with Jenő Brogyányi. 2015. Interview of Eszter Kovács with Jenő Brogyányi, November, 2015. New York, Sent by Eszter Kovács

“In the defence of Transylvania”. 2016. The Forty Years History of the *Hungarian Human Rights Foundation 40 éves története*. Conference held at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, December 6, 2016

Hámos, László. 1989. The responsibility of Hungarians living in the West: results and tasks. European Protestant Free University. Manuscript. Sent by László Hámos. May 1, 1989.

Hámos, László. 2016. Interview of Nándor Bárdi, Stefano Bottoni and Eszter Kovács with László Hámos. Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Sent by Eszter Kovács. July 5-6, 2016, Edited and shortened version published: Bárdi-Kovács, 2019

Latkóczy, Emese. 2016. Interview of Nándor Bárdi Nándor, Stefano Bottoni és Kovács Eszter interjúja with Emese Latkóczy. Manuscript version of the recording. Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Sent by Eszter Kovács. March 18, 2016

Hámos, László. 2010. Interview of the author with László Hámos. Budapest, December, 2010

Hámos, Margit. 2010: Interview of the author with Margit Hámos. August, 2010

Sándor, István. 2010a: Correspondance of the author with István Sándor. July 5, 2010

Sándor, István. 2010b: Telephone interview of the author with István, Sándor. August, 2010

Szekeres, Zsolt. 2016. Interview of Eszter Kovács with Zsolt Szekeres. Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, August 11, 2016. Sent by Eszter Kovács

4.1.3. Most used journals, brochures, publications and internet databases

CHRR. 1976. Testimony of László Hámos on behalf of the Committee for Human Rights in Rumania before the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means. United States House of Representatives on Continuing Most-Favored Nation Tariff Treatment of Imports from Rumania. Committee for Human Rights in Rumania. New York

Congress.gov (szénátusi és kongresszusi határozati javaslatok adatbázisa)

Committee on Foreign Affairs. <https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/> (Kongresszusi Albizottságok)

EV. [actual year] *Erdély védelmében*. [In Defense of Transylvania.] Committee for Human Rights in Rumania. The official publication of the Committee for Human Rights in Rumania, New York, 1976–1980

HHRF. 1983-89. *HHRF Bulletin*. Hungarian Human Rights Foundation. A Magyar Emberi Jogok Alapítvány hivatalos tájékoztatója. New York, 1983-1989. HHRF Archivum, New York

Transsylvania Erdélyi Tudósító. *Quarterly of The American Transylvanian Federation*. Az Amerikai Erdélyi Szövetség negyedévi tájékoztatója. (Publication: quarterly, New York City, NY, 1959–1978. Citation as: Transsylvania)

Vincze Gábor. 1999-2021 A romániai magyar kisebbség történeti kronológiája. 1944-1989. [The Chronology of the Romanian Hungarian Minority. 1944-1989] Source:

4.2. Most important secondary sources¹

4.2.1. History of the Cold War

- Bárdi Nándor. 2004. Tény és való. *A budapesti kormányzatok és a határon túli magyarok kapcsolattörténete*. Pozsony, Kalligram
- Borhi László. 2015. *Nagyhatalmi érdekek hálójában. Az Egyesült Államok és Magyarország kapcsolata a második világháborútól a rendszerváltásig*. Budapest, Osiris
- Courtney, Bruce J. – Harrington, Joseph F. 1991. *Tweaking the Nose of the Russians: Fifty Years of American-Romanian Relations, 1940-1990*. New York, NY: Boulder, CO, East European Monographs
- Kalmár Melinda. 2011. *Történelmi galaxisok vonzásában. Magyarország és a szovjetrendszer. 1945-1990*. Budapest, Osiris
- Kirk, Roger – Raceanu, Mircea. 1994. *Romania Versus the United States. Diplomacy of the Absurd, 1985-1989*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan
- Magyarics Tamás. 2000. *Az Egyesült Államok külpolitikájának története*. Budapest, Eötvös József kiadó
- Novák Csaba Zoltán
2011 *Aranykorszak? A Ceaușescu-rendszer magyarságpolitikája I. 1965-1974*. Pro-Print, Csíkszereda
2017 *Holtvágányon. A Ceaușescu-rendszer magyarságpolitikája II. 1974-1989*. Pro-Print, Csíkszereda
Chosen studies of The Cambridge History of the Cold War. Volume 1-3.

4.2.2. Diaszpóra-elmélet, általános és etnikai lobbi

- Baumgartner, Frank R. – Berry M. Jeffrey – Hojnacki, Marie – Kimball C. David – Leech L. Beth. 2009. *Lobbying an Policy Change. Who Wins, Who Loses, and Why*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. 2009. *Digital Diasporas. Identity and Transnational Engagement*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Koinova, Maria. 2012. “Autonomy and Positionality in Diaspora Politics” *International Political Sociology*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 99-103.
- Koopmans, Ruud, Statham, Paul, 2003: How National Citizenship Shapes transnationalism: A Comparative Analysis of Migrant Claims-Making in Germany, Great Britain and the Netherlands. In: *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. Edition: 1, Publisher: Palgrave Macmillan, Editors: Christian Joppke, Ewa Morawska, 195-238
- Dür, Andreas. 2008. Measuring Interest Group Influence in the EU. *European Union Politics*, SAGE Publications, 9 (4), 559-576
- Garrett, Stephen A. 1978. Eastern European Ethnic Groups and American Foreign Policy. *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 93., No. 2. Summer, 1978, pp. 301-323.
- Haney, Patrick J. & Vanderbush, Walt. 1999. The Role of Ethnic Interest Groups in U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of the Cuban American National Foundation. *International Studies Quarterly*. 13: pp. 341-361.
- Laguerre, Michel. 2006. *Diaspora, Politics, and Globalization*. VA, USA, Palgrave-Macmillan
- Marinova, Nadejda K. 2017: *Ask What You Can do For Your (New) Country. How Host States Use Diasporas*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY
- Loomis, Burdett A. 2012. (eds.): *Guide to Interest Groups and Lobbying in the United States*. Washington, D.C., CQ Press
- Marton Péter. 2019. Az érdekcsoportok szerepe az amerikai külpolitikában. In: Horváth Emőke, Lehoczki Bernadett: *Diplomácia és nemzetközi kapcsolatok*. Budapest, L’Harmattan, 2019, 227-238
- Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva.
2001 *The Politics of Migrants’ Transnational Political Practices*. WPTC-01-22. Paper was given to the conference on Transnational Migration: Comparative Perspectives. Princeton University, 30 June-1 July 2001. Forrás: <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/working%20papers/WPTC-01-22%20Ostergaard.doc.pdf>
Letöltve: 2021-09-12

¹ Az alábbi lista tájékoztató jelleggel a teljesség igénye nélkül, témakörönként adja közre az értekezésben felhasznált legfontosabb forrásokat. Részletes bibliográfiát lásd a disszertációban.

- 2003 *Transnational politics: Turks and Kurds in Germany*. London, UK; New York, NY: Routledge
- Paul, David M. – Paul, Rachel Anderson. 2009. *Ethnic Lobbies and U.S. Foreign Policy*. London, UK: Lynne Rienner, Boulder
- Portes, Alejandro – Mi Zhou. 1993: „The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants (Interminority Affairs in the U.S.: Pluralism at the Crossroads).” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 30 (November, 1993): 74–97.
- Shain Yossi.
- 1999 *Marketing the American Creed Abroad*. New York, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- 2005 *The Frontier of Loyalty. Political Exiles in the Age of the Nation-State*. Ann Arbor, Michigan Publishing. University of Michigan Press, 2005
- Sheffer, Gabriel. 2003. *Diaspora Politics: At Home Abroad*. Cambridge. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Tony. 2000. *Foreign Attachments. The Power of Ethnic Groups in the Making of American Foreign Policy*. Cambridge, MA – London, UK: Harvard University Press
- Zake, Ieva. 2009. *Anti-Communist Minorities in the U.S. Political Activism of Ethnic Refugees*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan

4.2.3. American Hungarian Diaspora

- Borbándi Gyula. 2006. *A magyar emigráció életrajza. 1945-1985*. Bern, Európai Protestáns Szabadegyetem. Internetes verzió: <https://mek.oszk.hu/03400/03472/html/> Letöltve: 2021-03-12
- Fejős Zoltán
- 1988 Magyarok az Egyesült Államokban az 1980-as években. (Demográfia, társadalmi adatok, fogalmi problémák). In: *Magyarságkutatás 1988. A magyarságkutató Intézet Évkönyve*, Budapest, 1988. 177-216.
- 2001 Az etnicitás árnyalatai. Identitások az amerikai magyar diaszpórában. *Irodalmi és társadalmi havilap*. 11: 13, 51-61
- 2002 Az etnicitás változatai. Identitások az amerikai magyar diaszpórában. In: A. Gergely András (szerk.): *A nemzet antropológiája (Hofer Tamás köszöntése)*. Budapest, Új Mandátum, 2-16.
- 2004 Diaszpóra és az „amerikai magyarok” – háttér egy fogalom alkalmazhatóságához. In: szerk. Kovács Nóra: *Tanulmányok a diaszpóráról*. MTA Etnikai-nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet, Gondolat: Budapest, 9-24.
- Gazsó Dániel:
- 2016 A magyar diaszpóra fejlődéstörténete. *Kisebbségi Szemle*, 1,1, 9-35.
- 2019 A magyar diaszpóra intézményesülésének és anyaországi viszonyainak története. In: Ambrus László, Rakita Eszter (szerk.): *Amerikai magyarok – magyar amerikaiak: Új irányok a közös történelem kutatásában*. Eger, EKE Líceum Kiadó, 15-33
- 2020b *Otthon és itthon. A magyar diaszpóra és anyaországa*. Doktori (PhD) értekezés. Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Bölcsész- és Társadalomtudományi Kar, Politikaelméleti Doktori Iskola, Politikaelméleti program. Témavezető: Dr. Kántor Zoltán. 310.p.
- Kovács Eszter.
- 2017 The power of second-generation diaspora: Hungarian ethnic lobbying in the United States in the 1970-1980s. *Diaspora Politics*. Published online: November 8, 2017. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09739572.2017.1398374>
- 2018 *Magyar diaszpórapolitika 1990 után az állam és a diaszpóra perspektívájából*. Doktori (PhD) értekezés. Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Politikaelméleti Doktori Iskola, Politikaelméleti Program. 216.
- Papp Z., Attila. 2008. *Beszédből Világ. Elemzések, Adatok Amerikai Magyarokról*. Budapest, Magyar Külügyi Intézet, Regio sorozat
- Puskás Julianna.
- 1982 *Kivándorló magyarok az Egyesült Államokban (1880-1914)*. Budapest, Akadémia Kiadó
- 1991 Migráció Kelet-Közép-Európában 19. és 20. században. *Regio – Kisebbségtudományi Szemle*. 2. évf. 4. sz. 1-15. <http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00036/00008/pdf/02.pdf> Letöltés: 2014-10-25
- Várdy, Steven B. 2000. *Magyarok az Újvilágban. Az észak-amerikai magyarság rendhagyó története*. Budapest, Anyanyelvi Konferencia

5. List of own publications

5.1. Studies and reviews published in Hungarian speaking peerreviewed journals

2021. Erdély védelmében. Az Emberi Jogokért Romániában Bizottság (CHRR) működésének első három éve (1976-1978). *Világtörténet*. Budapest, November, 2021, 461-492
2021. A Magyar Emberi Jogok Alapítvány (HHRF) érdekvédelmi tevékenységének rövid története, kapcsolathálói, ideológiai és infrastrukturális háttere (1976-1989). *REGIO. Kisebbség Kultúra Politika Társadalom*. (Under Publication)
2015. Az Amerikai Erdélyi Szövetség európai tevékenysége, 1958-1976. *Pro Minoritate*, Budapest, 2015 spring, 119-141 <http://www.prominoritate.hu/folyoiratok/2015/ProMino-1504-07-Hermann.pdf>
2015. A diaszpóra-politika koncepciójának különböző aspektusai és lehetséges tanulságai a magyar kutatás számára. *Kisebbségkutatás*, Budapest, 2015/2, Vol. 24., 50-72
http://bgazrt.hu/dbfiles/blog_files/5/0000010925/Kisebbségkutatás_2015_2%20korr-2.26-37.pdf
2011. Az Amerikai Erdélyi Szövetség története, 1952-1976. *Magyar Kisebbség*, Cluj-Napoca, 2011/3-4., Vol. 15., 7-111. <http://www.jakabffy.ro/magyarkisebbség/pdf/002Hermann%20Gabriella.pdf>

5.2. Books and book chapters published in foreign language

2013. Action Plan for Minority-related Challenges in Europe. In: Action Plan. Multiculturalism – Trap or Chance? Budapest, AJTK (conference volume)

5.3. Other types of publications published in foreign language

2019. Entries. COURAGE. Cultural Opposition: Understanding the Cultural Heritage of Dissent in the Former Socialist Countries. International Research funded by Horizon 2020 the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation. www.cultural-opposition.eu DOI: 10.24389/29511

Advertisement Appeared in 1976 in the New York Times.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n38308>

Archive of the Hungarian Human Rights Foundation.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n29511>

Brogyányi, Jenő.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n45875>

Hámos, László.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n33586>

Hungarian Human Rights Foundation.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n87883>

Participation at the Cultural Forum of Budapest and Social Gathering in the Home of the Sculptor of Romanian Hungarian Origin, Tibor Szervátiusz, 1985.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n174866>

The Short History of the CHRR's First Demonstration, 1976.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n60464>

Latkóczy, Emese.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n25305>

Lipták, Béla.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n24023>

Nagy, Károly.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n18636>

Veress, Bulcsú.

<http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n42231>

- Békés Csaba (chief ed.). 2014. The History of the Soviet Bloc 1945–1991. A CHRONOLOGY. PART 2. 1953–1968. Cold War History Research Center at Corvinus University of Budapest.

(The author of the dissertation participated in the electronic version of the chronology as an associate editor. For other authors see:

http://www.coldwar.hu/html/en/chronologies/1945-1991/Chronology_1953-1968_cover.html)