



**Doctoral School of
Sociology**

Thesis Synopsis

of PhD Dissertation

Zakariás Ildikó

**Solidarity and Power
In Voluntary Programs of Hungarian Ethnic Kin Support**

Supervisor:

Margit Feischmidt, Dr. habil.

Budapest, 2016

Institute of Sociology and Social Policy

Thesis Synopsis

of PhD Dissertation

Zakariás Ildikó

**Solidarity and Power
In Voluntary Programs of Hungarian Ethnic Kin Support**

Supervisor:

Margit Feischmidt, Dr. habil.

© Zakariás Ildikó

Table of Contents

I. Theoretical background and research questions	4
I.1. Reproducing ideologies of support	8
I.2. Recognition: potentials and limitations	9
I.3. Care and intimacy in philanthropic programs.....	12
II. Methods and data	13
III. Results	16
III.1. Reproducing ideologies of support.....	16
III.2. Recognition: potentials and limitations	17
III.3. Care and intimacy in philanthropic programs.....	18
IV. References	20
V. List of Relevant Publications	21

I. Theoretical background and research questions

The notion of helping, that is, contributing to someone else's 'good', is a complex phenomenon. What is meant by the good of others, of certain individuals, groups, or the public good in general is never self-evident and thus always demands complex interpretative processes. The notion of 'help' must be defined. Which needs should be fulfilled, which groups should be helped, what should the actual method and practice of helping be and who should be entitled to interfere with another's life? In the processes of planning and realization, participants create and rewrite the meaning of help and related notions such as selflessness, solidarity, morality, or the public good. Either on the level of representations, or on the level of its actual realization and practice, 'doing good' is a social construction, produced and reproduced through complex interactions between participants' ideas, actions and the social context.

Such ideas and actions are often embedded in pre-existing value systems, or ideologies (Geertz 1973). By orienting several aspects of 'doing good', these ideologies contribute to and ensure the coherence of ideas, emotions and actions around helping.

In my research I analyse philanthropic actions that are built upon national ideologies. By emphasising the importance of nationhood, national history, language and culture, and the duties related to its maintenance and preservation, this ideology offers several ways to think about 'doing good'. Firstly, national categorisations classify people, distinguishing between those who are members of a community, or those are worthy of inclusion, from those who are unworthy of inclusion. Secondly, responsibility and solidarity towards members and communities as a whole may be based on the criterion of their belonging to a national community (along with the feeling of there being an imperative to act in their favour). Thirdly, national ideologies comprise or are associated with values or sets of values that unite members, the preservation of which is their common duty.

A characteristic form of philanthropic actions in Hungary is closely linked to the working of national ideologies, more specifically the imperative of helping ethnic

Hungarian minorities of neighbouring countries. A core narrative of such helping imperative is formed around the discourse of national survival, assuming that minority societies and their national culture are under constant threat. This discourse uses a historically and culturally unified, homogenous concept of the Hungarian nation that includes Hungarian communities living in neighbouring states, and ignores the diversified history of these minority communities as well as advancing processes of assimilation into the majority society in some of these communities¹. According to this culturalising discourse, these Hungarians are characterized by a national authenticity, guarding the most ancient, most original, most valuable elements of the Hungarian culture; are taking up this role of guarding the national culture actively and consciously; and are under the constant pressure of coerced assimilation on the part of the majority society. Based on this discourse, these minority groups need the help of the mother country and its population in maintaining the Hungarian national culture and resisting assimilation. This discourse emphasising the preservation of Hungarian national culture and the national community as a goal in itself, often integrates a more individualistic human and minority rights discourse as well.

The alternative of the discourse of threatened national culture is a modernisation discourse. The modernisation discourse is a global hierarchical classification system that measures positions according to their level of modernisation and civilization. (Melegh 2006) The system has an idealised Western Europe as reference point, while all other positions are measured according to their distance (belatedness) on the modernisation/civilisation axis. In the Hungarian context, the slope is projected onto Eastern Europe implying a civilizational contest that is triumphed by Hungary as opposed to other countries. (Melegh 2006) Although in the last decade there is a reconsideration of this Hungarian regional economic and civilisational superiority, the former concept still stays alive in public discourses.

Furthermore, the modernisation hierarchy is also projected onto the Hungarian nation, creating internal East-West hierarchies: it states the heavy economic circumstances, economic and cultural underdevelopment and lack of civilisation of ethnic Hungarian minority communities residing in “less modernised” countries of Ukraine, Romania,

¹ Assimilation refers here to specific processes of inter- and intragenerational language change, intermarriage, inter-and intragenerational changes of national identification.

Serbia.² Based on common national belonging, the responsibility of Hungarians of Hungary should cover not only the preservation of national identity and culture in these minority groups, but also should take part in their material support, modernisation and development.

The outlined discursive field is in great part produced and maintained by intervention and assistance policies of the Hungarian state. (Bárdi 2010) These policies stretch over the classic terrain of state responsibilities that is the community of citizens. The principle of transborder responsibility is part of the Hungarian constitution, both the old and the new. Besides diversity of their actual form and content, a wide consensus is in place among different governments around the necessity of such support.

This helping discourse affects however spheres outside the state as well, that is private individuals and formal or informal voluntary associations. Large philanthropic organisations, such as the Maltese and the Hungarian Red Cross often have their specific division or programmes directed towards Hungarian minority communities in neighbouring states, and there is a multitude of smaller associations, family, church, workplace communities that organise such support. According to my estimations based on the official register of civic organisations in Hungary, out of 112000 civil organisations registered since 1989, the magnitude of those mentioning some support for ethnic Hungarians living in minority position in their official descriptions has been about 1600 (including the liquidated ones as well). These organisations operate in part independently from the state. They rely on certain resources provided by the state: for example they receive financial support, or use ideas and narratives constructed by state actors on helping co-nationals. Nevertheless, these voluntary and civic activities, relatively liberated from the bureaucratic and economic rationality characteristics of the state and economy, provide personal commitments, values, personal relations and interactions a greater role in defining the common ideological framework and the actual realization of actions.

² In case of ethnic Hungarians of Romania see Peti 2006, Feischmidt 2005.

The broadest scope of my PhD research addresses the following questions: How are actual practices, actions of such “doing good” made possible and shaped by national ideologies and discourses? On the other hand, how are national ideologies and discourses, concepts and categories reproduced in the process of such actions of “doing good”?

Processes of meaning construction are always deeply interwoven with power relations, which holds true also for morality, for notions of “doing good”. The voluntary character of the actions necessitates a minimal level of resources that allows the actor the liberty to volunteer. This is often lacking on the side of the recipients of help, which causes a structural asymmetry between initiators and receivers of help. This structural asymmetry becomes also reflected in meanings and actions that will be influenced and formed by those on the more resourceful side, that is the donors. Moreover, the addressees of help become associated with needs, absences, lack of capacities, and may become deprived of their full responsibility for themselves. On the other side, “doing good” and helping is often rewarded with recognition and gratefulness that may be mobilised in the future for the sake of the helpers, and may become constraints of actions for the beneficiaries.

Categorizations, ideas of sameness and difference are thus core elements of these helping ideologies. On the one hand, suffering and needs are emphasised on one side, while capacities and resources are stressed on the other. This indicates the binary roles played by the helpers and the helped and the boundaries and hierarchy that are created within the helping relationship. On the other hand, besides the differences that exist with needs, the similarities between the needy and their helpers has to be constructed as well. These ideas of similarity offer ways of identifying with the needy and as such provide an emotional basis for helping intentions and actions. Different ideologies, however, create these identifications in different ways. Universalist helping ideologies are based on the idea that the entirety of humanity is entitled, while other ideologies are particularistic: by pointing out the ‘same’, or deserving, valuable others, worthy of help, with whom one can easily identify, these implicitly or explicitly exclude helping others.

I.1. Reproducing ideologies of support

The interrelatedness of philanthropic actions and categorisations are given attention at various levels by sociologists. Processes of boundary making between those who are included in the philanthropic actions, and those who are excluded is surprisingly under-researched. As Bayertz pointed out, the universalist ethic that dominates the field of social theorizing has limited the empirical applicability of theories to a reality where boundaries and exclusions often restrict the range of solidarity and sympathy that is expressed (Bayertz 1999). As a result, a dominant field of study that concerns helping motivations and behaviour mainly addresses the concept using the notion of altruism - which understands helping as universal and undifferentiated motivation, detached from ideologies, identities, and emotions.

A different approach is taken, however, by several authors. Related to the working of the non-profit sector in the United States, Lester M. Solomon described the phenomenon of “philanthropic particularism” (Solomon 1987). In his article he aimed to draw attention to the uneven distribution of philanthropic care among different subgroups of society, “ethnic, religious, neighborhood, interest, or other”, as well as between the „deserving” and non-deserving poor. Besides these early steps, few contributions have been made to the field. Exceptions are Silk (1998), Flores (2011), Heron (2008), who emphasize the role of ideologies and discourses in philanthropy and volunteering, in the meantime highlighting the duty of social research to unveil such geographies of solidarities.

Apart from philanthropic studies, in my dissertation I also briefly overview explanations, ideas around helping in nationalism studies. Social constructionist and political philosophical approaches have analysed the relationship between national ideologies and solidarity. The former approach analysed solidarity as an outcome: as a feature of identity, emotions and attitudes reproduced in interactions. (Some important examples are Anderson (2006 [1983]), Eriksen (1991), Calhoun (1997), Calhoun (2007)). Among these Eriksen’s work on boundary making and social distance (1991, 1993) will be of primary importance for my analysis. This approach however, says little about national solidarity turned into actual practice and action. In my dissertation I investigate further in this direction. By analysing national

solidarities in the context of helping actions I follow recent calls to analyse nationalism not only as talk, narratives and discourses but as action and practice. Billig's banal nationalism, and Brubaker et al (2006) and Fox-Idris (2008) explaining everyday nationalism will provide the major tools for my analysis.

The relatively new-born subdiscipline of diaspora philanthropy studies carries the clear potential of uniting these two fields – that of philanthropy and nationalism research. However, the way the significance of ideology is missed from the earlier, the significance of ideology – and nationalism, in particular – is similarly missed by diaspora-philanthropy studies. A few exceptions are Carter (2007) showing how philanthropic actions initiated by the Croatian diaspora in the US to provide humanitarian aid for Croatians during the Yugoslavian wars rely on and reproduce national ideologies. Dan Lainer Vos's thorough and innovative research on the coupling of nationalism and solidarity in early 20s century Irish philanthropy, as well as in the working of American Jewish philanthropic organisations in the 50s, are crucial for my own.

Following these lines of thought, the following research questions are formulated in the first part of my dissertation:

- What kind of ideologies frame ideas around helping, needs, and suffering on one hand, and deservingness, merits, attachments on the other in the analysed programs? What are the constitutive notions, statements, symbols of these?
- How are these questioned and problematised during helping interactions among donors and recipients?
- What narratives volunteers and donors do construct to recreate and rewrite these ideologies? What are the rites of maintaining symbols and meanings around needs, suffering and merits, deservingness and attachments?

1.2. Recognition: potentials and limitations

Research on altruism, and psychological and social-psychological motivation-models of volunteering and philanthropy restrict their focus on the giver, and the givers' ideas and intentions, and have a blind spot on the actions and processes of giving, the interactions involved, as well as the perspective of the receiver. The topic of

hierarchies and power between the helpers and the helped are touched upon just implicitly and from afar, or entirely left out from the scope of analysis. The interactive and processual character of philanthropic giving - with a major emphasis on aspects of power - receives much more thorough attention in analyses following a Maussian approach on gift-giving. Bourdieu's analysis of disinterested actions, especially those activities that are carried out in the name of the common good, among them gift-giving is an important cornerstone of this agenda. According to his model, regardless of the intentions of the donors, and the "illusio" of the field concerned, effects and consequences of gift-giving is recreating the status quo of social structure: the distribution of economic/social/symbolic capital and thus power hierarchies between donors and recipients of giving remain unaltered, always and eternally favouring the former. (Bourdieu 1998)

Symbolic power in helping relations has been analysed from a different angle by post-colonial and feminist analysts in terms of how different helping relations are oriented from the first world towards the third. Based on Foucault, Spivak (1988) and Said (1978), these perspectives on philanthropic relations in humanitarian actions, international development, or voluntary tourism are devoted to disclose the working of discourses and ideologies underlying such helping relationships. In this perspective, donor-recipient interactions are major terrains for epistemic violence, for processes of unilateral meaning construction, that enable control over and objectification of the latter for the sake of the former's interests. (Escobar 1995, Heron 2007, Kapoor 2005). They show how othering takes place during such helping activities, and taking a wider view, how solidary relations, instead of emancipation, contribute to the maintenance of discourses of power and domination. In these approaches, hierarchic categories and relations are recreated through the interaction of discourses and acts of giving-receiving.

Both streams of research on giving and philanthropy described above tend to overemphasize the unilateral effects of helping relations to recreate power relations. To complement these perspectives, the dissertation proposes to rely upon Axel Honneth's recognition theory.

According to Honneth, subjects are formed in interactions and communication through processes of recognition. Recognition is an idealtypical mutual relationship, in which the subject perceives herself equal as well as distinct with and from the other. Such relationships are preconditions of the formation of autonomous subjects, thus the denial of recognition may be criticised as hindering such subject formation. Honneth distinguishes three forms of recognition. Attaching only few with strong emotional ties, love is dominant in the private sphere, and enables self-confidence, the belief that one has a legitimate distinct existence independently from one's physical and social environment. Rights, especially universal human rights is an impersonal form of recognition offered by the state, that recognises any human being as a morally competent person ensuring one's self-respect. Solidarity or merits is a form of recognising individuals or groups by many, according to their contribution to the common good of the community. This mode of recognition ensuring self-esteem differentiates between individuals and groups, assigns different rewards for those esteemed, and what is highly important for the purposes of our dissertation, it prescribes active support for the esteemed persons or groups.

The existence or denial of recognition phenomenologically may be perceived through emotional and affective states of participants: its positive effect is emotional security and self-confidence/self-respect/self-esteem, while its denial causes shame and humiliation.

The dissertation thus attempts to bring together multiple layers of analysis in understanding donor-receiver relationships. First, the embedding of helping intentions into ideologies and discourses is shown. Among certain circumstances, these ideologies may pave the way to recognition and solidarity towards the recipients. However, asymmetric positions of helping relations, hierarchies and denigration, as well as unilateral meaning construction may lead to denial of recognition. In such cases, groups and individuals initiate struggles to acquire recognition.

How do recipients perceive the positions that different ideologies offer to them? How do they understand the categories of needs and sufferings, deservingness and merits?

- To what extent do these imply denial of recognition?
- To what extent, in what ways do these provide the basis for solidarity?

What are the strategies to deal with the threat of denied recognition?

-What is the role of national discourses in the struggle for recognition of the recipients?

- How do strategies of resistance unfold? What other framings are born, that may be considered as resistance?

I.3. Care and intimacy in philanthropic programs

A significant proportion of voluntary programs intend to integrate personal donor-recipient relationships into their everyday helping practices. The promises of long-term intimate relations help to deepen donor commitments towards the programs. We hypothesise however, that such personal connections also have deeper implications, that affect power relations and recognition struggles. These consequences are in the focus of my research.

Honneth highlights a primary form of recognition labelled as love, that implies constraining one's own desires (needs, interests) in order to fulfill physical and emotional needs of close and distinguished others (family members and friends). Honneth's primary mode of recognition is close to the notion of ethics of care theorised by feminist moral philosophers and psychologists. (Gilligan 1982, Pulcini 2012). Boltanski's notion of agape also refers to a universal human capacity that enables one to perceive others as individuals, with their own desires, needs and sufferings. (Boltanski 1990). If the notion of „emotional needs” could be stretched so that they also cover needs for solidarity, recognition of group identities, worthiness and merits, than these intimate relations of private recognition (love, care, agape) unfold as potential sources of solidarity. In philanthropic interactions, such relationships – through the close emotional and often bodily contact between the parties – enable donors to access the perspective of the recipients of help. And thus enable the former to understand later's ideas and notions about „helping”, moreover understanding them in the context of struggle for recognition. As such, intimate relationships become potential tools for unveiling different forms of denied recognition and solidarity.

How are such intimate spaces created in donor-recipient interactions?

- How do institutional practices of the programs contribute to the construction of such relations?
- How do donors and recipients complement with their actions the production of intimacies?
- What are the consequences on common practices, philanthropic actions, donations and gifts?

What is the relationship between such intimate relations and the working of national ideologies?

- What ideas, narratives, categories orient philanthropic relations in such intimate spaces? How is merits, worthiness understood and transformed?

II. Methods and data

In the research qualitative data and analysis, semi-structured interviews, participant observation, document analysis has been applied. The semi-structured lifeworld interviews' (Kvale 2005) primary importance lies in their capacity to show narratives of philanthropy constructed by the individual. Also, it reveals certain aspects of meaning production in interactions.

Participant observation has been used to follow helping interactions. Spontaneous speech events in everyday interactions, as well as important collective events, institutionalised rituals have been in the focus of observation. (Feischmidt 2007) These contributed to access everyday perspectives of participants in their own natural context, so that the bias effects of research intentions and framing could be minimalised. Also, participant observation enabled that practices, dynamics, events not reflected upon by the actors could be detected. Observations have been recorded in a research diary.

The results are based on observations carried out in four philanthropic programs. Three out of these are institutionally linked to schools, two-of them maintained by churches in Hungary, one maintained by the state. One out of these runs a foundation, the other two have no formal organisational basis. The target categories of supported communities are Hungarian of Transcarpathia, Hungarian speaking Roma in

Transcarpathia, Moldovan Csángós, Hungarians from Across the Borders. One program has been founded after 1989, while the other two started operating in the second half of the 2000s. The fourth programs, also being the largest, supports the Hungarian language education of Csángós in Moldova. This program intends to recruit donors, who may not only give regular donations, but also through a symbolic kinship, called „god-parenthood” may develop personal contact with the students and their families supported by the program. Godparents also have a formal association.

	Budaörs- Program	Budapest- Program	Szentendre- Program	„Godparent” Program
Organisational aims³	Supporting Hungarian language learning, education, cultural support	Twin-school partnership, education, cultural relations	Catholic mission, education	Advertising God- Parent Program, supporting Hungarian language education and Hungarian language religious activities, social support
Categories of supported communities	Hungarians from across the borders, Transcarpathian Hungarians, Csángós of Moldova, Romania	Transcarpathian Hungarians	Hungarian Speaking Roma in Transcarpathia	Csángós of Moldova
Institutional background (in time of research)	Secondary grammar school in Budapest	Religious Primary School in Budaörs,	Religious Secondary Grammar School in Szentendre	An association organising Hungarian language education in Moldova
Organisational form	Public Foundation	-	-	Public Association
Magnitude of organisers, volunteers	<100	<50	<50	Several hundreds
Beginning of activities	1989-1990	2009	2006	2000

Table 1. The four voluntary programs

³ according to a nonprofit registry, founding documents, or home-page of program

III. Results

III.1. Reproducing ideologies of support

The ideology of national survival, and the ideology of „saving the Hungarianness” of the supported communities is a central pillar of organisational missions in three out of four programs.

The ideology consists of images on the authenticity of ethnic Hungarian minorities, according to which these communities are the bearers of a national culture that is „more real”, „more authentic”, „more Hungarian” than that of Hungarians in Hungary; these communities being under constant threat on the part of the majority state and majority society; the conscious and devoted struggle of these minority communities against this assimilation; and last but not least, the imperative of support on the part of the „mother country” are all reproduced in everyday speeches and rituals. Needs and suffering framed in these cultural terms are complemented with ideas on deservingness derived from national belonging and national sameness, in some cases, however, universalist ideologies of minority rights and cultural heritage discourses are also embraced.

Nevertheless, other ideologies and discourses also shape ideologies invoked by the programs. In less visible, less performed, ritualised, spoken forms, and more on the level of dispositions, habituses and practices, needs and suffering linked to poverty and lack of modernisation are also prevalent in framing the imperative of support. Merits and worthiness underlying the importance of helping may appear in diverse frames: it may be relegated to the discourse of national survival; the universalist ideology of Christian caritas; the policy discourse of „disadvantage”, or certain communitarian ideologies of solidarity. Worthiness may also be created through idealising the recipients in a „denationalised” frame, that is valuing their authenticity through formulating a critique of modernisation. Another tool for assigning worthiness is linked to ideas about children and childhood. This may interact with other frames of disadvantage, religious solidarity or national survival, reinforcing worthiness and merits.

Depending on the circumstances, these ideologies may be reproduced through practices, in a non-reflected way, through mechanisms described by Billig's banal nationalism paradigm. However, in interactions these categories may also become problematic in funding and coordinating philanthropic actions. In such cases, a constant effort is directed to rebuild and solidify ideologies of national survival. That this endeavour augurs well is in a great part enabled by the flexibility of this ideology, which has the potential to incorporate experience of difference produced by interactions. As such, notions of needs, sufferings as well as worthiness based on national categories motivating helping intentions may be rebuilt and reinforced.

The multi-layered ideological repertoire also enables the reconstruction of coherence between experience and ideologies through the possibility of shifting emphases and frames. This means that philanthropic interactions are both terrains of reproducing ideologies of national survival as well as of emphasising social-economic needs, and thus deepening commitment towards the poor.

In such moments of ideologies becoming problematised by the participants, notions, symbols, ideas are reproduced not in banal, self-explanatory ways, in non-reflected activities and practices, but through „interpretative crises” that require cognitive as well as emotional work on the part of actors involved.

In this part of the dissertation we also show the importance of concepts of worthiness. In case of less flexible ideological repertoires, with less layers of framing, otherness and difference generated in interactions may undermine helping intentions, besides the perceptions of needs and sufferings.

III.2. Recognition: potentials and limitations

Denial of recognition - of solidarity - is a central stake in donor-recipient relationships. Two major forms are described. Discourses of the civilisational slope assume and establish hierarchies among the participants that regard recipients as less developed, and as such less valuable, less respected than donors, in line with Melegh 2006. Othering and denigration is visible and perceptible by the former, resulting in paralysing experience of shame and frustration in these situations.

A different form of denial of solidarity is unveiled in cases, when, though ideologies posit recipients on higher grids of hierarchies, in more respected and valued positions, however recipients do not understand these as recognition because they do not recognise themselves in these positions, do not identify with these. As knowledge in such philanthropic interactions is unilaterally determined by the donors, such cases are similarly causing epistemic violence as explicit denigration described above do.

Othering and denigrating effects of the working of the modernization discourse may be shaded and covered in those encounters, where the recipients of philanthropic actions understand and identify with ideologies of national sameness and authenticity. These national ideologies offer a means for the addressees of help to find themselves in admired and “deserving” positions, that is, as receiving recognition.

Such meanings, however, are hindered in encounters with members of communities in late phases of language change, where the discourse of national survival is less prevalent. Epistemic violence caused by unilateral meaning production on the level of national discourses, as well as denigration on the level of civilizational discourses add up and mutually strengthen each other.

These various forms and threats of denying recognition are accepted by recipients, in exchange for the material resources offered through donations and volunteering. At the same time, they struggle for recognition. One possible answer is to accept discourses mobilized by donors and struggle to acquire deserving, respectable, worthy positions according to these discourses. Such long-term procedures of subjectivation are less the focus of the dissertation. However strategies of resistance are also born in these situations. One of these is the reinterpretation of philanthropic actions in quasi-market-terms of tourism, catering and hospitality, in such a way that encounters become understood as equal relations, and become a source of pride and recognition. Another strategy of resistance is built upon explicit denial of ideologies of national survival.

III.3. Care and intimacy in philanthropic programs

In philanthropic relations donors and recipients may build relationships that share similar features to Honneth’s private recognition, Gilligan’s care and Boltanski’s

agape. In order to deepen the commitment of its supporters, philanthropic programs make institutional efforts to contribute to building these intimate relations. In the last part of the dissertation we show that the implications of such relationships reach beyond these goals. Personal relationships, intimacy and commitment – through dialectic processes of denial and reconstruction of solidarity - create an alternative space of power, where knowledge may break with discourses and donor-recipient hierarchies of domination.

Programs found these intimacies by relying upon those layers of national discourses that mobilise categories related to kinship and familiarity. Moreover, familial relations are also evoked by creating roles and positions within the program resonating to family relationships. Additional tools of organising personal contacts, correspondence, giving mutual accomodation to recipients and donors all contribute to this goal.

Intimacy, love and care may be hindered by Otherness implying denial of solidarity built upon discourses of civilisation and the ideology of national survival (when threatening identities of recipients.) As opposed to the lack of reflection on these effects on institutional level, individual reactions (gestures, emotions, interpretations) on the level of actors do become created. Within the social interaction, recipients as well as donors attempt to deconstruct such discourses. The latter creating 'ethical codexes' for their visits in supported communities, as well as supporting the reinterpretation of philanthropy in the cadre of tourism and hospitality are all part of resistance strategies. Recipients as well as donors also may attempt decentering national discourses in order to open up intimate spaces. Care and intimacy is also created through bodily gestures of hugging and cuddling, especially among girls and women taking part in philanthropic encounters.

Through empathy mobilised in such intimate relationships knowledge coordinating common action may be altered, along with common actions themselves. National discourses may shade away, while perspectives, identifications, desires of the recipients come into the fore. These cover everyday struggles of getting by, education, employment, or everyday consumption.

Gifts and donations, practices of support reflect these changes in donor perspectives. Also ideas of worthiness of recipients may be altered. As personal relations develop, the importance of collective categories are fading; on the other hand worthiness becomes defined according to categories orienting the lifeworld of supported communities.

All of these may imply that donor-recipient relationships become „meaning capsules” isolated from the ideological space of the program, leaving the latter unaltered. On the other hand it may follow, that in order to reach certain coherence of ideas, donors attempt to reassemble different knowledges and experiences. As such creates new narratives about the participants of the philanthropic programs, among them on supported communities, and the goals and practices of the program itself. The program’s institutional ideologies may become problematic for the individual donor, not only the possibility of „success”, but also the relevance and legitimacy of tools and goals of action. Philanthropic interactions then, as epistemologic channels, enable these programs to become cradles for new meanings and interpretations on philanthropy as well as on nationhood and national belonging.

IV. References

- Bayertz, K.: “Four Uses of Solidarity”, in Bayertz, Kurt (ed.): *Solidarity*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1999, p. 3-28.
- Bárdi N., Misovicz T.: A kisebbségi magyar közösségek támogatásának politikája, in: Bitskey B.: *Határon túli magyarság a 21. Században*, Köztársasági Elnöki Hivatal, 2010
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Boltanski, L.: *L’amour et la justice comme compétences*, Paris, Métailié, 1990
- Bourdieu, P.: *A gyakorlati észjárás, A társadalmi cselekvés elméletéről*, Napvilág Kiadó, 2002
- Brubaker, R., Feischmidt M. Fox, J. and Grancea, L. *Nationalist Politics and Everyday Ethnicity in a Transylvanian Town*. 2006. Princeton University Press.
- Carter, S.: “Mobilising generosity, framing geopolitics: Narrating crisis in the homeland through diasporic media”. *Geoforum*, 2007, 38(6): p. 1103—12.
- Eriksen, T. H.: *Etnicitás és nacionalizmus*, Gondolat Kiadó, PTE Kommunikáció- és Médiatudományi Tanszék, Budapest-Pécs, 2008
- Eriksen, T. H.: The cultural contexts of ethnic differences, *Man*, 26/1, 1991, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2803478>
- Feischmidt M. “Az antropológiai terepmunka módszerei”, in: Feischmidt M. (szerk.): *Kvalitatív módszerek az empirikus társadalom- és kultúrakutatásban*. http://mmi.elte.hu/szabadbolcseszet/index.php?option=com_tanelem&id_tanelem=834&tip=0

- Feischmidt M.: „A magyar nacionalizmus autenticitás-diskurzusainak szimbolikus térfoglalása Erdélyben”, in: Feischmidt Margit: *Erdély-(de)konstrukciók. Tanulmányok*. Néprajzi Múzeum - PTE Kommunikáció- és Médiatudományi Tanszék, Budapest - Pécs, 2005
- Flores, R. (2013) “When Charity Does Not Begin at Home: Exploring the British Socioemotional Economy of Compassion”, *Sociological Research Online*, 18(1). <<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/18/1/17.html>>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5153/sro.2874>
- Fox, J.- Miller-Idriss, C.: „Everyday Nationhood”, *Ethnicities* 8.4 2008. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1468796808088925>
- Fraser, N., Honneth, A.: *Redistribution or recognition? A philosophical exchange*, London: Verso, 2003.
- Geertz, C. (1994): Az ideológia mint kulturális rendszer In Clifford Geertz: *Az értelmezés hatalma: Antropológiai írások*. 22-62. Budapest: Századvég Kiadó.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heron, B.: *Desire for Development – Whiteness, Gender and the Helping Imperative*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2007
- Honneth, A.: “Integrity and Disrespect, Principles of a Conception of Morality Based on the Theory of Recognition”, *Political Theory*, VI. 20 No. 2, 1992, 187-201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0090591792020002001>
- Honneth, A.: *The struggle for recognition: the moral grammar of social conflicts*, Cambridge, Mass: Polity Press, 1995.
- Hustinx, L. and Lammertyn, F. (2003) ‘Collective and Reflexive Styles of Volunteering: A Sociological Modernization Perspective’, *Voluntas* 14(2): 167–87.
- Kapoor, I., "Participatory Development, Complicity and Desire, " *Third World Quarterly* 26.8 (2005): 1203-1220, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01436590500336849>
- Kvale, S.: *Az interjú – Bevezetés a kvalitatív kutatás interjútechnikáiba*, Budapest: Jósöveg, 2005.
- Lainer-Vos, D.: *Sinews of the Nation: Constructing Irish and Zionist Bonds in the United States*. 2013, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Melegh A. (2006): *On the East/West Slope. Globalization, Nationalism, Racism and Discourses on Central and Eastern Europe*. CEU Press, New York, Budapest.
- Peti L.: „Identitásmodelláló tényezők a moldvai csángó falvakban”. *Tabula* 8 (2). Budapest. 2005
- Salamon, L: *The State of Nonprofit America*, Brookings, Washington, 2012
- Silk, J. (1998) “Caring at a distance”, *Philosophy & Geography*, 1:2, p. 165-182, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13668799808573643>
- Spivak, G. C.: "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in: Ed. C. Nelson and L. Grossberg. *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1988. 271-313.
- Wuthnow, R.: *Acts of Compassion: Caring for Others and Helping Ourselves*, Princeton University Press, 1991.

V. List of Relevant Publications

- Zakariás I.: „The Production of Solidarity: A Case Study of Voluntary School Programs of Ethnic Kin Support” In: Kleres Jochen; Yvonne Albrecht (eds.)

Die Ambivalenz der Gefühle: Über die verbindende und widersprüchliche Sozialität von Emotionen. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2015. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-01654-8_8

Zakariás I.: A jótékonyság nemzetiesítése iskolai programokban. (The Nationalisation of Philanthropy in Voluntary School Programs) In Feischmidt Margit –Glózer Rita –Ilyés Zoltán –Kasznár Kata –Zakariás Ildikó: Mindennapi nacionalizmus. Nemzetdiskurzusok és a nacionalizmus populáris kultúrája Magyarországon. L'Harmattan, Budapest, 2014.

Zakariás I.: Kultúramentés és szociális segítség – Esettanulmány egy határon túli magyarokat segítő iskolai mozgalomról, (Saving the culture and social help – A case study on a school program supporting ethnic Hungarians across the borders) *Café Babel*, 2013, 70.

Zakariás I.: Jótékonyság nemzeti keretben - csángómentés Moldvában, (Charity in national frames – Saving the Csángós of Moldova) *AnBlok*k, 2011. (5.)