

Hungarian flow 1956-1992¹

Memorial paper - After 50 years of Hungarian exodus

This article was written for the purpose of remembering the first Eastern European outflow that occurred in 1956 in Hungary and was the first unexpected and heroic event of the bipolar world formed after World War II.

At that time, migration was tightly associated with the idea of freedom, more than any legal context. The level of deliberateness of migrants was on an early stage, although they were looking for a better life, as well.

Another purpose of this article is to provide unique information and data about the named period between 1956-1992 and the building and dismantling of a „safe country”.

Hungary offers a good exemplar for how the topological position means the state of arts. A fully isolation is able to cause unexpected exodus, so it is advisable to leave open some narrow channels. After the sudden outflow, “testing the forbidden fruit”, every fifth emigrants returned. The miss-managed migration is able to cause higher illegal flow. The permanent temporary mobility is able to calm down to final intention for reside in abroad. If migration policy is not going into a stop and go fashion, people can get a better-founded decision. Each country strategy should be considered in a global context, to understand better the mutual interest, and to avoid the sudden streams.

The structure of paper follows the principles/regularities of migration² on case of Hungary and tries to point out them or try to shows the irregularities. The paper critically evaluates policy issues in a novel way.

The period of the Hungarian migration between 1956 and 1992 can be divided into several short periods. I would like to mention here the reason why I have chosen 1992 as the end of this period. In my opinion, this year was a turning-point in the history of Hungarian national migration policy, because by 1993, events changed their directions with the nationalist not gaining power again/further.³ From 1993, our national migration strategy should had fit into and should have harmonized like the European common practice.

Several historical events connected to Hungarians such as the East German exodus (Summer 1988), Pan-European Picnic (August 1989), Revolution in Romania (December 1989), Hungarians receive international passports (1 January 1990), Russian troops return to their home, or the break-up of the Soviet Union (end of 1991) and after the collapsed of Yugoslavia (June 1992). New states were acknowledged and a flow of nearly one million refugees began. Hungary became a part of all these events, thanks to its active participation and geographical situation. These occurrences affected in many instances the juridical and intendment questions of migration⁴, including the importance to take a/the global view of unmapped eastern migration. The evaluations of the periods of the Hungarian migration are coming up.

Background and consequences of 1956

There are regularities all over the world, reshaping of borders and power shift, it creates intensive mobility and the postponed demographic events, such as marriage, birth had a scenic boom. *After World War II, Hungary ended up with German interest and consequences of winners and losers of war became a part of Russian sphere of influence. Characteristic to period 1945-48 was the high mobility due to population exchanges and territorial realignment. The estimations are running from 3-4 hundred thousands in and outflow. People also left the country due to political change and the rearrangement in the property situation (collective farm ownership was on the decrease).*⁵ *The birth boom was next to the war, but later it was disturbed by the no abortion action 1953-1955.*

¹ Dr. habil. Mary Rédei SOPEMI Hungarian correspondent 1990-1995. maryredei@ludens.elte.hu

² The regularities made by different form.

³ In June 1992 the first train carrying Yugoslavian refugees to Austria was allowed to enter the country but the next ones were turned back. The Austrian authorities closed the border, this way the first Hungarian refugee camps were created in the western part of the country. This was a definite event regarding free movement.

⁴ For example migrants had to cross shifting state borders in the case of Croatia and Slovenia the borders solidified. The refugees did not arrive in a neighbouring country. More details „Mass migration conference” Vienna March 1993

⁵ As Jonas Widgren drafted in 1990: „their escape was like getting from hell to heaven...”

To strengthen a new domination, the terrorization was an essential instrument, it led to a type of forced internal migration. The 1950s were characterized by forced internal migration, labor camps („malenkij robot”), instability, difficult and low quality of life and existing without any perspectives. Generally, life was dominated by uncertainty and was dictated by central plans. The forced Russian culture was strange for Hungarians. It was obligatory to learn Russian language, especially through their political history.⁶ Considering the Soviet Union’s Cold War expansion purposes, Hungary’s geopolitical situation, the feature that this country has border with west and east, made a major importance. Centralization was able to produce economic results only in the short term. Furthermore, economic set backs were caused by years of extreme weather that caused droughts. At this time, Hungary was mainly an agricultural country.

A region could not be excluded from the global process for a long-term. Population lived totally isolated from international impacts and tourism. At that time, broadcasting was in an early stage and the region had no info-communication network system. According to the official statistics of KSH (Hungarian Central Statistical Office,⁷ in the first half of the 1950s, the number of immigrants crossing the Hungarian border was less than 100. Increasing personal tension, limited prospects, decaying quality of life and total lack of any kind of human freedom led to outbreaks a revolution at the initiative of a group of university students.⁸ The revolution in itself was as unexpected for the world⁹ as the opening of borders in 1989. Nevertheless, the main difference comparing 1956 and 1989, were following:

- 1956 was a bottom up process, discrete action in time and in regions, in bloody way by huge demolishment, no state institutional support even more the political power ask Russians to help them in stabilizations, and its was followed by retorsion,

- 1989 based on a central bargain between the civil society and the failing governmental forces. This transition spread to the other eastern European countries, towards the so-called PIT countries, (Partner in Transition), events went on a peaceful way, and was followed by economical, social, and institutional transition.

The opening of the borders in 1989, happened in connection with the Pan-European Picnic and was based on a political decision by Big Brothers. Despite the fact that the situation was continuously maturing at 1989 and was not so unexpected, however it created fear.¹⁰

There is no any “technological” defence wall, which is able to stop mass outflow. Like Iron curtain, Berlin wall, Ceuta and Melila corridor. These are playing a temporary roll to prevent more the inflow in one country, than the outflow from the sending region.

After 1990, the former technical barrier, the „Iron Curtain”, was cut into pieces and was dedicated as souvenirs, however this prompted the West to defend itself from a mass of eastern flow. The chair of Hungarian Migration Committee said in 1991: “We are manufacturing souvenirs from the curtain, but meantime we will shift this curtain function 500 km towards the eastern border. Not the border, but even more the life perspectives, regional disparities are building, separating our new life.” However, Hungarians have wide travel opportunities from 1990 and due to the huge refugees flow, the instable Eastern European situation began to formulate a new Western European control policy. We have got the prompt answer, when in summer 1992, when the second train carrying refugees from Croatia, was redirected by Austrian authority, and Hungary began to build the first refugees camp. There was low level of burden sharing to provide shelters refugees in Hungary in a crucial transition period.

On the Hungarian side, there were no strong border controls, so it became urgent to develop an early warning system form, such as it is on the western side. Another reason for prevention is that the members of the European migration politics returned to the principles based on the Club of Rome (accepted earlier, but kept in a drawer for a time) and elaborated the basis of the Schengen Agreement and the Maastricht Treaty. The risk directed by the national migration practice, especially in the control field of drug, human smuggling and weapons.¹¹ By this time the Eastern countries did not stop their citizens from traveling to West. The Schengen Agreement was rapidly implemented and was put into operation by special interest in

⁶ One of nowadays concequencies most of us able to tell stories about the revolution, but we are not able to ask a glass of water.

⁷ [Trends of tourism.](#)

⁸ For several decade this event was officially declared counter-revolution. In 1989 terms and contents were revalued. Since this date we say revolution that is closer to reality.

⁹ Events related to the Suez Canal also obscured it from world attention..

¹⁰ 20-25 million Russians would crowd Europe, says the spring issue of Economist in 1991.

¹¹ In 1993 Budapest Migration Charta.

Austria, because on the eastern side, there was no limitation of outflow, so the western countries were forced to do such of prevention against inflows.

1956 exodus

Due to the outbreak of the revolution on 23 October 1956, approximately 200 000 person left the previously totally closed country within a few months. The restraining, so called „puffer effect”, also influenced this mass of people; however only 2% of the population was affected constituting what was considered to be a normal flow. There were no legal treaties covering Hungarian emigrants, therefore this should be hardly considered by the decision to migrate; most people were hoping that „the West would receive them with open arms”. After a few months, 10 -20 000 person decided to return is a good solution, due to difficulties in host countries. Our emigrants were considered as refugees, this was also the first trial of the 1951 Geneva Refugee Convention. Political asylum standards were based on a continental political consensus. At the initiative of the USA, President Eisenhower pressured countries, through the „Parole Act”, to set new immigration quotas, to increase these numbers, particular by major immigration countries.

The Hungarian outflow in 1956 showed a typical migration profile in: its structure, like age specifically, sex ratio, geographical distance and topological penetration of every day experience, awareness of migration decision, traditional immigration countries host, and return migration:

- The migrant population age specification, was very young, 25% of the total emigrants were under 20 years. In the local demographic processes, one of the consequences of outflow in 1956 a couple of years later, when the “would be parents” were missing from the local demographic processes. Hungary in 1963 was on a deep level among European comparison in fertility, TFR 1,5. For emigrants, the young age was advantageous to achieve better integration... (for better integrating) in the host countries. They were adaptable and industrious, hereby forming a positive picture about Hungarians in several countries, which was later further affected by other waves of Hungarian emigrants.¹²

- The majority of migrants were male.

- Those that had left Hungary lived close to Austria. Migration was more magnetic and easier to them, because of local knowledge about how to cross border and also the attraction of the West. Another highly represented group was the population of Budapest, who had more information and was promptly affected by the revolution.

- Migration decision is better founded in the migration pattern, than in refugee case. There were two great waves of immigration, one, directly after the outbreak of the revolution, we may suppose they were not satisfied with the domestic situation, and without any hesitation, these people left the country in first obvious occasion. The other great wave immigrants were those who followed the entry of the Russian troops, in early November 1956. We can suppose they have lost their hope that the perspectives or will ever change.

It is verifiable that these movements affect the next-door country (humanitarian and mass basis) and the traditional recruiting countries (best and bright basis). *The receiving countries can be divided into two dominant groups; the ‘big historical immigrant countries’ (USA, Canada, and Australia¹³), and the ‘next to countries’ like Austria and Germany¹⁴. The directions of the flow were similar to previous historical movement, so the Scandinavian countries received quite amount of people.¹⁵*

The Hungarian '56 was unexpected and ahead of Czech (1968) and Polish (1981) revolutions.

1957 spring – 1968 economic reform

This period was know as the starting of the re-assessment of the Hungarian population, also was known about growing the level of living standards, at this time the central government gave some democratic

¹² H. Adelman (1991) Humanitarian and self interest, Canadian refugee and Hungarian refugees, Budapest Conference paper.

¹³ The average age of Hungarians living in Australia is 65 years.

¹⁴ Here not only the fact of neighbourhood is important but also the German knowledge by Hungarians.

¹⁵ In the middle of 50s participants in European migration were mainly originated in the continent what made acculturation easier. They were young, educated and arrived at a historic moment when economic boom offered wide opportunities for them.

freedom to the people and due to that migration intention was low. *Period of 1957 to 1968, was the cold war era, it was symbolized by building the Berlin Wall in 1961. In Hungary in 1968 had an open of economical reform, meaning more opportunities for market economy, and also at this time Hungary began to be independent from the central planning.*

The political statements of the West permanently mentioned realization of human rights and said that without improvement, there will be no negotiations over other issues. In detailed meaning, it was an umbrella, which is protected them, western countries, from a potential Eastern inflow, meanwhile they were sure it needs more time to realize the democratic circumstances. Unlike us, Western Europe already had massive permanent Asian, African inflow. There is no doubt about it, their integration carries more disturbing effects concerning by their culture, differing from European. By the rising geographical distance of potential migrants, these differences call for attention for this fact. As we can observe today on the labor market, the eastern Europeans were favorable then a same skilled African/Asian.

In 1989, when suddenly the border became permeable, and free movement became reality, Western European authorities were shocked¹⁶ and replied for the shifted situation by hysteric mode, and after it the question of human rights was not on the table. This period and the one followed by it was highly contributed to show for us the western life style, comparing to the other eastern countries. We enjoyed growing travel freedom, which contributed to more experience, and the improving domestic situation no add more to wish to stay abroad.

If one has temporary mobility, one does not want to reside in case of good accessibility. Nowadays we can recognize low level of intensity in Hungarian mobility. (Daily Mail, 07. 25. 2006. J. Salt) “In 1991 –as the Cold War was ending- he warned European ministers that their immigration policies were too weak to cope with the coming tide of immigrants from Russia, the eastern Mediterranean and Africa.”

In these days, several moments show in production, West needs Eastern market, human resource and their local consumption. So the global economical interest rewrites the symbol of freedom, especially in the case of labor force which has still barriers.¹⁷

Going back to the past, the entry of the Russian troops in 1956, the political punishments after the revolution,¹⁸ and the increasing of physical isolation, caused more hardships as defection and illegal migration from the country had higher number. Those people who left the Hungary were denationalized, houses were confiscated, returning family members were kept under observation, because of possible contact and any hope of final return seemed impossible.

The majority of emigrants had a good life carrier abroad, due to their young age, emerging economical demand. Although dogged by homesickness. As a Dutch proverb says: „a tree planted somewhere else than home, never blossoms as beautiful as it could be at home”. As the political situation changed in 70thies and the borders became traversable, the number of former emigrants started to visit homeland, and in the next decades pensioners repatriation (20 thousands) increased.

1. Chart International population changes in Hungary 1963-1992

Year	Arrivals				out migrants			balance
	Refugees	immigrants	returnees	total	Legal	Illegal	total	
1963	-	1 130	-	1 130	2 344	687	3 031	-1 901
1964	-	1 256	-	1 256	2 633	2 392	5 025	-3 769
1965	-	792	-	792	1 848	3 393	5 241	-4 449
1966	-	674	-	674	1 865	2 188	4 053	-3 379
1967	-	617	-	617	2 116	1 817	3 933	-3 316
1968	-	644	-	644	1 928	2 236	4 164	-3 520
1969	-	583	-	583	1 954	3 068	5 022	-4 439
1970	-	767	-	767	2 369	3 718	6 087	-5 320
1971	-	839	-	839	2 020	3 517	5 537	-4 698

¹⁶ Russian are coming, it is expected mass migration, cheap labor. Economist 1991 Spring . It was not a bad slogan in Eastern European mind, to frightene them, they really know what does it mean, when the Russian are coming. It was end of 1992, when the SOPEMI meeting had a statement, „the expected flow, did not realised.”

¹⁷ If the people would be money situation.

¹⁸ Affecting not only the ones participating in the revolution but also those returning home.

1972	-	979	-	979	2 240	3 364	5 604	-4 625
1973	-	1 588	605	2 193	2 335	2 891	5 226	-3 033
1974	-	1 508	589	2 097	2 312	2 176	4 488	-2 391
1975	-	1 572	827	2 399	2 456	1 541	3 997	-1 598
1976	-	1 687	800	2 487	2 259	1 660	3 919	-1 432
1977	-	2 001	629	2 630	2 229	1 858	4 087	-1 457
1978	-	1 994	735	2 729	1 987	1 805	3 792	-1 063
1979	-	1 958	773	2 731	1 788	2 614	4 402	-1 671
1980	-	1 912	680	2 592	1 898	4 657	6 555	-3 963
1981	-	1 487	746	2 233	1 839	4 108	5 947	-3 714
1982	-	1 326	865	2 191	1 637	2 616	4 253	-2 062
1983	-	1 880	987	2 867	1 490	2 239	3 729	- 862
1984	-	318	1 029	1 347	1 349	2 136	3 485	-2 138
1985	-	112	945	1 057	1 301	2 584	3 885	-2 828
1986	-	147	907	1 054	1 281	3 295	4 576	-3 522
1987	-	1 239	916	2 155	1 466	4 923	6 389	-4 234
1988	12 173	5 774	1 358	19 305	6 689	3 506	10 195	9 110
1989	17 448	10 180	901	28 529	11 835	-	11 835	16 694
1990	18 283	17 129	2 041	37 453	11 271	-	11 271	26 182
1991	54 693	20 500	2 235	77 428	5 376	-	5 376	72 052
1992	64 202	14 013	1 993	80 208	4 594	-	4 594	75 614
total	166 799	96 606	20 561	283 966	55 633	70 989	126 622	157 344

Source: Data was collected by author from Hungarian Ministry of Interior

1969-1974

The migration data collection should be reliable, available, and comparable which makes it visible the individual and state efforts. In this period the situation in Hungary can be described by better life, although the illegal outflow was bigger than the legal one. As chart 1. shows, the negative migration balance after 1956 was replaced by a positive balance until the middle of 1970s. The first wave of immigration was from Romania; the ethnic Hungarians started to move from Transylvania towards Hungary. Nowadays we see they are going to work the countries having a higher income level. (But currently from Hungary their number is estimated around 200 thousand and 2,2, million Romanians are working in western countries.)

The statistical dates of Hungary, does not accurately reflect their changes in the economic or political situation. International migration was a part of national security services, but it was not part of the public debate was more a taboo topic. The official statistics do not reflect the reality of mobility, as officially the yearly limit was around 2000 persons. The legal out- and inflow of families were largely down to certain countries making it possible for women or men to get married there. For example, it was favored that a women moves to Germany, and men move to Hungary following the marriage, also Russian women wanted to settle down in Hungary because of higher living standards. For many centuries, the influx statistics showed a high number of women population over 30 that may also indicate fictitious marriages. (Rédei 1993.) In 80thies Hungary's statistics show a high number of divorces that bring into connection by the make-believe marriages.

At the end of 70thies – when the Hungarian economic reforms began – it happened parallel with global oil crisis. During this time, a certain opening and permeability started, „Gulyás communism”, meaning that high life standard do not induce a desire to emigrate. Hungarians missed out the opportunity to join in the labor-power vacuum that was generated by the oil-crisis. Late Italian, Yugoslavian and Spanish workers who did migrate returned home, because of the economic recession and opened up their own businesses, this opportunity offered wide possibilities during another economic boom, when workers from Turkey and other Middle Eastern countries participated. Circulation of Hungarians contributed to develop a good mentality in local economy.

1975-1984

If a country is not part of the international circulation, then the inhabitants do not feel attracted, and are not able to raise their expectation. *“When productivity is fostered by both the individual's human capital and by the average level of human capital in the economy, individuals under-invest in human capital. A strictly positive probability of migration to a richer country, by raising both the level of human capital formed by optimizing individuals in the home country and the average level of human capital of non-migrants in the country, can enhance welfare and nudge the economy toward the social optimum. Under a well-controlled restrictive migration policy the welfare of all workers is higher than in the absence of this policy.”*¹⁹ *The economic difficulties affected by the oil-crisis, caused a crisis situation in second half of 1970s, which was compensated not a more effective economical policy, but Hungary took a long-term international financial credit. These circumstances do not have an impact on emigration volume, but strengthen the fall behind process in the human resources. During the increased number of travel opportunities*²⁰, *during our travel we should understand, we could not afford it. And it is invisible oriented our society value.*

In second half of 70s, the central government of Hungary started a dialogue on migration.²¹ That time wider opportunities became a reality; getting more information (TV, two-way tourism) that was a two sided tools;

- one side it showed: your life could be better if you move. This encourages them for mobility, pull effects,
- but on the other side, it took comparison by the domestic conditions, made the impacts of push effects secure.

A lively East-East movement was typical; the „shuttle migration” was marked by petty trader activity. The population could feel a provisional material improvement and had a chance to compare neighboring countries. The phrase „Hungary, the most cheerful barrack” originates from this period, when there were no consumer goods shortages.

The reforms in 1968, and the experiences of petty traders, meant a contribution to the market economy, formed in 1990s. During this period, there were tight restrictions on the amount of currency allowed for traveling, this amount was gradually increased, but everybody supplemented it, mainly unofficially. This movement restriction became liberal, but some of us after they could understand the mobility depending not only on the legal framework, but even more on the personal ability and skills. The number of immigrants did not rise, because most people moved in a short distance within the continent, having the possibility to return within certain time limits or without time limits.²² In Hungary, there is an act valid since 1992, stating, if one is staying for more than three months abroad, they must report it to the authorities. It was not controlled, or if it is recorded, it was not punished. Social benefits and allowances did however bring a significant difference regarding this issue. In this period, the rearrangement of the nationality movements according to diasporas or to economic advancement was typical. In Hungary, the number of qualified labor increased, making the country a beneficiary of the migration process. Growing immigration was realizable for those who had higher qualification. Skill gives the valid ticket for mobility.²³

¹⁹ Oded Stark World Development Vol. 32, 2004.

²⁰ in each third year for a month foreign stay. From the state budget we have got only 100 dollars,

²¹ *In this time the migration based on 2 actors, migrants and the host country. By managing international migration, more benefit for the receiving countries can be achieved, and a better integration process can be ensured. The bargain situation in migration was developed originally for two actors: the migrants and the destination country. As globalization develops, transnational companies need more highly qualified persons to their competitive production, and as soon as it is possible, which requires more flexibility in the migration system, as well. This situation changed the migration system to include three participants. To reach a better understanding and long-term staying in a place, they need to contact with the local authorities (a fourth participant) to get knowledge about the regional development goals. This results in subsidiarity in migration. The mutual benefit of migration is based on governmental security: to avoid the streaming out of human capital and to develop a better life for migrants and for multinationals to rise added value. One of the basic future questions is how to understand the international process in a national context and how the ambitions of all participants will get across. (M. Rédei Statistical Review 2005/7.)*

²²

²³ The Russians understood it weell,when they filled in early 90s the famous european colleges instead of to expected them like cheap labor flow.

1985-1992

This period was the second grand epoch in migration. It was a visible signal for transition. Hungary was encircled by countries with continuous crisis and conflicts, so that it joined to the international population movements and what is more, it became the recipient of emigrants and refugees.

In October 1989, Hungary adopted the Geneva Convention. Ten years later, Hungary signed the 'b' part – related to mass migration and refugees and removing geographic limitations on refugees. According that, Hungary would allow the reception of refugees from outside Europe. A new processes began in this period, such as:

- Mass migration and refugees processing and the government had no experience on this field,
- The former sending countries, became a receiving countries, with a new title „Ellis Island”²⁴
- 1956 refugees reaching/reached the pension age, and returned to Hungary
- The global migration flow transit Hungary.
- Worsening qualification composition since 90's: the highly qualified inhabitants already left the country in 80's, and after it arrives those who could get work at home.
- High unemployment in Hungary the surveys strengthening xenophobia (*Sík E.*)
- Ethnic Hungarians came from Romania, and they enjoyed the preferences
- The age composition is getting younger, most of them take migration as a luck hunting
- The migration decision of refugees was not as conscious as the one of those settling outside the country. 70% of settlers entered in the country with valid permission for residing. In mid of 90's, it decreased to 40%. Those who arrived they wanted to stay.
- Half of the arriving people chose Budapest and its surroundings as a first place of residence. A lot of emigrants settled down near the eastern border of Hungary staying close to their former homes. There were a great proportion of immigrants/refugees applying for Hungarian citizenship. (SOPEMI 1992) Probably 50.000 naturalization application was under consideration!
- The legal situation was murky, so as to the granting of Hungarian citizenship. Institutional and legislative criteria were not established, and with the result that existing migrant nationalities (i.e. Chinese) used the confusion of this gap to settle down in Hungary. That brought us in the middle of European politic interest as an eastern channel without any experience. The fact that Hungary preferred the admission of persons with Hungarian nationality on an ethnic basis further caused tension in the international immigration debate.²⁵

The movement volume is based on state and individual efforts. Opening the borders in August 1989 was a political decision that happened in cooperation with the government in Moscow. It was a heroic action to open the border for outflow, and by this action, to start to solve a problem and create more new ones. In 1990, Hungary had a „no visa” relationship with 70 countries; this included several South-American countries. Chinese's were the first to take advantage of the situation and in 1992 Hungary already had 100 000 Chinese living in Hungary.²⁶ In 1991 and 1992, the number of refugees and asylum seekers was more than 150 000 which meant a significant burden for the country with economic difficulties. International organizations and most European states gave humanitarian support with the unconcealed intention of keeping the refugees here. Remarkably a high proportion (70%) of the refugees arriving in the 1990s was accommodated by Hungarian families, thereby avoiding refugee camps.²⁷

In the early 1990s, the outflow was very low, showing that it was not legal barriers but the lack of ability that hindered Hungarians from moving to another country.²⁸

The so called 'eastern migration channel' flowing through Hungary formed a main route for migrants coming from other continents. 1990 China had free movement. After the Gulf crisis, the Arab world recalled their nationals to return home, some Asian countries implemented restrictive migration actions, so it was a good chance for migrants from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, and Pakistan to transit Hungary. Today, we are again facing to the same challenges, as during the previous decades, namely that economic migrant from the western labor market are the people arriving from Asia and Africa, and the Hungarian workers

²⁴ Published in Der Standard in March 1993.

²⁵ Mr József Antal, Hungary's minister president following the first free elections said several times that he would like to be the leader of 15 million Hungarians what brought up historic times and the emergence of border modifications.

²⁶ Published in Der Standard in March 1993.

²⁷ The openness and solidarity was referred to when in 1956 the world received the Hungarian emigrants.

²⁸ Rudolf H. wrote an article asking why don't they come?

should compete with them. Nowadays, one can see that capital, products and services are more liberalized than the labor force itself.

In the near future the world remembers 1956 as a sign of freedom, courage and international solidarity. A small nation was the impetus of great global changes, as it was in the 1990s, by breaking the bipolar world.

Bibliography

- J. Widgren (1990) International migration and regional stability, *International Affairs* 66.4.
- M. Rédei (1995) Hungary's migration trends; the past one hundred years and the problem of future projects. p. 17-25. (In: The genesis of a domestic regime the case of Hungary ed. H. Adelman, E. Sik, G. Tessényi. ISBN 1-55014-2372 York Lane Toronto.)
- M. Rédei (1993) Hungary, (In: ed. Solon A. Politics of East-West migration, Macmillen Press, London)
- KSH (1991) Eltűnt statisztikák nyomában, *Statisztikai Szemle*, 10.
- Boldizsár Nagy (1993) Hungarian dilemma, *Acta Juridica*, Budapest
- L.Thirring(1934) Hungarian movement, [In.:H. Wilcox:International migration vol. II.]
- M. Rédei (1994) (International migration in Hungary 1956-92.) Az 1956-92 közötti nemzetközi népegmozgások jellemzői Magyarországon – *Földrajzi Értesítő Vol. 43 1-2. sz., pp. 57-75.*
- M. Rédei (2005) The management of international migration, *Statistical Review* Vol.83. 7. p 662-680.