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Abstract
This article is to show the role of Hungary in international migration as a result of its geographical location. This former migrant sending country turned recently into a migrant receiving country. Since the turn of the millennium, more detailed, more reliable, internationally comparable and regionally detailed data are available for analysis. The authors aimed at identifying, besides the individual characteristics, the regularities of international migration that can be found here too. Hungary has been a destination country for nearly two decades and its migration strategy shifts towards a skills-based immigration policy. At micro-regional level domestic needs based integration objectives can be developed by using the input derived from databases of Hungarian Office of Immigration and Nationality on distribution of migrants. This article is to analyze those utilitarian elements, e.g. the age and employment distribution of foreigners, the propensity to pay taxes, the selection of where to settle down whose demographic-economic effects, are important in respect of how integration takes place in micro-regions and settlements.
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The role of geographical location

Hungary’s geographical location has a twofold role in international flows: on one hand, it is a host country, primarily a destination of international flows from neighbouring countries; on the other hand, it has a key intermediary role in European flows. It is a constantly evolving historical role. In 1990, the political border that divided east and west and later became an economic barrier was opened. The flow from east to west, as a result of unexpected crises in neighbouring countries, became an emphatic phenomenon that involved venture (Rédei 1994: 86-98). Despite a deep recession after regime changing in the former socialist countries, the emerging market economy and the international business relations contributed to the migration stabilization in the ’90s. The painful transition was compatible with the international business climate and institutions. As a result of the capital inflow a now two-directional flow from west to east appeared along with a decrease in the proportion of flows from the former socialist neighbouring countries. With the enlargement of the European Union a free flow was realized in which the liberalization of labour migration remained the last step. Nowadays
Hungary reached a turning point because Slovakia is not only a member state but also a member of the Euro zone, Serb citizens can enter into the European Union without a visa and Romania may soon access to the Schengen zone. In this way, the former socialist countries are in a new position.

Hungary, a former sending country, at the end of the ’80s, with the demolition of the Iron Curtain, made a great contribution to the realization of free migration. That is to say there was an increase in the number of non-neighbouring countries with visa free two directional flows. As a result of the ongoing crises in wider region of East-Central Europe Hungary became a relatively safe country, but besides the Southern European migration route, there was a temporary increase in the migration from east to west too. In all probability, the financial aid for refugees that the western governments provided was mainly to keep the problem in place. In this period, in addition to the refugees, an ongoing economic recession and the transition to market economy, burden sharing was a great challenge for Hungary.

In 1993, the first attempt to converge towards a mutual benefit of European migration took place in Budapest with the signature of a European Migration Charta1. At this time in Europe and especially in Hungary, which was surrounded by several conflicts, there was interest in migration control. In 1998, Hungary signed the point b) of Geneva Convention2, which is related to the acceptance of non-European refugees. After joining, the interest of migrants, to get recognised refugee status, had been duplicated. Hungary had relatively few experiences of enforcing immigration regulations, afterwards the country became part of a migration route from Asia, which brought positive and negative effects too. With the approach of EU enlargement and accession (2004.) the new legal situation became an issue. The Schengen rules came into force in Hungary in 2007. Currently, the country has four neighbours (Ukraine, Romania, Serbia, and Croatia) that are out of the free flow area. The Schengen rules emphasise the migration control and security dimension with reshaping the EU borders, in spite of flows of labour migrants and the settlement of old ethnic minorities in the neighbouring CEE regions. In this situation, the accession of Hungary to the Schengen Zone was a turning point. Since the end of the bipolar world migration has been not only a security issue, but a value based and utilitarian issue too. So the human capital of migrants, variety of languages and cultural diversity factors certainly represent benefits for the Hungarian society. The question is how can we reach an optimal gain through migration?

**Research hypothesis**

Our research hypothesis was that the incoming migrants who are concentrated in emerging areas are younger, more educated and economically more active than the average Hungarian. As a result of this they are not only a human, but also an economic asset for Hungary. Foreigners had different preferences in comparison with the resident Hungarian population when they choose a place to live, so they are concentrated geographically. This information could be a useful input to develop regional migration strategies. We are on the opinion that the national level plays a determining role in how the volume and security issues can be regulated, but the successful migration is a place based phenomenon, so a practice of subsidiarity is recommended for policy implementation (Rédei 1994: 86-98.). In light of the vertical (governmental level) and horizontal (local level) policy influence on migratory processes, tasks and goals of different actors need consensus.

Hungary was faced with this issue after the turn of the millennium. Nowadays, out of the seven neighbouring countries, four are member states (Romania, Slovakia, Austria, and Slovenia) and three are non-member states (Ukraine, Serbia and Croatia) in the European Union.

In Hungary, most migrants are from Romania (see Table 1.). The visa free regime of Serbia was enacted in December 2009, which is the beginning of a new period. There has been a considerable migration between Serbia and Hungary since the beginning of the Yugoslav civil wars. Serbs are the second most

---

1 European Migration Charta is an agreement among the sending and hosting countries concerning Europe (e.g. from Kazakhstan to Belgium) on migration issues. Discussion was held on governmental level and three main agreements were accomplished. All countries agreed on contrasting drugs-, weapons- and human cargo, while all other migration related issues were considered each individual country’s competence.

2 Hungary was late in joining the common platform. Hungary, together with Malta, was the last to sign point b. of the Geneva Refugee Convention, which governs how the non-European refugees should be received.
important immigrant group in Hungary. 10% of foreigners staying in Hungary on 1st January 2008 were Serbian citizens. This proportion has increased during the past three years. The proportion of foreigners from neighbouring countries in Hungary is great and increasing. On 1st January 2008, about 17,186 Serbian citizens stayed in Hungary; while additional 12,556 people have become Hungarian citizens since 1993 (97% of them have Hungarian as mother language). Therefore, according to the official statistics about 30,000 Serbian citizens have moved to and settled down in Hungary within the last 15 years. (Kincses and Takács 2010: 184-185). No doubt that one of the most highlighted issue of the continent is what migration patterns the Ukrainians have. Nearly the total area of Ukraine loses population, because of deep demographic crisis in the country since it became independent. The population showed a decrease of around 7.5%, i.e. 3.8 million people between the latest two censuses (1989-2001). Migration plays a significant role in the number of population changes. In 2003, Hungary, as a part of the accession process to the European Union (EU), imposed a visa regime on the citizens of Ukraine and since our accession to the Schengen area (2008) Hungary has been subject to the EU visa and immigration policy. All this in principle, is to protect the Hungarian citizens – who at the same time are EU citizens. It is important to ask whether, in a domestic context, we could actually speak about ‘an impending migration wave from the east’? (Karácsonyi and Kincses 2010: 1-2).

In Hungary there have been three sources of migration for a long time. The first and largest group (accounting for 62% of all Hungary based foreigners) with an ethnic Hungarian majority is made up of migrants from neighbouring countries. The second source is from the other countries of Europe. The first two groups accounts for 84% of migrants. The third group is from Asia (13%). Since there is not so much diversification in the regional distribution of migrants and most of foreigners speak Hungarian the integration is relatively easy in comparison with other countries. A total of 1.74% of the Hungarian residents are foreigners which is low in a Western European comparison. In spite of the fact that the majority of migrants have no language problems, a transitional period is needed especially in case of the labour market integration.

Hungary spent only a few years in the Schengen Zone. It could be early to draw conclusions, but we could reaffirm that there was a decrease in illegal migration. According to the border control reports the average annual illegal flows of 10 thousand people before joining Schengen in 2007 decreased to around 7 thousand with an 80% arrest rate after the Schengen accession. Nowadays, there is a significant illegal immigration from the direction of Turkey through Romanian and Bulgarian areas. The migration from the Ukraine is subject of an enhanced border control. Legal immigrants from the Schengen Zone, in their demographic and economic composition, are significantly different from the non-Schengen migrants. After 2001 the number of arrivals from Schengen area had duplicated and stabilised at around yearly 10 thousands. As regards the arrivals, an increasing number of immigrants are registered from Poland and Slovakia. Hungary has a female surplus from Schengen area, whereas there is a male surplus from non-Schengen area. The first pattern point out the process of family reunification, and the second one is instead related to the exploratory mode of movement, where males are the ones who explore the new local situation. Romania, Serbia and Ukraine are the country of origin of singles that look for a change in life. The juvenilia impact of immigration is relevant. The contribution to the working age group is rising: 77% of arrivals are, in fact, in this age group.

As mentioned earlier, currently national migration regulations in Hungary aim at selecting immigrants, establishing the domestic demand and setting migration quotas. Post-entry integration is about specific neighbourhoods. Best practices result from the pursuit of national objectives and the follow up of migrants even at regional level.

Migrants that have a common cultural background are tending to congregate. We carried out micro-regional analyses and time series data analyses by specific groups, e.g. groups by citizenship. Over the last 12 years, the spatial weight points of the specific foreign groups shifted towards the capital Budapest (Rédei and Kincses Á, 2008: 13). One of the important motivations of our research was the assumption that there will be an increase in the importance of the local management in the area of international migration and this process will contribute to a successful integration. The main local activities towards a successful integration focus on facilitating housing opportunities and voluntary family help for migrants, to invite them into local social life, to help their labour market
participation and to avoid any forced separation from autochthon residents. In the case of non-Hungarian migrants, this kind of best practices resulted into ethnic networking and not integration. Therefore, the impact of migration cannot fit for all. Migration as a rule brings to the surface several hitherto non-visible factors which explain why it appears in the focus of public interest. By global migration more conflicting interests emerge, more experiences meet, so to advocate for one’s goal is becoming difficult. Who governs migration? This is a frequently raised question, and clear answers could rarely be found. No doubt a multifarious consensus should be sought.

In our view, successful integration means security for the State and the use of essential quality labour, as well as effective work for the migrating person matching with his/her skills. Therefore, one of the paramount questions of the future is: how does the global business viewpoint of production relate to the labour’s decisions on individual mobility? And how do all these fit into a national strategy? We agreed on an impossible pattern: the monitoring of illegal migration has more impact upon the national strategy than the other domestic goals. State should set the direction against illegal migration and not vice versa. Due to geopolitical situation this region is highly affected by the shadow of mobility: i.e. the impact of illegal migration has an even more critical factor for shaping the strategy than the legal migration has.

**Major findings**

Since the turn of the millennium there has been a more than twofold increase in the number of incoming migrants, residents and refugees. Especially there has been a strong increase in the migration from the neighbouring countries (see Table 1).

**Table 1.** Foreign citizens staying in Hungary by citizenship (1 January)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>2107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>2571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7493</td>
<td>7676</td>
<td>7100</td>
<td>7393</td>
<td>6908</td>
<td>10504</td>
<td>15037</td>
<td>14436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU–15</td>
<td>11723</td>
<td>12181</td>
<td>11629</td>
<td>12143</td>
<td>9714</td>
<td>18357</td>
<td>25394</td>
<td>25490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2279</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2196</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>2681</td>
<td>2645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td>2759</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>2787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>2472</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>3597</td>
<td>4276</td>
<td>4944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>12664</td>
<td>11975</td>
<td>11693</td>
<td>12367</td>
<td>13643</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>12638</td>
<td>17186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>8947</td>
<td>9835</td>
<td>9853</td>
<td>13096</td>
<td>13933</td>
<td>15337</td>
<td>15866</td>
<td>17289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>41561</td>
<td>44977</td>
<td>47281</td>
<td>55676</td>
<td>67529</td>
<td>66183</td>
<td>66951</td>
<td>65836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>20584</td>
<td>21088</td>
<td>21552</td>
<td>22915</td>
<td>24493</td>
<td>24307</td>
<td>25314</td>
<td>26272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring</td>
<td>66359</td>
<td>70716</td>
<td>71913</td>
<td>85293</td>
<td>97711</td>
<td>99579</td>
<td>102769</td>
<td>108811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>93197</td>
<td>97640</td>
<td>98230</td>
<td>110915</td>
<td>122261</td>
<td>130535</td>
<td>140827</td>
<td>146145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>12603</td>
<td>14401</td>
<td>13480</td>
<td>14715</td>
<td>15121</td>
<td>18543</td>
<td>19733</td>
<td>22356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>2434</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>2667</td>
<td>2989</td>
<td>3075</td>
<td>3557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or unknown</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>110028</td>
<td>116429</td>
<td>115888</td>
<td>130109</td>
<td>142153</td>
<td>154430</td>
<td>166030</td>
<td>174697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Findings from the period following the turn of the millennium are as follows:
- From 1993 to 2009 around 120 000 people were granted Hungarian citizenship, 90% of them were from neighbouring countries.
Migration mitigates the adverse effects of the aging of population. The average age of migrants is 36 years. Despite of the ageing of migrants, they are 6 years younger on average than the resident population.

- Foreigners account for 2% of live births in Hungary.
- Migrants that arrived from any continent on average have higher educational attainment that of the resident population. Migrants show a correlation between the length of migration and educational attainment. Migrants from Europe show the least difference, while migrants from America and Asia the highest one (see figure 1).
- The migration of families presumably is not typical. It is too early to talk about family reunification in the Hungarian case. Working age people account for 70% of migrants’ (see figures 2 and 3).

**Figure 1.** Graduation level by region of origin (1 January 2008; aged 18-X)
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**Figure 2.** Foreigners by age and sending country (1 January 2008)
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Source: Illés, S. Kincses, Á. 2008
In Hungary, retired migrants are concentrated in less expensive areas with spa services and a mild climate (Illés, S. Kincses, Á. 2008: 90-97). Most of them come from the EU15 countries especially from Germany and Austria. 4,748 immigrants of sixty years or older from Germany, 949 from Austria and 312 from Switzerland stayed in Hungary at the beginning of 2008. People arriving from the West have their pensions transferred to Hungary and intend to own and maintain properties here. Since their consumption takes place in Hungary and they cover their health and social care expenses from their own resources, they obviously generate benefits for the host country.

**Figure 3: Foreigners by age and citizenship (1 January 2008)**


There is an increase in home buying both in the groups of young and older people. The Germans prefer the surroundings of Lake Balaton, the Dutch the rural areas, the Irish the urban ones. Studentification exerts an effect on the real estate market of large university cities.

There is an increase in consumption and economic activity in the destination areas of immigration. Taxes paid by foreigners and changes in local tax revenues are of special importance. In the tax year of 2007 the number of foreign taxpayers increased to 87 thousand, which is 1.94% of the Hungary based taxpayers (1.67% in tax year 2005). In Budapest, foreigners account for 4.5% of taxpayers.

Migrant residents are concentrated in two areas: 60-70% of them live in Budapest and its surroundings, migrants from neighbouring countries prefer to buy property in the other side of the border and are frequently commuters or self-employed/entrepreneurs. Border regions were traditionally considered as disadvantageous territories according to location theories, because of the barriers in international trade and the threats of military invasions. National borders have negatively affected regional economy because of increasing transactional costs. Taxes, different languages, cultures and business practice represented obstacles for cross-border trade in general, which reduces the willingness of national and foreign companies to locate in these regions. The alteration of this unfavourable image could generate a new increase in the border regions through greater international economic integration – with lower trade barriers. These regions have characteristics by which they can be defined as active contact regions (Nemes Nagy J., 1998: 140-143) (Nijkamp 1998: 1-22; Van Geenhuizen, Ratti 2001: 369-387) (see map 1).

Important target regions of international migration from Serbia towards Hungary are the settlements and counties near the border (besides the capital city). Border regions are thus
increasingly become active contact areas. For examples, between 1988 and 1999 there were 3982 Yugoslav investments realised in Hungary, which made 16% of all foreign investments. 70% of them were in the South Great Plain region (border region with Serbia), while only 20% in Budapest (which, however, reached its peak in 1993 with about one thousand enterprises) (Szónoky Miklósné Ancsin, 2001: 18-30). This activity is based on buying house in Hungary and the everyday commuting to e.g. Romania and Slovakia or by running business activity in Hungary and to live in Serbia. It can be realised thanks to a permeable border, except for the Ukrainian case.

Map 1: Proportion of foreigners per 100 residents

1 January, 2001

1 January, 2008


- Budapest host citizens from 158 countries: 58% of Africans, 77% of Asians, and 56% of Americans in Hungary lives in the capital. The farther one the foreign citizen comes from, the more likely he or she will chose the capital as first destination. 36% of people arriving from neighbouring countries (who know Hungary closer) live in Budapest: among them the Romanians represent the 41%, the Ukrainians the 36%, Serbian 23%, Slovaks 35%, Slovenians 47%, Croatians 20% and Austrians 17%. Significant number of immigrants comes from the EU 15 countries, and then from Slovakia, Turkey, China, Vietnam, Serbia-Montenegro, Ukraine, Russia, and Syria. The highest rate is from Romania with 37 000 persons.

- A relatively small and rich proportion of migrants prefer to live in the more prestigious areas of the Buda side, while the overwhelming majority of them live in the Pest side. In the district II of Budapest, the dominant immigrants are from the EU 15 countries (32% of total foreigners live here), and from Asia (23%). Besides them, there are quite a lot of residents from the USA (6%) too. Not more than 16% is the ratio of Romanians who also live in the district II, which is half of the 41% average of Romanians living in Budapest. We notice similarities in the XII and V. districts, i.e. the former area where the ratio of EU 15 citizens is 34%, Asians 14%, Americans 9%, Romanians 18%, Ukrainian 5%; and the fact of latter area is: 25%, 18%, 5% and 16%, together with 12% of Ukrainian citizens. In district VI. the ratio of EU 15 citizens is still high (19%). The ratio of persons arriving from the American continent is 4%, but the Asians (21%), the Romanians (25%), Serbian-Montenegrins and Ukrainians (7-7%) ratios are much higher. There is even a more significant difference in the VII district (10% of EU15, 19% Asians, 35% Romanians, 8% Serbian-Montenegrins and Ukrainians). The VIII. district has ratios like: 36% Asians, 38% Romanians, 7% Ukrainians, while the X. district is interesting, since the ratio of Asians (53 %!) is the highest, that of Romanians represent the 27% and Ukrainians the 7%. The X. is the only district where among foreigners the number of Asians is the highest, which is in correspondence with the market they operate. Earlier, it was also noticeable that markets were redirecting the Asians choice to settle (Rédei M., 2009: 41-42).
The fact that migrants from neighbouring countries, except for Romanian citizens, on average have a better educational attainment than that of the resident population results in a considerable increase in skills (Németh et al, 2009: 621). Hungary became a destination for students from wider distance, coming from all over the Word. Around 17 thousand foreigners are currently studying in the country. Hungary attracts young people from the neighbouring countries, who, after their graduation, will choose where to use their acquired skills. The student flow is a cursor of highly-skilled migration and it goes on replacement style. In 90s the Hungarian students filled the international schools in Hungary or they used to move to foreign countries. Nowadays Ukrainians, Serbs, and Croatians students are filling the educational institutes. The question of studentification is a peculiar focus of major cities. Foreign students reshape the local economy and the social milieu. In most cases, former military camps were re-used. At time of creation they were outside of towns, nowadays as towns grew, they became a part of the towns and towns decided to re-use these buildings. In some places not only the milieu, but even more the structure of the city has changed. Finally what is going in the “head” of enrolled students when they take a decision where to study? The answers seem always uncertain about their intentions. The first result of our Eurobroadmap survey (2009) which compares Hungarian students with others from new EU member states seem also to show a limited spatial extension in their mind. Main motivation of their movement is towards the western countries, but not so much as main immigration goals. The low level of interest is to the neighbourhoods countries. It was surveyed, although, that they know this environment far better.

Remigration is a multifaceted phenomenon (Illés S-Kincses Á, 2009:731-734) in the Hungarian context. One of these groups is made up of those ethnic Hungarians from neighbouring countries who spent a longer period in some western country, became eligible for a pension granted upon retirement, maybe were granted citizenship there and following their retirement settle down here. Another one is from those who emigrated in 1956 and return home to live in Hungary. The third one is made up of expats and those who spent a period of 6-8 years abroad and return home to start a family. Last year, as a result of the global crisis, there was an increase in the number of less-educated people returning from western countries. These migrants are the hardest hit labour force group, they become redundant. This vulnerability is partly due to the fact that migrant workers are overrepresented in economic sectors that have benefited from the previous long growth period, and are now particularly hard hit by the crisis such as construction, hotels and restaurants, etc. But immigrants, in particular those representing the most recent arrivals, are also more often employed in less secure and low-skilled jobs which are among the first to disappear during an economic downturn. Some comparative explanations are however useful in this global crisis framework related to different migration stages and dissimilar conditions affecting different categories of migrants.
eastern European migrants are in different situation than the third world countries migrants in Hungary. Eastern migrants can make a “wait and see” approach, compared to those who have difficulties for re-migration. The third world migrants, during the crisis, disappear in the shadow economy, thus contributing to a rising of the illegal situations. Last year the remittances to Hungary decreased by 5%.

- During the socialist period, skill development was of low importance and no considerable investment in skill development for Hungarian young people was made by their families. The emerging market economy increased the value of skills and made migration easier. The cohorts of late 80s of the labour market in Hungary is now aware of the effects of supply and demand, is socialized in an international environment, had better and international skills, and as a result of this has a higher propensity to migrate (see e.g. the out migration of physicians). A social dialogue is needed to be maintained so to disseminate clear messages and show related effects. This social dialogue is necessary as to how their life and domestic conditions will be matched in order to shape the future. It is essential to find a common platform, on the basis of mutual benefit, respect and advocacy of the goals. It is the time to start an initiative addressed to the different stratus of the host Hungarian society about their idea of “hospitality” as well as to set up clear political framework for the migrants about the kind of integration that can be implemented together.
- In the future not a reactive, but a domestic needs based pro-active strategy is needed. It should be clarified what skills are expected from the “would-be migrants” and what lesser or greater community needs can be satisfied in this way. The “laissez faire” policy can re-act to the past, and not framing any pro-active immigration policy. In our view, migration processes do not happen spontaneously; they rather emerge through implementation, with the harmonization of decision-making and executive powers. So the successful decisions of migration policy are always a reflection to those, who are hesitating to do the same.

Finally, the success of any target depends on how the society is able to adopt the long-term goals, to incorporate the individual and common interests and the above mentioned migration management principles. This outcome can serve as the framework for any social dialogue. Would the duty of society be confined to reactions to past events or rather pro action management based on the policy of central governance would prevail? Will there be a bottom up or a top down process? Social dialogue is the way to create a win-win solution. Feelings of shared responsibility, and the objective of creating a common platform based on social and individual benefits both for the migrants and the host country are currently still missing in the Hungarian society.

**Conclusion**

A migration strategy is not for everybody. This is the risk of the applied strategy.

International migration is a key asset for the Hungarian population policy. As a result of our unfavourable demographic situation our population is expected to fall below 10 million people along with a sharper decrease in the number of working age people. Inward migration may offset this demographic deficit, but it is questionable how the neighbouring countries will be able to satisfy this demand.

Budapest has an ageing population with an outflow resulting from suburbanization. According to the forecasts a positive net international migration of 300 thousand people is needed to reach a population loss less than the national average. As a result of these forecasts, an even higher spatial concentration and a slightly higher annual inflow are expected.

Since the turn of the millennium, migration strategies have had to react to an ongoing increase in the geographical diversity of migrants bringing in concomitant challenges. This outcome underlines the fact that a model of integration that is only subject to national rules will be increasingly insufficient. Generally the national rule is able to avoid the illegal and mass migration, and limit staying permit holder in a legal environment. After having step in the country, the immigrant is residing in a given geographical place and new social context. The regional conditions will determine
the success of his settlement, fill his expectations and possibly react to his motivations. So the national rules impacted the event of migration, and the regional rules contribute to a prosperous rooting process.

In our view, successful integration means security for the state and the use of essential quality labour, effective work for the migrating person matching with his/her skills, and a sorting surplus for the employer and the society as a whole in terms of social and human capital. Therefore one of the paramount questions of the future is: how does the global business viewpoint of production relate to the labour’s decisions on individual mobility? And how do all these fit in a national strategy by matching the economic with a rights-based approach?

Eastern European countries are significant players in the international migration system. Currently a new legal barrier within the free stream area has divided their interests. Although the former conflicts are not attached to the border area, the global crisis points out some rapid processes. After the period when security aspects came to the fore it is high time to develop a value-oriented migration strategy.

Hungary as part of EU will play a role in the migration monitoring of the continent until the free travel area will have an external border (similar to Rio Grande). So Hungary like during the Iron curtain period, on the one hand it is in a preventive position to avoid playing again the guard of irregular migration. On the other hand there is a chance to filter the would-be migrants taking into account their cultural diversity and thus enriching Hungary by an external source.
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