

Boldizsár Nagy

***Hungarian refugee law and refugee affairs from the system
change in the late eighties until accession to the European
Union***

Moral, political-philosophical and legal investigations

Theses of the PhD dissertation

Budapest, November 2011.

Supervisor: Professor Gábor Kardos

International Law Department

ELTE PhD School of Law

Table of contents

I. A brief summary of the research goal	4
II. Short description of the research and methods applied.....	5
III. A short summary of the scientific findings and ways of utilising them .	11
A) A short summary of the scientific findings.....	11
B) Possibilities for utilisation.....	19
IV. Bibliography of publications related to the thesis in a wide sense.....	20

I. A brief summary of the research goal

The author of the thesis set two goals:

1. The development of a consistent system of arguments in favour of protecting refugees

2. The review of the question, whether these arguments have been used in the period when Hungarian refugee law already existed and there were refugees arriving in Hungary, but the system was not yet under part of the European union, i.e. the treatment of refugees and the discourse about them was determined by domestic political and social processes.

Both led to untrodden roads (If anything can be a road if not trodden at all...) As to the ethical and political philosophical arguments it has to be established that the literature on refugee law suffers from a relative lack of publications systematically reviewing the potential arguments in favour of refugee protection.¹ The literature in Hungarian – which is in general not extensive - fully misses this point.²

Hungarian refugee affairs and refugee law have only a few commentators and there seems to be only one example of the discourse analysis of the public discourse and of the law, this thesis pursues.³

¹ The most important publications are:

Boswell, Christina (2005): *The Ethics of Refugee Policy*. Ashgate, Aldershot

Gibney, Matthew J. (2004): *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum: Liberal Democracy and the Response to Refugees*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK

Plaut, Gunther W. (1995): *Asylum A Moral Dilemma*. York Lane Press, Toronto

² A reguláris migráció kapcsán felmerültek morális megfontolások, ismét csak egy szűk kör tollából: Nagy Boldizsár: Lehet-e morális a migrációs politika? *Liget*, 2/1997. 3–11. p.; Tóth Judit: Lehet-e normatív a migrációs politika? In: Hárs Ágnes – Tóth Judit (szerk.): *Változó migráció – változó környezet*. MTA Kisebbségkutató Intézete, Budapest, 2010, 193–219. old.

³ Tóth Judit (1998): A menedékjogi törvény hányattatása. In: Sik Endre, Tóth Judit (szerk.): *Idegenek Magyarországon*. Az MTA Politikai Tudományok Intézete Nemzetközi Migráció Kutatócsoport Évkönyve 1997, Budapest, 57–73. old.

All this led to the consequence that the thesis could not follow a settled, generally recognised structure, and could not emulate a pattern that has crystallized in the academic literature. It had to set the goal of creating an autonomous thesis based on observations of several disciplines related to migration theory and practice and on the commentaries to the Hungarian refugee affairs history and refugee law.

II. Short description of the research and methods applied.

As indicated the research extends to two large topics: firstly, the elaboration of a (theoretical, i.e. moral, political philosophical) set of arguments in favour of granting protection to the refugees and, secondly, the application of such identified arguments to the development of Hungarian refugee affairs and refugee law from the change of the political system in the late eighties until accession to the European Union.

The first two chapters dealing with the arguments on refugee protection (Part II. of the thesis) develop the theoretical foundations. They address one research question: what arguments are to be found beyond or before the law, the resultant (combined impact) of which would be that refugees have to be protected. It searches for a normative position, for the arguments which lead the moral and /or political actor to conclude that the asylum seeker who has a well founded fear of persecution and who enters the country's territory or ends up under the state's effective control and asks for protection has to be (ought to be) protected and recognised as a refugee. Normative requirements inhabit the world of „Sollen“, they belong to moral philosophy and/or (legal) policy. Consequently the analysis is deductive: first it sets the goal of finding arguments justifying the need/obligation/reasonableness of protecting the refugee. Then it identifies the ethical, political and legal philosophical, occasionally the economic and sociological arguments supporting the claim.

The first unit of the theoretical part, Chapter 1, takes as its starting point the proposition according to which refugeehood is created by the lack of freedom of movement. If everyone was entitled to move from the country of threatened persecution to another one, where her life and freedom is not under threat and her

civil and political rights are not systematically or severely violated (and she would not have to fear *refoulement*) then refugees as we understand the legal term today would not exist.⁴ There would be no need for the refugee to apply for a special status in order to enter a state and to remain there. She would not have to request an exception from the rules on entry and immigration. The world would be as it used to be before the First World War. (It is admitted that there were exceptions from the freedom of movement and migration even before 1914, but the default modus of operation - at least for the population of the non-colonized world - was freedom of immigration. Chapter 1 concentrates on the question of what were the economic, cultural, social and security consequences if everyone was entitled – similarly to the citizens of the European Union - to freedom of movement, except those whose personal conduct represents „a genuine, present and sufficiently serious threat affecting one of the fundamental interests of the [receiving] society”.⁵ The chapter - relying on academic literature in the fields of migration theory, cultural anthropology and economics - and juxtaposing communitarian arguments with universalistic and other positions defeating the communitarian propositions comes to the conclusion that global freedom of movement could be posited as a rational goal. At the same time it acknowledges that limits and constraints could be maintained even within a global system of freedom of movement. An example for a justified cap on immigration could be if immigrants arrived in extremely large numbers and their purpose was to intentionally destroy the culture of the receiving society. At the same time it is also shown that countries (societies) which close themselves in an inconsistent manner, considering citizens of certain states as security threats and citizens of other states as not representing such dangers usually apply (essentialist)

⁴ I dare not presume that the threat of persecution would cease to exist. Of course the most effective tool of protecting refugees would be the elimination of the root causes of their flight. However, that problematique is not the subject matter of the thesis, in that respect it remains „realist” and assumes persecution will not be eradicated in the medium term.

⁵ The expression is taken from Article 27 para 3 of Directive 2004/38 EC on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the member States. OJ L 229 of 29 June 2004, p. 35-48.

justifications for this unequal treatment which can be refuted by economic, migration-theoretical or cultural-anthropological arguments. True, the road from the acceptance of such reasons by the mind to bowing to them emotionally is long and the thesis can not explore why the affected societies and individuals maintain the incongruence admitting the truth in abstracto and acting contradictorily in concreto.

The second unit of the theoretical part, Chapter 2, therefore takes as a starting point reality, i.e. the fact that the default rule at the beginning of the 21st century is the control of migration, in essence, it being prohibited. Visa and visa free access always constitute an exception to the rule which is: the foreigner must stay out. Freedom of movement as a right is fully or partially only recognised in the EU and some other regions. So if the person who is threatened with persecution at home can not reach safety as a simple immigrant, because she won't be able to meet the necessary conditions (possessing a passport, visa, finances covering longer term stay, health insurance and other possible entry conditions) then her crossing of the border and authorisation to stay must be based on a waiver of the entry and residence conditions in her respect.

The difference between her status and that of the regular migrant has to be explained and justified and it must also be shown that her protection is the task of society to which she applies for asylum .

The greater part of the academic literature on refugees takes the duty to protect refugees as granted, at least to the extent of the *non-refoulement* obligation. The thesis goes further; it scrutinises the realm before/beyond the law. Where can the rule protecting the refugee be based (anchored)? Why is it desirable/necessary that there be a rule protecting the refugee? How can an exception permitting entry of the refugees into an otherwise closed society be founded?

Moving from the law, the rule world, to the social reality the question arises whether the command of the law (and the metalegal argument on which it is based) is obeyed in reality? Does the refugee actually have a chance to get effective protection or do rules and techniques prevail which exclude her from protection or

make that protection, and the refugee status determination leading to recognition as a refugee, the responsibility of another state?

Chapter 2 identifies a series of arguments which may be used in favour of the refugees. Most of them relate to identity policy, therefore belonging to the discursive space of anthropology, sociology and occasionally moral philosophy. The point is this: the actor (be it a politician, an individual or a subset of the society, no matter how small, e.g. a nongovernmental organisation) has to be empowered and equipped with an internalised command which that actor follows and so becomes capable of evaluating the positive law through the lens of that internalised command. This has the consequence that whenever a new bill on asylum is presented or a bill for amendment is submitted, its assessment has to occur in light of this internal value and preference set, and it must entail an investigation of whether the (planned) law meets the requirement(s) flowing from the internal command. The first (double) question is to decide who is to be protected and why. Once the actor has defined the group of persons to be protected and the reason for protecting it, then it can be assessed whether the rule planned or already in force meets the requirements. These requirements stem from the wish to preserve (or to transform) the actor's identity, or they reflect utilitarian considerations. Chapter 2 identifies ten such arguments calling for the protection of refugees.⁶ The nature of the argument determines whether they are rooted in scholarship or social practice ranging from universalistic moral philosophy through communitarian and religious arguments to purely utilitarian considerations. Finding the final, decisive, all-encompassing argument is not the goal, as no such argument exists. The protection of the refugee, or the call for such protection, is the decision of the individual of the political community or of the state, reflecting the value choices, identity and aspirations of the given actor.

⁶ They are – to be explained in part III of this summary – the following: being part of humanity; belonging to a narrower community; „history as bank“; local – foreigner; rich – poor; democratic – oppressive; reciprocity (insurance for the future); political utilitarianism (political opportunism), historic responsibility and finally *non-refoulement* as general international (customary) law forming the background of the national laws.

Part III of the thesis exposes the theoretical suggestions to the test of practice, checking them against empirical material. Naturally it does this not with the argument for the global freedom of movement but with the arguments in favour of protecting refugees. Chapters 3–8 – speaking the language of law – review how national and international actors argued in favour of protecting and assisting refugees to Hungary. They also review the arguments proposed for a restrictive interpretation of the definition of who is entitled to protection, of the rights of asylum seekers and protected persons or for a shift of responsibility to other states. Analyses and comment on the legislative jurisprudential and scholarly discourse give an opportunity to recall the sequence of events (the history) at the same time. The „waves” of Hungarian refugee affairs are reviewed from the arrival of refugees from Romania (Transylvania) in the late eighties until accession to the European Union.

The goal of reconstructing the history of the development of the law together with the accompanying policy and moral considerations is to reveal if Hungary, and its environment, the European Union, meet the requirements which a democratic and liberal community must set itself, a community which is based on respect of the personality and rights of the individual and which recognises the equal dignity of human beings as the moral-philosophical starting point. Could it be said that Hungary is faithful to the so frequently mentioned European traditions, or in reality, that is not the case as there is a gap between the confessed principles and the actual practice and the EU and its member States prove to be Janus-faced?

The response is given by identifying periods (epochs) of recent Hungarian refugee history and specifying their characteristic features. The factual and legal history preceding EU accession is divided up into three main periods, the boundaries of which are generated from a combined impact of the legal changes and the altering patterns of incoming movements of asylum seekers. The two main constituent elements of the first period are the arrival of refugees from Transylvania and Romania in general and the formation of Hungarian refugee law encompassing

accession to the Convention relating to the Status of refugees of 1951/67. This period extends from the late eighties until 1991.

The second period is dominated by the impact of the war in the former Yugoslavia on Hungary between 1991 – 1996. The exceptional was made permanent in the sense that those persecuted by the Serb-Croat conflict and later by the war in Bosnia have found protection essentially outside the formal refugee and asylum framework just as those did, whose source of fear emanated from outside of Europe. The latter were excluded from the application of the ordinary system because of the geographic limitation attached by Hungary to the Geneva Convention

The third period extends from the preparations for the first refugee act⁷ until accession to the European Union (1996 – 2004). In this period – not least as a consequence of repealing the geographic limitation to the Geneva Convention - Hungary gradually becomes part, target and to some extent a participant in forming the global processes. Simultaneously the ever growing pressure to adjust to the European Union strongly influences the three amendments to the Asylum Act adopted in 1997.

The summarising Part IV. briefly reviews what was covered in the preceding chapters and notes that accession to the EU entails a change in the dynamic of the development of domestic law. Conflict between the more restrictive communitarian and the more generous universal liberal (cosmopolitan) arguments no longer takes place at the national level, but is relocated to the decision making process within the EU.

Methodology is manifold, corresponding to the transdisciplinary character of the research. Dominant is the deontological (normative) analysis, but frequently longitudinal and stock data analyses, usual in demography, appear, and naturally

⁷ The normative system adopted in 1989 was not based on an Act of Parliament, but rather on a decree of the government and on a decree of what at that time was called the „Presidential Council” and acted in lieu of a genuine president.

there is a lot of the traditional source analysis characterising legal scholarship. Close reading of documents and comparative techniques also feature in the thesis.

In general the text is less of a positivist legal analysis. Readers with a critical legal, moral philosophical or political science background will find more familiar turns (and terms) –especially in the theoretical part – than those privy to mainstream legal discourse, i.e. positivism.

Due to the large volume of empirical material used, frequently methods of source analysis used by sociology and legal history are applied, situating the actors in their own historic space and time..

So the methodology applied is complex, justified by the fact that the goal was conglomerate: it not only included the review of the legal development but also the reflection and critical commentary of the political and scholarly discourse related to the changes of law. To this had to be added the explanation of the actual refugee flows both in terms of arrival and return.⁸

III. A short summary of the scientific findings and ways of utilising them

A) A short summary of the scientific findings

The first substantive part of the thesis (Chapters 2 and 3.) constitute the elaboration of themes so far practically unknown in the Hungarian academic literature. Its cluster of arguments supporting the protection of refugees is an innovation even in the international academic literature.

It is shown though the systemic and critical review of the debate concerning freedom of movement between communitarians and universal egalitarians (cosmopolitans) that freedom of movement at the global scale is not a fancy but a conceivable rational goal, even if it contradicts the nationalist revival after the end of the Cold War.

⁸ Asylum seeking by Hungarian nationals abroad was not subject matter of the thesis, even if at times it was (is) not insignificant.

Proof of this claim is not limited to the universalist human rights based argument. The communitarians are challenged on their own turf and their plea for closure is shown to be lacking basis or leading to contradictions.

It is shown that the differentiation between the national and the foreigner is based on unjust principles. This is so, because nationality is either based on possession of (and birth in) a physical territory - usually acquired by conquest, that is brute force – or it is based on blood lineage, which is extremely ethnicising. Neither base of nationality is more justifiable (or noble) than feudal privileges. It is also demonstrated that most enemies of the democratic institutions are born within those democracies, therefore it is not a tenable claim that democracy can only be protected at the price of excluding (certain) immigrants. This finding is illustrated by the data of Europol, referring to the year of 2010, according to which fifty-three times more separatist terrorist acts were committed (by “own nationals”), than acts which can be linked to Islam.

As to the protection of culture, which is also a usual communitarian defence of closure: even if a definition of culture existed (which is not the case) one could not claim of most of the states or societies that nurture a single culture which is subject to change only because of immigrants. It is proven that the survival or disappearance (dramatic change) of a culture is not a (direct) function of the openness or closure of the borders. Moreover it is also questioned that immutability (permanence) of a culture would be an asset.

The processing of the academic literature on the economic impacts of global freedom of movement led to the conclusion that free movement of the labour force would lead to a significant increase in global wealth. This was the case with the “old” fifteen Member States of the EU, in which the accession of the “new” member States led to an increase of the GDP attributable to the contribution of citizens of the new Member States.

Finally, further arguments are offered, derived from development theory and advocating (also on moral philosophical basis) that the more developed states must

contribute to alleviating poverty in the less developed states also by way of allowing freedom of movement to their territories, even if for a limited period of time (a few decades), and in some focal points this may lead to social tensions.

The chapter on freedom of movement does not plead for the elimination of states or borders, i.e. for the dissolving of bounded societies. It recognises the role of the state in organising social life. It also recognises the necessity of border surveillance and checks at the border crossing point and the right of states to exclude by way of denying entry to, removal of, and entry bans for the future for those whose personal conduct represents a genuine, present and sufficiently serious threat affecting one of the fundamental interests of the receiving society. It is also acknowledged that immigration may be controlled and eventually stopped if a great number of immigrants intentionally attack the cultural, social or political system of the receiving society.

The chapter – utilising existing academic proposals – also identifies possible steps in the transition to global freedom of movement in order to alleviate the potential shock caused by liberalising migration.

The second part starts out from the fact that freedom of movement is not a global reality even if five hundred million inhabitants of the EU already enjoy it and similar efforts to create areas where movement is free – at least for several categories of persons - are identifiable both in certain regions of Africa, Asia and Latin-America. Consequently in order to get access to the territory of the potential asylum state the refugee must be granted a waiver from the general conditions of entry and it has to be recognised that she is in a specific situation.

This exemption from the entry and residence conditions is to be based on the arguments used in the political discourse in favour of the protection of the refugees. The thesis offers a multidisciplinary cluster of these justifications which is unprecedented. The analysis is deductive; it searched roads leading to a predetermined outcome. The hypothesis is that the legal obligation to protect refugees increasingly appears in the political discourse as a burden. Certain states

and groups of societies, including their opinion leaders, want to evade those obligations. According to the hypothesis of the dissertation if these actors are confronted with the identity political, political philosophical, moral and other bases of the legal protection of refugees, the acceptance of one or more of which inevitably leads to the legal obligation to protect, then they no longer can evade that obligation as long as they wish to remain consistent.

Chapter 2 offers ten such arguments of which six are identity-political, relying on the social psychological (social anthropological) truth that the encounter of the refugee and the state/society/individual deciding on her protection represents or forms the identity of the latter⁹.

Summarily the arguments are the following:

1) The universalist egalitarian argumentation – be it Rawlsian, utilitarian or promoting global solidarity – leads to the conclusion that one can not remain indifferent when another human being is subject to persecution. Then a duty to protect arises.

2) Reinforcing group identity and community by way of protecting persons belonging to the same group. In this context a short review of nationalism theories follows which may support or refute essentialist approaches to the concept of “nation” and concludes that irrespective of the outcome of that debate the plea for receiving and protecting refugees belonging to the same (imagined or “real”) nation may constitute a relevant and effective argument. Belonging to the same group as a basis for protection (and by protecting group members reinforcing own identity) is also seen as part of the teachings and practice of the Christian and Islam teachings.

3) Identity creation based on shared identity may be achieved by establishing commonality with predecessors by way of offering protection now to a persecuted group as a delayed reaction to granting protection to the predecessors of the present protectors by others. This thesis called is the “bank of history”, which means that

⁹ Naturally the identity of the refugee is no less affected by her experience, but that –again – had to be left beyond the borders of this dissertation.

forerunners had to flee and “borrow” hospitality at an earlier moment of history, now the successors pay that “loan” back, by being hospitable to others who are forced to flee to their territory and seek their protection.

The above three arguments derive the call for (duty of) protection from shared identity, either with the persecuted or with the predecessors. Protection serves to build or reinforce the self image and historic self-consciousness of the protector. The following three build identity from the juxtaposition of the protector and the refugee or her persecutor.

4) Juxtaposing the local and the foreign. By receiving and hosting the forced migrant, by giving her protection the protector reinforces her attachment to the given territory. She is at home, she has the title to the territory – that is why she is in a position to offer shelter to the “foreigner”.

5) The opposition of rich and poor: the one who protects the other shares home, harvest, resources, and is rich, independently from the market value of those resources. Self-image and self-esteem is developed through extension of protection to the refugee.

6) The contrast between democrats and oppressors. James Hathaway and others explained the birth of the Geneva Convention – among others – by the intention of the West to prove its superiority over the East, by admitting those who “voted with their feet”. That explanation is correct and equally valid and applicable today: rule of law states frequently justify the grant of asylum to refugees by depicting this obligation as a command derived from democratic traditions.

The further four argument for the protection of refugees are not so directly related to identity politics.

7) The utilitarian argument of reciprocity relies on the idea that today’s refugee may become the protector of tomorrow’s refugee. So it is practical to extend protection to those in flight today, thereby taking out an “insurance policy” for the case of future persecution. Van Heuven Goedhart, the High Commissioner for

refugees of the United Nations stated in 1953 that “It is unrealistic for anyone who looks at the refugee problem to say ‘ it cannot happen here’”.¹⁰

8) Refugee protection is advocated for in pursuance of a political goal according to the political utilitarian argument, as was the case when candidate states adopted their refugee regimes in order to qualify for admission to the EU.

9) According to the principle of historic responsibility protection has to be extended because the flight of those to be protected is or was triggered by the deeds of the asylum state, as it happened for example in the United States and (South) Vietnam context.

10) The principle of non-refoulement. Although the prohibition of return or rejection already belongs to the law as part of general customary law, it is directly neighbouring the non-legal world and binds those societies and states which as newcomers to the international society wish to enter it even without a formal legal undertaking of obligations. The section discussing the principle in a traditional international law fashion takes position in the heated debates of recent years. (Refoulement on the high seas, the customary law nature of the principle.)

Part III. covering the development of Hungarian refugee law and refugee affairs from the system change to the accession to the European Union has brought innovative elements to the Hungarian legal political science and present-day history literature.

The investigation of the parliamentary debates leading to adoption of the rules on refugees, the scrutiny of the primary sources like bills and statements of leading political authorities has shown that the Hungarian political elite, especially the conservative side, is receptive to the communitarian arguments. It sees the protection of refugees as a tool of minority politics and believes that preferential treatment of ethnic Hungarians arriving from the neighbouring countries is

¹⁰ van Heuven Goedhart, Gerrit Jan (1953): The Problem of Refugees (Lectures) Hague Academy of International law, Recueil Des Cours, Collected Courses, 1953 , vol. 82., p. 265

permitted. Many of the conservative actors also believe that fear of non-European asylum seekers and closing-off the territory from them is acceptable and justified.

Political actors on the left and liberal side of the spectrum are divided. The socialist party seems to be happy to transfer the suspicion against the “aliens” inherited from socialism into the securitising discourse prevailing in the EU member states in the nineties that led to the adoption of a number of measures and institutions acting against the interest of the refugees. An example of this was the introduction of the ‘safe third country’ notion into the constitution. In this context the thesis shows a connection to the conservative side which is also inclined to assume a security continuum which entails a linkage between crime, illegal migration and asylum seeking.

The liberal forces in Parliament put human dignity and respect for the totality of human rights before the interest of the state and are not willing to constrain these beyond the absolutely necessary extent. They are calling for measures serving the protection of the refugees and asylum seekers, such as curtailing the length of detention, the abolition of the geographic limitation. In doing so they frequently use universal egalitarian arguments or those related to historic identification with the predecessors (the bank of history). These liberals are supported by socialists who on the bases of the universal human rights also call for the removal of the geographic limitation.

Results of Part III. embrace the first periodisation – in the manner described above – the epoch between 1987 and 2004. They include the analysis of the statistics of migration and of the relation of the migratory movements to the changes of the regulatory framework.

This part offers an evaluative critique of all the adopted Acts related to refugees using the criteria developed in the theoretical part. That means that the analysis focuses on the question whether the subsequent regulations resulted in more or in less protection of the refugees. Laws are studied in their context i.e. together with the debates leading to their adoption and in light of the arguments

proposed for amending them, thereby combining the legal with the policy oriented and with the moral philosophical.

In the course of this investigation attention is devoted to the domestic and foreign actors having an influence on the formation of the law and so the investigation adopts a constructivist and institutionalist approach, without refraining from critical discourse.

The study proves the changes to the law which were frequently presented as harmonisation with the EU *acquis* were in fact adopted in order to realise institutional goals which were unrelated to the EU *acquis*.

The institutional goals and intentions were – especially following the admittance of those who came from Romania – restrictive. In case of those escaping the Yugoslav conflict in practice they were still generous as an unconditional protection in the sense of territorial asylum was offered to all the affected persons. However in legal terms these intentions were already curtailing the content of the protection by not extending the Geneva Convention rights to most of the refugees coming from the Balkans. In the third period starting after the end of the war in Bosnia even more tools turning away refugees were applied.

The dissertation sheds light on the necessity to accomplish a close and critical reading of the rules and parliamentary debates as there was no, and presently there is no, policy on migration. Neither is there any representative policy document reflecting general social agreement concerning the duty to protect refugees or the liberty to transfer responsibility for them to other states. This close and critical reading was due also because the Hungarian academic legal profession has not produced any scholarly output covering the whole period and moving beyond the nearly descriptive approach.¹¹

¹¹ There are a few notable exceptions, but they are limited to shorter periods or very specific aspects.

B) Possibilities for utilisation

Scholarship first and foremost engenders scholarship. This thesis may serve as a starting point for further investigations. As already mentioned the domestic scholarly discourse has so far not touched upon the questions raised in the theoretical part neither has it offered a systemic overview of the past two and a half decades. Therefore the relevant chapters may become points of departure in the legal science, in demography or in applied ethics.

With the help of the ten arguments offered in protection of the refugees legal developments within the EU maybe subjected to investigation. That could be combined with the review of the development of the Hungarian law at times of membership of the EU, and this could lead to a better understanding of EU – Member State dynamics.

Naturally the thesis will also produce practical benefits. First, policy makers in the refugee field, political actors and members of the non-governmental sector may pursue more articulated debates in connection with the future amendments of the Asylum Act and its implementing rules. Second, the Hungarian delegation participating in the elaboration of the second phase of the Common European Asylum System in the EU or participating in the drafting and adoption of secondary legislation on regular migration may rely on the impacts of the different regulatory schemes as identified in the thesis.

Finally, the author of these lines, as a participant in the Hungarian educational scene, hopes that chapters one and two as well as six, seven and eight may be utilised in various educational setups starting from legal and political science and extending to courses on moral philosophy or global studies.

IV. Bibliography of publications related to the thesis in a wide sense

Nagy Boldizsár (1989): Menekültek – menekülők. *Külpolitika*, XVI. évf./1989/4. sz. 114–142. old.

Nagy Boldizsár (1989): A jog barlangjai. *Esély*, 1989, 2. sz. 72–76. old.

Nagy, Boldizsár (1991): „Before or After the Wave Thoughts about the Adequacy of the Hungarian Refugee Law”. *International Journal of Refugee Law, Special Issue*, Vol. 3, No. 3., pp. 529–539.

Nagy, Boldizsár (1992): Asylum seekers and refugees: Hungarian dilemmas. *Acta Juridica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 1-2/1992 27–47. p

Nagy, Boldizsár (1992): Threats and Prospects in Europe: What's Ahead? (A Central European View) *AWR Bulletin*, 4/1992. 169–173. old.

Nagy Boldizsár (1993): Menekültek – menekülők (Magyarországi dilemmák) *Acta Humana*, No. 10, (1993), 31–55. old.

Nagy Boldizsár (1993): The refugee situation in Hungary: Where now? *Acta Juridica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 3-4 sz. pp 193–210. megjelent továbbá: *AWR Bulletin*, 3/1994, 125–139. p

Nagy Boldizsár (1993): Menedék és remény – Magyarország helye a nemzetközi vándorlásban. Asylum and hope. The new role of Hungary in international migration. In: *Honvagyók*, Pelikán Kiadó, 1993, 98–109. old. Megjelent továbbá: In: *Jönnek? Mennek? Maradnak?* [Az] MTA Politikai Tudományok Intézete Nemzetközi Migráció Kutatócsoport évkönyve. [3. köt.] 1993. Szerk.: Sík Endre – Tóth Judit. Bp. Neotipp Ny. 1994. 119–129.

Nagy, Boldizsár (1994): The Hungarian Refugee Law In: *Refugees in Hungary*, Ed. H. Adelman; E. Sík; G. Tessényi. York Lanes Publishers, Toronto, 1994, 49–64. p

Nagy Boldizsár (1995): Changing Trends, Enduring Questions Regarding Refugee Law in Central Europe. In: Pogány, István (ed.): *Human Rights in Eastern Europe*. Edward Elgar Ltd., Aldershot, pp. 185–215.

Nagy Boldizsár (1996): Lehetséges-e belső határok nélküli Európai Unió közép- és kelet-európai államokkal való kibővülés után? In: *Táborlakók, diaszpórák, politikák*. [Az] MTA Politikai Tudományok Intézete Nemzetközi Migráció

Kutatócsoport évkönyve. [5. köt.] 1995. Szerk.: Sík Endre – Tóth Judit. Bp. Sík K. 1996. 250, [2] p. 180–194. p

Nagy Boldizsár – Kende Tamás (1997): Köldökzsinór vagy pányva: Jogi kötelek az állampolgár (jogi személy) és állama között. In: *És mi lesz, ha nem lesz? Tanulmányok az államról a 20. század végén*. Szerk.: Gombár Csaba, Hankiss Elemér, Lengyel László, Budapest, Korridor Kötetek, 1997. 175–203. p. Megjelent továbbá: *2000* [folyóirat] 9/1997, 8–17. p

Nagy Boldizsár (1997): The Acquis of the European Union Concerning Refugees and the Law of the Associated States. In: *3rd International Symposium on the Protection of Refugees in Central Europe, Report and Proceedings Geneva*, UNHCR, European Series, Volume 3, No. 2., 1997, pp 51–81. Megjelent továbbá: In: *From improvisation toward awareness? Contemporary migration politics in Hungary*. Yearbook of the Research Group on International Migration, the Institute for Political Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. 1997. Ed. Sik Endre; Tóth Judit; Fullerton, Maryellen. Bp. Sík K. 1997. 102–127.

Nagy Boldizsár (1997): Migration between the European Union and Hungary and the Regulating Law: A Case Study. *European Public Law* 3/1997 363–387. p

Nagy Boldizsár (1997): Can the Hungarian migration policy be moral? In: *From improvisation toward awareness? Contemporary migration politics in Hungary*. Yearbook of the Research Group on International Migration, the Institute for Political Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. 1997. Ed. Sik Endre; Tóth Judit; Fullerton, Maryellen. Bp. Sík K. 1997. 157–164.

Nagy Boldizsár (1997): Magyarország az Európai Unió peremén: uniós jog és nemzetközi együttműködés a migráció területén. *Acta Humana*. Emberi jogi közlemények 27. sz. 1997. 9–26.

Nagy Boldizsár (1997): Lehet-e morális a migrációs politika? *Liget*, 2/1997. 3–11. p

Nagy Boldizsár (1997): Migráció: előnyök és hátrányok. *Európai Tükör* 2/1997. 57–62. p

Nagy Boldizsár (1999): A schengeni rendszer és Magyarország: Az út Amszterdamiig és tovább. *Acta Humana*, 37–38. sz. 1999, 24–56. p. Megjelent továbbá: In: *Az Európai Unió Évkönyve 1999–2000*, Szerk.: Forgács Imre, Inotai András, Wéber Attila. Budapest, DHV-Osiris, 2000, 113–148. p

Nagy Boldizsár (2000): Turn Back to Look Ahead? Central European Observations on the Future of Regimes Affecting Refugees. In: *Human Rights and*

Forced Displacement. Ed. Anne F Bayefsky, Joan Fitzpatrick. The Hague, Boston, London, Martinus Nijhoff, 2000, 245–261. p

Nagy Boldizsár (2001): Rodostótól Torontóig. Beszéd a menekülésről. *Élet és Irodalom*, 2001. február 9.

Nagy Boldizsár (2001): Utoléri-e a magyar Akhilleusz az unió teknősbékáját? Megfigyelések a menekültügyi jogharmonizáció körében. *Magyar Jog*, Vol 48/4, 213–220. old.

Nagy Boldizsár (2002): Hungary and the Forced Migration An overview. In: Byrne, Rosemary; Gregor Noll and Jens Vedsted-Hansen (eds) *New Asylum Countries? Migration Control and Refugee Protection in an Enlarged European Union*. Kluwer Law International, The Hague 138–199. old.

Nagy Boldizsár (2002): Is there a need for subsidiary protection in Europe? A view from a candidate country. In: *Subsidiary protection of refugees in the European Union: Complementing the Geneva Convention?* Bruylant, Brussels, 2002, 95–117. old.

Nagy Boldizsár (2003): A szuverén határai. *Fundamentum* 2. szám, 38–48. old.

The Refugee Law Reader Cases, Documents and Materials (2004) (Co-edited and comments written with Rosemary Byrne /editor in-chief/, Jean-Claude Forget, Maryellen Fullerton, Elspeth Guild, Jens Vedsted-Hansen, Eugen Osmochescu and Steve Peers), Budapest–Dublin, approx 10 000 pages

Nagy Boldizsár (2004): Ki a szuverén? In: *És mi lesz az alkotmánnyal?* (Majtényi László – Miklósi Gábor, szerk.) Eötvös Károly Intézet, Budapest, 98–126. old.

Nagy Boldizsár (2004): Kizárás vagy befogadás? A menekültekre és a migránsokra vonatkozó szabályozás az Európai Unióban. *Café Babel* 47–48. szám, 2004, 83–92. old.

Nagy, Boldizsár (2005): Country report: Hungary. In: *Study on Refugee Status in EU Member States and Return policies Final Report*, Strasbourg, European Parliament.[2005] 431–474.

Nagy Boldizsár (2005): A szabadság, a biztonság és a jog térsége az Európai Unióban. In: *Bevezetés az Európai Unió politikáiba* Szerk.: Kende Tamás – Szűcs Tamás. Budapest, KJK Kerszöv [2005] 775–851. old.

Nagy, Boldizsár (2006): The frontiers of the Sovereign. In: Human Rights and Refugees, Internally Displaced Persons and Migrant Workers Essays in Memory of Joan Fitzpatrick and Arthur Helton; Anne F. Bayefsky (ed.), Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, [2006] 91–122. p

Nagy, Boldizsár (2006): Enlargement and the free movement of persons. In: *L'avenir de la libre circulation des personnes dans l'U.E. The Future of Free Movement of Persons in the EU*. Sous la direction de / under the supervision of Jean-Yves Carlier & Elspeth Guild Bruxelles, Bruylant [2006] 127–158.

Nagy Boldizsár (2007): A menekülő EU polgár. In: Törzsök Erika; Paskó Ildi; Zolnay János (szerk.): Cigánynak lenni Magyarországon. Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány, Budapest, 2007, 53–61. old.

Nagy Boldizsár (2007): A szabadság, a biztonság és a jog érvényesülésének a térsége: a bel- és igazságügyi együttműködés és a harmadik pillér változatai. In: Kende Tamás; Szűcs Tamás; Jeney Petra (szerk.): Európai Közjog és Politika, Complex, Budapest, 2007, 272–286. old.

Nagy Boldizsár (2007): (With the contribution of Júlia Mink) Hungarian national report on the implementation of Council Directive 2004/83/EC of 29 April 2004 on minimum standards for the qualification and status of third country nationals or stateless persons as refugees or as persons who otherwise need international protection and the content of the protection granted. Budapest, 100. old. Report for the European Commission

Nagy Boldizsár (2007): (with Judit Tóth): Hungarian National Report. In: Kees Gronendijk; Roel Fernhout; Dominique van Dam; Ricky Van Oers; Tineke Strik: The family Reunification Directive in the EU Member States, CMR, Nijmegen, 2007

Nagy Boldizsár (2007): Hungarian national report on the implementation of Council Directive 2003/9/EC of 27 January 2003 laying down minimum standards for the reception of asylum seekers Budapest, 46. old. Report for the European Commission

The Refugee Law Reader. Cases, Documents and Materials. (2008) Author and editor with Ekuru Aukot, Bhupinder Chimni, Rosemary Byrne, François Crépepeau, Maryellen Fullerton, Madeline Garlick, Elspeth Guild, Lyra Jakuvleciene, Luis Peral, Jens Vedsted-Hansen. Budapest – Dublin, 5. edition. www.refugeelawreader.org and Budapest, Hungarian Helsinki Committee, [2008] (internet version 10 000 pages) és [2008] (printed summary) 202. p

Nagy Boldizsár (2009): A szabadság, a biztonság és a jog érvényesülésének a térsége az Európai Unióban. In: Kende Tamás, Szűcs Tamás (szerk.): Bevezetés az Európai Unió politikáiba. Complex, Budapest, 2009, 769–829. old.

Хрестоматия по праву беженцев: Решения, документы, материалы (2010) 1-е издание – Будапешт – Дублин – 2008 (2010) Главный Редактор: Розмари Бёрн (Rosemary Byrne) Редакционная Коллегия: Экуру Аукот (Ekuru Aukot) Бупиндер Чимнай (Bhupinder Chimni) Француа Крепо (François Crépeau) Мэриэллен Фуллертон (Maryellen Fullerton) Мэдэлайн Гарлик (Madeline Garlick) Элспет Гилд (Elspeth Guild) Лира Якулевичене (Lyra Jakulevičienė) Болдижар Нодь (Boldizsár Nagy) Луис Перал (Luis Peral) Йенс Ведстед-Хансен (Jens Vedsted-Hansen). Публикация Венгерского Хельсинкского комитета, Будапешт 196 ст.

Nagy, Boldizsár (2011): From the national border to the national eleven A (partial and partisan) appraisal of the state system’s performance since the end of the Cold War in: Crawford, James – Nouwen, Sarah (eds.) *Select Proceedings of the European Society of International Law*, Volume 3, 2010, Hart Publishing, Oxford, 2011 Megjelenés alatt

Nagy Boldizsár (2011): Nyitott határok vagy kivételek? Érvek a szabad vándorlás mellett és a menekültek védelmében. In: Kardos Gábor – Kajtár Gábor (szerk.): *Nemzetközi jog és európai jog: új metszéspontok Ünnepi tanulmányok Valki László 70. születésnapjára*, Saxum, Budapest

The Refugee Law Reader. Cases, Documents and Materials. Author and editor with Ekuru Aukot, Bhupinder Chimni, Rosemary Byrne, François Crépeau, Maryellen Fullerton, Madeline Garlick, Elspeth Guild, Lyra Jakulevičienė, Luis Peral, Jens Vedsted-Hansen. Budapest – New York, 6. edition. www.refugeelawreader.org and Budapest, Hungarian Helsinki Committee

Nagy Boldizsár – Jeney Petra (2011): A szabadság, a biztonság és jog térsége az Európai Unióban. In: Kende Tamás – Szűcs Tamás (szerk.): *Bevezetés az Európai Unió politikáiba*. Budapest, Complex Könyvkiadó, 2011, 637–730. old.