**Revue européenne des migrations
internationales**

vol. 35 - n°1 et 2 | 2019
Asia Pacific Migration

Otherring and Recognition: National Ideologies in Donor-Recipient Encounters in Hungarian Co- Ethnic Philanthropy

*Altérisation et reconnaissance : les idéologies nationales dans les rencontres
donateurs-bénéficiaires en philanthropie co-ethnique hongroise*

*Alterización y reconocimiento: ideologías nacionales en los encuentros entre
donantes y receptores en la filantropía coétnica húngara*

Ildikó Zakariás

Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/remi/13061>

DOI: 10.4000/remi.13061

ISSN: 1777-5418

Publisher

Université de Poitiers

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 October 2019

Number of pages: 215-237

ISBN: 979-10-90426-64-1

ISSN: 0765-0752

Electronic reference

Ildikó Zakariás, "Otherring and Recognition: National Ideologies in Donor-Recipient Encounters in Hungarian Co-Ethnic Philanthropy", *Revue européenne des migrations internationales* [Online], vol. 35 - n°1 et 2 | 2019, Online since 01 January 2021, connection on 16 April 2022. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/remi/13061> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/remi.13061>

Othering and Recognition: National Ideologies in Donor-Recipient Encounters in Hungarian Co-Ethnic Philanthropy

Ildikó Zakariás¹

In the case of Hungary, the working of national ideologies in current contexts of minority – kin-state relations have been described on two major terrains. Firstly, policies of the Hungarian state targeting ethnic Hungarian minorities have been thoroughly analysed, including their effects on minority communities (Kiss, 2015; Pogonyi, 2017). Authors of these texts often adopted the top-down framework proposed by Brubaker (1995) who emphasized the triangular relationality: of ethnic minority elites, of the host states' political actors as well as of the elites of kin-states claiming cultural/ethnic sameness with these minorities. Overlapping with these, migration-related phenomena have also been in the focus of scholarly attention: arrival of refugees and permanent immigrants from Romania and later from Yugoslavia in the 1990s, as well as circular labour migration between Hungary and neighbouring countries became hot topics in the research of co-ethnic relations (Fox, 2007; Pulay, 2007). In the field of policy research, ideas related to nationhood and nationality are understood as the result of reconfigurations of elite-level political arenas during and after the transition; while in the context of migration, notions and categories around the nation are understood as individual and collective reactions to structural constraints and possibilities created by the post-socialist states of the region and the labour market.

Compared to these major streams of research, some recent approaches demonstrate a heightened role of national ideologies in relatively unexplored arenas of co-ethnic interactions. Following Gingrich and Banks (2006) and Holmes (2000) Feischmidt et al. (2014) emphasize a heightened popularity of national ideologies among large segments of the Hungarian population, that is triggered not only by top-level politics, or a minority position, but may be deciphered as a popular reaction to new types of deprivations and perceptions of

¹ Sociologist, Research fellow, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Centre for Social Sciences, Institute for Minority Studies, 1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán u. 4, Hungary; zakarias.ildiko@tk.mta.hu

uncertainties induced by globalisation and transnationalisation. The perception of threatened social status and identities together with the elevated desire for strengthening community ties appear among large segments of the “majority”, “autochthonous” population in Hungary, which bestows national ideologies, identities and belonging to the national community with primary importance. This implies a readiness and receptivity to relate to these ideologies not only in exceptional moments, but in the everyday life as well, through everyday actions and practices, such as consumption, tourism or philanthropy (see also Feischmidt-Pulay, 2016; Ilyés, 2011).

These practices share several common features. 1) Relatively independent from legal institutions and the Hungarian state, they might be described, to some extent, as part of the institutional sphere of the voluntary sector.² 2) They are built upon national mythology emphasizing a national unity of all Hungarians and a heroic national past, and aim to formulate forceful visions of a heroic national future. 3) These ideologies assign certain members and communities of ethnic Hungarian minorities a special role: an elevated national identity and belonging are assumed, which constitute them as authentic (“true”) Hungarians, in comparison with the “ordinary” residents of Hungary. These gradations of national belonging on the level of ideologies offer special positions for ethnic Hungarian minority communities in such activities, programs and organisations. In this paper, I attempt to deepen scholarly reflection on co-ethnic interactions in the context of voluntary activities. Specifically, the institutional context of philanthropy, donating and volunteering and, on the other side, acceptance of donations will be the focus of my analysis.

Philanthropy as an institutional context has its own specificities that distinguish it from other institutions outside and within the third sector. Two types of boundary-making are inherent in these contexts. Firstly, philanthropy may require an ideology³ that implies a certain connection between the helpers and the helped, which prescribes the “worthiness” of the receiver, and often distinguish them from those who are viewed as “less worthy” or “unworthy”. Secondly, philanthropy prescribes dual positions: suffering and needs are emphasised on one side, while capacities and resources are stressed on the other. The binary roles of the helpers and the helped imply that boundaries, hierarchy and power relations are created involving the two sides.

National ideologies and discourses available in Hungary, as well as national discourses in ethnic Hungarian minority communities enable a helping relationship — by making it reasonable and legitimate — between such minority societies and the kin-state. By the use of national categorisation, national ideologies classify people according to their belonging to the national community, and as such create sameness between different categories, groups, communities, societies considered as ethnic Hungarian. Based on common belonging, they also claim responsibility and solidarity toward co-ethnics and the nation as a whole; and describe common values the preservation of which is a common

²These activities have also an important institutional background embedding them into economic mechanisms and the market (Feischmidt, 2014: 8).

³Ideology is understood here in Geertzian terms, as a pre-existing set of interconnected notions and statements, without the connotations of being tools of power and domination (1973).

duty of all members of the nation. However, as we will describe it below, the national imagery has several further layers that assign different characteristics to different groups and communities (within the Hungarian national/ethnic community), providing grounds upon which asymmetric roles of helpers and recipients may be built. These asymmetries and hierarchies have the potential of creating distance between the two positions. In this paper co-ethnic relationships will be examined from this angle, with the aim of answering the following questions. How do co-ethnic relationships unfold in the context of philanthropic institutions built upon national ideologies? What are the categories and identity positions offered in such encounters for different parties? What are the sources of ambiguities and tensions arising in these interactions? How are these tensions handled by the parties involved, and how do they shape narratives of national identification and categorisation?

Mainstream research on minority – kin-state relations has to date dedicated limited attention to philanthropy. While philanthropic activity organised from kin-state towards kin-minority or diaspora communities is almost entirely neglected by social scientists⁴, an emerging field of study labelled as diaspora-philanthropy is focusing on help initiated by diaspora communities and directed towards the country of origin. The majority of this latter research, however, often follows a non-profit management or public policy perspective, and thus focuses on motivations, mechanisms and benefits of diaspora philanthropy; while critical sociological perspectives, adopting an epistemological, social constructionist lens, or engaging in questions of hierarchies, power and exclusions are yet relatively missing from the field (Newland *et al.*, 2010; Flanigan, 2016).

An important exception is provided by the historical sociological work of Lainer-Vos. In his work on Jewish diaspora-homeland relations in the first half of the twentieth century, Lainer-Vos describes these philanthropic initiatives as phenomena uniting national ideologies and the intention of helping (Lainer-Vos, 2014). Gift-giving and philanthropy in his perspective unfold as the terrain of constructing and remaking national categories and sentiments, identities and the national collective. Moreover, he reveals how the reconstruction of the Jewish nation, imagined through its internal differences, is related to donor-recipient asymmetric relationships. The phenomenon at the centre of my attention invites a similar perspective. Building upon recent waves of nationalism research, I depart from the assumption that nationhood and related categories, sentiments and practices are not only elite-driven top-down processes, but everyday accomplishments achieved by ordinary actors in their everyday activities. Circumscribing goals and activities in national terms allows donors and recipients to engage in “doing the nation”, that is to perform national roles and ideas, effectuate national choices, or talk using national categories (Fox and Miller-Idriss, 2008; Brubaker *et al.*, 2006).

At the same time, in the context of philanthropy, I intend to analyse the role of national ideologies and the reproduction of nationhood and national belonging

4 For an exception, see Cramer (2016), on ideological transformations in the mission of Gustav Adolf Association in interwar Germany aiming to help minority German speaking communities in East and Central Europe.

as intimately related to helper-recipient binary positions. As it will be shown, differences, hierarchies and power constitute core phenomena in understanding the working of national categories. The interactionist analytical lens, its concepts and theories enabling us to do so will be summarised in the following chapter.

Discourses, Power and Recognition in Philanthropy and Volunteering

Post-colonial analyses of helping relations oriented from the “first world” towards the “third” emphasize the role of ideologies and discourses behind philanthropic giving. These analyses show how helping relations (in international development, or humanitarian aid), instead of emancipation, contribute to the maintenance of discourses of power and domination (Heron, 2007; Kapoor, 2005). In this perspective domination refers to three major phenomena: 1) “epistemic violence” means the dominance of Western/Northern notions, categories and knowledge hindering the expression and articulation of the knowledge of supported communities from the “South”; 2) Othering refers to negative stereotyping and denigration of the supported communities, or individuals; and 3) domination also means that helping activities and programs serve Western/Northern “interests” of control, instead of “interests” of recipients of support (Spivak, 1988; Hall, 1992). This perspective emphasizes the effects of helping relations to recreate donor-recipient power hierarchies.

Some authors, however, widen the scope of their models and allow for the potential birth of mutual respect and recognition in the act of philanthropic giving. Giving, in their perspective, may also create honour and status not only for the giver, but for the recipient as well. According to them, giving is often coupled with identification with the recipient, assigning “deservingness” and “worthiness” to them, which are acts of recognition, recognition of the value, status, identity of the receiver. Komter as well as Caillé devotes attention to recognition towards recipients of gifts, although none of them develop extensively in this direction. Komter emphasizes the moments of “recognition, acceptance and estimation of the recipient”, which in turn “confirms the self-identity and self-esteem of the recipient” (Komter, 2005: 44). Caillé also invites to investigate giving (voluntary work, among others) with its aspects of “ethical and identity-related ends” (Lazzerri and Caillé, 2006), and to reconceptualise giving as an act of mutual recognition of participants.

These authors, by suggesting the term “recognition” refer to the theoretical frameworks developed by Honneth and Fraser (Honneth, 1992; Fraser and Honneth, 2003). Honneth’s theory considers the conditions of the development of the autonomous subject. Subjectivity in his approach does not preclude communication and intersubjectivity, but instead is constituted in interactions. Recognition is an ideal-typical (mutual) relationship which enables that an individual perceives herself profoundly equal with the other, and distinct from the other, at the same time. Deprivation of this state — named as misrecognition — becomes thus criticised by Honneth as hindering the development of autonomous subjectivity. Besides love and rights, solidarity in this model is conceived of as the third type of recognition, which allows for the recognition of individuals according to their ‘merits’, their contributions to the wellbeing

of the community. This type of recognition differentiates between individuals: according to their performance, assigns symbolic and material resources to them, and important for our paper, prescribes an active helping relationship towards these recognised individuals. Recognition or misrecognition, from this perspective, is also mirrored in the emotional state of the person: the former implies self-respect, while the latter implies shame and humiliation.

Criticising Honneth for its excessive focus on psychological states, Fraser aims to underline the importance of discourses and economic-material preconditions in recognition processes. According to her relational, justice-based approach, every human has the right to participate in interactions equally with others (Fraser, 2001 and 2003). "Participatory parity," according to Fraser, rests on two conditions: first, according to the redistributive condition, material-economic resources are required that enable the individual to act and to have a voice in interactions. Second, according to the recognition condition, just and equal participation assumes that statuses ("institutional patterns of cultural values") allow equal positions for acting and speaking for all participants.

In this paper we aim to analyse our empirical data according to Honneth's model on solidarity complemented with Fraser's principle of participatory parity. 1) In line with Fraser's framework, we depart from the assumption that the discursive background of such encounters deeply affect and confine inequalities of action through recognition processes, that is through unequal statuses offered by these discourses to the participants. Our enquiry thus will address inequalities of freedom of action, and freedom of expressing own perspectives of participants in philanthropic interactions. Asymmetries and inequalities of action and speech will be analysed as embedded into economic and material inequalities, as well as in discourses of worth, merits and deservingness assigned to specific groups and categories. 2) Such inequalities and asymmetries will be identified through the emotional states of the recipients of help, such as self-confidence, pride, or shame, humiliation, frustration and the state of paralysis. We inquire on these emotions from a Honnethian perspective, as carrying primary importance in shaping, confining or broadening possibilities for action and for speech.

The paper first presents main ideologies characteristic in co-ethnic philanthropy in Hungary, as well as the applied methods and empirical data. In the second half of the paper we show how these ideologies may function as the discursive backgrounds for donor-recipient interactions, defining the statuses of different participants that is their conditions for acting and having a voice in philanthropic interactions. However, instead of treating these discursive spaces as fixed and given, in line with our interactionist perspective we also aim to show how participants attempt to use, alter and reshape meanings attached to these ideologies, in order to acquire better positions in these interactions.

Supporting Ethnic Hungarian Minority Communities: Institutionally Embedded Ideologies and Discourses

A characteristic form of philanthropy in Hungary is closely linked to the working of national ideologies, more specifically the imperative of helping ethnic Hungarian minorities of neighbouring countries of Slovakia, Ukraine,

Romania and Serbia. One layer of meanings around this helping imperative is based on the idea of minority societies and their national Hungarian culture being under constant threat. This discourse uses a historically and culturally unified, homogenous concept of the nation that includes Hungarian communities living in neighbouring states, and ignores the diversified history of these minority communities as well as advancing processes of assimilation into the majority society in some of these communities. According to this discourse on cultural threat and the survival of the nation, these Hungarians are characterized by a national authenticity: are actively guarding the most ancient and most valuable elements of the Hungarian culture; and are under the constant pressure of assimilation on the part of the majority society. Based on this discourse, these minority groups need the help of the kin-state (Hungary) and its population in maintaining the Hungarian national culture and resisting assimilation (Kürti, 2002; Feischmidt, 2005).

The alternative of the discourse of national survival of these minority communities is a modernisation discourse. The discourse constructed as a global hierarchical classification system measures positions of regions and societies according to their level of modernisation and civilization (Melegh, 2006). The system has an idealised Western Europe as a reference point, while all other positions are measured according to their distance to this reference along the modernisation axis. This modernisation hierarchy is also projected within the Hungarian nation, creating internal East-West hierarchies: it assumes economic and cultural underdevelopment and lack of civilisation of ethnic Hungarian minority communities residing in “less modernised” countries of Ukraine, Romania, Serbia. If extended to benevolent intentions based upon national solidarity, besides cultural support, the modernisation ideology also implies material support, modernisation and development to be offered to these communities.

The outlined discursive field is in great part produced and maintained by assistance policies of the Hungarian state (Bárdi, 2013; Zombory, 2012). Besides the diversity of their actual form and content, different governments all have agreed around the necessity of such support. The double-layered helping discourse operates in spheres outside the state as well: private individuals and formal or informal voluntary associations are implicated in its use. Large philanthropic organisations, such as the Maltese and the Hungarian Red Cross often have their specific division or programmes directed towards Hungarian minority communities in neighbouring states, and there is a multitude of smaller associations, or informal family, church, workplace communities that organise such support on a civic/voluntary basis.⁵

Methodological Background and Empirical Data

The paper is based on qualitative research conducted on three such philanthropic programs: two voluntary school partnerships initiated by teachers at two

⁵ According to my estimations based on the 2014 official register of civic organisations in Hungary, out of 112,000 civil organisations registered between 1989-2014, the magnitude of those mentioning some support for ethnic Hungarians living in minority position in their official descriptions has been about 1,600 (including the liquidated ones as well) (Zakariás, 2016).

schools (one in Budapest and one in the nearby town of Budaörs), and a child sponsorship network, all three designed to support different ethnic Hungarian or Hungarian-speaking schools, students and teachers in Romania and Ukraine.

The first program is a twin-school partnership, organized between a school in Budaörs, a suburban town of Budapest, and a Hungarian-language school in a small village in Transcarpathia, Ukraine. The program's major aim is to help preserve Hungarian national identities and national solidarities both among students in Transcarpathia and in Hungary. Since it was founded in 2009, the program has mainly consisted of visiting each other once a year. The program also includes material donations on the part of teachers and students, and their families in Budaörs: they offer food and lodging in their homes for students and teachers visiting from Transcarpathia, organize programs and offer gifts to them.

The second program was organised by teachers at a Budapest secondary school, and aims to preserve the use of the Hungarian language where it is in a minority. The first "native language camp" was organised for Transcarpathian children in 1989. After a flood in the region, the Budapest school hosted children in Budapest and the program helped with the reconstruction of schools in these settlements. In the mid-2000s, the program was enlarged to involve ethnic Hungarian children from Slovakia, Serbia and Romania and the native language camps were launched in the Eastern-Romanian region of Moldavia among the Csángó (Ceangai) communities. Offering food and lodging in their homes in Budapest for students from Slovakia, Ukraine, Romania and Serbia, offering donations and volunteer work to partner schools, and supporting the Transcarpathian children from Ukraine who study in Budapest is also part of their activities.

The third program, the "God-parent program" founded in 2007 aims to support Hungarian language education in Csángó villages in Moldavia, Romania, inhabitants of whom are considered by national discourses in Hungary as part of the historical Hungarian nation. The program seeks donations for Hungarian-language education in Moldavian csángó settlements by establishing a long-term quasi-familial relationship between the donor and recipient: the former becomes the symbolic god-parent of a Csángó child, the relationship is maintained through letters, gifts, and trips between Hungary and Moldavia. Less active god-parents may only restrict their activities to paying a certain sum of money to support Hungarian language education; however, god-parents are also expected to pay visits to summer-camps organized for these children in Hungary, or directly in their home villages in Moldavia.

Participant observation of encounters between the helpers and the helped (three one-week-long participant observation during three summer camps in school programs, and three trips with god-parents to Moldovan villages) and around forty semi-structured interviews with active participants (organising teachers in Hungary, Ukraine and Romania, volunteering parents, god-parents and god-children and their parents) were carried out, mainly in the years 2009, 2010 and 2014.

In the empirical analysis in the following chapters, we will show how different layers of discourses on ethnic Hungarian minority communities are

mobilised by charity actors, donors and volunteers, as well as recipients of the support.⁶ Emotional reactions of the latter that is shame vs. self-confidence allow us to empirically capture these encounters as places enabling recognition or misrecognition. It will be shown that while the mobilisation of modernisation discourse dominantly implies misrecognition, the working of national ideologies, depending on the social context of their use, has much more heterogeneous implications.

Misrecognition along the Modernization Discourse

The initiators of such philanthropic actions are middle-class health, education, cultural professionals, entrepreneurs, managers all being able to afford to participate in the program. They have the financial means to offer donations, they have free time to do fund-raising and voluntary work, they have the material means and free time to offer accommodation in their homes, and to travel to great distances to visit the supported communities in their settlements. Encounters between donors and recipients all depend upon such material and time offers of the donors. The majority of the recipients are less wealthy: they are less educated, living in economically depressed rural areas in Romania and Ukraine, the majority of adults working on the secondary labour market, being able to afford large distance travels only as part of labour migration to Western Europe or Ukrainian and Russian industrial areas.

The perception of such economic and educational inequalities between donors and recipients resonate well with discourses of regional or national differences along the East-West slope of modernization and civilization. Apart from the national ideology ubiquitous in formal spaces and places (organisational documents, formal events and interactions), in volunteer-recipient informal encounters, in more informal organizational events and spaces, and at a limited extent in formal organisational documents the modernization discourse gains emphasis. East-West, rural-urban, developed vs. undeveloped, civilized vs. uncivilised dichotomies are projected upon each other, affecting the ways volunteers perceive the recipients of their actions.

6 As highlighted also by the widely cited triangular model of Brubaker (1995) on East-Central European post-socialist societies, support of the kin-state towards national minorities (political, cultural or economic), as well as its counterparts in the voluntary sector is often understood by elite political actors as embedded in a “triadic relational interplay among national minorities, nationalising states, and external national homelands” (Host) state-related actors thus not only may be perceived as assimilationist towards national minority communities residing on their territories (as through the lens of the ideology of national survival), but may also openly express and formulate their policies in nationalizing — assimilationist — terms. Such explicit nationalizing agenda more typical of the sphere of politics and cultural policies do not necessarily connect and translate to everyday spaces of these philanthropic and voluntary programs; in some specific cases, however, such as the Csángó villages of Moldavia, local state actors may heavily interfere on these grounds with the organization of such philanthropic activities (Peti, 2011; Tánczos, 2012; Simon, 2012). Besides antagonism between host-state and kin-state actors, other relations, such as cooperation also may unfold, depending on the regions and countries, and the scale of actors concerned (whether national or local). State and civic support of ethnic Hungarian minorities initiated from Hungary may also be perceived by host state actors as complementing their duties in the educational and social welfare sectors (see for example the case of kin-state support directed to Transcarpathia: Tátrai *et al.*, 2017). The present paper, focusing on recognition processes between donors and recipients should be enlarged in future research to incorporate host-state perspectives and their influence on donor-recipient relations.

Donor behaviour reflecting these Othering regards may remain non-intentional facial and bodily gestures, or maybe explicitly expressed and discussed in the presence of recipients. Bodily hygiene, the living conditions (such as lack of a bathroom, or toilet), or the poverty of the supported families are often part of conversations — usually unintentionally in front of recipients, but sometimes even with them.

“A couple of friends, all god-parents have visited the supported community and their god-children in Moldavia. While discussing the local habits of rare washing with a mocking and sarcastic tone among themselves, one god-parent turned to a fifteen-years-old local boy, also present at the discussion and asked: ‘Mihai, how many times do you have a bath a week?’ No answer followed, just a blushing and embarrassment.”

(Extract from field notes)

Such potential gestures, talks, categorisations imply the emotions of shame and humiliation for those witnessing them, and as such result in an elevated state of distrust and suspicion towards donors and volunteers. In moments of such humiliation, as a result of shame and the feeling of inadequacy the addressees usually are defenseless, remain mute, without any immediate reaction.

“There was a couple who were not so kind. [...] They talked like ‘oh my god, what a poverty’. It happened once, I don’t want to talk about it. They didn’t tell it to me, I just happened to overhear how they talked between themselves.”

(Mother of god-child in a Moldavian village, accommodating god-parents and other voluntary tourists at their house on a regular basis)

The threat of such hierarchical perceptions may undermine interactions of donating and gift-giving aimed at some kind of poverty alleviation. Volunteers often aim to bring or send substantial amounts of gifts and donations to their supported families and communities, such as clothes, food, books, and computers. However, the frequent question *“What do you need that we could bring along?”* is usually turned down by the addressees of such questions, who rather choose to maintain their status in the interaction by refusing the position of the “needy”.

National Ideologies in Organisational and Individual (Donor) Narratives

Organisational ideologies as objectified in public founding documents, statutes, mission statements, and often appearing in formal organizational events and actions all have a focus on national identity, culture and common national belonging. The Hungarian ethnicity of various minority communities, their national authenticity, ethnically framed folkloric culture and traditions, the domination and assimilation pressures on the part of the majority nation-states, as well as conscious struggles against the latter constitute central elements of institutional ideologies of these three programs.⁷ These ideologies

⁷ A detailed description of national narratives in documents and official programs of the two school-partnerships may be found in Zakariás (2014).

are also evoked in personal interactions between donors and recipients. The former perceive the latter in these terms, and search for evidence supporting these assumptions of national authenticity. Performance of folkloric behavior (dressing up in folk-costumes, dancing and singing folk-songs), the use of Hungarian language, or the expression of Hungarian identity through adherence to educational-cultural institutions are all thoroughly observed.

These perceptions are not confined, however, to passive sensitivities of donors and volunteers: they also imply donor practices that evoke or provoke such recipient activities and behaviour. Openly asking the supported students or their families to show their folk-costumes, often by wearing it, asking them to cite Hungarian poems, verses, songs, asking explicitly their national/ethnic identities may all constitute such attempts. The following extract was recited during the opening ceremony, as part of the speech of a main organizer of the Budaörs program:

"When I came into this classroom I asked your [the Transcarpathian guest children'] names. And you know, so many beautiful Hungarian names you have. I've felt real Hungarian among you. Please, do feel yourselves Hungarian, when being with us."

These explicit invitations and expectations to perform roles related to the preservation of the Hungarian identity, culture and community have diverse consequences regarding recognition or misrecognition of recipients of support that we will analyse in the following sections.

National Ideology as Means of Recognition

The "front layer" of philanthropic activities directed towards ethnic Hungarian minorities is crystallized around the notions of Hungarian national culture, belonging and identity. As described in the introduction, the choice of such ideologies may reflect donors' desires for authenticity, belonging and the enhancement of community ties. This layer of meanings, however may also become a tool, for the recipients as well as the donors, to suppress and conceal derogatory meanings linked to the modernization discourse. Instead of material-economic needs and civilization backwardness, national sameness, common national identities and values, national bonds and national community become the cornerstones of framing philanthropic actions. Giving and helping are interpreted as supporting the fight against assimilation, while instead of poverty and material-cultural belatedness, needs of the recipients are understood as needs for support in this cultural fight for the common national culture. Instead of being stigmatized as poor and uncivilized, addressees of support are categorized as even more active, competent and worthy social actors than their co-ethnics who support this heroic struggle from afar, from the safe and sheltering "mother-country".

In all three programs the needs and resources linked to the preservation and fight for the common national identity and values are strongly emphasized by the donors and volunteers. In the twin-school program organized from Budaörs (Hungary) towards a Transcarpathian border-settlement in Ukraine discursive emphasis on aims of experiencing common cultural and national community, and the preservation of national identities enables that meanings around

economic-civilizational difference are almost entirely eliminated from interactions between initiators and addressees of support. In this twin-school program, and partly in the Budapest program recipients are socialized — in private as well as school environments — to know and identify with the roles and meanings assigned to them by these national ideologies. They themselves mobilize such meanings, or, when evoked by donors and volunteers, they respond actively and willingly. In such interactions the preservation of and fight for the Hungarian national culture is understood as merit and worthiness that is honored — recognized — by symbolic as well as material rewards.

The story of the Transcarpathian organizer of the Budapest program illustrates how philanthropic giving may be embedded in such national framing. The teacher accompanied her students to a Hungarian folklore contest to Budapest.

"There was this exhibition [in Budapest], our grandmothers' clothes in contemporary fashion. I have tried some clothes on, they fitted quite well. It suits you, buy it, the [sales] man told me. I said, I can't afford it, [...] How about half of the price, he asked. I said, no, I can't afford it. Thanks for letting me try it on. Later I went back, and tried on another one. In the meantime my students I came with started to chat with the wife of the salesman. [...] And then we started to talk, that I teach in a Hungarian school [in Ukraine], and so on, and she started to pack some things. And then, imagine, she took the robe, folded it, put it in a bag, and handed it over. I said, I just can't buy it. She said, no need for that, it's a gift. My tears started flowing, really, it was so touching. Then I asked if I can give her a kiss, and she hugged me so lovingly. And she said, this is worth for me, you speak Hungarian so perfectly, in Transcarpathia, and she said, I talked to the children, and you are working on the development of the Hungarian culture on such a level, and they know Hungarian folk songs on such a level. [...] I was almost crying. A robe worth a fortune, ok, maybe not for them, but definitely it was for me. And I'm still wearing that robe, and I'm showing off that I got it, because I am Hungarian [laughing]."
(Budapest program, organizer from Transcarpathia, Ukraine)

In this encounter it is sharply revealed how the two ideological layers, one on national solidarity and heroic fight for the common national culture, the other on economic-modernization differences are strongly interwoven in such philanthropic gestures. The idea of heroic fight for national identity, culture and community provide a motivational ground and legitimate framework for donors to exercise their generosity. Expressed material desires of those admired and respected, together with the working of the modernisation discourse that states the poverty of Hungarians in Ukraine offer a way for donors to express their solidarity in concrete actions. Meanwhile, the othering effects of the modernisation discourse are suppressed, and thus the potential denigrating effects of gift-giving and helping are concealed by this very same national ideology.

The ideology of "national worth" of certain ethnic Hungarian minority communities offers a way to eliminate denigrating effects of the modernization discourse behind such philanthropic actions. It requires, however, that the addressees of help understand and identify with this ideology. There are cases when they perceive the evoking of such ideologies as confining them into alien roles and categories, as their objectification and instrumentalization to fulfill visions and desires of the initiators of such actions. Such interpretations may frequently appear in philanthropic encounters, when the recipients are members

of communities in a late phase of assimilation into the majority Romanian, or Ukrainian society.

Misrecognition along National Ideologies

In the analysed programs in the case of Csángós of Moldavia (in the Budapest and God-parent program) and in the case of some Transcarpathian students and teachers, all living in communities of late phases of assimilation, roles related to the ideology of national survival are less familiar. Donor perspectives conceptually setting minority resistance against assimilationist states of Romania and Ukraine fail to understand that these recipients' strategies of social mobility (education, employment) may be closely tied to the host state (Romania, or Ukraine), and to ethnically heterogeneous networks of labour migration, towards Western European or Ukrainian and Russian central regions. The ideology of national survival thus may stay blind towards processes of language-shift, language-change, identity change, as all related to such structural processes, social mobility perspectives and strategies⁸.

Among such circumstances, the goals of supporting minority struggles for Hungarian culture and identity are extremely difficult to translate into actions and interactions. If the logic stating the respectability and deservingness of the potential recipients is intelligible only for the initiators of support, deep suspicion and lack of trust follows on the part of potential recipients, which might hinder the act of accepting the gifts offered to them. Fear of the possible Othering regards (along the modernization slope), as well as of indebtedness both contribute to the distrust and the refusal to participate.⁹

Peter on his first visit to Moldavia requested to have a god-son. At the end of his twenties, after a decade of partying, "living free", without responsibilities, he aimed to start a new, meaningful and responsible period of his life by "doing good", taking part in a philanthropic program.

"Together with the local Hungarian language teacher, they visited a family, where the teacher announced that Tiberiu, one of the boys may become the god-son of Peter. When remaining alone with him after the ritual declaration, Tiberiu's father, in a suspicious and uncomprehending tone, asked Peter point-blank what does he want from them, and why does he engage in such a relationship. Peter remained deeply puzzled by the ambivalent reception of his good will." (Extract from my diary, after an informal interview with Peter)

Even if the relationship is established, ideologies of (national) sameness and worthiness, incomprehensible for the recipients, become an obstacle in philanthropic encounters. Supported children and their families occasionally or never use Hungarian in their everyday lives, and they attend Romanian and Ukrainian language public schools. Thus, they are not acquainted with Hungarian national

⁸ In case of Moldavian Csángó communities see chapters in Peti-Tánczos (2012). In case of Transcarpathia, Ukraine, related to linguistic strategies in the context of education, see Ferenc (2013) and Papp (2014).

⁹ On gift-giving implying recipients' gratitude and indebtedness, and thus resulting in their subordination, and the reproduction of power and status hierarchies, see Bourdieu (1998).

discourses and the associated symbols and narratives, and they lack the knowledge of how to act according to roles prescribed by this ideology.

The initial aims of support and helping become gestures of control that may be labeled as “ethnic scolding”: continuous vigilance on the part of volunteers to promote and often enforce Hungarian language use and identification. Frequent inquiries on the identities and language use, as well as continuous attempts to persuade the recipients about their Hungarianness (Csángó students or some Transcarpathian students in the Budapest program, Csángó god-children and their families in the god-parent program) are typical of these encounters. Explicit calls to speak Hungarian, try on and wear folk costumes, sing archaic folk songs in these cases often evoke embarrassment, shame and frustration in the targeted persons, and place them in a mute and passive position in the interaction.

Reacting to Misrecognition: Exit, Strategic Actions, Resistance

As we have seen, the threat of being Othered by the discourse of the East-West slope of modernization is ubiquitous in the analyzed philanthropic encounters. This discourse may be suppressed and concealed from donor-receiver interactions by and through the use of the national ideology, that admires members of the target communities as heroic defenders of the Hungarian national culture, language and identity. However, in certain situations and communities such ideologies do carry the threat of further withdrawal of recognition. If the logic of giving and receiving and subsequent roles and behaviour are incomprehensible, or contradict identities and positions embraced by recipients, these interactions may lead to serious misrecognition. The pressure to act and identify themselves according to scripts alien to their selves, implies confinement of spaces of action and undermine self-confidence and autonomy by a deep feeling of frustration and humiliation.

A possible reaction on the part of recipients is to avoid such philanthropic encounters with donors or volunteers. This might take the form of refusing participation in the programs when the latter is present — as it is often the case with children hiding from god-parents visiting for a short time. Or may take the form of rejecting participation entirely, or quitting programs after some time. This refusal to participate has important structural consequences: misrecognition implied by discourses on underdevelopment and poverty, or epistemic violence caused by one-sided references to the ideology of national survival may be tolerated only by those children and families, who cannot afford to refuse the material and economic resources available through participation. In this way the poverty of recipients and their communities claimed by the discourse of the East-West modernization slope become empirically confirmed in these encounters, contributing to the reconstruction of such socio-geographic imaginaries. This mechanism partly accounts for the fact that children and schools in rural settlements and small towns are targeted by the analysed programs; and also explains why children from lower socio-economic background (parents working in agriculture, often pursuing labour migration on the secondary labour market of Western-European states) are included in these programs.

However, if the addressees of help aim to benefit from the material and symbolic resources offered (for example if they cannot afford to reject them), they need to stay, and maintain the links with philanthropic actors and volunteers. A major consequence of participating in these programs is to send children to summer camps in Hungary (often to Budapest or to Lake Balaton) that these families could otherwise never afford. These journeys to Hungary, as well as the Hungarian language programs organized in the localities of their residence in Moldavia or Transcarpathia are often perceived by the recipient families as creating or broadening mobility paths for their children. In the words of an organizing teacher from Ukraine in the Budapest program:

"The language teaching part is important for the Moldavian csángós, or kids from assimilated Hungarian Diasporas in Ukraine. For us, instead, it is more important that kids have a learning experience different from that at home, they see Budapest, they see the Balaton. It is a very important starting point for us. Everyone, who achieved something in their lives [in our village], lawyers, musicians, they all participated in these language camps. They came here and saw perspectives, to study design, or to become a priest. Many families in Hungary support them, often for years."

Such benefits may imply accommodating to donors' expectations in the form of strategies: that is participating in the programs intentionally for the sake of benefits, while distancing themselves from the roles prescribed by the helping interactions. When acting strategically, potential recipients attempt to present themselves according to donor and volunteer expectations. In these cases, the "redistribution" component of Fraser's participatory parity model is distorted: the actions and voice of recipients of help are confined by their material needs and their material dependence on donors. In the following extract a god-parent talks to his god-daughter and her neighbor in front of their house in the Moldavian csángó village.

"The woman tells half-ironically that she would enroll herself to the Hungarian language school, if she were given donations of clothes. She seems to be embarrassed at every word she utters in Hungarian, but always concludes by claiming how well she speaks Hungarian. After a time she seems to become aggressive and angry."
(Extract from field notes)

Such strategic actions of fulfilling donor expectations could be observed in some cases along the national ideology, recipients playing the roles of authentic Hungarians, fighting heroically against assimilation. However, such strategic actions were much less frequent along the modernization axis. Roles prescribed by discourses on poverty and underdevelopment have not been initiated by recipients in these programs, on the contrary, the majority of beneficiaries aimed at performing higher positions regarding their "levels of civilization", as well as higher socioeconomic statuses. The East-West slope of modernization, the rural-urban, past-future, poor-wealthy oppositions projected upon each other are not only echoed by these programs, but are ubiquitous in other social spaces as well, deeply sewn into the local lifeworlds of recipients. The constant threatening discourse of underdevelopment present in the everyday lives of beneficiaries hinders that these positions could be distanced from the selves of beneficiaries, and thus hinders that these roles be occupied strategically.

Apart from strategic accommodation to the ideologies of national survival, philanthropic encounters may also become terrains for resistance, that is, places of struggles for recognition. In what follows, we will briefly outline such interpretative strategies that contribute to counterbalance and suppress the threat of misrecognition. Ethnic scolding may thus often result in simply ignoring respective volunteer efforts. In the following extract irony and humour are used as possible tools to refuse such disciplining attempts.

"On the beach at Balaton: a student from Budapest volunteering in the program has scolded a girl from Transcarpathia that she is supposed to only speak Hungarian in the camp. The girl refused to attempt to speak Hungarian, and instead has asked, in a mocking manner, if she can use Ukrainian language at least in writing, with a piece of paper, while conversing with her friend sitting nearby. She asked it in Ukrainian, her friend translated. The two girls from Transcarpathia were laughing, the volunteer guy from Budapest tried to stay serious, with little success."
(Extract from field notes, Budapest program)

In the Budapest Program and even more in the God-parent Program supported children and their parents often openly formulate a critical stance towards the ideology of national survival. Adherence to Ukrainian or Romanian language use, the use of English as a common language with donors and volunteers (as a purposive action), or explanations on the secondary importance of Hungarian language and Hungarian identity are major gestures of this kind. One of my interviewees even before starting the interview, without me asking anything, has put a short claim on the topic (in Hungarian):

"I've told this several times, we will never become Hungarian Hungarians. [...] Because it's not nice, as it is [the Hungarian csángó dialect]"

Me asking: *"Why do you say it's not nice?"*

"Er, we are Romanian, we lived as Romanians, we were born as Romanians, we are Romanians. But this language, if we have this language, the Hungarian csángó language, we may speak it as any other language, can't we? I speak English, I speak French, do I? It is like these, a second language."

Rather than statements on essentialist ethnic or national identities that sociologists often seek for, these claims and declarations may be better understood as speech-acts on the part of potential beneficiaries of assuring a "safe-space" for the interaction: if listeners do not retreat from the discussion, and accept such claims, then the threat of ethnic scolding and misrecognition may be decreased, giving space for an interaction among more autonomous participants.

Another reaction of a smaller proportion of local inhabitants in Moldavia is to (re)interpret philanthropic activities in terms of tourism. For these women who are able to accommodate volunteers and donors in their homes on pay and stay basis, a market-exchange relationship is established. From this perspective volunteers' aims of travelling to Moldavia seem hedonistic and self-directed: visiting interesting places, and being accommodated in nice and comfortable ways. Helping, philanthropic intentions of the visitors become entirely invisible, the market-based service provision offering more advantageous positions than the philanthropic relationship; at the same time national ideologies also become irrelevant.

"They [people from Hungary] come because good people live here. They like to be here, we treat them well, so that they feel comfortable. You have to behave properly to them. Neither to talk too much to them, nor too little. They feel good staying at my place. And they also come to see the beautiful monasteries."
(Erzsike, mother of a god-child, accommodating visitors on a regular basis)

The frequent arrival of god-parents or other visitors from Hungary becomes a source of pride and recognition, while hierarchic relations of support entirely disappear from such interpretations. Also, ambiguities and misunderstandings of ethnic categories and national identifications and categorizations are eliminated through these interpretations.¹⁰

Summary and Discussion

In the present paper, we analyzed co-ethnic interactions initiated from Hungary towards minority communities considered as "ethnic Hungarian" in the institutional context of philanthropy and volunteering. Interpretative processes built upon national ideologies have been the focus of our research. Specifically, we aimed to unearth the relationship between national categorizations embedded into national ideologies and the logic of hierarchies operating at the core of philanthropic projects. With a major emphasis on the interactive character of giving and accepting help and donations we aimed to synthesize the postcolonial discursive critique of philanthropy and volunteering with critical theoretical approaches of recognition. The use of the latter enabled us to understand the working of power through a phenomenological lens with a major focus on the experience of the recipients in philanthropic interactions.

In this comparative study on three voluntary programs aiming to support ethnic Hungarian communities in the regions of Moldavia (Romania) and Transcarpathia (Ukraine), the working of a modernization discourse coupled with national ideologies has been shortly described. Desires for community and belonging select certain sub-categories within the unitary nation that are associated with a heightened "Hungarianness" and enhanced national authenticity. An anti-global, anti-Western, anti-EU orientation of such quest for belonging links national authenticity with traditional and non-modern livelihoods, and thus implies that peripheral, often rural regions attract the attention of potential donors.

The fact that philanthropic connections will be formed with heavily deprived regions stems partly from such romantic longing for authenticity as a lack of modernity. However, as our focus on recognition reveals, it is also tied to the working of hierarchies at the heart of philanthropic relations: only those individuals and communities will risk the potential threats of Othering and denigration, that is misrecognition, who are more deprived of other forms of economic

¹⁰This strategy of accumulating material and symbolic capital presumably affects only a narrow social stratum in these villages: women and families wealthy enough to afford accommodating guests for multiple days. Material-economic position sharply differentiate between families of god-children who may offer food and lodging to god-parents and other visitors related to the Hungarian language teaching program, and those who may host their supporters only for very short visits (see Zakariás, 2016).

and symbolic resources and capital, and whom would accept their subordinate position in return for resources offered by philanthropic programs and actions.

This paper aims to reveal interpretative processes in place that accompany such encounters, characterized by asymmetries of economic resources on one hand, and the double-layered ideological embeddedness, on the other. A previous paper (Zakariás, 2015), focusing mainly on donor perspectives, has shown how the hierarchic structure of philanthropy and its ideological premises produced and reinforced narratives of difference and devaluation either in the framework of “civilizational belatedness” or in some communities, related to national belonging and identity. The desire for community membership and belonging, however, make donors interested in maintaining philanthropic relations which in turn implies continuous efforts on their part to produce narratives of sameness and worthiness capable of incorporating the experience of difference. In this paper I intended to focus on the other side of such interactions. By referring to the theoretical apparatus offered by the post-colonial critique of volunteering and philanthropy, as well as to the theories of recognition elaborated by Axel Honneth and Nancy Fraser my aim has been to provide a critical account of philanthropic interactions built upon multi-layered national ideologies operating in Hungary. Through the experience of restricted voice of recipients, either resulting from dependence on material donations, or from statuses undermined by Othering discourses, I intended to show the working of power and domination. Such a theoretical lens also enabled to reveal mechanisms of emancipation operating in these philanthropic interactions.

Othering and denigrating effects of the modernization discourse may be overwritten in those encounters, where the recipients of philanthropic actions understand and identify with ideologies of national sameness and authenticity. These national ideologies offer a means for the addressees of help to find themselves in admired and “worthy”, “deserving” positions, that is, as receiving recognition. These statuses, while limiting their identification choices, allow recipients to accept material donations without becoming indebted — that is restricted in their future actions. Furthermore, by emphasizing national deeds, the hierarchies of modernization and civilizational belatedness become covered and hidden in donor-recipient interactions. Such meanings, however, are hindered in encounters with members of communities in late phases of assimilation. In these interactions domination and denigrating hierarchies may be built upon the very same national ideologies. A possible act of resistance on the part of the recipients may be to ignore, or openly criticize references and disciplining attempts (labelled as ‘ethnic scolding’ in this paper) along national ideologies; another is the reinterpretation of philanthropic actions in terms of (touristic) exchange, in such a way that encounters become understood as equal relations, and become a source of pride and recognition.

The close-up on recognition processes contributes to revealing not only the implications of national ideologies and discourses at the heart of these philanthropic interactions, but also helps to understand national ideologies (ideas, concepts, emotions) as the outcome of these interactions. Through the case of Jewish diaspora philanthropy Lainer-Vos revealed how internal boundaries within the unified category of the nation are constructed and reconstructed in benevolent actions, thus showing how — apart from similarity and homoge-

neity — the difference is produced while giving and receiving help. Lainer-Vos emphasized the internal boundaries in creating what he called “attachments” between the donor and the receiver, something similar to what we termed as “worthiness” in our philanthropy model.

In the case of philanthropy and volunteering towards minorities regarded as “ethnic Hungarian” this paper too has shown the (re)production of difference — the gradations of national belonging in the national imagery — in the center of philanthropic relations. However, the recognition lens allowed us to complement the model: to understand how such concepts of difference, besides “attachments” and “worthiness” are also related to another aspect of the philanthropic endeavor. Hierarchies, and the idea of needs and absences are paradoxically indispensable in the organization of such relations; and at the same time — through processes of misrecognition — constitute a continuous threat for the philanthropic project. The management of these meanings and interpretations with the aim of reducing the threat of misrecognition are thus crucial in maintaining the actions and programs. Reconstructing, strengthening or altering preexisting concepts of nationhood and national belonging become visible and comprehensible as closely tied to these processes.

Motivations for community and belonging stemming from globalization and transnationalization make large segments of the population in Hungary receptive towards national ideologies, and shift their socializing and benevolent capacities towards certain minority communities considered as “ethnic Hungarian” of high symbolic status in the Hungarian national imagery. However, instead of becoming terrains of performing “banal nationalism” as described by Michael Billig, in a non-reflected and self-explanatory manner, philanthropic initiatives and particularly personal encounters and interactions turn into struggles for recognition, and consequently set in motion ideas, notions and identities related to nationhood and ethnicity. The effect of such recognition struggles on public narratives, ideologies and discourses, their changes, or the lack thereof, has to be further studied.

References

- Bárdi Nándor** (2013) Different Images of the Future of the Hungarian Communities in Neighbouring Countries, 1989-2012, *European Review*, 21, pp. 530-552.
- Bourdieu Pierre** (1998) *Practical Reason: on the Theory of Action*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 153 p.
- Brubaker Rogers** (1995) National Minorities, Nationalizing States, and External National Homelands in the New Europe, *Daedalus*, 124 (2), pp. 107-132.
- Brubaker Rogers, Feischmidt Margit, Fox Jon and Grancea Liana** (2006) *Nationalist Politics and Everyday Ethnicity in a Transylvanian Town*, Princeton University Press, 439 p.
- Cramer Kevin** (2016) Philanthropy, Race, and Religion: The Gustav Adolf Association and National Socialism, in Gergory Witkowski and Arnd Bauerkämper Eds., *German Philanthropy in Transatlantic Perspective*, Cham, Springer, pp. 57-74.

Feischmidt Margit (2005) The localization of Hungarian discourses on authenticity to Transylvania. Introduction. [A magyar nacionalizmus autenticitás diskurzusainak szimbolikus térfoglalása Erdélyben], in Margit Feischmidt Ed., *Deconstructing Transylvania [Erdély-(de)konstrukciók]*, Ethnographic Museum, Budapest, Dep. of Communication and Media Studies University of Pécs, pp. 5-28.

Feischmidt Margit, Glózer Rita, Kasznár Katalin, Ilyés Zoltán and Zakariás Ildikó (2014) *Nationhood in Everyday Life. The popular culture of neonationalism [Nemzet a mindennapokban. Az újnacionalizmus populáris kultúrája]*, Budapest, L'Harmattan, 473 p.

Feischmidt Margit and Pulay Gergely (2016) Rocking the nation': the popular culture of neo-nationalism, *Nations and Nationalism*, 23 (2), pp. 309-326.

Ferenc Viktória (2013) School choice in Subcarpathia: The case of Beregszász (Berehovo), *Minority Studies: Demography, Minority Education, Ethnopolitics*, 15, pp. 161-184.

Flanigan Shawn Theresa (2016) Crowdfunding and Diaspora Philanthropy: An Integration of the Literature and Major Concepts, *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 28 (2), pp. 492-509.

Fox Jon (2007) From national inclusion to economic exclusion. Ethnic Hungarian labour migration to Hungary, *Nations and Nationalism*, 13 (1), pp. 77-96.

Fox Jon and Miller-Idriss Cynthia (2008) Everyday Nationhood, *Ethnicities*, 8 (4), pp. 536-576.

Fraser Nancy and Honneth Axel (2003) *Redistribution or recognition? A philosophical exchange*, London, Verso, 276 p.

Geertz Clifford (1973) Ideology as a Cultural System, in Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, New York, Basic Books, pp. 193-233.

Gingrich Andre and Banks Marcus (2006) *Neo-nationalism in Europe and beyond: perspectives from social anthropology*, New York, Berghahn Books, 303 p.

Hall Stuart and Gieben Bram (1992) *Formations of modernity*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 352 p.

Heron Barbara (2007) *Desire for Development-Whiteness, Gender and the Helping Imperative*, Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 191 p.

Holmes Douglas R. (2000) *Integral Europe: Fast-Capitalism, Multiculturalism, Neofascism*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 280 p.

Honneth Axel (1992) Integrity and Disrespect, Principles of a Conception of Morality Based on the Theory of Recognition, *Political Theory*, 20 (2), pp. 187-201.

Ilyés Zoltán (2011) The Csángós of Moldavia, in Bárdi, Nándor és Fedinec, Csilla és Szarka, László Eds., *Minority Hungarian communities in the twentieth century. East European Monographs*, 774, New York, Boulder, Columbia University Press, 859 p.

Kapoor Ilan (2005) Participatory Development, Complicity and Desire, *Third World Quarterly*, 26 (8), pp. 1203-1220.

Kiss Tamás (2015) Increasing Marginality, Ethnic Parallelism and Asymmetric Accommodation. Social and Political Processes Concerning the Hungarian Community of Transylvania, *Minority Studies*, 18, pp. 33-69.

- Komter Aafke** (2005) *Social Solidarity and the Gift*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 234 p.
- Kürti László** (2002) *The Remote Borderland - Transylvania in the Hungarian Imagination*, New York, State University of New York Press, 259 p.
- Lainer-Vos Dan** (2014) Brothers' keepers: gift giving networks and the organization of Jewish American diaspora nationalism, *Socio-Economic Review*, 12 (3), pp. 463-488.
- Lazzeri Christian and Caillé Alain** (2006) Recognition Today. The Theoretical, Ethical and Political Stakes of the Concept, *Critical Horizons*, 7 (1), pp. 63-100.
- Melegh Attila** (2006) *On the East/West Slope. Globalization, Nationalism, Racism and Discourses on Central and Eastern Europe*, New York, Budapest, CEU Press, 220 p.
- Newland Kathleen, Terrazas Aaron and Munster Roberto** (2010) *Diaspora Philanthropy: Private Giving and Public Policy*, Washington, D. C., Migration Policy Institute, [online]. URL: www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/diasporas-philanthropy.pdf
- Papp Z. Attila** (2014) Selecting a Majority-Language School by Hungarian Minority Students, or From PISA Results to Discourses in the Carpathian Basin, *Minority Studies: Demography, Minority Education, Ethnopolitics*, 17, pp. 89-101.
- Peti Lehel** (2011) "Wearied respondents" The Structure of Saving the Csángós and its Effects on their Identity Building Strategies, in Barszczewska Agnieszka and Lehel Peti Eds., *Integrating Minorities: Traditional Communities and Modernization*, Cluj-Napoca, The Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities - Kriterion, pp. 243-267.
- Peti Lehel and Tanczos Vilmos** (2012) *Language Use, Attitudes, Strategies: linguistic identity and ethnicity in the Moldavian Csángó villages*, Cluj-Napoca, The Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities, 286 p.
- Pogonyi Szabolcs** (2017) *Extra-Territorial Ethnic Politics, Discourses and Identities in Hungary*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 200 p.
- Pulay Gergő** (2006) Ethnicity, citizenship, labour market categorization [Etnicitás, állampolgárság és munkaerőpiaci kategorizáció], *Regio*, 3, pp. 25-42.
- Simon Boglárka** (2012) How do the Csángós "get ahead"? The linguistic strategies of avowal versus identity concealment in a Moldavian community, in Lehel Peti and Vilmos Tanczos Eds., *Language Use, Attitudes, Strategies. Linguistic Identity and Ethnicity in the Moldavian Csángó Villages*, Cluj-Napoca, The Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities, pp. 203-232.
- Spivak Gayatri** (1988) Can the Subaltern Speak?, in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg Eds., *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Urbana, University of Illinois, pp. 271-313.
- Tanczos Vilmos** (2012) Csángó language ideologies, in Lehel Peti and Vilmos Tanczos Eds., *Language Use, Attitudes, Strategies. Linguistic Identity and Ethnicity in the Moldavian Csángó Villages*, Cluj-Napoca, The Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities, pp. 203-232.
- Tátrai Patrik, Eröss Ágnes and Kovály Katalin** (2017) Kin-state politics stirred by a geopolitical conflict: Hungary's growing activity in post-Euromaidan Transcarpathia, Ukraine, *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin*, 66 (3), pp. 203-218.

Zakariás Ildikó (2016) *Solidarity and Power In Voluntary Programs of Hungarian Ethnic Kin Support [Szolidaritás és hatalom a kisebbségi magyarokra irányuló jótekonyságban]*, PhD Dissertation, Budapest, Corvinus University of Budapest.

Zakariás Ildikó (2015) The Production of Solidarity: A Case Study of Voluntary School Programs of Ethnic Kin Support, in Jochen Kleres and Yvonne Albrecht Eds., *Die Ambivalenz der Gefühle: Über die verbindende und widersprüchliche Sozialität von Emotionen*, Wiesbaden, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 145-169.

Zombory Máté (2012) *Maps of Remembrance: Space, belonging and politics of memory in Eastern Europe*, Budapest, L'Harmattan, 312 p.

Ildikó Zakariás

Othering and Recognition: National Ideologies in Donor-Recipient Encounters in Hungarian Co-Ethnic Philanthropy

The paper analyses minority — kin-state relations in the context of philanthropy initiated from Hungary, supporting ethnic Hungarian minority communities abroad. It focuses on the role of national ideologies and their reproduction in philanthropic interactions. Relying upon postcolonial theories of giving and helping, as well as theories of recognition it shows that the working of such national ideologies are intimately tied to donor-recipient binary positions, hierarchies and power relations. By providing the value system behind solidarity, national ideologies may carry the potentials of recognition of recipients. However, such ideologies simultaneously offer asymmetric positions for participants of helping interactions, Othering recipients, and implying their misrecognition. These processes, with a major emphasis on recipient perspectives will be described in the paper, based on qualitative data collected between 2009 and 2014 in three philanthropic programs, promoting Hungarian language education, and supporting Hungarian language teachers, schools and children and their families in Moldavia (Romania) and Transcarpathia (Ukraine).

Altérisation et reconnaissance : les idéologies nationales dans les rencontres donateurs-bénéficiaires en philanthropie co-ethnique hongroise

L'article analyse les relations entre les minorités et leur mère patrie dans le contexte de la philanthropie initiée en Hongrie, visant à soutenir les minorités ethniques hongroises à l'étranger. Il met l'accent sur le rôle des idéologies nationales et leur reproduction dans les interactions philanthropiques. En s'appuyant sur les théories postcoloniales et les théories de la reconnaissance, il montre que le fonctionnement de telles idéologies nationales est intimement lié aux positions binaires, aux hiérarchies et aux relations de pouvoir entre donateurs et bénéficiaires. En fournissant le système de valeurs qui sous-tend la solidarité, les idéologies nationales peuvent porter le potentiel de reconnaissance des bénéficiaires. Cependant, ces idéologies offrent simultanément des positions asymétriques aux participants des interactions d'aide, impliquant leur méconnaissance. Ces processus seront décrits dans cet article, sur la base de données qualitatives recueillies dans trois programmes philanthropiques, visant à promouvoir l'enseignement de la langue hongroise dans les communautés minoritaires hongroises en Roumanie et en Ukraine.

Alterización y reconocimiento: ideologías nacionales en los encuentros entre donantes y receptores en la filantropía coétnica húngara

El artículo analiza las relaciones entre las minorías y su patria en el contexto de la filantropía iniciada en Hungría, destinada a apoyar a las minorías étnicas húngaras en el extranjero. Se centra en el papel de las ideologías nacionales y su reproducción en las interacciones filantrópicas. Basándose en teorías postcoloniales y de reconocimiento, muestra que el funcionamiento de estas ideologías nacionales está íntimamente ligado a posiciones binarias, jerarquías y relaciones de poder entre donantes y beneficiarios. Al proporcionar el sistema de valores que sustenta la solidaridad, las ideologías nacionales pueden aportar el potencial para el reconocimiento de los beneficiarios. Sin embargo, estas ideologías ofrecen simultáneamente posiciones asimétricas a los participantes en las interacciones de ayuda, lo que implica su falta de reconocimiento. Estos procesos se describirán en este artículo, basado en datos cualitativos recogidos en tres programas filantrópicos, destinados a promover la enseñanza de la lengua húngara en las comunidades minoritarias húngaras de Rumania y Ucrania.