

3.
THE POPULATION OF COVASNA AND
HARGHITA COUNTIES.
ASPECTS OF INTERETHNIC CO-EXISTENCE

*Survey conducted by the
RESEARCH CENTER FOR
INTERETHNIC RELATIONS
June-July 2000*

*Financed by the
Open Society Foundation-Romania*

Marius Lazăr

IDENTITY PERCEPTIONS AND INTERETHNIC RELATIONS IN SZEKLERLAND. ELEMENTS FOR A "DECONSTRUCTION" AND A "RECONSTRUCTION"

PROLOGUE: NECESSARY CLARIFICATIONS AND PRECAUTIONS

The data presented below briefly transcribe the results of a sociological survey carried out by the Research Center for Interethnic Relations (RCIR) in the period between June 25 - July 5, 2000 in the counties of Szeklerland (Székelyföld in Hungarian, Secuime in Romanian), as part of a project entitled "The Deconstruction and Reconstruction of an Image: the Population of Covasna and Harghita Counties", financed jointly by the Ethnocultural Diversity Resource Center and the Open Society Foundation¹.

The readers, eager to go over the arid statistics, can - however - have enough reasons to be disappointed. As this is a survey the main objective of which is to assess the interethnic relations in the region with the largest compact Hungarian habitation in Romania, these are far from reinforcing the sensationalist or just piquant imagery that is associated with the counties in Szeklerland - what "everyone knows" and what "goes without saying" about its inhabitants: that here one finds open hostility towards everything that is Romanian, which is manifest beginning with local administration and to the smallest everyday gestures; that if you are just driving through, the shop assistants won't wait on you unless you speak Hungarian; that the Romanians here are "Hungarized" or - from a different perspective - that, though they are "aliens", they display an arrogance as if of the masters, disregarding the locals and their traditions, that - generally speaking - the state of facts causes interethnic tensions to rise to explosive levels, etc.

The common representations - heavily fueled by the media and politics - transform Szeklerland in an exotic and somewhat strange realm, where everything is upside down as compared to the order in the other regions of the country. As is the

¹ The CCRIT team who prepared and co-ordinated the survey in the field, included Irina Culic and Marius Lazăr, sociologists and teachers at the Babe⁹-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, together with research assistants Anca Covrig, Lorand Cziprian, Camil Postelnicu, Cristina Raş and ^atefania Toma.

case when approaching any "terra incognita", there are vigorously stirred fears directed towards and coming from the inhabitants here, like the representations of the Alien; the legends of Szeklerland² are becoming "well-known truths", criteria of the normality to which the concurring interpretations of the events relate, depending on the "minority" or "majority" perspective. "Hic sunt leones" seems to suggest itself to the traveler, journalist or researcher who - "trained" by the stories and rumors that forerun any contact with the region - considers paying a visit here. Therefore, invited to write a few introductory words to the results of the survey, I find myself faced with the delicate nature of the task.

My experience as a sociologist tells me that the most effective cure for the perpetuation of cliches similar to the above-mentioned ones is correct information, from the source - as the RCIR survey had proposed - administered in moderate regular doses. Only here the data that were gathered do not come upon a neutral ground, and so the political passions and pre-formulated opinions impose a previous de-mining of the field.

On the other hand, in the often emotionally inflamed context in which the problems of the region are raised, one notices that the very term "sociological survey" is somewhat inappropriate. It is perhaps useful to clarify that its sphere of competence is strictly scientific. In other words, the present study did not grow out of a wish to magnify a dispute, neither to clarify it: it does not aim at judging or "making justice", but rather at explaining, revealing the more profound resorts that motivate the evolution of the main actors, in the hope that in this way it will contribute to a more precise definition of the issue. Its role is to maintain a permanent distance between analysis and the intrusion of politics, according to a well-known methodological exigence that separates judgments of value from judgments about value.

There have also been "parliamentary investigations" (such as the one carried out by a parliamentary commission in 1991³, or the "visit" initiated by the RSDP members of parliament a few years ago⁴) meant to "uncover" the "mutiny" against the

2 At present, the name of the region refers to only two counties (Covasna and Harghita), which also made the object of our research, but historically speaking it covers a great many settlements of Mureș county also.

3 See *Raportul comisiei parlamentare de audiere a persoanelor care, după 22 decembrie 1989, au fost nevoite să-și părăsească locul de muncă și domiciliul din județele Harghita și Covasna* București, 1991. The conflicts in the area after 1989 are explained here by "the Hungarians' and the Szeklers' wish to return to the status of dominating nationalities in Harghita and Covasna, counties, and which "generated anti-Romanian actions that make the object of the present report" (p.24).

4 Partidul Democrației Sociale din România (Party of Social Democracy in Romania), *Informare privind concluziile delegației parlamentare care a vizitat județele Covasna și Harghita. Propuneri pentru păstrarea identității românilor*, 1997

state permanently planned by the Szeklers - which were in fact expeditions of threat and intimidation, the effect of which only enforced the adverse reaction against any kind of interference from the Center. Despite all promises of a democratic reform in politics and administration, they came to extend beyond the limit of the year 1989 the mentality of the authorities of the previous regime. Basically, treating the two counties in a bizarre manner as if they were an area of occupation (not explicitly, of course: see the implicitly authoritarian symbol of the huge Stalinist monument dedicated to the Romanian soldier in Sfântu Gheorghe), Ceaușescu's state only produced and reproduced, in often not too conscious shapes, an authoritarian ethno-ocratic discourse about its own power, and through this, implicitly, of the illegitimacy of its presence in a territory with "foreign" ethnic dominance. This also revealed once more the limitations of the perspective of nationalist etatism and of the fault that separates the local specificity of the region from the fundamental principles of the state. It must be admitted that here is one of the important sources of maintaining the ethnic tensions that have also affected the evolution of the Romanian democracy since 1989.

THE BANALITY OF COMPARISONS

The responses to the sociological survey of RCIR relate to the banality of the everyday co-existence rather than to the conflicts and "attacks to Romania's integrity", which inhabit the catastrophic imagination of politicians, feeding their so often fiery pleas.

The social and economic characteristics of the population here do not differ very much from those in other regions, even though in certain respects the area appears to be underprivileged. The data in the 1992 Census show that the percentage of urban population (46.9% for the entire region) is under the country average (54.3 in 1992 and 54.9 in 1996) and under the Transylvanian average (57.35%). The low urbanization must undoubtedly be due to the low rate of industrialization, a very important element in the regional homogenization of the country which the old communist regime made full use of, but which was inconsistently applied in Szeklerland as compared to the other counties at a similar level of development. However, the high economic potential of the communes (close to that of Brașov and Sibiu counties, which have the richest villages) and the above-average ratio of human capital development⁵ help balance the situation to a certain extent. Thus, with deficient economic infrastructures and transportation network, the area still has an average rather than low rate of development as compared to the entire country.

Population movement within the counties and to the outside does not show, at

5 High average (Covasna) and average (Harghita), according to the classification of Dumitru Sandu in *Spăžiul social al tranziției*, Iași, Ed. Polirom, 1999, pp.136-137.

first sight, any uncommon characteristics as compared to the general tendencies at country level. A recent analysis of the migratory fluxes in Romania⁶ based on the statistics of the past few years leads to a classification of the counties depending on the rates of departure from and arrival in the county. In this respect, the two departmental units of Szeklerland rank at the level of moderate departures, the percentage of those that settle down here coming from somewhere else placing Harghita among the low immigration counties and Covasna among the average immigration ones⁷. The destinations of those who leave the region, according to the study, are Mure^o County (for most of those who leave Harghita) and Bra^oov County (for people from Covasna)⁸.

The conclusions of the two sociologists are enforced by the data provided in the 1992 Census. Table 1, built on these data, reveals the trend of decrease in the population of the area in general, mostly because of massive migrations of the people from Harghita county towards other counties.

Table 1. Population movement toward and from the counties of Szeklerland, according to the data of the 1992 Census:

County	Moved within the same county	Come from another county	Left for another county	Migratory balance
Covasna	44.140	36.032	34.342	1.690
Harghita	62.539	33.160	62.501	-29.341
Total	106.679	69.192	96.843	-27.651

Thus, almost half (49%) of the people of Covasna that leave for other counties head for Bra^oov county; other important destinations of the migratory flux are Harghita (9.8%), Bucharest (6.4%) and Mure^o County (6.2%). People from Harghita, on the other hand, prefer Mure^o County (24.9% of those migrating outside the county) and then Bra^oov (12.9%) and Covasna (12.3%).

The exchange of migrating population between the two Szeklerland counties takes place in favor of Covasna, which receives 7,668 people from Harghita, as compared to only 3,365 that it sends toward the same neighboring county.

The area that those who immigrate into Szeklerland come from is the Transylvanian proximity of the region, and there is also a rather significant - though not decisive - influx from the neighboring Moldavian counties. Thus, people come to Covasna mostly from Bra^oov County (26.7% of the immigrants), Harghita County (21.3%), Mure^o County (11.1%) and Bacău County (9.3%). To Harghita people come from Mure^o (32.9%), Bacău (13.7%), Covasna (10.1%), Neamț (8.9%) and Bra^oov (7.3%).

6 Traian Rotariu, Elemér Mezei, *Asupra unor aspecte ale migrației interne recente din România*, in "Sociologie românească", new series, no.3, 1999, pp.5-37.

7 *Ibidem*, p.28.

8 *Ibidem*, p.23.

INTERNAL MIGRATION AND 'COLONIZATION'

Despite these banal appearances, the internal migration of the population, at the level of arrivals in and departures from the region, represents a permanent bone of contention. In the discourse of the political representatives of the Hungarians they often invoke a Romanian "colonization" done by Ceausescu's regime with a view to changing the ethnic composition of the area, and warn about its potential resuscitation. On the contrary, the political discourse of the nationalist Romanian parties mentions Romanians "who have been driven away" by the Hungarians after 1989, and ethnic persecutions directed against those who have remained. Both positions are trying to produce empirical arguments, without being able to make them very convincing, outside their obvious political commitments; in this context, the review-type official data that are published can hardly confirm any of the statements.

In the middle there is, on the one hand, the Transylvanian Hungarian population's fear of assimilation into the Romanian majority, frequently displayed in the discourse of the elite, though it does not hold first place in the hierarchy of reasons for the population's concern, while in the case of Szeklers, who live in a region where they are the majority, this is less pressing⁹. As a discursive reason, "assimilation" belongs to the larger theme of preservation of identity, having a defensive-integrating function that ensures the solidarity of the ethnic community by invoking threats (regardless whether they are real or imaginary). Examined for a longer period, the demographic percentage of the Hungarians in the Szekler counties shows a slight tendency of decrease (see the percentages in Table 2), which feeds demographic stress. The perspective of "extinction" seems to the Hungarians an implacable force whose causes are placed, at the level of common perception, not so much in a system of objective demographic determinants (the ageing of the population, the decreasing rate of fertility, the tendency to emigrate, etc.), but rather in a pre-determined project.

Table 2. The percentage of the Hungarian population in Covasna and Harghita at the 1966, 1977 and 1992 censuses:

	Covasna	Harghita
Percentage of Hungarians in the county – 1966	79.40	88.10
Percentage of Hungarians in the county – 1977	77.90	84.50
Percentage of Hungarians in the county – 1992	75.20	84.70

⁹ According to the data in the RCIR archive, the hierarchy of the Szekler's concerns, given a closed list, is: progressive impoverishment, emigration, the Romanian's nationalism, the weakening Hungarian identity, conflicts within the DAHR, assimilation, the breaking out of an interethnic conflict and the weakening religious faith. As one can notice, the economic and social fears dominate those of ethnic nature.

On the other hand, the ethno-demographic distribution in rural/urban profile indicates, maybe despite our expectations, a comparatively more important Romanian presence in the towns than in the villages (25.1% in the towns of Covasna, as compared to 21.08% in the villages of the same county; in Harghita 17.13% in towns, 10.02% in villages); the differences must be accounted for by the areas of recruitment of the newcomers in the process of urbanization. As the table below shows, the urban immigration of the Romanian population takes place in a significantly higher measure on account of those who settle down in the county coming from a different county, compared to the Hungarians, who come to town mostly from within Szeklerland.

Table 3. Origin of population in Szeklerland, by ethnic belonging and rural/urban residence

Sample			Residing in		Total
			Rural	Urban	
Romanians	Mobility: Area of origin	Do not move	67.7%	40.7%	53.5%
		Come from Szeklerland	9.0%	12.4%	10.8%
		Come from outside Szeklerland	23.3%	47.0%	35.8%
	Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hungarians	Mobility: Area of origin	Do not move	64.0%	47.0%	56.2%
		Come from Szeklerland	28.3%	34.7%	31.2%
		Come from outside Szeklerland	7.7%	18.3%	12.6%
	Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The RCIR survey managed to identify the main tendencies of immigration in the localities of the area, related to the two ethnic groups. Thus, in both communities it can be noticed that the dominating tendency is to move from village to town, in the case of both within-area and outside-area migrations, especially of individuals with medium and higher educational level. There is also a significant reverse tendency of migration from the urban to the rural areas, more frequent in the case of Hungarians from Szeklerland, which we must connect to the recent tendency of abandoning towns by those recently urbanized under the effect of the industrial decline, and of returning to their native villages where these people own property.

In the countryside, changes of residence take place as a result of marriages. As expected, many of those who move from one place to another are women who follow their husbands to the latter's native place; this phenomenon involves to the greatest extent local movements of population at the level of Szekler counties.

A specific tendency among Romanians is represented by the immigration into the rural settlements of the region of those qualified in industrial craft (graduates of vocational schools, recruited mostly from Moldavia) and of professional people who have come from other counties than Covasna and Harghita. We should note that those who do not change their residence tend to be less qualified.

In urban areas, immigrations reveals better an ethnically differentiated pattern. Here the immobility of Romanians is associated with lack of qualification (with the exception of an important segment of Moldavians settled in the last few decades, who have little education): more local people tend to have finished middle school and high school, as compared to the newcomers, who are holders of vocational school certificates (a second segment of those who originally come from Moldavia) and university degrees (those who come from other localities in Szeklerland, Transylvania or Walachia).

Consequently, there are two migratory senses at the level of the Romanian population: one from Moldavia, associated with a population that is meant to cover the demand for industrial workforce, and one of the arrivals from Transylvanian, or to a smaller extent, Walachian counties, meant to satisfy the need for qualified workforce.

In the case of Hungarians also immigration to urban areas takes place at two levels. Those with average qualifications are mostly to be found among the local people rather than the non-local ones. The newcomers, however, show two kinds of tendencies: one is given by the "internal" regional recruitments - immigrants born in Covasna and Harghita, who represent most of the middle school certificate holders; the second tendency is of the "external" recruitments of holders of university diplomas coming mostly from Transylvanian counties.

In conclusion, internal migrations indicate differentiated trends: while at the Hungarians migration is predominantly "internal" (at the level of the region represented by the localities in Szeklerland), in the Romanian population the immigrations are "external", the percentage of those who come from outside the area being higher than that of those who come from inside of it:

Table 4. Areas of origin of immigrants in Szeklerland for the main ethnic groups (% of the sample)

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
Mobility: Area of origin	Do not move	53.5%	56.2%	55.7%
	Come from Szeklerland	10.8%	31.2%	27.7%
	Come from outside Szeklerland	35.8%	12.6%	16.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The phenomenon is a constant one, encountered both before and after 1989. The differences between the two periods are felt mostly at the level of the Romanian group, where the entries after 1989 decrease in favor of those that come to Szeklerland from other counties, proportionally fewer than before this year. The educational structure of the area - in correlation with the professional one - which appears at present proportionally distributed between the ethnic groups, reveals however a slight deficit of professional people among the Romanians in the urban area, and a relative overrepresentation of those Romanians who only finished elementary school in the rural areas. This seems to justify, in a close perspective, a policy of providing for the demand for professional people, which is not an easy one to satisfy, by appealing to predominantly internal human resources, as in the case of Hungarians.

Table 5. Education level and residence in the Romanian and Hungarian populations in Szeklerland (% of the sample)

Residing in:	Education	Sample		Total	
		Romanians	Hungarians		
Rural	Education	Elementary school	41.0%	36.4%	37.1%
		Vocational school	25.7%	32.7%	31.6%
		Highschool	24.3%	23.8%	23.9%
		College/University	9.0%	7.2%	7.5%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	
Urban	Education	Elementary school	16.6%	15.3%	15.6%
		Vocational school	25.6%	20.0%	21.1%
		Highschool	35.8%	39.3%	38.7%
		College/University	22.0%	25.3%	24.7%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	

Thus, if the thesis of "colonization" seems to find enough arguments in the presented data, the phenomenon appears to have stopped at present. Indirectly, it has been confirmed, however, by those who - in their politically founded surveys - had been eager to dissimulate it. In a historic introductory excursus, mentioning the "privileges of the Hungarian and Szekler population" of the old Hungarian Autonomous Region, the Parliamentary Report of 1991 approaches the regional policy of the Ceau^oescu regime within an attempt to achieve the post-Stalinist "renationalization" of Szeklerland in the following manner: "The period of according privileges to the Hungarians and Szeklers lasted until the late '60s. After 1970 the central authorities gradually tried to re-balance interethnic relations, a process that was more emphatic after 1980. Thus, they established more schools and classes for Romanian students in Harghita and Covasna Counties; more Romanian teachers were sent to the area; measures were taken for the respect of the state's official lan-

guage and for all the insignia of the Romanian State, etc. There were some exaggerations, such as the establishment of more classes for the Romanian students than the real percentage of the Romanian population would have asked for, and in the same way proportions were disregarded when leaders of companies and administrative units were appointed. These errors of the communist leaders made the Hungarian and Szekler populations wrongly identify the Romanian people with the ex-leaders of the country, and therefore the anti-dictatorial action was mistaken for an anti-Romanian one¹⁰.

Praising such practices¹¹ (even if in a plenary meeting language that admits the fact that "there were some exaggerations" done by the "communist leaders", comrades!) relates in fact not only to a certain centralizing administrative inflexibility, but also to the inability to assess their consequences in the long run. Therefore, the "pacifying" solutions, which bring them back to the present, would seem even stranger¹².

THE LOGIC OF COMPETITION: DEMOGRAPHIC PERCENTAGES AND THE MAJORITY/MINORITY GAME

The element that individualizes the region remains the local ethno-demographic configuration, a reality which is able to defy the data of mental and sentimental geography of the homogeneous nation. Besides explicit self-identification (by declared nationality in the census), the present research revealed other criteria of

-
- 10 *Raportul comisiei parlamentare de audiere a persoanelor care, după 22 decembrie 1989, au fost nevoite să-și părăsească locul de muncă și domiciliul din județele Harghita și Covasna* (Report of the Parliamentary Commission on hearing the people who, after 22 December 1989, were forced to leave their workplace and residence in Harghita and Covasna Counties), București, 1991, pp.23-24.
 - 11 The last years of the Ceaușescu regime imposed a drastic reduction of education in Hungarian, even in the places where the Hungarians were the majority. The data of the contemporary Ministry of Education revealed, at the level of highschool education in Harghita County, a progressive reduction in the percentage of Hungarian students studying in their mother tongue: from 91.5% in the 1984-1985 academic year, they diminished to 83% in 1985-1986, 67.1% in 1986-1987 and 55.5% in 1987-1988. A 36% decrease in just four academic years! At national level, in 1989, 59% of the Hungarian highschool students were studying in Romanian; out of 7,091 Hungarian students, only 527 students were studying in their mother tongue - a few subject matters only!
 - 12 *Informarea privind concluziile delegației parlamentare care a vizitat județele Covasna și Harghita. Propuneri pentru păstrarea identității românilor* (Information about the conclusions reached by the parliamentary delegation that visited Covasna and Harghita Counties. Proposals for the preservation of the Romanians' identity), edited by RSDP in 1997 recommended similar measures to "improve the ethnic situation in Harghita and Covasna Counties; among others, it recommended the adoption of some measures specific of "special areas" or the "stimulation of Romanians who by the nature of their work (the military, the police, education, culture, agriculture, tourism, etc) may want to settle down in these areas". (p.xx).

ethnic identification: through mother tongue (including the use of language in the family), by descendents (relating to the parents' and grandparents' ethnic group), and identification in territorial terms. The two groups appear well-differentiated: the Romanian one is much more homogeneous than one could have predicted given the condition of co-existence with the Hungarians. The ethnic limits - among which homogamy in marriages and the use of mother tongue in the family are the most important indicators - are preserved, even if the declared intercommunity distances are not so significant. Ethnically mixed ancestry (in which at least one parent or grandparent is of a different ethnic belonging from that declared by the subject) is of 15% in the Romanians and 10% in the Hungarians - which are close to the average value for the entire Transylvania (15%). Under these circumstances, it is hard to reveal a process of assimilation of the Romanian minority by the Hungarian majority above a predictable level given by the general tendency in Transylvania, of ethnic homogenization of the mixed population territories to the benefit of the majority. (Here we mean the areas where one of the populations is clearly in the condition of minority, and not the conditions of ethno-demographic parity). The phenomenon could only be characterized more exactly in a temporal sequence of several decades.

On the other hand, with a Hungarian majority of 75.2% of the total population in Covasna and 84.7% in Harghita, the region represented by the two counties imposes a logic adapted to the functioning of majority-minority relations.

What is, however, their general operational framework?

Previous studies carried out by RCIR revealed a strong link between interethnic tension and the ethno-demographic composition of the localities. There is a variation of inter-community perceptions depending on the percentage of the majority and minority respectively in the region. Thus, given the competition between the two ethnic communities spread differently in the territory - as is the case of Romanians and Hungarians in Transylvania - it can be concluded that the declared hostility toward the representatives of the adverse group is smaller in the areas where the two groups co-exist than where the population is perfectly homogeneous.

The explanation consists in the difference between the Other's image perceived through means of mass communication and the image conditioned by direct interaction among members of different ethnic groups in the same community. The images of the Other shaped exclusively by the mass-media or by rumor depend on the emotional charge of the mediatized message. This refers to the representative of the other ethnic group as to an Absolute Alien, whose imagined features distance him from the familiar characteristics of the group of belonging and place him in the threatening posture of potential enemy. Direct contact with individuals of a different ethnic group, on the contrary, reduces the social perceptive distance to the dimensions of a Familiar Alien - ("our Hungarians/ Romanians/ Gypsies", who is more

decent than "the other Hungarians/ Romanians/ Gypsies" in general) - whose characteristics and reactions are easy to control if an adequate behavior pattern is used.

Problem-raising ethnic otherness is defined rather at the level of "imaginary communities" than at that of inter-community relations in the locality, in relation with which individuals have the feeling that they possess enough means to control them. The source of conflict is generally projected outwards, "the real reasons for conflict" being commonly attributed to and "explained by" reference to the "others' group" - whether these latter are competitors or simple intruders: for the preservation of one's status-quo, any exterior intervention is condemned. Individuals show trust in their ability to manage community issues themselves, but they are afraid of external factors. One of the dominating behavioral reflexes in relating to conflict consists in drawing the limit between community and extra-community, and in neutralization through the exclusion of exterior factors or people that can influence or interfere with a potential conflict. In this way, stereotype mechanisms and clichés can act to the benefit of preserving interethnic balance - and then they themselves build a non-conflictual mechanism of communitarian solidarity.

On this basis, mixed communities manage to control tension by establishing tacit norms of conflict avoidance, through which they permanently draw frontiers between them and the others, but also build contact zones. This does not involve a "more tolerant" attitude, but rather a social process of building tolerance as an instrument of exercising control over potential conflict - through which divergence with others - though admitted in theory - does not break out. The recommended conduct is discretion and avoidance of provoking situations, even though feelings - which are almost always dominated by fear - are most often repressed. As an everyday strategy of conflict avoidance this is also the usual form of "harmonizing" relations at community level: implicitly, there is an "embargo" on the topic of ethnic dissensions, a prohibition that condemns stirring discourse. This is a convention that does not exclude kindness, but which suspends clarifying discussions for an indefinite time. Related to the mechanisms of "ingroup" and "outgroup" position, it generates at the same time mechanisms of humanization and ritualization of hostile relations through which the explosive potential of the latter is diminished. (This is the explanation for the paradoxical situation in which though many of the Transylvanians accept that there are conflictual relations between the Romanians and the Hungarians, effective ethnic conflicts hardly exist). The figures in Tables 6 and 7, taken from the database of the *Ethnobarometer* done by RCIR under the patronage of the Ethnocultural Diversity Resource Center¹³ (see infra) are meant to

13 Also see: Research Center for Interethnic Relations, *Ethnobarometer. Interethnic Relations in Romania*, May-June 2000, financed by the United States Agency for International Development, second, revised edition, October 2000.

illustrate the described phenomenon, following - with special reference to Szeklerland - the variations in the perception of the Romanian-Hungarian relations.

Table 6. Which of the following expressions best describes the relations between Romanians and Hungarians in Romania?

Sample	Percentage of Romanians	Regions of the country	Conflict	Co-operation	Mutual ignorance	Other	Cannot assess	Total
Romanian	Majority	The rest	16.5%	42.7%	17%	3%	20.9%	100%
		Szeklerland	14.3%	37.6%	18%	1.5%	28.6%	100%
	Parity	The rest	13.2%	33.8%	19.1%	7.4%	26.5%	100%
		Szeklerland	29.8%	42.6%	12.8%	6.4%	8.5%	100%
	Minority	The rest	5%	65%	15%	-	15%	100%
		Szeklerland	12.3%	56.6%	19.8%	1.9%	9.4%	100%
Hungarian	Majority	The rest	30.5%	23.8%	28.1%	1.6%	16%	100%
		Szeklerland*	50%	50%	-	-	-	100%
	Parity	The rest	43%	17%	23.7%	0.7%	15.6%	100%
	Minority	The rest	45.9%	19.4%	24.1%	0.6%	10%	100%
		Szeklerland	33.0%	23.8%	24.7%	1.3%	17.2%	100%
Total			24.1%	34.9%	20.4%	2.3%	18.3%	100%

*Only four subjects in the box

Table 7. Of the following expressions, which one describes best the Romanian-Hungarian relations in the region where you live?

Sample	Percentage of Romanians	Regions of the country	Conflict	Co-operation	Mutual ignorance	Other	Cannot assess	Total
Romanian	Majority	The rest	6.7%	62%	9.8%	4.3%	17.3%	100%
		Szeklerland	7.5%	54.9%	13.5%	6.8%	17.3%	100%
	Parity	The rest	2.9%	70.6%	11.8%	7.4%	7.4%	100%
		Szeklerland	10.6%	68.1%	14.9%	4.3%	2.1%	100%
	Minority	The rest	-	87.5%	6.3%	-	6.3%	100%
		Szeklerland	10.4%	67.9%	16%	1.9%	3.8%	100%
Hungarian	Majority	The rest	13%	44.9%	32.7%	2%	7.5%	100%
		Szeklerland*	50%	50%	-	-	-	100%
	Parity	The rest	25.9%	32.6%	31.1%	-	10.4%	100%
	Minority	The rest	8.2%	41.2%	40.6%	6.5%	3.5%	100%
		Szeklerland	6.6%	43.6%	22.9%	10.1%	16.7%	100%
Total			10.3%	51.3%	22.7%	4.8%	10.9%	100%

*Only four subjects in the box

On another plane, the percentage of minorities in the locality also contributes to the variety of tension perception. Communities in a situation of parity have the tensest relations, and hostility - whether symbolic or effective - is not rarely expressed openly. The smaller the minority, the more the majority tends to express its tolerance in a relaxed manner, and the readier to compromise the minority is. In

this case, the explanation relates to the mobilizing potential of the communities in the event of open conflict: the closer the ethno-demographic ratio, the higher the capacity of mobilization and the chances of those in minority, as communities have a tendency to polarize, not leaving space for those who are immobile to express themselves (this is what made it possible for the conflict to occur in Târgu Mureş in March 1990, a conflict the effects of which are still felt in the mentality of the inhabitants). At this level, the role of the elite is essential: conflict will, in fact, jeopardize the position of its members, who are most motivated to dispose of the situation on their side¹⁴.

Therefore, the data of our analysis also converge to an explanation of the tensions by means of inter-elite competition. The changes that took place in Szeklerland in 1989 were marked, like in other places, on the one hand by the pressure of the population's eagerness to put right the injustice they had to bear before 1989, their civil pride being linked with their national and local-community pride - just as technical competence in activity within the region, or etatist nationalism outside it represented for the ex-activists of the regime the last resources of legitimacy put at stake in view of preserving their dominating position. Nationalism, therefore, was possible to instrument both by those in offensive positions and by those in defensive ones: for the Szeklers, the oppression of a personal communist dictatorship was easy to express as also national oppression - while the losers of the positions were able to justify their former activity through loyalty to the nation-state, not to the dictator. Some of them, who had left the area, were once again able to feel victimized in their posture of "patriots" removed by force from their high mission, and not in that of ex-activists of the communist regime.

THE LOGIC OF SELF-SITUATION: MAJORITY IN MINORITY, MINORITY IN MAJORITY

Such a paradox is made possible in the conditions of reversed relations of domination between the majority and the minority, which the ethnic configuration of the region imposes.

This is because the question, eventually, remains: Who is the majority and who is the minority here? The reversed ethnic composition, related to its structure at the level of the country, upsets the clichés of ethnic majority-minority relations. In fact,

14 Also see Marius Lazăr, *Transilvănenii la vot. Mize reformatoare și controverse etnice în alegerile generale din 1996* (Transylvanians at the poll. Reforming stakes and ethnic controversy in the general elections of 1996), and István Horváth and Marius Lazăr, "Reinventarea" localului și relațiile interetnice ("Reinvention" of the local and interethnic relations), in Irina Culic, István Horváth, Cristian Stan, *Reflecții asupra diferenței* (Reflections on difference), Cluj, Editura Limes, 1999.

both the Hungarian and the Romanian community show contradictory self-situating feelings and attitudes as related to the national self-definition on the one hand, and the game of interethnic co-existence on the other.

Of course, both the Romanians and the Hungarians build their national identity in terms of the great 19th century discourses on the Nation: national identity appears as an issue that is linked both to the genetic component (ancestors belonging to the same ethnic group) and, more importantly, to a cultural one - mother tongue and commitment to culture and national symbols - and of solidarity through declaring oneself Romanian or Hungarian. However, the differences are significant and they depend on the different percentages attributed to citizenship when defining one's nationality (Romanian for the Romanians, and Hungarian for the Hungarians). Romanians link nationality to the state and to the territory more than the Hungarians, who take into account items of communitarian solidarity: mother tongue, commitment to the Hungarian culture, etc. The Transylvanian Hungarians' definition as a cultural nation answers their need of not separating from the "Hungarians", clearly distinguishing between loyalty to the state and loyalty to the nation, the symbolic co-belonging expressed by culture - even if that is in the shape of a culture of adoption - being the substitute for territorial co-belonging with no chances to acquire (see the data in Table 8)¹⁵.

As representatives of the dominating nation in the state, the Romanians expect to be taken into account and accepted to impose as the majority. Impressed with the etatist-nationalist ideology induced by their identity concept, they display their expectations depending on the mentality prescriptions of the dominating national group. In exchange, they are treated either with condescendence by the Hungarians in the region (they are decent, because they are "our Romanians"), or with suspicion, because they are the local extension of the state surveillance bodies, being also perceived as reproducing at regional level the discourse of the official authority. They are faced, in other words, with the objective situation of a minority.

The Hungarians in Szeklerland, forced to refer to Romania as an exclusively national state, get to represent themselves mostly in the framework of minority identity discourse, accusing any attempt of discrimination and abusive enforcement of the state authority. They suspect the integrational policies of being assimilationist, and transform even potential discrimination in resource for strengthening an ethnocentrist discourse. Moreover, they tend to project the same discourse on the Romanian minority, on whom it refracts magnified, like a threat that affects the very cultural framework of ethnic survival. Under these circumstances, the Romanians

15 cf. Also the data of the RCIR survey of 1997: *Români și maghiari în tranziția postcomunistă. Imagini mentale și realități interetnice în Transilvania* (Romanians and Hungarians in the Post-communist Transition. Mental Images and Interethnic Relations in Transylvania), coordinated by Irina Culic, István Horváth, Marius Lazăr și Nándor László Magyar, Cluj-Napoca, 1998.

experiment on their own skin what the Hungarians in other parts of Transylvania feel when in contact with the ethnocentrism of the Romanian majority, and the Hungarians get to take over - almost without realizing it - the bored deference towards the problems of those in minority.

Table 8. Self-definition of national identity in Romanians and Hungarians: "In your opinion, which are the three most important things for someone to be considered Romanian/Hungarian?"

Definition of national identity	Romanians about Romanians			Hungarians about Hungarians		
	The rest	Szekler-land	Total	The rest	Szekler-land	Total
To be born in Romania/Hungary	56.4%	47.4%	54.3%	3.9%	0.9%	3%
To be a Romanian/Hungarian citizen	37.1%	33.4%	36.2%	9.3%	5.5%	8.2%
To be a native Romanian/Hungarian speaker	41.8%	43.9%	42.3%	80%	88.5%	82.5%
To be baptized in a Romanian/Hungarian church	30.1%	30%	30.1%	26.9%	15.3%	23.5%
To live in Romania/Hungary	18.2%	21.6%	19%	2.5%	2.1%	2.4%
To honor the Romanian/Hungarian national flag	14.8%	24.7%	17.1%	16.9%	18.3%	17.3%
To feel the Romanian/Hungarian culture as your own	23.2%	19.5%	22.3%	41%	53.6%	44.7%
To feel Romanian/Hungarian	40.2%	47.4%	41.8%	62%	68.1%	63.8%
To respect Romanian/Hungarian traditions	22.5%	20.9%	22.2%	26%	18.7%	23.9%
To speak Romanian/Hungarian in the family	14.7%	10.1%	13.7%	24.1%	28.9%	25.5%
Other	0.1%	-	0.1%	1.6%	-	1.1%

Being the majority means facing the others' problems incidentally, without your life depending on it very much. But being minority means bearing this condition every day, with no chances of escape. Therefore, the reactions will always be dis-

proportionate, when it comes to claims and issues raised by the minority: the irritated indifference of the representatives of the majority ("What do these ones want again?") and the hyper-responsiveness in the face of a real or imaginary obstacle.

The majority - minority game becomes in the end a role play that varies depending on the system of reference - and the apparent "schizophrenia" or "identity confusions" - a means of contradictory management of some role conflicts. The minority Romanians tend to state the same things as the minority Hungarians: they assess to a larger extent that the relations between Romanians and Hungarians are worse after 1989 than they were before. Like the Hungarians that live in minority, the minority Romanians believe that when one applies for a job or does business, the members of the majority group are privileged. The members of the majority, however, - whether Romanian or Hungarian - tend to declare that nationality does not matter, that the social order that they represent (and which makes them implicitly responsible as they are the majority) is fair and that in this order they offer equal opportunities for the others to assert themselves. The majority discourse is, in essence, the same; it is assigned to a social role, not to a particular ethnic group.

Role play, double strategy, combined ways of survival and - often - masks. Beyond them remains the banality of co-existence.

RESULTS OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL SURVEY:

'THE POPULATION OF COVASNA AND HARGHITA COUNTIES. ASPECTS OF INTERETHNIC CO-EXISTENCE'

25 June - 5 July 2000

TECHNICAL DATA:

The survey was carried out between 25 June - 5 July 2000.

A sample of 1282 respondents, representative for the Romanian and Hungarian populations of Covasna and Harghita Counties, selected from 40 urban and rural settlements of the counties, ethnically distributed as follows:

- Romanians: 632 (weighted: 145 respondents)
- Hungarians: 650.

Maximum admitted margin of error:

- in the Romanian subsample: +/- 3.97%, $p = 0.05$
- in the Hungarian subsample: +/- 3.92%, $p = 0.05$

For the whole sample: (the size of the weighted sample, through the adjustment of the proportion of Romanian respondents to the Romanian-Hungarian ratio in the two counties: 795 respondents. Maximum admitted margin of error: +/- 3.54%, $p = 0.05$).

Method of sampling: probabilistic, multi-stadial, multi-stratified sampling, with an over-representation of the Romanian population of the area.

The respondents were interviewed in their mother tongue, after they were previously identified ethnically (the interviewer asked: "Please, tell me if anyone in your family declared him/herself Romanian/Hungarian in the 1992 census").

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION

General characteristics of the investigated population:

Structure by residence:

County	Covasna	Harghita
In urban area	52.69	45.67
In rural area	47.31	54.33
Total population	100 %	100 %

Structure by sex:

County	Covasna	Harghita
Male	49.45	50.02
Female	50.55	49.98
Total population	100 %	100 %

The ethno-demographic distribution of the area, by rural/urban profile, according to the data in the 1992 census, is as follows:

County		Ethnic group						Total	
		Others		Romanian		Hungarian			
Covasna	Rural	1652	52.6%	22901	44.5%	84036	50.1%	108589	48.9%
	Urban	1487	47.4%	28512	55.5%	83585	49.9%	113584	51.1%
	Total	3139	100%	51413	100%	167621	100%	222173	100%
Harghita	Rural	2744	68.8%	19165	42.3%	169222	57.8%	191131	55.9%
	Urban	1243	31.2%	26126	57.7%	123446	42.2%	150815	44.1%
	Total	3987	100%	45291	100%	292668	100%	341946	100%

I. ETHNIC IDENTIFIERS:

1. What is the first language you learnt?

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
Language	NR	0.2%	-	0.1%
	Romanian	97.9%	1.4%	49.0%
	Hungarian	1.9%	98.6%	50.9%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

2. Use of mother tongue in the family: "What language do/did you speak with..."

Sample	Your husband?	Your father?	Your mother?	Your grandfather on your mother's side?	Your grandmother on your mother's side?	Your grandfather on your father's side?	Your grandmother on your father's side?	Your grand-mother on your father's side?	Your first child?
Romanians	Romanian	75.1%	96.5%	94.8%	91.6%	92.6%	93.2%	94.6%	71.1%
	Hungarian	2.2%	2.4%	3.8%	4.0%	4.1%	2.9%	3.0%	0.6%
	German	-	-	-	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
	Other	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	-	-	-	-	-
	Equally /Ro-Hu	2.9%	0.6%	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	2.1%
	Equally /Ro-Germ	-	-	-	0.2%	0.2%	-	-	-
	Equally /Ro-others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2%
	Non-applicable	19.7%	0.3%	0.2%	3.3%	2.4%	3.6%	2.1%	25.9%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Romanian	1.4%	0.9%	1.2%	1.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.1%	0.5%
Hungarians	Hungarian	75.9%	96.8%	97.2%	93.0%	94.0%	92.9%	93.7%	72.6%
	German	-	-	-	0.2%	0.2%	-	-	-
	Equally /Ro-Hu	1.7%	0.2%	0.3%	-	-	0.2%	0.2%	0.6%
	Equally /Ro-Germ	0.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Equally /Hu-Germ	0.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Non-applicable	20.7%	2.2%	1.2%	5.3%	4.9%	6.0%	5.1%	26.3%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

3. Ethnic ancestry of the subjects

Sample	Mother's nationality	Father's nationality	Grandfather's nationality on mother's side	Grandmother's nationality on mother's side	Grandfather's nationality on mother's side	Grandmother's nationality on father's side	Partner's nationality
Romanians	Romanian	95.4%	92.1%	91.6%	94.3%	94.5%	71.3%
	Hungarian	5.7%	6.0%	6.7%	4.4%	4.3%	8.4%
	Roma	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
	German	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	-
	Other	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	-
	Non-applicable	0.3%	0.8%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	20.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hungarians	Romanian	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.1%	1.1%	2.2%
	Hungarian	97.8%	97.1%	97.2%	96.1%	97.1%	77.3%
	Roma	-	0.2%	-	-	-	-
	German	-	0.3%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.2%
	Other	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.9%	0.3%	0.5%
	Non-applicable	-	0.5%	0.6%	1.1%	1.2%	19.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

4.1. Self-identification in national or regional terms (Romanian subjects):

	I firstly consider myself...	I secondly consider myself...	I thirdly consider myself...
Romanian	63.8%	27.6%	9.3%
Balkan	0.2%	3.9%	6.1%
East-European	0.3%	2.6%	18.9%
Transylvanian	25.4%	45.7%	13.1%
Oltenian	0.3%	1.1%	-
Moldavian	4.6%	8.7%	3.4%
Walachian	0.6%	2.2%	0.9%
Bucovinan	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%
Dobrudjan	0.5%	0.2%	-
Bihoran	0.3%	-	-
Bucharestian	0.3%	0.8%	0.4%
Banatean	-	0.3%	0.5%
Maramuresan	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
European	2.9%	5.5%	44.7%
Other	0.3%	0.8%	1.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

4.2. Hungarians: "Out of the following, which is most characteristic of you?" (only Hungarian subjects)

	No. subjects	Col. %
Hungarian from Romania	71	11.0%
Transylvanian Hungarian	230	35.5%
Hungarian of Romanian citizenship	111	17.2%
Szekler	185	28.6%
Other	50	7.7%
Total	650	100.0%

5. Plurilingualism: Extent to which languages spoken in Transylvania are used

Sample		How well do you speak Romanian?	How well do you speak Hungarian?	How well do you speak German?	How well do you speak Romani?
Romanians	It is my mother tongue	97.2%	2.7%	0.3%	-
	I speak it perfectly, though it is not my mother tongue	1.7%	9.7%	0.3%	-
	I speak it very well, but with an accent	0.9%	5.7%	0.7%	-
	I can make myself understood in most situations	0.2%	8.6%	1.2%	0.8%
	In some situations I can make myself understood, but with difficulty	-	17.0%	2.8%	1.0%
	I only know a few words	-	27.2%	16.1%	3.5%
	I do not know any words	-	28.8%	78.1%	93.8%
	NA	-	0.2%	0.9%	0.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		1.9%	98.1%	-	-
Hungarians	It is my mother tongue	12.7%	1.1%	0.2%	-
	I speak it perfectly, though it is not my mother tongue	22.7%	0.3%	1.2%	-
	I speak it very well, but with an accent	29.8%	0.2%	2.2%	-
	I can make myself understood in most situations	21.0%	0.2%	6.5%	0.3%
	In some situations I can make myself understood, but with difficulty	9.1%	-	28.9%	5.7%
	I only know a few words	2.8%	0.2%	60.6%	93.0%
	I do not know any words	0.2%	-	0.9%	0.9%
	NA	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Total				

6. Only for Romanians: How did you learn Hungarian?

		No. subjects	Col. %
How did you learn Hungarian?	From my Hungarian friends	84	47.7%
	At kindergarten or at school	19	10.8%
	From a relative that spoke Hungarian or was Hungarian	56	31.8%
	I took private lessons from a Hungarian	1	0.6%
	In another way	16	9.1%
Total		177	100.0%

II. INTERNAL MIGRATION OF THE POPULATION

1. Romanian and Hungarian immobile and migrating people

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
How long have you lived here?	I was born here.	55.3%	62.3%	58.9%
	I was not born here.	44.7%	37.7%	41.1%
Total		100 %	100%	100%

2. Periods of immigration in the area

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
How long have you lived here?	1913-1939	1.1%	4.4%	2.6%
	1940-1944	-	4.8%	2.2%
	1945-1949	1.1%	2.8%	1.9%
	1950-1954	2.5%	4.4%	3.4%
	1955-1959	3.9%	6.3%	5.1%
	1960-1964	5.0%	7.5%	6.2%
	1965-1969	10.6%	6.0%	8.4%
	1970-1974	12.1%	13.1%	12.5%
	1975-1979	13.5%	13.5%	13.5%
	1980-1984	16.0%	10.7%	13.5%
	1985-1989	13.8%	9.1%	11.6%
	1990-1994	11.0%	6.7%	9.0%
1995-2000	9.6%	10.7%	10.1%	
Total		100%	100%	100%

3. Territorial mobility. Departure areas

	Sample		Total
	Romanians	Hungarians	
Immobile/Undeclared	53.6%	56.2%	54.9%
The same county	10.1%	28.8%	19.6%
County in Szeklerland	0.6%	2.5%	1.6%
Neighboring Transylvanian county	8.4%	4.0%	6.2%
Neighboring Moldavian county	7.8%	1.1%	4.4%
Other Transylvanian county	6.0%	5.7%	5.9%
Other Moldavian county	6.6%	-	3.3%
Walachian county	6.8%	1.2%	4.0%
Hungary	-	0.6%	0.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%

4. Direction of migrations within the county, by the rural/urban criterion

Sample			Residence in:		Total
			Rural	Urban	
Romanians	First residence:	Rural	263	115	378
		Urban	37	217	254
	Total		300	332	632
			47.5%	52.5%	100.0%
Hungarians	First residence:	Rural	294	105	399
		Urban	56	185	241
	Total		350	290	640
			54.7%	45.3%	100.0%

NB: "First residence" refers to migrants' residence of origin, before all the movements that led to their present residence.

5. Direction of immigrations, depending on level of education and departure area

Sample	Residence	Education:	Area of departure					Total
			Immobile	Szeklerland	Transylvania	Moldavia	Walachia	
Romanians	Rural	Elementary school	47.3%	44.4%	23.3%	17.2%	27.3%	41.0%
		Vocational school	22.7%	25.9%	26.7%	41.4%	36.4%	25.7%
		High school	24.6%	25.9%	26.7%	24.1%	9.1%	24.3%
		College/University	5.4%	3.7%	23.3%	17.2%	27.3%	9.0%
		Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Urban	Elementary school	20.7%	24.4%	31.1%	35.5%	18.2%	25.6%
		Vocational school	45.9%	41.5%	26.2%	19.4%	36.4%	35.8%
		High school	12.6%	29.3%	31.1%	22.6%	33.3%	22.0%
		College/University	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Total	37.9%	31.6%	33.3%	75.0%	33.3%	36.3%
Hungarians	Rural	Vocational school	33.9%	29.6%	38.9%	-	66.7%	32.9%
		High school	23.2%	26.5%	16.7%	25.0%	-	23.6%
		College/University	4.9%	12.2%	11.1%	-	-	7.2%
		Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Elementary school	9.5%	26.7%	9.1%	-	-	15.2%
	Urban	Vocational school	21.9%	22.8%	9.1%	33.3%	-	20.0%
		High school	47.4%	30.7%	27.3%	66.7%	60.0%	39.0%
		College/University	21.2%	19.8%	54.5%	-	40.0%	25.9%
		Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Elementary school	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

6. Existence of a second residence

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
Do you have another residence beside this one?	Yes	8.7%	7.1%	7.9%
	No	91.3%	92.9%	92.1%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

7. Employment

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
Are you employed at present?	Yes	41.3%	41.3%	41.3%
	No	58.7%	58.8%	58.7%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

8. Declared frequency of trips to Hungary for work: How often have you worked in Hungary in the last ten years...?

	Sample			
	Romanians		Hungarians	
	Subject	Spouse	Subject	Spouse
Never	81.8%	83.5%	57.9%	59.1%
Once	1.7%	1.1%	8.3%	2.8%
Two or three times	1.4%	0.9%	4.7%	2.8%
Under ten times	0.8%	0.2%	1.1%	1.2%
Over ten times	0.3%	-	0.9%	0.6%
No answer	13.9%	14.2%	27.0%	33.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

9. Support network for finding employment in Hungary: Who helped you obtain your first job?

	Sample			
	Romanians		Hungarians	
	The subject	The spouse	The subject	The spouse
Relative or friend in the country	62.1%	50.0%	47.6%	53.7%
Relative or friend in Hungary	13.8%	21.4%	24.2%	20.7%
Firm in Hungary	3.4%	7.1%	8.5%	7.8%
Somebody else	20.7%	21.4%	19.8%	17.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

III. INTERCOMMUNITY RELATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

A. Possession and trade with land

1. Do you own land?

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
Do you own land?	Yes	53.5%	39.4%	46.4%
	No	46.5%	60.6%	53.6%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

2. Trade with land

	Sample			
	Romanians		Hungarians	
	Have you bought land in the last ten years?	Have you sold land in the last ten years?	Have you bought land in the last ten years?	Have you sold land in the last ten years?
NA	-	-	2.3%	2.3%
Yes, from/to a Romanian	8.6%	4.5%	1.6%	0.7%
No	88.5%	95.0%	80.1%	89.6%
Yes, from/to a Hungarian	2.9%	0.5%	15.9%	7.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

B. Comparisons: "In your opinion, out of Romanians and Hungarians.... "

Sample	Who works harder?	Who has better ideas and solutions?	Who manages things better?	Who earns more?	Who is a better workmate?
Romanians	23.0%	25.5%	20.0%	13.0%	25.0%
Hungarians	9.0%	8.1%	21.7%	23.4%	7.6%
The same	54.5%	46.2%	43.5%	46.8%	56.8%
DK/NA	13.5%	20.3%	14.8%	16.8%	10.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Romanians	0.4%	1.1%	13.1%	21.6%	2.0%
Hungarians	40.9%	43.4%	33.9%	16.3%	38.6%
The same	46.4%	35.0%	34.6%	37.8%	46.8%
DK/NA	12.2%	20.5%	18.4%	24.3%	12.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

C. Opinions on marriage

1. "When getting married, how much does the partner's ...matter?"

Sample		Fortune	Nationality	Physical appearance	Family background	Occupation
Romanians	Very much	15.1%	13.9%	21.1%	23.8%	28.5%
	A lot	18.1%	14.9%	32.5%	33.8%	35.0%
	Little	20.8%	20.9%	27.5%	19.0%	17.6%
	Very little	43.1%	47.9%	16.7%	20.9%	15.8%
	DK/NA	3.0%	2.4%	2.2%	2.5%	3.0%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Hungarians	Very much	10.8%	46.0%	29.7%	29.2%	42.0%
	A lot	24.1%	20.3%	35.3%	33.8%	34.4%
	Little	24.7%	11.8%	19.4%	19.2%	12.8%
	Very little	38.8%	20.7%	11.8%	16.4%	9.0%
	DK/NA	1.7%	1.2%	3.8%	1.3%	1.8%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2. "To what extent do the following matter when choosing your sponsor/best man for your wedding?"

Sample		He should be respected by people	He should be rich	He should be bride or groom's relative	He should be the same religion	He should belong to the same ethnic group
Romanians	Very much	41.8%	24.1%	12.9%	37.8%	27.3%
	A lot	36.6%	24.8%	17.9%	19.4%	15.5%
	Little	10.6%	26.4%	28.7%	14.6%	19.7%
	Very little	8.7%	22.5%	38.1%	25.9%	34.7%
	DK/NA	2.4%	2.2%	2.4%	2.4%	2.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hungarians	Very much	50.1%	7.4%	20.7%	27.5%	56.0%
	A lot	30.3%	8.1%	13.0%	15.9%	16.9%
	Little	7.6%	28.2%	18.0%	13.1%	7.1%
	Very little	6.5%	52.3%	44.5%	40.3%	16.8%
	DK/NA	5.6%	4.0%	3.7%	3.2%	3.2%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

3. Gifts at the wedding - mean value in ROL

	Residence in		Romanians	Hungarians	Total
How much money did you give to the newly wed couple when you went to the last wedding party?	Rural	Average	900 160	630 954	630 954
		Maximum	20 000 000	10 000 000	10 000 000
	Urban	Average	970 191	659 825	659 825
		Maximum	6 000 000	5 000 000	5 000 000
	Total	Average	933 930	643 728	643 728
		Maximum	20 000 000	10 000 000	10 000 000

4. Spending festivals

Sample		I spend Christmas with my family	I celebrate my birthday with friends	At Christmas I also invite friends	The friends I invite to my home are:
Romanians	Always	70.0%	20.0%	14.8%	29.6%
	Often	17.4%	19.0%	20.2%	57.8%
	Sometimes	10.6%	40.5%	42.4%	8.6%
	Never	1.4%	19.2%	21.1%	1.9%
	DK/NA	0.5%	1.3%	1.4%	2.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hungarians	Always	88.5%	19.2%	7.6%	67.7%
	Often	6.0%	17.1%	8.8%	19.4%
	Sometimes	4.8%	34.0%	30.3%	7.0%
	Never	0.6%	29.3%	53.2%	3.0%
	DK/NA	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	2.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

M. DISTANCES BETWEEN ETHNIC GROUPS

1. Who do you like more

Sample		A Romanian and a Hungarian	A Roma and a Hungarian	A German and a Romanian	A Hungarian and a German	A Romanian and a Roma	A German and a Roma
Romanians	DK/NA	3.0%	3.4%	3.8%	6.4%	1.6%	3.9%
	Romanian	73.8%	-	79.6%	-	91.1%	-
	Hungarian	4.6%	84.7%	-	55.1%	-	-
	Roma	-	3.4%	-	-	1.0%	4.5%
	German	0.2%	-	5.6%	25.4%	-	83.8%
	Neither	-	0.8%	-	0.3%	-	0.8%
	Indifferent	18.4%	7.7%	11.0%	12.7%	6.4%	7.0%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hungarians	DK/NA	1.8%	1.1%	2.4%	1.3%	4.2%	2.6%
	Romanian	1.5%	-	39.5%	-	84.8%	-
	Hungarian	88.9%	95.2%	-	88.1%	-3%	-
	Roma	-	0.6%	-	-	6.6%	4.9%
	German	-	-	51.8%	4.8%	-	88.4%
	Neither	-	-	0.2%	-	0.3%	0.2%
	Indifferent	7.8%	3.0%	6.1%	5.8%	3.7%	3.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

2. "Please indicate the statements that you agree with as concerns Romanians and Hungarians in Romania"

Sample		I wouldn't accept Hungarians/Romanians in the country	I would accept Hu/Ro in the country, but not in the county I live	I would accept Hu/Ro in the county, but not in my town	I would accept Hu/Ro to live where they want (in this country)
Romanians	I do not agree	85.4%	82.8%	82.1%	13.4%
	I agree	6.8%	6.8%	7.3%	78.8%
	NA	7.8%	10.4%	10.6%	7.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hungarians	I do not agree	93.7%	88.5%	91.0%	21.4%
	I agree	5.5%	10.7%	8.2%	77.9%
	NA	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

3. "Please indicate the statements that you agree with as concerns Romanians and Germans in Romania"

Sample		I wouldn't accept Germans in the country	I would accept Germans in the country, but not in the county I live	I would accept Germans in the county, but not in the town I live	I would accept Germans to live where they want (in this country)
Romanians	I do not agree	88.1%	85.1%	85.1%	11.6%
	I agree	5.9%	6.3%	5.9%	82.0%
	NA	6.0%	8.5%	9.0%	6.5%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hungarians	I do not agree	96.8%	94.6%	91.5%	11.8%
	I agree	2.6%	4.8%	7.9%	87.5%
	NA	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

4. "Please indicate the statements that you agree with as concerns Romanians and Roma in Romania"

Sample		I wouldn't accept the Roma in the country	I would accept the Roma in the country, but not in the county I live	I would accept the Roma in the county, but not in the town I live	I would accept the Roma to live where they want (in this country)
Romanians	I do not agree	54.9%	70.6%	68.2%	47.0%
	I agree	31.2%	12.8%	15.2%	47.2%
	NA	13.9%	16.6%	16.6%	5.9%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hungarians	I do not agree	74.6%	86.0%	82.9%	46.6%
	I agree	24.8%	13.4%	16.5%	52.7%
	NA	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

5. "Please indicate the statements that you agree with as concerns Romanians and Jews in Romania"

Sample		I wouldn't accept the Jews in the country	I would accept the Jews in the country, but not in the county I live	I would accept the Jews in the county, but not in the town I live	I would accept the Jews to live where they want (in this country)
Romanians	I do not agree	80.9%	82.9%	83.5%	18.8%
	I agree	10.3%	6.3%	5.7%	74.1%
	NA	8.9%	10.8%	10.8%	7.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Hungarians	I do not agree	90.4%	92.9%	90.1%	20.3%
	I agree	8.8%	6.4%	9.1%	78.9%
	NA	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

V. PERCEPTION OF DISCRIMINATION

1. "Before 1989 did you ever have trouble because of any of the following reasons?"

Sample		Religious belief	Age	The region where you were born	Political convictions	National-ethnic belonging	Material situation of the family
Romanians	Often	3.2%	0.6%	0.6%	3.2%	2.4%	4.0%
	Seldom	5.2%	4.0%	5.1%	5.1%	4.1%	7.6%
	Never	88.9%	93.0%	92.1%	89.1%	91.6%	85.9%
	DK/NA	2.7%	2.4%	2.2%	2.7%	1.9%	2.5%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Hungarians	Often	4.0%	0.5%	0.9%	2.8%	5.1%	2.3%
	Seldom	5.0%	2.5%	3.6%	7.7%	12.0%	4.3%
	Never	90.4%	96.3%	95.2%	88.8%	82.3%	92.8%
	DK/NA	0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2. "And after 1990?"

Sample		Religious belief	Age	The region where you were born	Political convictions	National-ethnic belonging	Material situation of the family
Romanians	Often	2.2%	0.8%	1.9%	1.7%	3.0%	6.5%
	Seldom	2.2%	3.2%	4.9%	6.6%	8.5%	10.1%
	Never	94.1%	94.5%	91.8%	89.6%	86.7%	81.5%
	DK/NA	1.4%	1.6%	1.4%	2.1%	1.7%	1.9%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Hungarians	Often	0.2%	0.6%	0.6%	1.1%	2.0%	1.3%
	Seldom	1.2%	1.7%	1.9%	2.1%	6.7%	4.3%
	Never	97.7%	96.6%	96.4%	95.4%	90.0%	92.7%
	DK/NA	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	1.4%	1.2%	1.7%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

VI. ROMANIANS IN MINORITY

1. "You live in a county which is mostly inhabited by Hungarians. Have you ever had any trouble because you are Romanian?" (Romanian subjects)

	At work?	At the doctor's?	At Hungarian festivals?	In a public place?	While seeing to daily issues?	Shopping?
Often	4.7%	2.4%	4.3%	4.0%	1.9%	4.9%
Seldom	13.1%	8.9%	7.6%	13.4%	10.8%	17.1%
Never	79.3%	88.0%	87.5%	81.6%	86.6%	77.4%
DK/NA	2.8%	0.8%	0.6%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2. "If you live in a region where the majority are Hungarians..." (Romanian subjects)

	I totally agree	I partly agree	I partly disagree	I totally disagree	DK/NA	Total
Life is more difficult.	5.5%	12.3%	15.3%	63.8%	3.0%	100%
I am proud that I am one of the Romanians here.	61.4%	18.0%	7.6%	8.1%	4.9%	100%
The fact that my county is mostly inhabited by Hungarians does not matter to me.	43.7%	16.0%	11.6%	19.6%	9.2%	100%
Romanians here have learnt from the Hungarians to organize their work better.	15.2%	18.2%	17.4%	40.8%	8.4%	100%
Only the Romanians who live here know the Hungarians well enough.	22.6%	15.2%	13.1%	36.1%	13.0%	100%
I feel isolated from the rest of the Romanians.	13.9%	17.9%	10.6%	45.3%	12.3%	100%
It is an advantage for me to live in this region.	19.8%	17.1%	21.4%	29.6%	12.2%	100%

VII. WAY OF LIFE

1. Average monthly income, in ROL

Sample			Residing in:		Total
			Rural	Urban	
Romanians	Net monthly income	Average	842 924	1165 626	1 010 866
		Standard deviation	1 033 922	1 080 041	1 069 479
Hungarians	Net monthly income	Average	1 076 639	1 292 313	1176 265
		Standard deviation	1 154 039	1 640 955	1 402 982

2. Unemployment in the last year

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
Have you been out of work in the last year?	Yes	13.0%	26.1%	19.6%
	No	87.0%	73.9%	80.4%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

3. Educational level:

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
Schooling:	No education	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%
	Elementary school	8.4%	9.1%	8.7%
	Finished middle school	19.1%	17.2%	18.2%
	Finished vocational school	25.6%	26.9%	26.3%
	Finished high school	30.4%	30.8%	30.6%
	Finished college	7.4%	8.9%	8.2%
	Finished university or post-graduate course	8.4%	6.6%	7.5%
	Total		100.0%	100.0%

4. Household appliances

	Sample					
	Romanians			Hungarians		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Telephone	47.9%	52.1%	100.0%	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
Mobile phone	16.5%	83.5%	100.0%	17.8%	82.2%	100.0%
CD-player	10.5%	89.5%	100.0%	17.0%	83.0%	100.0%
Hi-fi	20.1%	79.9%	100.0%	16.1%	83.9%	100.0%
Computer	10.0%	90.0%	100.0%	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
Access to the Internet	1.9%	98.1%	100.0%	2.6%	97.4%	100.0%
Video	17.3%	82.7%	100.0%	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
Dishwasher	1.3%	98.7%	100.0%	3.9%	96.1%	100.0%
Washing machine	32.4%	67.6%	100.0%	44.1%	55.9%	100.0%
Deep freezer	49.4%	50.6%	100.0%	50.6%	49.4%	100.0%
Microwave oven	5.2%	94.8%	100.0%	12.6%	87.4%	100.0%
Color TV	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%	79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
Automobile	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	43.0%	57.0%	100.0%
Cottage in the country	5.0%	95.0%	100.0%	7.9%	92.1%	100.0%

5. In the last 12 months, have you ever run out of money for...

	Sample							
	Romanians				Hungarians			
	Yes	No	NA	Total	Yes	No	NA	Total
Food	57.1%	40.6%	2.4%	100%	31.4%	67.4%	1.2%	100%
Apartment maintenance	58.5%	39.5%	2.1%	100%	28.8%	70.4%	0.9%	100%

6. Religion

		Sample		Total
		Romanians	Hungarians	
How often do you go to church?	Several times a week	3.6%	3.6%	3.6%
	Once a week	18.7%	23.1%	20.9%
	Two or three times a month	12.2%	14.9%	13.6%
	Once a month	17.1%	13.5%	15.3%
	Two or three times a year	26.6%	24.6%	25.6%
	Once a year at most	16.8%	14.9%	15.8%
	Never	4.4%	4.2%	4.3%
	NA	0.6%	1.1%	0.9%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

7. "People spend their free time in different ways. In the last three months, how often have you...?"
(Romanian subjects)

	Almost every day	Two or three times a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once a month	Once or twice	Never	Total
Been out of town	6.2%	5.1%	12.9%	12.7%	13.8%	21.9%	27.5%	100.0%
Visited friends	13.0%	15.3%	18.3%	15.9%	12.7%	11.9%	12.9%	100.0%
Been to the restaurant or the disco	1.9%	3.0%	9.1%	5.9%	9.2%	10.5%	60.4%	100.0%
Watched TV	75.0%	10.0%	4.9%	1.6%	1.9%	0.6%	5.9%	100.0%
Chatted with friends or neighbors	58.6%	18.0%	10.4%	4.9%	2.7%	2.9%	2.5%	100.0%
Been to shows or concerts	0.6%	1.1%	1.6%	2.9%	5.6%	17.2%	70.9%	100.0%
Done gardening or DIY	40.9%	9.9%	8.3%	5.3%	3.4%	4.2%	28.0%	100.0%
Been to the gym	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	2.1%	92.8%	100.0%
Listened to music	40.4%	13.7%	10.2%	3.8%	3.2%	3.7%	25.1%	100.0%
Done sports for your pleasure	4.0%	3.0%	5.3%	2.7%	3.2%	3.7%	78.1%	100.0%
Had a nap or rest (outside sleeping hours)	4.14%	13.6%	15.0%	5.3%	3.0%	2.9%	18.8%	100.0%
Played computer games	3.3%	1.3%	3.0%	1.4%	2.4%	3.3%	85.2%	100.0%
Been to the cinema	0.3%	0.6%	1.3%	2.2%	6.4%	10.2%	79.0%	100.0%
Read something relaxing	2.10%	10.5%	16.0%	7.3%	6.8%	8.1%	30.5%	100.0%
Done something else	9.2%	6.9%	6.9%	0.9%	3.2%	0.5%	72.5%	100.0%

(Hungarians subjects)

	Almost every day	Two or three times a week	Once a week	A few times a month	Once a month	Once or twice	Never	Total
Been out of town	0.3%	0.3%	7.8%	11.5%	9.6%	18.7%	51.9%	100.0%
Visited friends	8.7%	9.2%	20.9%	14.4%	11.0%	10.2%	25.6%	100.0%
Been to the restaurant or the disco	3.9%	4.1%	11.6%	4.8%	5.5%	12.7%	57.6%	100.0%
Watched TV	74.6%	7.9%	5.1%	2.5%	0.3%	2.3%	7.3%	100.0%
Chatted with friends or neighbors	80.6%	10.7%	6.0%	0.9%	-	0.5%	1.3%	100.0%
Been to shows or concerts	0.2%	-	0.6%	2.6%	4.7%	10.6%	81.3%	100.0%
Done gardening or DIY	47.7%	9.9%	10.5%	4.7%	2.3%	3.2%	21.8%	100.0%
Been to the gym	0.6%	1.1%	1.6%	-	0.8%	0.8%	95.2%	100.0%
Listened to music	45.6%	11.7%	7.3%	3.8%	1.1%	5.8%	24.8%	100.0%
Done sports for your pleasure	3.0%	3.5%	5.6%	2.3%	1.7%	2.8%	81.0%	100.0%
Had a nap or rest (outside sleeping hours)	24.0%	11.6%	10.1%	5.6%	1.1%	8.0%	39.6%	100.0%
Played computer games	2.3%	1.1%	3.9%	2.3%	2.0%	2.5%	86.0%	100.0%
Been to the cinema	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	2.9%	2.8%	5.1%	88.7%	100.0%
Read something relaxing	36.6%	11.3%	10.9%	6.5%	2.9%	5.6%	26.2%	100.0%
Done something else	26.6%	15.2%	5.9%	4.9%	0.9%	3.0%	43.4%	100.0%

VIII. POLITICAL OPTIONS

1. Options in the general elections: "If the general elections were to take place next Sunday, who would you vote for?"

	Sample	
	Romanians	Hungarians
RSDP	31.5%	-
NPCDP	1.3%	0.2%
LNP	4.0%	0.3%
DP	4.6%	0.2%
URF	0.6%	-
DCR	1.7%	0.9%
SDPR	0.3%	0.3%
DAHR	0.9%	73.3%
GRM	5.4%	-
NURP	1.7%	-
AfR	7.4%	-
NCDA	0.2%	-
SLP	0.5%	-
NRP	0.3%	-
Another party	1.6%	0.9%
Haven't decided	22.2%	11.1%
I am not going to vote	12.0%	10.2%
NA	3.8%	2.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

2. If the presidential elections were to take place next Sunday, who would you vote for?"

	Sample		Total
	Romanians	Hungarians	
Ion Iliescu	45.5%	0.7%	22.7%
Emil Constantinescu	10.9%	38.9%	25.2%
Teodor Melescanu	16.8%	1.4%	9.0%
Corneliu Vadim Tudor	14.4%	-	7.0%
Varujan Vosganian	1.7%	-	0.9%
Valeriu Tabara	0.7%	-	0.4%
Frunda György	0.7%	54.2%	27.9%
Radu Vasile	1.0%	-	0.5%
Victor Ciorbea	1.2%	2.9%	2.1%
Somebody else	6.9%	1.9%	4.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100%

3. "From the following list, choose three characteristics that the future President of Romania should have so that you will be pleased with him"

	Sample					
	Romanians			Hungarians		
	The first characteristic	The second characteristic	The third characteristic	The first characteristic	The second characteristic	The third characteristic
To be a good Romanian	47.0%	7.8%	5.7%	0.5%	0.8%	-
To promote the Romanians' interests in any context	11.5%	18.6%	10.2%	0.3%	0.9%	0.8%
To defend the majority from the claims of the minority	3.1%	0.6%	4.4%	1.7%	1.0%	5.2%
To militate for the Euro-Atlantic integration of Romania	5.7%	9.7%	4.7%	8.4%	7.3%	8.1%
To impose an adequate legislation in the field of environmental protection	1.8%	3.6%	5.0%	2.6%	5.8%	5.7%
To militate for the decrease of differences between people's income	13.4%	14.1%	9.4%	11.4%	10.4%	12.6%
To persuade foreign business people to invest in Romania	4.8%	12.0%	10.9%	7.6%	8.0%	8.2%
To increase the capacity of the Army for the better protection of the frontiers	0.9%	3.9%	2.9%	0.8%	0.6%	1.2%
To promote harmony between the majority and the minorities	1.0%	5.8%	6.5%	17.4%	24.4%	9.9%
To promote minority rights	0.9%	1.9%	1.1%	36.2%	17.7%	14.6%
To honor the heroes of the nation	0.9%	3.4%	4.7%	1.1%	1.9%	2.0%
To support the development of education in Romania	6.6%	10.7%	15.7%	6.9%	11.4%	12.2%
To maintain good relations with the neighboring countries	2.4%	6.6%	13.8%	4.9%	9.7%	19.0%
To militate for the unification of Bessarabia with Romania	1.3%	1.6%	4.9%	0.2%	0.1%	0.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%