

Appendix 1

Methodology: sample selection and data collection

Several challenges were faced in selecting the sample.

- There are no consistent records on the Jews of Hungary.
- Most Jews in Hungary are not listed members of the Jewish community.
- The significant extent of assimilation and mixed marriage blurs the boundary between who is Jewish and who is not.
- Historical fears related to antisemitism inhibit significant numbers of Jews from openly declaring a Jewish religious-ethnic identity.

Since there was no general database on Jews in Hungary, sampling based on random selection was only partly possible. As a starting point, lists that outlined well-defined groups of the Jewish population were used. As far as the older population (people born before May 1945) is concerned, the list of applicants for Holocaust-era compensation was used as the starting point for sample selection, the assumption being that this register (containing *c.* 20,000 names) covered almost the entire population born before May 1945. We extracted a random sample from this list. Respondents born before May 1945 make up half of the total sample.

In the second stage of sample selection, the issue of representing those born after 1945 was tackled. Two registers were used for constructing a random sample. The first was the records of the Budapest *chevra kadisha* (burial society) because even those Jews without ties to the community generally bury their family members in a Jewish cemetery. In addition to the *chevra kadisha* list, use was made of the membership lists of certain Jewish cultural and social organizations that are independent of the religious community. Only people born after 1945 were considered. In this way, a sample framework was created from which random selection was applied in choosing the addresses of the respondents.

Since the lists included too few addresses of people younger than 55, a second random sample from the compensation list was chosen. Members of the second sample were asked to provide the addresses of their younger relatives (children and grandchildren). However, this still provided too few addresses of younger people, which prompted yet another strategy. Using the data on the older and the younger population already contacted, a quota-sample selection based on three criteria was created: the distribution by detailed place of residence, age and gender. During the quota-interviews, interviewers could choose among the persons who identified themselves as Jews.

Persons on the list received a letter from the Federation of Jewish Communities in Hungary (MAZSIHISZ) asking them to respond to the questionnaire. The interviewers presented the same letter when they met their interviewees. The sample comprised 2,015 respondents. Information was obtained in face-to-face interviews that lasted on average two hours.

As already mentioned in the editor's introduction, there are several reasons for believing that the sample consists of people who are more strongly attached to

Judaism and possess a stronger Jewish identity than the Jewish population as a whole. This assumption is based on several factors. First, when assembling the sample of the younger population, interviewers received information from acquaintances. Finding interview subjects in this way will almost certainly result in the inclusion of those members of the Jewish population who appear more strongly Jewish, who express their Jewishness more freely, who live in a more homogeneously Jewish milieu, and who have stronger Jewish ties. In addition, as many interviewers were Jewish, among them students of the Budapest Jewish University, there was the distinct possibility that the resulting sample would be more closely attached to Judaism, that the interviewers would tend to choose interviewees from among their own social network. Furthermore, knowing how response mechanisms producing 'response biases' usually function, there is reason to believe that, on certain issues, the method of contacting the interviewees (e.g. by a letter from the Federation of Jewish Communities in Hungary) influenced answers in a way that made identification with Judaism more likely. This presumption is made because, in an interview initiated by the Federation and carried out mainly by Jewish interviewers, the interviewees might feel that certain response patterns were expected and in certain cases they might have given answers that they thought would 'conform'. On the other hand, because they felt 'protected' in the interview environment, they might have given answers that they would have avoided under different circumstances. All these features could have distorted the overall picture in favour of heightened Jewish identification and normative response patterns.

Appendix 2

Assessing the size of the Hungarian Jewish population, 1945–2000

The last usable census data on Hungary's Jews are provided by censuses conducted in the four years immediately after the end of the Second World War.¹⁵ Consequently, the current Jewish population of Hungary can only be estimated within certain broad limits. This is partly because there have been no demographic data on religious denominations since 1949 and partly because the data collected between 1945 and 1949 show significant disparities, thus making it difficult to define the size of the starting point from which to estimate, i.e. the number of Jews who survived the war and remained in Hungary. The question of who should be considered a member of the Jewish population raises further difficulties. As a result, the estimates embody much uncertainty.

The first calculation was to define the number of Hungarian Jews who survived the Holocaust. At the end of 1945, the Statistical Information Department of the Hungarian Delegation to the World Jewish Congress prepared a detailed statistical survey of survivors that included 143,624 registered persons. Other calculations—based on indirect means of recording data by German, Hungarian and other diplomatic and internal affairs reports written before peace was declared—estimated the size of post-war Hungarian Jewry at between 220,000 and 260,000. *The former figure of 143,624 persons is considered to be the minimum number of Jewish survivors in 1945 and the latter number of 260,000 persons to be the maximum.* The minimum number basically reflects the number of so-called 'Israelites', while the maximum number reflects the total number of survivors.¹⁶ These are the two data sources from 1945 that were used in estimating the minimum and maximum size of today's Jewish population.

Based on the 1945 numbers, the size of the Jewish population was calculated in five-year periods up to 2000. The demographic patterns of the total population of Budapest—the birth- and death-rates broken down by age groups—were projected on to the Jewish population of Hungary.¹⁷ Growth (in this case decline) of the population was estimated according to the rules of standard demographic calculations based on the size of the female population. In other words, the fertility rates of the total female population of Budapest were projected on to the Jewish female population. Demographic data on the Budapest population were used because, at the end of the war, two-thirds of surviving Jews already lived in Budapest and, over the following decades, most of the Jews in rural areas gradually moved there.

15 For the first time since 1949, the most recent national census of 2000 contained optional questions on religious and ethnic affiliation, but for several reasons (such as the reluctance of Jews to be 'registered') the data concerning the size of Jewish population is considered wholly inaccurate; c. 13,000 persons declared that they were Jewish either in a religious or in an ethnic sense.

16 The term 'Israelites' refers to those who declared themselves to be Jewish in the census carried out by the Hungarian Section of the Jewish World Congress in 1945–6, i.e. they were members of the Jewish Religious Community.

17 On demographic data of the Budapest population, see the series of Statistical Yearbooks published by the Hungarian Central Statistical Bureau.

In preparing these estimates, the decline in the population caused by emigration had to be taken into consideration. For these calculations, two large waves of emigration were considered. Based on available sources, it was estimated that 40,000 Jews left Hungary between 1945 and 1949.¹⁸ This number was subtracted from the estimated maximum number of surviving Jews, divided proportionally between the genders and age groups. However, the minimum number of Jews only decreased by 10,000, because this was the difference between the number of Jews registered in 1945 and the number of Jews counted in the 1949 census. For the emigration wave following the 1956 revolution, two figures were calculated: 20,000 and 10,000, i.e. 10,000 were deducted from the number of 'Israelites' and 20,000 from the estimated number of the total Jewish population.

Two final datasets were derived. According to the extrapolation made on the basis of the minimum number of surviving Jews (143,624), the Jewish population of Hungary in 2000 totalled 64,000 persons; on the basis of the maximum number of survivors (260,000) this number amounted to 118,000 individuals.

Table 35: Changes in the estimated number of Hungarian Jews between 1945 and 2000 (matrilineal descent)

Year	Estimated number	
	Minimum	Maximum
1945	143,624	260,000
1950	134,825	236,839
1955	134,195	234,434
1960	118,043	202,721
1965	110,041	187,550
1970	101,100	171,456
1975	94,480	164,120
1980	86,159	153,523
1985	80,353	145,015
1990	73,754	134,648
1995	67,843	124,353
2000	64,000	118,686

18 On Jewish migration, the following sources were used: Anthony H. Richmond, *Postwar Immigrants in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1967); Moshe Sicron, *Immigration to Israel 1948–1953* (Jerusalem: Falk Project for Economic Research in Israel 1957); Kurt R. Grossmann, *The Jewish DP Problem: Its Origin, Scope and Liquidation* (New York 1951); Jacob Lestchinsky, *Jewish Migration for the Past Hundred Years* (New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute, YIVO 1944); the documents of the World Jewish Congress and of YIVO; and the statistics of the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics.

What do these numbers mean? The estimate of 64,000 persons for the year 2000 theoretically represents the minimum Hungarian Jewish population. The final result of the second series of calculations—just under 119,000—represents the maximum number of the Jewish population based on matrilineage. Given that the population estimates calculated were based on the size of the female population, this final result—like all the results of the series—relates to the number of those considered *halakhic* Jews (i.e. Jews according to Orthodox Jewish law). However, this is only true if it is supposed that the female members of the 1945 population of 260,000—considered to be the basis of our calculations—were all considered to be *halakhically* Jewish.

In the calculations the number of children born to a Jewish mother was estimated, regardless of the origin and religious denomination of her spouse. However, the rate of mixed marriage in the age cohorts under 70 is *at least* 50 per cent. Thus, when the group in which only the father is of Jewish origin is also considered, the estimated number of Jews needs to be increased by approximately 25 per cent. On the basis of this calculation, *there are an estimated 80,000 to 150,000 people today with at least one parent of Jewish origin.*

In theory, the results of this population estimate can be tested by comparing them with concrete facts and figures. However, information on the size of the population is incomplete. The data available on the number of Jewish burials are partial and scattered to such an extent that for all practical purposes they are inadequate to verify the calculations. Theoretically, the number of people who applied for Holocaust compensation prior to 1995 could be compared with the relevant data in the tables. However, when reviewing them, it became obvious that the number of applicants and the number of Holocaust survivors who were alive at the time of application—in other words, of those theoretically entitled to compensation—do not correspond.

The information provided by the Hungarian Jewish Heritage Public Foundation (MAZSÖK) regarding persons entitled to a life-annuity (every person of Jewish origin born before 8 May 1945) was more useful in verifying the calculations. According to the Foundation's files, 18,634 individuals had applied to the organization for compensation as of 19 January 1999. Consequently, at this time, this was the minimum number of persons of Jewish origin aged over 54. This number does not differ significantly from the results of the calculations for the year 2000 based on the maximum number of survivors (260,000 individuals), which indicated that there were 21,073 persons over the age of 54 in the year 2000. Although by the end of 2000 deaths had reduced the number of people registered by MAZSÖK to less than 18,000, the difference between the number of applicants for compensation and the demographic estimate is surprisingly small. Moreover, the difference between the estimated population and the registered population is probably even smaller than that shown by the numbers, as in earlier cases not every survivor entitled to compensation contacted MAZSÖK.

Although the similarities between the concrete data on the number of Holocaust survivors and the results of the estimate of the population do not totally verify the calculations, it can be stated that the calculated data—especially the information concerning the overall population of survivors—reflect real demographic processes. Reinforced by two present sociological surveys, the

calculations probably do not differ significantly from reality: in 1999 and in 2003, just over 2 per cent of a sample representing the entire adult Hungarian population (older than 18) claimed to have persons of Jewish origin among their parents or grandparents. Projected on to the entire adult population, this means approximately 170,000 individuals. At the same time it is important to emphasize repeatedly that the population data merely reflect trends, and the numbers published in the tables with five and six digits indicate orders of magnitude only.