

COURAGE

Cultural Opposition: Understanding the Cultural Heritage of Dissent in the Former Socialist Countries

Country Reports

Hungary



Author

Péter Apor

Regensburg 2018



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 692919.

About the author

Péter Apor is Research Fellow at the Research Center for the Humanities, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest
apor.peter@mta.btk.hu

To quote this report:

Péter Apor, "Hungary", COURAGE Country Reports. Regensburg, November 2018, DOI: DOI:
<http://doi.org/10.24389/cr-hungary>

Table of Contents

Summary	4
Introduction.....	5
Background and framework.....	5
Aggregate information from the registry and background information.....	7
Best practice and recommendations	13
References:.....	17
Collections	18
Persons researched	21
Persons interviewed.....	29
Operators, owners.....	32

Summary

The theme of cultural opposition has not emerged as a means of framing public politics in Hungary. The cultural legacy of dissent, however, has been an object of vivid public interest since the early 1990s. Oppositional culture is largely associated in Hungary with the emerging circles of intellectual dissent in the 1980s and the semi-legal, non-conformist art produced since the 1960s. Nonetheless, groups that cultivated non-communist and critical cultures were more numerous and had existed practically since the rise of the dictatorship in the country in 1948–49. In addition to (1) intellectual dissent and (2) non-conformist art, these groups included (3) religious associations and (4) underground youth subcultures.

The infrastructure and institutional frames of archival and museum collections in Hungary are regulated by two major laws: the 1997 museum, library and archives act and the 2010 modifications of the 2001 act on cultural heritage. In principle, access to the documents of the communist era is fairly liberal in Hungary. Academic researchers enjoy open access to documents in public archives with the formal support of any academic institution, with reasonable restrictions pertaining to privacy rights. However, recent government initiatives to reorganize the major institutions of Hungarian culture (including museums, archives, and libraries) created unanticipated hindrances to practical public access to the documents. This situation increases the value of other types of collections, in particular the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security Services, regional and local archives, libraries and museums, and recently discovered private collections.

Until 2018, archives, libraries, museums, universities, and academic institutions were maintained by the Ministry of Human Capacities (this is the official English title of the ministry, though its Hungarian name would be more accurately translated into English as the Ministry of Human Resources). Hungary spends a relatively high percentage of its GDP on culture (roughly 2 percent, compared with the EU average of 1 percent). Collections suffer from insufficient support, however. Public budgets normally cover the sustainability costs (salaries, technical maintenance) of public museums, libraries, and archives and rarely allow for innovation or new acquisitions. Public collections can submit applications for funding to, for instance, the National Research Fund and the National Culture Fund, which regularly support these institutions. However, due to the relatively limited resources of these two foundations, larger-scale innovative initiatives or research programs are often pursued with the assistance of international public or private funding agencies such as the European Union or the Soros Foundation. Smaller and, particularly, regional and private collections are often unprepared to handle such complex application procedures, and, thus, they are frequently left to their own devices.

Introduction

In Hungary, debates on dissent and cultural opposition gained momentum right after the collapse of the socialist dictatorship, when two political-cultural groupings organized in the two major post-communist parties of the country (the leftist-liberal Alliance of Free Democrats, or SZDSZ, and the conservative-nationalist Hungarian Democratic Forum, or MDF,) competed for governance as well as for the legacy of anti-communism. Both groups could mobilize credentials of dissent and both tried to discredit the other by casting doubt on the authenticity of the oppositional records of their opponent. SZDSZ was the direct successor to the democratic opposition of the 1980s and enjoyed the support of many individuals from avantgarde art and underground rock and youth culture networks as well as from unofficial social activist groups and bodies of academic research. MDF was headed by populist intellectuals who before 1989 often criticized the regime of having ignored the cause of Hungarian minorities abroad and allegedly authentic national culture at home. Conservative nationalists were more radical in their attacks on their rivals, as prominent members of the party accused SZDSZ politicians of cultivating a radical leftist Maoist and reform communist legacy and even of having direct ties to the communist secret police. Leftist liberals, in turn, although milder in their tone, highlighted the compromises populists allegedly had made with the communist party after 1956.

This short interlude notwithstanding, the theme of cultural opposition has not emerged as a means of framing public politics in Hungary. The cultural legacy of dissent, however, has been an object of vivid public interest since the early 1990s. This is especially true of the field of art. Publications, documentaries, TV-films, and exhibitions on illegal and non-conformist art recurrently feature showrooms and media. Literature and underground rock had a similar status. Many unpublished or samizdat manuscripts and music recordings were first published or were republished by major publishers after 1989. While Hungarians were interested in counterculture and cultures of dissent, the theme of cultural opposition hardly figured as the focus of such interest. Whereas non-conformist and alternative cultures were deeply politicized both by participants and the communist authorities before 1989, they were not directly political and were not intended to create political alternatives to the one-party state. This factor helped Hungarians perceive the communist era in terms of culture and downplay the often embarrassing and uncomfortable memories of politics in the period.

Background and framework

In principle, access to the documents of the communist era is fairly liberal in Hungary. Academic researchers enjoy open access to documents in public archives with the formal support of any academic institution, with reasonable restrictions pertaining to privacy rights. However, recent government initiatives to reorganize the major institutions of Hungarian culture (including museums, archives, and libraries) created unanticipated hindrances to practical public access to the documents. The government sees the castle district in Budapest,

which for decades has been home to important Hungarian academic institutions, as a future centre of government institutions. Therefore, academic institutions, including the National Archives (which holds party and government files of the communist era), have been moved out of the area. The National Archives was closed to researchers in 2016 and began to operate in 2018 in a location that is more difficult to access than the previous one (“Traffic by tram 17 and 61 in Villányi Road. Get off at stop Alsóhegy street. In Alsóhegy street walk one minute by the railway tracks to get to the building”).¹ Furthermore, the administrative process through which a prospective researchers can gain access to the archives has been made more complex. In a similar manner, files of the Communist Youth Federation, which belonged to a public foundation of the Hungarian Socialist Party, were taken into custody by the National Archives. This act of centralization might have served the objective of securing better and safer access to the documents. In reality, however, the Communist Youth papers have now long been inaccessible due to the arrangement of the files into the new system of the National Archives.

This situation increases the value of other types of collections. The most spectacular and, in many ways, unexpected institution to open as a collection on cultural opposition was the Historical Archives of the State Security. The Archives, which began to function as a public institution in 1997, left researchers and the public inundated with oceans of unknown records on groups and individuals which the state police had once considered opponents of socialism. In addition, regional and local archives, libraries, and museums which often hold materials which had belonged to or concern groups or individuals who had been part of local forms of cultural dissent are being discovered by both researchers and broader audiences.

Currently, there is no specialized academic institution that focuses exclusively on contemporary history. Research on contemporary history is part of specialized departments at universities and the Academy of Sciences. The Institute for the History of 1956, which was an independent institution until 1994 and a public foundation until 2010, lost its status in 2010 and was reduced to the status of a department of the National Library. Money taken from the 1956 Institute was used by Viktor Orbán’s first government to found the House of Terror in 2002. In 2014, Orbán’s second government established a set of new institutions (the Committee of National Memory, the Veritas Institute of History, the Research Institute and Archives for the History of the Hungarian Regime Change) formally to balance research on the communist period. These institutions were founded and are monitored directly by the Prime Minister’s Office, and their Founding Documents compel them to pursue duties set by the government. These factors cast serious doubts on their capacity and willingness to perform independent academic research and decisively exclude them as specialized academic institutions.

Until 2018, archives, libraries, museums, universities and academic institutions were maintained by the Ministry of Human Capacities. The Hungarian Academy of Sciences, which has an extensive network of research institutions, regularly received a budget of 40 billion HUF

¹ Information on accessing the National Archives on its official website.
<http://mnl.gov.hu/mnl/ol/elerhetosegek> (Accessed 21 Nov 2018).

(12 million EUR). This was divided in two in 2018 and a new ministry, the Ministry for Innovation and Technology, has now been designated as the recipient of almost half of the original budget. This allows the ministry to control directly a substantial part of academic spending in Hungary. The Ministry of Human Capacities oversees museums, archives, and universities. Chancellors appointed directly by the government to the universities occasionally can hinder independent academic research. Chancellors, formally charged with the task of safeguarding the financial sustainability of universities, often block research budgets won from public research funds and can press academic decision makers not to initiate innovative but potentially not profitable study programs, such as gender studies.

Hungary spends a relatively high proportion of its GDP on culture (roughly 2 percent, compared to the EU average of 1 percent). Collections suffer from insufficient support, however. Public budgets normally cover the sustainability costs (salaries, technical maintenance) of public museums, libraries, and archives and rarely allow for innovation or new acquisitions. Public collections can submit applications for funding to, for instance, the National Research Fund and the National Culture Fund, which regularly support these institutions. However, due to the relatively limited resources of these two foundations, larger-scale innovative initiatives or research programs are often pursued with the assistance of international public or private funding agencies, such as the European Union or the Soros Foundation. Smaller and, particularly, regional and private collections are often unprepared to handle such complex application procedures, and, thus, they are frequently left to their own devices. Civic initiatives in culture were supported by the Soros Foundation until Hungary's entry into the European Union in 2004. Since then, particularly these local, community, and private initiatives have found it extremely difficult to obtain funding for their initiatives.²

Aggregate information from the registry and background information

Geographically, collections are centred in Budapest. However, there are interesting local and regional collections, particularly concerning alternative youth and art cultures and literary societies, in regional centres, such as Pécs and Szeged. State ownership is an important form of keeping collections on dissent and counterculture. National museums, archives, and libraries hold a spectacular array of relevant materials. The National Széchenyi Library and Petőfi Museum of Literature have among the most sizable collections of clandestine literature. The collection of contemporary art in the National Gallery is an indispensable component of Hungarian avantgarde and non-conformist art from the communist period. The Budapest City Archives holds important files on former opposition activists and samizdat producers György Krassó and Gábor Demszky.

State ownership, however, is not the dominant form of preserving such collections. This is especially true of the field of art. The most relevant collections of dissent art are held by

² Ébli, "From Ivory Towers."

private individuals or communities. Artpool was created by artist György Galántai and Júlia Klaniczay. The C3 Video Archives was a private initiative launched by Miklós Peternák. Similarly, art historians László Beke in Budapest and Géza Pernecky in Bremen created essential collections of neo-avantgarde and performance art. Religious collections are, likewise, often kept by private individuals and communities. The persecuted religious groups of Bokor and the Pasarét Protestant communities preserved their material via private efforts and community solidarity. One of the most important archives of religious dissent in Hungary, the Archives of the Jesuit Order, was saved by clandestinely transporting it abroad. It is kept by the Order today. The most important sites to the study of underground youth and counterculture are the private collections of journalist Tamás Szőnyei and historian Gábor Klaniczay. Hungary also has a unique asset relevant to dissent cultures. The Blinken-OSA Archives founded by philanthropist George Soros is part of Central European University, a private institution in Budapest (which has now been compelled by the Hungarian government to move parts to Vienna). OSA contains important samizdat material from Hungary and also from other former socialist countries, such as Poland.

Collecting began almost immediately after the communist takeover, as autonomous cultural groups and bodies began to be persecuted. These activities did not necessarily mean the deliberate and purposeful collection of material with regard to cultural opposition. Instead, they represented the will to preserve and save important material and forms of expression with which groups which were then persecuted identified. The typical collections that were generated in this era, hence, either consisted of materials gathered privately and often clandestinely or were archives created by people in exile. Church and religious groups were particularly active in these activities in this period. György Bulányi, the founder of Bokor, initiated the gathering of manuscripts and other unpublished materials created by the members of the community in 1945.

The anti-Stalinist revolt in October 1956 constituted an important turning point in the history of collections of cultural opposition. Several former participants who were persecuted after 1956 resolved to preserve the memory of the revolution and began collecting records and documents related to the events. In institutional terms, these collections were strikingly similar to their predecessors: they were kept by private individuals either in hiding or in exile. The most important people to create and maintain these kinds of private archives were Árpád Göncz and István Bibó. The leftist Marxist revisionary exile community established the Imre Nagy Institute, an archive in Brussels. In addition, the post-1956 period was crucial in shaping a nationalist-populist oppositional culture in Hungary. Many of the populist intellectuals were banned from publishing due to their involvement in 1956 and, as a result, they retreated to smaller, private, hidden social networks and particularly into rural areas, as for instance the collection of Miklós Galyasi in Hódmezővásárhely illustrates.

The mid-1960s bore witness to the emergence of interesting new forms of collections. More and more intellectuals and artists began to realize that they had little or no chance of having any kind of public presence in the official sphere and, thus, of having ties to official institutions of memory. Several of them set out on their own paths and decided to create collections of

materials related to the (counter)cultures in which they were active (for instance György Galántai, the Orfeo art group, László Beke). In many ways, silent cooperation among private individuals and state institutions remained the rule of collecting alternative cultural products in Hungary in the last decades of the socialist period. This applied also to the nationalist-populist oppositional culture, which could often benefit from the ethnographic and folklore collections. There were concerned individuals who themselves were also part of the emerging underground and punk youth subcultures and who documented the performances and everyday lives of these networks (for instance Gábor Klaniczay, Tamás Szőnyei, Ferenc Kálmándy in Pécs). In the 1980s, nationalist-populist critical culture started to be institutionalized as public foundations like the Gábor Bethlen Foundation were either tolerated or given permission to function openly by the end of the decade.

The collapse of state socialism constituted an important turning point in the history of the collections on cultural opposition in Hungary. Clandestine, hidden, secretly kept collections suddenly were openly recognized as important assets which might well offer intriguing insights into other parts of cultural life in socialist Hungary. This meant, first, the growing institutionalization of these kinds of collections. Many hidden collections suddenly became mainstream. Galleries and museums of fine art in particular realized that some of their previously marginal collections had now become mainstream and, indeed, could provide ammunition for carving out progressive and often also anti-communist identities.

The infrastructure and institutional frames of archival and museum collections in Hungary are regulated by two major laws, which correspond not only to two separate approaches to legislation, but also to two ways of understanding the roles of the collections and public administration. Whereas the initial 1997 Act on museums³ was passed virtually unnoticed by the general public and even by political decision makers, the 2010 initiative for a substantially modified new law proved largely controversial and was met with remarkable criticism, both by the political opposition and various professional organizations.⁴

Post-communist parties came to agree on one of the most important principles of the new model: the limitation of state intervention into the activities of the collections in order to reshape them as non-political, public institutions, openly accessible to all members of society. Furthermore, the common emphasis on cultural diversity, a European focus, and visions of cultural policy among the new parties served to draw attention to the importance of protecting and fostering indigenous national cultural values and perspectives.⁵

³ 1997. évi CXL. törvény a muzeális intézményekről, a nyilvános könyvtári ellátásról és a közművelődésről [Act no. CXL 1997 on Museum Institutions, Library Services and Public Access to Culture].

⁴ On the debate: *Heti Világgazdaság* (5 November 2010) and the roundtable of cultural periodical Magyar Szemle [Hungarian Review]

http://www.magyarszemle.hu/cikk/tudomanyos_kozintezetek_vagy_kozmuvelodesi_intezmenyek_-_vitaest_az_orzagos_muzeumok_jovojerol. and the debate of Batthyány Circle: Távlatok és teendők [Perspectives and Tasks].

⁵ A nemzeti megújulás programja [The Program of National Rejuvenation]. Elefánt a porcelánboltban [Elephant in the Chinashop].

At the same time, there were remarkable differences between the conservative-nationalist and liberal-leftist approaches. Conservative-nationalist cultural policy saw cultural institutions as important means of constructing, preserving, and protecting national culture. "National culture" had a double meaning for the conservative-nationalists. On the one hand, it reflected the priority of the domestic canons of arts, intellectual thought, creative thinking, and cultural traditions. On the other hand, national culture was conceived in broader linguistic-ethnic terms and was understood as embracing all Hungarian-speaking cultures and traditions. As a consequence, this type of cultural policy, while acknowledging cultural diversity in the form of various regional, linguistic, and ethnographic subcultures, emphasized unity and homogeneity as important aspects or allegedly conditions of social cohesion and equal accessibility to cultural capital, thereby at the same time downplaying the importance of ethnic or linguistic cultural minorities such as the Roma or recent migration tendencies from Southeast Europe, Southeast Asia, and Africa, as well as differences between contemporary urban subcultures and more rural-based popular cultures.

The liberal-leftist alternative, in turn, highlighted the roles of museums, archives, and libraries as crucial fora of civil society. This policy program considered cultural institutions as the asset of various autonomous social and cultural groups and as important tools with which these groups could construct and maintain their identities. Museums and similar institutions should have been inherently associated with various civil social groups, and governments should have encouraged them to construct their priorities and institutions freely. The liberals, however, did not regard this proposal as a step that would lead to a decrease in central state funding. The state was supposed to maintain its commitment and resources to keep the institutions running, and it was expected to do so according to three principles. First, the state was called to support the cultural demands of social groups with insufficient resources to fund their own activities. Second, state financing would supposedly take the cultural diversity of Hungarian society into consideration. Third, cultural policy was expected to encourage the private sponsorship of cultural institutions.

The principle of the state as responsible for the creation and maintenance of the institutional frames of culture but not their direct oversight or control was part of the program of the second democratic, socialist-liberal government, which proposed the first post-communist professional legislation concerning collections in 1997, the "no. CXL 1997 Act concerning the Protection of Cultural Property, Museum Institutions, Public Library Services and Public Education." Although the liberals, who were responsible for the cultural policy of the government under the leadership of Bálint Magyar, the SZDSZ Minister of Culture, cultivated the ideal of autonomous civil cultural activism, employees of museums, libraries, and other public institutions demanded institutional guarantees for funding for these activities. This social demand contributed to the preparation of the comprehensive professional regulation of policies on collections. As municipal administrations in the country were increasingly lacking in funding, which threatened not only the continuity of cultural activities, but also workplaces within the system, the government decided to develop a system of central funding and institutional guarantees for collections. The 1997 legislation thus served to guarantee basic

state funding for museums, archives, and libraries to cover personnel and basic infrastructural costs, and a special public fund was created under the administration by the Ministry of Culture for the occasional expansion of collections.

The 1997 legislation treated the collections as institutions associated with cultural heritage, universal as well as and national, and, because free access to the common heritage was considered a fundamental democratic right, it also sought to provide spaces for the study of this heritage. Policy makers appreciated the new law as crucial in securing the function of the collections in the preservation of this cultural heritage and the tasks of interpreting it and making it available to the public. Accordingly, the law regulated property rights with regard to objects considered part of this cultural heritage: the sale of such objects was prohibited without special permission from the minister. The law maintained the principle of free foundation and operation of collections, particularly museums, allowing both private and public bodies to engage in collecting and museum activities. However, the Ministry retained the right to supervise and withhold permits in the case of unprofessional management. In order to secure professional operation, institutional collections were obliged to employ adequately qualified staff only.

The law was intended to provide the necessary funding from the state budget to ensure the secure management of collections. State-owned collections were funded by the budget of the Ministry of Culture, regional and territorial collections from the budget of the Ministry of Municipal Autonomies, and all public and private collections alike were entitled to apply to the Ministry of Culture for acquisition funds. However, the law only guaranteed the covering of personnel and management costs for the collections, which, while creating a predictable future for staff and administration, rendered acquisition policy unpredictable and tedious. In 1998, the Ministry of Culture established the Directorate of Cultural Heritage for the purpose of supervising and monitoring the protection and definition of cultural property within the country. In effect, this organ, which served as a department of the Ministry, oversaw not only the operation of the collections, but also the protection of monuments and architecture.

Conservative criticism continued to produce ideas about the involvement of the state in cultural production. The conservative suggestion, this time already shaped by Viktor Orbán's Fidesz, was to centralize the tasks and organs of cultural activities and to increase state participation in the process. The conservatives understood heritage as embracing culture, monuments and architecture, and tourism, while education was viewed separately. Fidesz, therefore, largely with reference to the British model, established, after its electoral victory in 1998, a new Ministry, the Ministry of National Cultural Heritage, which would go on to shape institutional practices related to collections. The museums, archives, and libraries were expected to play a special part in accordance with the Fidesz program: they were intended to shield citizens from the alleged damages expected to be inflicted by global culture by creating firm grounds for cultural identities and subsequently confirming and strengthening these identities.

The concept of cultural heritage, which was also instrumental to the 1997 legislation, was crucial in framing the collection policy of the new conservative-nationalist government in the context of a broader cultural policy. The parliament elected in 1998 passed legislation on protecting cultural heritage in 2001. The 2001 legislation differed from the 1997 law in two important aspects. First, it concerned the concept of cultural heritage as the subject of cultural policy, shifting the emphasis from tangible collection practice to a more abstract philosophical-ideological notion. Second, it also shifted the emphasis on the balance of national and universal culture to a distinctly and uniquely national heritage, to which the government accorded special protection since this heritage was allegedly subjected to the menace of globalization. These transformations implied the idea of a homogeneous and unitary national culture, which, in turn, appeared clearly demarcated from other sets of national heritage.

The subsequent socialist-liberal government from 2002, however, would attempt to restore the balance between universal and national heritage by introducing the concept of “global heritage,” which also implied an approach to the global system of world heritage sites. Envisaging Hungary’s accession to the European Union, this government expressed grand plans to improve the infrastructure of public collections and accessibility to people within the country. It promised to apply for the title of European cultural capital, and it introduced free entrance to state-owned museums. This measure, while in principle rendering museums more accessible, in practice deprived the system of important income for which it would prove very difficult to find an adequate substitute. The government emphasized its European priorities and its intention to guarantee the autonomy and diversity of cultural activities. Symbolically, perhaps, major investments in the museum field were a manifestation of this: the establishment of the Ludwig Museum of Contemporary Art (Ludwig – Kortárs Művészeti Múzeum), which has since developed into an important European centre of contemporary arts.

The conservative-nationalist government elected in 2010 (Viktor Orbán’s second government) announced its intention to modify the legislation on collections. The severe budgetary crisis of the Hungarian state, however, prevented the government from implementing its ambitious plans. On the contrary, public collections were hit with serious budgetary cuts in 2011, which in many cases endangered their basic operations.⁶ In contrast, massive centralization was implemented in the field of public collections. In 2012, the government brought regional archives into the infrastructure of the National Archives, a step which formerly was intended to preserve documents of central political, economic, and cultural organs. Similarly, the two important state-owned art museums, the National Gallery and the Museum of Fine Arts, were unified. Formally, the centralization was meant to provide collections with better services, infrastructure, and IT facilities. As an important drawback, several collections, which were already losing their earlier independence, also lost opportunities to participate in applications and fund-raising and acquisition activities at their own initiative, which hindered access to

⁶ *Magyar Múzeumok* (11 November, 16 November 2011).

important professional and material resources. Also, since digitalization is not a legally defined duty of public collections, many important projects involving the digitalization of holdings in order to make them more accessible to digital users can be done thanks to voluntary efforts, particularly in cases of regional collections.

Up to the present day, there has been little effort to use counter-archives as sources in the writing of histories of the socialist period. Histories that were produced on the basis of cases of cultural opposition, for instance on Galántai's alternative art studio, remained known only to a more specialized audience and were not used to make their messages broadly available. In fact, the typical users of collections on the cultural opposition are academics who are interested in pursuing their own research agendas. In other cases, for instance the archives of the secret police, individuals who were once subjected to surveillance form an important group of users. Museums and galleries can reach out to audiences who normally visit museums, typically tourists or school groups, beyond the usual consumers of art. There are many reasons for this. First, these collections resist nationalist framings of history-telling. They do not speak of victimized nations suffering under imperialist great powers. In contrast, they tell the stories of courageous individuals who dared pursue their own agendas of creating and preserving culture, which were comparable in many countries and often also occurred in a transnational context. Second, these collections also often undermine the totalitarian framing of the socialist past, which is often too quick to divide societies into victims and perpetrators. As the records of counterculture show, being victimized was not the only viable alternative: there were always individuals and groups which chose actively to defend their values and causes. Indeed, highly popular and well-promoted public representations of the socialist era, such as the House of Terror, use none of the records from these collections, and possibly no authentic records at all.

Best practice and recommendations

a) Challenges

One of the first difficulties of rendering the collections of cultural opposition more accessible is that stakeholders, collectors, and owners of hitherto less familiar private holdings do not necessarily trust state archives and, therefore, are reluctant to approach these institutions and place their materials in them. The reasons for such distrust are manifold, but three factors clearly stand out. First, many private collectors do not sense the clear advantages of professional archiving. They do not see how institutions could further conditions of preserving and making accessible their holdings. Second, recently central archives, particularly, the National Archives, had to restrict access to its materials significantly due to reorganization efforts instigated at the initiative of the government which were poorly planned and mismanaged. The complete inaccessibility of the most important archival documents of modern and contemporary Hungarian history for more than a year has certainly not served to foster trust in the professional capacities of state archives. Third, the precedents of the loss

and destruction of material in state archives due to mismanagement have made prospective donators unsure of the competence of these institutions.

A second difficulty is that many stakeholders both in private and public collections tend to hide their material or, more precisely, are not interested in promoting their assets in public. The first important reason for this is that, in general, they lack the human resources to respond to prospective visitors' demands. Second, in general, they are not interested in international collaboration. In smaller archives as well as larger state collections, international projects would simply mean more work for the same, generally, below-average salary. International cooperation entails a complicated process of work in which most staff have no expertise, particularly in regional and local collections. Such work requires a command of the professional and bureaucratic languages of the European Union, and these languages often have an alienating effect on local stakeholders. Also, local EU offices which were established to bridge this gap sometimes can provide only general guidance, since their staff changes all too often. Archives would need more specific advisors who have expertise in cooperation with local cultural institutions. Funded trainee programs in grant management for the staff of local cultural institutions would be welcomed. Furthermore, the applications also demand considerable investments of time and effort from the employees with only a low rate of success. In the Hungarian context, especially for local and regional collections, it proves more useful to foster informal connections with local and national politicians, which often leads to the development of regionalist, nationalist, and, in some cases, anti-Europeanist agendas. As a consequence, most of the collections have only a low networking potential. They also often consider digitalization projects an extra burden, since they lack the necessary human resources (including funding), and they also often work with outdated technologies.

The third difficulty concerns the general low level of prestige enjoyed by research in the humanities as a contribution to relevant public achievements. This is connected partly to the relatively low level of electronic repositories and digital research tools in Hungary, which are the most community-oriented research activities today. Despite this, research and hiring bodies and committees often tend to undervalue these initiatives. Scholars and education personnel, hence, are also less interested in contributing to such digital humanities projects. These factors all lead to a general lack of sustainability, and electronic research projects and initiatives often end abruptly.

b) Opportunities

The first set of recommendations, therefore, concerns the fostering of trust in state-managed archives and public collections. On the one hand, this requires improving archival culture. Public archives should be more attentive to advertising themselves as repositories of important information. They should use their collections to promote a culture of evidence which clearly links the authenticity and authority of public statements to grounded proof and knowledge. It would be helpful to develop public programs which focus on exciting pieces of archival evidence and, thus, promote the archives as places of trusted knowledge. These

archival programs could be fostered by specific European Union and national cultural policy initiatives that would offer resources and expertise to grass-roots initiatives. In addition, the culture of trust should be shored up by new legislation, which would guarantee that no government or governmental body could introduce drastic restrictions on access to archival holdings on a permanent basis. Such legislation could be initiated on a European level, but national governments should be strongly encouraged to design their own national legal frameworks to address the problem

Second, it is important to develop strategies to make stakeholders more interested in collaboration. These kinds of strategies could emerge on three levels: European, national, and regional. They could include European Union programs encouraging the use of local and private collections for pan-European and international exhibitions and online and printed publication, as well as national museum and library initiatives that integrate such material into their national narratives of the communist period and local programs that shore up regional identities for citizens.

Third, international standards should be set that clearly acknowledge digital humanities and online resources as genuine scholarly contributions. European Union and national policies could encourage the development of higher education curricula (the Courage curricula offers one such example) and could support the wider use of digital resources in higher education in the humanities. Professionals and in particular school teachers should be also encouraged to use digital data focusing on local collections to bring young people close to history and civic values.

One of the most important models for best practices in Hungary is the Blinken-OSA Archives (originally the Open Society Archives) at Central European Society. It is unique in two ways. First, the activities of the Archives are funded by private donations, primarily by philanthropists George Soros and Donald and Vera Blinken. Second, the OSA is a regional archive that collects material relevant to countercultures from all over Eastern Europe. OSA is a counter archive in two ways. First, its core collection contains the former research and records of Radio Free Europe, which created counter archives itself by observing the Cold War other. Second, OSA actively collects materials from participants in communist-era countercultural activities. OSA has exceptional opportunities to receive private funding on a level that is unavailable to most Hungarian collections. Essentially, however, the way in which OSA makes use of its holdings to promote free access to information and to open its collections to broad audiences via exhibitions, public discussions, film shows, and short-term residency programs for scholars is a model that other collections may want to follow. By serving local and specialist audiences, other collections could also develop their capacities to connect to prospective private funders, donators, or in-kind voluntary contributors.

A possible model for working out licensing and copyright issues in Hungary is the unique photo collection of Fortepan. Fortepan is an extensive online collection of photos documenting the twentieth century until 1990. All photos fall under creative commons license. Started as a private non-profit initiative, Fortepan grew out of a core collection of 5,000 images, and it has

been dynamically expanding as both institutions and private individuals continue to donate photos to the collection. Images are largely about scenes of life in Hungary, but there is a growing number of photos taken in other countries. Fortepan is the largest free-to-use digital photo collection covering, among other things, cultural opposition under communism in Eastern Europe. Underground music scenes, alternative theatre and film, grey zone cultural activities, and the democratic and populist opposition are all topics covered in the collection. In contrast to state owned collections, which normally charge high fees for photo reproductions (even for programs of public use) and, thus, seriously limit access to visual heritage, Fortepan uses discarded material and private donations and gives permission to reuse its already digitized material free of charge. It thus has emerged as the unmatched source of visual material for works related to the history of the region in the twentieth century. Its successes may encourage other public collections to make their material more open-access as they start losing income due to the competition set by Fortepan, an income that was previously generated by the overpriced sale of photographic reproductions. Fortepan also collects and digitizes negatives that archives are not prepared and legally not obliged to collect in Hungary, but which constitute a part of visual cultural heritage that is has undergone destruction on a mass scale. Saving photo negatives would require immediate action by cultural politicians.

References:

A nemzeti megújulás programja. A Köztársaság első három éve [The Program of National Rejuvenation: The First Three Years of the Republic]. Budapest: A Magyar Köztársaság Kormánya, September 1990.

Elefánt a porcelánboltban. Az állam szerepe a kultúrában. Háttéranyagok a Szabad Demokraták Szövetsége kulturális koncepciójához [Elephant in the China Shop: Background Material on the Cultural Policy of the Alliance of Free Democrats]. Budapest, 1990.

Távlatok és teendők. Országos közgyűjteményeink jövőjéről [Perspectives and Tasks: Concerning the Future of National Public Collections]. Eds.: Zoltán Csehi, Anna Jávor, Péter Kovács, Zsuzsa Lovag, Pál Lővei, Ernő Marosi, Katalin Sinkó, András Szilágyi, Imre Takács, *Magyar Szemle* 18 (July-August 2009)

Ébli, Gábor. "From Ivory Towers to Visitor Centres? Hungarian Museum Policy in the Context of the European Union" in *Museum Policies in Europe 1990–2010: Negotiating Professional and Political Utopia* (EuNaMus Report No. 3). Ed. Lill Eilertsen & Arne Bugge Amundsen. Linköping: Linköping University Press, 2012. 101-126.

Heti Világgazdaság, 5 November 2010.

Magyar Múzeumok, 11 November 2011, 16 November 2011.

1997. évi CXL. törvény a muzeális intézményekről, a nyilvános könyvtári ellátásról és a közművelődésről [Act no. CXL 1997 on Museum Institutions, Library Services, and Public Access to Culture]. <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99700140.TV> (Accessed 9 November 2018).

Information on accessing the National Archives on its official website. <http://mnl.gov.hu/mnl/ol/elerhetosegek> (Accessed 21 Nov 2018).

Collections

"Mozgó Világ." Collection of a Prohibited Journal
'Klub Közlöny'. Collection of a non-conformist journal
1969 Budapest student movement
András Kisfaludy collection
Archive of László Beke
Archive of the Studio of Young Artists
Archives of the Jesuit Order Hungary
Artpool Art Research Center
Black Box Foundation Video Archive at OSA
Black Hole Underground Club. Nagy, Gyula Private Collection
Bokor Religious Base Community Collection
Béla Balázs Studio Research Archive
Collection of Hetényi Varga Károly
Collection of Historical Interviews at the National Széchényi Library
Collection of Lénárd Ödön
Collection of Ordass Lajos
Collection of Vargha János
Collection of religious dissent in the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security
Collection of the Calvinist youth congregation of Pasarét
Composer bequest of Lajtha, László
Diósi Pál's collection
Documents of György and Miklós Krassó (1956-1989)
Documents of the Bethlen Gábor Foundation
Documents of the Danube Circle's Association
Documents of the Hungarian Democratic Forum (1987-1989)
Emigré Collection at Petőfi Museum of Literature
Ethnological Archives
Experimental poetry collection in the Artpool Research Center
Family Collection of István Bibó's Heritage
Family Collection of Árpád Göncz's Heritage
Ferenc Fejtő Library
Ferenc Nádosy's Legacy
Folk Dance House Archives
Folk Music Collection of Lajtha, László
Fortepan
Fábri & Háber Collection on Alternative Pedagogy
Galyasi, Miklós Collection in Hódmezővásárhely
György Bp. Szabó Poster Collection
Gábor Klaniczay's private collection
Gáspár Nagy Memorial House

Géza Béri Papers
Hungarian Rock Museum and Hall of Fame
Hungarian Scout Association in Exteris Collection
Inconnu Art Group. State security photos of a banned exhibition
Interviews about Jewish identity in the 1980s
János Baksa Soós Special Collection
Kassák Museum
Kemény István's collection
Király Tamás legacy
Koszits, Attila New Wave Collection
Kálmándy, Ferenc Photo Archives
Lajos Vajda Studio Archive
Library of László Cs. Szabó
Liget Gallery Archive
Liskó Ilona's collection
László Végh Archive
Marelyn Kiss József's Collection
Mocsár Gábor hagyaték, Déri Múzeum
Modern Art Collection, Gallery of Szombathely
National Pantheon Foundation
Olasz, Sándor Private Collection of Banned Literature
Oral History Archives (OHA) in 1956 Institute
Orfeo Collection in the Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security (ÁBTL)
Orfeo Group's commune
Pataki, Ferenc Collection
Records of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Research Institute at OSA
Records of the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights at OSA
Records of the Union of Free Hungarian Students – Julius Várallyay's collection, 1957-1967
Religious sociological collection of István Kamarás
Reports of the state security about the 'Közgáz-klub'
Samizdat Collection at Petőfi Literary Museum (PLM)
Samizdat Collection at the Hungarian National Széchényi Library
Samizdat from Hungary in the Vera & Donald Blinken Open Society Archives
Sociological Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences Records
Soros Foundation–Hungary Records
Sound and Video Archive in the Artpool Art Research Center
State security photos about secret religious community's camping in Hungary
State security photos of Hungarian demonstrations (1989)
Szabolcs Vajay Library
Tamás Almási documentaries and feature films
Tamás Csapody's private collection
Tamás Cseh Archive

Tamás Szólyei Poster Collection

The Contemporary Collection of the Hungarian National Gallery

The documents of Cultural Forum and Counter-Forum Budapest 1985

The documents of SZETA - Hungarian dissidents' Fund for Aiding the Poor

The photo collection of Lóránt Méhes

Underground Music Records in Rottenbiller street Library Budapest

Veteran Circle of Hungarian Legionists in Provence

Zinner Tibor's private collection

Zsolt Csalog collection

Émigré Collection at the Hungarian National Széchényi Library

Persons researched

Agent Lantos
Agárdi, Péter
Aknay, János
Albert, Tódor
Almási, Tamás
Altorjai, Sándor
Altorjay, Gábor
Ambrus, Péter
Andor, Mihály
Antall, József
Bak, Imre
Bakos, István
Baksa Soós, János
Beke, László
Bencsik, István
Benda, Kálmán
Benke, György
Bereményi, Géza
Bernáth(y), Sándor
Bernátsky, Ferenc
Bibó, István
Birkás, Ákos
Bodnár, Gábor
Bodor, Ferenc
Bognár, Éva
Bokor, Péter
Bokros, Péter
Borus, Gábor
Botka, Ferenc
Bp. Szabó, György
Bukta, Imre
Bulányi, György
Bálint, Csaba
Bán, Mária
Bánfi, Szilvia
Bánki, Zsolt
Bárdosi, József
Béres, Dezső
Béri, Géza
Béri, Jr., Géza

Bódy, Gábor
Bújdosó, Alpár
Cs. Szabó, László
Csalog, Zsolt
Csapody, Tamás
Cseh, András
Cseh, Tamás
Csorba, László
Csoóri, Sándor
Csákó, Mihály
Czigány, Lóránt
Demszky, Gábor
Diósi, Pál
Droppa, György
Dénes, Iván Zoltán
Dér, András
Dévényi, István
Dóka, Zoltán
Edit Sasvári
Egyed, András
Elbert, Márta
Ember, Judit
Erdei, Ferenc
Erdély, Miklós
Erdélyi, Zsuzsanna
Erős, Ferenc
Esterházy, Péter
Fejtő, Ferenc
Ferenc, Fábri
Ferenc, Juhász
Fodor, Tamás
Frazon, Zsófia
Gadó, György
Galyasi, Miklós
Galántai, György
Gasner, János
Gerle, János
Gonda, István
Granasztói, Péter
Greza, Ferenc
Gubis, Mihály
Gulyás, András

Gyenis, András SJ
Gyula, Jobbágy
Gyurkó, János
György, Droppa
Gyürey, Vera
Gálig, Zoltán
Göncz, Kinga
Göncz, Árpád
Göntér, Zsuzsanna
H. Bagó, Ilona
Hajas, Tibor
Halmos, Béla
Hanák, Gábor
Haraszti, Miklós
Hargitai, Gábor
Havas, Gábor
Hegedűs B., András
Hegedűs, András
Hegedűs, György
Hegy, Dóra
Helle, Mária
Hetényi Varga, Károly
Hetényi, Zsuzsa
Holdas, György
Horváth, György
Horváth, Tamás M.
Horváth, Zsolt
Hubai, László
Háber, Ferenc
Háy, Ágnes
Illyés, Gyula
Illés, Árpád
Joó, Sándor
Jr., István Bibó
Juhász, Gyula
Jámbor, László OSJ
Jávor, István
József, Antall
Kamarás, István
Kardos, László
Kassák, Lajos
Katona, Anikó

Kelemen, András
Kemény, Gyula
Kemény, István
Kenedi, János
Keresztes, Szilárd
Kertész, Imre
Keserü, Ilona
Keszi, Péter Kovács
Király, Iliász
Király, Tamás
Kis, János
Kisbarnaki, Farkas Ferenc
Kisfaludy, András
Kiss Gy., Csaba
Kistamás, László
Klaniczay, Gábor
Klaniczay, Júlia
Klaniczay, Tibor
Kodolányi, Sebestyén
Konkoly, István
Konrád, György
Koszits, Attila
Kovács, András
Kozma, Éva
Kozák, Gyula
Krassó, György
Krassó, Miklós
Kulin, Ferenc
Kurta, István
Kálmándy, Ferenc
Kálmány, Lajos
Kály-Kullai, Károly
Kántor, István
Károlyi, Angelica
Károlyi, György
Kárpáti, Kamil
Kárpáti, Klára (Lajos Kassákné)
Kósa, Klára
Könczöl, Csaba
Kőrösi, Zsuzsanna
Kőszeg, Ferenc
Lajtha, Ildikó

Lajtha, László
Lakatos, Menyhért
Lakner, László
Lengyel, Gabriella
Leveleki, Eszter
Liskó, Ilona
Lukin, Gábor
Lukács, Bea
Lukács, László
Láner, László
Láng, István
Lányi, András
Lénárd, Ödön
Magyar, Dezső
Magyar, Gábor
Malgot, István
Marelyin Kiss, József
Markovits, Györgyi
Martin, György
Marton, László Távolodó
Matolay, Magda
Matyófalvi, Gábor
Maurer, Dóra
Mindszenty, Cardinal József
Mocsár, Gábor
Molnár, Gergely
Molnár, János
Molnár, Tamás
Mosonyi Kiss, Gusztáv
Márkus, Béla
Márton, János
Méhes, Lóránt
Méry, Gábor
Mészáros, Tibor
Mészöly, Miklós
Nagy, Csaba
Nagy, Gábor
Nagy, Sándor
Nemes, Sándor
Novák, Ferenc
Nádosy, Ferenc
Németh, Ilona

Nóvé, Béla
Ocsovszky, László
Olasz, Attila
Olasz, Sándor
Olasz, Sándorné
Ordass, Lajos
Orosz, István
Ortutay, Gyula
Pataki, Ferenc
Perczel, Anna
Perneczky, Géza
Pesty, László
Peternák, Miklós
Petri, György
Petrányi, Zsolt
Philipp, Tibor
Pinczehelyi, Sándor
Pogány, Ö. Gábor
Páldi, Livia
Pécsi, Györgyi
Radda, István
Radnóti, Sándor
Rajk, Júlia
Rajk, László
Ravasz, László
Reszler, Ernesztin
Pütkösti, Árpád
Rolf, Jenő
Romhányi, László
Rupaszov, Tamás
Rábai, Agent
Ráday, Mihály
Rész, István
Rév, István
Samu, Géza
Sarkadi, Péter
Sasvári, Edit
Schiffer, Pál
Schöpflin, Gyula
Sebő, Ferenc
Sipos, András
Solt, Ottilia

Soltész, Márton
Somlai, Katalin
Somogyi, Mária
Soros, George
Soós, Andrea
Soós, György
Soós, Sándor
Soós, Tamás
Sugár, János
Szabó, Márta
Szathmáry, Lajos
Szecskó, Tibor
Szelényi, Iván
Szenes, Zsuzsa
Szennay, András
Szenti, Tibor
Szentirmay, László
Szentjóby, Tamás
Száva, Gyula
Százados, László
Széchenyi, Mihály
Szépfalusi, István
Vajay, Szabolcs
Vargha, János
Vermes, Géza
Sebestyén Kodolányi
Szepessy, Ákos
Szilágyi, Zsófia Anna
Szulovszky, István
Szörényi, Levente
Szücs, György
Szőke, Annamária
Szőnyei, Tamás
Sára, Sándor
Sárközy, Margit
Sáska, Géza
Sümegi, György
Süvecz, Emese
Takács Bencze, Gábor
Tamási, Miklós
Tamási, Áron
Tandori, Dezső

Tari, Beáta
Taxner-Tóth, Ernő
Terray, László
Toldi, Lóránt
Tímár, Ágnes
Tódor, Albert
Tót, Endre
Tóth, Ferenc
Tóth, István
Tóth, Margit
Török, András
Türk, Péter
Uhl, Antal
Ujj, Zsuzsanna
Urbán, Tamás
Vincze, Ottó
Vadas, Éva
Vajta, Vilmos
Varga E., Árpád
Varga, Borbála
Varga, István
Viczián, István
Vida, István
Vincze, Ferenc
Váli, Dezső
Várallyay, Gyula - Julius -
Végh, László
Wahorn, András
Zinner, Tibor
Zombori, Mónika
Zsolnay, Miklós Mattyasovszky
Zádori, Zsuzsanna
ef Zámbó, István
fe Lugossy, László
i Szentiványi, Kálmán
Éri, Péter
Újszászy, Kálmán
Várnagy, Tibor

Persons interviewed

Almási, Tamás
Bakos, István
Beke, László
Bernátsky, Ferenc
Borus, Gábor
Bálint, Csaba
Bánki, Zsolt
Béres, Dezső
Csapody, Tamás
Cseh, András
Diósi, Pál
Droppa, György
Erős, Ferenc
Ferenc, Fábri
Fodor, Tamás
Frazon, Zsófia
Granasztói, Péter
Gulyás, András
Gálig, Zoltán
Hanák, Gábor
Haraszi, Miklós
Havas, Gábor
Hetényi, Zsuzsa
Hont, Péter
Háber, Ferenc
Háy, Ágnes
Jombach, Márta
Jr., István Bibó
Kamarás, István
Katalin Fejes
Kelemen, András
Kisfaludy, András
Klaniczay, Gábor
Kodolányi, Sebestyén
Kürti, Emese
Kőszeg, Ferenc
Lukács, Bea
Marelyin Kiss, József
Marosvári, Attila
Mink, András

Molnár, János
Muskovics, Gyula
Méhes, Lóránt
Mészáros, Tibor
Müller, Rolf
Nagy, Csaba
Nagy, Gyula
Nagy, Sándor
Novotny, Tihamér
Nóvé, Béla
Olasz, Attila
Olasz, Sándorné
Pataki, Ferenc
Perczel, Anna
Perneczky, Géza
Peternák, Miklós
Petrányi, Zsolt
Pécsi, Györgyi
Radnóti, Sándor
Szabó, Márta
Szenti, Tibor
Soltész, Márton
Somogyi, Mária
Soós, Andrea
Szilágyi, Zsófia Anna
Százados, László
Szentirmay, László
Szücs, György
Szőnyei, Tamás
Sípos, Zoltán
Tamási, Miklós
Török, András
Varga, Júlia
Varga, Katalin
Viczián, István
Vincze, Ferenc
Várkonyi, Ádám
Végh, László
Tamás Almási
Vörös, Géza
Zombori, Mónika
ef Zámbó, István

Várnagy, Tibor

Operators, owners

1956 Institute - Oral History Archive;
Almási, Tamás;
Archive of Corvinus University;
Archive of the Eötvös Loránd University;
Archives of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences;
Archives of the Jesuit Order Hungary;
Artpool Art Research Center Nonprofit Ltd;
Artpool Foundation;
Association of Hungarian Rock Hall of Fame;
Baksa Soós, János;
Beke, László;
Bodor, Ferenc;
Bokor Base Community;
Bp. Szabó, György;
Budapest City Archives;
Béri, Jr., Géza;
Csapody, Tamás;
Cseh Tamás Archivum Alapítvány;
Diósi, Pál;
Erős, Ferenc;
Ferenc, Fábri;
Ferenczy Museum, Szentendre;
Fiatal Képzőművészek Stúdiója Alapítvány;
Fodor, Tamás;
Gallery of Szombathely;
Galántai, György;
Gulyás, András;
Gyula Derkovits and István Dési Huber Memorial Museum;
Gáspár Nagy Foundation;
Göncz, Árpád;
Göntér, Zsuzsanna;
Havas, Gábor;
Historical Archives of the Hungarian State Security;
Hungarian Academy of Sciences - Soros Foundation Committee;
Hungarian Association of the Order of Malta;
Hungarian Heritage House;
Hungarian National Gallery;
Hungarian Province of the Society of Jesus;
Hungarian Rock Museum and Hall of Fame Association;
Hungarian Soros Foundation;

Háber, Ferenc;
Háttér Society;
Háy, Ágnes;
Institute for Musicology;
Joseph Károlyi Foundation;
Jr., István Bibó;
János Tornyai Museum;
Kamarás, István;
Király, Iliász;
Kisfaludy, András;
Klaniczay, Gábor;
Koszits, Attila;
Kovács, András;
Kálmándy, Ferenc;
Képzőművészeti Alap;
Lengyel, Gabriella;
Leveleki, Eszter;
MANK;
MNL Csongrád Megyei Levéltár, Szeged;
MaNDA;
Marelyin Kiss, József;
Museum of Ethnography;
Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest;
Méhes, Lóránt;
Műcsarnok;
Nagy, Gyula;
National Archives of Hungary;
National Pantheon Foundation;
National Széchényi Library (Hungary);
National University of Public Administration;
Németh László Public Library at Hódmezővásárhely;
Németh, Ilona;
Nóvé, Béla;
Olasz, Attila;
Olasz, Sándorné;
Orfeo Group;
Petőfi Literary Museum;
Research Institute and Archives for the History of the Hungarian Regime Change;
Savaria Megyei Hatókörű Városi Múzeum;
Scientific Collections of the Calvinist College of Sáropatak;
Studio of Young Artists Foundation;
Szőnyei, Tamás;

Tamási, Miklós;

The Institute for Cultural Research;

The branch library of the Metropolitan Ervin Szabó Library/Fővárosi Szabó Ervin Könyvtár,
FSZEK in Újpest;

Vajda Lajos Cultural Association;

Vargha, János;

Vera & Donald Blinken Open Society Archives

Viczián, István;

Voices of the 20th Century Archive and Research Group;

Várallyay, Gyula - Julius -;

Végh, László;

Várnagy, Tibor;

Tamás Almási;