



INTRODUCTION OF THE UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION. AT INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL AND ON LEGAL TERMS. THE HUNGARIAN EXAMPLE

HARLOV-CSORTÁN Melinda ¹

¹ Melinda Harlov-Csortán, Apor Vilmos Katolikus Foiskola, Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, ICOMOS Hungary; European Labour History Network
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2945-217X>

ABSTRACT: The text analyses the introduction of the supranational notion of cultural heritage together with the related processes (heritagization) at the Hungarian legal- and institutional level. First, the national governing powers and the legislative texts are analysed in order to find out the named processes on macro level. Then the connecting professional and scientific disciplines (monument-, environment protection and ethnography) are investigated through the institutional structures and their realization steps as well to decode their transformations to cultural heritage on national level. The research focuses on the period between the mid-20th century and the early 2010s, as during this period the international and scientific usage of the term cultural heritage got fully customized in the Hungarian context.

KEY WORDS: Hungary, legislative texts, UNESCO, World Heritage Convention, law, World Heritage Committee

Introduction

The term cultural heritage in the context of UNESCO World Heritage has its variations in every language. Rarely does any language use a foreign expression but instead adapts one of its own for the new meaning and or context. These local expressions have some connotations or historical backgrounds that influence the understanding of this new internationally widespread phenomenon¹. Such issue appears regarding other defining terms as well about which UNESCO World Heritage Committee is aware of. For example, the Nara Document expresses it regarding the notion of authenticity: “It was noted that in some languages of the world, there is no word to express precisely the concept of authenticity”².

The Hungarian term for heritage is *örökség* that has its basis in *örök* meaning forever like the evergreen tree is *örökzöld* in Hungarian. Accordingly, *örökség* is a noun that expresses the continuity from the undefined past to the unknown future. Even though such semantic investigation is hardly ever undertaken during the everyday use of the term, the connotation does exist in the human understanding. As *örökség*, according to the Hungarian Etymological Dictionary means someone’s place that has been left empty after this person’s death or the intellectual legacy of the same person³. This term with the named meaning was first documented in the late 13th century⁴. Accordingly, we can see that the Hungarian term for heritage has a long history, and its meaning is about a (tangible or intangible) property whose owner has changed over time. Even before the presently discussed understanding of the term and its widening scope of meaning, the Hungarian term *örökség* was adapted in multiple contexts but it was rarely seen as a scientific term.

Cultural heritage in Hungarian politics and policies

Politics, as a governing tool, unquestionably influences the notion of cultural heritage and heritagization process. It can be exemplified among others by the fact that in some cultural heritage definitions the political aspect is even explicitly expressed. For instance, Labadi and Logan proposed a definition for cultural heritage as:

a social and *political construct* encompassing all those places, artefacts and cultural expressions inherited from the past which, because they are seen to reflect and validate our identity as nations, communities, families and even individuals, are worthy of some form of respect and protection⁵. (*italicised by the Author*)

¹ For instance, Fejős Z., *Tárgy-fordítások. Néprajzi Múzeumi tanulmányok, Budapest 2003 and Sonkoly, Gábor, Bolyhos tájaink, Budapest 2016, pp. 11–12.*

² UNESCO, *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, 1994, 1. <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/nara94.htm>, (access: 20.12.2022).

³ Tófalusi I., *Magyar Etymológiai Szótár*, Budapest, 2001.

⁴ Zaicz G., *Etimológiai Szótár*, Budapest 2006, p. 537.

⁵ Labadi S., Logan W. S., *Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability: International Frameworks, National and Local Governance*, London 2015.

Partly because its politically influenced character the notion and the related processes regarding to cultural heritage are influenced by numerous “circumstantial” (non-professional or -scientific) aspects including international relations. Connecting to inter- or supranational organizations (such as UNESCO, RAMSAR, EU) means adapting vocabulary and operations through – among others – ratifying international regulations, establishing new institutions and practices⁶.

There is an extensive literature about the power relation within such international relations. Among others, Barkan emphasizes the inter- and supranational organizations’ power over the local practices through the “enforce[d] values” and “global standards”⁷. While others point to the fact that it is the nation state that manages every heritage example on its territory and the supranational powers do not have right or tools to effectively influence the operation on local level⁸.

The term *cultural heritage* with the analysed scope of understanding appeared in politics and policies in the Hungarian context as well. Looking through the parliamentary documentations among others Péter Erdősi pointed out that it was in the mid-1990s when the term “heritage” first appeared but only sporadically⁹. The researcher points to the international analogue of these adaptations and the European Union recommendations that the country had to fulfil at that time¹⁰. Accordingly, the term “heritage” appeared in the political discourse due to foreign influence. The term “cultural heritage” later appeared in the titles of the restructured state cultural ministries and offices and in the texts of laws and other legal regulations as well¹¹. Similar to the international organizations, the expression was not defined in its new cultural ministerial or policy usage.

In 2001, *Act on Cultural Heritage* seemed to provide an exception, as the term “heritage” was used almost two hundred times in the legal text¹². However, there was not an explicit definition for cultural heritage, only an enumeration of its categories (such as archaeological findings,

⁶ One of the adapted regulations is the UNESCO World Heritage Convention from 1985, newly established institution was among others the Hungarian National Committee of ICOMOS, and an example for internationally required practice to be realized was the Adoption of Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value in case of all UNESCO World Heritage examples in Hungary.

⁷ Barkan E., *Amending Historical Injustices: The Restitution of Cultural Property—An Overview*, [in:] *Claiming the Stones, Naming the Bones: Cultural Property and the Negotiation of National and Ethnic Identity*, E. Barkan, R. Bush (eds.), Los Angeles 2002, p. 27.

⁸ Askew M., *The Magic List of Global Status*, [in:] *Heritage and Globalization*, S. Labadi, C. Long (eds.), London 2010, pp. 20—22.

⁹ Erdősi P., *A kulturális örökség meghatározásának kísérletei Magyarországon*, [in:] *Regio*, Vol. 11. No. 4., 2000, p. 28.

¹⁰ European Union, *Compendium of basic texts of the Council of Europe in the field of cultural heritage*, Strasbourg, 1998, pp. 10-17, 23—25 and 61—67.

¹¹ Such as the Public Collection Department within the Cultural and Educational Ministry that was renamed in 1996 to Cultural Heritage Department, or within the text of the Monument Protection Act of 1997.

¹² *Act LXIV of 2001 on Cultural Heritage*, http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A0100064.TV, (access: 20.12.2022).

monuments, cultural properties, memorials and memory places) was present¹³. This law was modified numerous times, out of which on many occasions the modifications were due to the proclamation of a new UNESCO Convention¹⁴. In 2011 the *Act on World Heritage* was enacted in order to adapt the UNESCO World Heritage Committee's processes and vocabulary. It defined the locations, processes and the involved actors and adapted the notion of heritagization in the sense that it defined not just the application-, but the management steps as well.

The *Act LXXVII of 2011 on World Heritage* contained the expression “heritage” 232 times out of which it was used as “world heritage” 191 times¹⁵. Most of the remaining cases were used together with “culture” or “cultural”. Interestingly, “natural heritage” appears only two times in the entire text, even if “nature” was used 66 times throughout the text mostly in connection with the words: “territory,” “protection” and “value”. This small quantitative analysis also points out that the term “heritage” is the least commonly used regarding nature, and even “cultural heritage” is less common than “World Heritage”, which is one word in Hungarian (*világörökség*) unlike the above mentioned two¹⁶.

Moreover, the term “heritage” was many times mentioned in the *Hungarian Fundamental Law* as well which was established in 2011. Interestingly, in the preamble, the term “heritage” and its categories were listed after each other as equal elements, not as the name of a category and its components: “our heritage, our unique language, the Hungarian culture, the language and culture of the minorities in Hungary, the man-made and cultural values of the Carpathian Basin”¹⁷. The next example was due to a modification one year later in 2012, when our common heritage was used after the enumeration of its elements. Interestingly, this list of “our heritage” that was clearly composed of natural and cultural heritage, explained in much more detail the possible realizations of natural heritage. These examples for the usage of the term “heritage” clearly alluded to the original inheritance meaning of the Hungarian term. These cases in the *Hungarian Fundamental Law* also show that still in 2011 the new (cultural) meaning of the Hungarian term “heritage” were not fully adapted as its original meaning was still in use. Similarly, the hesitance regarding the scope of the meaning of cultural heritage was clearly definable. There might have been numerous reasons behind this such as the strict adaptation of the international practice¹⁸.

¹³ The lack of definition can be seen as a sign for following many international policy examples.

¹⁴ Like the introduction of intangible cultural heritage and the diversity of cultural expressions. Sonkoly G., *Social history of cultural heritage protection in Hungary*, [in:] *Protecting and Safeguarding cultural heritage. Systems of Management of Cultural Heritage in the Visegrad Countries*, J. Purchla (ed.), Krakow 2011, pp. 11–30.

¹⁵ *Act LXXVII of 2011 on World Heritage*, http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A1100077.TV&celpara=#xcelparam, (access: 20.12.2022).

¹⁶ Cultural heritage is in Hungarian *kulturális örökség*, while natural heritage is translated to Hungarian as *természeti örökség*.

¹⁷ *Hungarian Fundamental Law*, 2011, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a1100425.atv>, (access: 20.12.2022).

¹⁸ Other reasons can be providing enumeration rather than a descriptive definition, the long use and seemingly clear understanding of the Hungarian term heritage or a more political aim to keep open the possible understandings and adaptations of the term (and hence the institutions and decisions).

Besides institutions and legal texts, certain programs and prizes also adopted the term “heritage”. For instance, the Hungarian Heritage prize has been annually awarded to mainly individuals, but to groups or institutions and to achievements (such as movies or pilgrimage routes) as well. It has the aim of drawing the public attention to outstanding Hungarian achievement of the 20th century¹⁹. Such expanding adaptation of the term “heritage” can be stated in parallel with the international transformations both in terms of the scope of the meaning and the involved actors.

Monument protection

Monument protection is the discipline that first adapted the word “heritage” at national and international level too. The UNESCO World Heritage Committee has three intergovernmental Advisory Bodies, out of which ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) is responsible for „the implementation of the World Heritage Convention of UNESCO. As such, it reviews the nominations of cultural world heritage and ensures the conservation status of properties”²⁰. This part of the ICOMOS mission clearly shows that professionals of monuments and sites are nominated to focus on cultural heritage examples as well. However, there was an economic reason behind this official cooperation²¹. Similarly, in Hungary most of the key representatives of cultural heritage management have architecture and more precisely, monument protection educational background.

At national level it is important to say that monument protection has a long history in Hungary both as a practice, a profession, and a discipline taught on the highest educational level²². The nation-wide institution system of monument protection that was supposed to harmonize the processes from the local level to the highest national level and combine diverse necessary professions was - after turbulent years - re-established in 1957²³. Even at this early stage this discipline was assigned to fulfil a highly complex task similar to the later named and defined heritagization. That can be seen in a policy paper as well in the section 4 at Point H of the government decision numbered 1045/1957, which says: “Cultural Ministry fulfils the cultural policy tasks related to monuments (the utilization of monuments, adaptation of the aesthetics and historical values of monuments at the education and community management, propagandistic activities – and archaeological tasks related to monuments)”²⁴. At the early stage the institution was consisted of three departments: Department of Planning and Construction, Department of Monument Protection, Department of Science that also points to the complexity of tasks²⁵.

¹⁹ Hámori J. E., *Magyar Örökség Díj*, 2008, <http://www.magyarorokseg.hu/eloszo> (access: 20.12.2022.).

²⁰ *ICOMOS' Mission*, 2020, <https://www.icomos.org/en/about-icomos/mission-and-vision/icomos-mission> (access: 20.12.2022).

²¹ Román A, *A Velencei Kartától a Nara Dokumentumig*, [in:] *Műemlékvédelem*, Vol. 61. No. 1., 1997, pp. 2–5.

²² Monument protection in Hungary started already in 1846, and was first institutionalized in 1872.

²³ The title of the institution was National Monument Protection Inspectorate (OMF). Tilinger I., *A magyar műemlékvédelem jellegzetességei*, [in:] *Az Egri Nyári Egyetem előadásai*, G. Barcza (ed.), Budapest 1978, pp. 19–26.

²⁴ Ságvári A., (ed.), *Források Budapest múltjából V./b 1954-1958*, Budapest 1988, p. 324.

²⁵ Viskolcz N, *A veszteség gondos dokumentálása. A kulturális örökségvédelem intézményrendszerének változásai a rendszerváltás után (1990–2015)*, [in:] *Sodrásban képzések, kutatások (1975–2015)*, E. Sütő, E. Szirmai, E. Újvári (eds.), Szeged 2016, pp. 129–142.

It is also important to mention that the connection and the comparison between foreign standards and Hungary were not one-sided. Hungarian monument protection professional Dezső Dercsényi presented at the Second Congress of Architects and Specialists of Historic Buildings, where the idea and need for the later called ICOMOS was expressed and accepted²⁶. Few years later, Mohammed El Fazi, the president of the Executive Board at the 72nd UNESCO meeting in 1966 said: “Appreciating the outstanding work done by the Government of Hungary for the preservation, presentation and continued use of monuments and cultural property”²⁷. The text of the Venice Charter immediately after its introduction was disseminated among the Hungarian professionals in publications and at conferences²⁸. The Charter became the benchmark for architects working in monument protection²⁹.

After the regime change the state-led central system of monument protection then heritage management system went through numerous restructurings. Partly, due to the fact that many tasks were designated from central state management to local and regional level. For instance, by the *Act LXV of 1990 on Local Governments*, municipalities were assigned with the role of monument protection (§ 107)³⁰. The strong connection or even continuity from monument protection to cultural heritage management could be realized by the top-level management institution for monument protection: the National Inspectorate of Historic Monuments, which was renamed the National Office for the Protection of Historic Monuments (1992). The next change was to transform it into National Office of Cultural Heritage (2001), which was followed by the Gyula Forster National Heritage and Asset Management Centre in 2012. It was closed in 2017 transferring its functions to different ministerial divisions. Today there is no individual institution in Hungary designated to monument protection or cultural heritage. Just the names of these central institutions clearly show the transformation of the subject from monument to heritage and regarding the tasks and evaluations based on the institutional format from an inspectorate to an asset management centre. Among the numerous consequences were the decreasing role of documentation and scientific research, the over-bureaucratization of the processes or even duplication of them due to the segmentation of the former system³¹.

²⁶ Dercsényi, D., *Town-planning and the protection of historic monuments in Hungary*, [in:] *The monument for the man*. Records of the II International Congress of Restoration, P. Gazzola (ed.), Venice 1964, <https://www.icomos.org/publications/terza26.pdf> (access: 20.12.2022.).

²⁷ UNESCO, 72nd session of the Executive Board, 1966, <http://ulis2.unesco.org/images/0011/001132/113211EO.pdf> (access: 20.12.2022.).

²⁸ Dercsényi D., Horler M., *Beszámoló az 1964. évi velencei II. Nemzetközi Műemlékvédelmi Kongresszusról*, [in:] *Műemlékvédelem*, Vol. 8. No. 4., 1964, pp. 193—217.

²⁹ For instance, by keeping the monument object in the use of contemporary society, e.g. providing new function to vernacular architecture.

³⁰ *Act LXV of 1990 on Local Governments*, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?dbnum=1&docid=99000065.TV&mahu=1> (access: 20.12.2022.).

³¹ Granasztóiné G. K., *Szellemi örökségünk, a magyar műemlékvédelem*, [in:] *Magyar Szemle Újfolyam*, Vol. 22. No. 3-4, 2013, pp. 80—92; Granasztóiné G. K., *Szellemi örökségünk, a magyar műemlékvédelem*, [in:] *Magyar Szemle Újfolyam*, Vol. 22. No. 3-4, 2013, pp. 80—92.

It is important to mention that Hungarian professionals in their publications and presentations have always emphasized that dealing with cultural heritage is not a change in their profession but an extra task taken on by many of them. It was even legally ratified in 1997 by emphasizing that monument protection should be contributed in the management of World Heritage examples and National Memorials³². Other international scholars identified the same plurality of tasks that are required from monument protection experts by saying: “[T]he expanding roles played by conservation professionals – beyond technical expertise into mediation, facilitation, and embracing stakeholder status – are now widely acknowledged in practice”³³. Such transformation was realized even though both the subject and the methods of monument protection and heritagization are not the same as Tamás Fejérdy, conservator and Honorary President of the Hungarian National Committee of ICOMOS usually expresses “Every monument is heritage but not all heritage examples are monuments”. This is due to the fact that monuments (protected or listed buildings) are always scientifically chosen at national-level whereas a heritage example can be nominated by the inheritor.

The confusion regarding the separation of monument protection and cultural heritage management can be exemplified with numerous legal documents as well both on national and international level. On national level, some of the acts regarding monument protection or even environment protection, use both expressions: *monuments* and *cultural heritage*. For example, the *Act of LIV on Monument Protection* targets all those monuments that express special value for the public as cultural heritage³⁴. Similarly, the *Governmental Decree of 176/2008 (VI. 30.) on the Certification of Energy Performance of Buildings* alludes that cultural heritage regulations are adapted to monuments³⁵. Moreover, the fact that the types and not definition of cultural heritage based on the *Operational Guideline of UNESCO World Heritage Committee* are elements of the monument protection vocabulary is also a good indicator to this interconnectedness³⁶. It is important to point out that besides the interchangeable adaptation of monument protection and cultural heritage management, other external forces also shaped the identified transformation such as market economy and the increasing diversity and changing ownership of buildings³⁷. Moreover, “decisions about what to conserve and how to conserve are largely defined by cultural contexts, societal trends, political and economic forces—which themselves continue to change”³⁸.

³² *Act LIV of 1997 on Monument Protection*, § 2 (2), <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a0100064.tv> (access: 20.12.2022.).

³³ Myers D., Smith S. N., Ostergren G. (eds.), *Consensus Building, Negotiation, and Conflict Resolution for Heritage Place Management*, Los Angeles 2016, p. 34.

³⁴ *Act LIV of 1997 on Monument Protection*, § 1 (1).

³⁵ 176/2008 (VI.30.) *Government Decree on the Certification of Energy Performance of Buildings*, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a0800176.kor> (access: 20.12.2022.).

³⁶ Examples for common vocabulary are among others monuments or groups of buildings. UNESCO, *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, Paris 2015, 10, <https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/> (access: 20.12.2022.).

³⁷ Besides its interchangeability, it is important to point out that the latter one was constantly broadening in typology, adapted methods and involved actors.

³⁸ Avrami E., Mason R., de la Torre M. (eds.), *Values and Heritage Conservation Research Report*, Los Angeles 2000, p. 7.

Environment protection³⁹

Environment protection has a long history in Hungary⁴⁰ that scholars categorize into diverse periods with more or less successful segments in terms of institutionalization, legal framework and efficiency in the scientific research or its realization⁴¹. Even though the general idea that during the Cold War period in the Eastern bloc environment protection was not in the focus and the harmful technocratic environment management led to numerous problems there were contradictory examples and approaches as well. The importance on the human-nature interaction was in the centre of many Soviet scholars and led to its adaptation among the Hungarian experts (such as Kálmán Rajczi and Dénes Börzsöny) as well as early as in 1950s⁴².

Hungarian environment protection in the previous political period was mainly concentrated on water management through numerous institutions such as the Hungarian Hydrological Society or the General Directorate of Water Management. Similar to monument professionals, representatives of environment protection fulfilled state bureaucratic-, research and educational positions as well. Despite that, among others the ideological and economic circumstances made them unable to realize the complex ideas and theories of protecting the human nature coexistence⁴³.

The Hungarian term for *heritage* has been adapted to a small extent in the field of environment protection. Looking through the major publications, *heritage or natural heritage* were almost never used unless it was directly related to UNESCO World Heritage typology⁴⁴. Similarly, there has been hardly any institution that adapts the term *heritage or natural heritage*. On its highest, nation-wide organizational and supervising political level the term *environment protection*

³⁹ It is important to express the difference but interconnectedness of environment- and natural protection that is defined by Hungarian laws as well such as the *Act LIII of 1995 on Natural Protection*, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99500053.tv> (access: 20.12.2022) and *Act LIII of 1996 on Environment Protection*, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99600053.tv> (access: 20.12.2022). Environment protection pays attention on the man-made environment elements as well, while natural protection focuses on the protection of biological values and their diversity (the flora and fauna). Both fields are preventive and deals with the mutually sustainable cooperation and coexistence of humanity and its natural surroundings. The following section focuses on environment protection but looks at natural protection institutions as well due to the above-mentioned interrelatedness.

⁴⁰ Bihari Z., Antal Z., Gyüre P., *Természetvédelmi ökológia*, Debrecen 2008.

⁴¹ Tardy J., *Természetvédelem*, [in:] *Magyarország a XX. században II. kötet: Természeti környezet, népesség és társadalom, egyházak és felekezetek, gazdaság*, I. Tarsoly (ed.), Szekszárd 1997, pp. 115–124.

⁴² The movement later called Stalinist Environmentalism (Brain S., *Song of the Forest: Russian Forestry and Stalinist Environmentalism 1905–1953.*, Pittsburgh 2011).

⁴³ Gille Z., *From the Cult of Waste to the Trash Heap of History: The Politics of Waste in Socialist and Postsocialist Hungary*, Bloomington 2007; Pál V., *Discourses over nature. The politicization of the environment in Central and Eastern Europe during the Cold War (1949- mid 1980s)*, [in:] *The Living City - an anthology in urban environmental history*, S. Lilja, M. Legnér (ed.), Stockholm 2010, pp. 74–103.

⁴⁴ Markó B., et al., *Kultúra, természet, örökség: a kulturális és a természeti örökség kapcsolatának multidiszciplináris vizsgálata Délnyugat-Szilágyságban*, [in:] *Érték és közösség. A hagyomány és az örökség szerepe a változó lokális regiszterekben*, A. Jakab., A. Vajda(eds.), Kolozsvár 2016, pp. 101–129.

existed for a long period. Change happened in 2010 when the ministry responsible also for environment protection was named the Rural Development Ministry. *Environment protection* as an expression in the name of any ministry that would have defined it as a major task has not been used again.

Looking through the Hungarian laws and regulations regarding environment protection, there are less than ten documents incorporating the term “heritage”. In the case of laws about environment protection the word “heritage” usually appears in the preamble naming natural heritage to be “part of the national treasury” or “one prerequisite for the viability of humanity”⁴⁵. This is the case in the documentation of the environment protection tasks that have been planned in five-year cycles since 1997 following the international norms defined by the European Union⁴⁶. In addition, in the Act LIII of 1996, two of the named natural categories that are protected by law are defined by having, among others, cultural heritage significance⁴⁷. Many government decrees urge for cooperation between professionals of environment protection and cultural heritage⁴⁸. Along these lines, in the case of environmental impact assessment architectural heritage, monuments and historical landscapes have to be part of the investigation⁴⁹. Some other examples where the term “heritage” occurs are direct translations of the European Economic Community⁵⁰. In these documents the subject (for instance, natural resources and migratory species) is named as part of the “common heritage,” “the heritage of the peoples of Europe” or of “the Community’s natural heritage”⁵¹.

Hungary has joined numerous international programs and initiatives in the field of environment protection. For example, as member of UNESCO, Hungary joined the Man and the Biosphere Programme in 1970. Its Committee is responsible among others for the reports about the six biosphere reserves of Hungary in every ten years that are submitted for the UNESCO MAB

⁴⁵ *Act LIII of 1995 on Natural Protection and Act LIII of 1996 on Environment Protection.*

⁴⁶ Láng I., *Az EU előszobájában*, [in:] *Tények könyve*, A. Kereszty (ed.), Budapest 1998, p. 202.

⁴⁷ The two natural categories are both remaining of formerly used man-made soil formation such as ‘földvár’ castle made by soil, or ‘kunhalom’ man-made hill for territorial signage, burial or spiritual function. Láng I., *Az EU előszobájában*, 1998, pp. 200—205.

⁴⁸ 347/2006 (XII. 23.) *Governmental Decree on Identifying Organizational and Directional Institutions of Environmental-, Natural Protection and Water Management*, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?dbnum=1&docid=A0600347.KOR&mahu=1>, (access: 20.12.2022) and 71/2015 (III. 30.) *Governmental Decree on Identifying Organizational and Directional Institutions of Environmental-, Natural Protection*, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a1500071.kor>, (access: 20.12.2022).

⁴⁹ Žarnić R., Rajčić V., Skordaki N., *A contribution to the built heritage environmental impact assessment*, [in:] *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, Vol. II-5/W3, 2015, pp. 389—394.

⁵⁰ 275/2004. (X. 8.) *Governmental Decree on Sites of European Community Importance for Nature Conservation Purposes*, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a0400275.kor>, (access: 20.12.2022).

⁵¹ 79/409/EEC, *Council Directive of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:31979L0409> (access: 20.12.2022) and 92/43/EEC, *Council Directive of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A31992L0043> (access: 20.12.2022).

Secretary for evaluation⁵². Through these reports as well as by the ratification of the establishment and management of the biosphere reserves in the Hungarian legal system the international environment protection practices and the national realization got harmonized⁵³. The Hungarian documents in connection to such international cooperation and participation also include direct translations of the (usually English) international texts. In these examples, the usage of the Hungarian term for heritage is a given translation and not the chosen usage of the term. Moreover, as it has not been adapted to other Hungarian documents, these examples can be evaluated as pure translations⁵⁴.

The function or role of the official territorial separation of a given example is different in environment protection and at the field of cultural heritage. Experts of both fields separate a core and a buffer zone within the protected territory however in case of environmental protected examples the core zone consists of two segments⁵⁵. In case of both heritage management and environment protection, the buffer zone separates and establishes distance between the protected (core) and not-protected areas. Interestingly, in case of environment protection examples, especially at natural parks another zone is also defined, titled landscape/touristic or dissemination zone, where distribution of information and experience can be realized⁵⁶. Visitors' centres and recreation services can be found and are allowed usually at this segment. Such categorization follows the international requirements, however national differences regarding its adaptation can be decoded as well. Partly this can lead to the challenges of introducing the international cultural heritage management processes to the field of environment protection.

⁵² There are six biosphere reserves in Hungary: Aggtelek Biosphere Reserve, Mura-Drava-Danube Transboundary Biosphere Reserve, Pilis Biosphere Reserve, Lake Fertő Biosphere Reserve, Hortobágy Biosphere Reserve, Kiskunság Biosphere Reserve more information about the individual biosphere reserves can be found: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/ecological-sciences/biosphere-reserves/europe-north-america/hungary/> (access: 20.12.2022).

⁵³ *Act LIII of 1996 on Environment Protection* and the 7/2007. (III.22.) *Ministry Decree on the Hungarian Biosphere Reservoirs*, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=A0700007.KVV&celpara=> (access: 20.12.2022).

⁵⁴ Urbán M., *NATURE 2000: regulation and practice. Dissertation*, Szeged 2007.

⁵⁵ The first segment is the strictly protected one that is prevented from any dissemination (no visibility for the greater public). The second part of the core zone is the conservation or controlled protection zone, which has double function. On one hand, it provides a buffer zone for the first segment and on the other hand, this zone is aimed to be preserved. Accordingly, traditional activities are allowed with control and the territory can be explored at defined routes.

⁵⁶ Dobos A., *Az átmeneti (puffer)-zóna geológiai értékvédelemben játszott szerepének bemutatása egy bükkaljai mintaterület alapján, Földrajzi konferencia*, Szeged 2001, <http://geography.hu/mfk2001/cikkek/DobosA2.pdf> (access: 20.12.2022).

Ethnography

In the field of Hungarian ethnographic publications, the term heritage (*örökség*) appeared as early as in 1933. It stands for a uniting expression for inherited belongings and traditions⁵⁷. Others understood heritage more as solely the tangible inherited belongings separated from the intangible traditions. The differentiation in this context can also be characterized as static versus dynamic, but the main focus was to keep both the tangible and intangible aspects within the contemporary knowledge and practices. Otherwise, the given tradition or inherited belonging can be evaluated as dead⁵⁸. Without the practice the objects related to this traditional activity became elements of museums and it is hard to see them as heritage still alive within the perception of the contemporary society.

Throughout the decades of the previous political system and even after it, heritage was rarely used as a named category, or the subject of ethnography⁵⁹. Instead, the terms: traditions or tangible element of the traditional/vernacular/folk culture have been used most often. Even if the definition of tradition such as “knowledge, experience and memory that have been compiled and transmitted from generation to generation” shows a lot of parallels to the later adapted word (intangible) heritage⁶⁰. Ethnographers themselves too described their work in a way that resembled the later formulated cultural heritage and heritagization understanding: “This is the profession that documents the constant disappearance of (even) the resources and of the knowledge for its sustainability”⁶¹. Also the contemporary professional practitioners in the field of this type of intangible cultural heritage rarely used the term “heritage” but “tradition” that they cherished or continued. Interviewees explained that the Hungarian term of *heritage* implies for them a direct, personal inheritance. While their subject of profession (re-enactment group member, folk dancer or folk musician) was much rather understood as a community value that they nurtured and shared. They explained the process as a conscious and “belated” (as adult) learning process from a person with whom usually they did not have family relation⁶².

Due to the recommendation and partial finance of UNESCO from 1990 the European Centre for Traditional Culture and its professional organizational, apolitical, non-profit association, the Association for the European Centre for Traditional Culture were established in 1994 in Budapest. These institutions had many similar aims and goals (such as safeguarding authenticity and spreading knowledge about and respect for the realization of traditional culture) even at

⁵⁷ Viski K., *Tájékoztató*, [in:] *A magyarság néprajza I.*, Z. Bátky, I. Györffy, K. Viski, (eds), Budapest 1933, pp. 9–30.

⁵⁸ Györffy I., *A néphagyomány és nemzeti művelődés*, Budapest 1939, p. 7.

⁵⁹ Gunda B., *Hagyomány és európaiság. Akadémiai székfoglaló (1991. január 28.)*, Budapest 1994.

⁶⁰ Halász P., *Szükségünk van-e a hagyományra a harmadik évezredben?*, [in:] *Honismeret*, vol. 28. no. 6, 2000, p. 57.

⁶¹ Hoffmann T., *A tudomány forrásai-e a múzeumok néprajzi gyűjteményei?*, [in:] *Néprajzi értesítő* no. 51, 1969, p. 7.

⁶² Interviews were made with musicians and singers of the Hungarian State Folk Ensembles and members of the Applied Folk Arts Department in the Hungarian Heritage House who collects, document and provides folk craft workshops in 2019.

the time of their establishment to the ones expressed later in the UNESCO Convention in 2003. But they did not use the term *cultural heritage* at that time in their founding documents⁶³. The Association, only later, due to the law about organizations with public utility⁶⁴ incorporated the term *heritage* within its scope of activities such as “scientific (research) and cultural (protecting cultural heritage and publishing books and journals)”⁶⁵.

Along these lines the European Centre for Traditional Culture initiated a Hungarian book series in 1999 entitled *Heritage (Örökség)* and an English journal with the title *Hungarian Heritage* that was published between 2000 and 2011. Besides some other publications and organized scholarly events, the Centre and its Association played a significant part in the preparation and introduction of the notion and processes regarding intangible cultural heritage⁶⁶. Until the late 2000s, these two institutions had the main managing and organizational tasks to cooperate with many other national and international organizations. Due to a ministerial decision in 2008 these leading tasks were transferred to the Hungarian National Committee for the Intangible Cultural Heritage⁶⁷. Since 2012, a new institutional segment, the Directorate of Intangible Cultural Heritage within the Hungarian Openair Museum in Szentendre has served as Secretariat of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee of the Hungarian National Commission for UNESCO⁶⁸. The European Centre for Traditional Culture and its Association have continued their tasks mainly by organizing exhibitions, publishing scholarly research and cooperating with the new committees and directorates⁶⁹.

The nation-wide openair museum in Szentendre was established during the 1960s. It has had the aim of documenting and protecting outstanding examples of the vernacular tangible heritage examples (mainly buildings but movable objects as well). In this way vernacular monuments were turned into museum objects representing a particular settlement or region. On local level, regional houses have served as local museums and cultural centres for both local and visiting communities. These buildings that remained on their original sites, housed exclusively local design and interior elements, everyday life objects and costumes. These cultural and propagation functions during the previous political period that increased throughout the decades were on one hand, due to the contemporary ideologies (controlled and local tourism promoting healthy and workful lifestyle), but on the other hand, they also showed similarities with the notion of cultural heritage. After the

⁶³ Hoppál M., *Az Európai Folklór Intézet története*, [in:] *Folkloristica Varietas. Válogatott tanulmányok II.*, Budapest 2018, p. 212.

⁶⁴ In § 26 of the *Act of CLVI of 1997 on Public Organizations*, <https://mkogy.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99700156.TV> (access: 20.12.2022).

⁶⁵ Hoppál M., *Az Európai Folklór Intézet története*, 2018, p. 213.

⁶⁶ Voigt V., Hoppál M., *Ethnosemiotic – Hungary*, Budapest 2003, pp. 25–30.

⁶⁷ It was formed by representatives of diverse ministries and organizations dealing with (traditional) culture.

⁶⁸ More information about the Directorate can be read: http://szellemikulturalisorokseg.hu/index0_en.php?name=en_about_us (access: 20.12.2022).

⁶⁹ Besides cooperation, there is also personal continuity for instance, the head of the Directorate of Intangible Cultural Heritage within the Hungarian Openair Museum used to work at the European Centre for Traditional Culture from 1999. Hoppál M., *Az Európai Folklór Intézet története*, 2018, p. 214.

political change and due to the advanced financial and human resources at these rural cultural institutions, networks of local and regional research communities were able to form⁷⁰. In 2017 the management and organization of the nation-wide (and Carpathian basin-wide) system of regional houses was also assigned to the Hungarian Openair Museum in Szentendre⁷¹.

The Hungarian Heritage House which was established in 2001 operates as a mainly service institution combining diverse aspects of disseminating the different fields of Hungarian folk culture by combining the Hungarian State Folk Ensemble, audio, video and publication archives, methodological centre, museum and more⁷². All in all, it can be stated that in the field of ethnography the diverse institutions have practiced and fulfilled the aims and practices of the later called intangible cultural heritage management successfully but adapted the term later.

Summary

Looking at the realized processes before and after the introduction of the term *cultural heritage* in Hungary, it can clearly be seen that the tasks themselves have not changed but its scope might have widened over the decades. As heritagization has always been an interdisciplinary process, accordingly such activities have never been fulfilled by members of only one professional or academic discipline. The term “cultural heritage” was adapted in each discipline at a different time and with partially different meaning too. Its common comprehensive definition was missing for decades both at international and national level. That is why the so-called definitions were often rather descriptions, or enumeration of examples, describing diverse types of heritage categories and expressions and using the term “cultural heritage” interchangeably or alongside other more specific examples.

On national level, among others, the above described institutional and disciplinary changes, the change of the political system and the constant adaptation of the international requirements and narratives describe well certain aspects of the transformation. By widening the scope of the heritage examples, the involved actors and the related professional and scientific disciplines have increased as well, and the realization of the given projects and their critical research have become a complex task at national and international level too.

Accordingly, the critique about heritage and heritagization in Hungary might not be based on the lack of one comprehensive definition of cultural heritage or the complex new tasks of heritagization. The increasing scope of the subject and the widening meaning of the adaptable concepts are partially due to the globalized requirements. It is the change or many times almost termination of the previous institutional and operational system of the researched professional and scientific disciplines that is at the heart of the difficulties. The named new challenges in a new or disappearing institutional structure that limits the possibilities of former operations and adjustments as well, clearly provoke frustration and criticism.

⁷⁰ Gazda K., *Gyermekvilág Esztelneken Néprajzi tanulmány*, Bukarest 1980.

⁷¹ This system is on the Hungarian tentative list for nomination to UNESCO World Heritage (UNESCO, *The Network of Rural Heritage Buildings in Hungary*, 2017, <https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/6264/> (access: 20.12.2022).

⁷² More information about the Hungarian Heritage House can be read: <https://hagyomanyokhaza.hu/en/the-institution> (access: 20.12.2022).

Bibliography

Act of CLVI of 1997 on Public Organizations, <https://mkogy.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99700156>.
TV

Act LIV of 1997 on Monument Protection, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a0100064.tv>

Act LIII of 1995 on Natural Protection, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99500053.tv>

Act LIII of 1996 on Environment Protection, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=99600053.tv>

Act LXIV of 2001 on Cultural Heritage, http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A0100064.TV

Act LXV of 1990 on Local Governments, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?dbnum=1&docid=99000065.TV&mahu=1>

Act LXXVII of 2011 on World Heritage, http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A1100077.TV&celpara=#xcelparam

Askew M., *The Magic List of Global Status*, [in:] *Heritage and Globalization*, S. Labadi, C. Long (eds.), London 2010.

Avrami E., Mason R., de la Torre M. (eds.), *Values and Heritage Conservation Research Report*, Los Angeles 2000

Barkan E., *Amending Historical Injustices: The Restitution of Cultural Property—An Overview*, [in:] *Claiming the Stones, Naming the Bones: Cultural Property and the Negotiation of National and Ethnic Identity*, E. Barkan, R. Bush (eds.), Los Angeles 2002.

Bihari Z., Antal Z., Gyüre P., *Természetvédelmi ökológia*, Debrecen 2008.

Brain S., *Song of the Forest: Russian Forestry and Stalinist Environmentalism 1905–1953*, Pittsburgh 2011.

Council Directive of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:31979L0409>

Council Directive of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A31992L0043>

Dercsényi, D., *Town-planning and the protection of historic monuments in Hungary*, [in:] *The monument for the man. Records of the II International Congress of Restoration*, P. Gazzola (ed.), Venice 1964, <https://www.icomos.org/publications/terza26.pdf>

Dercsényi D., Horler M., *Beszámoló az 1964. évi velencei II. Nemzetközi Műemlékvédelmi Kongresszusról*, [in:] *Műemlékvédelem*, Vol. 8. No. 4., 1964.

Dobos A., *Az átmeneti (puffer)-zóna geológiai értékvédelemben játszott szerepének bemutatása egy bükkaljai mintaterület alapján*, *Földrajzi konferencia*, Szeged 2001, <http://geography.hu/mfk2001/cikkek/DobosA2.pdf>

Erdősi P., *A kulturális örökség meghatározásának kísérletei Magyarországon*, [in:] *Regio*, Vol. 11. No. 4., 2000.

European Union, *Compendium of basic texts of the Council of Europe in the field of cultural heritage*, Strasbourg, 1998

Fejős Z., *Tárgy-fordítások. Néprajzi Múzeumi tanulmányok*, Budapest 2003

Gazda K., *Gyermekvilág Esztelneken Néprajzi tanulmány*, Bukarest 1980.

Gille Z., *From the Cult of Waste to the Trash Heap of History: The Politics of Waste in Socialist and Postsocialist Hungary*, Bloomington 2007.

Government Decree on the Certification of Energy Performance of Buildings, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a0800176.kor>

Governmental Decree on Identifying Organizational and Directional Institutions of Environmental-, Natural Protection and Water Management, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?dbnum=1&docid=A0600347.KOR&mahu=1>

Governmental Decree on Identifying Organizational and Directional Institutions of Environmental-, Natural Protection, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a1500071.kor>

Governmental Decree on Sites of European Community Importance for Nature Conservation Purposes, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a0400275.kor>

Granasztóiné G. K., *Szellemi örökségünk, a magyar műemlékvédelem*, [in:] *Magyar Szemle Újfolyam*, Vol. 22. No. 3-4, 2013.

Gunda B., *Hagyomány és európaiság. Akadémiai székfoglaló (1991. január 28.)*, Budapest 1994.

Györffy I., *A néphagyomány és nemzeti művelődés*, Budapest 1939.

Halász P., *Szükségünk van-e a hagyományra a harmadik évezredben?*, [in:] *Honismeret*, vol. 28. no. 6, 2000.

Hoffmann T., *A tudomány forrásai-e a múzeumok néprajzi gyűjteményei?*, [in:] *Néprajzi értesítő* no. 51, 1969.

Hoppál M., *Az Európai Folklor Intézet története*, [in:] *Folkloristica Varietas. Válogatott tanulmányok II.*, Budapest 2018.

Hungarian Fundamental Law, 2011, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a1100425.atv>

ICOMOS' Mission, 2020, <https://www.icomos.org/en/about-icomos/mission-and-vision/icomos-mission>

Labadi S., Logan W. S., *Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability: International Frameworks, National and Local Governance*, London 2015.

Láng I., *Az EU előszobájában*, [in:] *Tények könyve*, A. Kereszty (ed.), Budapest 1998.

Markó B., et al., *Kultúra, természet, örökség: a kulturális és a természeti örökség kapcsolatának multidiszciplináris vizsgálata Délnyugat-Szilágyságban*, [in:] *Érték és közösség. A hagyomány és az örökség szerepe a változó lokális regiszterekben*, A. Jakab., A. Vajda(eds.), Kolozsvár 2016.

Ministry Decree on the Hungarian Biosphere Reservoirs, <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=A0700007.KVV&celpara=>

Myers D., Smith S. N., Ostergren G. (eds.), *Consensus Building, Negotiation, and Conflict Resolution for Heritage Place Management*, Los Angeles 2016.

Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, Paris 2015.

Pál V., *Discourses over nature. The politicization of the environment in Central and Eastern Europe during the Cold War (1949- mid 1980s)*, [in:] *The Living City - an anthology in urban environmental history*, S. Lilja, M. Legnér (ed.), Stockholm 2010.

Román A., *A Velencei Kartától a Nara Dokumentumig*, [in:] *Műemlékvédelem*, Vol. 61. No. 1., 1997.

Ságvári A., (ed.), *Források Budapest múltjából V./b 1954-1958*, Budapest 1988

Sonkoly G., *Bolyhos tájaink*, Budapest 2016.

Sonkoly G., *Social history of cultural heritage protection in Hungary*, [in:] *Protecting and Safeguarding cultural heritage. Systems of Management of Cultural Heritage in the Visegrad Countries*, J. Purchla (ed.), Krakow 2011.

Tardy J., *Természetvédelem*, [in:] *Magyarország a XX. században II. kötet: Természeti környezet, népesség és társadalom, egyházak és felekezetek, gazdaság*, I. Tarsoly (ed.), Szekszárd 1997.

Tilinger I., *A magyar műemlékvédelem jellegzetességei*, [in:] *Az Egri Nyári Egyetem előadásai*, G. Barcza (ed.), Budapest 1978.

Tófalusi I., *Magyar Etymológiai Szótár*, Budapest 2001.

UNESCO, *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, 1994.

Urbán M., *NATURE 2000: regulation and practice. Dissertation*, Szeged 2007.

Viskolcz N., *A veszteséggondosdokumentálása. A kulturális örökségvédelem intézményrendszerének változásai a rendszerváltás után (1990–2015)*, [in:] *Sodrásban képzések, kutatások (1975–2015)*, E. Sütő, E. Szirmai, E. Újvári (eds.), Szeged 2016.

Viski K., *Tájékoztató*, [in:] *A magyarság néprajza I.*, Z. Bátky, I. Györffy, K. Viski, (eds), Budapest 1933.

Voigt V., Hoppál M., *Ethnosemiotic – Hungary*, Budapest 2003.

Zaicz G., *Etimológiai Szótár*, Budapest 2006.

Žarnić R., Rajčić V., Skordaki N., *A contribution to the built heritage environmental impact assessment*, [in:] *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, Vol. II-5/W3, 2015.