

Remembering the Iron Curtain: Diverse Memory Events after 1989

Melinda Harlov-Csortán 

Apor Vilmos Catholic College, Vác, Hungary
Email: melindaharlov@gmail.com

Abstract

This article focuses on one section of the former Iron Curtain between Hungary and Austria that incorporates diverse memory events after the political change in 1989. The article concentrates on the Hungarian region during the last nearly three decades and investigates the actors and the memories of the former historic period, which show a uniquely diverse set of realizations. Among others, two private museums about the Iron Curtain (established and managed by two former border guards) and a memorial park (commemorating only one day, established and managed by a civil organization) in comparison to the official narrative presented in the last room of the permanent exhibition at the Hungarian National Museum in the capital are subjects of this investigation. Besides the actual memory places and the actors (those who initiated, maintain, and visit these memory spots), their relationship and role in the formation of the regional identity are also analyzed. As theoretical background, the connection between heritage, museum, and memory; the notion of post-Soviet nostalgia; authenticity; and the importance of time are activated for the analysis and to disentangle the complexity of the chosen case study.

Keywords: museum; heritage; memorial place; Cold War period; Hungary

Introduction

The time period and memories of the Cold War can be seen as a challenging subject for heritagization,¹ which is often not chosen to be evaluated by the local communities. It creates dissonance (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996, 27) in relation to the postsocialist self-representation of the communities. Many scholars (Light 2000, 145–160) look at the formulation of this kind of heritage from another point of view, emphasizing the fact that the created representation and the object of such heritage examples can be understood rather as a stereotypical image of “Others” in a Western European narrative (through texts and expectations). Rasa Čepaitienė (2010, 263), a Lithuanian researcher, divides the socialist² heritage into three categories: official heritage of the former regime and propaganda, heritage of the anticommunist resistance, and cultural heritage. Given that the main criterion of evaluation of the communist heritage is its political meaning, it remains unclear what to do with the structures that have ambiguous (cultural and historical as well as political) meanings.³ They are also called “contested heritage” by Benjamin Forest and Juliet Johnson (2011, 268–288), because their meaning has not been fixed, and as a result, they continue to be sources of major conflicts among the various political groups exposing contrasting ideas. Forest and Johnson also research the connections among political regime types (democratic, hybrid, and authoritarian) and the way states are dealing with their communist past. This observation is also justified by Stephan Troebst and Wilfried Jilge (2006, 1–81), who think that although the countries in Central and Eastern Europe built their politics and identities on the national ideologies and

narratives, they share different memory cultures about the communist past. That is why it is crucial to underline that the transnational memory about the Cold War period – for instance, the fascination toward the generalized sense of “retro” – might underemphasize the local peculiarities both of that period of the past and the decades since then (Bisht 2013, 14).

Theorizations of postcommunist nostalgia have been expanding in the last couple of decades, incorporating research from diverse disciplines. It is impossible to offer an exhaustive review and include references to all relevant literature. Instead, only a selection of significant examples is discussed below. The investigations include numerous aspects, such as Svetlana Boym’s (2001) often cited categorization in two discrete typologies: the restorative and the reflective. The restorative type can be understood as a wish to reconstruct the past, whereas the reflective one is the incorporation of critical reflections. This categorization also emphasizes the different temporal focuses of the nostalgic practice. A different temporal focus means that the target is not exclusively the past – it reflects the present and the future as well. Other research tends to explain such nostalgia as a form of mourning of a failed utopian project or the collective romanticizing of the past due to a failure to “catch up.”

More recent scholarship has regarded nostalgia as a search for iconological consistency. Oushakine defines it as “an attempt to chronologically enclose, to ‘complete’ the past in order to correlate it with the present” (2007, 455). In a similar vein, Bartmanski attributes the success of nostalgic icons to them being “mnemonic bridges to rather than tokens of longing for the failed communist past” (2011, 213). Along these lines, it is important to note that the same nostalgic object can have different interpretations and emotional attachments at different time periods and locations (Nadkarni and Shevchenko 2004, 505–506). An example from Hungary would be the reviving popularity of the blocks of apartments made from prefabricated concrete. This type of housing was and still is extremely common in the urban structure in Central and Eastern Europe. It represents the previous political era, and after the political change, it was not popular also due to its costly maintenance and lack of modernization possibilities. However, after two and a half decades, this housing type has become popular again especially among those young adults who grew up in this kind of house. They deliberately choose these apartments for not only economic but also nostalgic reasons. They want to provide a childhood experience for their kids that is similar to what they themselves had in the same location.

Regarding the social aspect of time, Assmann (1999, 31–33) emphasizes that the concept of the past is defined by its separation from the present. Consequently, only those aspects can be defined as past that can be interpreted in the present, and they are also differentiated from it. Accordingly, the current article investigates the diverse interpretational and representational techniques of the Cold War period in Hungary by looking at the last room in the permanent exhibition of the Hungarian National Museum in Budapest and at specific segments of the former Iron Curtain. The chosen examples are diverse types of memory events realized by state museum, civil foundation or private initiatives in the form of museums or exhibitions, heritage-labeled location, or memory place. The diverse formations can emphasize different aspects of the memorialization (such as the museums are more object-focused institutions, whereas a memory place on the original location incorporates the intangible significance of memorialization as well). Similarly, the different memory communities often have different possibilities, and usually the number of prospective visitors and their expectations are varied too. The diverse examples are investigated separately and compared and contrasted in the summary section.

The Last Room in the Permanent Exhibition of the Hungarian National Museum

The first analyzed representation of the Cold War period is taken as a section of the official narrative about history of the country. The Hungarian National Museum, as the first public museum in Hungary, is still evaluated as the number-one Hungarian museum (Pallos 2002, 8–14), where political and other social events have been organized regularly. Accordingly, its status is also

emphasized with these events, which have increased its relevance as the acknowledged and official narrative of the Hungarian past as well. Moreover, it is named as a national memory place (Netjogtár 2001) due to its role – both through its function and as a location – in the nation-building processes in 19th century. The title is given by the National Heritage Institute, which was established in 2013 (Netjogtár 2013) in order, among other things, “to protect physically and raise public awareness of the national and historical memory places in the country together with the national cemetery” (National Heritage Institute 2021). Being such an emblematic institution, the Hungarian National Museum has not gone through many modifications in terms of physical or organizational characteristics (Ébli 2006, 77–90). Accordingly, its statement of purpose is the most general one among all the national cultural institutions (Hungarian National Museum 2021c), which also influences its operation and image.

Significant changes happened in early 2000 for the 200th anniversary of its inauguration. The permanent exhibition was renewed, and many modernizations took place both within the building and in its surrounding garden as well. In 2002, the number of articles about the Hungarian National Museum also multiplied due to the huge reparation and modernization continuum (Rosch 2002, 9–12). These descriptive and evaluative articles in particular contain, in the most condensed way, all the “debatable operations” of the institution, which are rarely discussed in interviews or other publications made by or with members of the museum management (Gedai 1994, 12–13; Járó 1996, 29–37). Accordingly, the current investigation first looks at the expectations and evaluations of museums and exhibitions of that time and then analyzes the given room of the permanent exhibition in the Hungarian National Museum based on that. In addition, it investigates the events in the following decades.

At the turn of the millennium, Susan Pearce (1999, 12–17) underlined the importance of museums changing how they provide information. She says the purpose of museums in the postmodern period is not to educate but to stimulate people. Even 10 years earlier, Stephen Weil (1989, 32) summed it up perfectly by naming a museum a “stimulus.” Museums, according to Pearce, still have the characteristics formed at their founding, which underline the notion that the real world can be understood by classifying and exhibiting original objects. But some realizations in the postmodern period changed these expectations. She sees collections and museums as the representation of “current and natural” according to a special group, the dominant social group. The author thinks that new museums should organize exhibitions that encourage critical thinking and individual decision making, which help to internalize the information that the collection provides. She thinks that new, reflexive museums can be achieved by re-investigative and re-evaluative approaches, external and internal networking, and openness of activity.

Peter Davis (1999, 57) also analyzes museums in the postmodern era and identifies some of the characteristics that changed at that time. These transformations took place to serve the transition from a formal educational purpose to a more stimulating one. The new alterations, according to Davis, happen – or should happen – in three areas: changes in the operation of museums (such as conservation, the definition of mission and objectives, curatorial standards), alterations to the postmodern world (multidisciplinary displays, involvement of other cultures, site museums, etc.) and conversion to collaboration (internal and external networking, community involvement). These aspects of changes in the real world cannot be identified separately – one change results in another one and leads to the complex transformation to new museology.

The same is true for the reconstruction of the 20th-century exhibition in the Hungarian National Museum.⁴ Péter György (2007) complains that the European tendency has not been fulfilled in Hungary. The institutional goals have not been transformed from educational to stimulating ones, which could have been realized by a critical reconsideration of the role and purpose of the museum. According to him, the architectural reconstruction cannot be other than a logical architectural consequence of the self-archaeology of the museum itself. Members of the public can understand the new formations and the reestablishments of some previous forms only if they are made as – or in connection to – historical self-reflection. The proper representation (by, for instance, architectural

works) of self-reflection is the defining process of self-identity of both the museum itself and its collections. This representation can also help the audience's self-understanding – a role that is especially significant in the case of a national museum. Péter György expresses this as follows: “Both the reconstruction of the building and the materialization of the permanent exhibition push the changing history of what the national ideology means into the context of universal social and cultural history. Accordingly, this ideology should not be the evident starting point of the museum any more but the historical object of its critical operation” (2007).

György identifies the answer to the significant question that has existed since the foundation of the Hungarian National Museum about its main goal. This question has been whether it should show the cultural heritages of the world to Hungarian visitors or concentrate on collecting, exhibiting, and emphasizing solely those objects that define Hungarian national identity. According to the author, due to the fact that all specialized museums have been formed out of the Hungarian National Museum's collections, just the national reliquaries remained there. Being the home of national representations is problematic in many ways. György sees this as justified by the often-unbalanced representations and interpretations in the rooms of the permanent exhibition that supposedly show the history of the Hungarians. Moreover, with such a topic, the institution has adapted to the modern requirements (developed due to globalization and multiculturalism) with difficulty.

Another important critique about the museum was expressed by Zsófia Frazon (2008, 162–186). Her article is a combination of descriptive and comparative styles, and it deals with the realization of theoretical questions, such as local and global culture, remembering, and expressing scholarly and/or cultural and/or political views. In connection with the permanent exhibition, she emphasizes that the subject is highly determined by its location and time period. She underlines the quality changes of the exhibition techniques installed during the reconstruction and the successfully adopted new norms, the special attention serving the needs of entertaining and informing both children and visitors with special needs. As a contrast, she points out the absence of theoretical and methodological reforms in the understanding and interpretation of the exhibition's topic (the history of Hungarians). These opposing observations allude to the same problem that Péter György has already explained by unfulfilled task at the renewing and modernization processes at the early 2000s. Frazon (2008, 169) summarizes this as follows: “Despite the modern outlook, the cultural, historical concepts and the views about the improvement at the exhibition have not changed from the tradition generated in the 18th and 19th century.” The missing parts of the ideological modernization are, among many others, the lack of self-reflexivity and of the incorporation of modern studies (such as cultural anthropology). Only these two analytical articles point out that even right after the inauguration of the new/renewed permanent exhibition, there were critical investigations problematizing the hegemonic narration and the uncritical/nonstimulating interpretation.

The permanent exhibition (Hungarian National Museum 2021a) provides a general view of the changes in the Hungarian culture, habits, and atmosphere, with the help of valuable, tangible heritage and many (within the early 2000s context) media, such as video shots of contemporary news or music from different time periods. By concentrating on the most significant national events, figures, and objects, the museum leaves out some historical periods and components that would have diversified and questioned the chronology of the narrative. For example, the society is generally depicted as homogenic without emphasizing its complexity. This is true even representing the last section of the history when specific religious communities and ethnic minorities experienced significant change, which unquestionably affected the entire society of the country. The possible inequalities or diversity within the community (such as the claimed or real collaborations with the occupying forces) is not shown there either. Moreover, the second part of 20th century – the almost 50 years of the Cold War period – is summarized in only one relatively large room, whereas the first five decades of the same century are represented in four rooms. This is a physical realization of the general tendency to underemphasize the Cold War period in order to express

continuity (Young and Kaczmarek 2008, 53–70; Verdery 1999) of the national history without the communist past.

Another possible critique might have been the limited use of visuals and their similarity. However, the Historical Photography Collection of the Hungarian National Museum (2021b) includes more than one million still images. The collection, which became an individual head department of the museum in 1995, has existed in different forms and in a different structure for more than a hundred years. The department “acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits” (ICOM 2007) all those standing visual images, whose topics are part of the Hungarian history and/or which have significance in the history of photography. These museum objects are categorized chronologically and according to their themes, such as portraits and group photos, or photographs of cities or costumes. Despite the richness and the importance of this collection, at the permanent exhibition that supposedly shows Hungarian history from its beginning until 1990, there are only about 50 photos exhibited. Approximately half of them depict famous Hungarians who had significant roles in, for example, establishing industry in the country, along with photographs of scenes and everyday events of Hungarians in certain time periods. The other half were taken after World War I, and many depict not only Hungarians but their oppressors (the Nazi Germans and the Soviets). Interestingly, in the latter category, foreign individuals are usually shown in easily identifiable uniforms, and only those Hungarian figures who fulfilled leading positions are portrayed with close-ups. Accordingly, individual members of the society are not exhibited even through images.

The last room of the exhibition, titled *The Rise and Fall of Communism 1945–1990*, contains a large number of objects (such as posters, clothes, and newspapers). The analyzed exhibition room is segmented into 12 little units dedicated to general interiors (for instance, of a typical living room from the 1960s) and specific events (such as the reburial of Imre Nagy, the Hungarian prime minister at the time of the 1956 revolution). Despite the richness and visualness of this exhibition room, no question has been raised for (or in) the visitor, which also justifies György’s and Frazon’s evaluations at the time of the museum reconstruction by the early 2000s – namely, that the Hungarian National Museum did not catch up to contemporary understandings regarding both the task and the role of museums. For instance, neither the story of the institution (the Hungarian National Museum) nor the changes in interpretation of Hungarian history within those 45 years (1945–1990) are represented. Even though the 1956 revolution has one dedicated unit within the exhibition room, the importance of the museum and its surroundings as a location of the revolution is not mentioned. Similarly, the change in the interpretation of the same event (first being called a “counterrevolution” than a “revolution”) is not mentioned in the exhibition, even though it was a crucial step toward the political change in 1989. By denying its contested character (Forest and Johnson 2011, 269–288) throughout the decades, visitors are not stimulated (Pearce 1999) to think about the fact that contemporary circumstances can influence the understanding and evaluation of the past (Boym 2001). Moreover, the depicted chain of events ends with the political change and the first free election in 1990. On the one hand, the last represented historical moment gives the impression of the final goal of the entire narrated history (of Hungary); on the other hand, without representing the present, the differentiation between past and present cannot be realized (Assmann 1999, 31–33).

Since the early 2000s, certain segments (such as the beginning of the historical narrative) of the permanent exhibition got renewed (Museum.hu 2014), and even a new permanent exhibition section was added in 2019. The latter contains the findings from late Ancient Roman times in a modern setting (Hungarian National Museum 2019a). But the last segment of the permanent exhibition has been untouched for three decades now. It stops in the year 1990, but with temporary exhibitions, events, and projects (Hungarian National Museum 2017, 2019a, 2019b), the museum does target the oversimplified representation of the last historical period and also aims to describe certain segments of the yet “untold” decades. However, these projects are available only for a limited time. Due to the growing number of affiliated institutions, the Hungarian National Museum is also



Figure 1. Permanent exhibition at the Hungarian National Museum. The location is Budapest, Hungary.

able to exhibit its rich collections outside the museum building and at different locations. For example, a traveling exhibition arranged in a huge, bubble-like tent discussed the effects of World War I on the public, and it was inaugurated in the garden of the Hungarian National Museum (2018). Similarly, at the Holocaust Memorial Center (2006) in Budapest, the permanent exhibition contains numerous objects and materials and was supervised by colleagues at the Hungarian National Museum. Accordingly, it can be concluded that even though the institution adapts temporary projects and outside locations to exhibit certain sections of late 20th-century history, its permanent exhibition still shows a very condensed, top-down, monovocal narrative in the 21st century.

A Unique segment of the Hungarian Iron Curtain, the Fertő/Neusiedlersee Region

After the critical analysis of the official musealized narrative of the Cold War period, the current research investigates a sample of on-site memorialization events in the northwest corner of Hungary. By being in the former Iron Curtain zone, the researched area – the Fertő region – can be seen as *genius loci* in this investigation. The concept of *genius loci*, or the spirit of a place, has existed from the first human investigation of built environment. *Genius loci* consists of the given location; the political, historical, and cultural surrounding; and a kind of valued symbolic experiencing aspect (Skinner 2011, 281–292). Accordingly, this concept can be also understood as a possible connecting tool of intangible values and tangible heritage examples. It was officially declared by ICOMOS in 2008 with the Québec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place, which defined the concept as “the tangible and the intangible elements that is to say the physical and the

spiritual elements that give meaning, value, emotion and mystery to place” (ICOMOS 2008). Members of the 16th General Assembly of ICOMOS (2008) emphasized the equal role and significance of the “living, social and spiritual nature.” Some researchers emphasize locations (Cullen 1961, 9), whereas others place attention on the receiving/understanding process (Moulin 1995, 37) in the analysis of *genius loci*. It can have further diverse perspectives by focusing on the locals (Yi-Fu 1977) or the visitors (Jakle 1987, 8), the group or community localization (Hayden 1995), or individual initiatives. All of these aspects are interrelated, and they underline the plural and dynamic (not constant) features of the concept.

For instance, if there is an important historic, artistic, or other value connecting to a settlement, and locals do not associate themselves with it, this value does not contribute to the formation of the *genius loci*. Specific examples can be found also at the researched region, where, cooperation is missing among the local actors and decision makers mainly due to the incomparable evaluation regarding the late 20th-century reminiscences (Troebst and Jilge 2006). Yet another transformation is possible regarding the *genius loci* of a given location – that is, when the community has been modified or has changed completely, which has happened on numerous occasions in the history of Central and Eastern Europe. It is also a possible future scenario at the researched area due to generational change or the slow gentrification of the location (by the increasing number of foreign temporary inhabitants in the border settlements). This interconnectedness of the materiality and the social aspect of any evaluation process exists despite the categorization of intangible and tangible examples (UNESCO 2003).

The northwestern corner of contemporary Hungary has been chosen as the researched area because although this area had many similarities to other segments of the former Iron Curtain zone – such as being closed-off, highly protected, and inhabited by an increasing number of military personnel – it also had some peculiar moments in the almost 50 years that can be assumed to have become the subject of memorialization after the political change in 1989. These moments are the 1956 revolution (both during and after) and the Pan European Picnic in 1989. On both occasions, significant numbers of people went through the Iron Curtain to Austria unharmed. In June 1956, just before the revolution broke out, the mine system was eliminated at the Austrian-Hungarian border zone in order to “ease the international tension and to fuel the peaceful coexistence of the nations with different social systems” (Sallai 2009, 123). Accordingly, people could safely leave the country during and right after the revolution. The Iron Curtain was “reestablished” in 1957, especially due to the increasing number of people leaving the country to go to Austria. In the summer of 1989, at the peaceful Pan European Picnic, due to the high number of participants with the intention to leave the country, the border was opened again. This latter event has been discussed as one of the first and peaceful attempts to open the Iron Curtain. These two significant moments made the northwestern corner of Hungary unique during the Cold War period.

Besides the military presence and constant monitoring, the inhabitants of the researched region also suffered from the image created of their area during the Cold War period. It was depicted in propaganda as not just an alienated and closed area but also as the hot spot of the national- and foreign enemy. Accordingly, not only was the researched location considered unattractive, but the people there were also seen as suspicious (Jankó and Tóth 2011, 377–403). For example, those who received central permission to visit Sopron (a neighboring major city) were still not allowed to go to the case study area (neither close to Lake Fertő nor to the surrounding settlement, such as Fertőrákos). Moreover, the Iron Curtain border-zone state also influenced commercial, economic, and cultural life, as well as the transportation system (Zeidler 2002, 5–24). These consequences, according to Čepaitienė’s (2010, 263) categorization, were that the formal regime’s official heritage had long-lasting effects that prevented the quick recovery of the region and the possibility of use for tourism right after the political change.

The reconfiguration of the region and the local communities did start after 1989, when the borders reopened and people from different national backgrounds could form new local

communities. Nowadays, Hungarians work daily in Austria, and Austrians have settled on the Hungarian side of the border. Some new border-crossing points were also established after the political change with central state or international financial support, such as in Sopronkövesd in 2005 (*Kisalföld* 2005, 6). Similarly, cultural events are organized about the neighboring foreign cities (*Kisalföld* 2010, 4). Moreover, the increasing traffic through the researched location and certain restrictions regarding the agricultural and industrial activities due to the membership of diverse international organizations (such as the RAMSAR and MAB) might have decreased the feeling of isolation as well. However, according to Attila Fersch, member of the Fertő-Hanság National Park, locals feel isolated, because there is still very limited institutionalized cooperation between communities along the border, even though there is no longer a physical barrier (Fersch 2016).

The UNESCO World Heritage Committee inscribed the researched area on the World Heritage List as a transnational cultural landscape in 2001 under criterion V, stating that “the Fertő/Neusiedlersee has been the meeting place of different cultures for eight millennia, and this is graphically demonstrated by its varied landscape, the result of an evolutionary and symbiotic process of human interaction with the physical environment” (UNESCO 2001). Such a description points to the long and continuous coexistence of humans and nature in the researched case study, instead of pointing to one specific moment or period in the past. Nonetheless, its last phase of history, the second part of 20th century, was and still is not part of this continuum. Currently nine individual settlements and one part of the nearby city Sopron can be found in the Hungarian part of the transnational UNESCO World Heritage cultural landscape territory. These settlements directly surround Lake Fertő and its reed vegetation. In terms of population size, approximately one third of them (Fertőhomok, Fertőboz, and Hidegség) have around 500 or fewer inhabitants. The same number of settlements (Fertőszéplak, Hegykő, and Sarród) have a population of 1,000 to 1,500, and only two of them have reached a higher number,⁵ but only Fertőd has been considered a city since 1995. Interestingly, the settlement Balf – which is famous for (among other things) its thermal water, used both in health care and as a beverage – is named independently as part of the World Heritage territory, even though it has been part of the nearby city Sopron since 1985. Based on central statistics (KSH 2018), a general and small improvement in the population of these settlements (except for Sarród and Fertőd) can be noted since the UNESCO World Heritage acknowledgment, but the on-site interviews and the regional reports do not suggest a significant correlation between the two.

Due to its rich history, publications discuss the historical significance of this area by looking, for instance, at archaeological findings (Tóth 1971, 322–334) or other archival documents (Kiss 1999, 53–62). Similarly, numerous publications deal with specific settlements (Bárdosi 1970, 179–182) or social groups (Éger 1991). Very fruitful and multidisciplinary research projects have been conducted about this territory as a border area from sociological and economic points of view (Hardi 1999, 159–189; Locsmáncsi 2009, 135–153). There are other publications too that combine perspectives and form new research directions. For instance, Éva Konkoly-Gyuró and her colleagues’ works focus on landscape management and land-cover assessment of the region with a transboundary perspective both geographically (Konkoly-Gyuró 2002, 22–23) and via the related institutional frameworks (such as the European Green Belt) (Konkoly-Gyuró 2009, 126–135). Gábor Konkoly (2016, 161–183) looks at this UNESCO World Heritage site as an example for the heritage category: cultural landscape. He investigates the formation or transformation of its narration in the nomination and acknowledgment documents regarding its national (historic) character and the international “requirements.” Another important source regarding the current research project is Sándor Békési’s works (2007; 2009, 188–208), which look at the cultural and the public approaches toward the territory and especially the lake itself from a mainly Austrian point of view. The current research looks at the Fertő/Neusiedler region as a former Iron Curtain area and investigates the diverse local memorialization techniques.

Memorializing the Border Control Activities along the Former Iron Curtain

An important aspect of the Cold War period in Hungary is that the country was located at the Iron Curtain, which increased the importance of border control and border guards. This is no longer a distinct profession because in 2008 it was integrated into the police system. The memory of this profession is protected among others through a memory place and a museum initiated by the last national commander of border control, Béndek József, and the Ministry of the Interior in 2007. There are also some specialized exhibitions at police or military education units, such as in Kőrmend and Sopron, and fraternity-like civil organizations have also been established that are dedicated to this former profession. In addition, former border guards have established and manage private museums on their own premises. These examples are investigated in this section as memory events of the former border-controlling activities along the former Iron Curtain.

The officially institutionalized memory place and museum are located in Apátistvánfalva, which is on the Slovenian and Hungarian border (approximately 100 km south from Lake Fertő) in a former border-control building. Border guards served their duty in that building until 1991, and the museum was established just before the autonomy of the profession was eliminated in 2007. The exhibition, which can be explored both inside and outside of the building, expresses the life scenes of the border guards from the 1970s and 1980s (Magyar Rendőrrelikvia-Gyűjtők Egyesülete 2021), even though there are some objects from the later period as well (such as the medal collection of the last national commander) or objects related to other parts of the border region (such as a special ship that was used by the border guards in the shallow waters of Fertő/Neusiedlersee). The exhibition is full of objects that were collected at the time of its inauguration, and it has one strong narrative (the life of border guards in 1970s and 1980s) without any interactive element. All the texts are in Hungarian, except some short Slovenian descriptions that could be added in 2013 due to a designated funding (Hidvégi 2019). Such a “conservative” exhibition style can be explained due to both the financial difficulties of the institution and the lack of museum professionals’ cooperation. The memory place and museum are under the supervision of a civil organization, a special tradition and value protection unit of the police union. No curator or other professional was asked to contribute to the establishment or the management of this institution. Based on the on-site investigation, the value of narration is ensured by the only employee of the place, who takes care of the cleaning and maintenance tasks and works as the guide. László Merkli used to be a border guard himself, and his personal explanations and talkative personality make the visit unique and very meaningful (Merkli 2020).

The former border guards’ original location together with a former border guard’s personal memories and interpretation fuel the memory place understanding of the researched museum, given that the location carries memories that are connected to earlier human experiences (Connerton 2011, 84). This can also be stated conversely, by adapting Halbwach’s (1925) notion that all memories are locally based. This understanding of a location can be symbolic too, as Nora and his colleagues analyzed in the series titled *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, which was published between 1984 and 1992. These localized memories are also socially based, because the physical or symbolic location is understood and/or shared by members of the community. If the museum and memory place were not visited and acknowledged, memorialization wouldn’t be achieved. Moreover, the memories connected to a given location and their evaluations can change over time (Éric 2008, 113–146). It can be assumed that the house of the border guards (who were usually assigned to such service from other parts of the country during the Cold War period) had not been evaluated and treated the same way before its new (cultural) function was achieved.



Figure 2. Museum and Memorial Place of the Iron Curtain. The location is Apátistvánfalva, Hungary.

On March 19, 1992, the Central Museum of Border Control was established on the premises of the Border Control and Police College in Körmen, also close (circa 10 km) to the former Iron Curtain. The location used to be a military base, which was transformed into an educational unit in 1990, aside from border control, provost duties were also taught there. The exhibition covers the entire (not just the Cold War period) history of border-control activities in Hungary and serves the aim of strengthening the professional commitment of the local students (Ferenczi 2020). Another example of an educational exhibition is Csaba Keresztes's private collection in the Provost Vocational High School in Sopron. This collection is also often transferred to temporary exhibitions or events. Aside from collecting objects that used to be connected to border control, Keresztes served as a border guard in the past and is a policeman today (Trencsényi 2020). In this way, this second exhibition within a specialized educational premise is a private collection, which has a more general promotional aim by not being exhibited exclusively for the students. Despite its private-collection character, the exhibition in Sopron can be compared to the museum in Apátistvánfalva due to the personal narration by a former representative of the exhibited profession.

The diverse fraternity-like civil organizations have members of former border guards and interested civilians, who uphold the memory of this profession via reenactments and meetings and by regularly visiting the border area of the country and the remaining tangible memories of the border. They are also frequent contributors and volunteers at the above-mentioned institutions and have close relations with other civil organizations with related interests, such as the one dedicated to the history of radio technology in Hungary. Keresztes is also the president of one such organization, the Fraternity Union for Protecting Border Control Traditions Objects. Through the members' volunteer activities, these communities are more concerned about protecting and disseminating the intangible aspects of the former border control activities, and they often have no collection of tangible objects. All

of these cases are good examples of the importance and strength of both personal involvement and personal memories. They can also be connected to the restorative, postcommunist nostalgia typology of Svetlana Boym (2001), because for different reasons (such as lack of financial or professional support), they rarely incorporate critical reflections on their collections or activities.

There are two unique examples that combine both musealized and personal memory near Lake Fertő. In Fertőcsatár (*Vasfüggöny Múzeum 2021*) and Fertőrákos (*Turabázis.hu 2021*), two former border guards established private museums on their own premises from the materials they could collect either from their former employment or via purchase. Accordingly, these memory events incorporate authentic narration and private collections on private premises, which are neither authentic nor even functionally related locations. In Fertőcsatár, Sándor Goják established his museum in 2004 due to the constant interest in local Cold War history and his work expressed by the guests of his small restaurant and wine cellar, which have operated at the same location since 1990 (Gulyás 2018). Based on the on-site investigation and interview with the owner (Goják 2016), this museum covers the entire period of the Iron Curtain era and even contains “interactive” elements – for example, visitors can try out whether they would have been able to get through the former border control system. Goják keeps collecting not just tangible elements but also intangible memories that are an integral part of his tour. He has the goal of providing more and more modern services for visitors, such as an audio guide in the future, and he hopes to pass on the collection to either an individual or an organization that will continue his activities in Hungary. These goals can be understood as steps against the general trends of eliminating the tangible and intangible aspects of the Cold War period (Light 2001, 1053–1074; Tóth 2009, 92–97).

In Fertőrákos, the other private museum is dedicated specifically to the electronic signal system, which was the second version of the Iron Curtain that existed between 1964 and 1989. This system was much less harmful than the prior one, so it was called the “gentle curtain.” The founder and owner of the museum, Imre Csapó, spent more than 26 years in the military until his retirement. He started the collection (for instance, by buying objects at the time the border control museums in Győr and Sopron were closed down) with the goal of providing authentic surrounding for reunions with his former colleagues, which can be connected to the Oushakine’s (2007, 451–482) understanding of nostalgia. Csapó decided to establish his museum in 2009, on the 20th anniversary of the Pan European Picnic (Gosztonyi 2009). As the owner explained in the interview (Csapó 2018), aside from a general overview, Csapó also aims to express the local peculiarities of the border control assignment. Both private museums are created and managed by the two individuals without any professional or financial assistance. Due to such limits, the private museums neither have extensive marketing activities nor target a significant number of foreign tourists.

It must be stated that in the marketing and introductory leaflets, brochures, and books from and about the Fertő/Neusiedlersee cultural landscape and its components that are produced by the local municipalities, tourist offices, for-profit organizations, etc., no connections among or recommendations regarding different sites with cultural or natural significance are shown at all that would help visitors explore the whole area. Consequently, the disadvantages of the two researched private museums are due not only to their insufficient or unprofessional management but also to the lack of cooperation among all the organizations responsible for the local cultural or natural sites.

Pan European Memorial Park: Memorialization of a Particular Event by a Civil Foundation

Despite its closed-off and monitored status, the northwestern edge of the country played an important role in the history of the Cold War period (Romsics 2013; Romsics 2014, 111–140). At the end of the era, on August 19, 1989, a politically motivated young community (both from the neighboring settlements and from other parts of the country, such as Debrecen) organized an event on a meadow next to the border and close to Lake Fertő on the outskirts of Sopronkövesd. The goal of the event was to express the unity of Europe and its people, and it was to have music, dance, and an open fire. The event was intended to be (and eventually was) peaceful, and a press conference

beforehand in the nearby major city, Sopron was also part of it. Imre Pozsgay, the minister of state at that time, and Otto von Habsburg, the president of the International Paneuropean Union and member of the European Parliament for the Christian Social Union of Bavaria (CSU), served as patrons of the event (Kurucz 2000).

At the time of this Pan European Picnic, a significant number of people with East German origin were in Hungary, many of whom had the goal of either meeting with their relatives and friends from West Germany at Lake Balaton or getting to Austria through the border and apply for West German residence (Slachta 2016, 85–112). Many (approximately 600) of them heard about the event and came with the intention to go to Austria.⁶ Despite the fact that this was not part of the original plan, the border guards on duty, who were still assigned to keep the border closed, did not open fire on the masses approaching the border but allowed them to cross it (Oplatka 2012, 65–72). Fortunately, the event ended peacefully, and the representatives and members of the press who arrived belatedly did not oppose but documented it (Tóth 2021).

The organizers of the original event wanted to keep the memory of this historical event and formed a private foundation in the same year. Based on the interviews with diverse members of the foundation's management team (Kulcsár 2019; Magas 2017), since then, they have managed the site, organized the yearly commemorations on the same day (August 19), and worked on keeping and spreading the memory of that day. This intention and the related activities can be described using Čepaitienė's categorization as heritagization of anticommunist resistance (Čepaitienė 2010). Throughout the years, they have established international relations with similar institutions. However, for many years, both the foundation and the memorial park were criticized for not being well-known or significant as a touristic or informative/educational unit. The named criticism is partly due to the fact that as a civil organization with volunteer members they had limited possibilities. For decades, there were no service units (such as shops or bathrooms) on site, and there were very limited marketing activities. The situation started to change when it – together with the European Solidarity Centre in Gdansk – gained international acknowledgment by receiving the European Heritage label in 2015 (European Commission 2021). Later, the foundation also received funding to establish a visitor center for the 30th anniversary of the original events in 2019 (Soós 2019).

Because the original Hungarian event was organized at the border on a huge empty space, the memorial park also occupies a relatively large territory; for this reason, it can be handled as an area or landscape. By intending to maintain its emptiness for many years (only segments of the border fence and a watchtower can be seen from a distance), the memorial park preserved its original setting and therefore provided an authentic experience for visitors. However, as time has passed, there have been new objects on the field, such as some benches, information boards, and memorials. The location has become relatively crowded with numerous and diverse public art examples that emphasize its heritagized status. These public art pieces, donated by various national or foreign institutions, express the appreciation and relevance of the historic event. However, by being so diverse and not authentic to the memorialized event itself, they also eliminate the characteristics of the location (being an empty space) (Bisht 2013, 13–20). In a certain way, the newly established visitor center is transparent, because it mainly consists of glass and wood. For this reason, it does not stand out from its surrounding but instead is a unique feature of the location. However, together with all the monuments and other objects, it unquestionably modifies the authenticity of the location. As the Australia ICOMOS expresses in its Burra Charter (2013), preserving and managing a place leads to a possible change in its perception from an unacknowledged element of the past to an active part of the social, economic, and cultural revitalization of the present. But on the other hand, via changes of the material objects or their configuration, the original narrative of the place and the historical justifications of its relevance can be disturbed.

Such an extended territory as a heritage site has numerous management challenges; for example, its exact territory might be difficult to define, and the flow of visitors has to be planned. The other peculiarity of the site, from a monument protection point of view, is that it has little authentic, built

heritage, unless the former border-control objects with their new memorial/memento function are counted. The memorial park is an open space with a designated main activity: to commemorate. From this short analysis, it can be concluded that the subject of remembrance is not due to the tangible movable or immovable elements. Those objects have no function in the memory event. They became parts of the location where the defining event happened. It is the history and the message of the location that are valued by the contemporary society, as well as by the European Commission, which acknowledged it with the European Heritage label. Such a title is supposed to value the idea of Europeanness, not the tangible elements of a given location. The human aspect plays a crucial role, not just at the time of the original event but also later in its memorialization. Interestingly, the two groups of actors are intertwined as the organizing figures of the original event, and those who established and have been managing the foundation are the same, as in the case of the private museums in Fertőcsatár and Fertőrákos. By hosting and guiding groups as well as individual visitors, their personal narratives create community memory. The founders/guides intend to pass on the original experiences and messages to the greater public, but even more importantly, to future generations. Members of the foundation are especially keen on hosting school groups. They



Figure 3. Pan European Picnic Park. The location is Sopronkövesd, Hungary.

also visit schools to speak about the events they personally experienced. Consequently, the historic event is connected to the future through the contemporary activities of the managing foundation.

The researched location has been transformed from a meadow that did not have any cultural or touristic function. Today diverse approaches are adopted to keep and share the memory of the historical event. The location serves as *genius loci* where, aside from the authenticity of the location, mainly intangible elements preserve the values of what the place is appreciated for today. This site is viewed as the institutionalized location of an outstanding historical event. It represents a bottom-up, peaceful initiative to end the Cold War era by unification and shared values. This example memorializes not a planned, long process (e. g. the border control activities during the Cold War period) but only one event that became essential almost accidentally. Visitors cannot learn information about the local characteristics of everyday life next to the Iron Curtain. Despite this shortcoming, the site is considered to be one of the locations of important events leading toward the unification of Europe, as opposed to other heritagization examples of the Cold War period that Light understood as a possible act of “Othering” in a Western European narrative (Light 2000, 145–160).

Conclusion

The current research looks at the interpretation and representation of the Cold War period and certain segments both through the official narrative expressed at the permanent exhibition of the Hungarian National Museum in the capital and a handful examples in the former Iron Curtain region, especially in the northwestern corner of Hungary near Austria. This segment of the border region was chosen to be the case study area due to the significant historical moments within the Cold War period that might have fueled the local memorialization processes. Interestingly, there is no space-specific memorialization of the 1956 events in the researched region. The public art memorials dedicated to the 1956 revolution and the freedom fight in the researched region that served as locations for the yearly commemoration after 1989 follow the general patterns of similar art pieces throughout the country. Separate research should address the question of whether a central decision and the same time period of inaugurations were the reasons for the similarity or whether there was any conscious decision or preference not to memorialize the local specifics of this historical event due to its possible dissonant heritage character (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996). Only one analyzed example focuses on a specific historical moment – the Pan European Picnic Memorial Park. Others cover longer periods, such as the museum in Apátistvánfalva, which represents a decade. The private initiative in Fertőrákos focuses on two and a half decades, whereas the other private museum in Fertőcsatár as well as the last room of the permanent exhibition in the Hungarian National Museum cover the entire Cold War period. The exhibitions located on educational premises (in Körmen and Sopron) look at even longer time periods.

Remembering activates two time periods: past and present. It evokes the past (Connerton 1989), emotionally emphasizing and idealizing certain aspects and interpretations (Sinkó 1992, 67–79) by recreating it based on the current circumstances (Pótó 1989, 79). Moreover, according to Assmann (1999, 57–59), the notion of the past and the elements that refer to it, as well as the connecting (remembering) process are always specific in time and also incorporate the remembering communities’ characteristics. Consequently, not only the remembered past and the contemporary circumstances but also the time when the memory location was established are all important. For instance, at the time when the still existing permanent exhibition in the Hungarian National Museum was displayed, the country had not yet joined the European Union. Even though no conscious decision was communicated, merely the fact that the Cold War period (almost 50 years) is represented in only one-fifth of the exhibition area dedicated to the last century alludes to the then general Central European tendency to express and emphasize continuous Europeanness and underestimate the Cold War era (Kaneva and Popescu 2011, 191–207). In the case of the private

museum in Fertőrákos, the anniversary of the Pan European Picnic motivated the owner to make his private collection available to society. All analyzed museums have the general characteristics of being object oriented and of not having been established through cooperation with other similar institutions. The exhibition in the visitor center at the Pan European Picnic Memorial Park is different because it contains fewer original objects but more visuals. This can be justified by the peculiarity of the case as well as by the date of its establishment (at least a decade later than the other analyzed museum exhibitions).

All analyzed examples of memory events claimed authenticity but based on different approaches. The term “authenticity” itself can be understood and analyzed in many ways. Authenticity as material originality (through the exhibited objects, for example) means something different from, for instance, the acceptance of the “natural transformation” of a landscape (such as at the Pan European Picnic Memorial Park). Yet another approach regarding authenticity focuses on the authenticity of the given visitor’s or the entire society’s experience (such as at Fertőcsatár) or through the interpretation. The analyzed case studies exemplified well the value of personal memory for the effective narratives. Consequently, during the remembering process, oral history, personal and community memories, and interactions play defining roles on many levels. They can justify the memorialization process as well as construct what to remember (Hirst and Manier 2008, 186). Even though personal interpretations should not be overestimated (Schacter, Guerin, and St. Jacques 2011, 467–474), they do provide a unique narrative to the otherwise general or even untold narrative of border control at the time of the Cold War.

Wang (1999) differentiates three types of authenticity in this regard: objective, symbolic, and existential. Objective authenticity from the receiver’s point of view is solely related to the notion and belief that the experienced example is original (Wang 1999, 351–353) such as the scenes of the museum in Apátistvánfalva according to its usage in the 1970s and 1980s. MacCannell’s (1973, 589–603) concept of staged authenticity relates to this notion. Symbolic authenticity originated in the social construction of the experienced example: the targeted actor (such as the tourist) believes in the authenticity of his or her experience (Wang 1999, 353–358). Due to the credibility of the Hungarian National Museum, the narration there must have this type of impact on visitors. Consequently, this kind of authentic example is strongly connected to its context (Salamone 1997, 305–321). The last type refers to an experience through which one can feel authentic to himself or herself (Berger 1973, 81–90). In this category, true connection is formed not through the memory example but with the receivers themselves (Wang 1999, 358–361). Among the analyzed examples, the diverse fraternity-like communities for the memory of the border-control profession can be included. Through their reenactments, they ensure an authentic experience both for themselves and for the viewers. Therefore, authenticity can be established through diverse perspectives, and it “depends entirely on the situation and the context” (Karlström 2015, 29), but it is an essential value in the memorialization process.

The analyzed examples show a rich diversity in terms of categorization as well. There are examples that are named memory places, museums, or heritage sites. For instance, the Hungarian National Museum is also acknowledged as a national memorial place by the National Heritage Institute. The museum established in Apátistvánfalva is also called a memory place, as is the Pan European Memorial Park, which has a visitor center with an exhibition and which was given the European Heritage label. These terms (museum, heritage, and memory place) can be connected due to their main feature: the temporal aspect as an appropriation of the past, in the present, for the future (Milošević 2017, 54). Others highlight the emphasis of valuation and the emotional aspect that even has the power to beautify or minimize social conflicts (Ashley 2014, 39–54). In the case of the analyzed examples, none of them emphasizes the negative consequences of the memorialized past, such as the effects on the natural surroundings and the local communities in the Iron Curtain region of the border-control activities. Even the analyzed segment of the permanent exhibition at the Hungarian National Museum ends with the glorified message of the first free election of the country, and it does not speak about the negative long-term consequences of the Cold War period.

Consequently, heritagization, musealization, and memorialization are all cultural remembering processes that incorporate both protection and an interpretation or narrative creation. These processes are realized in territorially and chronologically defined steps, and they allude to the character of the remembering community and its values as well (Assmann 1999, 57–59). The current analysis pointed out these important aspects beyond – and in comparison, to – the national museum paradigm. All examples serve the double aim of protection and interpretation, but former “users” of the protected objects (in the case of the border guards) can create a more focused narrative than cultural professionals (museum curators at the Hungarian National Museum). The analyzed memory events beyond the national museum paradigm formulate individual narratives instead of or aside from the official one, due to the direct interpretation of the experienced past. They are also evaluating, interpreting, and rewarding processes, but they also have a kind of representation-building and -reinforcing role that is strongly connected to a physical realization and a location (Erdósi and Sonkoly 2005, 76). For instance, the former border guards memorialize the Iron Curtain past as justification of their profession and the relevance of their services. In these cases, more attention can be drawn to the intangible aspects of the personal memories.

The location of the memory event can fuel its authenticity by being an acknowledged institution, but this can also occur through the spirit of the place even in a less direct way (such as at the former border guards’ homes or on their land). However, the location also influences the size and character of a prospective audience – consequently, the sustainability of the memorialization. Even if such notions have been explicitly at the center of many investigations, their realization and evaluation seem to be continuous. Even nowadays, conferences (University of Toronto 2017) and publications question the forming ideology – what, by whom, for whom, and how it should be bestowed, which alludes to all three time phases (past, present, and future) – and seems to remain an open-ended question.

Disclosures. None.

Notes

- 1 Heritagization is the complex process of achieving and maintaining heritage status that is related to the identification, maintenance, safeguarding, and popularization of any example named “heritage.” Heritagization leads to a change in the understanding of the given example and the interconnections, interactions, and exchanges within and outside the inheritor community. Despite their different emphases, most understandings of the term emphasize its social embeddedness and also point to its representation-building and -reinforcing role.
- 2 As Western historiography often uses the terms socialist and communist as synonyms for the same ideological and political system that was widespread in the discussed territories of Europe just after World War II. This text uses the terms as synonyms as well. As Western historiography often uses the terms socialist and communist as synonyms for the same ideological and political system that was widespread in the discussed territories of Europe just after World War II. This text uses the terms as synonyms as well.
- 3 This can be justified, for instance, with the fact that even if there are different expressions (also in Hungarian for different architectural styles in that period – such as socialist realism (Prakfalvi and Szüts 2010) and socialist modernism (Lovra 2019, 75–92) – unfortunately, these terms are often used interchangeably.
- 4 The history of the 20th century (up to 1990) is exhibited in five rooms, out of which only one focuses on the 1945–1990 period.
- 5 Fewer than 2,000 people live in Nagycenk, and more than 3,000 live in Fertőd.

6 The slogan of the event – “Tear and take away!” (*Bontsd és vidd!*) – might also have fueled the idea that the border would open on the day of the event.

References

- Ashley, Susan. 2014. “Re-telling, Re-cognition, Re-stitution: Sikh Heritagization in Canada.” *Cultura - International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology* 11 (2): 39–54.
- Assmann, Jan. 1999. *Az emlékezés kultúrája*. Budapest: Atlantisz Kiadó.
- Australia ICOMOS. 2013. *The Burra Charter*. <https://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31.10.2013.pdf>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Bárdosi, János. 1970. “A hegykői és sarródi halászkok szerződése a szovjet csapatokkal (1945. augusztus).” *Soproni Szemle* 24 (2): 179–182.
- Bartmanski, Dominik. 2011. “Successful Icons of Failed Time: Rethinking Post-Communist Nostalgia.” *Acta Sociologica* 54 (3): 213–231.
- Békési, Sándor. 2007. *Verklaert und Verachtet: Wahrnehmungsgeschichte einer Landschaft: Der Neusiedler See*. Vienna: Peter Lang GmbH.
- Békési, Sándor. 2009. “Szerkesztés: A Fertő. Egy táj kultúr - és szemlélettörténetéről.” *Soproni Szemle* 63 (2): 188–208.
- Berger, Peter L. 1973. “‘Sincerity’ and ‘Authenticity’ in Modern Society.” *Public Interest* 31: 81–90.
- Bisht, Pawas. 2013. “The Politics of Cosmopolitan Memory.” *Media, Culture and Society* 35 (1): 13–20.
- Boym, Svetlana. 2001. *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connerton, Paul. 2011. *The Spirit of Mourning: History, Memory and the Body*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cullen, Gordon. 1961. *The Concise Townscape*. London: Architectural Press.
- Čepaitienė, Rasa. 2010. *Cultural Heritage in the Global World*. Vilnius: Lithuanian Historic Institute.
- Davis, Peter. 1999. *Ecomuseums: A Sense of Place*. London: Leicester University Press.
- Ébli, Gábor. 2006. “What Made a Museum ‘National’ in the 19th Century? The Evolution of Public Collections in Hungary.” In *The 19th-Century Process of Museumalisation in Hungary and Europe: Workshop Series 17*, edited by Ernő Marosi and Gábor Klaniczay, 77–90. Budapest: Collegium of Budapest.
- Éger, György. 1991. *A burgenlandi magyarság története*. Budapest: Anonymus.
- Érdősi, Péter, and Gábor Sonkoly. 2005. “A kultúra melankóliája.” *Világosság* 46 (6): 73–90.
- Éric, Brian. 2008 [1941]. “Portée du lexique halbwachsen de la mémoire.” In *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte*, edited by Maurice Halbwachs, 113–146. Paris: PUF.
- European Commission. 2021. *European Heritage Label Sites*. European Commission. <https://ec.europa.eu/culture/cultural-heritage/initiatives-and-success-stories/european-heritage-label-sites>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Ferencki, Attila. 2020. *A Technikum bemutatása*. Körmendi Rendvédelmi Technikum. https://www.krvt.hu/index.php/isko_lankrol. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Forest, Benjamin, and Juliet Johnson. 2011. “Monumental Politics: Regime Type and Public Memory in Post-Communist States.” *Post-Soviet Affairs* 27 (3): 269–288.
- Frazon, Zsófia. 2008. “Múzeum és kiállítás: Az újrarajzolás.” *Árgus* 1: 162–186.
- Gedai, István. 1994. “A Nemzeti Múzeum márciusai. Interjú dr. Gedai István főigazgatóval. [Riporter:] Halász Lajos.” *Új Magyarország* 4 (32): 12–13.
- Gosztonyi, Miklós. 2009. “Magánmúzeumot nyit a volt határőr.” *Kisalföld*, August 3, 2009. <https://www.kisalfold.hu/sopron-es-kornyeku/maganmuzeumot-nyit-a-volt-hataror-1854280/>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Gulyás, Regina Olimpia. 2018. “Háború, lopott autó, szigorú körmendi kiképzés – Múltidéző az egykori határőrrel.” *VAOL*, June 27, 2018. <https://www.vaol.hu/kozelet/helyi-kozelet/haboru-lopott-auto-szigoru-kormendi-kikepzes-multidezo-a-hatarorseg-napja-alkalmabol-2395436/>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- György, Péter. 2007. “A nemzet múzeuma.” *Élet és irodalom*, April 27, 2007. http://www.es.hu/gyorgy_peter_a_nemzet_muzeuma;2007-04-30.html. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1925. *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. Paris: Alcan.
- Hardi, Tamás. 1999. “A határ és az ember – az osztrák-magyar határ mentén élők képe a határról és a ‘másik oldalról.’” In *Elvált és összeköt – a határ*, edited by Márta Nárai and János Rechnitzer, 159–189. Pécs-Győr: MTA RKK.
- Hayden, Dolores. 1995. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hidvégi, Brigitta. 2019. “Határőr Emlékhely (Apátistvánfalva).” *Természetjáró*. <https://www.termeszettjaro.hu/hu/poi/muzeum/hataror-emlekhely-apatistvanfalva-/24482433/>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Hirst, William, and David Manier. 2008. “Towards a Psychology of Collective Memory.” *Memory* 16 (3): 183–200.
- Holocaust Memorial Center. 2006. “From Deprivation of Rights to Genocide.” <http://hdke.hu/en/exhibition/exhibition-permanent-exhibition>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Hungarian National Museum. 2017. “Anna. Változatok székely asszonysorsra.” <https://mnm.hu/hu/kiallitasok/special/anna-valtozatok-szekely-asszonysorsra>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)

- Hungarian National Museum. 2018. "Többes számban." <https://mnm.hu/hu/kiallitasok/vandorkiallitas/tobbes-szamban>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Hungarian National Museum. 2019a. "The Treasure of Seuso." <https://mnm.hu/hu/kiallitasok/allando/seuso-kincs>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Hungarian National Museum. 2019b. "Közös idők '89–90." <https://mnm.hu/hu/kiallitasok/virtualis-kiallitas/kozos-idonk-89-90-virtualis-kiallitas>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Hungarian National Museum. 2021a. "History of Hungary Part II." <https://mnm.hu/en/exhibitions/permanent/history-hungary-part-two>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Hungarian National Museum. 2021b. "Historical Photo Collection." <https://mnm.hu/hu/gyujtemenyek/torteneti-fenykeptar>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Hungarian National Museum. 2021c. "Küldetés." <https://mnm.hu/hu/kuldetes>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- ICOM. 2007. "Definition of Museum." *General Assembly*. http://icom.museum/hist_def_eng.html. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- ICOMOS. 2008. *Québec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place*. https://www.icomos.org/quebec2008/quebec_declaration/pdf/GA16_Quebec_Declaration_Final_EN.pdf. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Jakle, John A. 1987. *The Visual Elements of Landscape*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Jankó, Ferenc, and Imre Tóth. 2011. "Az osztrák-magyar határtertség történelme és politikai földrajza." In *Ausztria a 20. században. Az "életképtelen" államtól a "boldogok szigetéig": Tanulmányok*, edited by István Németh and Róbert Fiziker, 377–403. Budapest: L'Harmattan Kiadó.
- Járó, Márta. 1996. "És a műtárgyak hogy érzik magukat a kiállításon? Műtárgyvédelem a Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum új állandó kiállításán." *Műtárgyvédelem* 25: 29–37.
- Kaneva, Nadia, and Delia Popescu. 2011. "National Identity Lite: Nation Branding in Post-Communist Romania and Bulgaria." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 14 (2): 191–207.
- Karlström, Anna. 2015. "Authenticity. Rhetorics of Preservation and the Experience of the Original." In *Heritage Keywords*, edited by Kathryn L. Samuels and Trinidad Rico, 29–46. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Kisalföld*. 2005. "Készül a határátkelő Sopronkövesden." July 18, 2005.
- Kisalföld*. 2010. "Eisenstadti fotókból." February 8, 2010.
- Kiss, Andrea. 1999. "A Fertővel kapcsolatos vitás földrajzi kérdések középkori okleveleinkben." *Soproni Szemle* 53 (1): 53–62.
- Konkoly-Gyuró, Éva. 2002. "A Transboundary Landscape between Austria and Hungary around the Lake Fertő/Neusiedler." *Futuropana, For a New Vision of Landscape and Territory* 2: 22–23.
- Konkoly-Gyuró, Éva. 2009. "The Lake Fertő/Neusiedl Section of the Green Belt." In *The European Green Belt. Borders. Wilderness. Future*, edited by Thomas Wrba, Katharina Zmelik, and Franz M. Grünweis, 126–135. Weitra: Verlag Bibliothek der Provinz.
- KSH (Central Statistical Office). 2018. "Population of Győr Moson County." <http://nepesseg.com/gyor-moson-sopron/>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Kurucz, Gyula. 2000. *Az első határnyitás: Sopron, 1998. augusztus 19*. Budapest: Kortárs Kiadó.
- Light, Duncan. 2000. "An Unwanted Past: Contemporary Tourism and Heritage of Communism in Romania." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 6 (2): 145–160.
- Light, Duncan. 2001. "'Facing the Future': Tourism and Identity-Building in Post-Socialist Romania." *Political Geography* 20 (8): 1053–1074.
- Locsmándi, Szabolcs. 2009. "A határon átnyúló vaspálya. A GYSEV fejlődése és szerepe a határ menti kapcsolatokban Eisenstadt (Kismarton)-Sopron térségében." *Tér és Társadalom* 23 (2): 135–153.
- Lovra, Éva. 2019. "Szocialista modernizmus Tolnai Ottó 'hiányképzetének' mátrixában." In *A genius loci: irodalom és építészet*, edited by Máté Tamáska and Árpád Kollár, 75–92. Budapest, Martin Opitz Kiadó.
- MacCannell, Dean. 1973. "Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings." *American Journal of Sociology* 79 (3): 589–603.
- Magyar Rendőrrelíkvia-Gyűjtők Egyesülete. 2021. "Határőr Múzeum – Apátistvánfalva." <http://apatistvanfalva.hu/hataror-emlekhely/>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Milošević, Ana. 2017. "Historicizing the Present: Brussels Attacks and Heritagization of Spontaneous Memorials." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24 (1): 53–65.
- Moulin, Claude. 1995. "On Concepts of Community Cultural Tourism." *The Tourist Review* 50 (4): 35–40.
- Museum.hu*. 2014. Kelet és nyugat határán - A Kárpát-medence a Karoling-korban és a honfoglalás korában. http://www.museum.hu/kiallitas/12421/Kelet_es_nyugat_hataran_-_A_Karpat-medence_a_Karoling-korban_es_a_honfoglalas_koraban. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Nadkarni, Maya, and Olga Shevchenko. 2004. "The Politics of Nostalgia: A Case for Comparative Analysis of Post-Socialist Practices." *Ab Imperio* (2): 487–519.
- National Heritage Institute. 2021. "National Memory Places." <http://intezet.nori.gov.hu/nemzeti-emlekhelyek/>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Netjogtár. 2001. "Act LXIV on the Protection of Cultural Heritage." <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=a0100064.tv>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)

- Netjogtár. 2013. "144/2013 (V.14.) Governmental Decree about the Institute." <https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=A1300144.KOR>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Nora, Pierre. 1984–1992. *Les Lieux de Mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Oplátka, András. 2012. "The Pan European Picnic – Well-Known Facts and Blind Spots." In *Prelude to Demolishing the Iron Curtain*, edited by György Gyarmati, 65–72. Budapest: L'Harmattan.
- Oushakine, Serguei A. 2007. "'We're Nostalgic but We're Not Crazy': Retrofitting the Past in Russia." *The Russian Review* 60 (3): 451–482.
- Pallos, Lajos. 2002. "Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum." In *Múzsák kertje A magyar múzeumok születése*. 8–14. Budapest: Állami Nyomda Rt.
- Pearce, Susan. 1999. "A New Way of Looking at Old Things." *Museum International* 51 (2): 12–17.
- Pótv, János. 1989. *Emlékművek, politika, közgondolkodás*. Budapest: MTA Történelemtudományi Intézete.
- Prakfalvi, Endre, and György Szüts. 2010. *A szocreal Magyarországon*. Budapest: Corvina Kiadó.
- Romsics, Ignác. 2013. *Rendszerváltás Magyarországon*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Romsics, Ignác. 2014. "Regime Change in Hungary." *Remembrance and Solidarity: Studies in 20th Century European History* (2): 111–140.
- Rosch, Gábor. 2002. "Az épületrekonstrukció." *Magyar Múzeumok* (2): 9–12.
- Salamone, Frank A. 1997. "Authenticity in Tourism: The San Angel Inns." *Annals of Tourism Research* 24 (2): 305–321.
- Sallai, János. 2009. "'Vasfüggöny' a magyar államhatár mentén." *Közép-európai Közlemények*: 121–129. http://acta.bibl.u-szeged.hu/29752/1/kek_006_007_121-129.pdf. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Schacter, Daniel L., Scott A. Guerin, and Peggy L. St. Jacques. 2011. "Memory Distortion: An Adaptive Perspective." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 15 (10): 467–474.
- Sinkó, Katalin. 1992. "A politika rítusai: Emlékműállítás, szobordöntés." In *A művészet katonái: Sztálinizmus és kultúra*, edited by Péter György and Turai Hedvig, 67–79. Budapest: Corvina Kiadó Vállalat.
- Skinner, Heather. 2011. "In Search of the Genius Loci: The Essence of a Place Brand." *The Marketing Review* 11 (3): 281–292.
- Slachta, Krisztina. 2016. "Két világ határán: a magyar idegenforgalom az 1970-es években." *Múltunk - Politikátörténeti Folyóirat* 61 (4): 85–112.
- Sonkoly, Gábor. 2016. *Bolyhos tájaink*. Budapest: ELTE.
- Soós, Szabina. 2019. "Turisztikai fejlesztés a Páneurópai Piknik Emlékparkban." *Sopronmedia.hu*. <https://www.sopronmedia.hu/cikkek/turisztikai-fejlesztes-a-paneuropai-piknik-emlekparkban>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Tóth, Imre. 2021. "Historical Background." *Pan European Picnic Memorial Park*. <https://www.paneuropaipiknik.hu/uploads/document/11/tort-hatter-en-5ce506ec71d47.pdf>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Tóth, István. 1971. "A fertőrákosi Mithraeum II." *Soproni Szemle* 25 (4): 322–334.
- Tóth, Szergej. 2009. "Rendszerfüggő lexika." In *Tudományos és művészeti műhelymunkák: Új utakon a Pedagógusképző Kar című konferencia előadásai*, 92–97. Szeged: Szegedi Tudományegyetem Juhász Gyula Pedagógusképző Kar.
- Trencsényi, Zoltán. 2020. "Megelevenedik a múlt." *Zsaru Magazin*, July 30, 2020. <http://www.police.hu/hirek-es-informaciok/legfrissebb-hireink/centenarium/megelevenedik-a-mult#2>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Troebs, Stefan, and Wilfried Jilge. 2006. "Divided Historical Cultures? World War II and Historical Memory in Soviet and Post-Soviet Ukraine." *Themenheft von Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 54 (1): 1–81.
- Tunbridge, John, and Gregory Ashworth. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Turabázis.hu*. Vasfüggöny Múzeum. https://www.turabazis.hu/latnivalok_ismerteto_4767 (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- UNESCO. 2001. *Decision about the Nomination of Fertő/Neusiedlersee Cultural Landscape*. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/2288>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- UNESCO. 2003. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132540e.pdf>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- University of Toronto. 2017. "The Past in the Present: Mediating Cultural Heritage." *The Medium Is the Message: Media and Mediation in Archaeology Conference*. <http://www.archaeology.utoronto.ca/the-past-in-the-present-mediating-cultural-heritage.html>.
- Vasfüggöny Múzeum*. <https://vasfuggonymuzeum.hu/hu/hirek/>. (Accessed March 1, 2021.)
- Verdery, Katherine. 1999. *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wang, Ning. 1999. "Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience." *Annals of Tourism Research* 26 (2): 351–353.
- Weil, Stephen. 1989. "The Proper Business of the Museum: Ideas or Things?" *Muse* 7 (1): 28–38.
- Yi-Fu, Tuan. 1977. *Space and Place*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Young, Craig, and Sylvia Kaczmarek. 2008. "The Socialist Past and Postsocialist Urban Identity in Central and Eastern Europe: The Case of Lodz, Poland." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 15 (1): 53–70.
- Zeidler, Miklós. 2002. "Társadalom és gazdaság Trianon után." *Limes* (2): 5–24.

Interviews

Csapó, Imre. 2018. Owner of the Vasfüggöny Múzeum. Interviewed by author, May 20. Fertőcsatár.

Fersch, Attila. 2016. Head of department at the Fertő-Hanság National Park, who later became the deputy general director. Interviewed by author, June 10. Sarród.

Goják, Sándor. 2016. Owner of the Vasfüggöny Múzeum. Interviewed by author, June 15. Fertőcsatár.

Kulcsár, László. 2019. Member of the managing board of the Pan European Memorial Park. Interviewed by author, February 5. Kőszeg.

Magas, László. 2017. President of the foundation for the Pan European Picnic. Interviewed by author, April 10. Sopronkövesd.

Merkli, László. 2020. Employee of the Border Guard Museum and Memorial Place. Interviewed by author, July 15. Apátistvánfalva.