

A Dangerous Dream in (Re)building the Hungarian Nation**

Abstract. A museum as a scientific and informative institution should have numberless motives so that it is not only a shallow foundation: collection, categorization, restoration, knowledge-transmission, remembrance, research, emotion and intentionless analysis, publicity, conferences, publications, explanatory texts, multilingual tags, museum pedagogy, etc. Can the Trianon Museum be considered as a museum or is it something else? Exhibition, place of pilgrimage, shrine? Is it the field of a posttraumatic self-therapy? Or the tool of historicizing a nation's (re)building? Or is it a mixture of the above? Why was it only presented in the radical angled media organs and hardly ever appeared in the mainstream media? In this work we make an attempt – in the light of the evolving political intention – to give multiple answers to the questions raised by the reception of the Trianon-discourse which is shown in the museum.

Keywords: Competitive identity and remembrance politics, Trianon, museum, Trianon-discourse

Резюме. Музей як наукова і науково-популярна установа повинен діяти у різних сферах, аби бути музейною установою не тільки у назві: збір, категоризація, реставрація, поширення наукових знань, згадування, дослідження, беземоційний та безпристрасний аналіз, публічність, публікації, конференції, видання, тлумачення текстів, багатомовні написи, музейна педагогіка і так далі. Цікаво, чи можна Тріанонський музей вважати музеєм чи це щось інше? Місце прощі, святиня чи виставка? Можливо місце посттравматичної самотерапії? А може засіб історичної (від)будови нації? Чи можливо це суміш усього перерахованого? Якщо проаналізувати відгуки у ЗМІ, то постає питання: чому інформація з'явилася тільки у пресі радикального спрямування, а в популярних видання – ні? У статті зроблено спробу – у світлі сучасних політичних намірів – дати відповідь на озвучені питання кризь призму рецепції представленого в музеї дискурсу Тріанону.

Ключові слова: конкуруюча ідентичність, політика пам'яті, музей Тріанону, дискурс Тріанону.

Rezümé. Egy múzeumnak, mint tudományos és tudományos ismeretterjesztő intézménynek számos dologgal kell rendelkeznie, hogy ne csak a megnevezésében legyen múzeum: gyűjtés, kategorizálás, restaurálás, tudásközvetítés, emlékezés, kutatás, érzelem és intenciómentes elemzés, nyilvánosság, publikálás, konferenciák, kiadványok, értelmező szövegek, többnyelvű feliratok, múzeum-pedagógia és így tovább. Vajon a Trianon Múzeum tekinthető-e egyáltalán múzeumnak, vagy az valami más? Zarándokhely, kegyhely, kiállítás? Netán poszttraumás önterápia helyszíne? Talán a historizáló nemzet(újja)építés eszköze? Vagy a fentiek keveréke? Médiamegjelenését vizsgálva felvetődik a kérdés, hogy miért csak a radikális beállítottságú lapokban jelent meg, a mainstream médiában alig? Az elemzésben kísérletet teszek arra – a kibontakozó politikai szándék fényében –, hogy a múzeumban láthatóvá tett Trianon-diskurzus recepciója által a fent felvetett kérdésekre értelmezéssel választ adjak.

Kulcsszavak: versengő identitás és emlékezetpolitikák, Trianon, múzeum, Trianon-diskurzus

* PhD candidate, Corvinus University of Budapest, Social Communication Doctoral School. * Doktorjelölt, Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem, Társadalmi Kommunikáció Doktori Iskola. * Кандидат на звання доктора філософії, Будапештський університет «Корвінус», Докторантура соціальних комунікацій. E-mail: andras.hanga@gmail.com.

** The present publication is the outcome of the project „From Talent to Young Researcher project aimed at activities supporting the research career model in higher education”, identifier EFOP-3.6.3-VEKOP-16-2017-00007 co-supported by the European Union, Hungary and the European Social Fund.

Introduction

On 4th June 1920, Hungary signed the Trianon peace-treaty. This was a really sad day for Hungary. This diplomatic event is very interesting, because for the winner this is a national commemoration day, for the vanquished (loser) it is a memorial. Hungary lost two thirds of its own territory, seventy percent of its natural resources, thirty percent of Hungarian people. Five new states were born in the place of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy: Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia. Can a museum present this event in Hungary? To answer this question, we begin by taking a closer look at Trianon Museum communications. In this work we make an attempt – in the light of the evolving political intention – to give multiple answers to the questions raised due to the reception of the Trianon-discourse which is shown in the museum. Firstly, the matter of research is whether the museum in question is a museum indeed, by here I mean whether it meets all the historical and institutional requirements that we, museum visitors, can expect. In addition, we also have to examine the scene, Várpalota, is an important issue as “nothing took place there” that is related to Trianon. My next question is, whether it is possible to deal with the topic objectively. Is it really possible to separate such an institution from politics when symbolical politics has strengthened? Only with the help of these questions can the Trianon discourse be really understood.

About the Trianon Museum

A museum as a scientific and informative institution should have numberless motives so that it is not only a shallow foundation: collection, categorization, restoration, knowledge-transmission, remembrance, research, emotion and intentionless analysis, publicity, conferences, publications, explanatory texts, multilingual tags, museum pedagogy, etc. Can the Trianon Museum be considered as a museum or is it something else? Exhibition, place of pilgrimage, shrine? Is it the field of a post-traumatic self-therapy? Or the tool of historicizing a nation's (re)building? Or is it a mixture of the above? It seems that the intentions of the Trianon Museum are not the intentions of a museum. Going through its exhibitions, exhibited objects, processing its media coverage and getting familiar with the opinions of those living in Várpalota, the institution shows itself as a mixture of a museum, place of remembrance (Nora 1999)¹, worship, pilgrimage. What could be the reason for this unusual mixture to exist, how does it work as a signification-maker, how does it try to become an institution by the Trianon-discourse? Just like of the House

¹ Pierre Nora: Emlékezet és történelem között. *Aetas*, 1999/3. Ford. K. Horváth, Zsolt http://www.etas.hu/1999_3/99-3-10.htm (Accessed: 21 July 2018)

of Terror Museum² we could assume of Trianon Museum at first impression that besides its symbolic aspect, disposed of its taboo nature by the scientific critical discourses, it is a frame of emotionless social science researches and the scene of presenting these. It could be expected of a museum to be an institution based on historical consensus and to be a source-revealing, critical, knowledge-mediating tool of the discipline of history, a historical representation appearing to publicity. In general a museum should be a political, scientific resting point and wield the frame of rules of forms of the government's will (György 2007:7) and cultural remembrance, also the visual representation and context-creating process as it creates connection between those that can be showed and those which can't be showed. In this work we make an attempt to give multiple answers with explanations to the questions above raised by the reception of the Trianon-discourse which is shown, thematized in the museum.

The Trianon Museum and its exhibitions

The Trianon Museum opened its gates on the 26th of June 2004 in Várpalota under the premises of Zichy Castle, with the address Gróf Apponyi Albert grove 1. The building got under the handling of Trianon Museum Foundation in 2002, when they started to form the exhibitions. In the advisory board of the foundation founded in 2001 were Zsolt Bayer³, László Tőkéczki⁴ (PPKE) and Tamás Cseh⁵ who passed away in 2009. The forming of this foundation was accompanied with political and public storms, but the exhibition was/is also attacked by the left-winged and liberal members of political life. In an interview made in 2003 Pál Csaba Szabó⁶ formulated the program of the museum and the foundation this way: “it should make our collective past alive, loveable and defendable in its organic entity.”⁷

The building is located in Várpalota's city center on a hill, in its immediate neighborhood is a barrack, the cultural center of the former garrison and a catholic church. The road leading to the hill starts from beneath the castle and there still can be seen some parts of the old ring-fence and on one of these is a sign of the

² On the symbolic role and “museumness” of House of Terror the writing of Frazon, Zsófia and K. Horváth, Zsolt *A megsértett Magyarország* (<http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00036/00047/pdf/23.pdf> (25 November 2017)) gives further analysis.

³ Bayer, Zsolt (Budapest, 26 February 1963) – a Hungarian writer, journalist, publicist. In the January of 2012 he was the organizer of the mass demonstration Békemenet (Peace March).

⁴ László Tőkéczki (Szikszó, 23 September 1951) – a historian, university teacher. He holds around 100 presentations per year asked by scientific, religious, political and cultural organizations in Hungary and for Hungarians living abroad.

⁵ Cseh, Tamás (Budapest, 22 January 1943 – Budapest, 7 August 2009) – a Hungarian composer, singer, actor, performer, teacher of drawing winning Kossuth and Liszt Ferenc prizes.

⁶ Pál Csaba Szabó – Historian, manager of the Trianon Museum Foundation in Várpalota.

⁷ Haklik, Norbert: A házmaster-szubkultúra ellen. *Magyar Nemzet Online*, 2003. december 29. <http://mno.hu/kulturpult/a-hazmesterszubkultura-ellen-683504> (Accessed: 11 October 2012).

Trianon Museum. As compared to other well-looked-after surroundings of old castle parks the environment doesn't look as a park, although there are some ancient trees, aged decoration plants, it is not untended. Around the building there are the concrete pedestals of the exhibition objects of the former Artilleryman Museum which are currently not used and if yes, only for parking. There are two new objects in the few square meter park called Gróf Apponyi Albert⁸ grove, a strapped turul bird and a cross (People's Christ Hungary – Népek Krisztusa Magyarország). The façade of the museum waves a Hungarian tricolor, and a winter chill welcomes the visitor when entering the castle. On the ground floor in front of the door in the focus of the hall there is a huge photograph of a long-range Ikarus 55⁹ (“bottomed”) autobus hanging from the ceiling, which is a completely unfitting object in the exhibition. The picture's negative was made in 1960 at the former long-range bus station at Engels Square¹⁰ in Budapest, but according to the museum's cashier and amateur guide the Serbians took the to-be executed Hungarians in this type of autobuses in 1944.¹¹

In the ground level hall in May, 2012 there were display panels presenting Yugoslavian massacres in World War 2, which panels overlie the plotting board showing the significant border castles of historical Hungary. The interesting plotting board this way lost its role as a scenery-maker determining the first impression of the visitors. Its original purpose probably was to bring attention to the “geographically coherent” aspect of the Carpathian Basin, the long-gone “greatness” of the nation, the multitude of fortresses. It reminds of glorious past that is lost. From the entrance hall the doors lead to rooms placed practically to help operate the former noble estate. But for a 21st century visitor the building could seem as a labyrinth. The small and large rooms contain many thematically formed mini-exhibitions about the railway system, counties, annexing of North-Transylvania, the presentation of Trianon in contemporary elementary schools, the bravest city, Balassagyarmat, the Anthem, the Trianon monuments. Along the corridors many genuine maps, newspaper offcuts, postcards, photo reproductions await the visitors mostly without explaining captions or orientation signs. In the north-western corner of the ground floor in a showing room a compilation of contemporary documentaries and news is screened. In the room about Balassagyarmat on the screen of the television we can see a documentary-fiction film recalling the contemporary events. Upstairs we can find a stamp exhibition, Vargha and Reményik memorial room, Szelezcki Zita memorial corner, as an example of heroicness we can

⁸ Earl Apponyi, Albert (Wien, 29 May 1846 – Geneva, 7 February 1933) – a politician, minister, secret councilor, squatter, member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He was the leader of the Hungarian delegation at the peace conference in Paris, 1920.

⁹ The Ikarus 55's manufacturing began in 1952. <http://bkvv.webs.com/ikarusik30tlik210ig.htm> (Accessed: 30 April 2012).

¹⁰ http://www.old-ikarus.hu/nzs/650713_ga-79-34.jpg (Accessed: 30 April 2012)

¹¹ The picture was still present in May, 2012.

see the fight of the *székely* division and in another room there is an exhibition of the contemporary bathing culture of Hungary. In the containers and on the walls are mostly reproductions of original documents, newspapers, posters, photographs, etc., but we can also find several genuine ones. The large number of paper-based relics points out the lack of other objects, only a few clothes, flag, book, military relic shows up scattered in the rooms. On one of the plastic models in the museum the pulling apart of the Hungarian railway system and the harms inflicted are shown, on another one the 1910 state of the city Lőcse and the third one was meant to show the suffering of Hungarians driven away from Kolozsvár (this study does not undertake to determine whether these plastic models fit, and if yes to what extent with the formal requirements of installations used in the museum). We can find audiovisual elements in even more rooms besides the already mentioned showing room and the one about Balassagyarmat, from the speakers melodies, Zita Szeleccki¹² songs and Sándor Reményik¹³ poems are played when the cashier turns them on and on again running through the halls. The employee is just one room ahead of the first visitors with turning on the lightings and audiovisual devices. Where natural light is missing or is insufficient, there the objects, explaining captions, plastic models are poorly lit. With this the museum loses the opportunity to lead the eye and focus the attention. The electric system is visibly outdated and should be renewed; here and there we can still see some of the decayed, dismantled, broken infrastructure of the previous institution, the Artilleryman Museum. On the whole the exhibition is rather a conservatively composed museum showing, than an interactive experience, even though in several rooms documentaries, interview fragments, recitations, songs can be seen and heard repeatedly. We state this in full knowledge of that the idea of interactive experience is dynamically changing with technological development and the usage of museal presentation techniques can be counted within the formal rules of visualizability of the message.

Objects and the usage of objects

The base of the comparative analysis is the third chapter of Zsófia Frazon's *Museum and exhibition. The spaces of redrawing* (Gondolat 2011) where she writes about the meaning-mediating role of museal objects. This way there are authentic objects, tinkered objects and copies, and also unclarified objects from the aspect of the exhibition's context (existing objects of everyday life).

¹² Szeleccki, Zita (Budapest, 20 April 1915 – Érd, 12 July 1999) – a Hungarian actress. She left Hungary in 1945. While she was gone the people's tribunal convicted her for reciting the Petőfi poem *Up for the holy war!* at a so called "Hungarian Evening" event in November 1944. The poem is exhorting for defending the country against the Russians and was broadcast by the Hungarian Radio Corporation. In 1993 the Supreme Court absolved her of the false charges and granted her full pardon.

¹³ Reményik, Sándor (Kolozsvár, 30 August 1890 – Kolozsvár, 24 October 1941) – a poet, outstanding character of the Hungarian lyre in Transylvania between the two World Wars. He was awarded with many significant prizes and recognitions, but after 1945 – mostly for political reasons – he was banished from Hungarian literature for decades.

Authentic objects are those genuine objects to which personal stories, well known, exceptionally significant persons are connected. These kinds of objects are appropriate to start remembering, creating genuinity and also through them history becomes a value which can be mediated, accessed, acquired: artifacts, biographical objects, documents of the era. Including tinkered objects in museal installations in lucky cases helps placing into context and creating the meaning-net desired by the institution. Using these objects carries the potential to downgrade the exhibition into an attraction, in worse cases even the chance for manipulation. Dramatizing the historical context in this matter requires a stable institutional background and demands trust towards the institution. Lastly the unclarified objects are the objects of everyday life which lack the relevance of the given exhibition's context. So these can appear anywhere at any time and can be exchanged with each other.

Looking through the exhibitions of the Trianon Museum the objects show a very diverse picture regarding their usage. The documents of the *Székely division's patriotic fights 1918-1919* are almost completely duplicates. In the center of the hall a monument is standing made from the weapon of a soldier who died in World War 2 (!) and on the walls duplicates can be seen showing military actions from the two World Wars (mostly with explaining captions). The title of the exhibition and the documents presented are not in accordance with each other and probably only a handful of visitors spot the dissonance of putting these objects next to each other (not a single message mentions it in the visitors' book). This exhibition room shows something which is professionally set up, has leading texts, explaining captions, genuine documents and authentic copies of these but is only partially what the title promises. Is this carelessness or intentional deceiving? Asking the question this way we can't answer it, but we can say that if the title of the exhibition is regarded as a valid label of the category, then we can encounter numerous objects from categories which cannot be found in the object-categorization of Frazon. Amongst these the military-death memorial made of weapons is the smallest problem because it can effectively strengthen the idea of heroiness as a tinkered object. What is missing? Why can't a portion of the objects be put in any of the three categories? The objects in question are reproductions (documents, photographs, maps, sketches) but from the age of another historical event, the Second World War. This means that these objects in their own category, provided with the fitting label (exhibition title) can be regarded as authentic objects and are capable of recalling the historical context, depicting the further fights of the székely division existing in 1939-45. But here it is impossible to fit them in any of the categories set by Frazon. But in this paper we do not intend to answer this question.

The room leading to the balcony is a real mystery. The visitor looking for the connection between and collective meaning of the objects encounters a Moles-

like¹⁴ pile of objects. In the middle of the room an eye-appealing plastic model of the town Lőcse at the beginning of the 20th century can be found, behind it towards the balcony are three show-cases corded with tricolors, and inside them among others is a pottery with Trianon inscription, a statue representing a dump craftsman. The ribbons with national colors on the show-cases are carelessly tied up; one side is red-white-green, the other green-white-red. On the left there is a three-headed dragon monument carved out of wood (Zsolt Kovács: *The Trianon dragon*. 2006), next to it two candelabras, wreaths, flowers. On the walls we can see maps, postcards, the symbolism of the whole room is incoherent, and there are no explaining captions to orientate the viewer. Probably only the visitors filled with emotions are not confused by the pile of objects tossed at each other, because the three dimensional objects in the room, the installation connecting to the Trianon dragon, the statues corded with tricolors are in this environment only good for heating up one's emotions. The model in the middle of the room "floats" as the biggest, most colorful object and could rather be imagined as part of a local history exhibition which puts the viewer in the historical view of the town Lőcse. It is worthy of noting that the statue of Zsolt Kovács and the objects connecting to it are the only coherent, semantically united part of this room.

The exhibition *Pulling apart the Hungarian railway system 1918-1920* with its documents, plastic model is possibly the most professionally composed exhibition. In the show-cases we can find documents (timetable, credentials, layout) which are visibly from the era in question and we can also read orientation and explaining signs. If someone wanders in with a decent knowledge in engineering and sees the exhibition, it will be easily understandable for him/her how technologically, economically, geographically advanced and well-built the Hungarian railway system was prior to 1920. The Trianon trauma is represented in two very significant objects: the first one is a schematic model showing the pulling apart of the Transylvanian railway system; the second one is a Bethlehem-like statue, *The Hungarians driven away from Kolozsvár*, which is based on the visual elements of the székely people's wood carving art. This work is more comic than suited for showing tragic human fates. Whilst the railway model shows the happenings with captions and "tin soldiers", the Bethlehem's only connection with the railway inside the glass cage is that it has a stylized third class railway wagon with it. With its pine cones, blond string haired aunties, uncles dressed in ködmöns it looks more like a toy from an elementary school. It is hard to maintain one's seriousness and empathize with the hell of human fates meant to be showed, the feeling of being driven away from one's home, line of country, fatherland, the collapsing of historical Hungary, the "mother country".

¹⁴ Moles, Abraham A.: *A giccs. A boldogság művészete*. Ford. Orosz, Magdolna – Albert, Sándor. Háttér Kiadó, Budapest, 1996

The museum's reception

The most characteristic expressions in the museum's visitors' book¹⁵ are: revision, terror against the country, we don't forget, uplifting, heart-smothering, thanks, loyalty and persistence, moving, we take up the arms, don't take us into temptation, patriotic, every Hungarian should see this, silenced, sad, the turul will fly again, pathetic, makes up for shortcomings, treasure, not taught in schools, showing the truth, let's ascend, lots of content, shocking, full of emotions, heart-rending, astonishing, touching.

In the book one can read the usual panels (“grateful that we could be here”, “it was beautiful”, etc.), the other remarks are mostly silently grunting or written with a sad tone, we can't find deference in any of the remarks. There was only one call-to-action remark with outstandingly militant tone, “we take up the arms”, but even this one was finished with the “don't take us into temptation” prayer fragment. Because of the theme of the museum and the exhibition the remarks were written in a patriotic, irredentist tone and also in a tone that stereotypically puts the Hungarians above neighboring nations, also the remarks position the country as a victim, “people's Christ”, “watchtower of the West”, etc. The remarks reflect the general morale of the era between the two World Wars – the incomprehension, turning into introversion, scapegoating – and it can't be read anywhere that Hungary was always part of Europe, or that a common Europe would be a value in the irreversible chain of events of history. At this point we would like to mark that the text-analysis of the visitors' book exceeds the frames of this paper and that we are aware of its significance as a source in exploring the identity-forming role of the Trianon Museum.

Debates in the media

The methodology of scientific research requires us to take into consideration the intellectual debates and scientific discourses connected with the Trianon Museum when analyzing the museum's communication. In the joint search tool (EHM) of EPA, HUMANUS and MATARKA we only found one article about the Trianon Museum and its context and that was Péter György's *The shrine and the museum: the Trianon Museum of Várpalota* (Árgus, 2007. 4-5.), and the findings of this article have already been taken into consideration in the paper. Because of this we turned our attention towards writings published in weekly periodicals and until the 10th of August, 2018 we found 28 articles in which the Trianon Museum could be found. Going through the writings of Magyar Demokrata (7 pcs.), HVG (7 pcs.), 168 Óra (4 pcs.), Origo (2 pcs.), Heti Válasz (2 pcs.), Magyar Narancs (1 pcs.), Index (1 pcs.), !!444!!! (1 pcs.), Magyar Idők (1 pcs.), Kuruc.info (1 pcs.) and Lokál (1 pcs.) we can establish the following. The Zichy Castle in Várpalota became the seat of the institution through the personal connections of Pál Csaba Szabó after the

¹⁵ Visitors' book of 2012, until 5th of April.

Artilleryman Museum moved out, and at this time there were no available funds from the government or the municipality to upkeep and handle the castle, so for the symbolic price of 1 HUF the empty building was in 2001 taken into possession for ten years by the Trianon Museum lead by Zsolt Bayer. This decision was primarily made by political motives. In 2018 the foundation bought a place at Királyszállás, where they made the Greater Hungary Park, reports the HVG. Regarding the historical embeddedness the location of the museum is not the outcome of natural development, but incidental. According to 168 Óra it is a tool of forced tradition-making thanks to the “extreme right influence which is now significant in the area”, and it is an “alien body” in the city's life. HVG is not so straightforward when mentioning it as “local sight”, the Magyar Demokrata in an article draws a parallel between the Pál Csaba Szabó lead reviving of the Thury Castle in Várpalota and the reconstruction of the Sümeg Castle, and only mentions in passing the fact that the Trianon Museum is also connected to this process of tradition-preserving. In the article the comparison with notable historical locations in Hungary is quite poorish; it might even be a little farfetched to state regarding the budget-debates of 2011 that a portion of Fidesz¹⁶ representatives arm-in-arm with the Jobbik¹⁷ proposed the Trianon Museum to be worthy of funding (50 million HUF) besides Ópusztaszer¹⁸. Regarding the political embeddedness the examined articles primarily highlight the connection with the extreme right entities 13 times (Jobbik, Magyar Gárda¹⁹), 4 times highlight the connection with Fidesz, and in one article of 168 Óra even the label Nazi shows up. According to the articles the aim of the museum is to show the complex unity of the Carpathian Basin²⁰, mutual reconciliation, looking for joint solutions and honoring the victims²¹. According to 168 Óra's report, during the campaign of 2010 Jobbik meant the Trianon Museum as a “radical change to Budapest's deteriorating cultural life and to change the borders”. The examined writing shows that the creation and the functioning of the museum can be primarily tracked back to emotional reasons (14 times), but there are references to the nation as well (7 times), cultural objectives (4 times) and scientific activity shows up only two times in the articles.

¹⁶ Fidesz – a national conservative party positioned as a democratic people's party. Currently it is Hungary's governing party (leader: Orbán, Viktor) in alliance with the Christian Democratic People's Party.

¹⁷ Jobbik – a radical right wing party in Hungary, its current leader is Vona, Gábor.

¹⁸ Ópusztaszer – it is located in Csongrád County, its most important sight is the National Historical Memorial Park.

¹⁹ Hungarian Guard – an organization connected to Jobbik. Its characteristics are the black-white uniform with Árpád stripes, negative manifestations against the gypsies living in Hungary and according to many their aspects suggesting being a party militia.

²⁰ Huszka, Imre: *Polgári kastély*. 168 Óra Online, 2005. szeptember 27. <http://www.168ora.hu/itt-hon/polgari-kastely-2008.html> (Accessed: 20 October 2012)

²¹ Sz. n.: *Délvidéki magyar Golgota – emlékezés a vérengzés áldozataira*. *Magyar Demokrata*, 2011. november 23. http://www.demokrata.hu/cikk/delvideki_magyar_golgota_emlekezés_a_verengzés_áldozataira/ (Accessed: 20 October 2012)

They tried to set the scientific grounding right at the founding of the foundation but Ignác Romsics²² backed out, and Mária Ormos²³ could not remember that they asked her to take part in the museum's work. The scientific activity is only mentioned in two Magyar Demokrata articles, one regarding the series of conference-programs of MTA connected to the massacre in former southern Hungary, the other one is an interview regarding the role of Miklós Horthy in history. In the communication about the museum prestigious entities are referred to, such authorities are Miklós Horthy²⁴, Ottokár Prohászka²⁵, Albert Wass²⁶, Dezső Szabó²⁷, Cardinal Péter Erdő²⁸, the Institution and Museum of Military History, the University of Kaposvár, the Parliament and the MTA.

In the left winged/liberal angled newspapers the financial, economic and personnel scandals around the Foundation and the cultural event organizer public company of Várpalota are discussed, the national/right winged media entities write about the usefulness of the museum, its role in the preserving of the nation and its attribute as a memorial sight. In conclusion we can say that the usual separating lines are present, only the already mentioned writing of Péter György could overcome this and analyze with scientific ambitions the museum – non-museum characteristics of Trianon Museum and its role as a shrine.

Conclusion

In this paper whilst examining the communication of the Trianon Museum we took into consideration the buildings' location, the exhibitions with the maps and the visitors' book inside. Regarding the articles published in weekly periodicals we were curious about the social embeddedness of the institution and its connection to other institutions. We can conclude our findings with the following. In the

²² Romsics, Ignác (Homokmégy, 30 March 1951) – a Hungarian historian winning the Széchenyi Prize, university professor, member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Significant researcher of the history of Hungary in the 20th century.

²³ Ormos, Mária (Debrecen, 1 October 1930 – Budapest, 8 December 1919) – a Hungarian historian winning the Széchenyi Prize, university professor, politician, member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, a significant researcher of the history of Hungary and the world in the 20th century.

²⁴ Horthy, Miklós (Kenderes, 18 June 1868 – Estoril, 9 February 1957) – a Naval officer of the Austro-Hungarian Navy. From 1 March 1920 to 16 October 1944 he was the governor of the Hungarian Kingdom.

²⁵ Prohászka, Ottokár (Nyitra, 10 October 1858 – Budapest, 2 April 1927) – a Catholic religious writer, 15th bishop of Székesfehérvár, a significant representative of the Hungarian Christian socialism, member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

²⁶ Wass, Albert (Válaszút, 8 January 1908 – Astor, 17 February 1998) – a Hungarian writer and poet from Transylvania. One of the most controversial characters of the Hungarian literature, his works are published in Hungary only since 1989.

²⁷ Szabó, Dezső (Kolozsvár, 10 June 1879 – Budapest, 13 January 1945) – a Hungarian writer, critic, publicist, a significant representative of the Hungarian literature from between the two World Wars.

²⁸ Erdő, Péter (Budapest, 25 June 1952) – a Cardinal, theologian, canon lawyer, university teacher, proper member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. At the 28th of September 2003 he became the member of the Papal conclave.

city the museum is present as an alien body because its creation is not the product of natural development, but it was born “in medias res” due to its founder having connections to Várpalota and he could find an unused building here. The locals – mostly retired soldiers, miners, physical workers and their descendants – due to their present and former way of living can't really identify themselves with the intellectuality of the institution. The cultural heritage of those living in Várpalota was the Artilleryman Museum, which was created by them and everything inside was an important part of their lives. The Trianon Museum tries to create a much more abstract, national level of cultural heritages.

As a conclusion of reviewing the exhibitions, more precisely the setup, we can say the followings. What we see mostly resembles a traditional museal exhibition. Its fragmentedness, promiscuous-like characteristic is not only caused by the buildings' arrangement of rooms, the clues showing museal background work are mostly missing (for example, explaining texts, picture captions). From the visitors' book it shows that the museum has transformed itself into a memorial place, which is visited as a shrine by the guests. Using its maps it creates the unified Carpathian Basin; it tries to create this Carpathian Basin consciousness with setting “us” against “them”. No trickery, only understandable duality. The expressed will of the founders is to put the system-changing political elite under pressure, and start talking about this taboo event.

The repertory in question is operated by a foundation. This legal form primarily serves the fitting of civilian social initiatives into state frames, but nevertheless is attached by thousands of strings to politics, even if these are mostly informal ones, outside the mainstream of politics. The museums besides being national are also state institutions, because they are mostly maintained by the state lead by the all-time government, even though they are institutions in the hands of the municipality. The Trianon Museum presents as a national institution, national memorial place even though it is not part of the state's and municipality's institution-system. Oddly the museum's cashier was the one to touch the spot on why the museum is outside the mainstream when saying that “it is identified with Jobbik, so the Fidesz doesn't give any money”. It is almost entirely present only in radical media entities which many times almost express themselves in an illegal manner. It is not present in national news services which operate in the mainstream of publicity, although it could legitimate its existence and operation through discourses created here. This is the paradox the cashier pointed out without even knowing, because the lack of funding from the government shows the attachments of the museum to the extreme right, making the critical historical examination of Trianon almost impossible.

REFERENCES

1. APPADURAI, ARJUN: Introduction: Commodities and Politics of Value. In Arjun Appadurai (ed.): *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, 3–63.
2. BRUBAKER, ROGERS: *Nacionalizmus új keretek között*. Ford. Erdősi, Péter. L'Harmattan Kiadó, Budapest, 2007
3. ÉBLI, GÁBOR: *Az antropológizált múzeum*. Typotex Kiadó, Budapest, 2005
4. FEISCHMIDT, MARGIT: Populáris emlékezetpolitikák és az újnacionalizmus: a Trianon-kultusz társadalmi alapjai. In Feischmidt, Margit (szerk.): *Nemzet a mindennapokban – Az újnacionalizmus populáris kultúrája*. L'Harmattan, Budapest, 2014, 51–81.
5. FRAZON, ZSÓFIA –K. HORVÁTH, ZSOLT: A megsértett Magyarország. *Regio*, 2002, 13. évf. 4. sz. <http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00036/00047/pdf/23.pdf> (Accessed: 25 November 2017)
6. FRAZON, ZSÓFIA: *Múzeum és kiállítás. Az újrarájzolás terei*. Gondolat Kiadó, Budapest, 2012
7. GYÖRGY, PÉTER: *A kegyhely és a múzeum – a várpalotai Trianon Múzeum*. *Árgus*, 4–5. 2007, 26–36.
8. HAKLIK, NORBERT: A házmaster-szubkultúra ellen. *Magyar Nemzet Online*, 2003. december 29. <http://mno.hu/kulturpult/a-hazmesterszubkultura-ellen-683504> (Accessed: 11.10.2012.)
9. HOBBSAWM, ERIC – TURNER, TERENCE: *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983
10. HUSZKA, IMRE: *Polgári kastély*. 168 Óra Online, 2005. szeptember 27. <http://www.168ora.hu/itthon/polgari-kastely-2008.html> (Accessed: 20 October 2012)
11. MOLES, ABRAHAM A.: *A giccs. A boldogság művészete*. Ford. Orosz, Magdolna – Albert, Sándor. Háttér Kiadó, Budapest, 1996
12. PIERRE NORA: *Emlékezet és történelem között*. *Aetas*, 1999/3. Ford. K. Horváth, Zsolt http://www.aetas.hu/1999_3/99-3-10.htm (Accessed: 21 July 2018)
13. Sz. n.: Délvidéki magyar Golgota – emlékezés a vérengzés áldozataira. *Magyar Demokrata*, 2011. november 23. http://www.demokrata.hu/cikk/delvideki_magyar_golgota_emlekezés_a_verengzes_aldozataira/ (Accessed: 20 October 2012)