

**University of Debrecen
Arts Department**

Dr. Gábor Koncz

**Research Beginning on the Economics of Culture
in Hungary between 1974 and 1989**

the PhD's main points of the thesis

2004 Debrecen

a) Aim of the study, touching on the issue

In Hungary from the 1960's disputes were begun around cultural themes, financing of culture and its economic connections. These were motivated by those time's new economical considerations. To feel the *opportunity* of the cultural changing times in the middle of the 70's they started systematic, scientific cultural-economic researching. This work began with the analysis of wide domestic and foreign specialised literature, interpretation of the basic notions, looking at the reasons from the economical standpoint of culture.

In my dissertation I enclosed the beginning of the domestic economic-viewed, systematic scientific research of culture; the time between 1974 and 1989; its typical specialised literature and some parts of empirical analysis. I also give an outlined view for the 1990's.

Basically my dissertation is theory-history and analytical-statistic type.

My aim was, after looking through the reasons for research of the economical point of view of culture, to analyse the culture-theoretical disputes which were typical at that period; to sketch the views about the development's cultural dimension on the basis of the international specialised literature; furthermore, to interpret the wider and narrower culture's concept; for all of these context's and the category of the cultural sphere.

I have set myself the task to present and analyse the dimensions of economic research of culture; to specify the theme of the cultural economy; to survey the relationship between the economic theories and cultural sphere, as well as the period's theoretical course of culture-economic research.

On the field of empirical research one of my aims was to present the macro-economical tendencies of Hungary's cultural financing through the heterogeneous and the heteronym statistics and different analyses. My further aim was to write down today's financial structure and to work out the schemes; to make clear the notions of civilian and non-profit sectors, and the cultural homes' complex analysis by political, statistical and economical consideration.

I drafted new research missions that follow from the explored issues.

b) Sketch out the used methods

I endeavoured to analyse and summarise the domestic and foreign specialised literature and documents. I collected and systematised statistical resources. During the parsing I used the methods of ordinary statistics, termed dynamical and the structural comparing. From all of these I made theoretical conclusions and have shown numerated tendencies and structural changes.

c) List the thesis' conclusions

At the first chapter of my dissertation I analysed the approach of the opportunities and the related notion of culture's point of views; examined the wide and narrow concept of culture, specified the categories of the cultural sphere. I presented how (in the 1970's and 1980's) culture has risen as an economical problem at that time.

After the World War II the *direct reason* for the joining of economic and designing interest of the cultural process and condition was *the changing structure of the workforce*. A different outgrowth from this reason was the *financial problems* of the cultural institutions (knowledge-mediator systems). Behind these we can find the deeper, basic reason, which was the control *dilemma of the society with ambition for awareness* (state intervention). In the *industrially developed countries* after the World War II the economical growth and correcting the standard of living could not be continued solely by the ordinary production factors (land; simple physical work; capital which is embodied in material goods). *At the developing countries* the deepening gap between backwardness and development could not be ironed out without creating the “*intellectual infrastructure*”. Therefore arose the question; *if the central board (economic and political) should do anything for the dynamical harmony between the economic-development and level of education. Namely if education, culture and knowledge acquiring could be part of the economic development*.

The approach of the *essential education-economical works* refers to that they considered the growth factor not just skill but widely, education and knowledge – though these could not measure the economical effect.

Researching the culture's economic context was motivated by the following reasons: *in the 1970's and 1980's*: 1. Changing of the economic and social structure. 2. Cultural context of the two-world systems at those times fought. 3. Those time's decisions, alternatives and forces. 4. Inside development of science and scientific research. 5. Development of planning. *Furthermore from 1990's*: 6. Diversification of education. 7. Growth of the civilian organisations and formation of the non-profit sector. 8. Formation of the Central-Eastern Europe change of regime and the four sectors' economy. 9. Tendencies of globalisation and localisation. 10. Context of poverty and culture, and welfare and culture.

In the analysed term the economic modernisation of cultural philosophy and notions was a difficult problem to solve. When the disputes about the wider and narrower culture were going on at the same time *workers of schools, cultural homes, theatres and cinemas had physical and irrational regulation problems. It was proved that in the middle 1980's the physical regulations overburdened the problems of control and had close connection with the theoretical contradictions*. There were close connections between *interpreting the notions* and the *judgement* of the time's cultural relations and process (clearly: understanding problems).

One of the defining possibilities of notions was the philosophical, theoretical type. In the course of this it became an existence problem whether the question of connections among society, culture and a way of living. The other one was an ethnographical, anthropological type: in this case the problem of "culture turn up" at defining the empirical research's data, and the generalisation of the theoretical experiences. At the third approach the question was what could be considered culture from the financial and statistical data collection. This approach was more different from the first two: not only for the abstraction's other level, but for the attitudes direct practical results.

During the years of 1970's and 1980's the following motivated the development of domestic cultural discussions: seeking of the social origin's economical growth; searching for the reasons of social development. *Accordingly* faith in the economic-centralised growth was shaken; therefore the seeking of social parts and explanations led them to the problem of culture.

At the beginning hidden, later more and more a direct scientific fight was started against the mechanical, Stalinist interpretations of *exist and mind, basis and superstructure accordingly*: recognition of the teleological man-work's consequence of social organisation needed a different approach, such as technical and organisational *ambitions for modernisation*. Recognising the interdependence among the part systems of social re-production; and its "concrete dialects", the hierarchy's empirically captivating research *increasing* the knowledge about the world and the *gap* of some layer's knowledge *accordingly*: discovery the cultural dissension. Enlarging the role of financial *consumption accordingly*: the problem of alienation and with this the valued consumption. *Presence of new communicational techniques accordingly*: the intellectual production became industrial-type and global. *Crisis of the socialist adult education accordingly*: recognition of the layered, divided society and the choice of intellectual fact and opportunity.

Those time's opportunities make a connection between cultural theories specifically the narrower and wider culture concept and the economic analysis. Inside the latter: looking out from the trap of the contrast between basis and superstructure, financial and intellectual production, productive and unproductive works they had to fight with an other trap's real danger. Those time's points of view and expectations which would liked to measure everything, forced to justify the connections at least stochastically, were similarly pressed-in type. The possibility to join together the UNESCO's works and the literature of 1980's became the key to the theoretically based newer approach. People who worked on economic analysis made a consensus about the concept of culture: they should use a notion of culture that is measurable by statistics and suitable for covering economically analysable cultural areas².

Analysing the cultural theoretical disputes by the economic and sociological point of views I made the conclusion that people increased the re-structuring of social life beginning with integration, adaptation and renewing their workforce ability. Needed, but not enough of this condition to produce material goods and to fulfil the material like consumer expectations. Although from the international and domestic specialised literature we can find many different definitions for culture there is no doubt that a group of these definitions are part of the immaterial, uneconomic dimension of the social life's re-structuring. *Concept of the cultural sphere* concludes the following: special

organisation or *institution-system* of the preservation, production, division and consumption of knowledge; this institution-system's main activities and from these outcome *products and productions* (cultural goods and services); *social control* from the direct institutional and activity system; altogether specified *cultural connections and processes*.

Culture (widely meaning) is a relative-notion and at the same time these relations, inhabitations, life style, social process and furthermore in *objects, services* and organisations (institutions), which consist, carry, express these means and their manifestation. *Culture is the relation of people to themselves* and in this activity, which is manlike, different from the others (in actions, habits), he used objects and employed services. *Culture is the relation of a man to another man* and its manifestation according to the above. Furthermore *culture is the relation of people to nature; to the objective nature; to the formed and under forming social habits*. At least *culture is the relation* to the sign-type objectivity, their physical and servicing appearance to the institutions of guarding, producing and servicing. *With all of these the system of the narrower culture was formed:* science, education, arts, mass communication, culture, organisations and activities of electro-culture. *Concept of the cultural sphere* is the *institutionalised dimension of the social life and the wider culture*: it means the specialised activity system from material producing information, knowledge, saving, making (term), spreading (division) and receipting (consumption) the intellectual products and the related control.

Principal connections between culture and economy, the essential characteristics of modernisation are the followings: economy is part of the wider culture. Economy is globally specified, but working in the locally wider culture. The narrower culture depends on economy in short term, so the above discussed cultural sphere's financing and operation. In long term the wider culture and economy depends on the narrower culture.

At the second chapter I went through that time's theoretical dimensions of economical research of culture. Our research were settled around four main structural elements: 1.) analysing the theoretical and methodological economic questions of culture; 2.) the domestic fact approach; 3.) the international comparison; 4.) methodology of cultural forecast and planning. The object of the wider educational-economy is the examination of the economic connection of the cultural sphere. In the narrower meaning (the narrower cultural sphere) we examined *outside of* education and scientific research the institutions, productions, control and connecting social processes of culture; *so not one or the other but all of these together and their interactions*. The *cultural-economy* examines: quantity of the community and population's devoted and devisable resources for culture, mechanism of using this and the influencing economic interest-system; management of the companies, institutions and organisations which take part at establishing and saving the cultural materials and services; economic theories which specify the function of the cultural institutions. Theses are the economic act-types that specify the cultural processes. Therefore the cultural economic researches are enclosed in the economic questions of cultural materials' production, division and consumption. Using the theoretical and methodological knowledge of economic theories and the sectored economy on the field of cultural processes' analysing, planning and managing; economic projections of some communities, families' cultural forms, habits and cultural opportunities.

The cultural-economy is multiply a frontier area. It attempts to join the science of culture and the science of economy; therefore it is a functional economy, because it attempts to generalise theoretical conclusions. At the same time it is sectoral economy, because works with the functional mechanism and laws of the cultural sector (as an institution-system); industrial management, because it examines the functional specifics of institution types (e.g.: theatre, cultural house, library) which are related to a cultural sub- or specific-sector.

The international specific literature a number of people worked on social-economics, development theory called *culture-economy*, which took the stress on the cultural dimension of the social life. Others use the notion of culture-economy narrower as the *arts' economic connections*, or narrower for the economic categories of the culture's productions and products.

Searching for those periods' theoretical historical roots through the *connection of culture-economy*, the review extended from the classical civil political economy to the infrastructure, consumption and the theories of cultural industry. Theories and models of economy could draw only those dimensions of reality, which parameters were accepted or could be accepted. The economic (exactly: economist) interpretation of culture was in close connection with the *interpretation of productive and unproductive work* and with the economic policy consequences from this.

Those people who worked with the explanation of growth and the possible acceleration of development introduced culture as a special economic problem. The essence of the direction of theoretical history: *by the transition from "extensive type economic development" to "intensive", it became more stressed that the outside factors were developing, a growing role of direct material production.* The theoretical consequence: the relative backwardness of the whole infrastructure broke the economic growth and increased the standard of living, so relative backwardness of the cultural condition-system broke the social development and also economic growth. *The cultural sphere came to the economic interest's front when changes began at the producing method's technical and structural dimension, in which the material and intellectual production interweaved and when the different structural informational systems connected to each other.*

There is no doubt that the economic analyses of culture was motivated by the fact that education stepped out from the school-system. Demands of the system of adult teaching, permanent education etc. gave work for the mass communication institutions, libraries and cultural houses. Behind these examinations there was a more permanent reason: the "human factor" needed not only the development of healthcare, education or generally services but also the insurance of cultural possibilities outside education. The outside artistic and cultural conditional system's inner development required the comprehensive economic analysis, because the special institutions of direction of knowledge (radio, TV, newspapers, libraries, cultural houses) altogether became real industrial typed. Only one group from the economic connections means to cost so much money and needs managing and planning. The economic questions were at least important which

connected to the financial resources and the social division (to get and receive) the productions.

During those time's socialist countries and at the domestic specialised literature *the questions that returned full circle were the following*: economic valuation of the activities of cultural institutions; production or the consumption type of the cultural sphere; fighting against the principle of remains planning and financing, endeavour to change the ratio of re-distribution; examine the regulation and functional mechanism of financing; work out the economically captivated and measurable planning norms; problems of consumption of cultural goods and services. During the economic research of culture we would have liked to answer the question: in the time of socialism actually who financed culture; what were the macro-economical tendencies; what were the dynamics and rations according to resources and aims. What were the measure, place and role of cultural sphere as a whole? What were the measure, place and role at the social re-producing of some sub- and specialised factors? What kind of requirements had the modernisation at the cultural sphere, and what did that mean in that field?

The *unusual* (analysing the connection between the notion of wider and narrower culture and economy) and *specified* (analysing the institutions and activities) literature of culture-economy did *not* come from the direct continuing of the conception of human capital and education-economy. These kind of researches were motivated by solving the artistic and cultural institutions' real material problems, and the rise of the cultural industry. The approach and the interpretation of the results (in those time's socialist countries) led back to the original political economic question: the problems of productive and unproductive work, and basis and superstructure. *Authors from the west did not waste time normally* by definition of culture, but examined real economical connections at some kind of cultural institutions' function and development (or a product's production). *Therefore the economic examinations approaching social-theory and the concrete plans or sectors were divorced*. As for the researches of the culture-economy it was typical at the socialist countries that they set out from culture-theoretical discussions and they tried to connect this with the economical examinations of the cultural institutional-system. *The Eastern-European determination set out here, too: because of the practical and theoretical pressing they could reach the concrete only through the general*.

On one hand at the analysed period the central theme of the dissertations were to stress the necessity of the communal financing, searching for the principles and methodological of the optimal financing. On the other hand the necessity to work out the more channelled financing. *At that time we got into the shadow of a new informational, communicational (result from this production, making) revolution, but at home we had the previous industrial revolution's problems.*

As for capitalism the defined cultural goods came out as not article-like using values, but on the other hand the production process of these were eaten up by the logic of capital producing. Where the *constructive* lobby that created cultural goods could not fight with the market's rationalisation of capital *production* goods so at that place the cultural goods coming out as communal, special public article, which needed patronage. The uniqueness, autonomy and the systemic coincidence of production and consumption of the product could *not* be made possible for mass production. That's why the law of specific expenditure succeeded, and this closed out many times domination of economic rationalism of capital principle.

By the mass production of cultural goods and services the rationalisation and domination of capital production was spread out to the narrower cultural sphere of the social re-production. Cultural goods became real goods. While the logic of mass production became significant at the cultural production and consumption, at the same time the constructive activities, which created the essence of products, got stuck in the archaic economic sphere.

There began the meshing of material and intellectual goods' production by the mass production of cultural goods. The role of the cultural sphere became extended and essential at the social reproduction. With its role's changing it was broaden in dimension, therefore its notability in the national economy had thriven. The technical achievements of material production created new opportunities for art expressions and new forms for culture and acquirement. Achievements of the intellectual production became usable quickly and directly at the production of material goods through the system of mass production. Accordingly *the logic of the industrial system itself enforced the quick and more inter improvement of human endowment; and attended on the cultural industry and through this the material production.* In the course of this we could make the

conclusion that the broadest category was not the cultural sphere of the social reproduction but its *informational sphere*. Therefore *on one hand* every activity had an informational dimension. *On the other hand* the special activities for saving and producing information became bigger at the material, economic sphere of the social reproduction. *For the third time* the circle of institutions, organisations and people working with information were broaden by the social reproduction. *Evolution of the new directions of culture economy could be the newer direction of flare.* *It was built on the wider notion of culture which took the whole social structure under examination; inside this it gave honoured notability for the institutions, productions and services of the narrower cultural sphere.*

The collected empirical statistical and structural analyses at the third chapter are new in domestic literature. They had to create methodological thoughts to analyse (with really exhaustive work) statistically the financial tendencies of the period's macro-economic culture. Items could be collected and systematised from really heterogeneous and heteronyms statistical sources. They had to find the quantitative differences, which were coming from the structural rearrangement and methodological changes. *After these I did the dynamical, special sectionals and structural analyses.*

From the years of 1948 until the middle of 1980's the returning theme of the socialist ideology was that conditions of culture were insured by the state. Political documents and speakers laid stress upon this; it was the base of so much articles, and furthermore of the otherwise authoritative studies. *The cultural act of 1976 had declared this, too.*

Before the cultural party declaration of 1972 (it was the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Labour Party) during the doubtless board and clear work they had found negative facts; *but the systematically and scientific assimilation of the real system, measure, dynamic and structure of financing had not become real.*

We could see from the studies' analysis, reports and documents that the cultural relations and processes were essentially defined by the institution-system, which made and transferred the cultural goods. According to the rarely available facts and figures *the state expenses of culture had decreasing tendency at the first five years plan (1950-1954), and at the second three years plan (1958-1960), too.* Relatively high increasing year by year from 1950-52, but later the relative position of the cultural sphere was decayed. The dualistic disadvantageous approach for culture and production was highly got on.

Statistics *measured services by outgoings.* We could see from the items that the calibre of the tertiary sectors and not financial services were changed during the 1960's. At that time the GDP was growing much quicker, at the course of exchange and at the comparative price, too, than the calculated added value on the field of cultural services. The latter's growth was lower from the non-financial services' enlargement; it was lagging behind from science, and could not reached the general dynamics of healthcare and social expenses.

In the period between 1970-1976 the gross foreign product was increased by 9,7 percent on average on running productive price. Increasing of non-financial services was lower (9 percent). The collected inputs from healthcare, social and culture were generally (9,6 percent) higher. It was caused by scientific outputs. The general enlargement measure by 9,7 percent of the cultural sphere was in connection with the dynamic infrastructure development programme. It was built in the regulation of education-policy 1972 and in the regulation of culture 1974, exactly in the fourth five-year-old plan (1971-1975). The ratios that were counted from items of running costs showed the unchangingness of the cultural sphere's position. Using the comparative cost the situation was a little bit better on the field of measures and ratios. *The result of this kind of multiple conversions could be vain because the cost-base of 1976 measured on the beginning of 1970 could show bigger absolute enlargement.* At the second part of the decade the tendency was perceptible approaching the long-term average.

Between 1960-1980 the gross cultural costs of budget enlarged by 7,3 times, on yearly average by 10,4 percent. The enlargement was really waving, especially in 1960's. During these years there were huge leaps, from the beginning of the year 1970 the spread was smaller, the yearly measures stayed around the average, and *approaching to the year 1980 I could register decreasing measured enlargement*. The detailed calculations showed that the enlargement of costs was a little bit quicker at the local governments, but slower at the central budget's average. The spread of the average at the governmental costs was bigger, but at the central budget around the years of 1970 arranged around the average decidedly and quickly. All of these meant that the financial expenses of culture in the year 1960 the central budget and the local governments paid in 70 and 30 percent; this ratio changed in 1980 (rounded data) into 66-34.

When people talked about national finance of culture they thought about the previous items. *The real situation was much more complex*. The central budget financed the cultural companies from the line "support of companies and co-operative societies". This gross support grew by 23,8 percent yearly until 1975, after this time change became moderated. These companies from 1970 paid tax; it was increasing by 12,6 percent yearly. *Therefore the net state support of cultural companies showed large gaps, at the second part of 1970's it was constantly decreasing, in 15,8 percent average by year*.

The relative situation of culture within the national economy in the 2 decades examined was hardly changed. The gross cultural costs of the budget were between 0,2-0,3 percent between 1960-1980. The net cultural costs that included the citizens' expenses reached and passed only in 1969, one percent of the gross national production. The gross cultural expenses from the national incomes were around one percent with enlarging basic tendency. The net cultural expense with the citizens' costs from the national incomes changed from 2,25 percent to 3,12 percent. *However we could see positive tendencies in the ratios these were not considerable changes; they were led back greatly to the changes of the basic calculation of national economic relations*.

In socialism the ideological statement was that state expenses that were turned for culture were growing on real value, and the financing of culture was decisively a state task. I disproved with both statements on empirical basis by systematic analysis over a long term.

Growth was not balanced at all at the examined period. The significant changes that were closely connected to the political regulations then went on the decreasing tendencies quickly. It could be seen from the examination of rates. The position of cultural services was declined within the gross national production, the non-material services and the GDP (it was more on comparative cost, than on running cost); meanwhile the position of non-material services was improved. I examined with full particulars the financing of the cultural sphere according to their resources and the usage of the main special sectors; how it appeared according to the state budget and the national costs? The pulse of the public inputs showed capriciousness, and around 1970 it had a decreasing tendency. The pulse of the citizens' inputs were various; interesting variances were general from the year of having television, from the middle of 1960's; and from the 1970's general increasing tendency was typical in the period. The running cultural costs (I stress: without investment!) of public (central budget, governmental budget, mass organisations, companies) gave the 17,3 percent of all cultural inputs, consequently 82,7 percent was paid by citizens. By impermanent fluctuations the bearing the burden of costs of citizens was growing until 1967 (88,3 percent), then not easily but "stopped" the ration 25-75 percent between public and citizens. Accordingly the population paid the 75 percent of the costs of cultural institutions. (Meanwhile "it was not inside" in wages, and according to the socialist state theories it could had been a state job.)

From 1970 the content of the cultural expenses of the citizens was broaden. Though they had this kind of costs, the data collectors started to collect only from this time photos, musical instruments and the repairing costs of cultural instruments. On the field of ratios between the costs of public and citizens from the year 1970 it was 20,3-79,7 and reached the 25,5-74,5 percent. *Behind this there stood the development of radio, television and telegraph offices. Therefore: while the macro-economic position of public finance of culture did not change, the new institutions could save more and more from the support-enlargement that was just above inflation. So the old institutions' relative and absolute economic position was declined, while their function was left. It was the basic paradox of the culture's public financing and at least understandable fact for the authorities.*

Until the middle of 1980's the next overall consequences coming from the analysed statistical tendencies:

- The cultural investments were decisively for reconstruction or of supplementary type. Because of the cancelled investments huge needs accumulated. The differences of the maintenance among counties were cut down, but the inequalities within counties (or regions) were enlarged.
- The backwardness of cultural infrastructure (according to necessities and international scale) caused the detraction of the supply.
- The citizens' cultural habits became determinate according to their home and infrastructure.
- The relative position of the cultural sphere did not change at the financing of institutions and activities; its part did not grow within the using of national income and the budget. The tempo of enlargement of the running inputs did not compensate the inflation from the middle of the 1970's. The absolute growth of the inputs in the whole period covered the costs of the new entrant institutions and the new functions of the old ones. Therefore the "old" institutions' relative position and their activities were not improved, but getting decayed.
- The structural realignment was notable within the state and citizen financing: the role of culture intervention based on the mass communication and electricity increased, the general forms came to the forefront, therefore they had deeper financing problems.

- Suggesting the basic economic problems of the cultural sphere and the query of the economy-centralised social development essentially stayed in the cultural and ideological sphere. The economic development of cultural sectors did not get the part of economic strategy.

For the years of 1990's this kind of broad report was not made. On statistical basis, on comparable mode by the previous period it could not be done. It was because the *owners'* and the structural changes of *'who-how-what financing'* were really important, as the whole system was changed; the four sectors economy was worked out. But from the different analyses cleared up *a tough historical rate: the public 25-27 percent and the non-public (market, non-profit, houses) 75-73 percent*. Then I interpreted the structural changes instead of empirical, statistic tendencies. To work out the system (*who, how and what financing*) of today's Hungarian culture financing was new in the specialised literature. In my essay it was also shown the modern scheme for the four sectored economy; analysing the notional connections of civil sphere and non-profit sector. The direct and hidden financing and the economic viewed laws' critical analysis were the remarks on current meetings.

At the fourth chapter of my dissertation contains the complex analysis of cultural homes, especially between 1945-1985, by looking-outward. I presented the features of this important institution-system of culture-by-culture political documents, ministry papers, specialised literature of national education and sociology, reports and statistics. I made empirical based analyses at the dimension, on one hand politics of cultural homes, on the other hand money, regulators and pressures.

After 1948 by changing of power, owner and social-economic relations became real at the controllable institution-system of the power interest – instead of their differentiated organisations. The previous institutions of public culture had disappeared in two steps. By the change of the powers the original keeper and operator function were ended and at the same time by the beginning of the area the mobility of people and traditional community of requests were closed. The previous institutions and "structures" were liquidated with the socialisation of culture and with the build out of planning controlled leading system. *The cultural house net what was established* as the new institution of public culture *became the tool of enlarging at the political regulation with two functions*. On one

hand it was the actualised institution of agitation and propaganda of the local social economic tasks; on the other hand it was a service centre that complemented the autonomous culture-specialised institutions of the Cultural Revolution. *The functions of institution of complementation and the agitation-propaganda were hardly incompatible in concept and structural methods, too.* The pressures became outstanding when the institutions local type, functions of culture and social publicity were drafted. This work-structural pressure was enlarged by the fact that *the cultural house was established as an originally “over-political” institution.* The distrust atmosphere that originated from this fact was served the countable, measurable, and demolishable governing principles.

Changes were assisted by the outer opportunities and challenges, and the inner contradictions of the net. *The third function* appeared because of the cumulative demand crisis, the requests for independent facade cultural activities, the “place-hunting” of the young contemporary groups (on the whole different cultural demands); the task of public organisation and local public-creation. At the end of the 1960’s the tabula rasa was effected officially and formally, too: the so far ad hoc and extensive development politics were weighed by taking scale. They could not help the enlargement of the influence’s leading action for modernisation because the changes of the cultural attitude were restricted by cultural restrictions and financial possibilities. *Financing of the so-called aufclerism (~ enlightenment) was left for the enlightened ones; meanwhile the setting mechanism often blocked the use of the gathered funds.* The ideological and technical leading dimensions of cultural homes were controversial at the harmonisation of economic dimension and at the setting *implement system*. All of these intensified the existing crisis of demand and supply; there were no reserves for the changing necessities, while the demand that swallowed the means could not sold. If we look at this with the local characterised lacks of institutional supplies and with the centralisation-concentration tendencies we can realise clearly that the lack is not scalar but vectored; slack and lack became realisable together. These embarrassments *caused confusion* at the normally well acting institutions.

Next to these not only the leading and changing ambitions helped to make a living of the cultural homes. On one hand the companies gave support, because they made their task that was taken to them by the policy and at the same time they ensured automatically the visitor's demand. On the other hand a part of the people effectively needed a part of the cultural homes' supply! People needed the cultural home as a substitution and what's more a place, where the audience could meet itself. With the still of the big territorial-social realignment waves the new (and old) inhabitants looked for social relationships in cultural homes. The cultural homes' fourth, informational centre function was motivated together by the domestic society's becomes complicated, and by the difficulty of see through the lack-economy and mass of information. Among the beforehand outlined frames, the so-called continual and technical disputes were going on around the told or untold understanding, mixing and parting four functions. A part of cultural homes had sub-functions (exhibition, theatre, feast, concert etc.), meanwhile the sub-servicing and informational function was connected to this; it became a rather organising-developing of domestic society and interest-transmitter function.

The chapter contains (first time in the specialised literature) the running financial tendencies and analysis of the detailed, periodical investment data until the middle of the 1980's. In the outlined conclusion that covered the time of today I put as a hypothesis that the institution system of culture was the place of formation of the civilian sphere and the non-profit sector. Furthermore, I examined today's known new cultural opportunities, too.

At the fifth chapter of my dissertation I summarised the achieved results and outlined the researching tasks by categories.

d) The Author's Published Studies of the Theme of the Dissertation

Dr. Gábor Konecz: Autobiography (1974–2004)

I. Volumes, Independent Publications

[1980/a]: Művelődésgazdaságtan és a kulturális szféra távlati tervezése. (*Long Term Planning of the Culture Economic Studies and the Cultural Sphere*) Bp., Kulturális Minisztérium Tudományos Koordinációs Bizottság, 74 old.

[1980/b]: ~, Káposztás Ferenc, Monigl István, Szepesi György: Életszínvonal és foglalkoztatás. Tananyag a speciális kollégiumok hallgatói részére. (*Standard of Living and Employment. Curriculum for the Students of Specialised University Course*) (szerk.: Monigl István) II. kötet. Bp., MSZMP Budapesti Bizottsága Oktatási Igazgatóság, 289 old.

[1981]: A művelődésgazdaságtan szakirodalma. (*Specialised Literature of the Culture Economic Studies*) Bp., Statisztikai Kiadó Vállalat, 108 old.

[1983]: ~, Bali Gellért, Káposztás Ferenc, Monigl István, Szepesi György: Életszínvonal és életszínvonal-politika (1950-1980) Speciális Kollégium hallgatói részére. (*Standard of Living and Politics of Standard of Living 1950-1980. For the Students of Specialised University Course*) Bp., MSZMP Budapesti Bizottság Oktatási Igazgatósága Gazdaságpolitikai Tanszék. (szerk.: Monigl István) II/1. kötet 173 old., II/1-2. kötet 321 old. + táblázatok

[1984]: ~, Káposztás Ferenc, Monigl István: A kulturális szféra tervezése. (*Planning of the Cultural Sphere*) Bp., Tankönyvkiadó, 206 old.

II. Publications in Foreign Language

[1974]: The Scope of Culture and Some Special Economic Aspects of Cultural Life in Hungary. (*A kultúra fogalma és a magyar kulturális élet néhány közgazdasági kérdése*) In: Kultúra, Belgrád, angol nyelvű különszám, 55-60. old.

[1977]: Financial support for the creative arts in Hungary (*Az alkotóművészet gazdasági támogatása Magyarországon*) In: Support for the creative arts. The examples of Poland and Hungary. Paris, UNESCO, Cultural Development, Documentary Dossier. UNESCO Vol. 11-12. cc. 77/WS/34., 37-81. old.

[1978/a]: Some Achievements of Cultural Research. (*A művelődéskutatások néhány eredménye*) In: Ekonomiky kultúry (Ed. Oskar Novotny), Bratislava, Výskumný Ústav Kultúry v Bratislave, 153-168. old.

[1978/b]: What are the Culture Economic Studies? (*Mi a művelődésigazdaság?*) In: Zur Entwicklung der Kulturökonomie in der sozialistischen Gesellschaft. Berlin, Akademie für Weiterbildung beim Ministerium für Kultur. 19-42. old.

[1979]: Long Term Planning of Culture. (*A kultúra távlati tervezése*.) In: Kašjak, M; Novotny, O. (szerk.) Teoretické a metodologické problémy ekonomiky a riadenia kultúry. Bratislava, Výskumný Ústav Kultury, 26-41. old.

[1980]: An attempt at the economic analysis of musical culture in Hungary. (*Kísérlet a magyar zenekultúra közgazdasági vizsgálatára*.) Párizs, UNESCO, Division for Cultural Development, 95 old.

[1981]: Problems of Cultural Planning (*A kulturális tervezés problémái*.) Párizs, UNESCO, Division for Cultural Development, 104 old.

[1982]: Specialised Literature of the Culture Economic Studies. (*A művelődésigazdaság szakirodalma*) Prehľad odbornej literatúry. Kultúra v zahraničí, Bratislava, Výskumny Ústav Kultúry v Bratislave, 173 old.

[1985]: Co-ordinating education policies and plans with those for culture and communication within the framework of long-term economic and social policies. With a selected annotated international bibliography. (*Az oktatási, kulturális, kommunikációs politika és tervezés koordinálása a hosszú távú gazdasági és társadalmi politikák keretében. Válogatott, annotált nemzetközi bibliográfiával*.) Paris, UNESCO, Division of Educational Policy and Planning, 46 + 69 old.

[1986/a]: ~, Illés Iván: A critical analysis of the notion of planning, with particular reference to the Hungarian experience. A case study prepared at the request of the UNESCO Division of Philosophy and Human Sciences. (*Kritikai elemzés a tervezés értelmezéséről, különös tekintettel a magyarországi tapasztalatokra*.) Paris, UNESCO, Division for the study of Development; Report/Studies, STY. 38, 61 old.

[1986/b]: UNESCO's Action in the Field of Cultural Planning. A Synthesis of the Work Carried out within UNESCO's Programme since the end of 1960's. (*Az UNESCO tevékenysége a kulturális tervezés terén, az 1960-as évek végétől*) Paris, UNESCO, Section for Cultural Policies and Studies on Cultural Development. Report/Studies, CC/CSP/CP02, 92 old.

[1988] ~, Inkei Péter, Pöcze Gábor: The Diversification of the Education Field in Hungary. (*Az oktatás diverzifikálódása Magyarországon*) Paris, UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning, 61 old.

[1995]: Cultural Centres in Hungary. (*Kulturális központok Magyarországon*) In: Cultural Centres in Central and Eastern Europe. Culturelnik, special issue. Zagreb, IRMO, 97-104. old.

III. Essays, Articles

[1974/a]: Jövökutatás és távlati tervezés. Szakdolgozat. (*Long-term Planning and Futurology. Dissertation*.) Bp., Marx Károly Közgazdaság tudományi Egyetem, Népgazdasági Tervező-elemző Szak, Elméleti – Gazdaságpolitikai Szakágazat. (Kézirat), 81 old.

[1974/b]: A közművelődés közigazdasági kérdései. Kutatási terv. (*Economic Questions of Culture. Plan of Research*.) Bp., Népművelési Intézet, (Sokszorosítás), 17 old.

[1975/a]: Köll-e más az embernek? (A budapesti művelődési otthonok és klubok 1975. márciusi vizsgálatáról.) (*If People Need Something Else? About the year 1975. Examinations in Cultural Houses and Clubs of Budapest*.) In: Kritika 7. szám, 17-18. old.

[1975/b]: Pillanatfelvétel: budapesti művelődési otthonok és klubok 1975. március 1-4. (*Snapshot: Cultural Houses and Clubs of Budapest. 1-4 March 1975*.) In: Kultúra és Közösség, 1975. 1. sz. 33-48. old.

[1975/c]: Kirajzás. (Budapesti művelődési otthonok vizsgálata.) (*Popping out. Examination of Cultural Houses of Budapest*.) In: Kultúra és Közösség, 2-3. szám, 20-44. old.

[1975/cs]: Kultúrpolitika és a kultúra finanszírozása Jugoszláviában. (*Cultural Policy and Cultural Financing in Yugoslavia*.) In: Kultúra és Közösség, 1. szám, 112-126. old.

[1976/a]: ~, Andrássy Mária: Budapesti művelődési otthonok 1975. (*Cultural Houses of Budapest 1975.*) In: Népművelés, 1976. 7. szám, 12-15. old., 1976. 8. szám, 8-10. old., 1976. 10 szám, 10-11. old., 1976. 11.szám 8-10. old.

[1976/b]: A jövökutatás és társadalmi tervezés összefüggései a közművelődés irányításával. Egyetemi doktori disszertáció. (*Futurology and Connections of Social Planning Guiding by Culture. Thesis for the Doctor's Degree.*) Bp., Marx Károly Közgazdaságtudományi Egyetem, Népgazdasági Tervezési Tanszék, 250 old.

[1976/c]: A komplex kultúrakutatás finn modellje. (*Finnish Model for Complex Research of Culture.*) In: Kultúra és Közösség, 3. szám, 111-119. old.

[1977/a] ~, Vitányi Iván, B. Vörös Gizella, Andrássy Mária, Sági Mária: A tudományos kutatások eredményeiből leszűrhető tapasztalatok a kultúra távlati fejlesztési tervének kidolgozásához. (*Classifiable Experiences from the Issues of Scientific Researches to Work out the Long-term Development Plan of Culture.*) Bp., Népművelési Intézet (Sokszorosítás), 191 old.

[1977/b]: Mi a művelődésgazdaságtan? A gazdasági és kulturális fejlesztés összefüggéseinek vizsgálatáról. (*What are the Culture Economic Studies? About the Connections of Development of Economic and Culture.*) (In: Kultúra és Közösség, 3. szám, 16-34. old.

[1978]: Jegyzetek az életmód prognosztizálás lehetőségeiről. (*Notes about the possibilities of Life's Timing.*) In: Kultúra és Közösség, 4. szám, 23-48. old.

[1979/a]: Művelődésgazdaságtani kutatások Magyarországon a kulturális szféra tervezése szolgálatában. (*Researches of Culture Economic Studies in Hungary for Planning the Cultural Sphere.*) In: Kuti Éva: Néhány európai tőkés ország kulturális ráfordítás - és eredmény adatainak nemzetközi összehasonlítása. Függelék. Bp., Népművelési Intézet, 157-197. old.

[1979/b]: Kutatási kérdések és a tervezés. (*Questions of Researching and Planning.*) In: Kultúra és Közösség, 2-3 szám, 20-31. old.

[1979/c]: ~, Kuti Éva, Marschall Miklós: A szabadidő rétegek szerinti differenciált felhasználásának várható alakulása, a művelődési tevékenységek a szabadidőn belül. (Sokszorosítás), (*The Prospective Set of Differentiated Using of Free Time According to Layers.*) Bp., Népművelési Intézet, 83 old.

[1979/cs]: ~, Monigl István: A kultúra távlati tervezése. (*Long-term Planning of Culture.*) In: Társadalmi szemle. 2. szám, 36-44. old.

[1980/a] ~, Kuti Éva, Marschall Miklós: A közösségi jellegű művelődési tevékenységek alakulása. A művelődési mozgalmak. Az otthon kereteiben folytatott művelődési tevékenységek alakulása. (*Forming of the Public Type Cultural Activities. The Cultural Movements. Forming the Home Made Cultural Activities.*) (Sokszorosítás), Bp., Népművelési Intézet, 31 old.

[1980/b] ~, Kuti Éva, Marschall Miklós: A népesség és a foglalkoztatás jellemző strukturális változásai. Az életszínvonal növekedésének és az életmód változásának hatása a kulturális szükségletekre. (*The Characteristic Structural Changes of Population and Employment. Influences for Cultural Necessities of Growth of Standard of Living and Change of Lifestyle.*) (Sokszorosítás), Bp., Népművelési Intézet, 31 old.

[1980/c] ~, Inkei Péter, Kozma Tamás, Mihály Ottó: A közoktatás jövőben kívánatos modellje és lehetséges hosszú távú fejlesztési stratégiái Magyarországon. (*The Education's Desirable Model in Future and Its Possible Long-term Development Strategies in Hungary.*) Részanyag az Országos Tervhivatal prognózis-programjához. (Kézirat), Bp., Országos Tervhivatal, 102 old.

[1980/cs]: Mi a művelődésgazdaságtan? (*What are the Culture Economic Studies?*) In: Szocialista közművelődés. Szöveggyűjtemény. Bp., Kossuth, 1140-1166. old.

[1981]: Nemzetközi tapasztalatok az oktatás- művelődéstervezés területén. Előadás a Művelődéselméleti Nyári Egyetemen, Szeged, Művelődéselmélet. (*International Experiences on the Field of Education and Culture Planning. Lecture on the Summer Univercity of Cultural Theory, Szeged.*) Gazdaság és Kultúra. Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat, Szeged, 158-184. old.

[1982/a]: Művelődésgazdaságtan és a kulturális szféra tervezése. Jelentés a kutatássorozat 1978–1980 közötti szakaszáról. (*Planning of Culture Economic Studies and Cultural Sphere. Report about the Research Series between 1978-1980.*) In: Tanulmányok a közművelődés helyzete és fejlődésének távlatai című kutatási főírány 1978–1980. évi vizsgálatairól. Bp., Művelődéskutató Intézet, 7–53. old.

[1982/b]: A magyar zenekultúra statisztikai elemzése, 1960-1980. (*Statistical Analysis about the Hungarian Music Culture 1960-1980.*) In: Kultúra és Közösség, 1-2 szám, 96-114. old.

[1982/c]: ~, Deme Tamás, Mihály Ottó: A kulturális szükségeletek perspektivikus alakulása. (*Perspective Forming of Cultural Necessities.*) Neveléselmélet és Iskolakutatás, I. évf. 2. szám, 5-49. old.

[1983/a]: A kulturális szükségeletek perspektivikus alakulása (*Perspective Forming of Cultural Necessities.*) In: Prognosztika, 1-2. szám, 38-42. old.

[1983/b]: A művelődés népgazdasági tervezése (*National Economic Planning of Culture.*) (Jegyzet) Bp., MSZMP Politikai Főiskola, Művelődéspolitikai Tanszék, 40 old.

[1984/a]: Színház - hátrányos helyzetben. Statisztikai-gazdasági elemzés 1978-1982. (*Theatre in Disadvantageous Position. Statistical-economic analysis 1978-1982.*) I. rész In: Színház, 5. szám, 39-46. old.; II. rész In: színház, 6. szám, 39-46. old.

[1984/b]: Művelődési otthoni politológia. (*Politics of Cultural Homes.*) In: Beke Pál (szerk.): Tallrózó. Válogatás az Alföld közösségi művelődési vitájából. Bp., Múzsák Közművelődési Kiadó, 100-112. old.

[1985/a] ~, Inkei Péter, Pócze Gábor: Az oktatás diverzifikációja Magyarországon. (*Diversification of Education in Hungary.*) Bp., Országos Pedagógiai Intézet, 44 old.

[1985/b]: A közművelődés jövőjéről. Kritikus kérdések és a cselekvés lehetőségei. (*About the Future of Culture. Critical Questions and the Possibilities for Action.*) In: Ifjúsági Szemle, 6. szám, 14-24. old.

[1985/c]: Módszertani szempontok „A Művelődés Háza, Sárospatak” tevékenységének tervezéséhez. (*Methodological Aspects for „the House of Culture, Sárospatak” and its Activities’ Planning.*) In: Kultúra és Közösség, 1. szám, 36-54. old.

[1985/d]: ~, Hörcsik Richárd: Sárospatak a magyar művelődésben I. rész (*Sárospatak in the Hungarian Culture. I. chapter.*) In: Kultúra és Közösség, 2. szám, 103-113. old., II. rész In: Kultúra és Közösség, 3. szám, 20-53. old.

[1985/e]: A kulturális szféra szerepe a társadalmi újratermelésben – lehetőségek, kihívások és követelmények. (*Role of the Cultural Sphere at the Social reproduction – possibilities, Challenges and Requirements.*) In: A III. magyar jövőkutatási konferencia előadásai. Bp., MTA Jövőkutatási Bizottság, Szervezési és Vezetési Tudományos Társaság, I. kötet, 213-219. old.

[1985/f]: ~, Beke Pál: Művelődési otthonok: gondok, lehetőségek. (*Cultural Homes: Problems, Possibilities.*) In: Magyar Építöművészeti, 4. szám, A művelődés házai. 14-15. old.

[1986/a]: A művelődési viszonyok gazdasági összefüggései. Áttekintés a hazai művelődésgazdaságtani kutatásokról. (*Economic Connections of the Cultural Relations. Sketch about the Researches of the Domestic Culture Economic Studies.*) In: Gazdaság és Társadalom a nyolcvanas években Magyarországon II. kötet, (szerk: Gidai Erzsébet), Bp., MSZMP KB Társadalomtudományi Intézete, 247-269. old.

[1986/b]: A művelődésgazdaságtan aktuális kérdései Magyarországon és az információgazdaságtan kidolgozásának szükségessége. (*The Actual Culture Economic Studies' Questions in Hungary and the Necessity of the Informational Economic Studies Work out.*) In: Szabó József (szerk.): Tanulmányok az információgazdaságtanról. Bp., OMIKK KSH, 139-149. old.

[1987]: Innováció és gazdálkodás a közművelődésben. (*Innovation and Economy in Culture.*) In: Besenyi Sándor (szerk.): Művelődés és innováció. Szegedi Nyári Egyetem. Művelődéselmélet. 16. Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat, Szeged, 141-156. old.

[1989/a]: ~, Kuti Éva, Lovas Tünde, Fodor Péter, Hidy Péter: A kultúra és a kulturális fejlődés feltételeinek hosszútávú elgondolásai. Látlelet a kultúráról. Szakértői vizsgálatok. (*Long-term Thoughts of Culture and Its Development's Conditions. Medical Report about Culture. Professional Tests.*) Bp., Országos Közművelődési Központ, 44 old.

[1989/b]: A tábori konyha és a szétfolyó fagylalt esete; vagy: elég-e több pénz a kultúrára? (*Case of the Field Kitchen and the Rambling Icecream; or: is it Enough to Get More Money for Culture?*) In: Társadalmi Szemle, 12. szám, 22-29. old.

[1995]: ~, Beke Pál, Kováts Flórián, etc.: Ajánlások a községi és kisvárosi településfejlesztési koncepciók készítéséhez. (*Offers for Making Conceptions at Area Development in Village and Town.*) Településfejlesztési füzetek 14. Bp., BM Kiadó, 59 old.

[2000/a]: A művelődés-gazdaság tantól a kultúra-gazdaságtanig. Szubjektív kutatás-történeti és szakirodalmi áttekintés. (*From and to the Culture Economic Studies. Subjective Research-Historical and Specialised Literary Analysis.*) In: Daubner Katalin, Horváth Sándor, Petró Katalin (szerk.): Kultúra-gazdaságtani tanulmányok. Bp., Aula, 346-361. old.

[2000/b]: Húsz évről harminc percben (A művelődési otthonok szerepe a rendszerváltásban) (*About Twenty Year in Thirty Minutes. (Role of the Cultural Homes in the Change of Regime.)*) In: Kenyeres Sándorné (szerk.): Egy emberötö a közművelődésben az ezredvégen. „Húszévesek a pályán” országos szakmai konferencia (Szolnok, 1999. jún. 2-3) Szolnok, Megyei Művelődési Központ, 19-26. old.

[2001/a]: Sárospataki eu-tópiák. (*EU-topias of Sárospatak.*) In: Zempléni Múzsa, I. évf. 1. szám, február, 38-45. old.

[2001/b]: Komplex programok tervezése. Két esettanulmány vázlata. 1.) Szatmárcseke: Nemzeti, kulturális turisztikai zarándokhely. 2.) Olvasni jó! Rendezvénytani szempontok az „olvasás éve” megszervezéséhez. (*Planning of Complex Programmes. Outlines of two Case Studies: 1.) Szatmárcseke: National, Cultural Tourist Pilgrim Place. 2.) To read is good! Aspects of Programme Studies to Organise the „Year of Reading”.*) In: Szín, A Magyar Művelődési Intézet Folyóirata, 6/4. szám, október, 6-11. old.

[2001/c]: Épület és funkció. A Magyar Kultúra Alapítványról, a szinergizmus értelmezésével. (*Building and Function. About the Hungarian Cultural Foundation, with Synergy's Interpretation.*) In: Szín, A Magyar Művelődési Intézet Folyóirata, 6/5. szám, 16-24. old.

[2002/a]: Művelődési otthonok: komplex elemzés, 1945-1985. Avagy: „...a jó gyakorlat törvényre emelését gyorsítsuk meg...” (*Cultural Homes: Complex Analysis, 1945-1985. Or else: „...To Make Quicker the Enacting of the Good Practice...”*) In: Szín, A Magyar Művelődési Intézet Folyóirata, 7/1-2. szám, február-április, 15-54. old.

[2002/b]: Rendszerváltó közművelődés. (*Changer of Regime Culture.*) In: Új Holnap, Tél, 134-157. old.

[2003/a]: Mit kell tudni a gazdaságról? (*What We Should Know about Economy?*) In: Török József (szerk.): A szükséges tudás. IV. Közművelődési Nyári Egyetem, Szeged, 2002. július 1-5. Szeged, Csongrád Megyei Közművelődési Tanácsadó Központ, 91-96. old.

[2003/b]: Komplex elemzés a művelődési otthonokról 1945-1985 (részlet) (*Complex Analysis about Cultural Homes 1945-1985 (part.)*).In: Beke Pál, Deme Tamás (szerk.): A szabadművelődéstől a közösségi művelődésig tanulmánygyűjtemény. Bp., Széphalom Könyvműhely, 31-102. old. + 383-384. old.

[2004/a]: Mit kínál Magyarország az Európai Uniónak? (*What can Hungary Offer to the European Union?*) In: Ágh Attila (szerk): Magyar hozomány. Magyarország az EU-csatlakozás küszöbén. Bp., BM Kiadó, 195-217. old.

[2004/b]: „... Mélységes mély a nemrég...” Vázlat a kultúra fogalmáról. (“...*The Deeply Deep Lately...* Sketch about the Notion of Culture.) In: Közösségi művelődés. A Magyar Művelődési Intézet folyóirata, 9/3. szám, május, 56-71. old.

IV. Reviews

[1975]: Népesedéspolitika – a világ népességi problémái. (*Population Policy – Population Problem of the World.*) (Recenzió) In: Közgazdasági Szemle, 9. szám, 1105-1108. old.

[1976/a]: A „jövősek” (*The „Future Shock”*) (Recenzió) In: A kívánt jövőtől a lehetséges jövőig. Tanulmányok a jövőkutatás témaköréből. Bp., Gondolat, 260-280. old.

[1976/b]: Infrastruktúra. (*Infrastructure.*) (Recenzió). In: Valóság, 9. szám, 109-112. old.

[1980]: „Tanulunk meg élni” – a Faure-jelentés ismertetése. („*To learn to live*” – *Review of the Faure-report.*) (Recenzió) In: Prognosztika. 1-2. szám, 115-120. old.

[1988]: Életmód: modellek és minták. (*Lifestyle: Models and Samples.*) (Recenzió) In: Janus. V. 2. Tél, 51-62. old.

V. Other Writings

[1989]: Az itthonlét törvényéről Szent István ünnepén. (*Act of Being at Home on the Feast of Saint Stephen.*) In: Sárospatak, Közéleti Újság, szeptember, 1-2. old.

[1997]: Mi az őrzök feladata? (*What is the Function of the Watchers?*) In: Kultúránk – Válaszúton. (szerk: Békés Gellért és Deme Tamás) Pannonhalma, Bencés Kiadó, 137-142. old.

[1998/a]: Muhitól az Európai Unióig. Köszöntő a Magyar Kultúra Napján, 1998. jan. 21-én, Budakeszin, a Művelődési Otthonban rendezett ünnepségen. (*From Muhi to the European Union. Salutation on the Day of Hungarian Culture on 21st January 1998, at Budakeszi, Cultural House's Ceremony.*) In: Budakeszi Hírmondó, 1. szám 2. old.

[1998/b]: Kihívások és felelősség. (*Challenges and Responsibility.*) In: Hivatás és hitvallás (szerk: Ifj. Fasang Árpád és Fodor András), Bp., Mundus Magyar Egyetemi Kiadó, II. kötet, 822-824. old.

[1999]: Parázs és Idő. A Sárospataki Református Kollégium Alapítvány létrehozásának történelmi körülményei. (*Glow and Time. Formation of Historical Circumstances of the Calvinistic Course Foundation of Sárospatak.*) In: A Sárospataki Református Kollégium Alapítvány első tíz éve, 1989-1998. (szerk: Bolvári-Takács Gábor) Sárospatak, SRKA, 7-15. old.

[2000]: Dr. Koncz Sándor (1913-1983) Életrajzi vázlat és bibliográfia. (*Dr. Sándor Koncz (1913-1983). Biographical Outline and Bibliography.*) Bp., (Kézirat), 51 old.

[2001]: Átfordított pecsét. Zágon Bertalan emlékezete (1942. Zombor–2001. Budapest) (*The Turned Over Stamp. Remembrance of Bertalan Zágon. Zombor 1942 – Budapest 2001.*) In: Szín, A Magyar Művelődési Intézet Folyóirata, 6/3. szám, 47-48. old.

[2002/a]: Vitányi Iván köszöntése. (*Salutation of Iván Vitányi.*) Sárospatak, 2001. december. In: Pataki Diák. II. évf. 1. szám, 26-28. old.

[2002/b]: Ebadó. Mit tehet az ember, ha nem menekülhet. Illyés Gyuláról, 2002. október 20.-án. (*Dog-tax. What a man can do if he cannot leave. About Gyula Illyés on 20th October 2002.*) In: Magyar Napló, március, 39-43. old.

[2003]: Megértő felelössége. (Jókai Anna köszöntése.) (*Broad-minded Responsibility. Salutation of Anna Jókai.*) In: Reformátusok Lapja, XLVII. évf. 51-52. szám. December 21-28., 5. old.

[2004]: „A fehéringes közmagyar”. Kányádi Sándor köszöntése. (*The Hungarian White Collar Worker. Salutation of Sándor Kányádi.*) In: Napút, május, 3-6. old.