AlmaTourism

Journal of Tourism, Culture and Territorial Development

Pathos and the Mundane in the Symbolic Space of 1956 Revolution: the Case of Corvin-passage, Budapest

Erőss, Á.[*]
Geographical Institute Research Centre for Astronomy and Earth Sciences Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Hungary)

Michalkó, G. [†]
Geographical Institute Research Centre for Astronomy and Earth Sciences Hungarian Academy of Sciences and Corvinus University of Budapest (Hungary)

Galambos, I.[‡]
Committee of National Remembrance (Hungary)

ABSTRACT

The Corvin passage is one of the most important symbolic spaces of 1956 revolution in Hungary. The majority of armed conflicts took place in Budapest, where the largest resistance group had to battle against Soviet tanks in the neighbourhood of the Corvin Passage. This study aims to highlight the fact that, even though a general shift has taken place from the pre-1990 policy to 'forget' to today's established remembrance practices, the Corvin Passage still does not have a prominent position as a major historic site. Our research is based on a study of relevant national and international literature, on an analysis of documents relating to tourism site management, on historical sources related to the Corvin Passage, and on a content analysis of guide-books and websites.

Keywords: War; Revolution; Urban tourism; Public space; Heritage management; Hungary

[*] E-mail address: eross.agnes@csfk.mta.hu
[†] E-mail address: michalko.gabor@csfk.mta.hu
[‡] E-mail address: galaisti@gmail.com

Introduction

Voted "Man of the Year"[1] in 1956, the "Hungarian Freedom Fighter" appeared on the cover of Time Magazine on the 7th of January, 1957. The revolution (or insurrection or uprising), the hoped-for outbreak of a War of Independence against the communist regime, started on the 23rd of October 1956, but, following Soviet military intervention, lasted for a matter of days - less than 3 weeks. The majority of the survivors either fled abroad or faced serious reprisals. The area then lay silent for decades.

The terminology of 1956 (and, above all, whether "revolution" or "uprising" is more appropriate) is a very complex issue, deeply embedded, as it is, in issues of historiography which remain unresolved from both post 1956 Socialist era (often referred to as Kádár-era)[2] and post-transition political debate (Gyáni, 2006). International literature is also ambivalent[3]. The authors of this present paper accept the argument of János M. Rainer and refer to the events of 1956 as being a revolution[4]. Almost all armed conflict took place in Budapest, where the largest resistance group had to battle against Soviet tanks in the neighbourhood of the *Corvin Köz* or Corvin Passage[5]. The whole of the Corvin Passage area, in reality, consists of little more than a few blocks of flats, but it is one of the more significant war sites of the 20th century (Winter, 2009). Corvin Passage is today an official historical site[6], commemorating one particular episode of resistance to Communist dictatorship, although, more broadly, any grass-roots, civic movement set up to protect democracy and to combat any form of oppression can identify itself with its original goals and the events which it commemorates. Today, however, the location is one of the main road junctions in Budapest, serving a society, which has been transformed over the last ten years by a huge urban rehabilitation programme. The heart of the Passage is a cinema, built in 1922, now surrounded by shops, bars, cafes and a shopping mall and is only a few meters away from the city's main tram and subway lines. Sixty years after the revolution, and 25 years following the proclamation of democracy, it lies in a fragile limbo between fulfilling its functions as a major heritage site and as everyday public living space.

The Corvin Passage illustrates what we might term the dichotomy which derives from, on the one hand, the policy of forgetting which was cultivated by the leaders of the one-party state before 1989 and, on the other hand, the rival commemorative policy which has evolved since 1990 and which itself is deeply embedded in current political power struggles. Various divisions between NGOs and associations dedicated to the commemoration of the revolution resulting in, for instance, a great number of commemorative plaques placed in the Passage. Owing to a lack of site management (Irimiás, 2014), active commemoration is almost exclusively concentrated in a short period of official events, whilst on all other days of the year mundane, everyday activity dominates the public space. Consequently, a cyclical rhythm has evolved between the

poignancy of the days of remembrance and the mundane as expressed in everyday spatial activity (Photo 1). Following the change of regime (1990) the Corvin Passage was neglected in development terms, in the fields of both urban regeneration and tourism; in fact, the name is totally missing from the major marketing communication of Budapest, and no information is available in English in the vicinity. Consequently, it remains a blind spot on the maps of foreign tourists.

Photo 1. Corvin Passage: historical site dominated by cultural, service and retail functions (Photography: Erőss, Á.)

This study aims to highlight the fact that, even though a general shift has taken place from the pre-1990 policy to 'forget' to today's established remembrance practices, the Corvin Passage still does not have a prominent position as a major historic site.
Our research is based on a study of relevant national and international literature on memory and practices of commemoration, on an analysis of documents relating to tourism site management and on a content analysis of guidebooks and websites. Furthermore, it analyses historical sources related to the Corvin Passage found in national archive. Volumes discussing the 1956 Revolution, especially the events took place in Corvin köz, has been written in Hungarian in a greater number thus we refer to numerous Hungarian language sources.

1. Theoretical background

1.1. Commemorative sites, memorial policy

Memorials commemorating events and/or related individuals have become essential elements of the landscape during the 20th century. Such commemorative plaques,

statues, memorials or thematic parks have a seemingly clear function: by placing a physical reminder in a public space, so integrating and embedding the subject of the commemoration and its narrative into the collective memory and social practice. However, the proliferation of policies relating to commemoration and remembrance topics raises several questions which extensive multi- and inter-disciplinary research has attempted to answer since the 1980s.

Both individual and collective memories are selective by nature: actual memory is constantly shaped or formed by future expectation, whilst certain elements from the past are selected and incorporated into the construction (Assmann, 1995). Consequently, remembering and forgetting are inseparable: "memories are crafted by oblivion" (Augé, 2004: 20) which "is a necessity both to society and to the individual" (Augé, 2004: 3). Sites of commemoration actualize certain elements of the past, redefining their meanings, whilst other details tend to remain obscured. Memory cast in such a way into certain shapes starts gradually eroding (Forty, 2001), since the birth of a monument eternalizes a fixed narrative, in a fixed aesthetic, serving specific purposes and hampering the freedom of remembering and forgetting. Recognizing the huge representational power, which lays in memories cast in stone and installed in public spaces, political powers and regimes are usually eager to produce and control emblematic symbols and spaces (Meusburger *et al*., 2011). Consequently, such a commemorative place "[…] serves as a constantly re-energized repository of socially and politically relevant traditions and identity which serves to mediate between the everyday lives of individuals (…) and the national and supranational institutions which constrain and enable those lives." (Agnew and Duncan, 1989:7).

Nonetheless, for a monument to become a *lieux de mémoire* in Nora's (1989) sense requires live, regularly performed spatial practice to be embedded into social practices. Such commemorative practices not only stimulate the working of memory, but contribute to the production of meaningful places "where various individual (and collective) projects converge and/or compete with other projects." (Gustafson, 2001:13). Everyday practice or official ceremonies not only legitimize places of remembrance: such social practices transform a space into a place (De Certeau, 2011), shape individual and community place identity (Proshansky, *et al.* 1983) and engender attachment to places (Massey, 1994, Ehrkamp, 2005). Local traditions and urban legends make places alive and livable, and one can leave from and return to them (De Certeau, 2011). The survival of such local histories and meaningful places they are linked to depends heavily on current political and power relations such as urban regeneration plans, priorities and concepts (Tölle, 2010).

1.2. Heritage management

Since the early period of the evolution of tourism in the second half of the 19th century, it has rapidly become clear that not only must travel, accommodation and catering be organized professionally, but that tourist attractions also require professional operation (Foster, 1985). After the first organized travel led by Thomas Cook, the experience of the last 150 years has produced subtle management technologies, which facilitate the successful and sustainable operation of various touristic attractions

(Leiper, 1995; Swarbrooke, 1999). Regarding the literature of tourism, we hardly find any touristic products not related to specific management knowledge. For instance, cultural and heritage tourism (McKercher and Du Cros, 2012) and city tourism (Maitland and Ritchie, 2009) are based on the findings of regular research. The global competition which affects especially the tourism sector encouraged tourism specialists to invest more into the coordination of tourist behaviour visiting any type of attraction and to manage more accurately "the experience" (Moscardo and Ballantyne, 2003). Nowadays, technologies developed by applying the methodologies of visitor management are widely used to make visitors' experiences more vivid in museums, exhibitions, visitor centres, and thematic routes, cultural and sacred sites (Shackely, 1998, 2001). In cultural tourism, organizing the movement of tourists, the routes and interpreting elements of the attraction are the most important tasks of visitor management (Puczkó and Rátz, 2011). When such a process takes place in a functionally homogenic and well definable space, the duty of the operating institution or organization is to manage visitors' complex consumption. However, specialists face considerable challenges in the case of heritage sites located in public urban space.
Harmonizing the differing, sometimes conflicting, interests of tourism with those of residents, local authorities and enterprises is specially complicated when heritage sites are found in densely populated, urban settings, deeply embedded in diverse everyday routines (Puczkó and Rátz, 2003).

1.3. Military memorials in cities

Among the various sites of heritage tourism, attractions related to wars and armed conflict take a special place (Gordon, 1998). One particular feature of these attractions is that, at least earlier, battles usually took place in open areas far from human settlements and only the ruins of targeted cities show their former grandeur (e.g. Carthage). Today, due to the regeneration of the cities affected (with the exception of a few ruins preserved as such) only monuments of the actual battle stand as reminders of destruction. The trenches and bunkers of the First World War - today turned into tourist attractions - are located outside cities, in rather remote areas (Irimiás, 2013). However, massive air-strikes of the Second World War wiped out partially or completely several major settlements. Besides Dresden, the nuclear attack on Hiroshima should be recalled as the most destructive attack on urban space in history - and where the memorial has generated significant tourist demand (Siegenthaler, 2002).
Not only wars, but also revolutions or uprisings against oppressive regimes generated armed clashes when monuments symbolizing the regime were damaged or destroyed. Several European cities can be proud of heritage locations relating to many moments of glory in fighting for freedom throughout world history. The demolition of the Bastille - the infamous prison of Paris and the symbol of Bourbon oppression – in 1789 meant not only the end of monarchy in France; it induced a wave of uprisings or revolutions over Europe. Two centuries later, the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989 produced not only the East German revolution, but also the collapse of other dictator-ships influenced by the Soviet Union. Even though the Bastille was totally demolished, the

silhouette of the building is a "must" sight for tourists, whilst the remains of the Berlin Wall and the visitor centre are also compulsory for tourists in the German capital.

2. Historical context

2.1. On the way to revolution: transformation of dictatorship

Hungary was occupied by Soviet forces at the end of WWII. Although the occupation was at first assumed to be temporary, Hungary remained under Soviet military occupation from 1945 to the 19th of June 1991. (Szakács and Zinner, 1997)

Already in the 1950s, Soviet rule and Bolshevik-style dictatorship started to develop and reveal social tensions and unrest, and this culminated in the eruption of the Hungarian Revolution in 1956. In spite of defeat in two parliamentary elections (1945, 1947) the communists took control of the state with Soviet assistance. Politicians opposing communist rule were arrested and sentenced in Soviet-style predetermined show trials. Political police, led and organized by communists, raised terror to state level (Horváth and Ö. Kovács, 2015). There was an increasing discrepancy between communist party propaganda and reality. Imprisonment without judicial sentences or fair trials, internment and show trials touched one in three Hungarian families (M. Kiss, 2006; Ö. Kovács, 2015). The death of Stalin (1953) seemed to bring some relief, and so Hungary chose a new Prime Minister, Imre Nagy, in compliance with the wish of the Soviet rulers. Imre Nagy announced a "New Period", although this "New Period" left the basic Soviet structures - e.g. the one-party system and the planned economy a intact. However, the internment camps were closed and terror abated, whilst the upholding of socialist law and order was promised. The level and speed of industrialization were to be eased and promises were made to increase living standards. All of this created hope among the population (Pünkösti, 2000). In 1955, after Khrushchev seized power, Nagy was forced to step down (M. Kiss, 2006) and Rákosi regained power.

Social discontent reached its peak in the summer of 1956. A special envoy of the Party, Mikoyan, reported that the Hungarian communist leaders had lost control of the press and the Writer's Association (Mikojan, 1956).

Increasing numbers of people in the Writers' Association, in the Petőfi Circle and in meetings of the Patriotic People Front (a communist mass organization) criticized the Party. The first non-communist youth organization was formed at the University of Szeged and called itself MEFESZ (i.e. United Association of Hungarian University and College Students). The students were not satisfied with the Nagy manifesto and voiced the need for a multi-party parliamentary democracy, which would be a friend of the Soviet Union. Demonstrations in Poland made the situation more acute for the Communist Party (formally, the Hungarian Workers' Party from 1948). Referring to the centuries-long friendly relationship between Poles and Hungarians, students of Budapest Technological University announced a sympathy demonstration to be held on the 23rd of October 1956 in support of their Polish peers. The demonstration immediately turned into the uprising, which later became known as the Revolution – or the hoped-for outbreak of a War of Independence following Soviet intervention.

Corvin Passage (also known then as the Kisfaludy Passage) became an important site of armed conflict and one of the major symbols of the 1956 struggle. The revolution targeted both the Bolshevik dictatorship and the government. Although Nagy was the most popular of the communist politicians, when he was named as Prime Minister, unrest was fuelled: "the street" demanded more than a simple change of Prime Minister. The conflict was not between communists and anti-communists, but between those favouring a dictatorship and those opposing it. The first leader of the Corvin Passage fighters, László Iván Kovács stated: "The revolutionaries consisted of party members and people outside the party." "I wanted to give rights, real equality for everyone" he continued (Iván Kovács, ÁBTL). Nagy appreciated and accepted the will of the people and identified himself with their demands. Later he could not escape the consequences: following a secret trial he suffered a martyr's death in 1958 (M. Kiss, 2003).

2.2. Clashes in the Corvin Passage: a change of strategy

The heaviest fighting took place in the Hungarian capital and mostly in the inner districts. There were 33 resistance groups in the VIII and IX districts in the vicinity of the Corvin Passage (Eörsi, 2001). Groups acted independently led by their chosen leader although loose cooperation did exist. There were 16 groups with 1200 fighters in the Corvin Passage according to Eörsi and Filep (2007), although László Iván Kovács estimated his own group as being 5000 strong.

The Corvin Passage lays at the intersection of Üllői Road and the Grand Boulevard and has a serious strategic advantage. It is surrounded by four five-storey buildings and the exit and entrance to the Boulevard and the Avenue are very narrow - so inaccessible by tanks (Iván Kovács, ÁBTL). In addition, a petrol station (necessary for making Molotov cocktails) and a school canteen (essential to feed the fighters) made the Passage a superb centre for armed resistance (Vámos, ÁBTL).

The heroic deeds of the fighters were reported world-wide by the press of that time. These fighters, civilians, even children and teenagers with no military training, took control of nearby streets, captured anti-tank artillery and armoured vehicles, and destroyed many more. As a result of this totally unexpected success, they managed to hold their position against one of the most powerful armies of that time, the Red Army. In the early phases, the military successes were credited to Pál Maléter, who was the commander of the nearby Kilián barracks. Initially, in fact, Maléter had fought against the revolutionaries, but he later changed sides and fought alongside them. The importance and power of the Corvin Passage fighters are illustrated by the fact that, by their support, Maléter was nominated as Minister of Defence in the proposed new government. In addition, Nagy opened negotiations with the fighters and incorporated them in the newly established police force (Eörsi and Filep, 2007).

3. Policy of "forgetting"

3.1. Criminalisation

The Corvin Passage, as other '56 locations, has not been fully appreciated in the national memory or consciousness, even following the political transformation of 1989-1990. As a background to the possible reasons for this we need to recognise the brutal retaliation which followed and which itself was aided by enforced silence. Furthermore, the communist propaganda labelled the fighters as hooligans and mobsters, and the would-be revolution as a counter-revolution. The revolution of 1956 was fixated in the collective imagination in line with the oppressive propaganda based on lies and falsifications communicated by the Kádár regime, which had been manoeuvred into power by Soviet tanks. History books of the time might have outlined facts, dates and events correctly, but with their evaluations, their comments on events, or by their simple ignoring of the motivations of the participants, they offered no independent view as an alternative to the official state propaganda and to the related world-view. The Kádár regime did everything it could to denigrate the memory of the freedom fighters. One of their methods was to criminalize them, with prosecutors and courts accusing freedom fighters of criminal acts and jailing them. For example, fighting against the Soviet invaders was treated as manslaughter; robbery and mugging – lacking any evidence – were also on the list of possible charges.

These verdicts were declared unsubstantiated and to have been miscarriages of justice after the Soviet occupation forces had left Hungary in 1991. However, this still means, that Hungary has not yet faced the more significant matter of the crimes committed by the communists - e.g. by Hungarian military commanders who ordered unarmed civilians to be fired on and who have still not been tried.

Contradictions in the remembrance of 1956 cannot only be explained by the policy of forgetting practised by the Kádár regime: the enervated reaction of a young democracy following 1990 contributed heavily to sustaining such failures of memory. Society avoided facing the past, the sins of communism. The prosecution of military and police officers responsible for deadly fire on civilians in many Hungarian towns has never taken place and the guilty have not been punished. Historians have carried out fact-finding exercises and have held serious and lengthy discussions on problematic issues; yet - due to very weak public dissemination of such work – no relevant public discussion has emerged (M. Kiss, 2012). The results of such research by historians have only very slowly trickled down into the public domain and into history course books. Those exposed to communist propaganda on 1956 were suddenly able to read diametrically opposed accounts of 1956, accounts which had totally failed to trigger such euphoria as the fall of the Berlin wall had done.

3.2. Fragmenting remembrance: 1956 revolutionaries' internal divisions

Remembrance of the 1956 revolutions suffers not only from the ponderous heritage of Communist propaganda; the freedom fighters of '56 also had serious internal differences. The main dividing line can be traced between supporters of László Iván Kovács, the commander of the Corvin Passage and Gergely Pongrátz, his deputy-

commander, who arrested him (Kántor, ÁBTL). The main trigger of the conflict was a different evaluation of the situation, but a simple power struggle can also have been involved. Kovács trusted Maléter, supported his bid to be Minister of Defence and eventually wanted to conclude an agreement with the government under certain conditions (Vámos, ÁBTL). On the contrary, Pongrátz and his followers did not trust the government (Eörsi, 2001). Kovács remained in Hungary and stood up for national independence and a multi-party political system. These beliefs and his participation in the revolution brought him a death sentence post-1956 (Iván Kovács, ÁBTL). Pongrátz – avoiding the inevitable death sentence - escaped from Hungary. Therefore, succeeding generations were only familiar with the history of the conflict between the two legendary commanders of the Corvin Passage, Pongrátz and Kovács by the former's interpretation (Eörsi and Filep, 2007). In fact, the revolution of 1956 lacked a true leading figure: it was, rather, a battle by the *sans-culottes*, the masses (M. Kiss, 2012). The fighters were mainly known by their nicknames (Vágó, 2012). Following 1990, having seen the rivalry among the organisations of '56 and political parties' constant attempts to expropriate the legacy of the revolution, society in general lost interest in 1956. Disillusionment prevented the revolution of 1956 from taking its place in the national annals.

The Soviet Empire was initially shaken in Hungary in 1956 and totally collapsed on the opening the Iron Curtain in 1989, which allowed East German refugees to leave Hungary. Interestingly, the 1956 revolution gained essential symbolic importance in the country's velvet revolution. The rehabilitation and the public reburial of Imre Nagy in 1989 are considered as the symbolic start of the peaceful change of regime. That ceremony was followed by the erection of a large number of statues, monuments, commemorative sites in the course of the following years. However "not only simple *lieux de mémoire* were erected; we stepped into the present through remembering" (Kovács, 2001: 81).

3.3. The heritage of the 1990 transition

Following the transition, and owing to the emblematic role which Corvin Passage had played in the revolution, it became an important element in the confused and disputed historical exploratory work of the time and of the evolving culture of remembrance. The revolution bestowed additional symbolic virtues on Corvin Passage such as activism for democracy, heroism and comradeship. The decades of terror and oppression not only made it impossible to commemorate the events and the heroes, to progress, as it were, the sanctification of the revolution and adopt Corvin Passage as a site of collective memory, but it was completely deprived it of positive meaning. As a consequence of the policy of "forgetting", there is a hiatus in the memory of the place: the absence of the continuous presence of participants, survivors or other eyewitnesses of the events, local stories of the revolution have remained untold. Lacking commemorative traditions and a loyal community willing to keep alive the memory of the revolution, the Corvin Passage could not become a site of commemoration. With the change of regime, the mushrooming of commemorative plaques in Corvin Passage seemingly induced remembrance, but ceremonies only take

place during the few official days of remembrance, and other practices or rites have not yet evolved to fill the space.

However, besides the politics of forgetting in the Kádár era and the fragmented memory, remembrance of 1956 following 1990, one should consider one more additional aspect when taking into account the factors pose a limit to Corvin Passage to evolve into a national shrine: the effect of post-socialist urban transformation processes. The fall of the Iron curtain induced dramatic changes in post-socialist cities: they had to face the serious damages derived from the total collapse of economic and social system while at the same time the rapidly developing global economy imposed urgent calls and decisions (Tölle, 2010). Consequently, in the first few years of newborn democracies, politics of public space was shaped by two main processes: decommunization of urban space and the invention of a new, marketable city image. In case of Budapest decision makers quite unequivocally agreed that the reinvention and reinstallation of the image of pre WWI Budapest seems the most profitable and attractive from marketing point of view. However, the removal of signs of communist past from the cityscape induced intense debates not only among politicians but in the wider society as well (Palonen, 2008; Nadkarni, 2003). Decommunization of public space affected affairs far beyond practical concerns. Renaming streets, topple down old statues and installing new figures, the transformation of everyday environment triggered dynamics of remembering and forgetting (Nadkarni, 2003; Kovács, 2001).

3.4. At the periphery of tourism

Even though the Corvin Passage became a strong symbol of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution and War of Independence, the event that became the reference point to the democratic transformation putting a peaceful end to the communist dictatorship[7], the place did not become a cultic location, a historical pilgrimage destination of Budapest. Even though the Hungarian government pronounced Corvin Passage, the main scene of armed conflict of the revolution, as a historical heritage site, the New Public Cemetery (located in a peripheral district of Budapest, Rákoskeresztúr) where – among others – the martyrs of the revolution were buried, was declared a national memorial by the Hungarian parliament, so later gaining a higher level of recognition of official memorial policy. Trough the legislature, the Hungarian state policy confirmed the importance of Corvin Passage as a historic site, but in the actual narrative of the anti-communist revolution, the political victims of show trials occupy a more prominent position in the national account of the anti-communist revolution than the "boys of Pest", the young freedom fighters who died on the streets of Budapest. Consequently, the centre of the annual commemoration was gradually moved from centrally located Corvin Passage to the periphery of Budapest, the New Public Cemetery of Rákoskeresztúr. Whilst the fighting in the Corvin Passage embodies the non-descript, the mundane, the everyday, the sites of the New Public Cemetery symbolize pathos. Where the "the boys of Pest" dared to confront the Soviet soldiers, today one can find a busy and noisy quarter of Budapest surrounded by small shops,

bars, restaurants and minor cultural locations, whilst the cemetery of the political leaders' executed by the dictatorship is a scene of dignity and silence.

Corvin Passage was forbidden territory until 1990 in terms of both national and international tourism; only the bravest professional or voluntary guides (usually accompanying relatives or friends) dared to inform their guests about the historical role of the place. After 1990, taking photographs without the fear of reprisal and talking about Corvin Passage became normal behaviour. Gradually memorial tablets flooded the site and different organisations, declaring themselves heirs of the 1956 heritage held commemoration celebrations, dressing up the Passage in ceremonial costume each year, between the 23rd of October and the 4th of November. Despite now being free of an imposed silence lasting for many years, the euphoria, which might have help to put Corvin Passage on the tourist maps, never occurred. Guide books when explaining the 1956 Revolution mention very briefly the Corvin Passage, sometimes even the statues and commemorative plaques to be found there - but there is no detailed information about Corvin Passage and its history. (At most the Corvin Cinema is mentioned, since films are screened in their original English language, serving the needs foreigners, expatriates living in Budapest). Even the official recognition on the list of national heritage sites in 2011 cannot be considered as a breakthrough in its tourist role. The Hungarian Tourist Board mentions Corvin Passage among the cultural memorial places on its website, but there is no sign of any conscious product development or of any marketing policy. Corvin Passage is completely missing from the official tourism website of Budapest. In addition, the local authority (District VIII, Józsefváros) does not provide any information about one of the most important location of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.

Photo 2. Corvin Passage: memorial tablets with a background of coffee-bars and restaurants (Photography by Michalkó, G.)

Conclusions

The dialectics of remembering and forgetting are a major feature of the remembrance of 1956. In the years following the overturning of the revolution, the serious reprisals introduced by the Kádár regime totally silenced Hungarian society. The so called "Goulash communism" brought a "relatively improved quality of life for a large proportion of society, if – in exchange – they showed a lack of interest towards politics (Kovács, 2001; Nadkarni, 2003) and "play-act" co-operatively, in accordance with the expected attitude towards the regime in order to live a more fulfilling individual life (Yurchak, 1997:9). All the repression, the forced amnesia and oblivion (Gyáni, 2006) erupted after 1989. The removal of visible signs of the socialist heritage (street names, statues etc.) from the urban landscape to some extent served to cleanse the individual memories of those who had been complicit with the regime. Interestingly, one major feature of the regeneration of the memory of 1956 was that it was possible to forget by remembering: building a monument allows the real and heavy responsibility of memory to be avoided both at the level of society and the individual (Young, 1993). The case of Corvin Passage highlights that "a sacred place is a scarce commodity" (Kovács, 2001:75): Profane places with mundane functions such as Corvin Passage are difficult to transform into a place of commemoration or to channel towards tourism. However, with adequate management, the conversion of Corvin Passage from a place of collective forgetting to a place of remembering, a commemorative site acceptable to locals and interesting for tourists, should be possible. Undoubtedly, in today's "deheroized" world, when films were screened featuring historical heroes and heroines are rarely, if ever, part of school commemoration programmes (as they used to be), it is quite challenging to raise the awareness of revolution *or* introduce veterans as role models for future generations. Incorporating the Corvin Passage into the bloodstream of tourism in Budapest would not only enhance the development of the commemoration site; it would also give impetus to a much-needed exercise of the memory.

References

Agnew, J. and Duncan, J. (eds.) (1989). *The Power of Place: Bringing Together the Geographical and Sociological Imaginations.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Adam, C., Egervari, V., Laczko L. and Young J. (eds.) (2010). *The 1956 Hungarian Revolution: Hungarian and Canadian Perspectives*. University of Ottawa, Ottawa.

Assmann J. (1995). Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique* 65 (Spring–Summer), 125-133.

Augé M. (2004). *Oblivion*. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

De Certeau, M. (2011). *The practice of everyday life*. University of California Press. Berkely, Los Angeles, London.

Ehrkamp, P. (2005). Placing identities: Transnational Practices and local attachments of Turkish immigrants in Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 31(2), 345-364.

Eörsi, L. and Filep, T. (2007). *„Jogot akartam mindenkinek" Iván Kovács László emlékkönyv*. Gold Book, Debrecen.

Eörsi, L. (2001). *Corvinisták, 1956. A VIII. kerület fegyveres csoportjai.* 1956-os Intézet, Budapest.

Forty, A. (2001). Introduction. In Forty, A. and Küchler, S. (eds.) (2001). *The art of forgetting*. Berg, Oxford. pp. 1-18.

Foster, D. (1985). *Travel and tourism management*. Macmillan, London.

Gati, C. (2006). *Failed illusions: Moscow, Washington, and Budapest and the 1956 Hungarian Revolution*. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Gordon, B.M. (1998). Warfare and tourism. Paris in World War II. *Annals of Tourism Research* 25(3), 616–638.

Granville, J. (2008). Red, White, and Green": Romanian Reactions to the "We Have Wines of All Kinds: Hungarian Uprising in 1956. *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 54(2), 185-210.

Gustafson, P. (2001). Meanings of places: everyday experience and theoretical conceptualizations. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 21, 5-16.

Gyáni, G. (2006). Memory and Discourse on the 1956 Hungarian Revolution. Europe-Asia Studies 58(8), 1199-1208.

Horváth, S. and Ö. Kovács, J. (eds) (2015). *Állami erőszak és kollektivizálás a kommunista diktatúrában*. MTA BTK TTI, Budapest.

Irimiás, A. (2013). Katonai emlékhelyek turisztikai potenciáljának vizsgálata Észak-Olaszországban. *Földrajzi Közlemények*, 137(2), 153-163.

Irimiás, A. (2014). The Great War heritage site management in Trentino, northern Italy. *Journal of Heritage Tourism,* 9(4), 317–331.

Kovács, É. (2001). A terek és a szobrok emlékezete (1988-1990) – Etűd a magyar rendszerváltó mítoszokról. *Regio* 12(1), 68-91.

Leiper, N. (1995). *Tourism Management*. RMIT Press, Collingwood.

Lessing, E. (2006). *Revolution in Hungary: The 1956 Budapest Uprising*. London, Thames and Hudson.

Lomax, B. (1985). The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 and the Origins of the Kadar Regime. In *Studies in Comparative Communism* 18(2-3), 87-113.

Mikojan, Anasztasz Ivanovics szigorúan titkos távirata Budapestről a Szovjet Kommunista Párt Központi Bizottságának 1956. július 14-én. In: Szereda, V. and Sztikalin, A. (eds.) (1993): Hiányzó lapok 1956 történetéből. Dokumentumok a volt SzKP KB levéltárából. Móra, Budapest,pp. 40-48.

M. Kiss, S. (2003). Ceruzarajz Nagy Imréről. *Korunk* 14(12), 65–73.

M. Kiss, S. (2006). *Utak '56-hoz, utak '56 után.* Mundus, Budapest.

M. Kiss, S. (2012). „...a vezér nélküli felkelőknek ez a csodálatos látványa..." In: Gaganetz, P. and Galambos, I. (eds.): *A vidék forradalma – 1956, tanulmánykötet*. TITE, Budapest, pp. 9-27.

Maitland, R. and Ritchie, B. (eds.) (2009). *City Tourism: National Capital Perspectives*. CABI, Oxfordshire.

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place and gender*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

McKercher, B. – Du Cros, H. (2012). *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*. Routledge, New York.

Meusburger, P., Heffernan, M. and Wunder, E (eds.) (2011). *Cultural memories. The geographical point of view.* Springer, Heidelberg.

Moscardo, G. and Ballantyne, R. (2003). Interpretation and attractions. In Fyall, A., Garrod, B. and Leask, A. (eds.): *Managing Visitor Attractions: New Directions*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, pp. 237-252.

Nadkarni, M. (2003). The death of socialism and the afterlife of its monuments. Making and marketing the past in Budapest's Statue Park Museum. In: Hodgkin, K. and Radstone, S. (eds.): *Contested pasts. The politics of memory*. Routledge, London, pp. 193-207.

Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: *Les lieux de mémoire*. *Representations,* 26, Spring, 7-24.

Ö. Kovács J. (2015). Állami erőszak, paraszti társadalom, kollektivizálás - kutatási kérdések és válaszok. In Horváth, S. and Ö. Kovács, J. (eds). *Állami erőszak és kollektivizálás a kommunista diktatúrában*. MTA BTK TTI, Budapest, 29-48.

Palonen, E. (2008). The City-text in Post-communist Budapest: Street names, Memorials, and the Politics of Commemoration. *Geojournal* 73(3), 219-230.

Proshansky, H., Fabian, A. K. and Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place identity: Physical world socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 3, 57-83.

Puczkó, L. and Rátz, T. (2003). *Turizmus történelmi városokban–tervezés és menedzsment*. Turisztikai Oktató és Kutató Kkt., Budapest.

Puczkó, L. and Rátz, T. (2011). *Az attrakciótól az élményig: a látógatómenedzsment módszerei*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Pünkösti, Á. (2000). Két vagon kalap begyűjtve. Nagy Imre miniszterelnöksége, egy párthatározat elsüllyesztése. *Tiszatáj* 54(2), 52-67.

Rainer M. J. (2006). 1956: The Mid-Twentieth Century Seen from the Vantage Point of the Beginning of the Next Century. *Europe-Asia Studies* 58(8), 1189-1198.

Rainer M. J. (2011). Introduction. Originally published in: Rainer M.J. and Somlai K. (eds.) (2007). The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the Soviet Bloc countries: Reactions and Repercussions. Retrieved from: http://www.coldwar.hu/html/en/publications/janos%20-%20intro.pdf

Shackely, M. (2001). *Managing Sacred Sites: Service Provision and Visitor Experience*. Thomson Learning, London.

Shackely, M. (eds.) (1998). *Visitor Management: Case Studies from World Heritage Sites*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.

Siegenthaler, P. (2002). Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japanese guidebooks. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(4), 1111-1137.

Szakács, S. and Zinner, T. (1997). A háború „megváltozott természete" Adatok és adalékok, tények és összefüggések 1944-1948. MSZH Nyomda és Kiadó, Budapest.

Swain, N. (2006). The Fog of Hungary's Negotiated Revolution. *Europe-Asia Studies* 58(8), 1347 – 1375.

Swarbrooke, J. (1999). *Sustainable Tourism Management*. CABI, New York.

Tölle, A. (2010). Urban identity policies in Berlin: From critical reconstruction to reconstructing. *Cities* 27(5), 348-357.

Vágó, S. (2012). Korábban még Jézust is befalazták. In Gaganetz, P. and Galambos, I. (eds.): *A vidék forradalma – 1956, tanulmánykötet*. TITE, Budapest, pp. 171–204.

Winter, C. (2009). Tourism, social memory and the Great War. *Annals of Tourism Research* 36(4), 607-626.

Young, J. E. (1993). *The texture of memory: Holocaust memorials and meaning*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Yurchak, A. (1997). The Cynical Reason of Late Socialism: Power, Pretense, and the Anekdot. *Public Culture* 9(2), 161-188.

National Archive of the Intelligence Agency (ÁBTL)

Iván Kovács = Iván Kovács László és társai vizsgálati dosszié. – Állambiztonsági Szolgálatok Történeti Levéltára (ÁBTL) 3.1.9. V-145626
Kántor = Kántor Éva fedőnevű ügynök beszervezési dosszié. – Állambiztonsági Szolgálatok Történeti Levéltára (ÁBTL) 3.1.1. B-82723
Vámos = Vámos Erzsébet fedőnevű ügynök munkadosszié. – Állambiztonsági Szolgálatok Történeti Levéltára (ÁBTL) 3.1.2. M-29112

[1] Since 1999, "Person of the Year'.
[2] János Kádár was a General Secretary of Hungarian Socialist Worker's Party between 1956-1988. During the Kádár-era Hungary was often referred to as the 'happiest barrack', due to the relatively higher standard of living and greater extent of personal freedom.
[3] In international literature the term "revolution" (e.g. Rainer M. 2006; Lomax 1985; Gati 2006; Lessing 2006) and uprising (e.g. Granville 2008) are both used - in most cases alternatively - even in the same article, chapter or book (e.g. Swain 2006; Adam et al. 2010; Granville 2008).

[4] As Rainer M. (2011): "The Hungarian Revolution fits the definition of a political revolution, since it brought down a political system, if not permanently. (…) Despite its failure, it was an influential event, I think partly because it was short and concentrated." Retrieved from: http://www.coldwar.hu/html/en/publications/janos%20-%20intro.pdf

[5] The term "passage" clearly suggests a minor link between two major thoroughfares – significantly narrow at least at the two ends, although, frequently in many old European cities, with some open space internally. We use the English term in our text.

[6] 303/2011. (XII. 23.) Government Decree on Historical Commemorative Sites.

[7] The reburial of Imre Nagy took place on 16th June 1989 on Heroes' Square, one of the major squares of Budapest where 100 000 people gathered to listen to speeches delivered by representatives of the democratic opposition