

**COMMUNITY CULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND INSTITUTIONS
IN HUNGARY, 2001 – AN INTRODUCTION**
by Sándor Striker, Ph. D.

Terminology

The purpose of the present overview is to give a short summary of certain cultural activities and institutions in Hungary. In accordance with the last Parliamentary Act CXL. of 1997 concerning the rights and responsibilities of this socio-cultural sphere, within the framework of this paper we are going to use the term “community cultural activities and institutions” as we try to describe and introduce this rather wide field.

Whenever we talk about cultural activities and institutions, it is inevitable to advise the reader about our concept of “culture” as well. For the last two hundred years a rather wide scope of concepts and definitions were conceived from the narrow *high arts* sense to the wide *everyday culture* definition and “culture” became a synonym of *way of life* as well as that of *civilization*. All through the present paper we are going to apply this latter, broad concept of culture, based on the simple fact, that *community cultural activities* themselves are not limited to any special cultural field or to any form of art, and no authorities have any right to do so in present day Hungary. Moreover, the actors of this field are not only those, who practice some kind of a special activity, but those who taste a piece of the waste cake: those who come for some extra education.

When we talk about *community cultural activities* (*közművelődési tevékenységek*), we got to be aware, that this term itself has gone through a series of changes as well in Hungary for the last one hundred or more years. Looking for legitimacy, professionals proudly quote the inscriptions on the tympanon of the 19. Century Museum of Szeged, which says “A KÖZMŰVELŐDÉSNEK” (approximately: ‘for the self education of the community/public’). The 20. Century witnessed the dichotomy of the paternalistic term of *people’s education* (*népművelés*¹) vs. the democratic *free (self)education* (*szabadművelődés*²), before returning to the expression of *the self education of the community/public* (*közművelődés*³), abbreviated in English as *community culture*. Finally, university and college departments changed the name of their former, now somewhat renewed discipline to *cultural manager training* or *self-education/cultural management* (*kulturális menedzserképzés, művelődésszervezés*) to acquire new accreditation for the studies.

As mentioned above, extramural education for children and adults forms a considerable segment of community cultural activities in Hungary, therefore some of

¹ literally: népművelés (nép + művelés) = people’s cultivation, cultivation of the people

² literally: szabadművelődés (szabad + művelődés) = free/liberal self cultivation

³ literally: közművelődés (köz + művelődés) = the public’s self cultivation

the activities can be considered as *adult education* as well. The Parliamentary Act on adult education is also within sight, as it is discussed by the MPs these very days (as of November, 2001).

In public speech practitioners and journalists, nevertheless, use almost all the quoted terms these days as well, maybe with the sole exemption of *free (self)education (szabadművelődés)*, which this way remained to be a term connected to the short lived democratic coalition period of 1945-48.

Finally, we quote the definitions of *community cultural activities* and *community cultural institutions* as well as the actual *forms of community cultural activities*, which can be considered as such and supported by local governments according to the Schedule No. 1. and to Section 76. Point (2) respectively of the 1997 Act:

Community cultural activities: voluntary, active, self-educational, learning and creative activities of citizens outside the school system, which is characterized by the nature that it takes place on co-operative basis in communities.

Community cultural institution: an institution maintained by the local/central government or any other organization, founded to serve community cultural and educational activities of the public, meeting suitable conditions of professionals, personnel and infrastructure, operating on the basis of a founding document.

Section 76.

(1) Support of community cultural activities is a mandatory duty of the community's local government authority.

(2) The supported forms of activity can be, in particular:

- a) the establishment of voluntary self-education and training courses outside of the framework of the school system, adult educational opportunities for the improvement of quality of life and career chances, and folk high schools,
- b) research and presentation of the community's natural, spiritual and artistic values and traditions, maintaining and promoting local cultural traditions,
- c) presentation of universal and national culture, of the cultural values of national groups and other minorities, supporting general understanding and acceptance, and the preservation of the culture of holiday cults,
- d) support of learning activities and the activities of amateur creative and study groups,
- e) facilitating the development of local society, community life and the safeguarding of interests,
- f) promoting the development and maintenance of relations between different cultures,
- g) ensuring the conditions for cultural recreation activities,
- h) ensuring other opportunities which support community culture.

Socio-economic background

The population of Hungary is steadily decreasing for the last twenty years, although the recent census suddenly has come up with the surprising data of a 150 thousand, unexpected and unexplained increase reaching nearly 10.2 million as of January 1, 2001. (Table 1.) Looking at the population-tree (Table 2.), however, we can see a peculiar, if not unique double-tree shape, with two peak generations in the middle. In Hungary the first baby-boom occurred in the early 1950ies, when for a few years abortion was prohibited. Consequently, there was a second baby-boom in the mid-1970ies, when the first large generation began to establish their own families - which coincided with the introduction of the system of a 3-year maternity leave and other increased allowances as a new social policy in Hungary, aiming to balance the sudden drop of birthrate after 1956-60. These two generations had their peak periods in 1998-99 with 838 thousand and 880 thousand members respectively, exceeding the in-between and neighbor age groups by 20-30 percent.

From the point of labor market the above phenomenon contributes to the fact, that Hungary is going to preserve her active labor force potential for the next 15 years, maintaining a fairly high percentage of economic activities within the population. Unemployment is down to approximately 6.4 percent (year 2000), this and some other basic employment figures are shown here below.

Economic activity of population by age and sex, 2000

<i>Age-group (aged), sex</i>	<i>Employed</i>	<i>Unemployed</i>	<i>Economic-ally active</i>	<i>Economic-ally inactive</i>	<i>Of which passive unemployed</i>	<i>Participa-tion rate, %</i>	<i>Unemployment rate, %</i>
	<i>persons, thousands</i>						
<i>Male</i>	2 122,4	159,5	2 281,9	1 406,6	64,0	61,9	7,0
<i>Female</i>	1 726,7	103,0	1 829,7	2 167,7	42,9	45,8	5,6
<i>Together</i>	3 849,1	262,5	4 111,6	3 574,3	106,9	53,5	6,4

Owing to the above noted age-group constituency of the population, one may predict a more or less steady 38-41 percent of the total populous to be active on the labor market. The younger generations between the age of 0-19 years make up about 24 percent, while the second largest social group is that of the pensioners with 31-32 percent. This means a total of 3.1 million pensioners - 1.2 million males and 1.9 million females -, who are either old age pensioners above retirement age (2 million) or people receiving pensions and allowances on health, family or employment bases (1.1 million).

It would be rather difficult to predict the future number and proportion of old age pensioners in Hungary, as their number depends on at least three major factors - retirement age, average life expectancy and labor market/economic policies - all of which are subjects to change recently. Retirement age was raised to 62 years of age for males and females unanimously (from 60 and 55 respectively), while the average life span of males dropped to 65 by the year 1994, before “climbing up” to 67 - which is 7-7.5 years shorter than in Austria or Germany. Females - as anywhere else - are likely to have a considerably longer retired life with an average life expectancy of 75.6 years, approximately still 5 years less as their contemporaries in the mentioned countries. The third and also rather influential factor is the labor market/economic policy of the governments ever. Recently the Hungarian government raised the issue of lifting certain tax stipulations for the old age pensioners, namely that their pension would not be taxed even if they would have some additional income, which could raise the present number of 110 thousand actively working pensioners. (See Table 3. for more details and trends of employment in the late 1990ies.)

As we introduce contemporary Hungary with traditional statistical data, we can not, however, avoid to emphasize the necessity of giving *time series* as well, in order to show the dynamism of the ten or so years of transition - a metamorphosis, we would rather say. Table 4 on *economic activity, GDP and investment* indicates the nearly thirty year long “success story” of the so called goulash communism between 1960 and 1989 - a steady and even growth of GDP and *consumption* with a modest increase in investments. It fails to show, however, the price of this artificial “success story”, the more than USD 21 billion national debt, accumulated to finance the deficit of the Hungarian economy in the last ten years of the “planned economy”. The economic crisis was passed over to the new democracy, which is clearly visible from the sharp drop of GDP and consumption after 1990 - the way out, nevertheless is indicated by the dynamic leap in investments, set to a course of triplefold speed. According to other sources, Hungary attracted 50 percent of the total foreign investment into Eastern Europe until 1994, and the present proportion is still 20 percent.

Inflation, a hardly known phenomenon in Hungary since 1946, was also to be beaten, and wages of the employees could not catch up for awhile (see chart below). It was only after the 1995 strict consolidation measures, that the balance of economy was regained and stability attained.

Price and wage index chart

Previous year	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Price: 100 %	128.9	135.0	123.0	122.5	118.8	128.2	123.6	118.3	114.3	110.3	109.8
Wage						116.8	120.4	122.3	118.3	116.1	113.5

The simultaneously ongoing process of *privatization* changed the earlier proportions of ownership structure on a tremendous scale: state ownership in the productive and trade sectors decreased from 90 percent to approximately 10 percent, while the state share of 61 percent of the total labor force as employer came down to 36 percent by the year 2000. The general structure and management of the Hungarian economy at large became rather similar to those of the EU countries, no wonder Hungary is one of the leading candidates to become a member state in the coming years. Table 5 offers some comparative data on the domestic financial involvement of the governments of some EU countries and that of Hungary.

On the macro level, as we can see, the economy of the country can be characterized with *stability* and *growth*. The central budget accounts preliminary on the four single largest taxpaying contributions, which are the following:

Value Added Tax	31.2 %
<i>Personal Income Tax</i>	20.1 %
Consumption and Inland Revenue Tax	13.7 %
Company Tax	7.5 %

Looking at the above proportions, we got to realize, that the stability and growth - at least that of the central budget - is very much based on *consumption* and on the personal income of the people, both being an issue of individuals, of the citizens. Therefore it is the *micro* level, which is likely to be under pressure, and looking at the share of the personal income tax within the resources of the central budget, it seems to be surely one of the crucial points. (The other is the fact, that the first three numbers clearly lead to the conclusion, that a somewhat high level of inflation is favorable for the central budget, as this would keep up the 65 % share of its resources from these taxes and revenues.)

Personal income tax was introduced in Hungary in the late 1980ies and undoubtedly shocked most of the people. Up to that time most of the employees were used to the one and only system of getting into their hands the sum written on the payroll, and suddenly they were to see the deductions as well, which were rather high. The range of tax rates extends from 20 to 40 % - as 0% tax rate has been abolished within the first few years, which means no one is tax exempt. Income line thresholds are at an annual HUF 400 thousand (Euro 1570) at the bottom and HUF 1 million (Euro 3922) on the top, which means - as the minimum wage being set at HUF 40 thousand per month (Euro 157) and the nationwide average is HUF 87.6 thousand (Euro 344) - the followings:

- anyone working for the minimum wage for less than 10 months will drop very near to the minimum level of subsistence of HUF 28 thousand (Euro 110) after paying his/her income tax

- anyone working for the minimum wage for more than 10 months will fall into the 30 % tax rate and will fall right to the minimum level of subsistence of HUF 28 thousand after paying his/her income tax
- anyone earning the average Hungarian salary or even only 95 % of it, is to pay the top tax rate of 40%

From the point of our present paper - *i.e. from the point of cultural activities and institutions* - the above micro level conclusions are likely to lead to two macro level phenomena: *the presence of a rather limited purchase power and a decreased ability for donations on one hand, and increased expectation for state/government involvement on the other.*

Public Administration: Local Governments, Counties and Regions

After the political changes of 1989-90, a new political and administrative system was legislated in Hungary – one may rightly say, that together with the introduction of the multi party system and of market economy this legislation ensured real political changes and the re-establishment of democracy in the country. *A double level elected governmental and decision making system* was introduced as the central government and the Parliament became responsible for nationwide issues, while the local governments – in each and every settlement, all in all little more, than 3100 – became in charge of the local duties. Central and local minority governments were also set up also on the base of local elections. The duties and the principles of financial operations of the local governments are set by law, and they are entitled to set local regulations in decrees about the way they carry out their responsibilities. They may collect certain local taxes and launch their own enterprises to increase their budgetary income, which is - at least in the case of 70 percent of them– predominantly based on the redistributed income (taxes and revenues) of the central budget. The possible use of the resources allocated to the local governments are, depending on the issues in question, either strictly or as a principle defined by the same act and some other connected laws.

Local governments are – amongst others – responsible to run communal utilities (public roads, lighting, drinking water, sewage, etc.) and certain public services (medical care, public elementary education, etc.) In terms of local cultural activities and institutions, the CXL. Act of 1997, quoted above in the Chapter of Definitions, local governments are responsible to provide *public library services* and to ensure a *community space* for community cultural activities. Thus local governments of the villages may run a library and/or a community cultural center themselves or have them run by a contracting party, but they are not obliged to do so. It is only on the town level, that these cultural services are to be provided by the local authorities in form of (local) governmental institutions. The term community space itself is reflecting an inventive, quite unique, nevertheless a rather pragmatic compromise between different social, political and financial groups of interest. It offers plenty of

freedom for the local governments to fulfill their community cultural duties according to the local needs and traditions of the population, yet it does not prescribe rigid institutional forms for them, which can be financially ineffective in low-populated locations.

Local people may initiate and organize a wide range of cultural activities within and outside the walls of the local community space/community cultural institution – or expect the employed or hired professional cultural managers, if that is the case, to do so - and they are entitled to ask for and to receive financial support from their local government, if the activity falls under the criteria enlisted in the paragraph 76 of the CXL. Act, as quoted above in the Chapter of Definitions. Another unique characteristic of this field is, that the legal opportunity of civil control of the cultural decisions of the local governments has also been legislated in Hungary. The quoted Act enables the local cultural voluntary associations to set up a Community Cultural Council, which then is entitled to see all local governmental decisions influencing community cultural life at the given settlement, and they are entitled to publish their viewpoint on the issue as well.

County governments, however, are not given the rights of collecting taxes or re-allocating centralized resources in the manner of the local governments. They do have in-between duties and responsibilities in providing county public services (county hospitals and ambulance, county police forces, secondary education, etc.), which in the cultural sphere includes the responsibilities of running a county public library, a county museum network and a community cultural service and information agency. All 19 counties run their own theatre, co-financed from central budgetary resources. The role of the counties as authorities has considerably diminished as compared both to their pre-1990 (county council) and to their traditional, historical power. They remained, nevertheless, powerful geographical and symbolic entities of traditional self-identity, no wonder it takes a tremendous task to form the somewhat larger and economically more powerful *regions* out of them. This work has already started in Hungary, predominantly to meet EU requirements and to enable the country/regions to apply for certain available resources, but it will take some time for the regional system of the *seven regions* to take a fully operational form in Hungary.

Budapest – the Capital City

The home place for nearly 1/5 of the total population of Hungary, and the host of all central governmental bodies, the center of banking, trade, media, transportation and tourism with the only international civil airport of the country, Budapest is definitely an entity of its own right within the country. As more and more people move out to the surrounding suburbia, its population returned to the number of 1.8 million it once had around 1960, after a peak of more than 2 million at the turn of the 1980ies.

Its 23 districts are all run by their own local governments, as they would be 23 towns with populations ranging from 18 thousand to 140 thousand, there is a carefully balanced share of duties and responsibilities between the district governments and the Mayor's office. The intricate interplay of – sometimes different – interests inevitably adds to the dynamism of the city, as the mixture of local patriotism and different party political interests most of the time gets channeled into a new urban development, attractive festival or some other pragmatic initiative, most of the time to the satisfaction of the public.

As a point of reference for the rest of the country, Budapest attracts domestic tourism as well. Shopping malls and multiplex cinemas can be difficult to get in around the holiday seasons, and advance booking is rather necessary for fashionable restaurants from Friday evening onwards. Budapest youth managed to turn American type fast-food restaurants and run-down cellars alike into club-like vibrating meeting points and they are all over in the Internet cafés and pubs of the town. After the movie one can find a non-stop food store, all-night pizza parlor or gyros-shopwindow with ease to make feel assured of living in a metropolis. But those who want to give away their money for no return at all can find a surprising number of casinos for themselves in the city as well.

Those who prefer more conventional cultural institutions can nevertheless select their program from a choice of 22 theatres and an Opera House, fine concert halls, old and new art galleries, 94 museums, more than one hundred community cultural centers, and finally from a network of art cinemas. During the day libraries are also at disposal, of which the National Széchényi Library and the network of the Capitol's Szabó Ervin Public Library is open to all visitors.

The Budapest Cultural Center

Established in 1979 by the Capital City of Budapest, the Budapest Cultural Center (BMK) is the professional service institution of the community cultural institutions, civil organizations and communities of the city, yet it offers its services to the widest audience of the profession and for the public. Its main fields of activity are to collect, process and publish information on art and community cultural activities, to organize training and further training for professionals in the field and to offer methodological services in the form of new initiatives, conferences and publications, maintaining a database and archive of methodological documentation. Quiet research into these information databases is further ensured by the fact, that the local head branch of the district public library operates within the same building.

Hosting further training programs for professionals for the last ten years, the Center entered a co-operation with the Teacher's Training College of the Eötvös Loránd University in 1997. The 3-year further training program attracted more than 400 adult students. International co-operation in adult education is a more recent program of

the Center, which predominantly aims at preparing and enabling fellow professionals of the field in Budapest to launch their own international - most of all EU - projects in the near future.

The Center collects, edits and publishes the actual choice of programs of the community cultural centers and organizations operating in Budapest. As the cultural season and the traditional program period of the community cultural centers is generally identical with the academic year, the Center launched its new database on summer camps to fill in the gap – especially for families - , publishing the volume *Mini Tips for Summer Vacation* every year.

Just as all other community cultural centers, the BMK got well integrated into creative and busy world of community cultural activities, hosting and organizing a wide spectrum of programs from conferences and professional workshops amateur photography, ceramics, folkdance and creative arts, almost all available for children and adults alike. Utilizing its expertise and infrastructure in computing, word processing and website editing courses have also been launched by the Center. Its own website at www.bmknet.hu is serving the public and the professionals as well by making available more and more of the vast information database collected by the Center in the last decades.

Community Cultural Activities and Institutions

Culture in Context - the Micro Level

According to the findings of a cultural survey initiated by the Ministry of Culture and Education (1995-1997), *family*, *money* and *work* are the most important priorities on a ten grade scale - with 9.7, 8.5 and 8.3 points, respectively -, while *culture* comes fifth with 7.4 points. Friends, religion and politics can be found at the bottom line. The Youth 2000 survey, sponsored by seven ministries, investigated the priorities of the 15-29 year old age group, and its findings are echoing the earlier findings: *family*, *own future and income* are the first three priorities - with 9.7, 9.5 and 9 points -, while *culture*, *religion* and *politics* are at the end of the line with 7, 5.1 and 4 points respectively.

Approaching the same issue from the point of view of *consumption*, we can see, that according to household statistics, out of the sixteen major classes of household expenditure, *culture, recreation*⁴ and *entertainment* come twelfth, indicated by a 6.6 percent share of the total household expenditure. Generally one would not consider

⁴ ‘recreation’ stands for the Hungarian equivalent of ‘holiday vacation’ in the English translation of the official statistics

6.6 percent of an income as a large sum on the personal level, yet if we consider that - in case of a double income family working and earning 24 months a year - 6.6 percent takes 1.5 months of a single salary. Remembering that the average gross salary is HUF 87.6 thousand (Euro 344) in Hungary (see page 5), which after deducing the top tax rate of 40 percent there is still 1.5 times HUF 62 thousand, that is HUF 93 thousand (Euro 365) is spent on culture, recreation and entertainment by the average wage earner in the country. According to Table 3 there were 3.6 million wage earners at the end of the 1990ies, therefore the multiplication of these two figures would give a total of HUF 334.8 billion, but we should correct the number by deducing a 5 percent estimate on behalf of the part-timers. The result would be HUF 318 billion (Euro 1.25 billion) spent on culture, recreation and entertainment by the public in Hungary every year. When we check our rather complicated method against the household statistics on expenditures of this nature (Table 6 A + B), we see that the per capita HUF 26 219 would make up to a total of HUF 263 billion (Euro 1.03 billion) per year – out of which we can surely take off the HUF 53 billion of recreation, to boil down the *resources of the population* for the *cultural market* to approximately HUF 210 billion (Euro 820 million). This indicates a rather considerable purchase power and quite a public commitment for culture and entertainment.

Yet it is not only money Hungarians pay for entertainment, but their time as well. According to recent findings, they spend 3.5 hours in front of the television as a daily average, which makes up about 65-70 percent of their total leisure time – one of the highest values in the world. Satellite and cable television companies compete for their attention and money, leaving only two channels receivable with traditional arials on non-fee bases. There is hardly anyone on the streets in rural Hungary after 7 p.m. sometimes even on a bright and warm summer evening. Television has become the single largest opinion leader and unchallenged top advertiser medium with a deep impact on the individuals.

Its interactive counterpart, the internet is also on the move in Hungary. As household expenditure on PCs has clearly surpassed the sum spent on TV sets (see Table 6), one can say that there are more and more families, where there are two monitors to sit in front of by now. The difference between the two of course is rather plausible, as for example the habit of writing letters and thus communicating with friends regularly (again) is a definite effect of the use of the web. The same occurred with mobile phones in Hungary: reaching the number of traditional telephone lines, mobile phone owners – mostly the young – send each other written SMS messages any time a day – both phenomena coming as unexpected surprises to those being worried about growing literacy problems before.

The Cultural Market

Compared to the HUF 210 billion of public expenditure on culture, the budgetary expenditures come up to little more, than HUF 96 billion as of year 2000. (Table 7) This sum, however is not distributed directly, but directly and indirectly through different governmental bodies. The Ministry of Cultural Heritage directly spends HUF 15 billion on national cultural institutions (National Széchenyi Library, National Museum, Opera House, National Theatre, National Philharmonic Orchestra, National Heritage Board, etc.) and some other central cultural institutions, including a network of Hungarian cultural institutes abroad, while it distributes a little over HUF 50 billion partly into direct financing the construction and reconstruction of its theatres, museums and other facilities, and partly to its various foundations (Book Foundation, Film Foundation, Foundation for Creative Arts, etc.) to subsidize all kinds of cultural activities through competitions. The National Cultural Fund is an independent institution within the ministry, distributing the sum of the cultural fees collected on the base of a special law (presently approximately HUF 4 billion), introduced to subsidize cultural activities.

The other main source for cultural activities from the central budget aims at supporting the cultural activities and institutions of the local government, thus it is distributed by the ministry in charge, i.e. the Ministry of Interior. There are lump sum and per capita subsidies. Set by the CXL. Act of 1997, local governments are entitled to receive a per capita subsidy for enabling them to fulfill their community cultural and public library service duties (in the year 2000 HUF 792/inhabitant, which totals to HUF 8 billion), while the county governments receive a subsidy to cover their county community cultural and library service duties (in the year 2000 HUF 265/inhabitant plus an equal sum of HUF 67 million per county, which totals to HUF 4 billion). Theatres, orchestras and choirs of the local governments also get subsidies as lump sums through the Ministry of Interior, while – also on the base of the CXL. Act of 1997 – two kinds of special subsidies are available for local governments. One is a matching-fund model to invite local governments to raise their expenditure on public library services and community cultural activities, and to receive a subsidy in return, while the other is a sum aimed at revitalizing community cultural institutions in disadvantaged regions. For new constructions and reconstruction purposes there is a third opportunity from the central budget, aiming at long term development of the cultural infrastructure maintained by the local governments.

The above list of state subsidies suggests quite a richness in cultural activities. Looking at the six-page long Table 8 one can see the numbers summarizing them. If we browse them through, we can see the following chief data:

- 35 million volumes of nearly 9 thousand titles were published in 2000.
- more than 3500 public libraries and 4000 school libraries operate in the country
- 3270 community cultural institutions serve the public of the 3200 settlements

- even if in less and less number, but still 564 cinemas operate in Hungary, and 18-24 Hungarian long feature films are produced annually
- in Budapest 22, while in the rest of the country 30 theatres offered 12.6 thousand performances
- 131 concerts in Budapest, 990 in other county towns, while 160 village concerts were held in 2000 and
- 812 museums operate in the country with approximately 1 million visitors a year.

Community Culture from Within

The ten year long process of social transformation left its mark both on the institutions and on the spectrum of community cultural activities. Surviving the downhill period of the early and mid 1990ies, community cultural institutions adjusted themselves to the new era. Contrary to the expectations, the number of community cultural institutions has not decreased. Although a considerable number of former trade union and company cultural centers were closed down, the total of 3270 represents a peak period, owing to the fact that the civil society succeeded to set up more than 2800 cultural foundations and another 2550 cultural associations since the mid 1990ies, and these organizations set up and operate more than 450 community cultural centers. The number of qualified employees, however, did not rise. Local governments cut down on full time employees and entered contracts with small companies for the maintenance and cleaning jobs. One has to admit, on the other hand, that the full time job of a cultural manager is not highly attractive either for many. Out of the 3005 employed cultural managers only about 1200 is holding the appropriate degree of the profession, and another 1000 have university or college degrees. Considering the fact that ever since its introduction in the mid 1960ies more than 35 thousand students graduated at universities and colleges in *népművelés*, *közművelődés* or *cultural management*, we can surely say that this is the field of career leavers. The personal income tax system, described in the second chapter, also contributes to this low statistical data. Professionals decide to stay off from full employment and work on contract bases for the cultural institutions in a more cost-effective manner for both parties – as the institutions save on paying social security as well. This setup gives more freedom and mobility for both sides as well as more insecurity for all. Stability vs. flexibility is surely a dilemma for the individual and for the institution alike, and there is much at stake: once a civil servant status is given up and gets replaced by the contract system, it is almost impossible reverse the move. The pace of transforming government run community cultural centers into public purpose companies has slowed down and some institutions have even been re-established, but – as these organizations always operate within their own specific circumstances – much depends on the key individuals, and one has to be careful with generalizations.

The spectrum of community cultural activities has changed as well. Certain traditional club-type activities carry on for the children or for the elderly in places, yet new, alternative topics gain more and more attention. According to the latest tendencies, aerobic-type courses, fashionable a few years ago are going down, replaced by other kinds of artistic movements, while psychology classes and self-help groups gain space. Courses on website editing and CAD are available in many town centers, but the great wave seems to be adult education. Accounting, language and other practical courses seem to be popular, offering help for better employment opportunities.

Traditional activities in rural settlements nevertheless inevitably include all the commemorations on national holidays, and naturally the series of seasonal balls as well. Yet if we look at the last decades of community cultural activities and those of the hosting institutions, we can see, that there is a certain *pattern* in the constant change of their spectrum of programs in Hungary. New socio-cultural initiatives – usually with the lead of some enthusiastic, outsider expert – find their places in the community cultural centers and gain popularity spreading the fashion in the country. Film- and photography clubs in the early sixties, rock clubs for local youth a few years after, amateur theatre movement in the early seventies, followed by the dancehouse movement at its peak in the early eighties – they were all started in these institutions, not to speak of the local television studios, which preceded and partly helped the coming political processes in the late 1980ies. Most of their one-time leaders have launched their own organizations, companies or established their school or institution by now (video studios, discos, alternative theatres and drama schools, becoming folk music CD producers and publishers, etc.), based on the expertise and audience built up by them in the community cultural centers in the early days.

One can say, *that community cultural institutions are the incubator houses for new socio-cultural initiatives in Hungary, offering space for them until they establish their own systems of institutions.* This pattern makes it very difficult to define the scope of activities of the field in general, as they are always following the new trends and initiating new ones as well. This is the reason behind the idea of keeping a *community space* available for the local public in every settlement and of defining only basic principles of activities in Paragraph 76. of the CXL. Act of 1997. One can never foretell, what community cultural activities will actually make happy or crazy the coming generations, but there must be a place available for their happiness.

Conclusions

After the metamorphosis of the Hungarian political, social and economic system the community cultural activities and institutions of the country, can - it seems – put the sign “Business as usual” onto their entrance doors. This “business”, nevertheless, remained to follow the traditional manner of constant changes both on the

management and on the program side. The CXL. Act of 1997 wiped out speculations about their fate, as it enabled the parties involved – central government, local population, professionals, local government and the civil sector organizations to negotiate issues according to each and every case. The clarification of duties and rights erased much of the preceding uncertainties, and by now its mostly the mere interplay of local initiatives and financial opportunities, which decides upon the actual economic character of the local community cultural scenery. There is a mixed financing system of automatic per capita subsidy and competition models, which gives more room to local incentives, and an opportunity to find the appropriate form of operation as well.

The actual community cultural activities themselves stay and go, as it was the case before. But the community space is there for all, and it is up to the members of the local community, whether they make it a part of their life – by spending some hours of their life there - or stay away.

Sources

- Statistical Yearbook of Hungary, 2000, Hungarian Central Statistical Office, Budapest 2001
- Statistical Pocket-Book of Hungary, 2000, Hungarian Central Statistical Office, Budapest 2001
- Magyarország évtizedkönyve, A rendszerváltás I-II. *Sándor Kurtán, Péter Sándor, László Vass* (editors), Demokrácia Kutatások Magyar Központja, Budapest 1998
- A magyar társadalom kulturális állapota, Az 1996-os országos vizsgálat zárótanulmánya, MTA Szociológiai Intézete, Budapest, 1997
- Ifjúság 2000 Gyorsjelentés, *László Laki, Andrea Szabó, Béla Bauer* (editors), Nemzeti Ifjúságkutató Intézet, Budapest 2001
- Szakmatükör 2. A budapesti közművelődési intézmények tevékenysége tegnap és ma, *Gabriella Slézia* (editor), Budapesti Művelődési Központ, 2000
- A BMK szakmai fórumai, Műhelybeszélgetések a közművelődés aktuális témáiról, 1998-2000, *Gabriella Slézia* (editor), Budapesti Művelődési Központ, 2001
- Ajánló 2001-2002, Budapesti Művelődési Központ *Edit Brüll* (editor), BMK Budapest, 2001
- CD Jogász, Hatályos Jogszabályok Hivatalos Gyűjteménye 2001/8, Magyar Hivatalos Közlönykiadó
- Közigazgatási szakvizsga, Közigazgatási vezetési ismeretek, Államháztartási ismeretek 2. rész, *Bende-Szabó Gábor* (editor), Magyar Közigazgatási Intézet, Budapest 2001

- *József Kovalcsik: A kultúra csarnokai III.*, Művelődéskutató Intézet
Budapest, 1987

Population as of 1 January, 2001)

Year	Males	Females	Total	Proportion of males	Proportion of females	Females per thousand males	Population density (per km ²)
	thousands			percentage			
1960	4 804,0	5 157,0	9 961,0	48,2	51,8	1 073	107,1
1970	5 003,7	5 318,4	10 322,1	48,5	51,5	1 063	111,0
1980	5 188,7	5 520,8	10 709,5	48,4	51,6	1 064	115,1
1990	4 984,9	5 389,9	10 374,8	48,0	52,0	1 081	111,5
1997	4 863,3	5 311,2	10 174,4	47,8	52,2	1 092	109,4
1998	4 841,9	5 293,5	10 135,4	47,8	52,2	1 093	108,9
1999	4 817,6	5 274,2	10 091,8	47,7	52,3	1 095	108,5
2000	4 791,8	5 251,4	10 043,2	47,7	52,3	1 096	108,0
2001 ^{a)}	4 863,6	5 333,5	10 197,1	47,7	52,3	1 097	109,6

a) 1 February. Preliminary data of the census in 2001.

Table 2
Table 3

Employment balance in Hungary

	1994			1995			1996			1997		
	male	female	total	male	female	total	male	female	total	male	female	total
Source of employment												
Within employment age	3159,3	2912,3	6071,6	3163,5	2918,5	6082,0	3164,6	2916,1	6080,7	3167,5	2977,3	6144,8
Over employment age	82,4	117,7	200,1	67,4	102,0	169,4	50,3	83,8	134,1	40,6	67,8	108,4
Total	3241,7	3030,0	6271,7	3230,9	3020,5	6251,4	3214,9	2999,9	6214,8	3208,1	3045,1	6253,2
Utilization of labour force												
Active earners	2012,3	1688,4	3700,7	2006,5	1629,9	3636,4	2025,6	1589,4	3615,0	2026,5	1584,9	3611,4
Employed pensioners	81,3	99,8	181,1	69,1	87,7	156,8	56,8	71,9	128,7	50,1	66,5	116,6
Employed	2093,6	1788,2	3881,8	2075,6	1717,6	3793,2	2082,4	1661,3	3743,7	2076,6	1651,4	3728,0
Registered unemployed *	376,1	256,0	632,1	302,6	217,0	519,6	285,3	210,6	495,9	275,4	202,1	477,5
Economically active popul.	2469,7	2044,2	4513,9	2378,2	1934,6	4312,8	2367,7	1871,9	4239,6	2352,0	1853,5	4205,5
Working abroad	19,0	8,0	27,0	20,0	5,0	25,0	18,0	5,0	23,0	18,0	6,0	24,0
Inactive, within the age	753,0	977,8	1730,8	802,7	1110,9	1913,6	829,2	1123,0	1952,2	838,1	1185,6	2023,7
Of these												
Studying	289,9	287,8	577,7	297,4	292,2	589,6	304,2	301,1	605,3	313,8	317,4	631,2
Pensioners	219,3	151,2	370,5	231,0	154,0	385,0	233,4	153,6	387,0	259,6	149,4	409,0
Receiving maternity supp.	-	24,1	24,1	-	33,0	33,0	-	44,6	44,6	-	48,1	48,1
On maternity leave	2,2	252,4	254,6	5,2	246,8	252,0	4,6	226,0	230,6	2,0	245,1	247,1
Activity rate %	76,2	67,5	72,0	73,6	64,0	69,0	73,6	62,4	68,2	73,3	60,9	67,3

* Data from the National Methodological Center of Employment

surplus
of
males

Economic activity, gross domestic product (GDP), investment

Year	Economic- ally active population, 1 January, thousands	Gross domestic product (GDP)	Final consumption		Gross capital formation		Investment	
			total	of which total consump- tion of population	total	of which fixed capital formation	volume index	at current prices, billion HUF*
1960	4 735	100	100	100	100	100	100	42,6
1961	4 626	105	102	101	104	97	97	39,9
1962	4 544	111	108	105	112	107	108	44,1
1963	4 569	117	113	110	126	122	122	50,2
1964	4 653	123	119	116	136	126	129	52,0
1965	4 649	124	120	118	129	128	130	49,7
1966	4 666	133	126	123	141	142	145	54,9
1967	4 710	143	133	131	172	170	173	65,6
1968	4 802	150	140	137	174	173	176	65,0
1969	4 979	161	147	145	174	187	193	84,4
1970	5 127	168	159	155	201	219	227	101,4
1971	5 440	179	168	163	245	242	251	114,3
1972	5 491	190	173	169	215	240	249	118,4
1973	5 531	203	180	176	215	247	259	125,7
1974	5 563	215	192	187	265	274	282	139,4
1975	5 634	228	201	196	292	306	319	163,4
1976	5 679	236	205	199	298	306	319	170,7
1977	5 777	254	214	208	327	344	360	201,5
1978	5 742	265	223	216	385	360	377	218,5
1979	5 736	273	230	221	331	363	381	225,7
1980	5 470	273	232	224	318	340	359	213,4
1981	5 447	281	238	229	312	326	341	209,4
1982	5 437	289	241	232	301	320	333	215,6
1983	5 413	291	242	234	278	310	323	224,2
1984	5 392	299	245	236	272	298	314	231,5
1985	5 373	298	249	239	262	289	307	239,6
1986	5 361	302	255	244	285	308	314	259,2
1987	5 371	315	264	254	294	338	338	295,1
1988	5 329	315	256	243	284	307	312	290,4
1989	5 278	317	259	249	288	329	325	339,6
1990	5 251	306	252	240	275	306	293	356,3
1991	5 153	269	239	226	217	274	257	491,9
1992	4 940	261	240	226	173	267	253	555,6
1993	4 753	259	253	230	229	272	259	638,3
1994	4 514	267	247	230	274	306	291	842,7
1995	4 313	271	231	215	296	293	276	1 038,8
1996	4 240	275	223	208	337	313	290	1 337,6
1997	4 206	288	228	212	366	342	315	1 709,9
1998	4 211	302	237	222	429	387	355	2 137,9
1999	4 203	315	247	232	443	410	374	2 427,1
2000	4 282	331 ⁺	257 ⁺	242⁺	478 ⁺	442 ⁺	402 ⁺	2 831,7 ⁺

* Exchange rate: 255 HUF/1Euro or 300 HUF/1USD

+ Preliminary data

Table 5.
Government expenditures (GDP %)

Sources:	Hungary (1997)	EU average of 7 countries*	Ireland (1995)	Greece (1996)	Austria (1996)	Germany (1991)	France (1993)	U.K. (1995)	The Netherlands (1997)
Ministry of Finance, Hungary GFS YEARBOOK 1988 (IMF) IFS JANUARY 1999 (IMF)									
Total expenditures	49,7	50,8	50,9	32,9	50,1	49,4	57,2	53,8	61,3
1. General public services	3,3	3,6	3,4	1,3	5,7	3,7	4,1	2,3	4,3
2. Defence	1,2	2,0	1,1	2,4	0,8	1,9	2,5	3,3	1,9
3. Public order and security	1,7	1,3		1,0	1,1	1,3	0,8	3,0	1,8
4. Education	4,8	5,3	6,5	3,2	5,6	3,5	5,3	5,6	7,2
5. Health care	4,5	7,4	11,5	2,2	7,1	7,1	10,5	5,8	7,4
6. Social security and welfare services	14,6	15,7	11,5	6,1	19,0	17,6	20,1	14,5	21,0
7. Housing, neighbourhood and communal services	1,8	2,4	2,9	0,7	1,5	2,1	3,0	3,3	3,4
8. Leisure, cultural and religious activities	1,1	0,7	0,5	0,3	0,4	0,8	1,1	0,6	0,9
9. Heating, fuel and energy supplies	0,0	0,3	0,7	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,5	0,3	0,1
10. Landscape, forestry, fish and game economy	1,5	0,8	1,5	1,1	1,3	0,8	0,1	0,5	0,5
11. Mining and industry	0,2	0,5	1,3	0,5	0,7	0,5	0,1	0,2	0,2
12. Transportation and telecommunications	2,1	1,9	2,7	1,3	2,3	2,3	0,9	1,4	2,6
13. Other financial activities and services	1,3	1,1	1,1	0,3	0,3	1,6	3,1	0,9	0,6
14. Other expenditures of these: interest expenditures	11,8 10,0	7,8 4,7	5,8 5,0	12,7 11,9	4,1 4,0	6,1 1,6	5,2 2,8	11,3 3,7	9,5 4,4

* Ireland (1995), Greece (1996), Austria (1996), Germany (1991), France (1993), United Kingdom (1995), The Netherlands (1997)

Note: Only 1988 data was available on Portugal, therefore we have not included those

Source: IMF Annual Report, 1997

Annual detailed expenditure of households, 2000

Table 6

(HUF)

<i>Expenditure</i>	<i>Average value per reporting households</i>	<i>Average per capita value</i>	<i>Average value per household</i>
<i>Culture, recreation, entertainment</i>			
<i>Radio set</i>	10 143	111	295
<i>Television set</i>	48 457	1 226	3 254
<i>HIFI equipment</i>	62 700	396	1 050
<i>Video-recorder, video-camera</i>	38 585	323	858
<i>Other entertainment equipments</i>	20 691	357	947
<i>Camera</i>	42 903	221	588
<i>Personal computer, typewriter</i>	63 225	1 741	4 620
<i>Jewellery, art goods</i>	22 582	524	1 390
<i>Musical instruments, other durable goods</i>	41 756	113	301
<i>Newspapers, magazines</i>	12 003	2 578	6 841
<i>Books</i>	24 466	1 292	3 427
<i>Schoolbooks</i>	69 545	1 165	3 091
<i>School and stationery supplies</i>	18 560	985	2 613
<i>Sporting equipments</i>	33 172	343	910
<i>Toys</i>	36 278	1 098	2 914
<i>Records, audio and videotapes, other home</i>	26 914	591	1 567
<i>Photographic articles</i>	12 775	66	175
<i>Other entertainment articles</i>	30 161	66	174
<i>Tv subscription</i>	21 792	3 586	9 517
<i>Repair of cultural articles</i>	31 578	445	1 182
<i>School-fee</i>	68 403	2 167	5 750
<i>Theatre, concert</i>	23 677	428	1 135
<i>Cinema</i>	16 529	319	845
<i>Entertainment, tickets, fees</i>	21 924	643	1 707
<i>Other recreation services</i>	22 401	142	377
<i>Recreation domestic, subsidized</i>	39 901	1 764	4 681
<i>Recreation domestic, other</i>	76 129	1 022	2 712
<i>Recreation abroad</i>	139 337	2 506	6 649
<i>Total</i>	83 390	26 219	69 571

Table 7

Budgetary expenditures on culture

<i>At current prices, million HUF</i>	<i>Percentage distribution</i>
---------------------------------------	--------------------------------

<i>Cultural services</i>	1998	1999	2000	1998	1999	2000
<i>Book and journal publishing</i>	929	1 076	1 277	1,3	1,4	1,3
<i>Mass communication</i>	1 240	1 308	1 385	1,8	1,7	1,4
<i>Community cultural tasks</i>	38 521	43 417	57 499	55,1	56,6	59,9
<i>Of which:</i>						
<i>community cultural institution</i>	13 664	14 090	16 086	19,5	18,4	16,7
<i>library</i>	12 863	14 667	17 573	18,4	19,1	18,3
<i>museum, archive</i>	11 994	14 660	23 840	17,2	19,1	24,8
<i>Artistic task</i>	19 822	21 737	24 985	28,3	28,4	26,0
<i>Of which:</i>						
<i>theatres, musical establishments</i>	18 827	20 814	23 898	26,9	27,1	24,9
<i>Other cultural activity</i>	9 416	9 138	10 897	13,5	11,9	11,4
Cultural services, total	69 928	76 675	96 043	100,0	100,0	100,0

**Cultural Statistics
pages)**

Table 8 (total of 6

1/6

Book production by types of publications

<i>Year</i>	<i>Book</i>	<i>Booklet</i>	<i>Book and booklet</i>	<i>Note</i>	<i>Music, score</i>	<i>Map</i>
<i>Number of titles</i>						
1980	8 241	1 013	9 254	9 842	1 289	77
1990	7 464	858	8 322	2 237	599	76
1998	10 626	680	11 306	750	241	209
1999	9 731	621	10 352	419	116	228
2000	8 986	606	9 592	704	110	141

Copies, thousands

1980	94 710	9 590	104 300	6 743	1 880	1 286
1990	113 112	12 628	125 740	1 342	866	1 191
1998	47 046	2 824	49 870	283	323	1 400
1999	44 652	2 614	47 266	173	181	1 299
2000	35 246	1 749	36 995	222	124	685

Published books by type

<i>Year</i>	<i>Scientific</i>	<i>Educational</i>	<i>Special literature</i>	<i>Literary</i>	<i>Juvenile and children's literature</i>	<i>Schoolbook</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Books published per hundred thousand Inhabitants</i>
-------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------------	-----------------	---	-------------------	--------------	--------------	---

Number of titles

1980	878	1 307	3 525	749	397	1 329	56	8 241	77
1990	124	1 281	2 864	1 470	347	1 178	200	7 464	72
1998	177	1 517	3 843	2 377	657	1 696	359	10 626	105
1999	28	1 199	2 952	2 169	550	2 357	476	9 731	97
2000	74	1 583	2 848	2 050	394	1 580	457	8 986	90

Copies, thousands

1980	929	24 247	8 287	17 683	17 327	25 676	561	94 710	884
1990	123	27 465	6 766	44 060	11 645	20 706	2 347	113 112	1 091
1998	260	6 555	6 075	14 743	4 331	14 089	993	47 046	466
1999	55	4 928	4 664	12 221	2 943	18 641	1 200	44 652	444
2000	38	6 185	3 935	11 096	1 897	10 977	1 118	35 246	352

Table 8

Libraries
2/6

<i>Denomination</i>	1990	1998	1999	2000
<i>Public libraries</i>				
<i>Libraries</i>	4 179	3 315	3 273	3 132
<i>Total stock,</i> <i>thousand library units</i>	40 925	43 717	43 355	43 906
<i>Registered users, thousands</i>	1 486	1 350	1 365	1 357
<i>Library units lent, thousands</i>	35 915	35 210	34 900	34 494
<i>Public libraries of workplaces</i>				
<i>Libraries</i>	3 171	593	513	453
<i>Total stock,</i> <i>thousand library units</i>	10 711	3 188	3 000	2 569
<i>Registered users, thousands</i>	370	95	96	84
<i>Library units lent, thousands</i>	6 709	2 011	1 837	1 635
<i>School libraries</i>				
<i>Libraries</i>	3 882	3 981	4 095	..
<i>Total stock,</i> <i>thousand library units</i>	28 897	37 925	39 413	..
<i>Library units lent, thousands</i>	6 521	9 231	9 142	..

Community cultural institutions, Association for Dissemination of Scientific Knowledge

<i>Denomination</i>	1990	1998	1999	2000
<i>Community cultural institute</i>				
<i>Institutions</i>	2 391	2 629	3 000	3 270
<i>Educational lectures</i> <i>number</i>	24 136	15 107	21 267	16 480
<i>participants, thousands</i>	1 072	578	822	885
<i>Evenings with entertainment</i> <i>programme number</i>	23 973	23 747	26 195	25 651
<i>participants, thousands</i>	5 012	6 116	6 349	7 355
<i>Creative cultural communities</i> <i>number</i>	8 203	6 055	5 737	5 908
<i>members, thousands</i>	177	132	131	145
<i>Clubs</i> <i>number</i>	4 537	4 747	4 163	4 678
<i>members, thousands</i>	236	227	176	191
<i>Association for Dissemination of Scientific Knowledge</i>				
<i>Lectures</i> <i>number</i>	43 483	16 053	15 769	14 299
<i>participants, thousands</i>	1 465	491	590	509
<i>Courses</i> <i>number</i>	7 209	2 077	1 892	3 528
<i>persons enrolled, thousands</i>	145	68	65	61
<i>Participants of other programmes,</i> <i>thousands</i>	215	45	86	39

Members of the Association, total 14 167 11 581 7 982 11 034

Table 8

Cinemas, video-cinemas
3/6

<i>Denomination</i>	1990	1998	1999	2000
Cinemas	1 960	628	604	564
<i>In Budapest</i>	81	87	99	125
<i>In other towns</i>	497	303	295	296
<i>In villages</i>	1 382	238	210	143
<i>Settlements with cinema as a percentage of all settlements</i>	40.9	11.8
<i>Cinemas for standard films</i>	947	625	603	564
<i>Cinemas for small films</i>	917	—	—	—
Performances, thousands	416	242	296	372
<i>In Budapest</i>	79	120	141	193
<i>In other towns</i>	207	107	144	172
<i>In villages</i>	130	15	11	7
Attendances, millions	36	15	14	14
<i>In Budapest</i>	10	7	8	8
<i>In other towns</i>	20	7	5	6
<i>In villages</i>	6	1	1	0
<i>Attendances per thousand inhabitants</i>	3 495	1 438	1 432	1 426
<i>Share of cinema-goers to Hungarian films, per cent</i>	5,2	5,6	3,7	8,7
<i>Receipts from tickets per cinema-goer, HUF</i>	42	364	454	538

Number of films produced for presentation

<i>Year</i>	<i>Films prepared for cinema presentation</i>	<i>Of which Long feature films</i>	<i>Films prepared for the TV</i>	<i>Films produced for special purpose</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Of which video</i>	<i>Dubbed Films</i>	<i>Of which for the TV</i>
1990	98	25	62	119	279	104	802	688
1991	92	19	57	75	224	53	953	725
1992	102	21	133	131	366	232	1 664	1 086
1993	43	26	186	14	243	204	2 664	1 624
1994	32	17	124	9	165	111	1 770	767
1995	31	10	354	30	415	352	1 199	523
1996	18	10	15	21	54	36	862	775
1997	12	12	7	33	52	31	144	67
1998
1999	73	24	12	9	94	65	1 337	1 337
2000 ^{a)}	53	18	100	9	162	109

a) On the basis of reports of 11 film producer establishments.

New feature films by producing countries

<i>Country</i>	1990	1998	1999	2000
Feature films presented, total	258	165	176	199
<i>Of which:</i>				
<i>Australia</i>	—	1	—	1
<i>France</i>	17	13	13	14
<i>Poland</i>	8	—	—	1
Hungary	31	13	16	22
<i>Great Britain</i>	6	9	9	14
<i>Germany</i>	9	1	—	7
<i>Italy</i>	12	3	3	1
<i>Romania</i>	2	—	—	—
<i>Russia</i>	9 ^{a)}	1	—	2
<i>United States of America</i>	126	113	119	125
<i>Canada</i>	1	—	1	2
<i>Japan</i>	3	1	—	1
<i>Spain</i>	—	2	2	3

a) Soviet Union.

Table 8

Theatres
4/6

<i>Denomination</i>	1990	1998	1999	2000
<i>Theatres</i>	43	48	48	52
<i>In Budapest</i>	21	21	22	22
<i>In other towns</i>	22	27	26	29
<i>In villages</i>	1
<i>Seating capacity^{a)}, thousands</i>	23,6	28,5	28,1	29,5
<i>In Budapest</i>	13,6	14,3	14,6	13,6
<i>In other towns</i>	10,0	14,2	13,5	15,9
<i>Persons employed full-time in theatres</i>	6 345	5 130	5 114	4 962
<i>In Budapest</i>	3 472	2 697	2 711	2 461
<i>In other towns</i>	2 873	2 433	2 403	2 501
<i>Performances^{b)}</i>	11 534	12 295	12 806	12 682
<i>In Budapest</i>	5 987	5 965	6 093	6 189
<i>In other towns</i>	5 178	6 139	6 443	6 241
<i>In villages</i>	369	191	270	252
<i>Attendances, thousands^{b)}</i>	4 990,8	4 116,1	4 013,3	3 937,8
<i>In Budapest</i>	2 983,5	2 200,8	2 151,4	2 086,8
<i>In other towns</i>	1 937,3	1 881,1	1 818,3	1 807,2
<i>In villages</i>	70,0	34,2	43,6	43,8
<i>Attendances per thousand inhabitants</i>	482	407	399	393
<i>Receipts from tickets per paying theatre-goer, HUF^{b)}</i>	88	475	559	647

a) Excluding seating capacity of theatres under reconstruction. – b) Excluding data of outdoor performances.

Other entertaining programmes

<i>Institutions</i>	1990	1998	1999	2000
<i>Petőfi Hall</i>				
<i>performances</i>	429	378	432	408
<i>attendances, thousands</i>	498	650	627	594
<i>Circus-troupes</i>				
<i>performances (in Hungary)</i>	430	422	401	400
<i>performances (abroad)</i>	314	–	–	–
<i>attendances (in Hungary), thousands</i>		490	302	329

Table 8
5/6

Concerts*

Year, genre	Performances				Attendances, thousands			
	Budapest	in other towns	in villages	total	in Budapest	in other towns	In villages	Total
1994	210	956	247	1 413	120	325	59	504
1995	191	921	165	1 277	106	310	43	459
1996	176	910	162	1 248	103	301	40	444
1997	157	787	139	1 083	77	261	36	374
1998	145	894	143	1 182	68	282	41	391
1999	108	987	151	1 246	68	301	40	409
2000	131	990	160	1 281	77	306	43	426
<i>Of which:</i>								
<i>oratorios</i>	20	42	–	62	15	18	–	33
<i>orchestras</i>	46	264	18	328	40	88	4	132
<i>choirs</i>	4	17	6	27	1	7	1	9
<i>chamber music</i>	27	417	77	521	7	139	27	173
<i>recitals, aria</i>								
<i>and song</i>	34	94	36	164	13	17	4	34
<i>mixed concerts</i>	–	156	23	179	–	37	8	45

* Own programmes of the National Philharmonic Society, excluding programmes organized for other institutes.

Folk ensembles

Performances, attendances	1990	1998	1999	2000
<i>Performances (in Hungary)</i>				
<i>State Folk Ensemble</i>	64	186 ^{a)}	183	170
<i>Honvéd Ensemble</i>	..	436	420	174
<i>Dance Forum</i>	–	..	39	97
<i>Performances (abroad)</i>				
<i>State Folk Ensemble</i>	88	27 ^{a)}	16	71
<i>Honvéd Ensemble</i>	..	13	38	11
<i>Attendances (in Hungary)</i>				
<i>State Folk Ensemble</i>	33 016	41 256 ^{a)}	41 697	73 239
<i>Honvéd Ensemble</i>	..	93 450	109 975	38 835
<i>Dance Forum</i>	–	..	13 740	51 863

a) Since 1998 the State Folk Ensemble and the Budapest Dance Ensemble have been merged.

Table 8

Museums, exhibitions
6/6

<i>Year, area</i>	Museu ms	<i>Exhibitions</i>	<i>Attendances, thousands</i>	<i>Total work of arts, thousands</i>	<i>Number of publications</i>	<i>Museum attendances per thousand inhabitants</i>
1990	754	1 909	13 977	42 293	896	1 349
1995	767	2 207	9 064	57 734	1 109	886
1996	775	2 239	9 888	57 793	1 200	970
1997	776	2 295	9 509	60 277	1 100	933
1998	788	2 396	10 009	60 719	1 347	990
1999	804	2 583	9 714	62 548	1 678	965
2000	812	2 804 9 895	63 080	1 727	987	
<i>Of which:</i>						
<i>in Budapest</i>	96	604	2 604	37 293	470	1 448
<i>in other towns</i>	445	1 776	5 274	24 426	1 126	1 155
<i>in villages</i>	271	424	2 017	1 361	131	551

Source: Ministry of Cultural Heritage.