

FINAL REPORT

Project no.:	21830274
Project title:	Visualizing Cataclysm and Renewal Visual culture and War Representations in Central and Eastern Europe in World War One and its Aftermath (1914-1920). International conference by Budapest History Museum
Project implementation period:	10/02/2019 to 01/05/2020
Grantee name:	Budapest History Museum
Address:	Szent György tér 2, Budapest, 1014, HU
Name of project coordinator:	Anikó Katona
Phone:	+36302939202
Email:	kataniko@gmail.com

1. DELIVERABLES

In this section, we would like you to describe each output (event or product) that has been realized as part of your project. Please include ALL outputs separately, when possible. **Do not copy text from the application form.**

OUTPUT no. 1.

TITLE OF THE EVENT/PRODUCT:	International Conference of 7 panels
Dates (in case of event):	2019.05.29. 14:00 - 2019.05.31. 14:00
Location (in case of event):	Budapest History Museum
Description: What was the purpose of this output?	<i>The purpose was realizing a successful international conference with a special focus on visual art during WWI in Central Europe by bringing together a great number of scholars from older and younger generations and from a variety of fields to explore visual art in WWI.</i>
Achievements: What did you achieve with this event/product? How did it contribute to the fulfilment of the project objective set in the application?	<i>Thanks to all these elements the conference was very rich and as it was expected, presentations displayed quite many similarities in visual arts in the region during WWI and its aftermath. Due to a lack of time and to the specificity of the topic the conference speakers were selected by the organizers instead of launching a call for paper. Thanks to that we could build connections not only with individual speakers, but also via them, with various research groups and institutions with different national background interested in exploring visual art during this period. Considering the participants among a totality of 26 conference speakers one was Slovakian, two Czechs, two Polish nationalities (along with 12 Hungarians, incl. the three organizers), the rest came from other neighbouring countries such as Romania, Serbia, Austria, but also from ex-belligerent countries such as Russia, Turkey and Germany. We had four keynote speakers: the French Annette Becker, prominent specialist of art during WWI, the British-American Paul Stirton, professor of modern design history, as well as Katalin Bakos and Enikő Róka, both</i>


 Az eredetivel megegyező
hiteles másolat.

2020 AUG 13.

	<p><i>of them art historians specialized in the period.</i></p> <p><i>Our most important achievement is that participants (and the audience) could learn about the historical narratives of other nations regarding this very chaotic period. Since this historical event (World War One and the following years) meant a great success for some nations and national tragedies for others, it was great to see that participants as well as the public audience were open to learn about the others' point of view and details of various nations' history and art.</i></p> <p><i>We think we budget quite well, so we could cover the travel and accommodation costs in the case of every speaker (even if they came from Moscou or Istambul). Also, we could offer sandwiches and coffee as well as a diner (local cuisine) to all the speakers the first evening at the informal dining room of Kőleves restaurant in downtown Budapest. We were happy to experience that participants enriched positive experiences and strong, positive relationships were built among the them.</i></p>
<p>Dissemination/promotion:</p> <p>Event: How was the event promoted? List the media and include links if applicable.</p> <p>Product: By what means did you promote and disseminate the product?</p>	<p><i>The conference was mainly promoted on the Internet, more particularly on social media platforms. A young graphist was asked to create a spectacular logo for the conference which suits well to its title and focus. Also, a quite lot of brochures and posters were physically distributed (with the same information and logo) in universities and cultural institutions of the different embassies.</i></p> <p>The webpage of the event: https://vcr2019.wordpress.com/program/</p> <p>The Facebook page of the event: https://www.facebook.com/Visualizing-Cataclysm-and-Renewal-Conference-2660884310594538</p> <p><i>The host institution, BTM promoted it on his web page:</i></p> <p>http://www.btm.hu/en/events/details/51-Visualizing Cataclysm and Renewal</p> <p><i>Also, the most well-known Hungarian blog on WWI promoted it:</i></p> <p>https://nagyhaboru.blog.hu/2019/05/16/katakizma es megujulas?fbclid=IwAR2qFDD8GXqcDBD3xTWxY-9kPPnGpPzmlVhky9DsQCKq23PCpGrDHCgZ_D0</p> <p><i>+ see our BROCHURE, leaflet and poster as attached pdfs.</i></p>
<p>Target groups:</p> <p>Which target groups were involved in this output and in what way?</p> <p>What was the number of people within each group?</p> <p>What was the balance in respect to V4 countries?</p> <p>Attach attendance list/s or other proof/s of involvement/participation to the Final Report, when</p>	<p><i>The main target group composed of researchers, students, professors, curators of Budapest located museums (BTM, Hungarian Museum of Fine Arts and National Gallery, Kassák Museum etc.), universities and other research centres. Since this was an international conference, it naturally attracted English-speaking audience, which composed effectively of the above-mentioned targeted groups.</i></p> <p><i>Week point: we were not able to reach audience from the countryside.</i></p> <p><i>We organized seven panels with totally 26 speakers, every panel was chaired by whether a Hungarian conference speaker, whether a Hungarian scholar (not coming from conference speakers). Considering the V4 countries among a totality of 26 conference speakers one had Slovakian, two Czech, two Polish nationality (along with 12 Hungarians, incl. the three organizers).</i></p> <p><i>Proofs of audience: see the attached photos and attached attendance list of speakers.</i></p>



Az eredetivel megegyező hiteles másolat.

2020 AUG 13.

<i>possible.</i>	
<p>Partnership: Describe each partner's involvement in realizing this output. Summarise the strong points and weak points of your partners' involvement within this output.</p>	<p><i>strong points:</i> BTM was a great host, offered one of its knight's hall as conference room with a wonderful view over the city of Budapest. The Embassy of France and its Cultural Institute generously offered the travel and accommodation costs of Professor Annette Becker (Paris), keynote speaker of the 1st day. The Czech, Slovak and Polish partners all were cooperative, with the latter via Anikó Katona the Hungarian National Gallery maintain already a professional relationship. All our partners were busy to suggest us participant(s) from their community which offered us the opportunity to meet great scholars we would not have been able to encounter otherwise. They also reported about the conference in their scientific community.</p> <p><i>weak points</i> The Slovak partner delegate a scholar speaking only French, but the Slovak institute assured a translator.</p>

OUTPUT no. 2.

TITLE OF THE EVENT/PRODUCT:	Conference proceedings
Dates (in case of event):	
Location (in case of event):	
<p>Description: What was the purpose of this output?</p>	<p><i>To preserve the results of the conference and make them accessible afterwards. We plan to make a scientific publication that will be a key literature in the future, regarding the region's history and history of art in this respective period (1914-1920). As you can see, we have collected 13 texts from various authors (Hungarian, Polish, Czech, Austrian, French). We consider this as a basis for an extended future publication.</i></p>
<p>Achievements: What did you achieve with this event/product? How did it contribute to the fulfilment of the project objective set in the application?</p>	<p><i>In the first phase of the afterlife of the conference, we only could gather conference papers for the Visegrad Grant online repository, but definitely we plan to edit an illustrated volume with more completed versions of these papers.</i> <i>During the implementation of the project we have realised that we would need much more financial resources for the proofreading and editing in order to make a proper scientific publication. In addition we have received feedbacks from the conference participants that a paper based publication would be much more appropriate to preserve all the results of the conference. Considering all this, we have decided to continue this project in the future in the means of an extended conference proceeding.</i></p>
<p>Dissemination/promotion: Event: How was the event</p>	<p><i>The product, the conference proceeding is available through our website: https://vcr2019.wordpress.com/publications/</i></p>



<p><i>promoted? List the media and include links if applicable.</i></p> <p>Product: <i>By what means did you promote and disseminate the product?</i></p>	<p><i>This is the un-edited version of the conference talks. We believe that we will be able to make a much more valuable conference proceedings based on this version in future, if we can gain financial resources for the printed publication. For this, we are also planning to hire get a professional translator for the proofreading, and we also plan to expand the volume with other additional texts as well. For this, we plan to re-apply for other resources in the future. Because we decided to continue to work on this volume, we didn't promote the current online version.</i></p>
<p>Target groups: <i>Which target groups were involved in this output and in what way? What was the number of people within each group? What was the balance in respect to V4 countries?</i></p> <p><i>Attach attendance list/s or other proof/s of involvement/participation to the Final Report, when possible.</i></p>	<p><i>In our original application we planned to reach the whole scientific community with the conference proceeding. Now, we have realised that with adding some extra work we will be able to improve this publication in order to make it a really significant literature that will be a reference point in the future. We also plan to make from this expanded publication a paper based real book, possibly distributed throughout the world.</i></p> <p><i>Because of this, currently we only plan to reach the community of the conference participants (speakers, chairmen and audience), approximately 30-50 people.</i></p>
<p>Partnership: <i>Describe each partner's involvement in realizing this output. Summarise the strong points and weak points of your partners' involvement within this output.</i></p>	<p><i>All of our partners have contributed with articles on their topics. Their museums and institutions also offered the digital pictures of their collections for the publication.</i></p> <p><i>Weak point: we didn't get the proper paper from our Slovak participant, who represented the Slovak partner, so we were unable to publish her work.</i></p> <p><i>We didn't get the texts from all conference participants, some of them referred that it was published elsewhere, others just refused to send it. We couldn't force them, but it was a bad experience that not everybody was active in this regard.</i></p>

2. IMPLEMENTATION

What progress/change did you achieve within the context/problem specified in the application?

We were successful to gather around many experienced specialists from the region as well as prominent researchers from France and U.S. We could share questions, ideas as well as research results. Since then Anikó Katona helped a couple of them (Gizem Tongo Overfield Shaw, Paul Stirton, Mariusz Knorowski) in pursuing research in the war poster archives of the Hungarian National Gallery (HNG), and some of them helped researchers of the HNG to research in their own collections (such as Mr. Knorowski). Also, we created the basis of a planned volume by collecting conferences presentations in completed versions



and illustrations. Only we have to find financial support to realize this expanded and printed volume.

What evaluation tools (indicators) were undertaken to report this progress/change throughout the project implementation? List them together with their conclusion/analysis.

One indicator was the number of audience which met our expectations concerning such a scientific event. Other indicator was the satisfaction of participants (speakers and audience): as organizers we are convinced that the conference was a great success, participants assured us that it was very informative, filling a gap. Our main goal was to support professional relationships between scholars of the region; and in this matter we had several great success: Facebook contacts and emails approved this (unfortunately we are not able to share all these personal messages). The invited conference speakers sent us happy acknowledgment mails. We got this letter from Dr. Knorowski (who was also our Polish partner):

“Dear Aniko & Zoltan,

I am asking you both to accept my apologies. Indeed, there was no time to say goodbye. The time was very limited and I had to “abandon ship” quickly. In fact, at the last minute I reached the airport. There was a lot of traffic. I suspect that the discussion was interesting, because my lecture could have stimulated Aleksandera's controversy, but anyway - to present and discuss the historical truth sometimes is terrific task and sometimes it should has to be objective. I consider this conference the best in my life, from organization to substantive content. You would love to see the publication. I hope to continue our relationship. I invite you always to the Poster Museum.

Best regards & greetings

Mariusz Knorowski
Chief Curator
Poster Museum at Wilanow”

The French Institute was represented in the opening day by Sébastien Reymond (Attaché de coopération scientifique, technique et universitaire), who was also satisfied with the event.

Identify the weak points of the project implementation. What would you do differently if you could start over again?

Deeper cooperation with universities to attract more students than we could thank to a better distribution as well.

Museum as a conference area is perfect because it offers a very rich environment to held conference on visual art. However, we could have imagined a better timing: since our international conference was held in 2019, the temporary exhibitions with a focus on WWI art were already closed and those with a focus on art of 1918-19 revolutions and on the creation of the new states during 1918-19 were not (yet) exploited in Budapest.

We didn't realise the amount of work and the required resources for the conference proceeding. Because of this we have to reapply for additional resources.

We also didn't realise how much work we will need to do to run the project, which was totally voluntary from our part (meaning the three organizers: Anikó Katona, Eszter Balázs, Zoltán Suba). Even though we have worked a lot for free, we are satisfied because we have learned very much from this project, and



Az eredetivel megegyező
hiteles másolat.

2020 AUG 13.

we believe that we could achieve our goals.

3. PARTNERSHIP

Do you plan to cooperate with these project partners in the future? If yes, in what way? If not, what could improve the partnership to make it a lasting cooperation for the future?

Yes, a cooperation has already started with the Polish partner (see his email), we are planning to visit each other and maybe engage in future common projects. Regarding the planned volume, we would like to involve Prof. Annette Becker as collaborator. We are also cooperating with dr. Stirton, who promised to help us in publishing some of the results in the US.

We also plan to keep contact with our Czech partner, we were discussing future museum projects, exhibitions, etc.

Weak point: we didn't have good experience with our Slovak partner. In the future we should try to find other Slovakian institutions and researchers to build professional contacts. However the Slovak Institute in Budapest was very friendly, helped and supported our project.

Summarise the strong points and the weak points of the partnership throughout the project.

Strong points:

- we built several great relationships with institutions and researchers as well
- we were able to create a friendly and really inspiring atmosphere to share views and knowledge
- there was absolutely no tension between the scholars of various nationality, which means that everyone was open to the others' national historical narratives regarding this very turbulent period. We have all learned very much about each other's history and tragedies through visual representations. A very good example for this was Tijana Palkojevic's presentation that made the 'Alban Golgota', Serbia's great national tragedy during WWI an experienceable horror for everyone (and which is very rarely discussed in Hungary otherwise).

Weak points:

- it was very hard to reach Slovak collaborators.
- the Czech Prague National Gallery is currently moving, so we were unable to involve their researchers more than we could.

4. FOLLOW-UP

How do you plan to build on the results achieved in this project in the future?

We intend to edit an illustrated volume with the completed versions of the conference papers around 2023-24.



If you plan to continue/run similar projects in the future, what improvements - based on experience from this project - do you foresee?

We plan to publish the conference proceeding in print format, for which we will need to reapply for funding. We plan to reapply with a different institution, possibly with a publishing house. We would like to plan the distribution of the publication as well, for which it would be nice to cooperate with a Western publishing house; it would be the best way to make the history and history of art of the Visegrad Region more known.

Prepared by: Anikó Katona, Eszter Balázs, Zoltán Suba

Signature of the statutory representative: Népessy Noémi

Stamp:

Date: 13.08.2020 Budapest



IVF's evaluation: (KEEP BLANK, TO BE COMPLETED BY IVF)	
Partnership:	
Level of achievement of the objective specified in the application:	
V4 relevance/feature:	
Communication with the grantee:	
Respect of the rules/deadlines/budget:	



Az eredetivel megegyező hiteles másolat.
2020 AUG 13.
[Handwritten signature]