



Opportunities and challenges of barrier-free tourism in Hungary



Editors:

**Dr. Tibor Gonda
Roger Schmidtchen**

Disability, accessibility, and mobility as basic existential characteristics

¹Jácint Farkas – ²Csilla Petykó

¹Corvinus University of Budapest, SZKDI, farkas.jacint@gmail.com

²Budapest Business School University of Applied Sciences, KVIK, petyko.csilla@uni-bge.hu

Abstract

Our study is linked to the theoretical and practical aspirations of the science of tourism, which seeks to map and create accessibility on both the demand side and the service provider side, it also provides a brief insight into the primarily philosophical extension of the concepts of accessibility and disability.

Therefore, we intend to outline, without claiming completeness, the contexts of “well-known” concepts, in the light of the referring statements of prominent thinkers in life- and anthropological philosophy as well as Buddhist philosophy, on disability, accessibility, and adaptation, through which participants in the world of travel can look at both the people involved and the services offered from a broader perspective.

Our work can create the basis for a new type of adaptive approach in the revision and development of tourism-related professional methods, which can be introduced in the near future.

Keywords: existential disability, barrier-free access, adaptation, accessibility, tourism services

Introduction

In tourism, regardless of its segments, people with disabilities, the elderly, and travellers with children, for instance, are receiving more and more attention. As a result of this, the dimension of accessibility has become inseparable from the mapping of the tasks arising from the implementation of accessibility.

We believe that either the well-known concepts of disability or accessibility and the conclusions generally drawn from them (GONDOS 2020) do not always serve the elimination of social inequalities, especially when disability is confronted with health, even unintentionally. (FARKAS 2019, FARKAS - PETYKÓ 2019)

Our research is a special mix of theoretical and practical methodologies because the main theme of the work is based on the original approach of the philosophy of life and philosophical hermeneutics. The study introduces two new concepts, rooted primarily in anthropological philosophy and philosophy of life: the *hermeneutic orb* and the *metavidum*²⁵. These concepts could not be presented in detail due to the limitations of this study, but both are seen as such an approach if you like an investigative “lighthouse”, which increase the number of interpretive and practical dimensions of *existential disability, accessibility, adaptation*, and, last but not least, sustainability. In this way, the so far undiscovered areas of the knowledge about them that can be acquired, become accessible to the human traveling in existence. One of the peculiarities of hermeneutical research is to make the world, accessible to humans, and the knowledge of existence, etc. approximate and merge, where it is possible, the fragmentation among horizons. Creating a circle where the knowledge of the past, such as what is left to us in writing, and the similar contents of our age come together, as a result of intellectual effort, and kind of fertilize each other. (GADAMER 2003). In our opinion this two-dimensional cognitive structure can and should be extended into three-dimensions, this is the *hermeneutic orb*. Which also symbolizes the whole canon of human knowledge. Thus, it is not about the horizons mentioned above, or closed disciplinary approaches, but we are all perceiving- and travelling the *ever-changing* horizon. We know and we can get to know this holistic perspective in more and more detail. However, due to its enormous

²⁵ A more detailed explanation of all these new or novel ways of philosophical examinations and ways of exploring concepts can be found in the PhD dissertation plan: *The possibilities of fulfilment inherent in existential disability - An insight into the world of meaning of the concept*. Which defence and discussion took place in June 2020. Its public defence of the final dissertation is expected to take place in the spring of 2021. (FARKAS 2020b)

size, depth, and complexity, to become transparent, research “around” and in the interior of the orb requires both the temporary abandonment of individuality and the attainment of the *metavidum* state. This can also be interpreted as one of the postmodern archetypes of the symbiotic human mentioned later. This aspect of attitude to life “nurtures” a close relationship with the Buddhist approach to philosophy tangentially mentioned in the present study. In which philosophy all living and inanimate entities inhabiting the Earth are in an inseparable and hierarchy-free relationship with each other (TÓTH - FARKAS 2019).

Thus, when we mention the hermeneutic horizon-fusion, we also mean the *hermeneutic orb*, and where we refer to the *symbiotic human*, the possible attainment of the *metavidum* state is also a self-evident goal.

This is closely matched by the specific tourism-science-research, which gets its data and claims primarily from the world of digital availability and accessibility.

1. About the existentially disabled human who separates itself from existence

As we know, nearly 6% of the world’s population has permanent vision-, hearing-, mental-, autistic-, musculoskeletal, etc. impairment or cumulative disability, the “so-called characteristics” resulting from one’s disability prevent them from developing an active - and in most cases independent - way of living in the society (FARKAS – PETYKÓ 2019).

Considering the contexts of life philosophy in our researches so far, it has become clear to us that how disability is used in an ordinary sense, simply do not cover the extremely wide and deep ranges of interpretation of existence, available to people as an opportunity. Disability, as an independent concept, can be a professional “treat” etymologically and linguistically for the experts. We do not have adequate professional preparedness for these interpretations. We made this notice because the forthcoming description of the attempt to expand and deepen the concept will not address linguistic issues. Furthermore, we share Heidegger’s philosophy “task-assigning” position, in which he sharply separates the two modes of investigation: “*Besides, “subject” and “object” are erroneous terms in metaphysics, which in the form of Western “logic” and “grammar” has appropriated its interpretation of language from the beginning. What is hiding in this process is what we just beginning to guess today. To free the language from grammar and pave the way for it to a more original structure of essence; it awaits for thinking and spending.*” (HEIDEGGER 1994: 118).

So where we started was: how the human, who has moved away from its own spiritual region of origin (HEIDEGGER 2019) - or, as we call it, from the source region -, is able to interpret more correctly than ever its own opportunities for the cognition of existence including ontological-, epistemological- and transcendent dimensions?

Without exaggeration, the questions raised above have been generating philosophical discourses for thousands of years. For our part, as we have already pointed out, we do not want to take a stand for or against any of the categorical approaches. We seek to outline a synthesis - if not in full detail - that is unconventional in European and North American philosophy and various disciplines, such as, in our case, tourism studies, but it is fully accepted in Buddhist philosophy.

Hence in our interpretation, the descriptions, so, the created concepts of being and existence, arranged along with the absolutes, hierarchies, and dualities, in most cases distance us from reality. As a more optimistic approach, they create permanent and seemingly unbreakable “walls” between humans and reality (HEIDEGGER 1988). Consequently, the term disability, existential-philosophically is a consequence of the *splitting* associated with JASPERS (2004). In Jaspers’ interpretation, the above-mentioned splitting is an artificial separation of subject and object. As a result of this one tries to put oneself once in one perspective and another time into another. This self-perpetrated violence further cleaves this particular, already dual state of existence, which has critical consequences anyway (JASPERS 2008).

Worth mentioning here Jaspers’ proposal for the resolution of the above-mentioned, high-risk state of being, which is nothing more than a state called: *comprehensive-state* (JASPERS 1996). According to our interpretation, the German philosopher discusses the way and necessity of achieving

and maintaining this in almost all of his work. The essential elements of this are the following: it is necessary to build a bridge between the subject and the object to achieve the ability of orientation and the relative stability in existence. This bridge connects the two perspectives, and this structure is built up of the elements of communication (NYÍRI 2015). The tangible and empirically traceable way to do this, is to create or can be created by implementing accessible travel (FARKAS - PETYKÓ 2019).

Therefore, we see the juxtaposition of disability and health as the coercion of self-determination of an *existentially disabled* person who cannot accept the ever-changing nature of his or her own existence (FARKAS 2019).

We would like to note, that we do not try to deny the existence of physical-, sensory-, mental-, or a set of disabilities, we interpret disability only as a feature of the human body – which is perceptible in most cases - arising from its finiteness, fragility, and transiency. In the case of social disability, we share the relevant views of the science of disability that the listed permanent or temporary conditions may indeed impede the well-being of the people in their own environment. So reaching both the demand and supply side of the world of travel can be challenging for them (GONDOS 2020). Thus, the affected people cannot or can, but only in very difficult circumstances, take advantage of the opportunities and services provided by society. This disability often “spreads” to their relatives and helpers as well. Therefore, we define the “classic” classifications of disabilities as functional disabilities, by referring to the aspirations of disability science that we also consider to be correct, which draws attention from the medical nature of disabilities to social limitations.

Thus, the fact that the above-mentioned existential disability affects all people significantly rewrites our technical terms of disability, which have been used so far - almost in a determinative-, but definitely in a discriminatory way. We also hope that it will have a positive effect on society's attitude towards itself as well as humans in the medium term.

Ferdinand Tönnies' view on the organization of societies partly confirms our position, although he does not explicitly or implicitly mention the so-called disabilities of humans. According to the German scientist, humans were once part of nature, forming a community with nature and their fellow human beings. Then, gradually, “artificially,” created the increasingly complex artificial social arrangements (TÖNNIES 1983). As a result, common human values and interests then became increasingly distant. Thus, Tönnies outlines a form of alienation. However, he described the paths from the natural state to the artificial state as an evolutionary process, but this finding is significantly different from our views we have outlined.

Gehlen's interpretation is partly similar to this: people were forced to create society and culture because its physical endowments were far behind the animals living around them and because of its physique, they were unable to survive long-term environmental changes due to weather conditions, for example (GEHLEN 1976).

Adler adds to this that the history of social progress is about, among other things, how people worked together to overcome their disabilities and their lack of certain skills (ADLER 1998).

What Tönnies, Gehlen, and Adler did not state, at least in our interpretation, from an existence theory point of view, Jaspers does instead of them in his book, *What is the human? Philosophical thinking for everyone*: “*Humans may even be disabled compared to animals*” (JASPERS 2008: 163).

Alfred Adler approached from a psychological perspective how disability applies to all of us. In his book “*The science of living*”, he devotes a chapter to demonstrate the limitations of the abilities of human beings. Similarly to Gehlen's position, the author believes that the results of human creativity almost one by one - including the formation and use of languages - are the results of the pressure to adapt, what pressure originates from the disabilities and weaknesses of human beings. Adler writes in the previously mentioned chapter of his book: “*Among other things, the story of social progress is about how people worked together to overcome their disabilities and the lack of certain abilities. Everyone knows that language is a social achievement, but only a few are aware that the weakness and imperfection of each person was the trigger of this achievement.*” (ADLER 1998: 23).

All three thinkers have confirmed to us that functional and existential disabilities are necessarily a separable human way to be. Philosophical anthropology formulates its comparisons between humans

and the animal kingdom through this perspective. In most cases, the thinking human is defeated by its existential companions in nature, if the physical and biological endowments, necessary for survival, are the basis of comparison (HORVÁTH 2019).

In our opinion, humans are beings who began to know their habitat and themselves as they were born into nature and living in *symbiosis* with it. The conditions for their survival were given from the moment of their appearance. In our interpretation, members of the flora and fauna, like us humans, are free from the state of perfection but the state of imperfection too. The framework of this study does not allow a detailed explanation of Buddha's teaching that there is no artificial distinction between humans and their environment. Of course, the obvious differences appear in the teaching, but they are highlighted only in certain places to drive attention to the unique possibility that distinguishes humans from all life forms on our planet, so that humans may become able to know the existence and themselves, and therefore getting rid of the cycle of suffering.²⁶

In our opinion, in parallel and equivalent to the definition of *homo sapiens sapiens*, humans can also be called *symbiotic*. This innately *unity-being* carried in itself the qualities potentially associated with existential disability. At that time humans could not even be called accessibility-creators, knowing that their existence intertwined with nature they did not see their environment as a tangled web of obstacles, but as an inherent feature of life, and they adapted to it.

Kropotkin's theory of evolution points out, albeit, through the observations of members of the animal kingdom, that cooperation as the basic motive for tribal development is inevitable (KROPOTKIN 1908). Without these, the categorical statements about humans' place and role would not have been formed, just as POLÁNYI's (2004) theory of reciprocity came to the forefront of our study in a similar way.

If we consider the findings of Gadamer's hermeneutic method on knowledge horizons as a basis, the theories of Kropotkin and Károly Polányi go hand in hand. This theory states, for example, that the interpretation of a text, primarily takes place in a historical context, and when the author's actual message is "brought to life" in the current, present moment, a merging of interpretive horizons occurs (GADAMER 2003). We also consider the science of tourism as such, knowing that the mostly practical knowledge accumulated in it, also contributes to the expansion of the aforementioned hermeneutical knowledge base.

We believe that this horizon-fusion can be achieved more effectively if we not only try to bring to life, only at the level of our thoughts, the philosophical message preserved in writing, for example, but also we express orally the questions, statements, and opinions formed in our consciousness, in the company of people who are interested in that particular topic or affected in that case in some way.

Going back to the complementary nature of the theories developed by Kropotkin and Polanyi, it is worth to see that both philosophers in their field - based on the results of their empirical studies - came to the life-philosophically substantiated conclusion that humans' ability to cooperate is not only one of the later developed characteristics for survival but also an ontological foundation of its existence. It's quite simply the consequence of the two eyes, two ears, two hands ... etc. Without their cooperation ("the right hand does not know what the left is doing") one would be unviable (KATONA 2014).

Thus, in our opinion, mutual help and reciprocity are a set of attitudes that create humans in a spiritual sense, define our world, and can be originated from the experiences of discoveries made during travels. Even partial oblivion of all these fundamentally changes the *individuals* of our time. In connection with the (post)modern image of a human, which is becoming independent, we note that we consider the transcendence of individuality to be the *gateway* to the possibilities of fulfillment inherent in existential disability, so the formation of the so-called *metavidum* (FARKAS 2020b).

²⁶ In the study, *The terminologies of two religious leaders. Rhetoric about communities in Pope Francis' and Dalai Lama's tweets*, published in 2019, we analysed the Twitter communication of the Dalai Lama XIV and Pope Francis (TÓTH - FARKAS 2019). It revealed that the Buddhist leader interprets Buddha's teaching as it is originally written, about the inextricable connection among human beings, animals, plants, and even the inanimate natural formations.

Since the framework of this study does not allow us to explain the concept and express the relation to existence and to our fellow human beings, which is different by its nature, it can be summarized as follows in the context of the hermeneutic examination: one of the basic conditions for the applicability of the fragmentation-free hermeneutic approach is the temporary abandonment of the researcher-individual to "exchange" for the dissolution into the so-called *metavidium* state. So the fragmented nature of getting to know our world and the knowledge we have acquired so far simply forces us to give up our individuality, which is essential to our discoveries, to create a unified, though not homogeneous, picture of our constantly expanding knowledge for the sake of our quality-existence (CSIKÓS 2008).

We believe that this state of forgetfulness is another stage or stop of the above mentioned Heideggerian (2019) theory of forgetfulness of forgetting existence. Becoming human is not about reaching one step of evolution, or jumping there, it is much more than that. We interpret humanization as a never-ending process that, in addition to the undoubtedly necessary tribal developmental and biological attitudes, requires a lot of spiritual effort from us.

The existential disability that characterizes all of us is, on the one hand, the result of a cleavage process. One manifestation of this is the juxtaposition of functional disability with the ideal image of an imagined healthy person. On the other hand, it is a direct consequence of the humane-oblivion. We highlight three aspects of this. The first aspect is the gradual forgetting of the principle and practice of mutual help and reciprocity. The second is the belief of becoming human becomes final. The third is the non-recognition of the *dukkha* experience, known in Buddhist philosophy. What does it in short means, that humans are more and more unable to recognize and acknowledge the unsatisfactory nature of existence.

In the next chapter, this triple articulation gives the starting point for the explanation of the concept of the accessibility-creator human.

2. The differences between the adaptable-human and the accessibility-creator human

Priorly, we presented to our readers our position on the difference between functional disability and existential disability, what we call ontology. In the following, we will talk about the philosophical aspects of human activity, which is called accessibility-creation in our everyday life, and which presupposes primarily technical transformations. These aspects are kind of preparing the closing remarks of our study, the extension of the scope, and ways of applying the access to information in travel-planning and operation. This, in our understanding, is also the measure of the degree of accessibility furthermore it is independent of the presence of functional disabilities.

We have already found that human beings, by the reasons of their peculiar physical and conscious structure, are compelled to organize their society and their cultures. As Gehlen and Adler explained. Although we share this view, we also add that these types of activities, driven by human disabilities are precisely the catalysts of existential disability. One of the "results" of this is almost the demonization of functional disabilities.

Going further on the life-philosophical paths of concept-analysis and -creation, we have, of course, encountered the barriers of accessibility. Already in the course of explaining existential disability, the possibility arose to examine the issue of the compulsion for accessibility. Nowadays, it has become clear that precisely as a result of technological development we are creating more and more obstacles and barriers around us (BYUNG-CHUL 2019).

We see human life primarily as a *symbiotic existence*, as we have already pointed out in several cases. One of the characteristics of this is that humans adapt to their environment, and this adaptation has and requires only the amount of need for change that ensures the survival of all the involved *existence-factors*. By this, we mean, for example, the forms of shaping the living environment where the design of it involves minimal limitations (SCHUMACHER 1991).

During our investigations, we follow the footsteps of the Heideggerian "concept-purification", we dug deeper and deeper, searching for the original meanings of accessibility. One of the stops on this

journey of discovery was to learn about Erich Fromm's work and to integrate his thoughts into this subject. In his work, *The Art of Loving*, Fromm talks about love and emotions in such contexts that, after the publication of the book, resonated greatly among scholars as well as among laic readers. He approaches the appearance of love in our world and its roles in existence as if it could only reveal its true face when operating in perfect harmony with rationality (FROMM 2012).

Besides, the Dalai Lama XIV. express his thoughts similarly in a volume summarizing interviews with him about our social responsibility. According to him, love is one of the most logical things in the world (TENZIN 2005, GOLEMAN 2015).

The world of thoughts just mentioned has been an astonishingly inspiring force to understand-, live- and, in this case, to articulate in writing more clearly why we consider the differences between the adaptive human and the accessibility-creator human to be cardinally significant. There seems to be no big difference between the two human activities, as in both cases, one modifies the given structure of its natural environment to allow itself and its companions the survival. In contrast, in our age, aspects of comfort are increasingly taking the lead, at least in the western world and in some of the *more developed* countries in Asia. However, we see that the difference between the two types can be experienced in the best way through the line of thoughts outlined about emotions and rationality.

How we define a concept and organize it into a hierarchy of values is often done along the contours of a passed-on socio-psychological and sociocultural framework. Furthermore, it also depends on if we recognize the process nature of their existence and the resulting multitude of flexibility factors that also affect our concepts (KOLAKOWSKI 2012).

Of course, this type of automated reaction mechanism has its advantages, and in many cases, it is necessary to use these practiced reactions in everyday life. In our case, however, it is necessary to see that accessibility is (also) used almost at the level of stereotypes, so we do not interpret the concept pointing to a given activity.

Fromm, in a similar way, sheds light on the use of love, which - in his opinion and in ours too - is used as a product for consumers, and degraded it:

"People think that love is easy; only the right object is hard to find for our love or affection. There are various reasons for this attitude, and each of them is rooted in the development of modern society. One reason is the great change that took place in the twentieth century in the selection of the "object of love." (...) Love is an activity, not a passive emotion; we do not fall into it, but we cope with it. Most commonly, we can describe the acting nature of love as loving is primarily about giving, not receiving. (...), The carpenter apprentice first learns how to plan a tree; the novice pianist practices the scales; in zen archery, apprenticeship begins with breathing exercises. Who wants to be a master must dedicate his or her whole life to it, but at least he or she must adapt to it. The person itself becomes a tool in practicing art and must maintain such specific functions that he or she must conform to. In the art of love, this means that whoever wants to be a master in it must first practice discipline, concentration, and patience at every stage of his or her life." (FROMM 2008: 2, 14, 64).

To the fulfillment of Fromm's psychological and philosophical worldview was an indisputable contribution, that he became acquainted with the Zen Buddhism and one of its initiated, excellent thinkers, the Japanese Buddhist philosopher Professor Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, with whom they had passionate oral debates. Fromm himself introduces us to this process and to the mutually fruitful nature of their friendship, which has deepened over time. For example, in their work *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis* were written by the two of them (FROMM, SUZUKI 1995).

Degradation is a strong statement, but in our view, it is unfortunately appropriate. We would like to point out that precisely the rationality of the most beautiful and important fulfilment possibilities of human existence is getting lost (BYUNG-CHUL 2019).

Similarly, to the differences between the adaptive- and the accessibility-creator human, a kind of difference emerged which, in our view, resulted in the emergence of non-self-evident, non-self-existent differences. The adaptive human - like the existential disability - carried the ability of accessibility in itself. When it specifically articulates, it labels its activities, and classifies them as

independent “entities,” it becomes more and more distant from being and existence (WITTGENSTEIN 1989). Thus, it sees a multitude of obstacles both in nature and in its narrowest environment.

This is how the *logical* symbiosis of emotion and intellect is transformed into sets of emotions and rationalities (FROMM 2002), just as nowadays the unimaginable achievements of technical civilization, or social institutional systems, have transformed into a global obstacle-course.

Behind our categorical claims, however, we want to speak out against the messages of communication- and business channels that suggest extremes. We argue that the accessibility-creator human can regain the status of the adaptive human, just as the path is open to the existentially disabled human to become again a symbiotic one of its existence. Thus, the humans’ drift in existence, outlined by Heidegger (2019), can be transformed into a journey again (FARKAS 2019). The latter transformation can also be created through *physical* journeys that take place today. In our view, the paradigm of the travel, what makes you happy – the happy traveller, outlined by Michalkó (2010) implicitly anticipates the above-mentioned state-change. However, the basic condition for this, among other things, is (also) creating barrier-free access to the already mentioned information and its information-communication conditions. The following chapter provides an insight into our research in this area.

3. On the connections between accessibility and tourism

Examining the situation of people with disabilities, how - within the framework of the present study - we relate to accessibility and its creation in the field of tourism is, in our opinion, an important social issue. This attitude is a good indication of the “maturity” of a country’s population. However, moving beyond the moral approach, it should also be properly seen that this is also an economic issue in the tourism industry. Whether we care about the needs of a population group or, within other frameworks: the demand segment, whether we try to meet those needs at the level of services, is also an economic decision. In the following, we formulate our thoughts on this topic without claiming completeness.

Based on the 2016 micro census survey the number of people with disabilities in Hungary is 408 021 (4.3% of the total population) (KSH 2018). This statistical data is astonishing at first, as looking back over a longer period, we know that roughly 5% of the Hungarian population belongs to this social group. The census data conducted in 2011 also showed this proportion, as 490 578 people classified themselves in this category (KSH 2018). The question immediately arises: what might have happened to the more than 80 000 people between 2011 and 2016? One of the main reasons for the significant decrease in the number of people with disabilities measured in the statistical data is the significant transformation of the system of health-related social benefits in the indicated period. The eligibility conditions of the benefit-system have been changed, the disability pension has been abolished, the benefits for the elderly-care have been changed to pensions, and the reintegration of those, who affected, into the labour market has been reviewed. As a result of all these measures, from 2011 to 2012 the number of people receiving benefits related to health status in the register of the Central Administration of National Pension Insurance decreased by almost 70,000 (KSH 2018). The other main reason for the changes, in our interpretation, is the discrimination against people with disabilities, which may also have resulted in a reduction in the number of people who identify themselves as disabled. Of course, the fact that the positive benefits of the improvement in the effectiveness of medical devices since 2011 and the further developed medical procedures, may also have contributed to the reduction in the number of people living with disabilities, is also acceptable to us.

All in all, as definite data do not support the fact of a significant number of positive changes in the health status of people living with disabilities, we consider that at the time of writing our study, their share in the Hungarian population is unchanged: nearly 5% (0.5 million people).

Looking at all European countries, experts in the field have presented different data in their studies on the proportion of people with disabilities in the population. According to RAFFAY and GONDA (2020), almost 10% of the European population (74 million people) are affected by some form of disability, while GONDOS (2020) writes that 20% of the population of the European Union (89 million people) is projected to be disabled by 2020.

Without arguing the numbers determined by the experts based on different criteria, the magnitude speaks for itself. From the tourism point of view, therefore, we can talk about a significant

segment on the demand side, which would be a very bad decision to ignore. As we cannot yet consider that accessibility is understood by a wide range of Hungarian tourism professionals in the extended way we formulated (FARKAS – PETYKÓ 2019), we must also mention that people with disabilities have special travel needs. Taking these into account and developing services in this way is the key to involve them in tourism. Similar to the findings of RAFFAY and GONDA (2020), our research experience also supports that accessibility has already been implemented in several elements at the level of declarations, but unfortunately, the levels of practice show a different picture in many cases.

Ensuring accessibility is also one of the development goals both in the European Union and Hungary. However, accessibility requirements need to be interpreted in many different ways and many different areas. In the present study, as mentioned earlier, we expand in more detail the area of access to information.

Accessibility means, among other things, equal access to information and communication systems for people with disabilities. However, its implementation is still lagging behind nowadays. For example, in the EU27 countries, only 5% of public websites meet the accessibility requirements of web interfaces (Gondos 2020).

In Hungary, after the data collection of the 2016 micro census, the limitations and “obstacles” of people with disabilities in Hungary were examined in certain areas of activity. The results show that the majority of people with disabilities (59%) experienced difficulties in everyday life, as well as nearly half of them in the transport system. Even though the number of people defining themselves as disabled has decreased by 17%, in the areas of functionalities, the number of people with disabilities has increased compared to the 2011 data. Such as the case of communication and information acquisition related to our topic, where the growth rate was almost 8% (KSH 2018). This situation also predicts the characteristics of the condition experienced in tourism.

Before travelling, everyone needs information to make a plan that suits their own considerations. According to researchers, when planning their travels, people with disabilities need to spend much more time to obtain the necessary information than non-disabled people (UN 2003 quotes FIELD 2019). In examining accessible tourism, EICHHORN and BUCHALIS (2011) name three types of barriers, barriers to physical access, barriers in attitudes, and lack of information. They also find that information on services available to people with disabilities is inadequate.

There is currently no database in Hungary that would provide reliable, accurate information on accessible tourist services and attractions (MEZŐ 2019). To get an idea of the accessible services and the information provided by the service providers about them, in the autumn of 2019 we examined the websites of 3 spa- and 22 wellness hotels in Budapest within the framework of a student project. The study focused on the following characteristics: whether it is indicated on a website if the hotel is accessible; whether the hotel and its public spaces, rooms, traffic routes, car park are barrier-free or accessible; if the hotel has a barrier-free room, does it appear among the room facilities; whether the hotel employs a person with a disability and whether the staff is prepared to welcome a person with a disability (training, etc.).

As a result of the project, only 10 out of the 25 hotels in Budapest had clear information on accessibility on their websites, no further information was available at all in the case of 10, and in the case of the remaining 5, it could be concluded from some references that minimal accessibility is achieved.

The results showed that the accessible services of the hotels surveyed - if they indicated it on their website - provide opportunities primarily for people with reduced mobility. None of the 25 hotels advertised services for the hearing impaired, for example, and only 5 websites had information on the free entry for guide dogs. In none of the cases did the websites provide detailed information on the specific features of accessible rooms. It should be noted that the study of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (KSH) cited several times above also shows that a large number of people with autism and oral disabilities appeared in the examined period “*in front of the public*”. For them, it is at least as important to provide availability for physical- and online spaces.

We did not find any available information on whether the hotels surveyed employ anyone with a disability or whether their staff is adequately trained to welcome guests with a disability.

Overall, the domestic examples show significant shortcomings on the service provider side. The narrow framework of the information provided by the websites reinforces the assumption that very few accessible services are currently available on the supply side of Hungarian tourism. As a consequence, this also means that the implementation of accessibility is further away from us in time than it should be expected, and as we would like it to be.

4. Summary

Our study cannot be called comprehensive in every detail, which is due not only to the limitation of it but also to the almost inexhaustible depths of the subject. Furthermore, the implementation of our primary research required for this is still in its initial phase, which will primarily reveal the connections among the tourism approach in Hungary as well as the supply- and the demand side. Thus, the present study primarily discusses the theoretical and philosophical background of this initial situation.

It may be questionable whether the explorations of concepts in a philosophical way (HEIDEGGER 1994) and findings that may seem foreign to the discipline at first glance, may hold their place in tourism research. In our opinion, however, by completing the self-definitions and establishing the philosophical foundations of this still relatively young field of expertise also contributes to its recognition both in the domestic and international disciplinary space.

In our time, it is a factual statement that the autonomy of independent disciplines is not damaged by the emergence of either multi- or trans-science, arising from postmodernity (MICHALKÓ 2016).

The growing number of travellers with disabilities itself stimulates both the tourism service providers and legislators. If we supplement this with the growth rates of the European Union forecast quoted in the study, we have almost stepped out of the framework of tourism, as the creation of an accessible, barrier-free, and the sustainable social environment becomes a noble social condition.

If the scientific community embraces our claim that disability, accessibility, and adaptation are basic, existential human features, then it will not only be conceivable but will also become mandatory to redesign and make online platforms accessible to all.

Our everyday life is shadowed by a pandemic at the moment. As we can see, this has effects on tourism, if not fatal, but it is certainly shocking. In our view, accessible and adaptive intellectual and technological approaches as well as the practice can make a person more responsive to such a situation more effectively and humanely. Knowing that globalization organized humanity into such a *multidimensional network* that, in addition to providing “infinite” possibilities, can cause shocking regression due to the vulnerability of the web.

The relationship between networking and accessibility can be learned in more detail shortly in FARKAS's (2020a) study focusing on this area. As in the field of sustainability, this can be done similarly in the study of FARKAS - PETYKÓ (2019).

Acknowledgments

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

References

- ADLER, A. (1998): *Életismeret*. Kossuth Kiadó, Budapest.
- BYUNG - C. H. (2019): *A kiegészítés társadalma*. Typotex Elektronikus Kiadó, Budapest.
- CSIKÓS, E. (2008): *Élő gondolkodás - A folyamatfilozófia klasszikusai: Hegel és Whitehead*. L'Harmattan kiadó, Budapest.

- FARKAS, J. (2020a): *A hálózatok, mint az akadálymentesség és az akadálygenerálás határpontjai - Rövid útikalauz az együttműködések életfilozófiai jelentésvilágaiban történő eligazodáshoz.* Tanulmány megjelenés alatt.
- FARKAS, J. (2020b): *Az egzisztenciális fogyatékoságban rejlő kiteljesedési lehetőségek -Betekintés a fogalom jelentésvilágába.* PhD értekezéstervezet. Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem, Budapest.
- FARKAS J. (2019): Az akadálymentesítés primátusa a turisztikai termékfejlesztésben. In: Irimiás A., Jászberényi M., Michalkó G. (szerk.): *Innovatív turisztikai termékfejlesztés*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. pp.146-156.
- FARKAS, J. – PETYKÓ, CS. (2019): Utazás az akadálymentesség, a fogyatékoság és a fenntarthatóság multidiszciplináris és bölcséleti dimenzióiba. *Turizmus Bulletin* 19(4): pp.13-22.
- FROMM, E. (2008): *A szeretet művészete.* Háttér Kiadó, Budapest.
- FROMM, E. (2002): *Menekülés a szabadság elől.* Napvilág Kiadó, Budapest.
- FROMM, E., Suzuki, D. T. (1995): *Zen-Buddhizmus és pszichoanalízis.* Helikon Kiadó, Budapest.
- GADAMER, H-G. (2003): *Igazság és módszer.* Osiris Kiadó, Budapest
- GEHLEN, A. (1976): *Az ember.* Gondolat Könyvkiadó, Budapest.
- GOLEMAN, D. (2015): *A jóság hatalma.* A dalai láma látomása az emberiségről. Libri Kiadó, Budapest.
- GONDOS, B. (2020): *Speciális igények a turizmusban – A mozgáskorlátozottak helye szerepe, és lehetősége a turisztikai szektorban.* Széchenyi István Egyetem, Győr.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (2019): *Lét és idő.* Osiris Kiadó és Szolgáltató Kft., Budapest.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (1994): *"...Költőien lakozik az ember..."*. T-Twins Kiadó, Budapest.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (1988): *A műalkotás eredete.* Európa Könyvkiadó, Budapest.
- JASPERS, K. (2008): *Mi az ember? – Filozófiai gondolkodás mindenkinek.* Media Nova Kiadó, Budapest.
- JASPERS, K. (2004): *A filozófiai hit.* Attraktor Kiadó. Gödöllő.
- JASPERS, K. (1996): *Bevezetés a filozófiába.* Európa Kiadó, Budapest.
- KATONA F. (2014): *Az emberi kéz kultúrtörténete.* Medicina Könyvkiadó, Budapest.
- KOLAKOWSKI, L. (2012): *Mit kérdeznek tőlünk a nagy filozófusok?* Typotex Kiadó, Budapest.
- KROPOTKIN, A. P. (1908). *A kölcsönös segítség, mint természettörvény.* Atheneum Könyvkiadó, Budapest.
- KSH (2018): *Mikrocenzus 2016. 8. A fogyatékos és az egészségi ok miatt korlátozott népesség jellemzői.* Budapest
- MEZŐ, N. (2019): *Az információk hozzáférhetőségének centrális jelentősége az akadálymentes turizmusban.* Szakdolgozat. BGE KVIK, Budapest
- MICHALKÓ, G. (2016): *Turizmológia.* Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- MICHALKÓ, G. (2010): *Boldogító utazás.* MTA Földrajztudományi Kutatóintézet, Budapest.
- NYÍRI, T. (2015): *Antropológiai vázlatok.* Corvinus Kiadó, Budapest.
- POLÁNYI, K. (2004): *A nagy átalakulás – Korunk gazdasági és politikai gyökerei.* Napvilág Kiadó, Budapest.
- RAFFAY, Z. – GONDA, T. (2020): Az akadálymentes turizmus innovatív jó gyakorlata. *Modern Geográfia*, 2020/IV. pp.1-14.
- SCHUMACHER, F. E. (1991): *A kicsi szép.* Közgazdasági- és Jogi Könyvkiadó, Budapest.

TENZIN, G. (2005): *Egyetemes felelősségtudat*. Trajan Könyvműhely, Budapest.

TÓTH, T., FARKAS, J. (2019): The terminologies of two religious leaders. Rhetoric about communities in Pope Francis' and Dalai Lama's tweets.– *European Journal of Science and Theology*. 15(5): pp. 159-178.

TÖNNIES, F. (1983): *Közösség és társadalom*. Gondolat Kiadó, Budapest.

WITTGENSTEIN, L. (1989): *A bizonyosságról*. Európa Könyvkiadó, Budapest.

Other sources

EICHHORN, V. – BUCHALIS, D. (2011): Accessibility – A Key Objective for the Tourism Industry. In Buhalis, D. & Darcy, S. (Eds.) *Accessible Tourism: Concepts and Issues*, Bristol: Channel View Publications. pp. 46-61.

ResearchGate online. Elérhetőség/hozzáférés:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292258255_Accessibility_A_key_objective_for_the_tourism_industry/download (letöltés dátuma: 2020. augusztus 8.)