

Hungarian and Finnish Family Farming in Village Community from the 1950s to the 1980s

Péter PORKOLÁB

1 Introduction

This article purports to present the village family life both in Hungary and in Finland from the 1940s to the middle of the 1980s. The method of study was the one of participating observation and the concrete data is preserved on magnetic tapes in the possession of the author. Such a method, aiming to introduce the life of one farmer family from both countries within the above mentioned period, has not been applied before. Another explanation is relevant at the outset: because everyday language usage often confuses the concepts of 'country', 'rural' and 'village', in this article the term 'village' has been adopted as it refers to a distinct community whereas the other ones are more indefinite.

Significant political and economic changes took place in both countries after the Second World War, thus my research harks back to the 1940s. These changes should be taken into consideration; otherwise understanding later events would be impossible. Furthermore, in the middle of the 1980s remarkable changes took place in the village life both in Hungary and Finland, as well as in the life of the studied families. These changes introduced a new era in the life of village people.

The main role in this article is played by active villagers who lead their lives, work and earn their living in a village. They are the 'full value' members of the village community; therefore their whole life connects them to their village. This article does not deal with those village inhabitants, who commute or lead a

double life and have a home in another settlement as well. It also means that the situation of the whole rural society is not discussed but a rather determinative stratum of it.

The two families did not become the subject of research by chance. As a result of a wider survey, they both seemed suitable for a comparison from the point of view of the present study. It was important that both families should represent a determinative stratum of families and family farms in their own countries. From Hungary the village of Tiszadob (in the north-eastern Szabolcs-Szatmár County) and family Porkoláb, while from Finland the village of Lankamaa (in Central-Finnish Laukaa parish) and family Hienonen were chosen. The following aspects were considered in choosing the particular families:

- The families had lived in the same settlement at least for a period of three generations
- The families have had a connection to agriculture and farming at least for a period of three generations
- Within the time period of the research the family members led their lives as active villagers in the given village.

Participant observation had a great significance in the research. The life of the Hungarian family on the farm has been personally observed since the 1970s, while it was possible to collect data on the Finnish family for a three-year period from 2000. The Finnish family had been visited and observed for a number of occasions to make a deeper study possible. One may remark that neither of the families had any significant interest in politics, although, for instance, it was customary for the Finnish family to support the politics that promoted agrarian interests.

This study is structured as follows: first, the results of the research carried out in Hungary, the history of countryside, the village and the family are described. While analyzing the situation in Hungarian village community, more examples about the given village are cited than in the case of the Finnish countryside. It is due to the fact, that the events that took place in Hungarian villages as a result of collectivization require deeper introduction to the whole community. In Finland private farms

could function continuously and communal activities were formulated solely through contacts between friends or neighbors. The analysis of Finnish village community and the Finnish family follows the part discussing Hungarian settings.

2 Hungarian Villages from 1945 to the middle of the 1980s

In Hungary the political turn after 1945 changed the social structure of the village to a great extent. After the system of large estates came to an end, those without landed property, as well as small-holders were provided land or landed property according to the Land Redistribution Act enacted on 17 March 1945.¹ Already in spring 1945 villagers started to carry away belongings from the estates of Counts; they were encouraged both by sheer aversion and anger, but also by the post-war political upheaval. On 15th April 1945 the first land distribution ceremony took place also in Tiszadob. The Land Redistribution Committee invited priests and all the villagers to the event.

In 1945 the plans of the communist and Smallholders' Party were executed throughout the country in the process of land redistribution. Accordingly, agricultural workers, manorial servants, as well as dwarf and small-holders owning land less than 10 cadastral holds (one hold = 0.5755 hectares) were given new land. In the villages land claiming committees were formed from claimants for land. They distributed the land following the principles and wishes of the above-mentioned two political lines. In Tiszadob the land claims committee was called together from those agricultural workers who had not found work on large estates before 1945 owing to their leftist political views and also because the quality of their work was not sufficient enough for the demands of the landowners. Consequently, they represented the poorest stratum of the rural society.

Land distribution was completed at a great speed throughout the whole country, affecting 34.6% of the territory of the country,² namely 5.6 million cadastral holds.³ 60% of this territory was given to agricultural workers, manor servants and dwarf holders. As a result Hungary became the land of smallholders.⁴

However, these newly formed small estates lacked the necessary means of production and cattle – draught power or sowing-

seeds for cultivation. Also the adequate knowledge and agricultural competence were missing in many cases. Landless people and those owning only a small plot were not earlier forced to plan and think comprehensively of all small details in organizing agricultural production. For many who faced these tasks for the first time, it was very difficult to start. Obviously those owning bigger farms or estates already before 1945 were in a more advantageous position, mainly in respect of agricultural organization and planning. Experience and knowledge accumulated and handed over through generations is more valuable in many cases than larger landed property and bigger stock, or a larger variety of equipment. The very farming itself requires a holistic approach and knowledge gained through instruction and experience, and it cannot be replaced by anything else.

The speeded-up execution of land distribution was not only due to the general land-hunger in the country, but also to Soviet political influence. Voroshilov, the Chairman of the Allied Control Commission, made it clear to the Hungarian leaders that the early accomplishment of land redistribution also serves Soviet military interests, i.e. that of the Red Army. The argument behind this was: if people realize the quick accomplishment of land redistribution, they will jettison the Fascist Arrow-Cross Government and the nation may become united.⁵ Thus the Soviet leadership exercised influence on Hungarian policy as well as Hungarian people and public life as soon as they appeared in the country. The Soviet authority ended only with the change of the regime in 1989–1990.

In spite of land redistribution, many people remained without land, or gained only a small landed property, which was not enough to provide living for a family. Many of these families left the villages and started a new life in a city, where as a result of national industrialization program factories were built attracting masses of village dwellers.⁶ In Hungary the flow of migration from the countryside to the cities, from agriculture to industry was continuous from the 1940s until the collapse of heavy industry.

Those leaving Tiszadob did not choose commuting as so many did in other parts of the country, but they looked for new

livelihood in cities. They settled in the industrial area of Borsod. As the distance between Tiszadob and the main industrial cities of the area is not very long, those leaving Tiszadob moved to the following cities in the neighborhood: Leninváros, (today Tiszaújváros), Miskolc and Kazincbarcika. Mainly young people left the countryside. For them it was important to reach the village where their families stayed⁷ – it was easier to leave if the city where they settled and started a new life was close to the onetime home village.

Those staying at home and intending to earn a living from agriculture were to face difficulties. In the years of scarcity after the war, delivery obligations and progressive tax afflicted the villagers, especially the old⁸ and bigger landowners. Those harvesting from a plot smaller than 2 holds were to deliver 25 kg wheat, while those harvesting from 15 holds had to deliver 120 kg bread crops. The principle ‘the more you have, the more you can stand’ was complied with.⁹

In Tiszadob local committees, the Executive Committee and the Permanent Delivery Committee controlled different areas within the village, and taxed mostly old landowners, who had cultivated their own land already before 1945. The new landowners¹⁰ were in most cases the followers of the new regime, and since it was them who distributed the land, they were also provided bigger landed property, and it often happened that the new landholders owned far bigger landed property than the old landowners. The old landowners were regarded as men of the Count, men of the old regime. They suffered from the highest taxes and they were controlled most strictly in time of delivery. New local authorities aimed at making life difficult for the families they did not like.

The idea of establishing co-operatives was present in Hungarian politics already in 1947, and later the idea of collectivization became popular in certain circles of rural population. At Tiszadob the onetime agricultural workers – becoming new landowners – stood for the idea of collectivization and considered the co-operative form a good solution. Collectivization and the prospects of agriculture in general caused strong debates and conflicts among political leaders.

Rákosi and Gerő argued against the line represented by Imre Nagy, who was for a gradual change. Rákosi intended to fulfill Soviet demands. The Soviets demanded the foundation of co-operatives in Hungary following the model of *kolkhozes*, even by radical means.¹¹ Opposed to this Nagy supported a long-term gradual change: co-operatives would have worked parallel to family farms, supporting them and this way gradually persuading the landowners to their side.¹²

In the studies of Péter Veres the ideal image of the smallholder from the end of the 1940s appears, alongside with the ideal of the small family farms. He does not consider the foundation of co-operatives effective in the whole territory of Hungary but imagined them as supporting institutions of individual family farms.¹³

Three years after the land distribution, in 1948, new landholders of Tiszadob founded the fifth farmers' co-operative group of the country, which was at the same time the first one in the county. Landowners, who took hold of the greater part of the dismantled manorial estates, together with their buildings and equipment, joined the co-operative. Local authority in the village also supported the foundation of co-operatives following the political line of Hungarian Workers' Party (Magyar Dolgozók Pártja, MDP). Thus the livelihood of the old landowners and especially of those, who were considered kulaks, was made very difficult.

In 1950 Rákosi announced that peasants had to be compelled to join co-operatives to build socialism.¹⁴ Parallel to the institution of collectivization, the MDP aimed at abolishing agricultural activity of wealthy landowners, demonstrating that private farms had no future in Hungary. The MDP aimed at eliminating peasant farms on the basis of the first five-year plan. It was planned that in a very short time 60% of the land would be cultivated by co-operatives, and 6% of the land by state farms.¹⁵

The stratum of wealthy landowners (kulaks) was regarded as the main obstacle of rural development in Hungary, and in 1948 their persecution campaign started. All those who owned 25 cadastral holds were regarded as kulaks, as well as those, whose land was worth more than 350 gold crowns. Kulaks were put on the so called kulak lists. The people recorded on the list were to pay 'kulak tax', officially called 'agricultural development contribution'.¹⁶

Who was to pay this tax (contribution)?

1) Those who owned forest and landed property (hereafter: estate), the area of which reached 25 cadastral holds or those whose cadastral net income reached or exceeded 350 gold crowns,

2) Those who owned an estate of 15 cadastral holds or less did not have to pay even if its cadastral net income exceeded 350 crowns. No contribution should be paid either, if the territory of the estate exceeded 25 cadastral holds, but its cadastral net income did not exceed 150 crowns.

3) Those whose estate reached or exceeded 15 cadastral holds and its cadastral net income reached or exceeded 150 crowns, and if the landholder, besides forest and agricultural income had other income liable to general income taxation (over 5,000 forint annually).

Horticultural and wine growing estates were bound to pay threefold the size of the cultivated area would have counter for.¹⁷

However, not only the wealthier farmers were constantly controlled and taxed, but also those with smaller estates had to fulfill delivery obligations. Those who neglected any of their duties were punished by different ways. Propagandists were sent out to the threshing to estimate the quantity of the crop, as well as to urge the landowner to deliver the crops directly from the threshing machine. They also controlled and executed delivery obligations.¹⁸

In spite of obligations, old landowners at first hold onto their private lands and stayed out of co-operatives but in 1952 the wealthiest landowners finally lost their lands as the process of persecution of the kulaks was successfully completed. In 1951–52 the opposition of the peasantry against collectivism declined. It was mainly due to the process of consolidation of holdings, which was executed several times a year in order to integrate dispersed land-strips. As a consequence the farmers never knew whether they cultivated the land for themselves or for somebody else. Thus the Hungarian peasantry was crushed. In the second half of 1952 agricultural co-operatives were formed one after the other. Increasing number of smallholders offered their lands to the co-operative, giving up their private landed property. Until the end

of 1950 2,185 co-operatives had been established, by the end of 1952 their number had increased to 5,110.¹⁹

The policy of collectivization seemed to be successful. In Hungary in 1948 the Soviet (artyel) type of co-operatives of 1935 was regarded as the basic model. Three types of co-operatives were distinguished in Hungary: co-operatives of type I, II and III. In co-operative type I fertilizing, cultivation and sowing were done collectively, all other tasks were completed individually. In co-operative type II after collective fertilizing, cultivation and sowing the land was not distributed to individual farmers. Everybody had to work on the piece of land measured according to the landed property given by him to the co-operative, or the land was again divided to individual cultivation. In both cases the gathering of crops was accomplished collectively. In co-operative type III each work phase was completed collectively according to the directions of the co-operative, and the share after work was counted by work units. In the case of co-operatives type III the members had to give up all their landed property except 1.5 holds. This remnant constituted the household plot which the families cultivated individually. In Hungary farmers' co-operatives of the type III became dominant and developed into co-operatives of the Kádár era.²⁰

Following the decision made in Moscow after the death of Stalin, on 4 July 1953, Nagy was nominated Hungarian Prime Minister replacing Rákosi, who kept his position as First Party Secretary.²¹ The provisions of the government led by Nagy were the following:

- agricultural taxes and delivery obligations were decreased
- formerly accumulated arrears of taxes and delivery obligations were remitted
- kulak lists were abolished
- for co-operatives and their members, in case they had paid their taxes 100% for year 1953, the complete tax arrears for year 1952 were refunded by the state
- for private smallholders, in case they had paid 50% of their taxes for 1953, the other 50% was cancelled by the state
- in addition to tax and delivery allowances, the state compensated for damages caused by hail or fire, also in cases, when the victim did not have insurance

Also leaving the co-operatives was made possible. The measure, which prohibited members from leaving the co-operative for three years after joining it, was repealed. Also the process of consolidation of holdings was stopped for 5 years.²²

Due to these provisions people left co-operatives in great numbers, especially the ones who had given up their private, landed properties because of the strict regulation of previous years. The foundation of a great number of co-operatives, the radical increase in the number of new members, and the quick decrease in the number of members followed one another very rapidly. In Hungary at the beginning of the year 1953 5,224 co-operatives functioned. In the second half of 1953 their number fell by 688, then in 1954 by 225. By the end of 1953 out of the total 376,000 members 126,000, and in 1954 20,000 left the co-operatives. At the beginning of 1953 the area of co-operatively owned or cultivated land decreased from 1.620,000 holds by 477,000 holds, and by a further 61,000 holds in 1954.²³ However, delivery obligations remained unchanged and were continuously in effect, although compared to previous years to a lot smaller extent.

In village life we also can see other changes than the continuous changing of agriculture which determined to a great extent the life of Hungarian villages in the 1940s–1950s.

The process of electrification with the development of electric network in Hungarian villages started in the 1950s. In 1954 local administration in Tiszadob applied to the County Council for developing an electric network of 5 km and for establishing a driven well in Újtelep. They claimed that in the Legújjabb Telep part of the village the electrical network was not yet established. In the area of Újtelep only one well functioned, which could not supply enough water for the population of the whole area, and the water of the well was not healthy either. People in Újtelep fell sick with goitre, which was due to the inadequate quality of water.

In 1954 the Local Council of Tiszadob obliged local inhabitants to build permanent wooden closets on their yards. This measure was also due to the typhoid epidemic that swept the

village before 1954, which was a consequence of the unsuitable handling of human excreta.

Among the aims of village development in 1955 we find the following: establishing new roads, pavements and wells and renovation of the old ones. In April 1955 all districts of the village applied for extension of the local electric networks, as well as for establishing completely new ones. Even the biggest farmstead, called Reje, belonging to the village, joined this application. The farmstead in Reje asked for a new access road, together with telephone connection and a new well. In order to complete all these duties, the Local Council obliged the inhabitants to do community service and pay Village Development Contribution.²⁴ Recreation was also coming into the village: a tractor drivers' Sports Club was founded with 200 members in September 1954. In 1955 a football-, a table tennis-, a ski-, a chess-, a volleyball- and a swimming-club functioned in the village, as minutes of the local council tell us.²⁵

By 1955 a great number of smaller farmsteads had ceased to exist in the neighborhood of the village, and a diminishing number of people stayed there. There were only very few children so that schools were closed down. Afterwards many families finally left their farmsteads. The school of Kocsordos-Katahalma closed down in 1949 due to depopulation in Katahalma farmstead. Only in Kocsordos a school operated until 1952. In 1955 also the farmstead school of Farkashát closed down, when the teacher, Tibor C. Jankovich died.

The years 1954–55 marked again a turning point in Hungarian villages. After the Federal Republic of Germany joined NATO, the economic policy of the Soviet Union changed. The development of heavy and military industry became a priority, and Hungarian policy was criticized for neglecting the improvement of these industrial branches.²⁶ In spring 1955 the political line of Rákosi gained power again, and old delivery obligations and taxes of agricultural producers increased, and in autumn 1955 Rákosi started another campaign for collectivization.²⁷ People's hatred against the regime culminated and led to an uprising in October 1956. In the countryside the revolution

of 1956 went on rather calmly, compared to what upheaval was going on particularly in Budapest.

Party Executive Committees were closed in the whole country from October 1956 to March 1957, also at Tiszadob. From there it was reported: a teacher from local school encouraged his pupils into 'revolutionary' activity, i.e. did not stop them from burning their Russian course-books. A group was formed to hunt down the leaders of the village in the name of the revolution, and a list for the purpose was written. Some of the members of this group were later arrested and put into prison. According to both the report of the Executive Committee and the witnesses, all this happened rapidly and in haste.²⁸

In late 1956 the Hungarian government was led by János Kádár. He allowed people to leave the co-operatives; and he also made their dissolution possible. Two thirds of the agricultural co-operatives broke up and several hundreds of small and middle-sized peasant farms resumed their work all over the country. The Kádár government did not rescind the cancellation of the compulsory delivery system, thus Hungary was the first among socialist countries to abolish the delivery system.²⁹

During the meeting of communist parties in Moscow in November 1957 the socialist reorganization of agriculture was discussed again. As a result in 1958 the Central Committee of the HWSP decided on the development of co-operatives and the recommencement of collectivization.³⁰ In the process there was no longer a chance for private landholders to hold on. The most prominent stratum of farmers was compelled to join the co-operatives, contrary to the earlier practice. Moreover, in many cases these big landholders became the leaders of co-operatives. The co-operatives founded in course of the third wave of collectivization were established on the model of co-operative type III. Thus everything was made common in the co-operative, only a piece of land of one cadastral hold was allotted to the members of co-operatives on which they could cultivate whatever they pleased. In many places the cultivation of household plots the land was prepared and sowed by the co-operative, while cultivation as well as harvesting was done by the members themselves.

By 1962 collectivization had been completed all over Hungary. In the following years the number of landholdings, whose owners no longer worked in co-operatives, increased.³¹ Many people left the villages and agriculture. At the end of the 1950s and at the beginning of the 1960s another wave of emigration took place from villages to cities. In this period the number of industrial workers, together with that of commuters rapidly increased. Many of them were employed in building industry. It was not only the emigration that increased the area of unoccupied land left in co-operatives. The same happened with the property of the members who died. These lands could have been separated from the co-operatives according to the Hungarian constitution. However, this never happened, as the apparatus of the state, the interest of which was to keep the co-operatives intact, supported the leaders of the co-operatives. Kádár claimed in 1966 that although it was unconstitutional to do so, i.e. not to give the land back to the family, according to various laws which circumvented the constitution the owner could not decide about his land anyway.³² Those who were not members of the co-operatives could not inherit the land taken by the co-operative. The land was bought from these people for a rather symbolic sum of money. Thus the co-operatives gained more and more landholdings.

On 1 January 1968 a New Economic Mechanism was introduced in Hungary. As a consequence agricultural co-operatives received far more support and could get rid of several legal and organizational problems.³³ In the 1960s household plots became supplementary farms for village population. These were legal and even supported by the state. Half of the products produced on household plots served livelihood of the family, what was left was marketed. Household plots played a significant role in supplying the country with vegetables, fruit and poultry.³⁴

At Tiszadob it was cattle- and pig-breeding that dominated in household farming. On the plots mostly crop was grown. It helped the raising of pigs and cattle, but there was a lack of market which could buy other products of agriculture from the village. The farmsteads and settlements around Nyíregyháza,

e.g. Nagycserkesz, could more easily and quickly reach markets where it was possible to sell early fruit and vegetables grown in greenhouses. Similarly, in the villages around Budapest the inhabitants earned their living from producing for the markets of the capital. This phenomenon was traditional: villages situated closer to bigger towns had a better chance to make profit in production and marketing than the ones far from them and with worse infrastructure – not to mention the dead-end villages, like Tiszadob. There the local railway station is 3 km away from the village which makes it rather difficult for local people to use railway connections. Thus they do not use railway for traveling or transport as often as it is usual in villages with better railway connections. In addition, local bus traffic was in this period rather poor. There was one line going to the direction of the nearest town, to the county centre, Nyíregyháza. In this period one could leave the settlement either by train or on the only road leading to Tiszadada-Tiszalök. Over the river Tisza, and on the asphalted road between Polgár and Tiszadob one could leave the village towards Miskolc and Léninváros. However, to these directions there was no local bus connection or any other means of public transport. The only direction that most of the inhabitants of Tiszadob could go was the road leading to Nyíregyháza.

The inhabitants of Tiszadob bred cattle both for meat and milk. They took the milk into the dairy of the co-operatives, and the co-operatives paid them monthly milk-money. Co-operatives helped members also marketing meat cattle. As for pig-breeding the locals sold both porkers and piglets. The co-operatives helped also marketing porkers, while people sold their piglets directly from the house or in livestock markets. The inhabitants of Tiszadob went to sell and buy livestock in the markets of Nyíregyháza and Ónod. Owing to household farming and the stabilization of co-operatives' salaries, the living standard of village population started to rise.

Collectivization slowed down the development of Hungarian villages and the growth of peasantry for a few years. However, a general development can be observed from the middle

of the 1960s, and the trend intensified from the year 1968. The development was gradual; people following a different model than that of the 1950s. Earlier landed property meant everything. Each family aimed at increasing the amount of land claiming that it was basically land that they lived on. They needed landed property to bring up and marry off their children. The aim was to improve financial situation. That is why besides striving after new landed property village population often followed the custom of having only one child in the family.³⁵ If there was only one child in the family, the estate did not have to be divided but it provided a living for the only heir. However, the children could not get hold of the land before their parents died. This meant that young couples were to face difficulties. Often they had to live according to the wishes of their parents until they inherited the land, and the same order of things continued in their own life as well.

After collectivization this tradition completely changed. Families lost their landed properties and they were forced to find other ways of living. This was hard since the Hungarian peasant did not know how to accommodate to the new situation. Urban manners did not suit him.³⁶ He was used to relax while working. The occasions of common spinning, corn husking and feather plucking were his 'free-time' occupations. To these occasions the villagers gathered in the evenings and listened to a good storyteller or played games.³⁷ It was only sleeping that meant a real rest. All this was about to change, too. Instead of expanding their landed property, they enlarged their houses and acquired new equipment. They educated their children and they strove to provide their children everything that the modern world demanded: motorcycles, cars, and in many a cases, a flat for the married couple.

The forms of entertainment changed, too. Old customs disappeared; sometimes dancing or a feast on the pay-day were organized at the co-operative but mainly work consumed the day. After finishing their tasks at the co-operative everybody went home to work on their household plots. They tried to work as hard as possible in order to pay for the growing de-

mands. The customary collective forms of entertainment and work disappeared from the villages.

In the second half of the 1960s the appearance of television sets in villages brought about a revolutionary change in the way of entertainment and relaxation. Watching television became the main form of spending free time.³⁸ This changed human relations, consequently also certain customs. For instance, long meetings and discussions in the evenings with neighborhood families started to recede. People spent now their free time in their homes watching TV and nobody was longing for the long discussions at neighboring houses.

The change in the life of villages was visible also from the outside. The old, long rectangle-shaped houses were replaced by the cube-shaped house type. In many cases mainly young families did not build farm buildings behind the houses, which previously used to be indispensable for village homes.

Electrification was completed in Tiszadob in 1964. Washing machines, refrigerators and televisions appeared in the households. More people started to buy bicycles and motorcycles.

After the collectivization was completed in 1962, farmsteads were gradually disappearing in Hungary. As a first step smaller schools were closed down. In 1966 in the vicinity of Tiszadob the school of Kisliget, educating children from seven farmsteads, was closed down.

By the end of the 1960s villages had a new look. From the 1970s the financial support of villages decreased and an urbanization project was launched aiming at developing the towns intensively. The rate of agricultural settlements decreased from 51% to 31% from the 1960s to the 1970s.³⁹ During this period, co-operatives even villages and schools were united. As a consequence of the centralization process 40% of the schools were closed down in Hungary between 1974 and 1977. The number of General Consumer and Marketing Co-operatives (Általános Fogyasztási és Értékesítési Szövetkezet, ÁFÉSZ) also dropped by 80% between 1960 and 1980 due to integration.⁴⁰ The centralization process was promoted with the idea 'the bigger, the better and the more socialist'.⁴¹

The leaders of co-operatives were displaced on central decision. With the new leadership a new stratum of agricultural intelligentsia appeared in the villages. They completely reorganized the structure of existing co-operatives. Also the social structure of villages remarkably changed.⁴² Beside professionals, increasing number of skilled workers started to work in co-operatives. A group of young professionals, technicians and skilled workers replaced the former non-skilled workers and low unqualified leaders of co-operatives.

As a result of mechanization and professional production in agricultural co-operatives, great part of the former worker's brigades and teams was dissolved, and the village people started to get alienated from each other, due to lack of contact.

Despite urbanization and due to the reorganization of the co-operatives the living standard of village population continuously grew. Cars – Lada, Skoda, Trabant, and Wartburg – appeared in the villages in the 1970s. The growth of families was supported also by centralized development projects; pipe water supply reached the villages. In Tiszadob the building of the water system started in 1976 and the work was almost completed in the next few years. During the 1970s another wave of development and expansion reached the villages. In this period villagers started to build stables, cowsheds and storage units on the yards behind the cube-shaped houses. Villagers realized how great a financial help the household plot could provide raw materials. Moreover, it could produce extra income for the family. This was followed by another building boom all over the country. It was possible to take loans on 3% interest rate and many people started to build houses also in the countryside. Hungarian villages now took on the outlook also visible nowadays. Since then this has been changed or extended only in regions close to cities, or in villages with good infrastructure or in resort places.

Development was visible not only in the life of the inhabitants but also in a village settlement as a whole. In Tiszadob the following institutions were being built: new kindergarten in 1976, a supermarket and a restaurant in 1978, a bank and a pharmacy in

1979, a new school in 1982. At the beginning of the 1980s citizens could already feel and in the middle of the 1980s it was already obvious that the political system was shaking in Hungary. This led at great speed to the change of the regime and the leadership in the country.

3 Village Life in Finland from 1945 to the middle of the 1980s

In Finland, agriculture and forestry played decisive roles in livelihood of the people until the middle of the 1950s.⁴³ Previously agriculture had meant subsistence farming. Self-supplying farms characterized Finnish agriculture and the Finnish countryside in the 1940s and until the end of the 1950s. Owing to the process of settling inhabitants from the ceded territories of Karelia as well as to the national agricultural and economic policy, small farms with arable land not bigger than 2-10 hectares became common. The number of dwarf holdings increased between the 1930s and the end of the 1950s as a result of population settlement, and until the beginning of the 1970s dwarf holdings constituted 2/3 of the farms in the country. In this period the second most common type of farm in Finnish agriculture were family farms with an area of 10-25 hectares. The number of farms with a territory smaller than 2 hectares was around 100,000 but the agricultural income they produced can be considered as insignificant from point of view of national economy. The number of farms bigger than 50 hectares was still small even at the end of the 1970s. In the 1950s farms with an area of 8-10 hectares arable land were considered ideal. Later by the end of the 1970s the size had grown to 25-35 hectares, depending on the agricultural branch and location of the farm. During the 1940s and at the beginning of the 1950s self-subsistence in foodstuffs was aimed in Finland. However, agricultural production increased so rapidly that at the end of the 1950s and at the beginning of the 1960s agriculture required strict control due to overproduction. By the turn of the 1950s and the 1960s a part of the farms broke up into so little pieces on account of inheritance that they became unviable.⁴⁴

The act of leasehold in 1958 aimed at blocking this process. It encouraged farmers to buy land by providing cheap loans and by making the redemption easier in case of inheritance. New area could be bought mainly from state wooded land property until the middle of the 1960s. This was supported by the state with advantageous loans with low interest rates. According to the acts of 1969, agricultural income was regulated. Compensation was paid to the farmer, who left his land uncultivated for a while, also in the case when he gave up stockbreeding. In order to restrict pork and egg production penalties had to be paid. Acts regulated the production in all branches of agriculture. From 1968 income tax was introduced instead of the previous tax paid on basis of area. In the agricultural agreement made in 1973 a pension system was established for those working in agriculture. This could be used in case somebody gave up agriculture or a generational change took place within the family. Besides the new pension system an institution granting leave was also founded. In consequence, those making their living from agriculture could go on holiday in any time of the year, similarly to those working in other fields of economy. Owing to the agricultural income law, the salary system of those working in agriculture followed the changes taking place in the wage system of employees living on regular wages or salaries. However, also very small farms producing minimal income 'died away' in large numbers during the 1970s. The rise of agricultural income was also due to the fact that the quality improved and the quantity of production increased significantly. Afterwards, due to different reasons, mainly to agricultural policy, agricultural production in Finland began to stabilize.

From the 1940s average crop production per hectare gradually increased due to compulsory fertilization, more intensive cultivation and also to the better quality of crops. By the 1970s the average production had doubled. The production of barley increased so fast that it soon surpassed the cultivation of the traditional oat. By the end of the 1970s the production of hay decreased by 50%, and its place was soon taken by ensilage. The area of cultivated land grew significantly although vast areas were left uncultivated.

The area of arable land dropped to the level of 1945 during the 1970s. Nevertheless, land was cultivated more intensively than in the 1940s. The productivity of agriculture increased also as a result of improvement works. While in the 1960 only 8% of the fields were pipe-drained, by 1980 the rate increased to 34%. The expansion of oil plants and vegetable plants was also remarkable.

In stockbreeding raising cattle, pig and poultry remained significant branches. The structural changes in agriculture affected firstly the breeding of sheep which started to lose ground in the 1950s. Only before complete extinction, in the middle of the 1970s, it was realized that it was necessary to save Finnish sheep stock. The decrease in horse stock was due to the appearance of tractors in Finland. This process started already in the 1950s and by the 1960s Finnish horse keeping had collapsed. Later the state paid for colts, and owing to the popularity of horse riding, the drastic decrease of horse stock in Finland stopped. Nonetheless, horses have never restored their onetime position in agriculture. The number of cows also fell, but due to cattle breeding and better feeding conditions the milk production continuously grew. In consequence the overproduction of milk has caused problems in Finnish agriculture and economy since the 1960s. From the beginning of the 1960s breeding pigs and poultry spread due to the introduction of mechanized feeding system.

Hunting and fishing seemed to be significant branches but in fact they constituted only 0.3% of the gross output. More important was sea fishing. Herring fishing was important but came to an end in the 1970s and was replaced by salmon breeding which became a significant branch. Reindeer breeding in Lapland has not developed since the 1960s as the area of pasture has decreased. Today reindeer breeding plays a significant role in tourism.

In Finland the area of forest decreased by 12-13% due to parceling. Nonetheless, also the amount of growing forest decreased significantly due to intensive cutting. In the 1940s-50s 65% of Finnish wooded land was in private ownership. This represented 80% of the growing wood. In the 1950s 90% of the owners of private forests were farmers. By the 1970s this rate had changed; only 70% of

the forest owners lived in villages and earned their living from intensive cultivation. It happened in the 1970s that the amount of growing stock started to increase. Forestry preferred conifers, but between the 1950s and 1970s the composition of forests regarding the species of tree changed only slightly: in Finnish growing stock scotch fir constituted 45%, spruce 37%, deciduous species of tree – mainly birch – represented 20%.

In the 1950s in order to stop the drastic decrease of growing stock, forestry initiated fertilizing, accelerated drainage and supported forestation of the arable land. The state supported the planting of saplings. The laws of forest improvement of 1967–69 strongly supported the expansion and stabilization of forestry. Between 1959 and the middle of the 1970s wooded land of private estates increased by an average of 4%, and at the end of the 1970s cutting plans demanded 60 million m³ of crustaceous trees compared to the 50 million m³ of the 1950s. During the 1950s forestry work was done with hand tools and horses dragged the wood. Tractors not only in agriculture, but also in forestry displaced horses until the 1970s. In 1975 no horses were used in forestry and logging tasks. From the 1950s on forestry work became specialized to such an extent that it required more special skills and knowledge. Due to mechanization forestry could employ less people – mainly winter seasonal laborers.

Motor saws appeared first, but their first types were rather heavy and huge, thus they were used mainly in falling tasks and cutting bigger pieces of logs. Other tasks, for instance lopping were still carried out with hand tools. Lighter motor saws appeared rather quickly, which could be used by one person which made logging significantly easier and quicker. At the beginning of the 1970s multifunctional machines appeared which accelerated the displacement of human workforce from forestry and logging. In logging the amount of cutting was yearly 300 m³ per logger during the 1950s, which grew to 1400 m³ by the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s. Due to production increase as well as to the development of techniques, quality and quantity of mechanization, during the 1970s more and more forestry workers be-

came unemployed. Not finding jobs in the countryside they moved to urban centers to earn their living.

It was the rapid spreading of mechanization that had the greatest effect on Finnish agriculture and forestry, as well as on family farms and Finnish village life. It meant modernization which the people largely accepted. This led to remarkable changes in village life after the 1960s.⁴⁵ In the first place, electrification contributed to the quick spreading of machines in agriculture. Machines powered by combustion engine or steam did not spread on Finnish farms, their place was at an early stage taken by machines run by electricity, which could be also handled more easily. Parallel to electrification different types of tractors appeared, which in the 1960s completely displaced horse-carriages from agriculture and later in the 1970s also from forestry as already pointed out. First field tractors were used also in forests, but at the beginning of the 1970s four-wheel driven machines appeared and replaced field tractors in forestry. In the beginning the size and the capacity of these machines were growing, later at the end of the 1970s more specialized machines and equipment appeared. These made work easier and quicker both on cultivated lands and in forests. Combines (harvesters) became widespread in agriculture very early, while milking machines were introduced in the 1950s. Intensive milking technology appeared in the 1970s which gradually replaced the system of transporting and storing milk in cans. The quick development in mechanization was one of the reasons that soon made farmers specialized.

Mechanization made an impact on all fields of village life.⁴⁶ Old farm buildings such as barns disappeared or began to collapse, and huge, modern silos replaced them. Hay-cocks and hay-tacks were rarely seen. The size of stalls and barns became bigger so that machines could move and work in them unhindered. Mechanization and modernization led to the specialization of farms on one product only. In the 1940s self-sufficiency was regarded as the most important factor in family farming. However, by the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s specialized farms purchased all they needed in the household

from the income they earned from one main product. Around 60% of agricultural products were sold in the 1940s. This rate had grown to 90% by the beginning of the 1970s.

Considering all this we may conclude that the share of agriculture in gross output was 16% in the 1950s, which then dropped to 11% in the 1960s and to 5% by the end of the 1970s. Living from agriculture was a life-style in Finland until the 1960s, but soon it became gradually one way of living among many others. Finnish agriculture had aimed at self-sufficiency but this led to enormous overproduction⁴⁷ which characterized even the 1980s.⁴⁸

The viability of the countryside depends to a great extent on working opportunities, although the presence of a rising generation is also important. They together determine how viable a certain village is. Again, in a village the most crucial institution for children is school. A operating school also shows the viability of a village. For children the village school is not only the place of education, but it also hosts community feasts and other important gatherings. Village schools flourished in Finland until the 1960s. Due to emptying of the villages during the 1960s, in Finland a large number of village schools closed down, between 1954 and 1975 altogether 2,280. After the 1940s the number of schools in the countryside continuously increased. The 1960s was the period of maintaining schools, while during the 1970s schools were united. As a result many old school buildings were left empty in the thinly populated regions of Finland. Many of them started to decay. At the end of the 1980s most schools had only two teachers, while more than half of the elementary schools employed 1-3 teachers. The School Act of 1984 made it possible for schools to operate also as meeting places for the local community. They became so called 'village houses' (*kyläntalo*). In school buildings different clubs were organized, and not only for school children. For instance, for smaller children day care was arranged, for elderly people pensioners' clubs or handicraft clubs were initiated in a way which did not disturb normal education. This opened a new period in the life of village schools.⁴⁹

For Finnish village population getting to work, school and other institutions is a crucial question, since they live very far from each other and from centers. It concerns mainly elderly people, young mothers with small children and the young. Traditional bus transport is not a rewarding solution for them. Since the houses are scattered, it is difficult to find a suitable place for the bus stops so that it would be close to everybody. Thus the number of travelers is very few. Villagers in Finland must use alternative means of transport. For example, they use cars, taxis or order buses and other services as well as multi-functional transport. In the middle of the 1970s in Finland 66% of the households had a car, 48% of women had a driving license, while 65% of men had one. In the 1980s more than 70% of village households used a car. Thus the car became the alternative for public transport for those who owned one. It is still students, mothers and the young who face difficulties in public transport. Since the 1980s school buses and school taxis have been allowed to transport also others than schoolchildren, if there are free seats. The habit of ordering special buses or taxis has become popular. This makes traveling for village inhabitants remarkably easier.

Transport services do not aim at taking village dwellers to different services but the services are brought to the inhabitants. For instance, besides carrying and delivering the post, the post vans can run other errands based on agreements made with local inhabitants: they could take people shopping, transport other things, etc. In order to strengthen and preserve this practice, Finnish Post made the multifunctional tasks of post vans official at the end of the 1970s. They have proved to be popular and are still used in the countryside.

Building countryside road network speeded up when cooled milk-tanks were introduced for storing milk for transport to the dairy. Milk trucks required a road of better quality in order to reach each individual farm. State and local communities together maintained local roads while the owners and others users maintained private roads. Most of the small roads are pebble-paved and cannot stand very heavy traffic. In spring these

roads in most places become impassable due to water and mud issuing from melting frost.

Alongside the permanent villagers there is a seasonal stratum of village inhabitants. Namely people who own or hire a summer cottage (*kesämökki*) and literally occupy the countryside in the summer holiday season. From the 1950s the number of summer cottages doubled in every ten years until the beginning of the 1970s, and at the beginning of the 1980s their number was over 265,000. Most of the cottages were built at the end of the 1960s and at the beginning of the 1970s. In this period the inner and northern parts of the country became more popular for building cottages. People who had left their home villages and moved to towns started to use their old homestead as a summer cottage or built a new one close to it.

Most popular resorts for summer holidays are lakeshores. Consequently, cottage plots close to a lake were the most popular and became quite expensive. The cottage building boom brought with it one negative consequence: the quality of water and natural life of small lakes suffered. As a result, the building of summer cottages was later strictly seriously restricted.

The appearance of temporary summer population in certain villages where the number of permanent inhabitants had decreased remarkably caused also positive changes. The increasing consumption of foodstuffs, petrol and building material could ensure the very survival of a particular village. It has to be underlined that the owners of the *mökki* still pay their taxes to local parish. Consequently, villages with a great number of summer cottages received a significant income from holiday-makers' taxes.

Farms with their red houses and household buildings, grazing lands for cows, roads to the fields, huge school buildings and summer cottages hidden here and there in the middle of wooded and watery landscape represent the Finnish countryside for the outside observer. But inside many tensions can be sensed: generational problems, lack of jobs and income, the impact of urbanized society caused many leave their home villages during the 1960–70s. This tendency has been continuing

ever since and only few people can realize their dreams to move back.

4 The Porkoláb Family in Tiszadob

The Porkoláb family has lived in Tiszadob at least since the eighteenth century. The settlement of Tiszadob was mentioned already in 1220 in the Regestrum of Várad. The village belonged to the Andrassy family until 1945. It has a radial and agglomerated settlement structure. New parts of the village were built in the 1920s and after 1945. Tiszadob is a dead-end village, as it borders in the west on the river Tisza, which can be crossed only on a temporary floating bridge. The village had an asphalted road until the end of the 1980s which led to Nyíregyháza, the center of the county of Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg. Its railway station is two kilometers away from the village on the railway line Nyíregyháza-Ohat-Pusztakócs. In the period under scrutiny the co-operative employed most of the inhabitants in Tiszadob. The service of local shops has been satisfactory and the local school has always fulfilled the needs of the village.

The grand-grandparents of the author, Béni Siető and Erzsébet Sóron settled in Tiszadob after getting married. At first Béni Siető worked as a farm worker, then as a forester on the estate of Sándor Andrassy. Since his parents were wealthy farmers, he was not used to obeying orders and he intended to earn his living independently as soon as possible. The couple moved from the manorial farmstead into the village. They built a house on a plot provided by the Count. It was 14 meters long based on stone and roofed with tiles. It consisted of a big house, a small house, a kitchen and a larder at the far end. On the yard there was a thatched pigsty, which later was also roofed with tiles. There was also a cowshed attached to the cart-shed. The couple cultivated a land of 13 holds on a family agreement, since the parents of Erzsébet Sóron owned it. The young couple itself owned a land of 4 holds. On the 13 holds they could sow anything, but after harvest they were to pass half of the product to Erzsébet's parents, who on this occasion served them fine meal. They rarely hired helpers, only in times of hay-making, gathering the forage, reaping, carry-

ing and harvesting. During harvest they hired a worker who was given one third of the yield. For seasonal other hard work they hired a day worker, usually the same person.

The family kept cows, pigs, poultry and pigeons. Pigeons were popular, as they were productive and required very little care. On the land wheat, corn, barley, rye, as well as forage, such as alfalfa was grown. Besides they owned hayfield and grazing land, and a patch of forest. Dairy products, eggs and hens sold to the market-women accrued remarkable profit for the family. Pork was cooked twice a week. The family ate a lot of pigeon meat, stirred food, dumplings, potatoes and rice. They ate a lot of beans, which they also marketed. There were years when they sold 300 kg beans. They bought 130 liters of wine every year, for which they paid with products. Béni Siető bought the wine usually from one of his fellow soldiers, and later he went with others to purchase wine from a village in the district of Hegyalja. They took 4-5 sacks of crops for the wine. They distilled 15-20 liters of pálinka each year, and they bought beer and rum in time of harvest.

Their three sons of the family died very young, only one daughter stayed alive, called Erzsébet Siető. Every member of the family worked; also the growing child had to start working at a very young age. In harvest time the daughter had to collect the forage left on the field. She also milked the cows, killed and cleaned the poultry. The young girl was told very clearly and directly that her work was needed. So much so that despite her outstanding school results and the teacher's request, the parents did not let their daughter to continue her studies at day school. Parents considered most important to own larger landed property in order to survive in future saying: 'If we have 8-10 holds of land, our child can make a living'. Actually at the time, even a land of 5 holds could provide living for a small family.

The family was not remarkably well-to-do but lived relatively well. They were satisfied with their life compared to the prevailing conditions in general. There were not many possibilities for improvement; and, for instance, the medical inspection of the three dead children cost three holds of land. Their

living standard slightly improved or rather stagnated until the beginning of World War II. Before the war they managed to buy two oxen, which made transport and certain agricultural tasks easier.

In 1949 Erzsébet Siető got married with Károly Porkoláb who also lived in Tiszadob. His parents were R. Porkoláb Károly and Porkoláb Borbála, who lived in the other end of the village. Their home was a house built on the ground without basement, with two rooms and tiled roof. On the yard there was a stable, a cart shed – later a store – stores for chaff, carrots and potatoes, and a pigsty. Hens spent the night on the attic of the pigsty. The family had two horses, 4-5 cows, and 6 porkers for market each year as well as poultry, ducks and chickens.

In the garden there were haymows and straw-stacks. The family had different fruit trees in the garden: 5 apple trees, sweet apples, summer apples, plum trees, a mulberry-tree, a cherry tree and a gage tree. Hazelnut or grapes were not grown. The family cultivated 8 holds of land of their own, and besides they rented arable land. They grew wheat, barley and rye. Each year they planted half a hold of potatoes, half a hold of melons, which they took to Miskolc to sell. It also happened that they sold the melons directly from the field. On half of the rented land they could sow everything, while on the other half the owner decided what he wanted to grow.

The family earned extra income from selling dairy products to market-women, especially butter. They had also income from horse carriage transport Károly R. Porkoláb occasionally took on, including transport of ashlar from Bekecs, the bringing of different crops and pork to the market of Miskolc. In winter he worked as a second forester on the estate of the Count. Although he was offered this job for the whole year, he did not accept it. He did not want to give up the independence of a smallholder who had a fixed yearly income and some other benefits.

In time of harvest they hired a worker, who picked the swathes and the wife herself bound them. They hired a day-worker for various tasks as well, who was paid for a three-day

job with a carriage. The day-worker was served food and drink at the house. The day-worker always ate at the same table with the host.

The family slaughtered a pig of 180-200 kg once a year. They tried to preserve it so that it could last until the following autumn, since the season of ducks arrived then. The housekeeper fed the ducks with corn, so that they and their liver fattened. Ducks kept in this way were called fattened ducks, whose liver was big enough for breakfast for the whole family. Duck meat was also excellent to roast. They cooked soups, such as sweet bean soup, sour bean soup, semolina soup, rice soup, thickened gooseberry soup with meat, and lebbencs⁵⁰ -soup. For breakfast they had milk, tea, barley coffee, bread and lard. They also ate a lot of millet mush, but millet was also thickened, or popped, or used for baking strudel. They often ate dumplings, jam pockets, scones and *gúnárnyak* (gander's neck).⁵¹ On Sundays the family ate chicken-soup, mush, potatoes or dumplings with stew. If father and son went to work on the field, the child took half a liter, the father 0.7 liters of milk, which they drank after having bacon and bread for breakfast. The housekeeper took the lunch out to the field, which usually included two courses.

They drank beer, wine and pálinka in the family. They distilled pálinka themselves at home; they purchased beer in bottles of half a liter from the local pub, but mainly during the summer, in time of harvest. They bought wine at the bodega of the Count for 35-40 fillérs a liter.⁵²

Clothing was much simpler and poorer than today. In a Porkoláb family which lived well, the child had a pair of walking shoes, a pair of winter shoes and a pair of boots. In summer, as a matter of course, the child ran barefoot in order to save the shoes. Clothing included three shirts, three pairs of underwear, summer clothing, a winter and feast clothing. Adolescent man got a long and a short winter coat.

Until 1938 they were three members in the family. One child died early, but in 1938 the third child was born, a girl. So they were four at that time in the family. The children started to help in work at a rather early age, especially the son. When he left

school at the age of thirteen, he went regularly to plough, and in winter he fetched trunks with a sleigh for days alone. His work became remarkably important – in that he was treated as an adult.

Károly Porkoláb took a heifer with him to his father-in-law's house, as landed property could be inherited only after the parents died. Thus Károly Porkoláb and Erzsébet Sietó started their common life at the house of Béni Sietó and Erzsébet Sóron. From now on we follow the life of the young family there.

During World War II, when the front reached their village, the Sietó family fled together with other families to a farmstead far away from the village. Their farm was damaged rather seriously, the pigsty and their straw-cutter was bombed, and German soldiers took away their pig, among other things. Before the family fled, they hid their belongings and food. They were away only for a short time, but it was enough for the villagers left in the village to spoil the houses left behind. In consequence, the family had hardly anything to eat and start life anew after the war. Moreover, delivery obligations introduced after 1945 made their life difficult. The leaders of the village forced the family to deliver such an amount of milk, eggs, and later of crops that was impossible to fulfill. On top of all that they had to carry milk twice a day to the other end of the village.⁵³

In 1945 it was already possible to claim for landed property, but Béni Sietó did not do it. He thought that the 'old time of the Count' would come back soon.⁵⁴ Others – servants, agricultural workers – immediately claimed for land, sometimes even for 20 holds, and they got it. They also claimed for cattle, equipment, and buildings from the estate of the Count, which they also received. It was only in 1948 that the Sietó family claimed for landed property. They claimed for not more than 5 holds, from the land that was still left and of not good quality.⁵⁵ In 1948 the families who had received landed property, equipment, cattle and buildings already in 1945 established the first co-operative in the village. They claimed that because before the war they had not owned landed property, they lacked agricultural experience and sufficient knowledge. The first wave of collectivization did not touch the Sietó family. From 1949

both on the newly received land and on the fields so far cultivated it worked together with the young couple. Common work started. In spite of political difficulties and family quarrels the family holding improved. In 1949 Károly Porkoláb junior was born; he was the only child of Erzsébet Siető and Károly Porkoláb. In 1951 they bought a vine-yard which was registered in the name of the young husband, Károly Porkoláb. Vine-yards had always been expensive, before 1945 only richer landholders and farmers and owners of local domains could own them. The family bought a vineyard of 278 *négyszögöls* (one *négyszögöl* = c. 3.6 square-meters) for 4,000 forints. They sold a cow for 2,500 forints and adding it up they managed to buy a vine-yard in a garden-plot where they grew grapes, pears, apples and currants and planted tomatoes and pepper. Their happiness was reflected thus: 'The grapes were so beautiful that already on the way home people bought them from our basket, and also the tomatoes and pepper grew nicely.'

In 1952 the family moved from the Újtelep part of the village to the center. They sold their house for 26,000 forints in Újtelep and bought a house for 32,000 which was not newly-built. It was an old, thatched house in a rather weak condition. The farm buildings were even worse, left uncared for. Nevertheless, the farm was large enough to maintain two families and very suitable for cultivation. First, new farm buildings had to be built for the farm had to provide a living for the big family. In 1953 a new cowshed was ready. During the previous the difficulties started when in March Károly Porkoláb was enrolled in military service for three months, exactly at the time when summer work should have begun.

In autumn 1952 after gathering and trashing was completed, Béni Siető joined one of the co-operatives in Tiszadob, called Táncsis. He took with him the landed property, and the family was left without land and work. In the autumn of the same year Károly Porkoláb went to work at the local forestry office as a forestry worker. The following one and half years were spent in mixed feelings, when in autumn 1953 due to the political changes Béni Siető left the co-operative. His son-in-law, Károly Porkoláb, left the forestry office in spring 1954. Together they

resumed independent cultivation, but this time not on their 'old land' but on the exchange land they got through reallocation of fields situated dispersedly around the village. From 1954 they worked again as private farmers. They cultivated a land of 16 holds. They grew wheat, corn, potatoes, sugar beet, which they could sell quite profitably. Instead of the previous forms of co-operatives called *Hangya* (Production, Trade and Consumer Co-operatives) this time producers' co-operatives were founded in increasing numbers. Similarly to their predecessors they dealt with buying up and selling products, supplying the needs of the villagers, and marketing. However, they followed the line of new politics. The agricultural co-operative bought up potatoes, and in order to market sugar beet it contracted with the sugar-mills of Szerencs.

Porkoláb and Siető also managed to sell other products, such as cereals and corn.

Their family kept 5-6 store-pigs and a sow, which were let out to the pasture with the herd every day. They also bred 2-3 cows. During the whole summer the cattle stayed on the pasture with the herd, while the 2-3 milking cows stayed with the village herd. They had two young bullocks, which were yoked. Besides cattle they kept poultry, which was not a source of income, but provided meat for the family of 5 members. They kept chickens, ducks and pigeons, even rabbits for a long time.

Despite delivery obligations and high taxes the farm was improving and the financial situation of the family started to get better. In 1957 they bought in Károly Porkoláb's name two weaned colts, which they started to harness. At the end of the 1950s they rented a Hoffer tractor with rubber wheels from the machine station of Tiszavasvári to haul the manure to the end of the ploughland, from where they spread the manure on the field by horse carriage. In the 1950s the family started to build a new house on the place of the old rectangular-shaped house. Although the building work itself was finished only in 1961, the needed financial sources were found in the second half of the 1950s.

It is an important fact that the 1950s was the last period in Hungarian agricultural history when the village peasant, the private

farmer, could meet his own needs himself, especially regarding food-supply. Only very rarely did they have to resort to buying: 'We produced the sowing-seed ourselves, we did not buy food in the shop, we received sugar for the sugar beet we sold, and it was only salt that we bought.' Self-sufficiency ended at the end of the 1950s and at the beginning of the 1960s. Land was finally taken away from the Hungarian peasantry, by general collectivization completed by 1962. Consequently, also Hungarian village population tried to adjust their tastes to the goods sold in the shops.

The agitation for joining the co-operative started in autumn of 1959 also in Tiszadob. The agitators came from Tiszavasvári. There were particular agitators sent to certain houses, who sat in the house from morning to night. They did not let anybody work but disturbed the people and did not stop talking. Even the well-to-do peasants, who were regarded as kulaks and were persecuted from 1952 and who stayed in the village but did not give their lands to the state, had to praise co-operative agriculture. These peasants were not earlier come close to the co-operatives but in collectivization of the 1960s they were also forced to join them. They were approached by saying 'even wealthy peasants realize that the only prospect for agriculture in the future is the co-operative'. The agitators intended to make those family members join the co-operative, who officially owned the landed property in the family. Béni Siető owned the family land and in autumn 1959 only he joined the co-operative as a foot-worker. In spring 1960, because of the lack of other opportunities, Károly Porkoláb also joined the co-operative as a coachman because he had brought horses with him. Erzsébet Siető became member of the co-operative only later, while Erzsébet Sóron never joined it. The family joined the co-operative called Tánctsis, which had been working from 1948, and where Béni Siető already had been a member for a short period.

Almost all villagers became members of the co-operative, only a few people could retain their lands. They were farmers with 1-2 holds of land, who got their plots in one piece very far from the village on fields of poor quality. Those who stayed out of the co-operative cultivated their small plots, and also dealt

with carriages. Most of them later became weir-keepers. Those farmers, who remained private farmers, did not have a better livelihood than those, who joined the co-operative.

In co-operatives friends, acquaintances and relatives formed working teams, brigades. Thus the old system of connections and relations could survive also in the world of the co-operatives. The Siető and Porkoláb family acquiesced with it. Although they did not like it, they had to put up with it, since everybody did the same around them. There was no real choice. After joining the co-operative in 1961 they started to build their new house. It had 3 rooms, a kitchen, a huge corridor and a pantry; its structure was different from the old rectangular type. It was based on ashlar with doubled cob-walls, it had tiled roof, and large twin windows gave it light. The ashlar were brought from Bodrogkeresztúr on train, the adobes were made in Tiszadob, and the tiles were brought from Polgár on carriage from where also other needed materials which the local building master could not produce were to be had. The wooden material of the house was cut and sawn in the village, but the builders also used a great deal of the wooden structure of the old house while making the roof for the new one. The house was ready to move in already in 1961 but many things were still needed. The money to continue building work came from selling meat cattle and bulls. When they managed to sell 1-2 bulls, they had something completed in the house. Thus the completion of the building lasted for several years.

At the beginning of the 1960s the salaries were very low at the co-operative. In the first period members received 40% of their salaries as the co-operative could not afford to pay more. A member doing physical work earned 200-300 forints a month. For the families, which had cattle and animals at home less was paid, and they did not receive bonus at the final account either. The Siető and Porkoláb family continued breeding milk and meat cattle, also store-pigs. They could earn considerable income by selling milk and meat cattle. As Károly Porkoláb had it: 'The salary paid by the co-operative was equivalent to zero'.

The co-operative provided each member a household farm of one hold, where they planted corn and potatoes. They could decide how much corn and potato they could cultivate. The family had 300-300 square-fathoms for potato, the rest for corn. They would have like to have more potato grown as it was proper feed for store-pigs, which still provided good profit for the family. At first the area of household farms provided was reduced if it had a vineyard or garden-plot. Thus Károly Porkoláb got a household farm, the area of which was reduced by the area of his own vineyard. The women in the family cultivated the household farm, the vine-yard and kept the garden around the house. They looked after the animals as well. Men mowed the fodder grass and hay-making, but they could do it only on Sunday, since they had to work at the co-operative from Monday till Saturday. However, after mowing the fodder grass in many cases the two women and the growing son completed the hay-making. Men carried the hay home, but it was not a hard job, as Károly Porkoláb could do it with his two horses, since he was a coachman.

At the beginning of the 1960s the family gave up intensive religious life. So far they had celebrated all feasts, gone to church, but since men could work on the household farm only on Sunday, they gradually gave it up. This happened to every family in the village.

Even those who were not members were forcefully called to work for the co-operative in order to prevent the formation of prosperous household farms. Called or not, everybody worked on co-operative lands. Men could not manage to work on two lands besides their everyday work. Consequently, the household farm was left to the women to run. The growing child in the family also worked a lot at home during the summers. He/she usually fed, cared for and gave water to the animals. Fulfilling these tasks together with the children of the same age from the neighborhood was not so difficult for them.

However, children worked not only at home. Károly Porkoláb junior already as a primary school pupil took part in summer agricultural work at the co-operative together with several of his fellows. Sometimes 30 children worked in a team.

The children knew each other well from school, and their parents also worked at the co-operative together. Thus it was a matter of course that if one child went to work, the others also wanted to go. They worked mainly during fruit and vegetable harvest, or did other jobs that children could do led by 2-3 adults. The adults earned 3 forints per hour at the co-operative; children received 1 or 1.5 forints per hour. Károly Porkoláb recalled: 'We children wanted to go to the co-operative, since at noon we had a two-hour long lunch break when we could play. I had very good, positive memories from my childhood regarding the co-operative.' Junior worked every summer. As a grammar school pupil he guarded sunflowers, his task was to frighten crows away. Later he worked at grain clearing. Combined harvesters could not clear the grain completely, and it had to be cleared again. The grains cleared in this way were stored in sacks, and pupils helped in putting the sacks where they belonged. They worked in pairs, one week at night, next week daytime. This was a real adult job which paid well.

After finishing grammar school Károly Porkoláb Jr. applied to college, but he had already missed the first year. Until the next academic year he worked in the co-operative, this time as a young man. He worked as a wage accountant at the co-operative, which meant regular work with regular and fixed salary. When he went to college⁵⁶ he made a contract with the co-operative for his college years. He received a scholarship from the Táncsis co-operative of Tiszadob and did his summer practices there – he spent the whole summer working. After graduating from college he continued working at the co-operative. The salary from the co-operative was enough for him to live independently from his parents during the college years.

It has been seen that every member of the family worked in a one way or another at the co-operative, one as an active member, one as a child, one as a young worker or as student, others on the household farm, or on the land cultivated by shares. In the family Béni Siető and Károly Porkoláb were members, Erzsébet Sóron and Erzsébet Siető worked on the household farm and on the lands cultivated by shares. Erzsébet Siető also

became an active member in the 1970s, while Károly Porkoláb Jr. worked at the co-operative as a child, as a student and as an active member. In all, local families and the entire village community were bound to co-operatives very tightly.

In 1968 the New Economic Mechanism was introduced in Hungary which supported the co-operatives. They strengthened and the situation of villagers stabilized. Those cultivating their household farms were given more possibilities. Also household farming as a source of income was supported if the farmer was a member of a co-operative. That the people considered co-operative to be common property – this was also the policy of the party and local leaders – started a new custom in the late 1960s in Hungarian villages which people regarded as moral and legal within the limits of local unwritten regulations. This was that every worker in proportion to the area he worked on in the co-operative regularly took home a part of the product he produced there. It has to be emphasized that this was not considered illegal, as everybody followed the custom, both the leaders and the workers. During the years even a silent regulation developed in the community on how much one could take home from the common products according to his position at the co-operative. The impact of this kind of extra income could be seen also in the outlook of the settlements and whole village. Nonetheless, it was considered as normal and nobody was reprehended. The intensive cultivation of household farms led to considerable improvements in Hungarian villages.

In our case the family furnished a room in the new house with new furniture. After finishing grammar school successfully, Károly Porkoláb Jr. got a Jawa motorcycle with an engine of 250 cm³. Other improvements were also made in the family. In the middle of the 1960s they bought a new bicycle for Erzsébet Siető, since before they had only one men's bicycle in the family. They bought a television set in 1965 and at the end of the 1960s a washing machine and a refrigerator. On the yard they built a new pigsty, farm buildings and a corn-crib – the latter for storing household corn. Such significant changes could be seen in the life of the family between 1959 and the end of the 1960s.

From the 1970s there were three families. Károly Porkoláb Jr. graduating from college got married in 1972. He married Katalin Kalydy, whom he got to know at college, and who also graduated as a horticulturist. They had two children. The new family introduced a lot of new into their lifestyle. Most importantly, they moved into a separate house. Both being young agriculturists, the co-operative provided them a managerial house, which was situated 1 km from the village in an old vineyard. With the help of their parents the young couple managed to buy a Trabant in 1974. In 1976 they moved into the village, to another managerial house of the co-operative. In Tiszadob water system was established in the very same year but was installed in the house which already had a bathroom and a water closet only in the following year. Till then a pump in a well in the yard lifted water for washing and bathing. Since the water was not suitable for drinking, the family carried drinking water in cans from further away. The young couple lived considerably comfortably; in 1979 they bought a Lada, traveled in Italy and Bulgaria on trips organized by the co-operative, and in Romania and Czechoslovakia by their own car.

The young family continued to cultivate the land of their parents and grandparents. Károly Porkoláb Jr. tried bee-keeping and having sheep. However, he was promoted in the co-operative and did not have enough time to continue that. Consequently, he and his wife did not take part in running the family farm between the beginning of the 1970s and 1984.

In the following both households are dealt with because that shows continuous changing within the family

At the beginning of the 1970s in Károly Porkoláb's Sr.'s family the cattle stock was decreased because of alterations in farm buildings. One part of the cowshed was turned into a tool-store; the forage shed was turned into a garage. Higher salaries at the co-operative made it possible to pay these improvements. The family worked on the household farm, but its significance decreased remarkably in the 1970s. At the end of the 1970s water system was installed in the house, and a bathroom and a

kitchen sink were built inside. In 1976 Béni Siető died. His son-in-law took over the running of the household farm.

At the beginning of the 1980s a wave of house building spread all over Hungary. If somebody could buy a plot, he started to build a house. People were provided loans with very low interest (3%), which made building a new house together with all the necessary farm buildings possible. People used building loans also for purchasing cars and furniture, since building itself was completed with help of the community. Brothers and sisters, friends and colleagues helped. They were not paid for their work, but provided with food and drink.

Károly Porkoláb Jr. and his wife also started building a new house in 1982. At that time they had been married for 10 years. They received financial support from their parents, and they also contracted a loan. A local builder led the building work, and brothers and sisters, relatives, friends and colleagues came to help. The couple kept a record of some aspects of building work. It shows how many people took part in the building of the basement and the walls, and also for how long they worked there. Recorded also was how much and what kinds of food and drinks they bought for the helpers. Basement building lasted for 7 days. Number of helpers during these days was as follows: first day 5 people, second day 14 people, third day 14 people, fourth day 3 people, fifth day 12 people, sixth day 12 people, seventh day 7 people. Wall building lasted for 6 days. Number of helpers during these days varied from 2 to 10 people. During the recorded time – 13 days – altogether 102 people took part in the building. For them the following foodstuffs and drink were purchased:

5 kg pork	5 ducks
10 kg beef	70 eggs
6 knuckles of ham	5 packets of coffee
13 kg sausage, lard and salami	26 l pálinka
4 smoked trotters	10 l wine
2.5 kg cottage cheese	475 bottles of beer
3 cartoons of sour-cream	3 l refreshments
8 chickens	

This shows that the family wanted to treat the helpers properly with food and drink, since paying cash for their work was out of the question. During the 1980s the custom of building houses in voluntary communities (*kaláka*; in Finnish: *talkoot*) was still alive. A man went to help in several building sites, and those whom he helped all came to help him when he built his house. At Tiszadob this practice disappeared at the end of the 1980s and professional building brigades built the houses.

Bricks were delivered from Mályi, tiles from Békéscsaba, wooden material was cut and sawn in the village. The house was modern, for instance, it had central heating. It was completed in 1983.

On March 1, 1984 a great change took place in the life of the family, since Károly Porkoláb Jr. resigned from the Táncsis Co-operative for personal reasons. He went to work for the forestry property of Tiszadob. His wife also resigned and went to work in the children's home of Tiszadob. From forestry work Károly Porkoláb Jr. earned half the salary he had had at the co-operative. Instead he had much more free time and his job was now more peaceful and balanced. At the same time he took over the running of the household farm from his father, Károly Porkoláb Sr.

Already before leaving the co-operative Károly Porkoláb Jr. had bought a cow, but real improvement took place in the farm only after he took the new job. The farm was very suitable for cattle-breeding, there was professional knowledge, and the senior farmer could also help with his experience. They started to enlarge the cattle stock rapidly, but not with the old Hungarian speckled type, but with the red and black speckled Fries type, more suitable for intensive milk production.

5 The Hienonen Family at Niittyharju

The Hienonen family lives in Central Finland, in Lankamaa. Three lakes along the road to Rautalampi surround Lankamaa: Kynsivesi on the east, Leivonvesi on the south and Kuusvesi on the west. The area of the village was inhabited already in the sixteenth century. It belonged to Hankasalmi parish until 1967,

when it was connected to Laukaa to which it still belongs. Electricity was installed in the village in 1949, telephone connection was built in 1959, and the road suitable also for car traffic was laid in 1960–61. The shop vans of Keskimaa, Mäki-Matti, Topeilius, Lukkarinen and Kyläri supplied the population of the village until 1992. The trucks of Valio and Mäki-Matti transported the milk from Lankamaa. Post is delivered 6 days a week, and a library-bus and a passenger bus comes regularly to the village. The community has organized regular taxi transport for those, who need it.⁵⁷

The Hienonen family lived on the central area of the present farm as crofters before the national crofters' emancipation of 1917. After 1919 the family started private farming, similarly to many Finnish peasant families. The present farmer's great-grandfather, Taavetti Hienonen built the first family house at Niittyharju. Today houses (2) and farm-buildings are situated close to each other. A pine tree and some remnants of the stone basement show the place of the first house on the other side of the brook running through the estate.

The first farmer and his son were both smiths. Nobody continued their work later on in the family. Iisakki Hienonen, the son of Taavetti and Silja Hienonen, married a Helli from Savio, near Jyväskylä. Iisakki and Helli – as they were called in the village – built a new house in 1922, which is today called as the old house. One son was born in the family, Eino Hienonen. However, they also had a foster-child, adopted from the wife's family.

Iisakki Hienonen led the estate, which consisted of forests, plough-fields, pastures and hayfields. They also kept cows, pigs, sheep, horses and hens. The farm was self-supporting, although they also marketed some products, mainly by barter. The farmer, being a smith, earned his living not only from farming – he was a handyman. He completed everything he once imagined. He made everything himself that he considered important for his family and the farm but also for his own amusement. He built boats in his workshop, which he sold. This provided remarkable extra income for the family. He also

made a *kantele* and an accordion. He built the first water system from wood in the village, and it provided water both to the house and the farm buildings. He dammed the water up in the brook running through the farm, and this ran the generator he himself planned and built. This system provided the farm with electricity, until the state electrification reached the village. Using their own electricity was not easy, as they did not have a transformer. The current was either too strong, so all the lamps had to be switched on in the house, or too weak so that the planing machine could run but the mill could not always be operated. Despite the difficulties it was a great achievement considering the circumstances of the 1940s. Before the Second World War they had already used machines on the farm, which were powered by internal engine motors. The electric ones built by Iisakki Hienonen modified these machines after the war.

The farm in this period aimed at complete self-sufficiency and developed intensively. Homemade machines and equipments helped the work in the farm and the household. At this time the family owned a landed property of 12 hectares and servants worked on the farm already in this period.

The Junior Heinonen's, namely Eino Hienonen's wife, Eila Muurikainen, came first to the farm as a servant in 1947. Having been away for a year, she came back to the family as a wife. Eila Muurikainen's family lived close to Lankamaa. On the paternal side she came from a well-to-do farmer family. Her father's father owned a land of 1000 hectares. However, Eila's father had not been in good terms with his father – he did not inherit anything after the father died. The family had to send their children, among them Eila, to serve on other family farms as usual in Finland at the time.

Now, when the family became larger with the arrival of the new wife, it had 6 milk cows, 2 mares, which had colts in succession. They kept approximately 20 sheep, 10 pigs and poultry. The farm was still led by Iisakki Hienonen but the young couple did most of the work. The farmer spent his days mainly in his workshop, and took part in farming only in time of summer season. The family lived on a common budget. They ate at the

same table and the farmer arranged all financial affairs. He checked everything very carefully both in the family and on the farm.

Until 1953 Iisakki Hienonen led the farm. His son, Eino Hienonen, succeeded him. His parents had only him and so the process of inheritance went smoothly. Eino Hienonen inherited everything but they made a contract on selling and buying property and on pension to the parents. But they still lived together, ate at the same table, and this remained so until the parents died. When they stroke the contract a couple from Tahkokorva arrived as witnesses. The contract regulated everything in detail: it told how much butter, flour, potatoes and other food as well as hygiene products constituted the pension, even Iisakki Hienonen's daily cognac portion was listed which he drank on medical prescription. The contract ensured a respectable life for the elderly parents. Money was not mentioned in the contract, since the young couple had officially bought the farm from the parents. They had one year from the signing of the contract to pay the whole sum of money, and when the payment took place between father and son, nobody knew exactly to what extent it was finally completed. As the parents had their own money, the contracted pension was called 'lifepension', i.e. the young couple had to support the elderly parents for the rest of their lives. Had the parents moved away, for instance, the points of the contract should have been followed very strictly. The family, however, agreed to continue living together and they stayed on good terms with each other.

After the farm became Eino Hienonen's property in 1953, the family continued agriculture and developed it. Eino did not continue his father's job as a smith – he did not make boats, saying that if he also started making boats, farming and agriculture would come to an end. He began intensive improvements on the farm. In the beginning they milked 4-5 cows and had a tank of 10 liters to store and transport milk daily. During winter time the amount of production of milk was not enough to fill it but when production started to grow, they acquired a 20-liter tank which became almost full in summer time. Five years after Eino

had become the farmer and the family had with great efforts gathered the capital, they started to build a new cowshed.

Men worked not only on the farm, but took up other jobs as well to get some extra income for the family. Iisakki Hienonen made boats but his son, Eino took up transport and forestry work and also hunted to earn extra money. The family had two horses in this time. With one of them Eino delivered wood in the forest during the winter. Often the housewife's brother and other neighbors, or often she herself drove the horse on the farm when his husband was away from home. He was away from home not only due to delivery jobs, but he also went to cut and float wood for weeks. The most popularly hunted animal was squirrel, since its fur could be sold most profitably. The fur was salted and put out to dry on the wall of the house. Then they were sold in Jyväskylä where a lady who had a squirrel fur coat was considered very rich.

On the farm there were also sheep, usually around 20. They were kept for own consumption, but some of them were also sold. Their sheepskin was salted and prepared for making winter blankets, waistcoats and coats. Women spun the wool at home. In summertime the family fattened pigs, at times as much as eleven, and sold them in Kytönniemi or slaughtered them for family consumption. They kept hens, but only for their eggs, since they did not eat their meat. Besides mutton and pork they also ate beef. They slaughtered one bull each year.

Women cared for the cows and completed different household duties. They also earned extra income by selling dairy-products and bread. Since there were families which did not regularly bake bread, women on the Hienonen farm baked bread for them as well.

The family aimed at complete self-sufficiency; they bought very few products from shops or tradesmen, mostly sugar and salt as well as textiles for clothing, and particular tools and utensils they could hardly make at home. They bought them either in a grocery or from an itinerant vendor. The nearest grocery was in Laukaa; itinerant vendors came with their goods in a certain time of the year.

The family grew rye and barley, which they took to the mill. The nearest mills were situated in Lievestuore and later in Lankamaa. The family also had a home mill which almost supplied their complete flour needs. At times the home mill ground the rye so white that it could be used for baking yeast bread. Saturday was the baking day for women. They baked buns, yeast bread and rye bread but they did not need to bake rye bread every Saturday for it lasted longer. Baking yeast bread and buns on Saturdays was a must for women. They baked buns from 4-5 kg flour but they often ran out by the middle of the week. So they just waited for the next baking day.

The family did its duties according to a certain order, kept the meals of the day, and divided the duties of the week. The annual feasts also had their own place, their accustomed order. The family got up every morning at five o'clock, had a cup of coffee together and then everybody went to her/his duty: some to the cowshed, some outdoors, some stayed indoors depending on the nature of the task. In the 1940s and 1950s only men worked in the forest, on the arable land and hayfield, and with the carriages. In those days men did not work do housework, not even in the cowsheds. The breakfast was ready by 7 o'clock, and it was made of potatoes and some kind of sauce. Then around ten or eleven o'clock they again had coffee together. They ate lunch between midday and one o'clock, three o'clock in the afternoon they had coffee together again. They had dinner at seven; by that time everybody had finished working. Later this order changed, when Eino and Eila Hienonen became the owners. Men took coffee, sandwiches and buns with them to the forest. When they arrived from woods a substantial warm meal awaited them, usually potatoes and meat. For breakfast they often had rye porridge, but the most popular food was potato with some kind of meat or sauce or fish. If they worked at home, the family usually had a rest after lunch, and after that everybody continued working. The family went to sauna on every Wednesday and Saturday. On six days of the week everybody worked, but Sunday was a day for rest. Similarly to other days of the week they got up at five and looked

after the animals but Sunday was a sacred day and they did not do any other work. The order of the meals was the same as on weekdays.

Going to church was very important. They went to church in Laukaa, which was 15 kms away from their house across the lake. In summer they went to church by motorboat, in winter by horse sledge. Those who could not go to church listened to the service on the radio at home. On Sunday afternoons neighbors visited each other. Either somebody came to the family, or the family visited somebody in the neighborhood to talk and have a cup of coffee. Christmas was the main feast of the year. The family was always present at the service in the church at six o'clock in the morning together with the others from the surroundings. On the first Christmas day they fed the horses earlier in the morning. The cows were given so much hay the evening before, that they did not have to bother about feeding them in the morning, they only milked them. Jingling sledges from every direction were heading to the Laukaa church on the ice early in the morning. After the service they went home competing, who would arrive home first.

On Sundays on the way home from church men did not drive the horses any longer, but sat back in the sledge and the horses were left to find the way home. Men always had spirits with them in sledges, and some of them got drunk on the way home.

Self-sufficiency literally meant that everything the family needed was to be homemade. For instance, flax was grown and women wove linen at home and made underwear from it. However, they wore homemade linen clothes only until the 1940s, later that they bought textiles from the shops and made their clothes at home of it. Underwear was made at home for a longer time but a tailor from Laukaa made, for instance, men's suits or they bought them in Jyväskylä. From leather they made blankets, waistcoats, coats and gloves. Gloves made from dog leather were the warmest. Besides clothing it was food that they produced and gathered themselves. Main products have already been mentioned but the family picked up berries in the forest, mainly cowberries and blibberries. They also sold cowber-

ries but usually they conserved them for themselves for the winter. Bilberries were dried, or they made jam of them. From red bilberries they made jam, or stored them mashed in their own juice in which they lasted even without sugar. They picked great amount of mushrooms, which they salted and conserved in small pots. They salted lot of fish and conserved it in big wooden tubs, just like meat. In autumn they salted more fish than in spring. They salted pike and bream in springtime. Bream was salted, then dried in the sun or in the oven, and stored in the pantry or in the attic in large baskets. They cooked fish together with potatoes; the salt coming out of the fish salted also the potatoes. For salting meat and fish they bought coarse salt in sacks of 50 kg, and they bought sugar in 5-10 kilo lumps. Of the belly and stomach and other intestines of the animals they did not eat, soap with alkali bought in the shop was made. They grew carrots, potatoes, beetroots, cabbages, onions, turnip, swede and sugar beets in the fields around the house. They drank home made beer and sour milk; home made beer and milk were always available at the table.

The family could start building a new cowshed in 1958. In it they installed a milk tank of 40 liters, and also brought in new cattle breed which they produced more and fatter milk. At the beginning of the 1960s they completely gave up sheep breeding. They increased the number of cows and young cattle instead. Already at the end of the 1950s the family joined a tractor society and used it together with other four farms. This was always driven by the same person in order to avoid quarrel about possible problems in the work. The Hienonen family bought their own tractor, a Nuffield in 1962, which was used in ploughwork and in the forest. Together with the tractor a milking machine, crucial on a dairy farm, was bought. The farmer and his friend used this machine in milking the cows, since the wife did not like it and continued to milk by hand. When the new cowshed was built, they joined the society of milk testing. They started to transport milk to the milk bay around 1954-55, when the road suitable for cars was built in the neighborhood. In the beginning they took the milk of only three cows to the dairy,

churned butter from the milk of four cows at home, and marketed it, like in old times. However, finally all the milk was taken to the dairy. At first milk went to Äänekoski dairy, later to Jyväskylä. At first farmers collected their milk in a nearby house from where in the summer a motorboat, in the winter a horse sledge took the milk to a collecting point where a truck collected and transported it to the dairy. Although the family sold the milk, they still drank their own milk and churned butter from it for domestic use.

When the family joined the society of milk checking, they handed down milk with 6% fat content. The new cows gave so high-quality milk that the Hienonens won several prizes with them. Hard work, good caring and investment bore fruit. The family farm became specialized by conversion to a dairy farm at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s firstly by reducing, later by eliminating other activities. They strengthened the main profile of the farm buying new machines, equipment and investing their capital. They bought a forest of 19 hectares which also served the improvement of the farm. The Hienonen farm was an example for the neighboring farms. Many people came to ask for advice and many people saw how the farm was run because the post of the 7-8 families was delivered to the Heinonens. People coming to pick up their post stopped for a moment to talk with the members of the family.

Unexpected deaths divided the family into two and halted the tendency of improvement on the farm. In January 1965 Iisakki Hienonen died, shortly afterwards his wife, Helli passed away and the most hitting death was that of Eino's in May. Eino and Eila Hienonen had three sons. Markku was 11, Martti 9 and Reijo 6 years old, when their father died and Eila was left alone with her sons and the farm. Her brother, Antti helped her a lot for two years while he also lived on the farm. Often women, but also men from the neighboring houses came to help. The two elder boys, Markku and Martti, helped the most. It was his father who taught Markku how to drive a tractor, and the young boy liked this work very much. He often helped her mother driving the tractor, since Eila could not handle it al-

though she tried. Martti helped on the farm in everything; he worked in the cowshed, on the hayfield, on the plough field or in the forest. Although he was still at elementary school, it maybe said that he worked like an adult.

Eila's bother, Antti left to Helsinki after two years. Eila had to run the farm by herself again. However, with the neighbors' and children's help he could manage and the farm started to improve again. Improvement of the fields already started, horses were sold and machines did all the heavy work. Markku became an architect; at present he lives in Oulu. Reijo studied a trade and lives now with his family on the lakeshore part of the farm. Martti stayed at home in the old house with his mother. He is the one, who has continued farming.

After primary school Martti studied at a farmers' college (*maamieskoulu*) which lasted for a winter. He has been living on the farm ever since. At first his mother ran the farm, later Martti himself as he bought up the farm in 1982 from his brothers, Markku and Reijo. He made a contract with his mother based on the same principles as the one his parents made with his grandparents 30 years earlier. When Martti Hienonen bought the farm, the area was 40 hectares, out of which 10 hectares were ploughed. They had 12 cows, five bulls, five growing heifers and some hens. Later Reijo bought from Martti the summer house situated on the lakeshore and the land around it.

Martti gradually enlarged his estate and improved the farm. He started to cultivate a part of the wooded land, and also bought new arable land which slowly amounted to 23 hectares. The plough lands are all situated in the area of Lankamaa, besides there is forest of 40 hectares which is mostly situated in the same area. The landed and wooded areas together with the house and the land around it now come to a little bit more than 60 hectares. He not only enlarged the farm but following in the footsteps of his parents modernized it. Later he built a new cowshed where he installed a new piped milking system with milk-cooling tanks. He bought a new machine every year either in the cowshed or for the work on cultivated lands and in the forest. In 1981 he renovated the main living-house built by his

great grandfather. Downstairs there is a sauna, a laundry-room, a bathroom, a toilet, a living-room (*tupa*), a kitchen, and an office room. Eila Hienonen lives upstairs in a separate apartment; and in the other part there are two rooms. The old fireplace remained in the house as a heater; it heated a new central boiler. In the new cowshed functions a separate heating center and the central boiler of the heating system is there. The building is at the same time a store for firewood, also a workshop and a garage for cars and tractors.

Martti also continuously improved the cattle stock. He grew oat, barley and hay on the fields, he strengthened the profile of the farm – milking cows and live stock (*lihakarja*) at the end of the 1970s. However, it was still milk production that made the bigger profit.

After taking over the farm Martti got married. Solja came to the family as a wife in 1985. Since then the structure of the family and the method of farming changed. This change was not only due to the new housewife's will but also to the national change of economy which deeply affected the life of Finnish family farmers. The term 'family farm' is fitting because in Finland for the families, who started to live on the land and insistently continued to live on agriculture throughout the years, farming was not only a source of living, but also a lifestyle. Farming determined their everyday life, with its positive and negative sides. The family and its source of living, i.e. farming, were strictly connected. The private farms specializing only in one single product, have managed to continue farming in case the whole family was involved in it. Thus 'family farm' describes them most precisely.

Looking over the 40 years, the following changes took place at the Hienonen farm. They already had their own generator providing electricity around 1945. The village gained central electricity in 1949 and the family has also used this since then. Iisakki Hienonen also built a water supply system from wood at the end of the 1940s. Eino Hienonen renovated this system while rebuilding the cowshed, which since then has been modernized following the requirements of the age. There is still no public water supply system in Lankamaa. Each house has its

independent water pipe system and pump for drinking water supply. This is a general practice in the Finnish countryside. The telephone system was installed in the village in 1959; also the Hienonen family received a telephone-line then. However, they shared it with the Friman family. The two families could use the line by turns. When it rang twice, the call was for the Hienonen family; when once, it was for the Frimans. In 1971 the manual telephone system was altered to an automatic system in the village. The family had a washing machine already in the 1950s and they bought the first refrigerator at the end of the 1960s and their first freezer in the 1980s. They heated the house by a wood stove until 1981 when heating was modernized with the already mentioned central heating system. They installed a modern bathroom also at the time.

6 Conclusion

Since 1945 Hungarian villages and their inhabitants have been tested in many ways. In 1945 the abolition of the system of large estates marked the end of an era, while the redistribution of land opened a new one. The country of servants and landless peasantry became the country of smallholders. The new situation did not last very long either. In 1948, three years after the redistribution of the land, family estates were already regarded as obstacles of the socialist regime. Family farms strived further until 1958 under political pressurizing. Between 1958 and 1962 yet another far-reaching change took place in the Hungarian agriculture: the process of general collectivization was started. Co-operative farms were established all over the country. This changed the structure of agriculture and the life of farming families radically. People tried to get accustomed to the new conditions, meaning a struggle for survival for them. Most of the people staying in villages worked in co-operatives, and in a few years time slow economic growth was reflected also in the living standard of the Hungarian village population. However, the 'survival' of this social stratum has always been crucial for those in power, since their very existence depended on the well-being of the peasantry.

Villagers adapted themselves to the new circumstances: they aimed at enlarging and improving the small private property they were allowed to have, i.e. the household farms. The cultivation of household lands was fundamental for both the system and the owner of the land. Conditions in Hungarian villages improved. New houses were being built, electricity and water supply was installed, cars and household machines and equipment appeared in the households during the 1960s and 1970s.

In Hungarian villages a strong stratum of farmers could not develop within the discussed time period. Prominent farmers were eliminated from the villages during kulak persecutions. The stratum of active farmers disappeared from the Hungarian countryside. The called co-operative peasants stayed in the villages. The expressions 'farmer' and 'landholder' had disappeared from everyday language usage. Instead, Hungarians referred to peasants, often pejoratively, regarding somebody as uneducated and uninformed. In Hungary villagers were often identified with these negative characteristics during the time period discussed.

In Finland after the Second World War agriculture became stronger – 94,000 new individual estates started cultivation. However, in consequence the average size of a property decreased from 10 hectares to 8-9 hectares. After the war the number of village inhabitants increased, also the number of children grew. Consequently, a lot of schools were founded in the Finnish countryside.

Owing to the fast developing agriculture Finland reached the level of national self-sufficiency in the 1950s. Nonetheless, this soon led to agricultural overproduction. As a result Finnish government aimed at abolishing small and uneconomic farms. The state even gave subsidies to those giving up agricultural activity. Consequently, at the end of the 1960s great changes took place; Finnish society with a majority of village population living from agriculture turned into a consumer, primarily urban society within a few years period.

One million people gave up farming. Most of them left the countryside and moved either to the big towns of southern Finland or to Sweden.

At the end of the 1970s the state encouraged specialization in agriculture in order to sustain village life in Finland. Family farm became the basic unit of agriculture. The Finnish countryside turned into a producer of raw material. During the 1980s agricultural overproduction continued and the farmers received remarkable subsidies. The following differences can be traced between the situations of villagers in the two countries within the discussed period: due to political pressure, collectivization and its consequences formed the outlook of Hungarian villages. They lost a definitive stratum of their population, that of the independent, active farmers. The value system changed, the land, as a basis of agriculture was no longer a key-concept and a reality defining values and making wealth in Hungary. In fact, its position in Hungarian society was not taken by any alternative, until land was again privately owned in the 1990s. Hungarian village population lost its land in the 1960s and looked for other ways of economic activity, often showing off and exaggerating. However, we can state that Hungarian village dwellers were in a disadvantageous position regarding social welfare if compared to urban population.

On the contrary, in Finland a stratum of strong private farmers could develop, also due to political situation. Nonetheless, the alteration of this stratum had also dramatic effects on the whole country. As working opportunities drastically decreased in the countryside, a great deal of the population moved away. Consequently, the very survival of several villages was questionable. Finnish society became urbanized very rapidly which caused difficulties both for villagers and for urban population. The improvement of the Finnish countryside took place almost as speedily as urban modernization. Owing to both modernization and traditionalism so characteristic of Finnish village population, it faced and experienced modernization in a way that it did not lose its inherited customs and methods completely.

NOTES

- ¹ Ignác Romsics, *Magyarország története a XX. században*. Budapest: Osiris 1999, 281-82; Tibor Valuch, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében*. Budapest: Osiris 2002, 190; Zsuzsanna Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig'. In Estók János (szerk.), *Agrárvilág Magyarországon 1848–2002*. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó – Magyar Mezőgazdasági Múzeum 2003, 265.
- ² Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 264; Romsics, *Magyarország története a XX. században*, 282.
- ³ Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 266.
- ⁴ Ferenc Donáth, 'A kisparaszti mezőgazdaság 1945–1949'. In Gunst Péter–Hoffman Tamás (szerk.), *A Magyar mezőgazdaság a XIX–XX században, 1849–1949*. Budapest 1976, 401-472; Sádorné Laczka. 'A földterület és a földhasználat alakulása 1945 és 1994 között'. *Statisztikai Szemle* 2/1998, 117-129; József Nádasdi, *Tagosítások és birtokrendésések Magyarországon a XIX. század közepétől 1956-ig*. Nyíregyháza 1996, ff.
- ⁵ Varga 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 265.
- ⁶ Valuch, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében*, 213-234; Gyula Belényi, *A sztálini iparosítás emberi ára 1948–1956*. Szeged: JATE 1993; Antal Böhm, László Pál, *Társadalmunk ingázói – az ingázók társadalma*. Budapest: Kossuth 1985.
- ⁷ Leninváros is situated 20 km from Tiszadob between Polgár and Tiszadob. Miskolc is 40 km; Kazincbarcika is 60 km from Tiszadob. There used to be a pontoon bridge or ferry connection on the river Tisza.
- ⁸ I consider 'old farmers' or 'old farming families' the ones which had their own private family estates already before 1945, and neither the farmers nor their family members worked on local large estates.
- ⁹ Varga 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 289.
- ¹⁰ I consider 'new farmers' those who received landed property in the land redistribution of 1945. They did not own a family farm earlier and earned their living by working on local large estates receiving different allotments.
- ¹¹ In the Hungarian villages the people who had lived on agriculture before the World War II stuck to their rights to own land which they gave up only until under coercion in the beginning of the 1950s.
- ¹² Béla Fazekas, *A mezőgazdasági termelőszövetkezeti mozgalom Magyarországon*. Budapest: Kossuth 1976; Romsics, *Magyarország története a XX. században*, 374-382; Valuch, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX.*

- század második felében, 191-94; Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 283-293.
- ¹³ Veres Péter, *Az alföld parasztsága*. Budapest 1936; *Szocializmus, nacionalizmus*. Budapest 1939; *Falusi krónika*. Budapest 1941; *Parasztsors – magyarsors*. Budapest 1942; *Próbatétel*. Budapest 1951; *Pályamunkások*. Budapest 1951; *Gyepsor*. Budapest 1954; *Három nemzedék*. Budapest 1957.
- ¹⁴ Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 283.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 238.
- ¹⁶ Pál Závada, *Kulákprés*. Budapest 1986; *Jadвига párnája*. Budapest 1997; Jávor Kata – Molnár Mária - Pirooska Szabó – Sárkány Mihály, 'A falusi társadalom a szocializmus időszakában'. In Paladi-Kovács Attila (szerk.), *Magyar néprajza VIII. Társadalom*. Budapest: Akadémiai 2000, 981, 1001.
- ¹⁷ Valuch, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében*, 192; Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 288-289.
- ¹⁸ Szabolcs-Számár-Bereg Megyei Önkormányzat Levéltára (= The Archives of the Counties Szabolcs, Szatmár and Bereg (SzSzBML), XXIII.812.TÜ jko. 1950. The file XXIII.812 contains minutes concerning Tiszadob.
- ¹⁹ Valuch *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében*, 194-95; Varga 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 293.
- ²⁰ Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 290-91.
- ²¹ Romsics, *Magyarország története a XX. században*, 374-382; Valuch, , 240-46; Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 294.
- ²² SzSzBML, XXIII.812. TÜ jko. 1953; Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 294-96.
- ²³ Valuch, 193-94; Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 294-95.
- ²⁴ SzSzBML, XIII.812. TÜ jko. 1954–55.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, VB jko. 1956.
- ²⁶ Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 269.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 299.
- ²⁸ SzSzBML, XXIII.812. VB. jkv. 1957.
- ²⁹ Valuch, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében*, 195; Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 301.
- ³⁰ Fazekas 1976; Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 204-309.
- ³¹ Varga 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 316.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 316-317.
- ³³ Romsics , *Magyarország története a XX. században*, 423-454; Varga 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 320.
- ³⁴ Varga, 'Az agrárium 1945-től napjainkig', 326.

- ³⁵ Péter Elek, Béla Gunda, Zoltán Hilscher, *Elsüllyedt falu a Dunántúlon*. Budapest 1936; János Kodolányi, *Ormánság*. Budapest 1960; Kalász 1961.
- ³⁶ Jávör – Molnár – Szabó – Sárkány, 'A falusi társadalom a szocializmus időszakában', 989-992.
- ³⁷ Ákos Janó, 'A társasmunkák és a kendermunkák társas jellege Szatmárban'. *Ethnológia* LXXVII/1966, 517-527; 'A fonó munkaszervezeti és társas-összejöveteli formáinak történeti és recens vizsgálatához'. *Déri Múzeum évkönyve*. Debrecen 1979, 291-318.
- ³⁸ Jávör – Molnár – Szabó – Sárkány, 'A falusi társadalom a szocializmus időszakában', 989-992.
- ³⁹ Éva Valér, 'Az urbanizálódás falvakat érintő fő sajátosságai'. *A falu* 2/1987, 32.
- ⁴⁰ György Enyedi, 'A Magyar településhálózat átalakulása'. *A falu* 1/1985, 15-23.
- ⁴¹ Ibidem.
- ⁴² Pál Juhász, 'Az agrárértelemisség szerepe és a mezőgazdasági szövetkezetek'. *Medvetánc* 1/1983, 191-224; Rudolf Andorka, 'A falusi társadalom változásai'. *Agrártörténeti Szemle* 1994/1-4, 3-26.
- ⁴³ Saarikangas, Kirsi, 'Puu, metsä ja luonto'. Toim. Lehtonen, Tuomas M.S., *Suomi. Outo pohjoinen maa? Näkökulmia Euroopan äären historian ja kulttuuriin*. Porvoo: WSOY 1999, 170-172.
- ⁴⁴ Petrisalo Katriina, 'Maaseutukulttuuri elää'. Toim. Kirkinen, Heikki, *Sukupolvien perintö 3. Talonpoikaikulttuurin sato*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä 1985, 193-226.
- ⁴⁵ Korhonen, Teppo, 'Maaseudun elämäntavan muutos'. Toim. Löytönen Markku & Kolbe, Laura. *Suomi. Maa, kansa, kulttuuri*. Helsinki: SKS, 1999, 136-155.
- ⁴⁶ Petrisalo, 'Maaseutukulttuuri elää', 193-226; Pihkala, Erkki, 'Maa- ja metsätalouden uusi asema'. *Suomen taloushistoria* 2. Helsinki: Tammi 1982, 387-407.
- ⁴⁷ Väänänen, Jouko, 'Osuustoimintaimperiumien kukoistusaikaa'. Toim. Itälä, Jaakko, *Suomalaisten tarina 3. Rakentajien aika, 1937–1967*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä 1993, 152.
- ⁴⁸ Eskola, Antti, *Maalaiset ja kaupunkilaiset*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä 1965, 55-177; Pihkala, 'Maa- ja metsätalouden uusi asema', 387-407.
- ⁴⁹ Vuorela, P., Kosonen M., Virtanen, P.V., *Suomalainen maaseutu*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä 1983, 110-114.
- ⁵⁰ Clear soup with boiled potato and pastry cut into big irregular pieces.
- ⁵¹ It is a kind of noodles.

⁵² In order to understand the prices better it may be pointed out that a pair of an adult's leather boots cost at the time 15 pengős, a pair of children boots 8 pengős and a milking cow 120 pengős. Fillér was the change for the pengő.

⁵³ They took the milk twice a day 2-3 km away.

⁵⁴ Despite difficulties, people like them somehow managed to fare better.

⁵⁵ According to the family, Béni Siető was not astute enough so that they did not receive bigger and better landed property.

⁵⁶ Agricultural College.

⁵⁷ Leinonen, Otto & Pietiläinen, Martti, *Lankamaa. Vesien helmi, saloseudun kukka*. Lankamaan kyläseura ry, 1995, 9-10.