

SETTLEMENT SYSTEM OF SCATTERED FARMSTEADS AND PROBLEMS

OF THE NEW COMMUNITIES WITH SCATTERED FARMSTEADS

ON THE GREAT PLAIN

E. P e t r i

Geographical Research Institute  
Hungarian Academy of Sciences  
/Hungary/

Within the problem of settlement system of scattered farmsteads of the Great Plain, the questions of population and settlement of the new communities with scattered farms represent special ones. In the course of my investigations the field-work has been representative, it has spread over the whole territory of the Great Plain, and has included one fifth of the new communities with scattered farms. The survey of changes between 1960 and 1970 according to communities has been prepared on the basis of the material of two censuses, including six counties /this is more than the 90 % of the area with scattered farms of the Great Plain/. It has been carried out not only in connection with the new communities but with the old ones, too, for the sake of comparison. In my present lecture, I. try to summarize the results of investigation up to now.

As it is well known, the special settlement system of scattered farmsteads of the Hungarian Great Plain has been inherited from the pas. The scattered farms, as independent working and

dwelling place units of peasant small-scale producers, adapted themselves to the comparatively dense network of villages and market-towns of considerable extent, and were dispersed in the agricultural area. According to their genesis, they have constituted a unity with the closed settlement /town or village/ on the confines of which they have taken place. Administrative unit of a small population consisting for the most part of inhabitants of scattered farms, in the course of the capitalist development has hardly come into being. The number of these communities has considerably increased in the course of the administrative reform after World War II.

The social-economic transformation of the country after World War II gave a hope also to the solution of the much-debated problems of "scattered farms". In the case of replacement of the private peasant farms by socialist large-scale farms, the scattered farm as agricultural working place theoretically ceases to exist, and so it can be done away with also as dwelling place. It makes possible for the population of scattered farms to move to the already existing closed settlements, or to the ones to be newly established.

This consideration has led the creators of the administrative reform, when they have called into being nearly 100 new communities with scattered farms in the Great Plain, breaking up the historically developed boundaries of the towns and villages. The territories of the new communities have been carved out from the territory of settlements, interspersed by scattered farms, having big agricultural areas. It was a quite frequent solution that the territory of the new community has been formed by the unification of border territories split off of more adjoining units. In the case of the market-towns with scattered farms,

more communities have been organized from the agricultural territory detached from the town.

The administrative arrangement thus carried out, had two aims:

a/ to relieve the towns and bigger villages, having the hope of urbanization, of the troubles of solving the "tanya" - /scattered farm/ -problem in order that they should be able to concentrate their attention and force to the development of the closed settlement, and

b/ offering them administrative independence to enable the territories with scattered farms to solve their own problems, which would be pushed into the background in the frame of a bigger unit, and with establishment of villages of the new communities to speed up liquidation of the scattered farms.

The experience of the past quarter of a century proves that the process of liquidation of scattered farms, even in spite of significant results has not been so rapid as it had been supposed at the beginning of the social-economic transformation. The function of production of scattered farms has not ceased completely to exist even after the socialist reorganization of agriculture. By means of household farming, from working place it became secondary working place, which also strongly attracted the inhabitants to their dwelling places of scattered farm. But if the scattered farms functioned only as dwelling places, they could not even be liquidated at the imagined pace. Even beside the really quick economic development of the country, the power of the state is not enough to liquidate more 100 thousand family

houses and rebuild them in other places, naturally meeting the requirements of today /the capacity of building material industry and building industry, the significant communal investments needs running with the establishment or enlargement of closed settlements etc/.

The above difficulties present themselves both at the new and at the old communities with scattered farms. The special problem of new communities with scattered farms is due to the fact that the population is not incited by anything to move into these villages, the majority of which has been only topographically indicated. And the communities of a small population are not able to alter this situation unaided.

In order to understand the followings, it is necessary to speak something about Hungarian population statistics. The censuses publish the distribution of population between population of downtown and that of the outskirts broken down also to the administrative fundamental units. Downtown population means strictly speaking in the case of towns the inhabitants of the towns, in the case of communities, the inhabitants of the villages. The population of outskirts in the Great Plain means, for the time being, the inhabitants of the scattered farms with some negative deviation.

At the investigations I have considered as community with scattered farms such communities, of which at least 20 % of the total population is living in the outskirts. In the course of the administrative reform /mainly in the period between 1947 and 1954/, on the territory of the six departments of the Great Plain, 89 communities with scattered farms came into being, their total population counting 229,2 thousand persons in 1960. In 1960 the number of the old communities

with scattered farms was 138, their total population 654,8 thousand persons.

Considering the categories of order, the rate of population of scattered farms and the extent of the closed villages, there are apparent differences between the old and the new communities with scattered farms /see Tables 1, 2, 3/.

The comparison of the population and settlement development of the old and new communities shows that between 1960 and 1970 the total population has decreased in both groups /with 11,4 resp. 7,3/, and so has the number of population living in scattered farms as well /with 24,9 resp. 27,5 %/. This decrease, in the case of the old communities with scattered farms has resulted in the fact that in 1970 only 30,3 % of their total population lived in scattered farms, the rate of population of scattered farms goes beyond 50 % only in 32 communities, and at the same time 42 communities have ceased to exist as community with scattered farms, for the rate of their outskirts does not reach 20 %. At the same time, 64,1 % of the total population of new communities with scattered farms is still living in scattered farms. In 73,5 % of the communities the rate of outskirts population surpasses 50 %, in fact, in one third of the communities, more than three forth of the population is living in scattered farms, and only 6 communities have got out of the category "community with scattered farms". Examining the question from the point of view of village development, in the old communities with scattered farms the speed of increase of downtown population is slower /5,6 %/ than in the new ones /30,5 %/, but in absolute numbers this means that during ten years, into the old communities with scattered farms still with 5,5 thousands more inhabitants have moved than into the new villages.

The decrease in number of population of the new communities with scattered farms can only slightly be put to the credit of the formation of new villages. It rather proves that in new communities with scattered farms as in agricultural settlements, the general tendency of our age also comes across: the decrease of agricultural population together with the decrease of total population. The settlement system of scattered farmsteads has rather an opposite effect as compared to the general tendency, it weakens the intensity of decrease where household farming is profitable. And it is valid in an increased degree relating to the new communities with scattered farms.

Nevertheless, where the process of liquidation of scattered farms has started, the moving in has not taken place, for the most part, to the new village, but

a/ with carrying on agricultural occupation, to some nearby infrastructurally more developed settlement, generally from which the territory of the new community had been cut out,

b/ with giving up agricultural occupation, to any distant industrial or industrializing settlement of the country.

The classification of the new communities with scattered farms, according to settlement development, is possible by the help of categories arising from the combinations of numerical changes in total, downtown and outskirts population.

Theoretically the combinations may produce 10 categories. The treated material shows that the new communities with scattered farms of the Great Plain can be included in six cate-

gories. With the purpose of comparison, on the basis of the same principles, we have done the elaboration also with regard to the old communities with scattered farms /see Table 4/.

It affords opportunity to interesting conclusions, if we compare the categories of order of the communities, the extent of the villages, and the rate and number of population living in scattered farms to the categories of settlement development. Unfortunately, for the lack of time, I can only show you their elaborated tables.

It depends on an extremely lot of components of settlement development, which of the tendencies predominates in a given new community with scattered farms. The most important of them are:

a/ what has been the settlement character of the new community at the time of establishment /the place of the village has been indicated only theoretically; the new community has already had a formerly developed village core; a developed village and its neighbouring scattered farms have also administratively separated from another settlement/,

b/ some conomic factors, first of all: the types of large-scale farms on the territory, their level of development /profitability/ and as a function of this, their participation in the concentration of population of the scattered farms /housing estates of state farms, housing scheme of co-operative farms etc./.

Conclusions reached from the investigations until now: The establishment of new communities with scattered farms has not led in many instances to the intended result. The question ought to be examined, whether under the present circumstances it is necessary to insist on the establishment of a new village in communities of less than 2000 inhabitants, if it has not developed till now. In the case of the new communities with scattered farms of more than 2000 inhabitants, which are under a handicap in developing villages, it is important to reveal the factors checking village development and to judge one by one the future of these communities.



Table 1/a

1960

Total popula- tion/head	n e w		o l d	
	communities with scattered farms			
	number	%	number	%
under 2000	36	40,5	27	19,6
2000 - 5.000	47	52,8	68	49,3
5000 - 10.000	6	6,7	30	21,7
over 10.000	-	-	13	9,4
	89	100,0	138	100,0

Table 1/b

1970

Total popula- tion/head	n e w		o l d	
	communities with scattered farms			
	number	%	number	%
under - 2000	41	49,4	27	28,1
2000 - 5.000	38	45,8	45	46,8
5000 - 10.000	4	4,8	18	18,9
over - 10.000	-	-	6	6,2
	83	100,0	96	100,0

Table 2/a

1960

Population living outside the clo- sed settlement of the community in %	n e w		o l d	
	communities with scattered farms			
	number	%	number	%
20 - 35	11	12,4	75	54,3
35 - 50	5	5,6	20	14,5
50 - 75	24	27,0	27	19,6
75 - 90	27	30,3	11	8,0
90 - 100	22	24,7	5	3,6
	89	100,0	138	100,0

Table 2/b

1970

Population living outside the clo- sed settlement of the community in %	n e w		o l d	
	communities with scattered farms			
	number	%	number	%
20 - 35	8	9,6	45	46,9
35 - 50	14	16,9	19	19,8
50 - 75	30	36,1	20	20,8
75 - 90	21	25,3	10	10,4
90 - 100	10	12,1	2	2,1
	83	100,0	96	100,0

Table 3/a

1960

Population living in the closed settlement of the community	n e w		o l d	
	communities with scattered farms			
	number	%	number	%
under 1.000	71	79,8	31	22,4
1000 - 2.000	16	18,0	37	26,8
2000 - 3.000	1	1,1	23	16,7
3000 - 5.000	1	1,1	21	15,2
5000 - 10.000	-	-	23	16,7
over 10.000	-	-	3	2,2
	89	100,0	138	100,0

Table 3/b

1970

Population living in the closed settlement of the community	n e w		o l d	
	communities with scattered farms			
	number	%	number	%
under 1.000	64	77,1	29	30,2
1000 - 2.000	14	16,9	25	26,0
2000 - 3.000	3	3,6	16	16,7
3000 - 5.000	2	2,4	13	13,6
5000 - 10.000	-	-	12	12,5
over 10.000	-	-	1	1,0
	83	100,0	96	100,0

Table 4.

Sign of num- ber	population			n e w		o l d	
	to- tal	living in the closed sett- lement of the commuty	living outside the clo- sed sett- lement of the commuty	communities with scattered farms			
				number	%	number	%
1.	-	+	-	67	75,3	87	63,0
2.	+	+	-	8	9,1	9	6,5
3.	+	+	+	1	1,1	-	-
4.	-	-	-	9	10,1	36	26,1
5.	+	-	+	2	2,2	4	2,9
6.	-	-	+	2	2,2	2	1,5
/+/ increase; /-/- decrease				89	100,0	138	100,0

