

Planning urbanisation in Hungary, 1945–1989

Sándor HORVÁTH

Introduction

Social and regional inequalities have always been and still are the central issues of town planning, regional and settlement policies. The official ideology of Eastern Bloc countries declared that egalitarian principles, the development of underprivileged social groups, and the official discourse dealing with town planning and regional differences had the same set of aims. The new socialist towns represented the official images of cities of the future, 'where there will not be poverty, beggars, and periphery'.¹ However, the principles declared and the unofficial and western image of Hungarian urban development was confronted with each other day by day. Segregation, urban poverty and poor housing conditions met the eye of anyone, who began to analyse the urbanisation processes of the socialist period in Hungary.

Iván Szelényi's model of urban social inequalities in socialism became one of the most known, which was based mainly on research done at the new housing estates. It comes clearly out of Szelényi's works, that urban segregation can also take place in such non-market or pseudo-market conditions, which were created by the command economy and the socialist state. The main reason for this phenomenon is 'that the different institutions [...] need a different structure of workforce, and that is why the housing districts allocated near to such kinds of "symbiotic complexes" will have a potentially different social structure.'²

Segregation, poverty and urban inequalities characterised not only Budapest, but also small and middle-sized Hungarian towns.³ Though officially these tendencies were never generally admitted, the development of Hungarian urban planning, changes in dealing with regional differences, and settlement policies clearly show, that planners and

politicians tried to confront these challenges in different ways from decade to decade.

1. Socialist cities for socialist people

The first important regulation for socialist town planning, the National Building Act (*Országos Építésügyi Szabályzat*) appeared in Hungary in 1947. It was largely designed to regulate the chaotic rebuilding process of towns, because approximately 18% of residential areas were destroyed in World War II. At this time the most significant objective was that new, planned towns had to be built instead of the restoration of old, 'provisionally built' settlements, because the planned periods for industrialisation needed a new kind of workforce. It followed from this objective, that the diffuse building of houses outside towns and villages was banned by the government in 1949, in order 'to increase the level of communal life'.⁴

The first socialist regional planning institute (*Területrendezési Intézet*; Institute for Regional Organisation) was established after 1948, but most of the plans it laid down could never be put into practice, because settlement policy and town planning of this period (1948–1956) was subordinated to the economic policy.⁵ The Three Year Plan (1947–1949) and the first Five Year Plan (1950–1955) had much more influence on urban planning than the institutes created for this assignment. The Institute for Regional Organisation was suspended in 1952, and the Regional Planning Department of the National Planning Office got most of its duties⁶, which shows that urban planning was subordinated to economic planning. Most of the plans for settlement policy were created mainly at the National Planning Office (*Országos Tervhivatal*) and at the Committee for National Economy (*Népgazdasági Tanács*) between 1949 and 1956, but these plans were never published. These 'top secret' plans clearly show the image of urban planning created by the leaders of the socialist command economy. Most of the plans contain ideological concepts which means, for example, that the most important goals of the urban planning were 'to promote the leading position of the working class', and 'to provide for the planned socialist industrialisation', 'which would be the basis of the new settlement policy'.⁷

One of the most important intentions of the state was to restrict the economic autonomy of local authorities in order to subordinate the settlement policy and urban planning to the national economic policy.

This process already began after World War II because the budget of reconstruction was centralised. The state restricted first of all the budgets of agricultural towns (*mezővárosok*)⁸ (mainly in the Alföld area).⁹ The adaptation of the Soviet, centralised council-system (*tanácsrendszer*) in 1950 made the local authorities wholly dependent on central directives, and they lost their relative financial autonomy (their budget was fixed at the Ministry of the Interior).¹⁰ The national settlement policy supported mainly the industrial and the newly established industrial towns between 1947–1953. The main problem of the agricultural towns was that they could not have newly build factories till the 1960s, and this was the most important reason for their limited budget. The direction of migration process of this period clearly shows that most of the migrating people came from the agricultural towns of the Alföld area. The main targets of their migration were Budapest and the supported industrial towns.¹¹

During this period regional planning and settlement policy was realised by improving the infrastructure of industrial and newly established towns as centres of the regions. Although the propagandistic aims of regional policy were to level town/country differences and to lower the contrast between underdeveloped and developed regions, most of the costs of regional programmes went to heavy industry; accordingly the beneficiaries of the socialist settlement and investment policy were the industrial regions.¹²

Therefore, most of the urban plans of this period dealt with the 'socialist towns', which were not only symbols of the socialist system, but also the manifestations of the new urban planning programmes. In propaganda these towns showed the ideas of planners and architects in which technology and nature no longer negated each other, where urban and rural no longer confronted each other as strangers, where factory and home were not separated by long distances which devoured time and energy. The main goals of the architectural design were to demonstrate socialist principles, and to show the people 'the socialist modes of behaviour'. According to the ideas of city planners the spatial structure of these new, 'socialist towns' had to be clear and transparent in order to control the everyday activities of people living there. The city centre and the main street had a special importance in socialist cities: they had the function of representing a place where people paraded primarily on 1st May, which was represented in the propaganda as the main feast of the working class. One of the most impor-

tant functions of socialist cities was to train the inhabitants to be 'socialist people'. The planning instruments of this training process were: (1) the urban spaces and places (which should be designed to raise the level of 'collective spirit' and 'communal life'), (2) public buildings (such as offices, cinemas, theatres, restaurants, and the 'houses of culture'), and (3) the form of the houses, which was mostly devoid of 'fussy decorations'.¹³

Socialist urban planning defined its role against 'capitalist urban planning' at that time. The official model of the Hungarian planners was Soviet urban planning, which tried to demonstrate that socialist urban planning could be more equal and function better than a capitalist one. 'The joyless monsters of skyscrapers in New York and in Chicago symbolise the slavery of soulless and mechanical "business" [...] The skyscrapers of Moscow serve the whole city: their monumental and graceful form fix the new architectural scale of the capital.'¹⁴ Every new town, every new district, and every new building had to be the symbol of the 'socialist society', and they were planned and criticised ideologically. The most significant period of adaptation of Soviet urban planning and settlement policy was between 1952–1953, when following Soviet settlement policy a rayon-system for Hungary was planned in order to replace the traditional regional network of counties (*megye*) with economic districts (rayons), but because of the new policy of the government of Imre Nagy it could not be realised.¹⁵

There were about 1,8 million residential houses and buildings in Hungary in 1949, and 98,3% of them were one-storied buildings (73,6% in the old Budapest districts), and 84,3% of them included only one apartment. The dominant house-type of the period was the detached (family) house, and not only in villages, but also in urban areas and in Budapest. 98% of houses and apartments were private, the urban apartments (mainly the urban blocks of flats) were nationalised in 1952.¹⁶ Approximately 6 million people (60% of the inhabitants of Hungary) lived in single-room apartments (341 people/100 rooms), and 421 thousand lived in three-room apartments. There was a bathroom only in 10,1% of the apartments (in Budapest 35%, in other towns 7–13%).¹⁷

The shortage of flats was one of the most serious problems of the period (mainly in industrial areas), and the planning institutes¹⁸ tried to solve it by standardisation and mass-production of apartments. The first plans for the standardised blocks of flats (*típuslakóház*) were

drafted in 1947, and the building of these 'new-type' houses began in 1948.¹⁹ Standardised, detached (family) houses were also planned as 'the best types of houses for families with many children' from 1947–1948, but because of their high costs they could never be realised.²⁰ The same architect, who propagated the detached (family) houses in 1948, wrote about these types of houses in 1949 that they 'are not only expensive, because of the building costs, but the inhabitants of the detached family houses are inclined to fall out of communal life, or to become individuals behind the protection of their fences'.²¹ The reason for building standardised block-houses was a financial one, but it should be explained ideologically, too. This phenomenon characterised the whole urban planning process in Hungary in the socialist period. Urban planning and the centralised allocation system of flats were subordinate to economic reasons, and explained by ideological purposes in official discourse.

The 1948 prototype of standardised flats included one room, one tiny bedroom (enough for the 'modern man' to sleep in), a little kitchen, a little antechamber, a bathroom and a toilet. These types of flats were about 50 square meters. But because of economic reasons they had to be 'modernised', so the kitchen ('modern' and 'socialist' people do not cook at home!), and the antechamber became smaller, and the toilet and the bathroom were united. By doing so the little bedroom could be enlarged, so these flats could be called 'double-room apartments' in 1949. After 1949 they became the prototypes of the standardised apartments. People needed to learn new phrases for housing such as half-room, 'sleeping cabin' (*hálófülke*) instead of bedroom, 'eating cabin' (*étkezőfülke*) instead of dining room, 'hip-' or 'sitz-bath' (a bath, where you can only sit) instead of bath-tub.²²

However, people coming from ruined or cold water flats were generally content with their new homes, as the results of an official local survey conducted at some of the new housing estates of Budapest revealed in 1949. The tenants of the standardised flats had problems only with the big windows, and they disliked the central heating, because it was much more expensive than the old one.²³ Some of these new buildings were called 'Buildings of Ace-Workers', because most of the flats went to the 'ace-workers' and 'stachanovists' of mass-production. In contrast with the results of the official survey the tenants of these houses were not really content with their new apartments because of the high costs at the end of the year, when they had to pay

the bills of the 'economical' central heating. They applied for permission to replace the central heating with their old heating (usually gas-and coal-heater)²⁴, and after it was not allowed, almost 90% percent of them wanted to move to another, low-cost apartment. The caretakers of the new houses became informers of the authorities by keeping under control the everyday life of the tenants. They wrote regularly about the 'unrest' because of the high costs of flats.²⁵ The only way to end the grumbling was to lower the costs of apartments, which was done in 1950, mostly because of propaganda reasons.²⁶

After Stalin's death and the formation of the new policy of Imre Nagy's government, in 1953 a slight modification could be recognised in the national settlement policy. Its most important point was that the underdeveloped agricultural regions could get much more attention. In 1954 many industrial investments were stopped, but because of the confusion and the short time period, the new ideas could never be realised. After 1953 the state never showed such favour toward 'socialist towns' as before, but Budapest could keep its leading position by the allocation of investments. The continuity of urban policy making can be shown by a statement of Mátyás Rákosi. The main secretary of the Communist Party (MDP) tried to explain at the end of 1954, why Budapest had to have more apartments and not the rural towns: 'It is not the same when 1,700 thousand (sic!) rural people and when 1,700 thousand inhabitants of Budapest are grumbling about the bad housing conditions'.²⁷

Although Budapest and the industrial towns had a special function in the urban planning and settlement policy, the major part of the investments went to industry, and not to the urban infrastructure or residential areas. Between 1949–1953 the average number of newly built flats was only 800 yearly in Budapest. The economic policy of Imre Nagy's government turned much more pro-consumption, and the planning of some of the new little housing estates already began in 1954. Because of the impact of this new policy 7,820 new apartments were constructed in Budapest in the years 1954–1955.²⁸ The government also tried to decrease the shortage of flats by supporting the building of detached family houses, which were built as private houses.²⁹ The policy of increasing the number of flats served as a general strategy to reduce social and urban inequalities not only in this short time period, but also during the whole Kádár era.

2. More flats, more housing estates, 1956–1971

Architects of the communist era were accustomed to planning buildings suitable to the regime's current tastes. After Stalin's death they had to forget some of the cornerstones of their former official practices. In December 1954 Nikita Khrushchev gave a speech 'On Useless Things in Architecture' at a Conference of Soviet Builders in Moscow. The speech categorically attacked the style of Socialist Realism and claimed that architects should stop planning with 'expensive' materials and 'representative exterior'.³⁰ The architects had to find a technological solution suitable to the regime, and to the economic expectations. The solution to the low cost building was the panel-building, which became a symbol for the 1960s and the 1970s in Hungary and in many other Eastern Bloc countries.

Many an architect thought that the building of panel blocks of flats was the only way to carry out the political and social demand for building many more flats in a shorter time period. It needed less manpower, and that was important not only because of the costs, but also because of the shortage of labour.³¹ Furthermore, panel buildings also suited the official ideology, which demanded that differences between social classes should be eliminated, i.e. that people did not need different types of houses. The housing estates with the same types of houses and with the same set of flats were appropriate for demonstrating this attempt. The panel flats were planned for different family-sizes, and this was the only one factor which could affect the differentiation between the panel flats.

The 1956 decree on flats was stricter than before, because the allocation of flats was much more institutionalised, and also the number of state owned new flats increased. The most important modification was that officially nobody could apply for a concrete flat at a specific address, but only for a non-specific flat for somewhere in town. The people who wanted to rent a state owned flat had become 'applicants' queuing at the 'office of flats' (at the workplaces or at the local councils). After they applied for a flat, there was no deadline for decision making; the authorities' only duty was to register the application. Officially the most important factor in decision-making was 'who was in need', but this category was not defined. The 'allowable demand on a flat' was defined as in 1953 (2 persons per room). One's 'right to rent' a flat became heritable and changeable, which made these flats quasi private.³²

The modification of the centralised apartment allocation system and the mass production of panel buildings were the two main factors which influenced urban planning in the 1960s. The standards of architecture were determined by economic approaches and not by artistic ones. The number of flats to be built and the costs of building were planned in the most economical way. Standardisation and prefabrication became the key elements of urban and house planning. Not only the structure of the buildings, but whole buildings (like nurseries and typified flats) were standardised, and many standardised types had to be designed with the architectural elements, which could be made cheaper by the non-standardised modes of building. There is a consensus among Hungarian architects that there was a fall in the standards of architecture by the end of the fifties (and at the end of socialist realist architecture) because the quantity, not the quality of the flats was emphasized. Besides, the state took a more intensive part in the building of houses at the end of the 1950s.³³

In 1956 a delegation of Hungarian experts travelled to the USSR to investigate the technology and methods of panel building, and to analyse the techniques of adaptation of this technology. The report of this journey claimed that Soviet technology was suitable to building different type of houses, but the factories which produced prefabricated houses had to 'beware of producing the same types of houses'.³⁴ The first panel block of flats was built in 1959 in the first Hungarian socialist city (Sztálinváros), which was a 'laboratory' of some of the new modes of architecture.³⁵ Until the prefabricated housing factories could begin mass-production, the so called 'bloc-type' building (*blokkos építés*) was dominant. These houses had a ferro-concrete skeleton with brick walls, but this technology was not cheap and quick enough, so in the second part of the sixties whole houses were built from prefabricated ferro-concrete (panel) parts.³⁶

Housing factories produced only a few types of prefabricated parts, because their most important impetus was to fulfil the orders of building companies as fast as they could, so that most of the houses and the flats became the same. Paradoxically, the urban planners of the fifties had much more freedom in planning than in the sixties or in the seventies, because they could plan more varied types of houses and flats because of brick-wall technology. The urban planners of the sixties had freedom only in situating and spacing the houses, because there were large vacant urban areas not far from the city centres which also

had some infrastructure ready. The housing estates of the sixties were built mainly in urban areas, not far from the city centres, and the placing of the buildings in the new housing estates was not so schematic as in the seventies.³⁷

Official discourse tried to represent the new housing estates as the results of the so called 'modernisation' process. Besides, the increasing number of panel-flats were represented as the products of more 'humane socialism', which officially had only a few continuous elements originating from the fifties. At the end of the fifties economic policies turned decidedly more pro-consumption, which brought about a diversification of images created about the 'cityscapes'. For example, the making of the modernised, urban image of Budapest of the sixties appears in quite different ways. On the one hand, the memoirs depict the city as grey, dull, monotone and austere. The Boulevard (*Nagykörút*) was equipped with fluorescent tubes, which made the road a 'light-tunnel'. This innovation was out of fashion after a few years, and it seemed to be really provincial. People used to wear plastic, 'orkan' type raincoats smuggled from Austria. Although raincoat smugglers were often exposed, the catchpenny became widespread, and everybody, semi-skilled workers as well as professors had an 'orkan' raincoat.³⁸ The other kind of narrative represents this new fashion as an urban phenomenon characterising 'consumption socialist' behaviour: 'The oblivion was easier because of the rise in the standard of living. The first self-service restaurants were opened, sometimes some western goods could be bought, too, and the "orkan" type raincoats made mainly in Italy were particularly high in popularity'.³⁹

Pro-consumption and ideological statements of the economic policies were mixed in official discourse, which can be well illustrated by the example of the most popular soap-opera called Szabó Family (*Szabó család*) broadcast on radio from 1959. The modes of behaviour of the members of this fictional family depicted the consumption and the urbanisation of socialist Hungary from a micro-level perspective. They were urban people, mainly representatives of the intelligentsia and the working-class, which had to be more and more dominant in urban Hungary. Although there were some scenes from the countryside, the scenes made at the new housing estates were much more characteristic for the serial, which represented the 'new way of life' at a housing estate.⁴⁰

The feature films of the 1960s show Budapest as a spectacular, colourful, diversified shop-window, differently from the 1950s, when the Budapest image of the films was much more homogenous.⁴¹ The diverse representations of the city, and sometimes the acknowledgements of segregation could also be found more regularly in the media. Illustrated magazines, such as the popular Women's Magazine (*Nők Lapja*) published reports about some districts of the cities, about the townspeople's problems and their different modes of behaviour.⁴² These representations fostered the definitions of urban life and the re-interpretation of the urban spaces.

The reinterpretation and the change of image of Budapest could be explained by the fact that the migrants coming to Budapest at the end of the 1960s were mainly workers coming from small villages or agricultural towns. However, only a fractional part of them could get a flat in Budapest, because of the restrictions on settlement in Budapest in 1962.⁴³ Old stereotypes about poverty and workers had a special role in the creation of new stereotypes of the new housing estates. The old slum called 'colony of Mária Valéra' was demolished, and not far away a new housing estate named after Attila József – who was officially represented as the poet of the working class – was built. The articles written about the demolition of the slum, and about the building of the new housing estate emphasized not only the 'new way of life', or the 'new beginning' of the inhabitants of the slum, but contrasted the stereotypes about the '*lumpenproletariat*', whose members live in slums with the ones of the 'self-conscious working class', which lives in housing estates.⁴⁴ This representation fitted into the ideological concept, which stated that the new, socialist environment not only raised the standard of living, but 'educated' the people. Housing estates were represented in the official discourse as places where people (mainly the workers) could get educated, and the classes of society could come together.

In order to demonstrate this effort, the urban and the villager lifestyle were also confronted in the official mind in the 1960s. In this context urban people represented the 'civilised ones' and rural people the 'wild ones', which should have been civilised. This urban and socialist 'civilisation' process contained the propaganda of the new way of urban consumption, which influenced the official images made about the future Hungary. In 1962 a fictional letter was published in the most popular magazine called Women's Magazine about the life

of the people of Budapest in the 1970s. The central point of the letter was that the women do not have to work as hard in the future as in the past, because they will not have so much housework.⁴⁵ The future family of the letter lived in a large 'belt-house':

„We have three rooms and a little kitchen (and a bath-room and an antechamber), but we do not need a bigger one. I order our breakfast and dinner from the central kitchen by phone, and after 5–10 minutes we get a delicious, smoking-hot ordinary meal... If I sometimes want to cook, I have no difficulties with the shopping: I order, what I need, and it comes through the pneumatic post in minutes. I do not toil with the cleaning up at all. I have agreed with the administration of the house about cleaning up twice a week...“⁴⁶

3. From panel blocks to socialist gentrification, 1971–1989

Housing estates were represented in the official discourse as 'social flats' which solved the housing problems, and it was because of their labelling as such that many people thought that only poor and unskilled people could get a flat in them, and that their inhabitants were coming from the old slums. However, it came clearly out of the research of György Konrád and Iván Szelényi that 'there are three times more graduates living in the housing estates than in average urban areas'. One of their astonishing observations was that there was not a single estate among the so-called upper-class districts of Budapest where the proportion of graduated people was as high as in the Lágymányos Housing Estate.⁴⁷

Although the ideological concept of the new housing estates and the panel building programme was to decrease the differences among the housing situations of the different social groups, the people with higher income and skill could have the advantage of lower status social groups by obtaining a flat. For these not-privileged groups the only way to get a flat was to build or to buy a flat or a house, mainly in the suburban areas, because the state-built blocks of flats dominated the urban areas. These groups had to pay for their flats, not as people having much more income and connections, which nevertheless was the most important criterion for obtaining a state built flat. The quality of apartments became better in this period but the difference in the position of the social groups with different social status in the housing

market increased. The panel blocks of flats could not decrease urban inequalities.

The number of newly built flats was the highest in the 1960s and 1970s; however, in the whole period the number of industrial workplaces grew in the urban areas, and the largest amount of the investments allocated to house building and infrastructural development was reduced. This fostered the trend that villagers who left for urban industry got stuck mainly in their own built detached houses in the suburban 'agglomeration belt' of the towns, while keeping several elements of the rural way of life (animal husbandry and farming). The administrative measures, which regulated the settling process, also had a significant role by the phenomenon that the unqualified workforce could not settle in the towns, only 'commute' day by day from the agglomeration (that is why the percentage of unskilled and semi-skilled workers has grown in the villages in the agglomeration belt of industrial towns, especially of Budapest). This trend characterised not only the 1960s, but also the 1970s.⁴⁸

The new national concept for regional and settlement development policies (*Országos Településhálózat-fejlesztési Konceptió*) was accepted in 1971. The main objectives of this conception were to equal the town/country and Budapest/countryside differences, and to accelerate the urbanisation process. This concept intended that not only the development of industry, but the investment into urban infrastructures was also an important factor in the making of urban Hungary. The changes in local investments and the restructuring of central investments could decrease regional differences, but the main goal of the concept which was to equalize the different levels of settlement hierarchy could not be achieved. For instance, the number of state built council flats (*tanácsi lakások*) increased only in urban areas and not in the villages.⁴⁹

Besides the state-owned council apartments, there were three basic types of dwellings: co-operative apartments (*szövetkezeti*), condominiums (*öröklakás*), and detached family houses (*családi ház*). The co-operatives' apartments were spreading since the late 1960s. These types of apartments featured private ownership. The members of the housing co-operative had to pay only 15% of the full price of the flat, and they could have a low-premium loan for 30 years. The flats of the co-operative went to the members of the co-operative as 'personal property'.⁵⁰ From 1971 a new decree also allowed the building of

'groups' of family houses, not only blocks of flats.⁵¹ The spreading of co-op apartments changed the style of the houses and streets in some districts, especially where condominiums and family houses were being built, which were not restricted by administrative means. In Budapest the industrial districts became the centres of newly built, big housing estates (*Újpest, Csepel*); the green and expensive districts in Buda attracted the so called OTP-houses (co-ops and condominiums).⁵²

The right of claiming a 'council flat' depended on the family size. For example 2 persons could claim 1–2 rooms, 3 persons 1,5–2,5 rooms, 4 persons 2–3 rooms. However, the local administration had the right to choose families for flats.⁵³ The main objective of the 1970s was to increase also the number of flats, and modern planning approaches had been ignored. Many of the housing estates of these decades were planned in order to decrease the number of the crane-towers, and in this way the costs of the buildings. Most of the buildings of these types of housing estates were eleven-storied line-buildings (*sávház*), consisting sometimes of more than ten staircases. The communal buildings of these housing estates were also standardised and built by panel technology: the schools, the kindergartens, the health centres and the supermarkets were uniform in different towns and in different housing estates. Most of these communal buildings were completed only some years after the first inhabitants had moved into their newly built flats.

Not planning concepts, but panel-technology and housing-costs determined the housing estates of the 1970s, and the social status of housing estates was lowered. The main types of planning were adaptations of standardised panel-blocks of flats. From the end of the 1970s many articles appeared in newspapers, which criticised the role of the Hungarian housing estates in the cityscape, their monotony and emptiness, sometimes contrasting them, for example, with the exemplary Finnish Tapiola.⁵⁴ These tendencies led to depreciation of the flats in housing estates, and from the 1980s living in a housing estate for many people signified a social drawback.

The number of newly built flats financed by the state radically decreased in the 1980s, mainly because of the economic depression of the decade. For this reason, the proportion of the private flats has been increased, most of the blocks of flats and houses were financed by private persons or housing co-operatives. The main problem in this period was not only the shortage of flats, but their allocation. Only a

few new housing estates were built, and their planners tried to abandon the schematic planning methods characteristic of the 1970s. However, because of the limited budgets of housing only a few new ideas could be realised. The housing estates of the 1980s became smaller, they were allotted streets and squares, and the new blocks of flats had wider doorways than earlier, but the staircases remained as narrow as before. Different types of flats were planned, for instance panel ones with one and three half-rooms, and one- and two-storied panel buildings.⁵⁵

Urban renewal in Hungary set in at a later date than in Western countries, and only in a limited way. By the end of the 1980s the ambitious goal of improving the housing situation of the working class was abandoned, but due to the existence of the 'second housing market', there were early developments of 'socialist gentrification', which means that people having higher social status could get a flat in one of the show-pieces of urban renewal. However, the main tendency was that younger and better educated persons used to move to the new housing estates or to the suburbs, and there was an influx of marginal social groups into the old city centres.⁵⁶

Since the 1980s as a result of an overall economic crisis the facilities of the state became much more limited in setting up priorities in urban and regional planning. A project for the development of economically backward regions was elaborated only in 1985, when the Regional Development Fund was created in order to support the settlements, which were at a lower stage in the settlement-hierarchy. But this Fund had very little influence on regional development, on the one hand, because of its limited budget, and on the other hand, because of the fact that the resources of the Fund were mainly used to support industrial establishments and not to modernise urban infrastructure.⁵⁷ Although the government took notice of urban and regional inequalities, paternalistic institutions such as the Regional Development Fund could not achieve their levelling goals, because of the inequalities rooted in the command economy, which could never decrease them. By the end of the 1980s, and at the time of the transition there were no central, coherent and complex regional and urban policies in Hungary. There were only many projects, dealing with crises, but they had a very limited scope of activity.

Notes

- ¹ Sándor, András, Sztálinváros. Budapest: Népszava 1951, 23.
- ² Szelényi, Iván, Városi társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó 1990, 99–102. Szelényi, Iván, Urban Inequalities under State Socialism. Oxford University Press 1983.
- ³ See the case studies of this phenomenon at Pécs, Szeged, Salgótarján, Veszprém, Miskolc, Debrecen, Békés, Kazincbarcika, and Sztálinváros (Dunaújváros). Béres, Csaba, A városfejlődés fordulópontján. Debrecen 1983; Saád, József, A lakosság területi szegregálódása a városnövekedés folyamatában, Valóság 3 (1977), 78–87; Tóth, Pál, Társadalmi kapcsolatok szerveződése és típusai a lakótelepeken. Miskolc 1978; Andor, Mihály–Hidy, Péter, Kazincbarcika (kézirat) 1986, 107; Kovács, Teréz, A települések társadalmának szegregációs kérdései, in (ed.) Csefkó, Ferenc, Állam – térkapcsolatok – demokrácia. Pécs: MTA 1987, 507–519; Papp, István, Békés város tagozódása és a népesség szegregálódása, Békési Élet, 2 (1987), 191–206; Szirmai, Viktória: 'Csinált' városok. Budapest: Magvető 1988, 114; Horváth, Sándor, Mentális térképek Sztálinvárosban, in (eds.) Bódy Zsombor, Mátay Mónika, Tóth Árpád. A mesterség iskolája. Tanulmányok Bácskai Vera 70. születésnapjára. Budapest: Osiris 2000, 450–478.
- ⁴ Sós, Aladár, A magyar városrendezésről, in (eds.) Sós, Aladár–Fragó, Kálmán–Hermány, Géza–Korompay, Györg. Sztálinváros, Miskolc, Tatabánya. Városépítésünk fejlődése. Budapest: Műszaki 1959, 15.
- ⁵ Germuska, Pál, A szocialista városok létrehozása, Századvég, 2 (2002), 49–73.
- ⁶ Belényi, Gyula, Az alföldi városok és a településpolitika (1945–1963). Szeged: Csongrád Megyei Levéltár 1996, 102–103.
- ⁷ Hajdú, Zoltán, Az első szocialista településhálózat-fejlesztési koncepció formálódása Magyarországon, Tér és Társadalom, 1 (1989), 86–96.
- ⁸ These towns had their economic production largely from agriculture.
- ⁹ Belényi, Az alföldi városok és településpolitika, 74.
- ¹⁰ 1950. (V.11.) I. tv.
- ¹¹ Belényi, Az alföldi városok és településpolitika, 162. E.g. in 1960 almost 10% of the inhabitants of Budapest lived in the 'Alföld'-area.
- ¹² Germuska, Pál, A szocialista városok helye a magyar urbanizáció történetében. A magyarországi szocialista városok kialakulása. PhD-dissertation. Budapest: ELTE 2001, 77, 131. The new official manifestation of the classification system of Hungarian cities was created in 1951. The first group of cities included mainly industrial towns: Budapest, Miskolc, Komló, Pécs, Ózd, Szeged, Székesfehérvár, Győr, Mosonmagyaróvár, Sopron, Lőrinci, Esztergom-Dorog, Tatabánya, Salgótarján, Szigetszentmiklós, Szombathely, Ajka, Várpalota.
- ¹³ Weiner, Tibor, Sztálinváros, in Sztálinváros, Miskolc, Tatabánya. Városépítésünk fejlődése, 17–88; Horváth, Sándor, Sztálinvárosi felhőkarcolók, in Majtényi, György–Ring, Orsolya (eds.), Közel-múlt. Hús történet a 20. századból. Budapest: Magyar Országos Levéltár 2002, 127–134.

- ¹⁴ Arkin, A., Az együttes – az építőművészet legmagasabb foka, in Perényi, Imre–Novák, Péter (eds.), *Tanulmányok a Szovjetunió építészetéről*. Budapest: Építészeti Kiadó 1953, 57–66. 64.
- ¹⁵ Belényi, Az alföldi városok és településpolitika, 102–107.
- ¹⁶ All of the rentable buildings were nationalised, among them the old block of flats. Elnöki Tanács 1952. (II.17.) 4. sz. törvényerejű rendelete.
- ¹⁷ 1949. évi Népszámlálás. 4. kötet. Épület és Lakásstatisztikai eredmények. Budapest: Központi Statisztikai Hivatal 1950, 9–29.
- ¹⁸ Some of the most importants were: Építéstudományi Intézet, Városépítési Tervező Vállalat (VÁTI), Budapesti Városépítési Vállalat (BUVÁTI).
- ¹⁹ Prakfalvi, Endre, 'Alapok – tervek – épületek, 1947–1949', in Ständeisky, Éva (ed.), *A fordulat évei*. Budapest 1998, 287–309; Gádos, Lajos, *A korszerű lakás térszükséglete és berendezése*. Budapest 1946.
- ²⁰ Gádos, Lajos, *Családi lakóház*. Budapest 1948, 13.
- ²¹ Gádos, Lajos, *Lakásépítkezésünk eredményei és tanulságai*. *Építészet – építés* 1–2 (1949), 11–18.
- ²² Ifj. Kismarty–Lechner Jenő, *Városi lakástípusok*. Budapest 1947, 5–13.
- ²³ Preisich, Gábor, *Közvéleménykutatás az új házak lakói között*. *Építészet – építés* 6–7 (1949), 30–35.
- ²⁴ Politikatörténeti Intézet Levéltára. Szakszervezetek Központi Levéltára (Central Archive of Unions in the Archive of Institute of Political History = PIL. SZKL). Szakszervezetek Országos Tanácsa. (SZOT). Bér- és Termelés. 1949. 11/66.
- ²⁵ PIL. SZKL. SZOT. Szoc.pol. [Dept. of Social Policy] 1949. 3/13.
- ²⁶ PIL. SZKL. SZOT. Szoc.pol. 1950. 4/14.
- ²⁷ In Hungarian it read: „nem mindegy az, hogy vidéken morog 1700 ezer (sic!) ember, vagy Budapesten morog 1700 ezer (sic!) ember a rossz lakásviszonyok miatt.” PIL. 276. f. P.B. 1889. Az MDP Politikai Bizottsága 1954. december 6-i ülése. Quoted in Belényi, *Az alföldi városok és településpolitika*, 123.
- ²⁸ Data from Preisich, Gábor, *A lakásépítés és a lakásállomány változása*, in Preisich, Gábor (ed.), *Budapest városépítésének története. 1945–1990*. *Tanulmányok*. Budapest: Műszaki 1998, 69–120.
- ²⁹ Gábor, László–Győri, Péter, *Guberálás a lakáspiacon*, in Győri, Péter (ed.), *A város, a város társadalma, életforma csoportok*. Budapest: Wesley János Lelkészképző Főiskola é.n., 113–136.
- ³⁰ Preisich, *A lakásépítés és a lakásállomány változása*, 74.
- ³¹ About the shortage of labour under command economy, see the model of János Kornai about 'economics of shortage' in Kornai, János, *A hiány*. Budapest: KJK 1982; Kornai, János, *Economics of Shortage*. Amsterdam–New York: North-Holland Pub. Co. 1980.
- ³² Gábor–Győri, *Guberálás a lakáspiacon*, 122–123. 15 / 1956. (IX.30) M.T. sz. rendelet a lakásbérletről; 15 / 1957. (III.7.) Korm. sz. rendelet a lakásbérletről szóló 35 / 1956. (X.30.) M.T. sz. rendelet végrehajtásáról; 1027 / 1957. (III.2.) Korm. sz. határozat a lakásbérletre vonatkozó átmeneti rendelkezésekről.
- ³³ Preisich, *A lakásépítés és a lakásállomány változása*, 74–75.

- ³⁴ Preisich, Gábor–Kiss, Dénes, Házgyári technológia és városrendezés, *Építésügyi Szemle* 6 (1965); Csorba, Zoltán, Paneles építési módszer az építőszekrény elv alkalmazására, *Magyar Építőművészet* 6 (1977).
- ³⁵ Kapsza, Miklós, Dunaújváros építészete, in Erdős, Ferenc–Pongrácz, Zsuzsanna (eds.), *Dunaújváros története*. Dunaújváros: Dunaújváros Megyei Jogú Város Önkormányzata 2000, 322.
- ³⁶ Preisich, A lakásépítés és a lakásállomány változása, 78–79.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, 79–83.
- ³⁸ Kecskeméti, Kálmán, 1960. In *Beszélő évek, 1957–1968. A Kádár-korszak története, I. rész*. Budapest: Beszélő 2000, 164–169.
- ³⁹ Ungváry, Rudolf, 1959. In *Beszélő évek, 1957–1968*, 113–123.
- ⁴⁰ The depiction of the years of the transition in this soap-opera between 1988 and 1991. See: Fonyó, Attila, A rendszerváltás a Szabó családban, in Várad Péter (ed.), *Első Század. 1998 . I.* Budapest: ELTE 1999, 45–111.
- ⁴¹ Varga, Balázs, Várostérkép. Az ötvenes-hatvanas évek magyar filmjeinek Budapest-képe, in *A mesterség iskolája*, 502–516; The diversification of the image of the city appeared also in the mass-media, see e.g. *Budapestnek melyik részét szereti a legjobban és miért?* *Nők Lapja*, 14. February 1970.
- ⁴² See e.g. *Angyalföld az emberek földje*, *Nők Lapja* 1962. január 6; *A kör bezárul*, *Nők Lapja* 1962. január 6; *A mi Budapestünk*, *Nők Lapja* 1962. január 20; *A Rákóczi útra kiküldött tudósítónk jelentik*, *Nők Lapja* 1962. február 17.
- ⁴³ Benda, Gyula, Budapest társadalma. 1945–1970, in Fokasz, Nikosz–Örkény, Antal (eds.), *Magyarország társadalomtörténete. III. Válogatott tanulmányok. II. kötet. (1945–1989)*. Budapest: Új Mandátum 1999, 8–31.
- ⁴⁴ *Nők Lapja* 1959.07.15; similar stereotypes can be found in the representation of an other slum, called 'Dzsumbuj'. *Nők Lapja* 1969.04.19. About this phenomenon, see Ambrus, Péter, *A Dzsumbuj. Egy telep élete*. Szeged: Lazi 2000.
- ⁴⁵ This topic was a popular one at the time, and most of the debates were dealing with the other name of the housework: 'the second shift'. Németi, Irén, *Egy milliomos emlékiratai. A Nők Lapja főszerkesztője voltam*. Budapest: Gasteria 1996, 163.
- ⁴⁶ A második műszak eltörlése. Levél a jövő évtizedből. *Nők Lapja* 1962.02.17.
- ⁴⁷ Szelényi, Iván–Konrád, György, *Az új lakótelepek szociológiai problémái*. Budapest: Akadémiai 1969, 29.
- ⁴⁸ Kárpáti, Zoltán, *Területi hátrányok és az életforma urbanizációja*, *Szociológia* 4 (1972), 506–527; Szelényi, *Az alföldi városok és a települési politika*, 178.
- ⁴⁹ Beluszky, Pál, 'Tradicionális' területi hátrányok és terápiájuk Magyarországon (1948–1992)', in Kovács, Katalin (ed.), *Település, gazdaság, igazgatás a térben*. Pécs: MTA Reginális Kutatások Központja 1993, 49–64.
- ⁵⁰ 20/1959. (IV. 16). Korm. számú rendelet a lakásszövetkezetekről. *Törvények és rendeletek hivatalos gyűjteménye*. Budapest 1959.
- ⁵¹ 6/1971. (II. 8.) Korm. számú rendelet a lakásépítő szövetkezetekről. *Törvények és rendeletek hivatalos gyűjteménye*. Budapest 1971.
- ⁵² Preisich, *A lakásépítés és a lakásállomány változása*, 88.

- ⁵³ Lakásépítés, lakáselosztás, lakbér, in Dudás, János (ed.), Lakásépítés, lakáselosztás, lakbér. Budapest: Kossuth 1971, 55.
- ⁵⁴ Preisich, Gábor, Tapiola, vagy Békásmegyer?, Élet és Irodalom, 20. Szept. 1980; Pusztai, Éva, Építészet, életmód, Magyarország, Élet és Irodalom, Szept. 15. 1980.
- ⁵⁵ Preisich, A lakásépítés és a lakásállomány változása, 90.
- ⁵⁶ Cséfalvay, Zoltán, Várospusztulás és városfelújítás, 1945–1989, in Lichtenberger, Elisabeth–Cséfalvay, Zoltán–Paal, Michaela (eds.), Várospusztulás és –felújítás Budapesten. Budapest: Magyar Trendkutató Központ 1995, 29–45.
- ⁵⁷ Beluszky, 'Tradicionális' területi hátrányok és terápiajuk Magyarországon (1949–1992), 58–59.