

# Some Aspects on Post-war Reclamation in Finland

Hideo TSUKADA\*

(Received September 30, 1974)

## 1. Foreword

There has long been a national tradition of "Northward Movement" in Suomi, Finland, through the whole history of her, before and after her independence from Tsar Russia in the second decade of this century. Archaeology has made it clear the farming in Finland started in and spread from the south-western coastal plain to north and east". Eino Jutikkala contributed most in the field of agricultural history of Finland piecing together numerous informations from many districts with varied interests".

Apart from this, great changes have occurred in the agriculture of this country after the last war and many geographers have referred to these changes, besides as many historians and agroeconomist have done.

In short, the present author should say, neglecting many other phenomena, that there were two most important matters. These are the post-war land clearance and the Pellonvaraus--land reservation which is valid since 1969. The reason why the author mentioned these most important was that these two were most drastic and seemed to have effected most seriously upon the Finnish agriculture. Of course the author recognizes that there have been less drastic but as fundamental and successive elements in the mentioned changes. Even so, the author is trying a brief review about those studies which have treated post-war land clearance, because this relates directly to the author's main scientific interests, one general and another special. The former problem is policies and administrations as changing and locating determinants and the latter is if there has been a stressed "Northward Movement" during the post-war period, connecting with the retreat from the "North". As to the conception "to proceed and to retreat", Stig Jaatinen suggested the author through his work on the similar problem in the Finnish archipelagoes".

As for these two problems, general and special, you will find similar ones in Japan, and the more concrete phenomena which the present author is to treat are also found in Japan in almost same forms.

---

\* Geographical Laboratory, Nara University.

## 2. Principles and facts about resettlement

When Finland was defeated in two wars against the Soviet Union, 1939-1940 and 1941-1944, she had to surrender one of the most prosperous farming region, Ita-Karjala (East-Karelia) to the Soviet Union. Having lost 10% of arable land and more productive capacity, it had become very difficult and urgent problem to accept more than 400,000 evacuees including many farmers, to let them resettle and to feed all the starving nation. Abolishing Pikaasutuslaki (Emergency Colonization Law), the government issued Maahankintalaki—MHL (Land Acquisition Act) and this law which committes strong power to the government had been valid up to 1959 to proceed post-war land clearance. Main contents of this law are as follows": 1) Land acquired according to this law is given to evacuees from East-Karalia, invalids, war widows, war orphans and ex-service-men, besides those who works bodily. 2) Lands are to be acquired in the first place from those owned by the government and those sold voluntarily by any landowner. And if these are not enough, it will be expropriated from neglected farms, large estates, companies, rural communes and other possible land owners. 3) As for land acquisition, local expropriation committees were granted major power. 4) This law will not be applied to some districts including Ahvenanmaa, Kuusamo and Salla. 5) Large farms are to be divided into as many farms and farm capable lands on which the resettlers are able to get at least subsistent incomes and there are to be enough transporting and farming conditions and ordinary size of forest".

Since the beginning of the fifties, several surveys are available. But in this first period of study, most of them depended upon those materials and informations collected and published by Maatalousministeriön Asutusiasianosasto--Colonization Board of the Ministry of Agriculture. That means we need, in the first place, review these reports found in Asutustoiminnan Aikakausikirja which contain descriptions about principles and situations in that stage.

Veikko Vennamo, referring to the principles of settlement or colonization activities, argued that there must be adopted variable principles according to variable conditions in different times". In short, though at that time when so-called Pika-asutus had been in process, he stressed that too much land dividing is likely to produce too small holdings and consequently to make the farming productivities extraordinarily low. At the same time he anticipated growing manufacturing industries and greater mobility of newly settled and settling population. In this sense, how to select the granted farmers had been very important problem and it was done rather well, to consider the situation was very emergent. He insisted the improvement of farm management of the already settled and existing farms. In any way, his arguement is remarkable at the stage of 1950.

Responding the mentioned opinion, in 1952, leading principles in the report

of committee for the Land Use Act which was finally issued in 1959 were already made public<sup>1)</sup>. Here too, land acquisition was thought the biggest problem, but to whom the acquired lands were to be distributed and to what size the existing and planned farms were to be enlarged were treated from different viewpoint. And there were discussed enlargement and rationalization of farms together with its financial basis. This let us recognize that the emergency colonization had been inevitable and its principal purpose e.g. subsistence had reached to its original goal. But at the same time, it is quite clear that living conditions and standard were poor and low, that is why the above quoted intention to improve the settlers' conditions had appeared in such a early stage.

In parallel with the discussions on farm size, the orientation of farm management or constituents of enterprises was discussed. According to Eino Lähdeoja<sup>2)</sup>, maahankintatila (newly colonized farm based upon Maahankintalaki) numbered ca. 41,000 at the end of 1949 and their arable land was ca. 270,000 ha., each means 14% of total number of farms and 11% of arable area. It shows that new farms were apparently smaller in their size compared with the established farms. Not only the arable area but also the shared forest area which have in a sense more meaning than arable area itself in Finnish farming were small too. Moreover, the physical—soil, inclination, drainage, frost and other climatic—and locational—distance to rural centres, transporting measure and farm isolation—and financial conditions were all inferior to the old established farms. All of these poorer conditions limited the possibilities of farm management on maahankintatila. With some exceptions in Uusimaa and Varsinais-Suomi where soil and climatic conditions are superior and the division of some large estates was possible, the dairy farming, connected closely with forestry and employment outside the farms, was predominant.

According to Paavo Väisänen<sup>3)</sup>, the share of bread grains on cultivated arable land decreased steadily since 1947, besides absolute area and production decreased since 1949, and the share of bread grains on the total cultivated area was 16.7% in 1952. When existed arable land had been in large scale used for resettlement, period between 1945-1949, total production of bread grains increased rapidly. This means that in spite of small size of new farms on the divided estates, preferable conditions available there had let the settlers once grow wheat and rye. There might be thought several reasons in addition to this. There had not been enough cows to distribute for settlers to start with dairy farming, it was the surest way for them to grow bread grains at least to feed themselves, and in ceded Karelia they had mainly engaged in bread grain growing. When small farmers orientated their management to more commercial one to earn necessary cashes, there was no other way than dairy farming and intensive garden farming. But the market for garden farming was limited then. Consequently it is quite clear that both in established agricultural regions and in more unfavourably conditioned frontier regions the new settlers had been

forced to incline dominantly to dairy farming gradually.

To keep increasing number of cows, meadows should have been enlarged in forests and marshlands which had not been suitable for arable land. For this purpose special law<sup>14)</sup> was issued in addition to MHL. Usually those meadows acquired by MHL belonged to groups which the settlers in neighbourhood consisted. The allotted land was not enough to increase cows and inevitably intensive land use was necessary, that is to say, cultivated grassland covered the arable land. And this program to create common meadow had started in rather small scale that 1/4~1/3 ha. of common meadow should be given to 1 livestock unit. And by the end of 1948, 1358 common meadow which cover ca. 10,000 ha. were provided, though this figure was less than half of the planned.

This part of settlement activities is deeply related to rural tradition in Finland that almost every item of land had been owned commonly by communal members<sup>15)</sup>. In modern ages this was losing its meaning gradually with the growing private ownership, especially with so-called ISO-JAKO<sup>16)</sup>. In an emergent situation, this once diminishing organization revived and played some roles for the new settlers' farm managements.

In addition to this common meadow, so-called *asutusyhteismetsä*, which is literally settlement common forest, was promoted to set forward by the government<sup>17)</sup>. The legal common forest in Finland has its origin in the end of 19th century when for the first time public law granted the people's right to keep common forest according to the established custom of communal usage of it. This common forest have had very important meaning for established farmers and the government had tried to provide same kind of forest for the new settlers by special regulations in 1945 and 1947. The settlers founded *hoitokunta*, forest committee, and controlled common forest that had usually expropriated from those land owned by government and big companies. The settlers had right only to buy timbers from this forest, to fell and to sell them. But especially in Northern Finland, the income from this common forest supported them very much. Based upon MHL, 75 areas which covers about 100,000 ha. in different regions were given their foundations.

It seems that there were two main principles, largest support of government and largest self-dependence of settlers. In a sense these two are contradicting conceptions and are supposed that the two stand at the each end of one line. Generally speaking, the increase of one side leads to the decrease of another. But given conditions at that moment were so difficult that there was no overlapping parts between them but left unfilled gap. They could consist with and did not spoil each other. For the settlers, indispensable and impossible condition was land reformation, which the government carried out through MHL. On the other hand, settlers' own personal responsibility and initiative were realized e.g. in the form of so-called *Kylmä-tila*, cold farm.

Psychological elements played important role, that is to say, desire for posse-

ssion, spirit of initiative and desire for independent endeavour were expected to the settlers and they had these<sup>111)</sup>. It has always been underlined that national need and national consensus functioned to unite these two elements. Consideration from varied fields focused upon this activities and lead it to success.

In addition to these above quoted arguments, we can find so many articles concerning resettlement policy and principles in *Asutustoiminnan Aikakauskirja*—Colonization Activity Yearbook, but the present author is passing by them because of their quality and mainly of their amount. But some lines must be devoted to Heikki Waris's *Siirtoväen sopeutuminen*. In this voluminous work, he applied both special and general methods. On the one hand, he interviewed evacuees from Ita-Karjala and reported their history as case study and he used statistical material too to make clear the figure of these evacuees as a whole. On the other hand, he argued on the colonization and settlement policies.

Side by side with Waris's, Keijo Kuhla's work can not be negligible<sup>112)</sup>. He concentrated his interest into short but very dramatic period between 1944-1948. As a result, Kuhla could summarize encyclopedically the refugees' movement from Ita-Karjala. But his work appears to be deficient in historical viewpoint. In any way, the two last mentioned studies could succeed to bridge between two different tendencies in investigation of post-war resettlement in Finland. What the present author meant with two different tendencies is that one is orientating rather agro-political direction and the other rather geographical as will be mentioned below.

### 3. Cold farm—Kylmätila in relation to "Northward Movement"

We find, in earlier stage of investigation, some works from geographical standpoint not only in *Asutustoiminnan Aikakauskirja* but also in other publications. As for the so-called "kylmätila"—cold farm, W. R. Mead for the first time brought it into international discussion in 1951, but before that, in 1950, Johannes Kuikka had made a short but very readable report<sup>113)</sup>. According to him, kylmätila is a new farm based upon MHL, which had not had either farm building or field at the beginning of its settlement. In April of 1950, these kylmätila numbered 10,407 and 40% of the total new settlements at that stage.

The distribution of kylmätila showed large regional difference. He noted that in North- and Central-Finland kylmätila was abundant both absolutely and relatively. Perhaps because of his theme, his interests had not been addressed to the explanation of this regional difference, but he had pointed out the very difficult situation there and its causes. In Finland, the North and East parts mean without any explanation more inferior physical conditions to the Southwest. In the first place, poor climatic conditions were stated and it is worth noting that the heavy frost damage 1949 had already caused the abandon-

ment of kylmättilä under clearance. He wrote on difficulties of drainage and remoteness from transportation measures.

Besides these, the present author should say that there had been very serious problems of poor installation on these farms at least at earlier stage of settlement and of contradiction in labour and capital inputs between farm management on already cleared field and clearance at rather later stage. These facts and problems lead further to more fundamental considerations. On kylmättilä, where had not been any productive measures at the earlier stages, the settlers' livelihood had naturally depended upon the trees in plotted forest which was becoming arable land. They felled trees and got some money to live on and clearance could keep rather rapid pace. But, in general, Finnish farms had had immense area of forest land attached to them as the main objectives of labour inputs and of course as the main sources of necessary cash and materials of everyday life. To clear the forest too much is not preferable seen from long term viewpoint, and the only possible substitute for forest land from which arable land was to be brought about was suo—marsh or peat bog. But the clearance of suo, different from of metsä—forest, did not give any money to settlers but claimed very large investment in its process which was not available by settler himself. This suggests that settlers had to face, though in a very minute scale, to the very severe and long-lasting problem which is same to the government since the latter half of the last century. That is contradicting advantage between forestry and agriculture, in other words, between small holders and companies and large holders. It is apparent that MHL—Land Acquisition Act was successful to inherit and even reinforce traditional Finnish policies of land reformation". Though agreed to that, the present author can not say the farming administration in that period was of no deficiency. Even if the excuse that to feed the people was too emergent stands, to see from long term viewpoint, it resulted in too serious questions to solve. In this sense, quoted Vennamo's opinion seemed very meaningful".

Powerful support from the side of government was indispensable under such condition not only to the kylmättilä but also to the general settlers. According to Yrjö Räsänen", many kinds of subsidies are given to settlers, and usually they were addressed to proceeding of land clearance and not to livelihood directly, among them one of the most important items was road construction. Besides these financial aids, many kinds of informations are delivered quickly to even distantly located settlers and this contributed very much to keep the isolated settlers in their places.

Abandonment of kylmättilä in early stage as quoted above suggests the present author that there had been the problem of "to proceed" and "to retreat". Though the present author can not find the term "Northward Movement" in Finland in those literatures read up to now, he believes there has been such movement, reviewing her national history. But there might have been small

fluctuations in times. Sometimes the frontier advanced very quickly being led e.g. by hunters, tar producers and farmers themselves in accordance with economic, social and political necessities. Sometimes it got back e.g. because of climatic deterioration".

What the present author intends to try is to examine, first, if it is right to assume the post-war resettlement merely as one special phase of "Northward Movement", and secondly, how the post-war advance of farming frontier relates to contemporary retreat from the "North" which is to be discussed later.

For these purposes, it is of more use to review the post-war resettlement through some more studies. One of the most readable in the first half of the fifties is Mead's. According to him", the directions of evacuees' movement are as follows; isthmus and S.W. Karelia—Peninsular Finland, Ladogan Karelia—Central Lake District, Border Karelia—East and North—Central Lake D., Petsamo—southward, Salla and Kuusamo—Western half of their community, Swedish speakers from Porkkala—Swedish speaking fringe of the south coast. He summarized that the directions of movement were in general south and westward. As for this problem of direction, Mead stated only about the results, but Kaarlo Pihkala showed the reason very clearly". That is to say, there were two both reasonable claims, one from Swedish speakers in coastal land to maintain the linguistic relation equal between the Swedish and Finnish speakers. This reflects difficult situation between the majority and the minority. And as a result, these Swedish speaking regions, though in general there were larger estates which should be divided up if the general rule had been applied, were excluded from the compulsory land expropriation for money.

Another claim was evacuated Karelians' to limit the northern end of compulsory land expropriation area on the line between Kokkola and Joensuu, which largely paralleled 60°N. This was intended to keep the physical conditions in their resettling places as good as their former circumstances. Regarding these difficult questions, Keijo Kuhla cited in details".

Concerning the present author's own problems above mentioned, Mead wrote that the established farmers had kept clearing land also in this century and though the settlers' effects upon the physical landscape had no difference between before and after the war, there were differences in types of them. He underlined the emergency and large scale of post-war land clearance and recognized two regions as central, they are 1) end moraine regions that form outlier in the hinterland of Helsinki, 2) long stretched area which is adjacent to Central Bothnia". This means that emergent resettlement including kylmätila had not contributed much to "Northward Movement" but concentrated to rather existed agricultural centres and their surrounding areas mostly in South-Western Finland. All the evacuees were appointed any type of land, farm or not, by the end of 1951. What Mead summarized in 1951 represents the nearly

final stage of emergent resettlement, at least as for settlers' distribution. The proportion of new farms in total number of new and old farms is larger in inland [districts than in coastal ones, though the absolute area of new farms is large also in coastal communes. In Mead's discussion, we find one problem that he assumed that evacuees had largest share in settlers. But as a matter of fact, cold farms were allotted mainly to those who were not from ceded parts and who had strong need and will to clear. In some parts of south and west Finland, emergency resettlement deforested and increased the ratio of cultivated land there, but to assess finally, wider and longer term view points are necessary.

Following after Mead, Erkki Kanervo studied the problem of displaced population from general viewpoint, solely geographical. His indication is very noteworthy in the following points that the acceptance of displaced people in the autumn of 1944 is considered as temporary one based on civil defense strategy and after this there were adjustment transfers made. He showed on maps that the displaced people moved from compulsory and temporary resettlement areas which had their gravity centre in Central and North Ostrobothnia to secondary and planned areas. So, the figure on the 1st of January 1945 shows heavy concentration of evacuees in Ostrobothnia and vacancy in Northern Finland. At the end of 1947, this gravity moved to South-Western Finland with less concentration and some were found in Lapland as well, in contrast with the figure two years ago. Kanervo stressed the direction of movements, first from Karelia to Ostrobothnia and Satakunta and secondly to eastward. According to him", the population densities of the existed and the resettled show regional difference, that is to say, in South-west Finland these two are parallel but in North Uusimaa, South Häme and West Karelia etc., areas with high density of the existed show low density of the resettled. This leads to consideration that the existence of reclaimable land differs region to region and suggests that in some areas dividing large estates provided arable plots for resettlement and in others wasteland and forestland substituted for the existed arable land. Considering the distribution of kylmättilä, this is right.

He noted the rejection of allotted land by resettler who saw its conditions. In Ostrobothnia where soil conditions are sometimes too stony and sometimes too marshy, this rejection rates were higher than in other regions. In the case of kylmättilä, the abandonment rate reached to 11% in 1947".

He found also that the communes which accepted more than 100 farms or plots had concentrated to south or east of the line which ran through Pori-Tampere-Virolahti-Kiuruvesi-Suomenjoki-Juva-Joutseno and this line almost coincides with the northern limit of these regions where the ratios of evacuees exceeded 10% of total population". Here again, we must conclude that emergency resettlement under MHL did not contribute to "Northward Movement".

Toivo Lapinleimu esteemed the area cleared between 1945-1948", deviding it



into two categories, clearance by new settlers based upon resettlement-movement and by old established farmers. In each year, the latter exceeds the former and the former contributes only ca. 37% to the total, ca. 53,500 ha. This ratio increased yearly from ca. 11% in 1945 to ca. 38% in 1948. This shows that the allotment of land and the development of reclamation are quite different things and naturally there had been time lag between them. And we have to wait some more years before it becomes possible to assess the final results of post-war land clearance.

#### 4. Social and financial problems

Before stepping in the final stage, we need check some more works and make clear what the post-war land reclamation was. Pihkala is an agro-economist. Like other authors, he reviewed the history of Finnish land policies since Lex Kallio in 1922 to MHL in 1945, and of course he devoted many pages to the contents of MHL and its concrete carriage. He was interested in difference of allotted land area in accordance with respective local conditions e.g. purely agricultural area of good marketing possibilities and area of permanent non-agricultural employment<sup>10</sup>. It is most remarkable that not only the physical equality or resemblance of pre- and post-war residing areas was respected but also the former rural communities in ceded Karelia were tried to maintain largely in their new area. Eventually it was very difficult to do so in scattered available land for reclamation, and he called this principle as language paragraph of the law<sup>11</sup>. Even though it had been almost impossible to carry it out completely and former rural commune had been dissolved into groups, the settlers at one reclaiming unit area were from one commune in ceded parts. Mead referred to this point and listed up the advantages of this policy as follows; cooperative reclamation, competitive effects and larger possibilities of lasting reclamation activities<sup>12</sup>. Apart from these interesting indications, Pihkala's argument were peculiar in the field of national economy, that is to say, he stressed the heavy economic burden caused by resettlement and he did not think that this huge amount of national investment were payable from purely economical viewpoint, anticipating changes in product structure and accompanying marketing difficulties. But was so the national consensus then, he accepted this program as unavoidable<sup>13</sup>.

Erkki Kivinen was common to other reporters as for reviewing the history of settlement activities, and his work is characteristic in the point that he spent many pages for the organizations to carry out reclamation and construction, public authorities, local committees and private corporations. What he stressed is that, based upon national consensus mentioned above, all the organizations had acted very not only emergently but also effectively. As for this point, the experience of so-called Rauhaaika—peace time between the last two wars against U.S.S.R., was of use.

They had to accept people from the lost land after the first war, but on the way of this settlement, another war happened to occur and farmers had got back to their places having followed up the front. This influenced in two ways, on the one hand, Karelian farmers had to cross the former national boundary three times and consequently there were more confusions, but on the other hand, the government had already had preceding experience to let the evacuees settle inside of then temporary boundary. That means when MHL was issued in 1945, there had already existed e.g. colonization board and the fundamental survey for possible arable land had been partly finished and partly on its way. Each commune was responsible for e.g. soil research and for assessment of capacity of acceptance").

Each settler inherited Finnish farmer's long tradition to make everything by himself, covering the shortage of all materials. First he had built sauna hut and having lived in it, he added necessary farm buildings to it. Talko had played very important role in construction and reclamation. It is a traditional way of labour exchange among neighbours, based upon free will and without any payment but meal on the day").

It is said that solid and long lasting Finnish tradition of clearance and well established organization for it had made it easier together with reinforced land reformation.

Axel De Gadolin has a little different viewpoint. One of his objectives seems to show his fear of socialism or U.S.S.R.. And concerning MHL, he wrote that there had been some invasions of private ownership"). In this context he valued the heavy indemnity to U.S.S.R. rather ironically, that is to say, Finland had to develop emergently her engineering industries to pay the indemnities to U.S.S.R. and the labour market for the evacuees was enlarged. He concluded that the resettlement had succeeded and what had brought this success were American aids and good marketing conditions for woods products. It is true that rapid development of industries and emergency reclamation had needed huge amount of capital respectively and without those two factors it had been more difficult or almost impossible. But the present author can not agree with him, even if the difference of standpoint between us were granted, as to the point that he did not refer the self-dependent struggle of Finnish people at all, even though his indication that the strong desire for landed properties of the evacuees, ex-servicemen, farm workers and so forth was to acquire real property in contrast to inflated money is interesting. And following indications are no less noteworthy, as above quoted, that some new farms had already been sold by new settlers, that acquired land by the government according to MHL had been becoming useless, that some divided farms had not yet been received by any settlers and that emigrants especially to Sweden had been increasing.

De Gadolin did these indications in 1952 and his intention then seems to show that radical land reformation caused the crisis of established social order

and left some problems unsolved, stating that social consideration exceeded economic one. The present author is against this opinion but what pointed out at that stage let us return to the problem what position the emergency resettlement should be given or what meaning it had in the history of "Northward Movement" or of advance of pioneer fringe. With some exceptions, emergency resettlement had its centres in established agricultural regions as concluded already and in cities. In fact, many evacuees, not only former urban inhabitants but also farmers, had found their accommodations in cities, remarkably in Lahti, and their suburbs where it had been easier for them to have found employment<sup>44</sup>.

##### 5. More specialized and localized viewpoint, its necessity

As already mentioned, there had been many studies on the resettlement problems in Finland after the World War II, though many of them were political, economical and sociological ones. In his report about so-called cold farms, Mead spent the first half for general survey, but in the second half he treated with one region, that is Lapinlahti, and this is the first readable case-study on resettlement<sup>45</sup>. Describing the activities there, he suggested the settlers' difficulties caused by the difference of surroundings and by the friction between them and old farmers. Great changes in land ownership and land use had brought the crisis of economy especially of old farms. The contradiction between balanced farm with most economic combination of stock, crop land and woodland and balanced economy with enough woodland which was necessary for both old and new holdings as cash source was difficult problem to solve.

Tauno Aminoff reported about the life in Lapland which had been very difficult for those Lappish people who moved from ceded Petsamo district<sup>46</sup>. For them large wild grazing area for reindeer was indispensable but even in such a remotest region there had been established system of land use and friction was suggested.

Though Atte Hirvas<sup>47</sup> treated with Heinola region, his interest had been concentrated to effects of loan offered by the government for settlers. If we were not interested especially in capital problems or resettlement activities, this report is negligible.

Seppo Salminen's work<sup>48</sup> on moved fishing holdings from Viipuri and Ladoga regions to remained Finland Bay region is not a detailed case study but is very remarkable because it is rare study on this theme. He noted that these fishermen had got their land according to MHL and these land had not belonged to the categories of farm land or farm capable land, but to just residential plot. That means these fishermen could find their income sources only from the sea. They had to depend much upon limited resources of so-called silakka—Baltic herring.

There are some studies on the reconstruction problem in Lapland which was

heavily damaged by German troops at the end of the last war<sup>1)</sup>. But the present author is passing by them because of the peculiarity of this problem.

In 1959, Maankäyttölaki passed the parliament and the direction of Finnish agricultural policy changed greatly. This is literally Land Use Act and aimed the structural changes of Finnish agriculture. Anticipated almost at the beginning of resettlement activities, very serious market worsening of dairy products was getting reality at that moment<sup>2)</sup>. Small-sized dairy-farmers had been steadily increasing their number and producing capacity, in accordance with proceeding reclamation. Many categories of subsidies for farmers from the government were becoming heavy burden to national finance.

To improve the productivities of dairy farming and of total farming, there must be enlargement of farm size. According to this law, the government refrained from establishing so small farm as under MHL but proceeded large scale reclamation especially in Northern Finland in order to place larger farms there. Though the settlement of small scale ceased according to this law, it does not mean the decrease of small-sized farms and consequent rise of productivities. We do not have enough space to describe these situations at the moment. In any way, so-called Voivuori—mountain of butter increased its height. Finnish butter produced on small farms under poorer physical conditions had not competitive capacity in international market at all without much subsidy<sup>3)</sup>. And at last Pellonvaraustoiminta—Land Reservation Act was given its validity in order to reduce arable area under cultivation and dairy products<sup>4)</sup>. There shall be another opportunity to discuss about this process. What is intended with summarizing these changes in agriculture and agricultural policies is to make it clear that many studies done in 60's about post-war land clearance in Finland could have more long-term viewpoint to value it than those done in 50's could have.

In this sense, reviewing these studies done after the issue of MKL, we might be able to get answer for the questions what position the resettlement or reclamation has in the history of "Northward Movement" and how policies function as determinants in location of agriculture.

Helmer Smeds showed wide ranged, say, general viewpoint<sup>5)</sup>. His consideration started with physical possibilities of reclamation after showing the ratio of reclaimable / arable area according to lääni. He concluded that the northern provinces had become greater possibilities of reclamation because of their vast peatland which had become possible to reclaim with technical development. But he clearly distinguished the difference between "technically reclaimable" and "economically reclaimable". Oulu-joki valley had been assumed by him as pioneer fringe belt and he stressed that leading pioneering communes had located mainly south of this belt in pre-war era and transferred to north in post-war era<sup>6)</sup>. Who suggested the concept of "Northward Movement" to the present author is Smeds<sup>7)</sup>. And he argued that in the north the reclamation

ratio had been higher than in the south. Recognizing that the evacuated people had concentrated in the south, he explained the low ratio of reclamation there as the tradition of reclamation had already been missed. The indicated facts were right but this explanation was not agreeable. As for the reason why the reclamation by evacuees had not succeeded in a full sense, he listed two points, one that there had been told the possibility of returning Karelia to Finland, another that those Karelian evacuees were from the regions where the reclamation had been getting to its final phase.

He reviewed the rejection of kylmätila by allotted settlers. The rejection rate up to 1959 reached to 25% and itself might not be so surprising to consider the industrial development, but in South-Ostrobothnia it was 50%, in Central Finland 31%, and in Uusimaa and Varsinais-Suomi 30% respectively<sup>11</sup>. Though he did not point it out, it is very interesting that the rejection rates in more urbanized area were larger than in less urbanized areas. That the local land receivers had shown less rejection than the evacuees is notable. And the development of reclamation means, according to the present author, that tradition of land clearance was inherited by small farmers in pioneer fringe encouraged by several regulations mainly directed to displaced people. High rejection rates by refugees in the south means in a sense that normal pioneering pace had been disturbed by post war resettlement program, it might be said if we remember huge investment to those wasted farms, immediately after or later.

Smeds concluded that the pioneer fringe had reached its limit which was close to national border both in the north and the south. And he prospected shrinking of small holders especially in the south and surviving of them in the north being supported with forestry. The present author thinks he was almost right but he lacked view for worsening milk products market and for reducing labour market in forestry.

Though we can find many literatures about the present theme with general or specific standpoint<sup>12</sup>, the contents of them have already been discussed and we are now reviewing some case studies which are thought notable.

Among them we have to refer first to Mauri Palomäki's<sup>13</sup>. He spent many pages for general studies and there he thought that the settlement area had important meanings in many ways and criticised e.g. Mead's study because it had depended on simple year statistics in 1948. He was much interested in the effects of resettlement upon landscape, which is closely connected with land use. Showing land use map in large scale, he compared the clearance in Iikesenniitty and Jukajoki. And this is very valuable because this is the first one of this types of studies. Iikesenniitty is located on less marshy land than Jukajoki, though both two belong to Kontiolahti commune in North Karelia. At the stage of 1960, the former is more developed partly because of more favourable conditions. Apart from the contrast between them, this report is very important because clearance was carried out on marshy land as resettle-

ment activity. In Karelian waving hilly land, so-called vaara-settlement is common because on the top of the hill they can enjoy more frost-free climatic and preferable soil conditions. In this context, we can say emergency resettlement had brought different type of settlement into Karelia.

As a special case, Porkkala region was studied, which had been leased to U.S.S.R. and returned to Finland in 1956<sup>11)</sup>. This is a survey of economic condition in returned porkkala region and though it is of great interest for economic politicians, it is not so much useful for us to quote.

One very interesting study treated with three areas in Lapland<sup>12)</sup>. Sampled areas are Kuparivaara, Puolakkavaara and Jouttiaapa. The author, Tri Eckart Ehlers compared these colonizing area and made it clear that there were large differences between them not only in farm size but also in general layout of settlement, land use pattern and so forth. And these differences were caused by local changes in relief, vegetation types and condition in micro-climate. He argued that several stages of colonization had resulted in different landscapes.

Another German geographer, Hans-Peter von Soosten<sup>13)</sup> studied colonization area in Salla and Kuusamo which are very peculiar region in the point that the national boundary divided these communes into Finnish and Russian parts and the people had to move from ceded to remained parts of their own communes. Though the case study in the last half of his work is noteworthy as well, the present author should like to rank the general review of the resettlement history high. He placed MKL in his sight and that why he could assess the balance sheet of post-war colonization.

Though the standpoint is quite different, Tapani Lasola contributed very much for the study of kylmätila<sup>14)</sup>. He researched productivities on many cold farms about many kinds of crops and factors affecting to their differences. Both geographical and economical factors had been the objectives of his research and relations between these had been shown in success. But the most valuable point for us is that he collected his materials from many sampled farms which spread in all the main districts of cold farm distribution. Consequently he could compare the results with the stressed concept of regional difference. Though he is not interested in landscape at all, his study can be said to be an accumulation of regional studies.

One of the centres of resettlement activities is Suomenselkä which is located in the Middle-Finland and is watershed area between the Gulf of Bothnia and the Lake district. Stig Jaatinen and others selected this area as study field of post-war resettlement<sup>15)</sup>. Three sampled regions have different characters in their history and physical conditions. And the authors analysed and compared them in many ways. One of the most important characteristics of this study is that they respected the changes in the courses of time since the beginning of the resettlement. For example, they pursued the changes of land ownership in respect of time. Only with such intensive method as employed in the study of

Miiluranta, Hevospuuro and Latvanen we can solve the difficult question concerning the subjectivity of settlers themselves. In this sense, this type of studies should be accumulated as much as possible in order to know the way for settlers to respond to the economic and social changes which influence them.

## 6. Conclusions

Resettlement activities were not only of the government but also of settlers themselves. The government functions with its policies and administration but the settlers work on the field or in the forest following their own need and desire. Usually these two reactions to the changing situations have common goal, but sometimes not. Through the short review of the history of studies on post-war settlement, we can surely ascertain that policy of government has strong influence on location of agriculture at least temporarily. But at the same time more personal motivation seems to function collectively. This appears in the response of Karelian refugees and local small holders to given situations. What we see in today's Finnish agriculture reflects both accordance and inaccordance between these two elements.

As for "Northward Movement", many materials have proved that it existed, though, as Smeds noted<sup>1)</sup>, it stopped. When Finland kept or was forced to keep subsistent economy, there was no barrier in front of this movement but when she opened her door for free international market, there developed difficult conditions. In this movement, the Karelian evacuees' role was not so important, moreover, it can be suggested that they had rather negative meanings to the movement. It moved the gravity centre of population to opposite direction, it is because the whole nation recognized the problem as national. Conclusionally we must exclude the evacuees' resettlement out of this movement including the case of those in Kuusamo and Salla. But as a matter of fact pioneer fringe advanced to north and in Lapland large settlement areas had their foundations in the course of 1950's. In this respect we are sure that other constituents in those entitled for land acquisition under MHL and MKL took parts to this movement willingly and being backed by the government.

The problem of "retreat from the north" is another one. Neither when it began, nor how it proceeds is clear. So far as we compare the number of farms in 1959 and 1969 according to agricultural census, in many communes in Lapland it increased or decreased little, when in the communes south to Oulujoki valley decreased it very much with no exception. In any way, the retreat from the north have already begun, but its study belongs to the future.

## References

1. Kivikoski, Ella: Finland (1967 London).
2. Jutikkala, Eino: Suomen talonpojan historia. (1958, Helsinki).
3. Jaatinen, Stig: Expansion and retreat of settlement in the southwestern Archipelago

- of Finland. Fennia 84.
4. Maahankintalaki: From Suomen historian dokumentteja 2 (1970 Helsinki).
  5. Supposed forest size is different according to local conditions.
  6. Veikko Vennamo: Asutustoiminnan yleisistä periaatteista maassamme. Asutustoiminnan Aikakauskirja (AA) No.1, 1950.
  7. Maankäyttölainsäädäntökomitean mietinnön johtavia periaatteita. AA No.1, 1952.
  8. Eino Lähdeoja: Maan tarkoituksenmukaisesta käytöstä tulevassa asutustoiminnassa. AA No.2, 1950.
  9. Väisänen, Paavo: Maahankintalain toimeenpanon vaikutuksesta leipäviljantuotantoon. AA No.1, 1954.
  10. Kallio, K.M.: Maahankintalain mukaan muodostetuista laidunalueista. AA No.1, 1949.
  11. *ibid.* 2.
  12. Literally means great division, land redistribution or enclosure.
  13. Huupponen, Ilmari: Asutusyhteismetsistä. AA No.4, 1949.
  14. Some aspects of post war settlement activity and reconstruction work in Finland and principle adopted, p.3—because of present author's mistake only note by him left.
  15. Kivinen, Erkki: Om återuppygnads verksamheten i Finland. Det Norske Myrselskap No.6, 1954 p.3.
  16. Waris, Heikki: Siirtoväen sopeutuminen. Yhteiskunnan Korkeakoulun Julkaisuja IV, 1952. Helsinki.
  17. Kuhla, Keijo: Karjalaiset Kantasuomeen. 1969. Jyväskylä.
  18. Mead, W.R.: The cold farm in Finland. Geographical Review 41.
  19. Kuikka, Johannes: Asutustoimenpiteistä ns. Kylmillä tiloilla. AA No.2, 1950.
  20. All the literatures concerning the characteristics of MHL refer to this point.
  21. *ibid.* 6.
  22. Räsänen, Yrjö: Maahankintatilojen tukemistoimenpiteistä. AA No.3, 1950.
  23. Mead, W.R.: Farming in Finland. 1953. London.
  24. Mead, W.R.: *ibid.* 18. p.531.
  25. Pihkala, Kaarlo: The land settlement program of Finland. Land Economics vol. 28 No.2, p.150.
  26. Kuhla, Keijo: *ibid.* 17. p.176, p.215.
  27. *ibid.* 18. p.532.
  28. Kanervo, Erkki: The displaced population. Fennia 72, p.381
  29. *ibid.* 28. p.387.
  30. *ibid.* 28. p.391.
  31. *ibid.* 28. p.387.
  32. Lapinleimu, Toivo: Uudisraivauksesta maataloustiloilla. AA No.2, 1949.
  33. *ibid.* 25, p.152.
  34. *ibid.* 25. p.154.
  35. *ibid.* 18. p.537.
  36. *ibid.* 25. p.158.
  37. Pihkala, Kaarlo: Det finska kolonisationsprogrammets kostnader och finansiering. Nordisk Lantbruksekonomisk Tidskrift 3, 1952.
  38. *ibid.* 15. p.3.
  39. *ibid.* 15. p.5.



40. De Gadolin, Axel: The solution of the Karelian refugee problem in Finland. p.37. 1952. The Hague.
41. *ibid.* 40. p.39.
42. *ibid.* 40. p.38.
43. *ibid.* 18. p.533.
44. Aminoff, Tauno: Petsamon luovutetulta alueelta siirtyneiden kolttalappalaisten elinmahdollisuuksien turvaaminen I. II. AA No.3, 1950, No.1, 1951.
45. Hirvas, Atte: Asutuskassalainoituksen tuloksia Heinolan maalaiskunnassa. AA No.1. 1951.
46. Salminen, Seppo: Havaintoja siirtokalastajaväestön maanhankintalain nojalla saamista kalastustiloista. AA No.3, 1951.
47. Saksalaisten joukkojen maailmansodan aikana Pohjois-Suomessa aiheuttamat tuhot ja sodanjälkeinen jälleenrakentaminen. AA No.1, 1954.
48. Tauriainen, Juhani: Maaseudun rakennemuutokset ja maatalouden sosiaaliset ongelmat. p.12. (Maatalous ja Yhteiskunta, 1972. Helsinki).
49. Nikkola, Antti: Maatalous ja kansainvälinen yhdentyminen. p.39. (Maatalous ja Yhteiskunta, 1972. Helsinki).
50. Suomen maatalous 1960-1980. PSM Julkaisuja No.14, 1973. Helsinki.
51. Smeds, Helmer: Post war land clearance and pioneering activities in Finland. Fennia, 83.
52. *ibid.* 51. p.22.
53. *ibid.* 51. p.1.
54. *ibid.* 51. p.14.
55. Väisänen, Paavo: Legislation concerning the position of displaced population in Finland. 1964. Wien.  
Lasola, Tapani: On the prospects of farmers on so-called cold settlement farms in 1963. Smeds Helmer: Recent changes in the agricultural geography of Finland. Fennia, 87.  
Kärkkäinen, Ulla: Changes of farm size structure in Finland, 1959-1964. Acta Geographica 20, No.15.
56. Palomäki, Mauri: Post war pioneering in Finland, with special reference to the role of the settlement areas. Fennia 84, III. p.43.
57. Väisänen Paavo: Tutkimus Porkkalan entisen vuokra-alueen maatalousväestön taloudellisesta asemasta. AA No.2-3, 1964.
58. Ehlers, T. Eckart: Kuparivaara, Puolakkavaara, Jouttiaapa. AA No.3, 1968. original in Erdkunde 21-3.
59. Von Soosten, H-Peter: Finnlands Agrokolonization in Lapland nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. (Marburger Geographische Schriften. 1970).
60. Lasola, Tapani: Peltokasvien sadoista ja satomäärin vaikuttaneista tekijöistä ns. kylmillä asutustiloilla v. 1959-1963. 1965. Helsinki.
61. † Jaatinen, S., Krokfors, C., Nygard, M. and Helmer, S.: Resettlement, its motivation and realization in the Northern Suomenselkä, Finland. Helsingin Yliopiston Maantieteen Laitoksen Julkaisuja, Sarja A 102.
62. *ibid.* 51. p.26.