

**Searching for the Social Man:
Hungarian and Finnish Psychologists Collaborate***

Anssi HALMESVIRTA

1 Introduction

The scientific relations of small capitalist and socialist countries during the Cold War era are largely a neglected area of study. Either it is deemed quite insignificant in comparison to wider issues of transfer of technology and know-how between greater countries or it has simply been overlooked as a peripheral subject. This holds true also of the scientific relations between Hungary and Finland. In spite of the fact that since the end of the 1960s Kádár's regime was ready to acknowledge that although the ideological warfare against the West had to be accelerated, Finland was in the category of the capitalist countries with which extensive agreements concerning scientific co-operation could be struck. Finland, like Sweden, was not an imperialist country but a capitalist one, and 'pink'¹ at that. In the beginning of the 1970s Finland was not regarded only as a highly attractive field for scientific and cultural propaganda by the Hungarian authorities but also a country where to send junior experts in increasing numbers to learn Western techniques and innovations.² The rapprochement of Hungary and Finland was preconditioned by the way Finland promoted the 'good

* This article is a revised version of the second chapter of the author's study *Co-operation across the Iron Curtain*. Hungarian-Finnish Scientific Relations of the Academies from the 1960s to the 1990s. Studies in General History, vol. 12. Jyväskylä University Printing House, Jyväskylä 2005.

neighborhood policy' towards the Soviet Union. 'Finlandization' could become to mean something positive for the Hungarians since it was – paradoxically enough – Finland, not Hungary that gained favours (Porkkala, the lease of the Saimaa Canal) and advantageous trade agreements from the Soviets.

In the favourable foreign political situation of the early 1970s, and as the science policy of the Academy of Finland (AF) was radically reformed (1970) and became impregnated by leftist concept of science ('science for the people'), an opportunity for widening scientific co-operation opened. After lengthy negotiations a bilateral agreement between it and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA) was signed in 1976. The traditionally dominant finno-ugric studies had to give room to the breakthrough of up-to-date natural and technical sciences within the framework of scientific exchange activities. In the following years, they received the lion-share of funding, a fact reflected also in the composition of the symposia of the first Days of Finnish Science held in Budapest in May, 1979. Under the pressure from social reformers the priorities of the AF were, however, soon to be reshuffled.³ The shift towards social sciences can be read in the programme for the Days of Hungarian Science held in Finland (27 August – 3 September 1981); among others, one symposium of psychology was organized at the Jyväskylä University, Central Finland.

Regarding the rise of the societal role of social sciences in general, it may not be amiss to reassess the significance of psychology among them and as a field of Hungarian-Finnish scientific co-operation and exchange. Psychologists in both countries were convinced that psychology was the basic study of human behaviour and as such of immense value for social reform. Reforms were based on planning and 'social engineering' which, for their part, craved for psychological data and generalizations to back up their projects. The subject-matter of psychology was more critical than, for instance, that of medicine or agricultural sciences in shaping the understanding of society. Since the same kind of social problems and deviant behavior were found

to be on the increase in Hungary and in Finland, it was foreseeable that both could learn and benefit from each others' methods and research results. The debates and arguments of the experts would also reveal some fundamental differences between the Finnish, more individualist approach and the Hungarian, collectivist approach to psychology, and possibly lead to a point where touchy philosophical questions of values and norms were encountered. Pivotal questions in this article are: how and why was it possible for psychologists from two juxtaposed social and science systems come to terms with each other and find common ground for scientific discussion and joint projects? One must also reconstruct what results the co-operation was able to show and how and in what forms it was carried on after the change of the system in Hungary (1989).

At the outset, one has to keep in mind how 'psychology' was understood in the West when it reached its heyday in the 1970s. It was not principally a study of 'psyche' as in psychoanalysis or deep-psychology but simply 'the study of human behaviour'. The human being was seen as a mechanism of stimulus and response governed by the laws of causation. Mental processes were measured according to neurological theories rather than by interpretative analysis. This behavioralism also became quite popular in educational psychology. For a contemporary observer, it was possible to state that in Hungarian, 'socialist' psychology, the value of psychological devices of control and education of man was exaggerated and in Finland the possibilities to change human environs in order to 'improve' behaviour were underestimated.⁴ However, the behaviouralist definition of psychology implied a fair dose of psychologism, meaning that all social problems could be reduced to the analysis of individual human behaviour. In Finland, this was softened by functionalism: as in sociology, conflicts in a society were interpreted as improving its efficiency and cohesion, also in psychology the development of an individual was seen in the context of contestation of prevailing values and norms. Hungarian psychology was not equally permissive.

In Marxist psychology leanings towards behaviouralism were overridden by more holistic approaches emanating from the theories of man's social development expounded by Lev Vygotsky (1896–1934)⁵ and Anton Makarenko (1888–1939)⁶ which took root in Hungary in the early 1960s. In the 1950s Hungarian psychology had been rather vulgarly collectivistic, and it was established by administrative measures. It did not rise through patient scientific discussion and emphasized stability at the expense of creativity. At the time Hungarian psychologists had very few contacts with the West, simple Pavlovism with naturalist reductionism dominated. Vygotsky's teaching became more known in the 1960s, and studies in psychology of work, educational psychology and psychology of children's development were launched. Also studies in propaganda, public education, traffic, criminal, and sports psychology became popular⁷, and they were already infiltrated by ideas from the West. However, psychology was given a peculiarly collectivistic task: by studying the laws of behaviour finding regularities on the basis of which authorities could optimize people's adaptation to social life. Social psychology in socialism set out to manage people's everyday problems.

Marxism tended to preformulate the phenomenon under study and omit the phenomenon itself. Consequently, expectations concerning psychology were very high: it should have been able to find knowledge and means to eradicate fluctuations in work-force, traffic and shop-floor accidents or quickly to reduce the number of neuroses, suicides and antisocial behaviour in general.⁸ Authorities suspected that building socialism after all breded all sorts of crime.⁹ These fears reflected the dark side of the social reality; alcoholism, suicides, and mental depression were disquietingly widespread.¹⁰ Psychology was burdened with an enormous responsibility to heal society.

Marxist psychology took root in Finland in the early 1970s, and in the reforms of teaching of psychology in the highest educational and pedagogical institutions such as Jyväskylä University, the new reference material included a Soviet handbook of

psychology along with works of Halperin, Leontjev¹¹ and others which had been translated into Finnish. They were being advertised as 'opening a new scientific-materialist phase in Finnish psychological literature'¹². The leading psychological review regarded 'friendly' relations with the Soviet Union as very important also for the development of psychology in Finland. The editor was convinced of the 'bridge-building' role of Finnish psychologists which was to allow discussion between American and Soviet traditions of psychology to flow freely in Finland.¹³ Yet, the same paper occasionally took a critical stand against the pseudo-philosophical bias in Marxist psychology itself. It was argued that the 'mentalistic' language of Halperin and Leontjev remained aloof of empirical processes and the connection of psyche to material conditions was obscure. Behavioralism was to overrule such philosophizing: consciousness was to be translated into language which described behaviour.¹⁴ It seems that Vygotsky's collectivist theories were not taken as seriously in Finland as his more applicable studies in schizophrenia¹⁵ which shows the eclectic character of Finnish psychology.

Psychology had already experienced a revival in the early 1960s in both ideological blocs. Hungarian psychologists would not refer to their domestic predecessors but to foreign sources. They tried to follow international trends, and in the end of the 1960s the latest development was the institutionalization of educational psychology which dealt with retarded populations and human selection in the name of social hygiene and educational reform. At the time when political intervention still hindered rivalry within science in Hungary,¹⁶ in Finland the state began to demand 'socially valuable' results from all social sciences, psychology included.

Both in Hungary and Finland it was widely expected that psychology would become one of the social sciences – yet another efficient means of planning and control. What was common to Socialism and Capitalism in the 1960s–1970s was the belief in the secular religion called 'progress', be it evolutionary or Marxist. In that they rivalled: human reason was promiscu-

ously applied in regulating human affairs and cultural and natural environment. The control of populations was rationalized and conscious planning of social policy was to be based on sociological and psychological knowledge. Modern ways of persuasion and indoctrination were invented and further developed in party headquarters and research institutions especially for use in education and mass recruitment. Educational psychology developed into an effective means to create suitable tastes, opinions and values. These remained ideologically different in socialist Hungary and capitalist Finland – at times the Hungarians complained of the expansion of American values and culture in Finland. Propaganda-makers exploited modern mass-media. Psychologists who would not study social structures and milieu as deeply as individual behaviour became redundant. In Finland canvassing and ‘policy of satisfying’ directed at the consumer appealed to irrational traits of the man, in Hungary irrationalism was to be rooted and a ‘new, really social man’ was to be created. Both systems were wary of stagnation and in the progressive atmosphere social engineering was not only a matter of adjusting this or that minor problem of social adaptation, it had to cater for overall social development. In its name, in Hungary during the whole period under scrutiny and in the late 1960s and 1970s also in Finland¹⁷, ‘reactionary’ ideologies were deemed futile in this respect.

The ensuing co-operation between Hungarian and Finnish psychologists was to lead to concrete, and in the eyes of the authorities, also socially applicable results. It was optimistically assumed that psychology could reveal peoples’ dispositions and give lessons to direct their behaviour into socially acceptable channels. In Hungary this became a question of viability of socialism, in Finland it was to be the recipe for ‘peaceful social progress and economic growth’. The role of psychology was deemed critical: for instance, recently detected forms of deviancy among adolescents, students and some marginal(ized) social groups were to be studied in order to make their rehabilitation possible. This served the more final goal to encounter the ‘threatening’

erosion of the moral backbone of social order in both countries.

A sociologically oriented intellectual who described the grievances of society had formerly been potentially dangerous to the Communist Party in Hungary but in the 1970s it was possible to raise such issues. The tone was changed: apologies to ideology and covering up 'mistakes' in planning and their execution were gradually given up.¹⁸ Towards the 1980s sociologists and psychologists were no longer the masters of the ideological warfare, and every now and then an interesting article or documentary was made public.¹⁹ Marxism-Leninism became so flexible in definition that a variety of interpretations of it could live side by side. Many a well-educated communist could transform himself/herself from a 'Red to an expert'.²⁰ Also the transfer of know-how and technologies from the West was emptied of 'class-content' in the 1970s which amounted to the rise of technical intelligentsia also in Hungarian society.²¹

One intriguing question is how the 'psychological mission' could be jointly accomplished. Notwithstanding the apparent compatibility or complementarity of theories, study tasks and methods, the contradictory value-systems behind the two 'psychologies' – individualist versus collectivist – could cause hiatus in planning joint research. In such a basic 'science of man' as psychology was, one could expect that in principle antagonistic world-views of Marxism-Leninism and Liberalism – the latter being the pronounced principle of science in Finland – would cause insurmountable obstacles. Disagreement over ethical and epistemological aspects of study would arise. It has to be specified here how and why deep-lying philosophical problems were being evaded or avoided in a pragmatic manner which satisfied both sides. This involves further questions: was it that in the name of 'neutral co-operation' examination of premises of study was glossed over? Or was it that, for the sake of 'maintenance of the social order', the results of joint activities were exchanged and utilized happily without further ado? Although theories could clash, the study methods might be the same and lead to similarly applicable results. Or did any form of co-operation end

up in a cul-de-sac which could not be bypassed?

Although Finns were usually more ignorant of the condition of psychology in Hungary than the Hungarians of the one of the West, both knew of the principles, development of methods and of some of the innovative results of psychological studies over the Iron Curtain. Radical students of psychology in Jyväskylä University naively believed in the 1970s that the 'really social, virtuous man' had already been born in socialism whereas the staff of the Department took a much more moderate view of the achievements of socialism.²² Idealism vanished as the drawbacks of 'modernization' were recognized on both sides, and reassessment was demanded along similar policy lines. Knowledge of modern society and mind was expected from psychologists in both ideological camps, and their co-operation presupposed a 'depoliticized' agreement on what were the common problematics.

The records of the MTA and the AF archives preserve reports of Hungarian and Finnish exchange researchers telling their superiors about the urgency of reforms and further research co-operation to investigate mental and social grievances and deviant behaviour. The most alarmist messages issued forth from the contributions of criminologists and experts of child and adolescent psychology. The worry of losing a whole generation due to immorality, anti-social behaviour and juvenile delinquency increased during the 1970s, and for instance, the conference report of the psychologists taking part in the Days of Hungarian Science (Jyväskylä, 1981) carried with it a certain mood of common, albeit hidden despair. Partly in response, respective authorities put forward plans of 'rescue operations', tailored to specific circumstances in Hungarian and Finnish societies. Official publications and correspondence of the MTA and the AF from the same period show a considerable and continuous increase of funding in social sciences, psychology included. The 'painful' areas of society received more attention, and research of the neglected areas of social reality was started. Suggestions for reforms in mental care and changes in criminal law were forwarded to the Ministries, and law experts

and officials referred to psychological investigation to back their proposals.

It seems that in these programmes both the Marxist-oriented and the evolutionary, developmental psychology were reaching a point in which their credibility was challenged. They were now seeking support from state authorities and, to a certain extent, from each other. In Finland this led to a situation in which behavioralism had to give space to rivalling, systemic theories in which the human being was recognized as an organized, active and goal-oriented whole.²³ Under the impact of theories of cognition and mental development of Vygotsky Hungarian psychologists also leaned towards the idea that human beings should be studied in concrete contexts, not only in laboratory conditions. In this way, 'psyche' was making a come-back in psychology, and during the 1980s it was becoming a more dynamic faculty than it had ever been.²⁴

In its due course, as the coercive nature of total social planning and control became transparent, rude progressivism was exhausted. The uncontrollability of huge social processes – forced industrialization and urban development in Hungary, the plight of the countryside and migration waves to south and Sweden in Finland – was gradually understood. Corrective measures took their place, for instance, when such phenomena as unemployment, crime and booming traffic with its terrific accident numbers started to worry the social engineer and the decision-maker in both countries. In scientific and technical cooperation between Hungary and Finland quite a few common problems were found and up-to-date techniques were applied to the advantage of both sides. Psychology tackled the psychic problems caused by dislocation and alienation of certain sections of the populations in the two countries resembled each other greatly. They could be studied by the same methods even though basic social values and goals remained different. The future of the youth and the development of its potential to socialization was a one of the most pressing common concerns.

One common consequence of the theoretical shift can be

found in the plans for educational reform in both countries. More stress was now laid on new forms of education which would not be as authoritarian as had been customary both in Hungary and Finland. It was as if it had been realized that coercion was the wrong method, and a more sympathetic approach, enlightened campaigning and teaching by competition and example the right one. One comes across with variations on this theme in the records and it remains to be studied how social political questions were tackled in bilateral relations before the collapse of Marxist psychology in Hungary.

At first, the impact of social psychology was felt in re-evaluations of the state of social and political order in Hungary and Finland. The Hungarians were more eager than the Finns to draw lessons from the collaborator's social and political life – it was their mission to transfer information on the workings of Finnish society to Hungary. The initial assumption of the Hungarians studying in Finland was that Finland was on a lower, less developed stage of social 'progress' than socialist Hungary. From the Hungarian vantage point 'underdeveloped' Finnish democracy was to be compared with the 'maturing' Hungarian people's one. To Hungarian exchange researchers the 'new Finnish social policy' based on reformist social psychology of the 1970s somehow resembled socialist social policy, and was thus welcomed as a step in the 'right' direction. However, the outcome of studies pointed also to another, unexpected direction; for instance, when Finnish institutions of local democracy were carefully studied by a few younger Hungarian political and social scientists in the 1970s-1980s, they were found almost exemplary. It must have been a shock for a young communist to realize that in the final analysis it was the Finnish 'rational freedom' that bore such fruits to society and economy that made Finns themselves mentally and physically satisfied and relatively happy, and Finland a stream-lined and modern industrial country, ahead of Hungary in many respects.²⁵ As Finland turned out to be less 'reactionary' than Hungary, a mood of disillusion resounded in the reports of Hungarian researchers.

Parallel astonishment can be detected in some articles of Hungarian historical and literary reviews of the 1970s on Finnish social and scientific affairs. The realization of the fact that Hungarians had not been able to follow the Finns on 'the way to the truth' caused tangible anger in the authorities at home.²⁶ An alarming conclusion was: something was wrong with the socialist morality if it was losing the battle over souls to basically Lutheran, bourgeois mentality.

It is hard to say how widely this message from Finland was spreading in Hungary but it certainly contradicted the image the official, diplomatic representatives of Hungary delivered from Helsinki to Budapest. The Finnish political culture of 'excessive pluralism' (too many parties, extreme Right-wing propaganda, remnants of fascism and chauvinism, electioneering in local and general elections, decentralized power structures etc.) was, in their view symptomatic to a chaotic system, and eventually overcome by some form of leftist 'Finnish Popular Front'. In contrast, what came to realities in Finland was, at the same time, sadly realized by some experts that it was not Kádár's Hungary but Kekkonen's Finland that benefited politically and economically from relations with the Soviets Union.²⁷ Under the foreign political umbrella, it was equally painstaking for a visiting Hungarian scholar or scientist to gather that the Finnish economic-political system – science policy as a part of it – which should have been 'backward' was definitely more efficient than the one of Hungary. The causes for it were not found only in the usual rich natural resources and pragmatic foreign policy but also in the enterprising psycho-social build-up of the Finnish people. The 'Finnish dilemma' motivated many a Hungarian social scientist and psychologist to apply for research grants in the 1970s and the 1980s to Finland. And, in answering the question 'what did psychology have to do with changes in political culture?', it may be tentatively argued that the results and impressions they reported at home, even if not making any direct impact on the decision-makers, nevertheless could mould the way scientists looked at Hungarian science and society more critically.

2 The Jyväskylä Symposium

It was the general agreement of the Academies from the year 1976 that regulated the official scientific relations of Hungary and Finland. Although its outspoken purpose was to open co-operation in new sciences, psychology was not among them at the beginning. It did not feature in the agreement (1977) concerning the organization of the Days of Science either. Neither did the programme of the first Days of Finnish Science in Budapest in 1979 include a psychology symposium. However, in 1979 out of the MTA's and AF's 44 joint research projects seven were in social sciences, two of them being conducted in psychology; 1) a project on 'event-related potential correlates of psychological processes' carried out as experimental studies in electro-physiology (Helsinki University), 2) examination of the bullying and the behaviour of victims in primary and secondary schools (Turku University).²⁸ The first purported quite ambitiously to establish a link between electro-physiological processes of the brain and the processes of the mind, and the second focussed on a common problem at schools in line with studies in deviancy.

In the background, the floor for more extensive co-operation had been long prepared by Professor of Psychology and the Director of the Department of Psychology in Jyväskylä University, Martti Takala. During his pioneering career there (1954–88) psychological studies orientated towards developmental studies. The Department of Psychology was the oldest in Finland (est. in 1936) and developmental and educational psychology there had already acquired international fame, for instance, in family studies and in the pioneering studies in aggression by Professor Lea Pulkkinen. As the Department was growing fast in the beginning of the 1970s, the studies branched out into several directions such as social development and control of children and youth, studies in ways of life, and more specifically, studies of student attitudes (Isto Ruoppila) and social drifting and deviancy (Pulkkinen).²⁹ Although psychology be-

came a legitimate university branch of higher education of its own only in 1980 in Finland, research in the field had been conducted in Jyväskylä since the 1950s. The number of staff grew from eleven to seventeen from 1971 to 1981, and in 1980 it had got its own building on campus, the biggest of its kind in Finland. Facilities in Jyväskylä were excellent although the studies were at the beginning quite diverse, and often theoretically and methodically rather weak.³⁰

In times when Hungarian psychology lived through international networks and informal cross-talk over the borders³¹, psychology in Jyväskylä also drew the attention of the Hungarians. Common interests were soon found and Takala made personal contacts with Hungarian colleagues in international congresses in early 1970s, and it was he who gave them access to the Department in Jyväskylä.³² These initiatives were to grow into quite intensive and manifold collaboration. One of the most conspicuous results was that the Hungarian and Finnish psychologists were able to have a psychology symposium on youth education with the timely topic 'Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects of Youth Education' (from the 31st of August to the 1st of September) included in the first Days of Hungarian Science held in Finland (27th of August – 3rd of September, 1981).³³ Jyväskylä was a provincial centre but it was honoured to be the venue of the symposium, the others being held in the more easily approachable capital. It was the first official scientific meeting-point of Hungarian and Finnish psychologists under the auspices of the Academy allowing relatively free and extensive exchange of ideas and research results. Special impetus was given to its proceedings by common understanding of psychology as a social science with distinctive value as signs of social disintegration were recorded in both countries. Finnish developmental and social psychologists were well aware of anti-social tendencies and of the defiance of 'traditional' values and norms among the younger, radical generation. These were the areas of study from which the Hungarians were very keen to learn when in Finland.

From the Finnish side the symposium was co-ordinated by Professor Isto Ruoppila³⁴ from Jyväskylä, and from the Hungarian side by Dr Ferenc Pataki, the Director of the Institute for Psychology at the MTA since 1977. Pataki's career was having an upward swing and at the end of the 1980s he belonged to the closest circle of György Aczél's advisors in science policy.³⁵ Thanks to Aczél's pragmatism, psychology was also to benefit from the reform of the Academy of the 1970s. Pataki clung to the Marxist-Leninist world-view, but he agreed with reform-minded colleagues that the socialist educational philosophy in Hungary painted an altogether too rosy, 'idyllic' picture of the socialist society without tensions and contradictions while the educational institutions themselves were 'conservative'. Schematism, unquestioned stereotypes and psychological atomism misled not only educational psychologists but also teachers in the field. It was high time that education were brought to the level with the needs of the times by up-to-date socio-psychological data.³⁶ It was psychology's function to become self-critical against prevailing hyperempiricism and 'thirst for facts' (*tényszomjúság*).³⁷ What was missing from Hungary, but well-advanced in Finland, was studies in educational psychology, which would help teachers to harmonize their work with the phases of development of children. For Pataki, Makarenko's and Vygotsky's dynamic theories of development had already helped in refuting the belief in 'natural development'.³⁸ He was also inspired by Western developmental psychology, which regarded pedagogy as a branch of social psychology. If applied in Hungary, it would have meant a decisive turn away from 'old' mental hygiene towards school and youth studies. In spite of his reformist leanings, Pataki held on to the basic Marxist tenet which emphasized man's nature as a social being (*társas lény*) – the 'primitive man' had already been disposed to live in company (*társulási készítés*), a presupposition providing the credo for collective psychology. However, Pataki launched studies of school life and youth group/community studies by Western methods.³⁹ He applied them in studies of performance and con-

flict, in studies of youth culture, ethos and values, and specialized in studying conflict situations between university students and authorities. These were delicate issues, because it had been realized both in Hungary and in Finland that certain groups of young people rejected the values and norms used in socialization in higher educational institutions.⁴⁰ In Finland the studies in problems of integration of society, in reception of norms, values and in acquisition and performance of roles, were up-to-date. The head of the AF, Erik Allardt, following in the footsteps of T. Parsons, witnessed the heroic climax of critical sociology when Kekkonen accepted communists in the government (1966)⁴¹ – the danger of upheaval from that quarter was thus eliminated.

It is remarkable that psychology found room among other Science Days' symposia representing the new generation of harder sciences, namely computer-aided cardiological research, laser physics, biology, pharmacology, neurochemistry and geophysics.⁴² However, it was not to be the least of newcomers: developmental psychology with its studies in childhood and adolescent development became one of the most exhaustively analyzed fields of social studies within the co-operation of the Academies. Since the 1981 symposium in Jyväskylä, developmental and educational psychologists met regularly and aimed at generalizing their topics, for instance, to cover the wider problematic of socialization and child-rearing practices (a symposium in Jyväskylä, 4 – 6 October 1995).⁴³ Although the highlight of the co-operation occurred in early 1980s, and has somewhat abated, the contacts have so far lasted at least until the year 2000 when the latest joint conference was held in Szeged, in Hungary.

As a member of AF's Committee for Social Sciences, Ruoppila advanced the cause of psychology, took care of international relations and organized congresses in Finland. He had wanted to find concrete and high-level themes of study from the very beginning, and he also saw to it that only internationally renowned psychologists arrived from Hungary. He was positively

surprised to find out that they were not 'censured' people followed by 'shadow-minders' whom the Russian colleagues had to endure while in Finland.⁴⁴ Of course, Ruoppila could not intervene in the way the MTA chose delegates from among its own members of institutes, not from the Universities which were kept at bay in international relations.

The opening speech of the Days of Science given by Kai-Otto Donner, the Director of the AF, reflected recent, 'progressive' changes in Finnish science policy. He honoured his predecessor and the 'grand old man', Kustaa Vilkuna (d. in 1980), and remembered the 'old AF' as the cradle of natural and national sciences. However, as he emphasized, bygones were bygones, new sciences, among them the upstart psychology which produced humane applications for the common good of society, ruled the day.⁴⁵ Undoubtedly, they were more 'progressive' than the 'old ones', since they accrued benefits for wider society, not only for the industrial and scientific élite.

The honorary guest lecturer of the Days, the President of the MTA, Lénárd Pál, responded to Donner's speech and agreed with him to a certain point. In his opinion the wider public had also been disappointed at the 'old sciences', a condition which had brought with it deprecation of the social value of science in general. Pál defended 'new sciences' more potently than Donner: although – even in socialism – they were not omnipotent, they were of 'inestimable value' in building the socialist society. However, there remained the 'pitiful' discrepancy between natural and social sciences: the knowledge of nature had become overwhelming in the last 50 years while the knowledge of society and its laws lagged strangely behind. The reliability of social knowledge was certainly more questionable than that of nature if seen from the perspective of the forces of production and the socialist economy. During the processes of forceful industrialization, especially in building heavy industry, society and environment had suffered from harmful side-effects. Alarmed, Pál demanded a reevaluation of the role of science in socialism. In serving the needs of modern technology and pro-

duction, science had 'unfortunately' pushed the needs of the people aside. Planning and production should recognize the 'human factor' – people's needs and expectations should have enticed production to create new products. Production should not have created 'unwanted' needs in population. It was sociology's task to find out what people really wanted. Reflecting on the growing concern for 'social production', Pál specifically pointed to the responsibility of psychology to heal modern mental ailments caused by uncontrolled technological progress. Advanced and quickened communication, in particular, strained the 'nervous system' (stimuli moved faster than they could be processed) of the urban population. The challenge was: scientists and researchers should find innovations that could satisfy the modern demand for smoother services and comfortable infrastructure. Some key spheres of life which needed urgent, socially acceptable safety solutions were the rapidly expanding traffic and technically complicated shop-floor conditions.⁴⁶ In this way, both in Hungary and Finland, psychology was coined the social science which should find and dispense alleviation to maladjustment. The consequences of industrialization and urbanization were considered similar enough in capitalism and socialism that lessons of psychology were complementarily applicable to both. Psychology was becoming openly, and in the eyes of science authorities and planning officers, legitimately interventionist. If sociology was to deal with the general problems of adaptation of youth into society, the education of skilled workers and students, guiding them in their choices of career and in family planning was to remain the domain of social psychology.

In the papers presented at the Jyväskylä symposium, case studies of aggression, ways of life, and the formation and inculcation of values gained prominence. By way of introduction, Professor Ruoppila updated the situation in modern societies with which the psychologists had to come to terms. Changes in the structures of societies had caused 'problems' to be grappled with: urbanization, service-orientation in economy, internal waves of emigration and

unemployment (7–8% in Finland/assumed 'non-existent' in Hungary). This state of affairs had brought with it a radical change in the role of psychologists from control and treatment of children and teen-agers with psychic problems and learning difficulties to the care of their 'sound psychic development'.⁴⁷ Recent research in Jyväskylä and Helsinki concentrated on determinants of youth's social behaviour, skills and systems of value. The latest orientation was to study problems in adolescent socialization caused by unemployment, as yet an unexplored subject for the Hungarians present. They were more interested in the work done at Tampere University by T. Nummenmaa (1979) on the development of sequential structures of children's thought. Children had been shown a series of events on a film which they had to describe. Afterwards a stage model had been laid out and tested.⁴⁸ Quite remarkably, this procedure found mutual applications when designing TV-programmes for traffic education of school-children.

At this point it should be noticed that the underlying antagonism between Marxist collectivism and Western individualism in psychology had not been brought forward, let alone resolved at the Jyväskylä symposium. There was no point in causing friction in budding collaboration by ideological skirmishes. The socialist ideas of man's educability put forward by Marxist educational philosophy had not made so profound an impact in Hungarian psychology that it could have caused friction in Jyväskylä. In fact, it had been agreed by the participants to stay silent on philosophical questions and avoid a situation of competition between capitalist and socialist science. Even comparisons of experimental methods were put aside because of insurmountable cultural differences in criteria. The success of the Jyväskylä symposium was ensured by limiting the topics into social application of psychology. The Finns were quite well aware that in Hungary science was 'collectivistic', hierarchical, and controlled by the Party, but it was also clear that Hungarians were as independent as the 'Georgians', and compared favourably with hard-line colleagues coming from the GDR. A symposium was not a venue to talk about politics⁴⁹: it could be left to a more informal place such as the sauna.⁵⁰ To stress: the reason to

call the symposium together at all was its scientific interest. The Finnish psychologists had learned through their reading that their Hungarian colleagues published in English and in German studies on the same subjects as they themselves did, namely on youth development from the educational point of view which was also one of the special fields in Jyväskylä.

It was only Dr Pataki whom the Finns suspected of being a hard-line Marxist psychologist or ideologue overseeing the other Hungarian visitors. This suspicion proved false, since Pataki was at the time of the symposium conducting studies the results of which inescapably led to the criticism of the existing educational and social system: he studied the maladjusted, their deviant behaviour, and people living in disadvantageous situations in socialism. He demanded studies in alcoholism, for instance, among university teachers. He had already also spotted many signs of social disintegration in Hungary where there was found an alarming number of families in which the father was an alcoholic who needed frequent detoxification, in which the mother was in a mental hospital, and in which the children were kept in custody.⁵¹ Nevertheless, Pataki made only minor concessions to anti-authoritarianism in youth education. His paper on the results of the MTA's and the AF's joint project on 'Juvenile Health Habits', awarded by the IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Education), dealt with the consequences of the relaxation of discipline of adolescents at school. It had been in the common interest of school authorities in Hungary and Finland to support 'healthy' socialization, for example, eradication of smoking and drinking habits and reorienting the young to sports. It was also a common concern at the symposium that symbols of discipline and strict forms of communication between the pupils and the teacher at school were undermined. Pataki had to confess that 'soft' values appealed to youth and that they were more interested in matters of mode and taste than learning proper behaviour in class. He rejected functionalism and neo-behaviouralism by

pointing to social conflicts, irrationality and complexity of normative behaviour. He had uncovered that a youngster could be a member of many groups and share many norms and values, which indicated that also in Hungary the authorities should anticipate differences in socialization in order to preserve social dynamics. He declared that an individual's autonomy should not be sacrificed and lamented the prevailing, 'severe, autocratic and indifferent teaching atmosphere' in which young people had to learn under a heavy homework-load, pressure of competition and mental tension.⁵² Pataki's lessons were applauded by his Finnish colleagues.

Pataki did not, however, favour the 'liberal' education, practised in Finland, either. The maladjustment of youth in capitalism could be put down to it. Surveys implied that 'liberal' teaching methods had been deemed 'weak' by both pupils and teachers in Hungary and in Finland. One thought-provoking result he picked out was that the teachers who had slackened discipline had failed to achieve the objectives of education. Leaning on this, Pataki ventured to giving a political lesson. In his view, before the socialist educational system could become 'perfect', centralism was paramount but not in the prevalent form of mechanical uniformity and over-regulation. He harked back to Makarenko's image of the model teacher who should have been 'independent, responsible and willing to take initiative', an image resembling his 'magnetic comrades' who ignited the spirit for collective building of socialism in the masses.⁵³ Thus Pataki had not given up the basic teachings of socialist psychology, which opposed the 'bourgeois' idea that man could not be transformed from a selfish, competitive, individualist 'animal' to an altruistic social being seeking the collective good (cf. Makarenko's young communists in Dzerhinsky Labour Commune). In Hungary the ideal was the 'actively serving and sacrificing' New Man, a hero pursuing chivalrous morality.⁵⁴ The ideal of socialist communal life cropped up in Pataki's presentation; teaching should have taken place in a 'perfect school-community' where teachers and pupils formed

a co-operative partnership in equality. Pupils and students should not have been treated as subjects because such 'autocracy' created dangerous anti-values in them (indifference, hostility, passivity). However, Pataki emphasized that schools should have been prepared to fight against 'stupid fashions' and 'negative' behaviour patterns (e.g. adult-aping drinking). Approaching the core of the matter, Pataki put his finger on a very tense topic in Hungarian education: the failures of the teachers to impede antisocial phenomena. Concurring with more open modes of critical discussion spreading at the time in Hungary, he dared to state that 'socialist democracy' would increase only if critical situations in schools were not made public. The system should not protect an ill-advised teacher from critical examination.⁵⁵

In spite of his 'openness', Pataki in principle held to the basic moral propensities idealized in socialist rhetoric⁵⁶, and hoped that they could still be cherished under a less authoritarian order. He admitted that the speeded-up economic development in Hungary under Kádárism had brought problems for the population in adaptation with it. Values espoused by Socialism had not consolidated after eradication of the traditional (religious) ones, a mentally distressing condition confirmed by later historians.⁵⁷ On the basis of comparison, the main difference between Finland and Hungary was that the Hungarian economy had not met the 'consumerist' demands of the people. For instance, production could not heal the 'car-fever' of the younger generation. Expectations of universal attainability of goods had been aroused but not satisfied, whereas in Finland the situation was far better. Everything was to be had. Hungary suffered also from something that seemed to be missing from Finland in the early 1980s: tolerated parasitism of the old élite and its privileged clientele. These modern dilemmas of 'individualization' – incomplete within the higher echelons but expanding in wider society – had caused 'severe incertitudes' for human sciences, psychology in particular. For Pataki, however, it was the students that caused

the problem, not the hierarchical, bureaucratic nature of the educational system. He blamed them for sticking to one-sided life-styles (e.g. reading addiction). The worst of their kin were the 'failed ones' who 'formed control-evading territorial groups of anti-social subcultures'. Pataki's judgement was straightforward: it was self-interest, the antinomy of socialist morality that had overwhelmed them. Alarmingly, young people with decent educational opportunities tried to dodge all physical labour – greatly idealized in socialist heroism – and nourished the illusion of finding an easy but well-paid job.⁵⁸

Problems of maladjustment and conscious evasion of socially 'respectable' habits made it difficult for the authorities to plan social development and adjust it with 'reality'. Pataki's concern was that reality was apparently slipping away from psychologists' purview. According to another research report presented at the symposium, student life-styles were not as erratic and disquieting in Finland as in Hungary. Finnish students' mental development was by large more positive and they were usually successful in their studies if they were allowed to study according to a 'free' program. If not, the research results showed opposite tendencies. What seemed worrying from a psychologist's point of view was that students considered university study in Finland very 'stressful'.⁵⁹ At the time of the symposium both school and university education systems in Finland were fundamentally reformed, and the students' reaction was mostly critical. Nevertheless, the dialogue with Finnish colleagues confirmed for the Hungarian psychologists that young people fared better in capitalism than in socialism which could not but be disquieting news for them. Had they not in the 1970s already realized what 'prejudices' the youth – like during the uprising of 1956 – had against Socialism in general.⁶⁰

Before the 1970s aggression was studied in Hungary in pathology and criminology. Studies of aggression from the angle of developmental psychology were launched in the MTA in the late 1970s, when patterns of anti-social behaviour were spotted and classified. This had ushered in a change of paradigm, so much

so that children's and adolescent's aggression was studied with psychoanalytical methods developed by Erik Erikson, the German psychoanalyst of identity crises, and other well-known Western authors.⁶¹ The findings of Hungarians could now be compared with empirical results of studies in violent behavior in Finland. It especially seemed to be corroborated that violence shown on TV to children incited violence in play. More tentative was the conclusion that boys 'liked' violence in cartoons but were frightened by realistic violence.⁶²

The impact of psychoanalysis on Hungarian psychology could also be heard from another paper dealing with psychodiagnostics of marginalized young people, this time married young couples facing difficult living conditions. The Hungarian speaker complained that science could not really 'catch' a deviant phenomenon: it appeared powerless against 'unfavorable effects' (illiteracy, deviancy of parents, parents' failures and mistakes in education at home, living in some isolated ethnic group). Stimulus/response -tests and multi-factor analyses did not explain the development of deviancy in such complicated situations. Socialist psychology which presupposed patience with adaptation into realities of Socialism did not seem capable of providing sufficient incentives to it. 'Individualization' begot individuals who either remained or chose to remain outsiders, a phenomenon not recognized by the science politicians. Blatant discrepancy prevailed between what families regarded as socially relevant according to their values and what really was significant to society as a whole. For a psychologist it was a moot point to realize that families did not prepare their children for school properly although they 'must' have done it. One explanation was, however, at hand; although promised in planning and propaganda, the Hungarian system had not been able to create and maintain equal educational opportunities for everybody.⁶³

Deviating from Pataki's interpretation, the younger school of Hungarian psychologists courageously criticized the prevailing system itself rather than, for instance, teachers, parents and

students. They pointed to paternalism and conservatism which allowed too little room for 'free play' of talent. They recommended that in order to root out inequality of opportunity – seen also in regional differences – the general cultural level of the unprivileged people, formerly non-existent in statistics, should have been elevated. Only thus could parents be induced to improve home education and better prepare their children for school. Another discomfiting message issued forth: a civilizing mission of such a magnitude was possibly too much for Hungarian socialism to accomplish in times of serious economic distress and ideological inflexibility.

Another example of unequal opportunities in Hungarian society was the disadvantageous position of the gypsies, a phenomenon which was acute at the time also in Finland. They seemed to have no motivation for adaptation, and their illiteracy was a lot higher than that of the average population, 25% in Finland and 39% in Hungary. Referring to recent developmental studies in the field the symposium cautiously concluded: gypsies could be integrated into 'normal' society only very slowly (!). How this could be done was to be discovered in a joint follow-up research.⁶⁴ The results of the research remain unknown but the problem itself has become marginal in Finnish psychology. In Hungary it is a constantly recurring public issue.

The most delicate theme of the Jyväskylä symposium was the one of juxtaposed value systems prevalent in Hungary and in Finland. Their comparative evaluation concerned the issue which system, socialist or capitalist, had better succeeded in socialization. Leaving the question of the use of symbolic violence aside, it was, according to one Finnish expert, 'obvious' that young people in Finland were generally more satisfied with the prevailing political system than youngsters in Hungary. This result of a questionnaire study was interpreted to prove that young Finns satisfactorily adopted the values of their parents. Finns congratulated themselves: 'We are progressing in the right direction'. The Hungarians could not believe their ears

when they heard that Finnish children, predisposed to individualism, were more ready to socialize than the Hungarian kids who were supposed to grow community-oriented. Some researchers referred to studies of Hungarian and Finnish ABC-books as evidence. In Hungarian books the character-building of a child proceeded with examples of punishment and of virtues of diligence, unselfishness, punctuality and honesty in action. In Finnish ABC-books such moralizing was not conspicuous, and pictures of punishment were missing. Instead, they were more neutral in showing scenes of physical and hygienic practices, gave lessons in traffic safety and ordinary manual skills. One Finnish psychologist considered the poems, songs and fairytales in Hungarian books to be good nourishment for emotional development which the Finnish children very rarely enjoyed. Surprisingly enough, it was the Finnish books that seemed to provide for 'internationalism' so eagerly promoted by socialist proselytizing. They taught the 'everyday knowledge of man' so that children could learn to understand others (dissimilarity, alterity) and become peace-loving and tolerant persons.⁶⁵ Thus the psychologists working in Jyväskylä laid emphasis on the so called 'moral education' – not disciplining – which supported the ethical development of the youth.⁶⁶ Here lay the obstacle to further co-operation in studying of values: because the value-systems were so different in Hungary and Finland, it was quite impossible to find any common criteria for the 'measurement' or evaluation of the values, which could be applicable in both countries. The problem was essentially a philosophical one, falling outside psychologists' competence. It could not be discussed on a platform, the speakers of which did not pretend to be able to dictate common normative aspects of science. More pertaining to the topic would have been to reassess the evidently contradictory achievements of the symposium.

As preconceivable, the AF's report on the Days of Science contained the recommendation that the controversial study of value-systems should be dropped from the future agenda of co-operation. It was suggested that most of the traditional

disciplines, such as linguistics, ethnography, folklore and musicology should be returned to the lists of the Academies, and that a comparative study should be written on science policies in Hungary and Finland under the supervision of the Hungarian Academician, Péter Vas-Zoltán. Obviously, there was a deeper learning-process going on in Hungarian-Finnish scientific relations, for it was planned that not only the science systems should be compared but also 'the cases of frustration and occasional lack of results'.⁶⁷ For psychology it was deemed advisable to concentrate on the most up-to-date studies. First, experimental psychology, i.e. physiological psychology, with its methods of modern computerized data processing, was to be rated highly on the agenda. Secondly, and in line with developmental psychology, studies in early childhood and personality development, acquisition of language skills and the way of life of youth deserved to be continued.⁶⁸ In this way, despite intermittent ambiguity and stumbling-blocks, an agreement between the Hungarian and Finnish participants was reached, which paved the way towards revision and expansion of co-operation in psychological studies.

It must be pointed out that the Hungarian side was to gain more from the co-operation than the Finnish one. As it dawned on the Hungarians that the equipment and resources at Finns' disposal were far better than their own at home, they became eager to intensify research exchange by increasing the quota of visitors.⁶⁹ While in Finland, Hungarian psychologists had an easy access to well-equipped laboratories and to most important international journals of their science, dearly needed in Hungary. It also could be sensed that Hungarian visiting researchers envied the great choice of research themes available for the Finns in Jyväskylä, especially in experimental psychology. It was not merely out of politeness that the Hungarians wrote highly of Finnish psychology. Not that the co-operation was quite imbalanced or unequal. Valuable for the Finns was that they learned from their Hungarian experiences how high-quality research could be done with meagre resources. They

had to admit that the papers Hungarians had read in the Jyväskylä symposium had been very good. The Hungarian visiting professors distinguished themselves as valuable supervisors for Finnish post-graduates who prepared their theses. About the exchange of publications there is not much record, usually Jyväskylä-based psychologists sent quite a few of the 200 copies of their serial to Hungary but it was not known how their colleagues utilized them. The material arriving from Hungary was dealt out at the Department to the researchers interested in it.⁷⁰

The satisfaction Hungarian psychologists continuously expressed of their research conditions and experiences in Finland issued forth from one follow-up visit report written a year after the Jyväskylä symposium. Having visited all psychology departments of Finnish Universities, Dr Sándor Veres from the MTA praised them for the 'maximal help' and 'deep cordiality' with which he had been able to complete his research with 'total and faultless solutions'. Without hesitation Veres could recommend Finnish institutions as exemplary research bases to his superiors. The realization of the fact that both Hungary and Finland had after World War II gone through a period of accelerated industrialization had encouraged him to wider comparisons, for instance, of social mobility using socio-psychological methods well-developed in Finland but neglected in Hungary.⁷¹ He proudly listed the institutions from which he had collected contacts, information and impressions. In the Department of Social Psychology of the University of Helsinki he had met colleagues who worked closest to his own field, minority studies (mobility, identity, migration). Besides, he became acquainted with family studies and discussed this with some leading representatives of Finnish sociology and psychology, E. Haavio-Mannila, V. Stolte-Heiskanen, E. Allardt, M. Alestalo, R. Alapuro, J. Simpura and J.-P. Roos among others. Most enlightening to him were studies in Finnish alcoholism and the declining birth-rate, serious concerns in both countries. In Turku he gathered information on aggression studies (K. Lagerspetz) and

in Tampere he became involved in 'an extraordinarily interesting exchange of ideas' concerning incarceration and rehabilitation (lunatic asylums, workers' homes, AA-centres). In his expert opinion, modern Finnish rehabilitation measures were something very suitable for reforms in Hungary.⁷²

In Jyväskylä Veres took part in the conference of the Association of Finnish Psychologists and visited the venue of the 1981 symposium to renew contacts there. He was welcomed by Professors Takala, Pulkkinen and Ruoppila and some junior members of the staff. On the basis of negotiations a joint research theme was hit upon: family life-modes and life-styles after 1945. This could be combined with studies in social mobility and socialization more popular in Hungary but familiar also to the Finns. Summarizing the utility of Finnish psychological institutions for Hungarian visitors, Veres stated that they 'are very flexible, centralized and ready to adapt', the very qualities the MTA had been looking for. Without eulogy he enumerated the 'progressivism' of Finnish psychologists: they kept pace with international developments, co-operated with Scandinavian colleagues in particular, reacted smoothly to changes in their own society and had founded new institutions to study the impact of those changes. All this was recommendable for the Hungarians, and it was, in Veres's opinion, a shame that Hungarians had established relations with Finnish psychologists much later than, for instance, colleagues from the GDR and the Soviets Union. It was high time to make official contact with the Finnish Psychological Society.⁷³ Veres's report was very well received by his superiors, and their remarks in its margins suggest that they took heed of his 'advice' and urged to enter selectively into private discussions with the leading partners in Finland. In Veres's report one could not detect the usual self-censure and reassuring rhetoric towards superiors, and it may well be that its frankness made an impression in the decision-makers of the MTA, although it was not particularly pleasing to them. Instead, it pointed to the weaknesses of their science policy and prompted to self-

criticism. Egged on by the Jyväskylä symposium, psychology proved to be a viable science among the 'harder' sciences in Hungarian-Finnish scientific relations. As a respectable social science on the rise since the late 1960s, it was very much in demand because modern societies developed so fast that some groups of people were dropping out, suffering unforeseen psychic discontents and maladies. Together with law studies and economics it was one of the sciences the function of which was to provide useful comparative and differential results to base decision-making for social planning. In the context of Hungarian-Finnish relations Hungarian psychologists were continuously interested in the economic and social problems connected to relatively fast economic growth in Finland.⁷⁴ Studies in social structure, social relations and social policy carried out also in Jyväskylä were duly reported back to the MTA.⁷⁵

It has already been suggested that the orientation of joint psychological studies was steered away from studies in value-systems towards subjects regarded as more neutral. The 'old' approach became less esteemed also because in Finland teachers were allowed to teach different values to their pupils. The tendency to 'pure empiricism' was reinforced in the 1980s. During the Days of Finnish Science held in Budapest in 15–22 April 1985 the delegation of Jyväskylä University's Department of Psychology, led by Professor Heikki Lyytinen, took part in a symposium of psychophysiology. Lyytinen's own paper on 'Psychophysiological preparation for sensory, cognitive and motor events' was quite in line with the innovative methodology of experimental neuropsychology. Later psychologists from Jyväskylä and the MTA developed a common registration system for neuro-psychological testing which is actually still in use. It was the measurement of nerve activity with sensory electrophysiology as a branch of cognitive psychology which succeeded best in this respect and was to feature prominently from the late 1980s on. Hungarians particularly were enthusiastic of these new methods which suited their interests in experimentation. This was one of the permanent achievements of

Hungarian-Finnish collaboration. To point to disappointments, the harmonization of methodology failed because the science cultures were basically too different. To cite only one typical case, harmonization was tried in studying violence shown on TV but the coding of filmed sequences turned out to be impossible because the TV programmes in Finland were largely international. This did not match with Hungarian TV which was national.⁷⁶

Bilateral relations of psychologists were kept alive by regular meetings, seminars and conferences organized by turns in Hungary and in Finland. Developmental psychology struggled to maintain its central role and managed yet another conference in Helsinki in 1989 on child-psychology and studies in parent-infant interaction in modern families. New trends also made their way to Jyväskylä where developmental psychology was traditionally at its strongest. To illustrate, one Hungarian visitor presented there in 1989 a poster on 'Rhythm in preverbal communication' which aroused great attention and was filed for later publication. Again Jyväskylä showed its know-how value as a useful partner in 'cross-cultural analysis'⁷⁷ which included also comparative studies in the development of intellectual skills.⁷⁸ Jyväskylä was picked up as the venue where one could meet the best experts of the field.

3 Conclusion

In all, the contacts and co-operation of Hungarian and Finnish psychologists were from the very beginning quite unforced, and at least according to representatives of Jyväskylä University, it was easy to work with Hungarians. Surely, the contacts were few in comparison to the relations with the West, especially the Nordic countries, but they were quite continuous, flexible and easy-going.

In general, Jyväskylä's relations with Hungarian science were many-sided and diverse; for instance, its doctoral school in musicology (Kodály-studies), the project of multidisciplinary Hungarian Studies, contrastive studies in linguistic, and the

traditional finno-ugric studies fare well even today. Among others, this has come about in the bilateral relations with Debrecen University. Sometimes psychological studies approached general sociology, in which the research co-operation branched out in many directions ranging from family-studies to studies in alcoholism and deviancy. Not surprisingly, this thematic had strong implications for social policy, one representative example being the restructuring of social services for the elderly pensioners pioneered by Professor Marjatta Marin from Jyväskylä. That the Finns preferred to take care of them at home till the end (one 94 year-old woman lived alone in a distant homestead in Sumiainen near Jyväskylä) and did not send them to institutional care was very much a service worth implementing in far-away small farms in Hungary.⁷⁹

In the 1970–1980s, the message of both Hungarian and Finnish psychologists was that the societies of their countries were going through a critical period, the Hungarians facing impending socio-economic crisis, Finns suffering from incessant fluctuations of the capitalist world economy. By way of conclusion, it may be suggested that the research co-operation was, on one hand, motivated by analyses of social statistics showing ‘negative trends’, and on the other, by the need to find ‘progressive’ measures to provide prophylactics or heal the ‘diseases’ of society such as increasing juvenile delinquency, deviancy, alcoholism, rising suicide-rates, rapid increase of deaths in traffic, and discontents of rapid urbanization in general common in both countries.⁸⁰ While in Finland the reform policy was rather utilitarian, Hungarian Socialism hated criminals and aimed at uniformity, common rules and behaviour patterns to enforce loyalty and discipline.⁸¹ Against the expectations of Hungarian socialist leaders, the expected eradication of crime under Socialism did not come true. For their part, the Finnish psychologists were not as pessimistic of the future of society as the Hungarians, but their studies also revealed symptoms of misadaptation, especially among the young living in the peripheries.

Relations in psychology brought in tangible but at times contradictory achievements and opened unexpected vistas of co-operation and dialogue. They also show some of the tensions between the two systems, conspicuously in the use of 'propaganda' and 'know-how'. But as usual in Hungarian-Finnish relations, the co-operation also of cultural and scientific elites was not seriously disturbed by the contradictions between the values of the capitalist and the socialist system. This is typically 'liberal' attitude which largely ignored or found its way around Marxist criticism thus avoiding open confrontation.⁸² The Marxists, for their part, did not want to force the issue and make the kind of politics of science that would upset or estrange their partners. Thus co-operation went surprisingly smoothly. Psychology and its applications to control human behaviour in society's sore points were equally useful in both countries.

As for the repercussions of the co-operation in psychology for science policies and political culture it may be suggested that research results awakened the decision-makers to the understanding that society needed the services of psychology in order to define social grievances and plan their alleviation. In common venues this became quite evident. For instance, when the MTKK (the Hungarian Centre for Culture and Science, Helsinki) opened a Centre for Hungarian Studies in 1988, contrastive linguistics, history, literature, ethnology, sociology, fine arts and architecture, musicology, education, film and theatre studies, geography, and also psychology were called in to make up the programme.⁸³ It led to founding of a permanent psychology work-group in 1988–1989 which organized seminars and conferences, the thematics of which were problems of maladjustment in Hungary and Finland.⁸⁴ At about the same time the Universities of Jyväskylä and Lapland (Rovaniemi) started to organize continuing education for psychoanalysts and psychotherapists in psychodynamic individual psychotherapy, the latest seminar of which, eleventh in a series, was held in Budapest in 9–16 May 2004. Guided by their Hungarian colleagues, Finnish psychologists had returned to the roots of psychoanalysis – the theme of the

seminar was Sándor Ferenczi and his heritage.⁸⁵

In Finland the Nordic type of welfare society has been maintained, although the Popular Front government had to step down in 1987. In Hungary the belief in the reformist role of social sciences collapsed in the end of the 1970s as it became evident that society cannot be made socialist by social reforms. The optimistic and activist ethos connected to Socialism was fading away. Although Hungary could list the CSCE process as a diplomatic achievement, relations with capitalism developed ominously. As György Földes has concluded: in the end of the 1970s the Kádár regime was already facing grave problems in keeping the Hungarian public satisfied with the way Hungary was cooperating with the capitalist countries.⁸⁶ The planned economy turned out to be too expensive but for the sake of social integration it had to be carried on. Later on, as the internal opposition gathered strength, the discontent with the political leadership developed into a more general criticism of the high politics of statesmen and diplomats, of the so called 'détente culture of Helsinki kitsch'⁸⁷, advocated by Finland and supported by Hungary. In these circumstances the status of Hungarian, socialist science was undermined whereas in Finland science was able to maintain its financing on a relatively satisfactory level. In these circumstances the demand for psychology has not diminished. New grave problems like children's depression preoccupy the experts. It is not only the science authorities who are alarmed, also the Finnish politics of interest groups (the relations and agreements between employees, the Trade Unions and the state) encourages studies into dislocation, social inequality, and entertain wider reforms of social policy.

NOTES

- ¹ Földes, György, 'Kádár János külpolitikai nézetei (1956–1967)'. In Pritz Pál (szerk.), *Magyarország helye a 20. századi Európában*. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat 2002, 139.
- ² Cf. Előterjesztés a kulturális és tudományos propagandáról (KKI). MOL, M-KS-288-22.cs-1971-34, ö.e..
- ³ Anssi Halmesvirta, *Co-operation across the Iron Curtain*. Hungarian-Finnish Scientific Relations of the Academies from the 1960s to the 1990s. Studies in General History, vol. 12. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Printing House 2005, 61-64.
- ⁴ Jörn Donner, *Raportti Tonavalta*. Transl. Seppo Virtanen. Porvoo: WSOY, 186.
- ⁵ Vygotsky was a Soviet psychologist who applied Marxist social theory to individual cognitive development conceived in historical-cultural context. In Finnish there was his *Ajattelu ja kieli* (1982), already published in English in 1965.
- ⁶ Makarenko was a major figure in developing the Soviet education in the 1920s and 1930s. He rejected both 'liberal' education and biological determinism (e.g. hereditary genius) and based his system of pedagogical logic on dialectical materialism. He specialized in working with homeless children and adolescents in labour communes combining physical labour and classroom instruction.
- ⁷ Pataki Ferenc, 'A magyar pszichológia történeti útjának néhány időszakos tanulsága'. *Magyar Pszichológiai Szemle*, vol. 34, no. 6 (1977), 572-575.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, 582.
- ⁹ Erős Ferenc, 'Mérei Ferenc életműve és a magyar szociálpszichológia', in Kiss György (szerk.), *Pszichológia Magyarországon*. Budapest: Országos Pedagógiai Könyvtár és Múzeum 1995, 128.
- ¹⁰ Valuch Tibor, 'A "Gulyáskommunizmus"', in Romsics Ignác (szerk.), *Mitoszok, legendák és tévhitek a 20. századi Magyarországon*. Budapest: Osiris 2002, 389.
- ¹¹ Leontjev was highly regarded by the leftist psychologists in Finland and his works were translated into Finnish. See e.g. A.A. Leontjev, *Kieli ja ajattelu*. Helsinki: Kansankulttuuri Oy 1979.
- ¹² *Yleinen psykologia*. Ed. A.V. Petrovski. Helsinki: Kansankulttuuri 1974, backsleeve. Vygotski and Makarenko feature in it as leading authorities.
- ¹³ 'Uuden vuoden näkymiä' (=editor's foreword), *Psykologia* 1 (1980), 1.
- ¹⁴ Markku Ojanen, 'Marxilainen psykologia: kriittinen arvio'. *Psykologia* 1 (1980), 13-21.
- ¹⁵ Esa Sariola, 'L.S. Vygotskin anti skitsofrenian ajatushäiriöiden tutki-

- mukselle', *Psykologia* 3(1982).
- ¹⁶ Csaba Pléh, 'Hungarian Contributions to Modern Psychology'. <http://www.jate.hu.szeged.hu/pleh/english/articles>, 4.
- ¹⁷ Jukka Relander, 'Jäähvyäiset Snellmanille'. *Suomen kulttuurihistoria* 4. Eds. Kirsi Saarikangas, Pasi Mäen pää & Minna Saarentola-Weiss. Helsinki: Tammi 2004, 138-167.
- ¹⁸ George Konrád, 'Foreword', in Miklós Haraszti, *The Velvet Prison*. New York: Basic Books 1987, xii.
- ¹⁹ György Konrád, *Antipolitics*. Transl. by Richard E. Allen. London, Melbourne, N.Y.: Quartet Books 1984, 111, 166-67.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 146.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 140-41.
- ²² Kustaa H. Vilkuna & Marjo Havila, 'Edistyksellinen kulttuuripolitiikka, opiskelijat ja vallankumouksellinen liike Jyväskylässä 1960-luvun lopulta 1970-luvun lopulle', in Heli Valtonen & Johanna Hämäläinen (eds), *Suomalaisen Suomen pääkaupunki*. Jyväskylä: Minerva 2003, 149; Prof. Isto Ruoppila's interview on the 11th of March, 2002.
- ²³ *Suomen psykologisen tutkimuksen kehitys, nykytila ja kehitysnäkymät 1980-luvulla*. Helsinki 1985, 51-54.
- ²⁴ Pléh, 'Hungarian Contributions to Modern Psychology', 4.
- ²⁵ X/1267-82; XII/1708-85; X/496-88. Útjelentések. MTAA.
- ²⁶ Szopori Nagy Lajos, 'A finnek megítélésének hullámzása Magyarországon', in *Hatalom és kultúra*. Jyväskylä: Hungarian Studies 2002, 196.
- ²⁷ Cf. Török Ádám, 'A finn gazdaság strukturális illeszkedéséről', *Külgazdaság* 10 (1981).
- ²⁸ Az MTA-Finn Akadémia közötti megállapodás keretében folyó együttműködési témák jegyzéke. NKO 729 (1979). MTAA.
- ²⁹ Reports from the Department of Psychology, no. 228. University of Jyväskylä 1979: *Ibid.*, no. 245 (1982).
- ³⁰ *Suomen psykologisen tutkimuksen kehitys, nykytila ja kehitysnäkymät 1980-luvulla*, 18.
- ³¹ Pléh Csaba, 'A magyar pszichológia kétféle hagyománya: a természeti és a közösségi ember'. (lecture given at the MTA, 1999; Pléh's homepage, see n. 11).
- ³² Ruoppila's interview (Febr. 20th of, 2002).
- ³³ Memorandum, 14th of Sept., 1980. Hbb, FAA.
- ³⁴ Isto Ruoppila (b. 1935) specialized in educational and social psychology. In 1971 he became the Professor of Developmental Psychology in Jyväskylä University. Recently retired.

- ³⁵ See Révész Sándor, *Aczél és korunk*. Budapest: Sík Kiadó 1997, 356-57.
- ³⁶ Pataki Ferenc, 'Történelmi-, társadalmi és politikai nevelés'. *Magyar Tudomány* 3 (1975), 153, 156.
- ³⁷ Kiss György, 'A hazai pszichológia történeti kutatások eredményei', in *Pszichológia Magyarországon* 12-14.
- ³⁸ Pataki Ferenc, *Nevelés és társadalom*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó 1982, 73-77.
- ³⁹ Pataki listed e.g. Johnson, Aronson, Getzels, Erikson and Hare.
- ⁴⁰ Pataki, *Nevelés és társadalom*, 82, 92-95, 216. Pataki had – to embarrassment to political leaders, found out that stress and mental diseases were widely spread in Hungary. See Ignác Romsics, *Múltról a mának*. Budapest: Osiris 2004, 400.
- ⁴¹ Risto Kangas, 'Introduction', in *Yhteiskunta*. Tutkijaliitto, vol. 331. Helsinki 2003.
- ⁴² István Lang – Antti Kulmala, 'Suomalais-unkarilainen yhteistyö luonnontieteiden alalla', in *Ystävät – sukulaiset. Suomen ja Unkarin kulttuurisuhteet 1840–1984*. Pieksämäki: SKS 1984, 118-120.
- ⁴³ Mirja Kalliopuska's report 5.11. 1995. *Matkakertomukset* 1995. FAA.
- ⁴⁴ Ruoppila's interview.
- ⁴⁵ K.O. Donner, 'Opening Address', in *Days of Hungarian Science. August 27 – September 3, 1981*, Finland. Suomen Akatemian julkaisuja 5/1982, 11-12.
- ⁴⁶ Lénárd Pál, 'What is Science Worth?', in *Days of Hungarian Science. Aug. 27 – Sept. 3*, esp. 14, 23. Cf. János Ferenc, 'Gazdaságunk mai ellentmondásaink eredete és felszámolásuk útja'. *Közgazdasági szemle* 7-8 (1969), 816-817.
- ⁴⁷ Isto Ruoppila, 'Recent Research on Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects of Youth Education in Finland'. In *Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects of Youth Education*. Reports from the Dept. of Psychology, no. 254. University of Jyväskylä 1983, 5.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.
- ⁴⁹ The ideological arm-wrestling was left to politicians like Aczél himself who visited Finland in May 1981 to prepare the ground for the Science Days. He was engaged in a TV-dialogue with a leading right-wing political scientist, Professor Jan-Magnus Jansson, over the pros and cons of socialism and capitalism. Aczél's message, triumphantly quoted in a Finnish left-wing paper, was that socialism was definitely winning. For one thing, there was no unemployment, rather lack of work-force. An unemployed Finnish reader might have been upset by Aczél's comment on the dole: 'It breaks one's moral backbone'. See *Kansan Uutiset*, 15 May 1981.
- ⁵⁰ Ruoppila's interview.
- ⁵¹ 'Tudományos életünkéből', *Társadalmi Szemle* 6 (1981), p. 107-108.

- ⁵² Pataki, *Nevelés és társadalom*, 224-226.
- ⁵³ Pataki Ferenc, 'Kollektívizmus és szocialista életmód', *Valóság*, vol. 19, no. 6 (1976), 13, 17.
- ⁵⁴ Pléh Csaba, *Pszichológiatörténet*. Budapest: Gondolat 1992, 276-77, 294-95.
- ⁵⁵ Ferenc Pataki, 'Some aspects of the relationship between teacher and pupil', in *Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects of ...*, 18-28.
- ⁵⁶ Szabó Márton, *Diszkurzió térben*. Budapest: Scientia Humana 1998, 51-58.
- ⁵⁷ Valuch, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX század második felében*, 257-270.
- ⁵⁸ Ferenc Pataki, 'The Way of Life of Young People', in *Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects...*, 132-146.
- ⁵⁹ Saari, Salli, 'The Nature of the Study System and the Development of Students' Personality during the First Three Years', in *Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects...*, 167-68.
- ⁶⁰ *An Overview of Social Research in Hungary*. Ed. Tamás Szecskő. Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó 1978, 15-16, 23.
- ⁶¹ Jenő Ranschburg, 'Aggression research of the developmental psychology of the Institute of Psychology of the MTA', in *Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects...*, 31-33.
- ⁶² Kaj Björkqvist, 'Children and violence on TV', in *Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects...*, 53, 59.
- ⁶³ Sándor Illyés, 'Young people living in difficult circumstances in Hungary', in *Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects...*, esp. 62, figures from p. 71.
- ⁶⁴ Illyés, 'Young people living in difficult circumstances in Hungary'; Huttunen, K., 'A cigányok oktatása Finnországban', in Szövény, Zs. (szerk.), *A cigány gyermekek nevelése-oktatása*. Budapest 1979.
- ⁶⁵ Annika Takala, 'Values and World View', in *Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects...*, 95-96.
- ⁶⁶ Ruoppila's interview.
- ⁶⁷ Report on the Days of Hungarian Science 27th August – 3rd September, 1981; Memorandum on negotiations between the MTA and FA, 5th of Febr. 1982. Hbb, FAA.
- ⁶⁸ 'Introduction', in *Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects...*, 3.
- ⁶⁹ The exchange of psychologists in 1981–1983 was not extensive: altogether nine Hungarians stayed in Finland for a longer time, two of them being neuro-psychologists, three developmental or educational psychologists, and four social psychologists. From Finland *none* went to Hungary yet but, for instance, to the United States 27, to the Soviet Union 28, to the GDR nine, and to Poland seven. See, *Suomen psykologisen tutkimuksen kehitys, nykytila ja kehitysnäkymät*, data gathered from tables

on pages 58, 60, 64 and 79.

⁷⁰ Ruoppila's interview.

⁷¹ He lectured in the MTKK on public education, on continuous education, on playgrounds for children in Budapest, and took part in family policy seminar on 21st – 22nd November 1981, in which he presented a paper on 'A társadalmi mobilitás néhány pszichológiai konzekvenciája a mai Magyarországon'. Előadások. MTKKA.

⁷² Veres Sándor's report. X/207-982. 8. d. MTAA.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Lang István, 'A finn-magyar tudományos együttműködés értékelése, távlatai' (Speech at the Days of Finnish Science, 16th April, 1985). NKO 729, MTAA.

⁷⁵ Rózsa Klára's report XIII/2549-88. 74.d. MTAA.

⁷⁶ First Finnish-Hungarian symposium on psychophysiology, Budapest, 17–18 April 1985. NKO 729 (1985). MTAA; Ruoppila's interview.

⁷⁷ Sugár Péterné's report X/1237-90. 102.d. MTAA.

⁷⁸ Geffert Éva's report X/1238-90. 102.d. MTAA.

⁷⁹ Széman Zsuzsa's report X/216-90. 95.d. MTAA.

⁸⁰ Cf. Valuch, *Magyarország társadalomtörténete a XX. század második felében*, 357-365.

⁸¹ Haraszti, *Velvet Prison*, 75-76.

⁸² Cf. Michael J. White, *Political Philosophy. An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Oneworld Books 2004, 7.

⁸³ Beszámoló jelentés a helsinki Kulturális és Tudományos Központ tevékenységéről/1987. aug. 17 - 1988. június 30/ (Nyirkos István) 275/i, MTKKA.

⁸⁴ Beszámoló jelentés a helsinki Magyar Kulturális és Tudományos Központ tevékenységéről/1988. július 1 - 1989. június 30/ (Nyirkos István). 275/i. MTKKA. The first of its kind was held in Lahti, Finland, in July 1988 with ten Hungarian psychologists.

⁸⁵ Päivi Aho-Mustonen to the author 24 May 2004 (a letter containing the program).

⁸⁶ Földes György, 'Kádár János külpolitikai nézetei (1957-1967)', in Pritz Pál (szerk.), *Magyarország helye a 20. századi Európában*. Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat 2002, 146.

⁸⁷ Haraszti, 'A Helsinki giccs'.