

Social Cohesion and Development

Vol 18, No 1 (2023)

No 35

Social Cohesion and Development

Biannual Scientific Review,
Spring 2023, volume 18, issue 1

Κοινωνική Συνοχή και Ανάπτυξη

35 Εξαμηνιαία Επιστημονική Επιθεώρηση,
Άνοιξη 2023, τόμος 18ος, τεύχος 1

ARTICLES Άρθρα

Zois Gerasimos Katsimigas & Christos Papatheodorou, The interaction between pension schemes and economic activity: a «demand-based» theoretical approach

Chara Vavoura & Ioannis Vavouras, The asymmetric socioeconomic effects of global food crisis

Georgios Filippidis & Anthi Baltzidou, Addiction of teenagers to Electronic - Internet Games

Vasiliki Kantzara, New governance and the rationalisation of Greek education in conditions of financial crisis. Analysis of reforms from a Weberian perspective affecting the rationality of organisational power relations

Stavros Pantazopoulos, Social and political change in post-war Greece. Demographic transformations in the in the 1970s

RESEARCH Έρευνα

Multiplier event for project «Continugee»: A comprehensive overview and reflection (**Zarahoviti Eftychia**)



Social and political change in post-war Greece. Demographic transformations in the in the 1970s¹

Stavros Pantazopoulos, *University of Peloponnese*

Κοινωνικές και πολιτικές αλλαγές στη μεταπολεμική Ελλάδα. Δημογραφικοί μετασχηματισμοί στη δεκαετία του 1970

Σταύρος Πανταζόπουλος, *Πανεπιστήμιο Πελοποννήσου*

ABSTRACT

This post-doctoral research endeavors to elucidate the phenomenon of internal migration (astyphilia) that occurred within Greek society during the post-war era. Specifically, the period of scrutiny spans from 1971 to 1981, during which a substantial number of Greek citizens embarked on a massive exodus from rural areas to urban centers. The reasons behind these relocations exhibit variability contingent upon the temporal context and geographical disparities across regions. Illustrative factors contributing to the urbanization of this decade include inadequate agricultural wages, labor scarcity, limited arable land, attempts to industrialize rural areas, and disparities between agricultural and industrial remuneration. The objective of this article is not only to outline the causes of the extensive urbanization observed during this period but also to demonstrate the ensuing consequences for Greek society.

KEY WORDS: Internal migration, demographics, social change, Greece, 1971-1981, urbanization, astyphilia.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Η παρούσα μεταδιδακτορική έρευνα επιχειρεί να αποσαφηνίσει το φαινόμενο της εσωτερικής μετανάστευσης (αστυφιλία) που εκδηλώθηκε στην ελληνική κοινωνία κατά τη μεταπολεμική εποχή. Συγκεκριμένα, η υπό εξέταση περίοδος εκτείνεται από το 1971 έως το 1981, κατά την οποία ένας σημαντικός αριθμός Ελλήνων πολιτών ξεκίνησε μια μαζική έξοδο από τις αγροτικές περιοχές προς τα αστικά κέντρα. Οι λόγοι πίσω από αυτές τις μεταγκαταστάσεις παρουσιάζουν μεταβλητότητα που εξαρτάται από το χρονικό πλαίσιο και τις γεωγραφικές ανισότητες μεταξύ των περιφερειών. Ενδεικτικοί παράγοντες που συμβάλλουν στην αστικοποίηση αυτής της δεκαετίας περιλαμβάνουν ανεπαρκή γεωργικά ημερομίσθια, έλλειψη εργατικού δυναμικού, περιορισμένη καλλιεργήσιμη γη, προσπάθειες εκβιομηχάνισης των αγροτικών περιοχών και ανισότητες μεταξύ γεωργικών και βιομηχανικών αμοιβών. Ο στόχος αυτού του άρθρου δεν είναι μόνο να σκιαγραφήσει τα αίτια της εκτεταμένης αστικοποίησης που παρατηρήθηκε κατά τη διάρκεια αυτής της περιόδου, αλλά και να καταδείξει τις επακόλουθες συνέπειες για την ελληνική κοινωνία.

ΛΕΞΕΙΣ-ΚΛΕΙΔΙΑ: Εσωτερική μετανάστευση, δημογραφία, κοινωνική αλλαγή, Ελλάδα, 1971-1981, αστικοποίηση, αστυφιλία.

1. Introduction

The present study endeavors to portray the causes and consequences of population movements within Greece during the period of 1971-1981. This research sheds light on the factors that prompted individuals to relocate, particularly to the major urban centers, with a specific focus on the capital city, Athens and endeavors to shed light on the interrelationship between socioeconomic transitions and human migration patterns, using Greece's post-war internal migration as a pivotal example.

To achieve this objective, several key questions arise, primarily concerning the population's composition, size, and patterns of movement. Additionally, an exploration of the underlying reasons driving this migration is essential. Building upon previous research conducted during the first two decades following the end of World War II, this study aims to determine whether the migratory flow observed in earlier years persisted during the period under investigation. Furthermore, it seeks to uncover the causes propelling populations to migrate and evaluate the ensuing effects of these movements.

The hypothesis in this article proposes that the marked increase in internal migration (*astyphilia*) within Greek society during the post-war era of 1971-1981 can be attributed to a complex interplay of socioeconomic factors, including a shift from agrarian to industrial employment, increased urbanization, and policy reforms. Specifically, we hypothesize that these systemic shifts catalyzed a significant demographic transition from rural to urban areas, thereby causing substantial internal migration. To test this hypothesis, we analyze primary and secondary data.

The primary and secondary data for this study were predominantly sourced from the Hellenic Statistical Authority, which provided the necessary sources, as well as from population censuses conducted in 1961, 1971, and 1981. The collected data underwent meticulous processing to ensure its relevance and suitability for analysis. Notably, the present research exclusively focuses on internal migration and does not encompass the examination of external population movements.

By examining existing literature and analyzing the acquired data, this research accurately and comprehensively reflects the changes in both the composition and structure of the population. The findings reveal that internal migration impacted the entire territory of Greece, with some areas experiencing population losses while others witnessed population gains. The most significant population decline was observed in rural regions, which incurred substantial losses. Conversely, large urban centers, particularly Attica (with Athens as its core) and to a lesser extent, Thessaloniki, emerged as the primary recipients and beneficiaries of this migration. The redistribution of the population is intrinsically linked to internal migration, resulting in a transformative shift from predominantly rural to predominantly urban settlements. This shift in settlement patterns also influenced changes in occupations and professions, with a notable transition from the primary sector to the secondary and tertiary sectors.

As we delve deeper into the intricacies of internal migration within post-war Greek society, our research explores the political and social historical contexts of the era that had significant implications on the Greek populace. We scrutinize how these elements may have instigated and influenced mass population movements within the Greek territory between 1971 and 1981. Subsequently, we probe into the demographic metamorphosis that unfolded during this decade, leading to compelling findings. To ensure the rigor and credibility of our research, we employ comprehensive data provided by the Hellenic Statistical Authority. These quantitative insights offer a robust foundation for our investigation, enabling us to elucidate the multifaceted dynamics of internal migration during this transformative period in Greece's history.

2. The historical context

The decade from 1971 to 1981 in Greece was characterized by profound political changes, shaped predominantly by the fall of the seven-year military junta and the transition to democracy. The military dictatorship that began in 1967 was brought to an end in 1974 following a failed coup attempt and the subsequent Turkish invasion of Cyprus. The transition to a democratic government in 1974, known as the *Metapolitefsi*, marked a significant turning point in Greek history. During this period, political instability was rife, as the country grappled with the remnants of authoritarian rule and navigated its way toward a functioning democratic system. The period also saw the rise of Konstantinos Karamanlis, who led the charge towards Greece's reintegration into the European community, culminating in its admission to the European Economic Community in 1981.

As the main scholars of the period report, the transition in Greece from 1971 to 1981 was marked by considerable political, economic, and social shifts that played a decisive role in the patterns of internal migration within the country (Tsoukalas, K., 1987, Dertilis, G., 2016, Vergopoulos, K., 1975 and Sakellaropoulos, T., 2011). Economically and socially, this was a period of both growth and upheaval. The earlier trend of rapid industrialization and urbanization continued into this decade, drawing more and more people into the cities, most notably Athens. These changes were accompanied by significant socioeconomic shifts, such as the movement from agrarian to more diversified livelihoods and the increase in wage labor. The urban influx exacerbated social issues in major cities, such as overcrowding, inadequate housing, and infrastructure challenges. Concurrently, rural areas suffered from depopulation and economic decline, further fueling the cycle of internal migration. Overall, these trends catalyzed a period of dynamic social transformation that echoed across the Greek society and economy, paving the way for the phenomena that we seek to understand in this study.

During the period from 1970 to 1974, an established coup d'état endeavor sought to implement a liberal economic policy that aimed to attract domestic investment. The coup administration introduced a range of measures aimed at bolstering the economy and promoting internal financial circulation (Sotiropoulos, D., 2019, p. 138).

One of the notable measures implemented by the dictatorial governments involved facilitating the construction sector by reducing bureaucratic interventions and easing regulations. These changes streamlined the process of building construction, while also revising loan conditions favorably for builders seeking financial assistance for housing projects. Consequently, a «para-industry» emerged, centered around the construction sector and particularly the construction of buildings. This development acted as a catalyst, attracting various related sectors such as cement industries and others, thereby stimulating economic activity and growth (Patronis, V. & Liargovas, P., 2017, pp. 114-115). This factor served as a crucial catalyst that motivated numerous rural inhabitants to invest in constructing houses within the capital city and other major urban centers of the country. Consequently, it led to the proliferation of unregulated construction practices that are evident in the present era.

The exploitation of the European tourism stream was equally significant. Prior to the dictatorial governments, a broader tourism movement had already been established in the southeastern regions of Europe, and this fact was fully capitalized upon. The governments implemented favorable measures to encourage the creation and development of tourist units and hotels. This factor played a vital role, as it prompted many rural residents to transition to alternative professions and engage in the provision of tourist services. Furthermore, the exchange rate between

the dollar and the drachma proved highly advantageous, making it exceptionally convenient for American citizens, including Greek-Americans, to visit Greece as tourists. The favorable exchange rate meant that the drachma had a lower value compared to the dollar, making Greece an affordable and attractive destination for tourists from the United States (Kazakos, P., 2001, pp. 270-279), as the drachma was equivalently inferior to the dollar.

Table 1. Growth rate, inflation, unemployment, current account balance and GDP per capita (%), 1970-1981

| Year | Growth | Inflation | Unemployment | Current Account Balance | GDP per capita |
|------|--------|-----------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| 1971 | 7,8 | 3,0 | 3,1 | -0,9 | 1.426 |
| 1972 | 10,2 | 4,3 | 2,1 | -0,7 | 1.627 |
| 1973 | 8,1 | 15,5 | 2,0 | -2,1 | 2.146 |
| 1974 | -6,4 | 26,9 | 2,1 | -0,5 | 2.419 |
| 1975 | 6,4 | 13,4 | 2,3 | -0,5 | 2.703 |
| 1976 | 6,9 | 13,3 | 1,9 | -0,5 | 2.909 |
| 1977 | 2,9 | 12,2 | 1,7 | -0,4 | 3.327 |
| 1978 | 7,2 | 12,5 | 1,9 | -0,2 | 4.019 |
| 1979 | 3,3 | 19,0 | 1,9 | 0,8 | 4.881 |
| 1980 | 0,7 | 24,9 | 2,7 | 0,6 | 5.030 |
| 1981 | -1,6 | 24,5 | 4,0 | 1,7 | 4.575 |

Source: Hellenic Statistical Authority, Statistical Yearbooks of Greece of the years 1967-1984.

In addition to the aforementioned measures, the dictatorial regime introduced a comprehensive five-year economic development plan spanning from 1968 to 1972, following a similar approach to the first post-war governments. This program emphasized the promotion of a free-market economy and private entrepreneurship, particularly in the financial sector (Koniordos, S., 2015, p. 40). Furthermore, the plan included provisions for supporting the rural population and the manufacturing sector. Notably, those engaged in the primary sector, such as agriculture, benefitted from the dictators' agricultural policies. These policies involved redistributing arable land, as well as canceling outstanding debts and loans (Sakellaropoulos, T., 1992, pp. 221-222), thereby providing significant relief and support to individuals involved in agriculture.

The implementation of these measures resulted in considerable growth rates, albeit lower compared to the early post-war years. Particularly noteworthy is the high level of economic growth experienced during the initial years of the dictatorial regime. However, it is important to highlight that inflation rates also rose during this period. A significant turning point occurred during the two-year period of 1973-1974, marking a notable shift in economic dynamics, when the growth rate fell to -6.4% from 4.3% in 1972. The pronounced consequences of this economic downturn included the expansion of both external and internal migration. As economic conditions worsened, individuals sought opportunities elsewhere, leading to increased emigration from the coun-

try. Simultaneously, internal migration also surged as people moved from economically distressed regions to more prosperous areas within the country. During this challenging period, financial assistance and market revitalization were primarily sustained through remittances sent by those who had previously emigrated abroad. These remittances played a crucial role in providing support and injecting much-needed funds into the struggling economy, helping to alleviate financial difficulties and foster some degree of market renewal (Glytsos, N., P., 1994, p. 116).

Another significant factor was Greece's gradual isolation from the European Economic Community (EEC) due to the undemocratic nature of its regime. This led to the failure to meet the requirements for harmonization with the economic institutions of the community, strained relations, and the suspension of the interconnection agreement signed with the EEC since 1961. As a result, Greece experienced a gradual deterioration in its relationship with the EEC, leading to a decrease in economic cooperation and missed opportunities for integration with European economic institutions (Manou-Pantazopoulou, E., 1999, p. 27). The culmination of the crisis was the withdrawal of Greece from the Council of Europe in 1969 (Poimenidou, A., D., 2018, p. 110), which resulted in the revival of relations with the USA (Grigoriadis, S., 2011, pp. 181-182) and the expression of a state of anti-Europeanism (Tzortzis, I., 2020, pp. 146-153).

The primary objective of the first post-dictatorial government was to initiate a comprehensive reorganization of the state. As part of this endeavor, there were significant changes made to the administrations of public utilities, banks, and state-owned enterprises. Additionally, efforts were made to redress state employees, which involved various measures aimed at addressing and rectifying the issues that had arisen during the preceding dictatorial regime. The overarching goal was to establish a more efficient and transparent administrative apparatus within the state (Rizospastis Newspaper, 1974, p. 12 and Sotiropoulos, D., 2016, pp. 15-68) and the finances of the dictatorship were subjected to a comprehensive reassessment to determine if there had been poor financial management during that period. This examination aimed to identify any irregularities, mismanagement, or instances of corruption within the financial operations of the dictatorship. Regarding the security forces, efforts were made to remove individuals who had supported the junta regime. However, this purge was conducted gradually and selectively rather than through a complete and immediate expulsion of all junta supporters. The objective was likely to strike a balance between the need for reform and the preservation of stability within the security forces (Tahydromos of Egypt Newspaper, 28/2/1975, p. 1).

When the first post-dictatorial government took over the reins of the country, the finances were in a very bad state. Apart from the immediate restoration of the Democracy, the economic base of the state had to be restored as well. The country's external borrowing was increasing as the current expenses had to be paid while the balance of income and expenditure was around 1 to 1, and inflation stood at 26.9%, double that of European industrial economies (Economou, C., Sabethai, I., Simigiannis, G., 2010, p. 98).

The economic remittances of immigrants of the previous period had been greatly reduced, mainly due to the fact that the number of external immigrants had also been greatly reduced after the fall of the dictatorship. Data collected from the Hellenic Statistical Authority, reveal that in 1973, 27,525 people emigrated, in 1974, 24,448, in 1975, 20,330 and in 1976, 20,374 (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 1980, p. 98). During the same period, repatriates equaled about the same number of migrants (Petropoulos, N., 1994, Table 1, p. 249). Becomes apparent that an additional problem of integration and absorption of repatriates into the Greek economy, of that period, was created. Moreover, the construction sector, that during the dictatorship was the driving force of the economy, was showing an awful decline.

Table 2. Budgetary figures, as % of GDP 1971-1981

| Year | Net Government Borrowing | Government Revenues | Total Government Expenditure |
|------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| 1971 | 0,1 | 26,9 | 26,9 |
| 1972 | 0,0 | 26,5 | 26,5 |
| 1973 | -0,1 | 24,8 | 24,8 |
| 1974 | -1,4 | 28,4 | 28,4 |
| 1975 | -3,0 | 30,2 | 30,2 |
| 1976 | -1,7 | 30,7 | 20,7 |
| 1977 | -2,5 | 31,6 | 31,6 |
| 1978 | -2,9 | 32,0 | 32,0 |
| 1979 | -2,4 | 31,7 | 31,7 |
| 1980 | -2,6 | 31,8 | 31,8 |
| 1981 | -9,1 | 38,0 | 38,0 |

Source: Greek Statistical Authority, Statistical Yearbooks of Greece of the years 1967-1984.

For this very reason, a five-year economic program for the period 1976-1980 was re-established, such as the first post-war governments did. This defined the framework in which the state will operate, something between fiscal liberalism, combined with a basic state intervention. Indeed, private initiatives took place during this period, but the State also proceeded to the nationalization of many private companies of particular strategic importance (e.g., Olympic Aviation), in order to improve the financial indicators (Sakellaropoulos, T., 2011, pp. 98-99). In addition, the need for convergence with the policies of the EEC, mainly on agricultural products, was established. However, Greek farmers, although they had been greatly modernized compared to the pre-dictatorship period, were unable to harmonize with the requirements of the European community (Maravegias, N., 2011, pp. 236-244).

The period between 1977 and 1981 is a landmark period as the economic crisis of oil is raging worldwide and the Greek Government is struggling with a series of infrastructure projects, in order to create a first embankment. Moreover, tries to give incentives to the primary sector, because understands that Greece's foremost export weapon is agricultural products, despite the multiple problems faced by Greek agriculture (Macedonia, Newspaper 15/2/1978, p. 9). In combination with some subsidies from the European Community, Greek farmers, trying to cope with the ever-increasing European competition, are getting modernized as much as possible. In this context, an increase in agricultural tractors is enormous. It is estimated that the number of tractors in 1981 was 221,919, while on a percentage basis, this figure was 218% greater than it was in 1971 (Moisidis, A., 1986, p. 333).

The economic crisis forced the Government to revise the program announced and tried to incorporate these current conditions into these changes. This was necessarily done due to the generalization of the oil crisis in 1979, where it necessitated the restructuring of the country's economic policy (Liargovas, P. & Patronis, B., 2011, 539). This, however, was quite a difficult undertaking because of the huge number of civil servants that the state apparatus numbered at

the time. For this very reason, the political leaders took advantage of the tactics of nationalization and took further ownership of many financial and banking institutions (Moisisidis A., 1986, p. 322), indirectly acquiring control over all the utility companies.

Finally, undoubtedly the most important event of this period was the signing of the Treaty of Accession of Greece to the European Economic Community; it was an extraordinary achievement that promoted Greece to a new era. In fact, the country's efforts to restore both the economy and democracy were rewarded, while it was a guarantee of its subsequent economic improvement (Macedonia Newspaper, 29/5/1979, p. 1).

3. The Demographic transformations

3.1. General demographics of the population

Already, since 1947, the extent of the country remains the same, as there was no annexation or removal of territories. What is interesting in the following data is the change of the inhabitants' population in absolute numbers. Between the censuses of 1961 and 1971, there is a population increase of 380,088 people or 4.53%. In the following decade, 1971–1981, the population of the country increased by 971,776 inhabitants or 11.08%.

Although the balance between births and deaths is negative, this population growth observed over the decade, is under review. This fact is explained by the significant turnout of repatriated Greeks and repatriated Pontians, which is happening simultaneously during this period (Kotzamanis, V., 2000, p. 33). The difference between these two censuses in terms of residents per km² is also significant. This increase is also attributed to the influx of economic migrants and repatriates into the country.

From the comparison between the censuses of previous years, it is also observed that in the 1971 census, it seems for the first time that the urban population is larger, in solid terms, if in contrast to all the previous censuses, where the rural population was significantly superior. To this day, the urban population is the most populous while the rural population is decreasing per census. Thus, it is observed that the urban population in 1971 constituted 53.2% of the total population of the country while the rural population constituted 35.2%. Respectively, in the next decade, the gap opens even more, being the urban population at 58.1% and the rural population at 30.3%. Noteworthy is the stability of the semi-urban space, which remains in both censuses at 11.6%.

It is also observed, in all geographical regions of the country, that the urban population constitutes about 30% to 35% while the rural population constitutes 40% to 50%. An important exception is Attica and central and western Macedonia. In Attica, the urban area constitutes 80% and the rural area 10% while in Macedonia, these percentages change to about 60% and 30%. This also explains why, while in all other areas the rural population far outweighs the urban population, in overall, the urban population is superior. In Attica, central and western Macedonia reside about half the population of the country. Proportionally, therefore, the urban population is more than the rural population although in the majority of the Greek prefectures the rural population is more, numerically. And the increase of the urban population during the decade 1970 – 1980 resulted in the conversion of 5 semi-urban settlements in cities (Kos, Koropi, Nafplio, Alexandria and Kalymnos). This means that gradually, the population that lived in semi-urban settlements, with the continuous population growth, was transformed into urban settlements (Papadakis, M., 1994, p. 204).

Subsequently, the gradual reduction of the rural population in the country as a whole is small but not negligible. The rural populations of Attica and the islands decreased by about 20,000 inhabitants, Macedonia by 30,000, the Peloponnese and Central Greece by 70,000, Central Greece by 25,000 and Crete by about 3,000. Epirus alone, showed an increase in population of about 5,500 inhabitants. We, therefore observe a movement of the rural population to urban centers.

Thus, in absolute terms, in 1971 the rural population constituted 35.2% of the total population of the country and in 1981 30.3%. The difference in this decade translates to 126,389 people. However, the difference is clearly much greater. If we assume that in the decade examined, 620,000 people moved to the urban centres of Greece (Glytsos, N., 1994, p. 300), then we will have to look elsewhere for such a widening of the gap between rural and urban populations. An important contribution to the widening of this difference is due to the influx of Repatriates, who settle mainly in Macedonia and the capital (Petropoulos N., 1994, p. 244).

Table 3. Population of the Capital Region compared to the population of Greece

| | Population 1971 | Population 1981 |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Capital Area | 2.548.065 | 3.038.245 |
| Total country | 8.768.625 | 9.740.422 |
| % | 29,1 | 31,2 |

Source: Hellenic Statistical Authority, own processing of Population Census data 1971 and 1981.

Although the population growth rate of the capital decreased from 37.1% to 19.2% in this decade, we observe that in absolute numbers it increased by 490,180 inhabitants. This leads us to the conclusion that the migratory traffic to the capital decreased greatly but in general, the tendency to move to the major urban centers remained largely (Emke – Pouloupoulou, I., 1998, p. 33).

The 490,180 inhabitants, combined with the external emigration (Tsachouridis, P. 1988, p. 215, Table 1) that is still thriving on Greek territory and the wave of repatriated Pontians, who, as mentioned above, settled mostly in the capital region, are the increase of this area. However, it is clear that apart from the Urban Complex of Athens, a large population increase is observed in the region of the rest of Attica prefecture, where within this decade there is an increase of 57,357 inhabitants (Chouliarakis, M., 1988, p. 16). Becomes apparent that the gradual expansion of the capital's population to the outskirts begins, creating new suburbs, mainly due to lack of space (Emke – Pouloupoulou, (1998), p. 39).

It is glaringly striking that the population difference between the two censuses is 993,000 inhabitants. It is clear that not only has the increase in the number of cities from 56 to 61 contributed to this, but it is a more general phenomenon affecting all urban centers. However, we note that the rate of change of urban dwellers is falling sharply. From 2.6% in 1971 to 2% in 1981. Clearly, we cannot assume that this decline existed throughout the decade, nor can we prove the opposite, namely that this reduction took place in the last years of the decade.

For what we are sure, however, is that the difference in the average annual rate of change is not dramatically large and that the urbanization of previous years continues to occur but at a lower rate. If we also consider the fact that a fairly large percentage of the immigrants outside

Greece, consists of people who come from rural areas, then we understand that the external migration of this period had a catalytic role in still increasing their population, the urban centers (Tsachouridis, 1988, p. 216).

This is confirmed by the size of urban centers in proportion to the rest of Greece. In 1971 it was 53.2% compared to 58.1% in 1981. This happens because, without the explanation that it is the rural residents migrating outside the Greek borders, it would cause an oxymoron, since although the growth rate of urban centers is decreasing, their size is increasing more and more.

It is noteworthy that the population of the mountainous areas decreased within a decade by 107,416 people, at the same time that the inhabitants who lived in the semi-mountainous areas, increased by 774,778 inhabitants. This means that populations that lived in inaccessible areas and who probably had poor transportation to the nearby towns were forced to move to more lowland areas.

In fact, in over a decade, the population living in mountain areas fell by 2.3 points (from 12.0% to 9.7% in 1981). This percentage was distributed approximately equally in semi-mountainous and lowland areas (1.1 units went to semi-mountainous areas and 1.2 to lowlands). In other words, we observe a tendency to move towards the lowlands.

Apart from the purely quantitative redistribution of the population, which was shown above, with the internal movements of the populations, there have also been qualitative restructurings. The change of residence and living space of the citizens, led to a change of practice of profession. The majority of those who lived and worked in rural areas were engaged in agriculture and animal husbandry. When they emigrated to another region, they were forced to change their professional occupations, moving from the primary production sector to the secondary and tertiary ones.

As the data of the Hellenic Statistical Authority highlight, the number of people involved in the primary sector (agriculture and livestock farming) from 1951 onwards was constantly decreasing. This resulted in 42.1% of the total workforce being employed in agriculture in 1971, or 1,334,700 people, while in 1981 we had a reduction of this percentage to 31.1% or 1,102,700 people.

The direct result of this is the automatic increase of employees in the secondary and tertiary production sector. This, of course, also worked both ways, as the increasing involvement in the services sector and the secondary sector has helped to over-centralize the population in urban centres, and on the other hand, to depopulate the countryside (Katochianou, D., 1994, p. 197).

Table 4. Distribution of employment by categories of economic activity

| Category of Economic Activity | 1971 | % | 1981 | % |
|-------------------------------|---------|------|---------|------|
| Primary | 1.334,7 | 42,1 | 1.102,7 | 31,1 |
| Secondary | 835,6 | 26,3 | 1.003,7 | 28,5 |
| Services | 1.001,3 | 31,6 | 1.422,9 | 40,4 |
| Total | 3.171,6 | 100 | 3.529,3 | 100 |

Source: Robolis, S., (1988). *Economic structure and migratory movements in post-war Greece*, at EKKE (1988). *The rural world in the Mediterranean area*, Athens, p. 245.

The secondary and tertiary sectors of production may have been an important factor in attracting population to cities, but the primary sector suffered exceptionally large losses during this period. It is worth noted that in all regions of Greece, the other two sectors outperform the

primary in productivity, even in predominantly rural areas. Based on this, we can conclude that the primary sector is lagging behind both in the number of people involved in it and in terms of supply in production (Katochianou, D., 1994, p. 200).

In addition, always exist the dangers of natural disasters, which can destroy production. On top of that, the low wages of farmers, combined with the expenses they have in their work (fertilizers, sowing, irrigation of crops / animal feed, etc.) and the wide inequality between agricultural and industrial wages, tend to less and less occupation within the primary sector.

It should also not go unnoticed that there is a very high preference of the inhabitants of urban areas in the secondary sector and more specifically in the construction sector. This also explains the fact of the excessively large construction traffic, both in this decade examined and in the previous one.

The number of people occupied in the tertiary sector during this period is also noteworthy. Particularly high percentages of employees share the hotel and restaurant sectors, which is also an 'exploitation' of the tourism stream that had begun to appear as early as the previous decade.

Finally, in order to better understand the excessive increase in the number of workers in the secondary and tertiary sectors, explanatory data concerning them should be noted. In 1971, there were 413,000 of those involved in banking, commerce and insurance and in 1982, 652,000. Those working in industry and crafts, in 1971 were 554,000 and in 1982 681,000. In 1971, municipal and private services employed amounted to 409,000 employees and in 1982 to 571,500. Finally, 255,020 people were employed in public services and infrastructure, while in 1982 294,000 were employed. These figures are actually very large, especially when compared to those of the primary ones (Robolis, S., 1988, 3rd note, p. 247).

4. The postbellum urbanization (Astyphilia)

Since the early 1920s, there has been a gradual and increasing strengthening of urban centers, mainly due to the settlement in the cities of part of the refugees of the Asia Minor Catastrophe (Anogiatis-Pele, D., Dimopoulos, D. and Mavreas, K., 2014, p. 11), but also before that, due to the raisin crisis (Patronis, B., 2015, p. 90). The 1940s, due to the World War II and the subsequent Greek civil war, are considered largely unexplored, yet it remains undeniable that a large part of the rural population residing until then in the Greek countryside, was forced into internal and external migration (Kotzamanis, V., 1990). From 1950, when the country returned to normality, until 1974, the areas that experienced this phenomenon were essentially the rural areas and the large urban centers (in particular Attica and Thessaloniki). The rural areas due to the fact that they lost a large amount of population, and the cities, because of the reception of the aforementioned population (Kanellopoulos, K.N., 1995, p. 9).

Particular emphasis is given to the comparison of urban and rural areas, while it is important to present the balance of incoming and outgoing in the two major urban complexes of the country, Athens and Thessaloniki.

Examining the first post-war years, it is shown that in the period 1956 – 1960, 644,800 people were forced to move from their place of residence and relocate to other areas in search of a better fate. The largest percentage of those who moved, went to urban areas (408,400), 265,000 of them, moved purely to Athens and Thessaloniki. The rural area suffered great losses through internal migrations, which amounted to 222,800. Correspondingly, in the period 1966 – 1970, the rural population decreased by an additional 248,500 amount of people.

A total of 862,900 inhabitants moved to urban centers, while Athens and Thessaloniki recorded a net population change of 252,200 people. Specifically, 19.2% (or 42,800 people) aged from 0 to 14, 48.9% from 15 to 29 (108,900), 17.5% (38,900) belonged to the group 30 – 44, 45-64 belonged the 10.5% (23,500) and 65 and above 3.9% or 8,700 people. What is striking is the large number of people in the 15-29 age group. This age group, along with 30 - 44 and 45 - 64, constitute the active population of Greece.

The total number of emigrants between 1966 and 1970 was about the same, reaching 263,700, about 40,000 more commuters. While between 1951 and 1960, a total of 360,000 people moved from rural areas, 474,000 emigrated in the next decade. The semi-urban areas also had sufficient losses, where in the first decade they lost 22,000 people, while in the second 28,000 in total, in the rural and semi-urban areas. Thus, in the period '51 - '60 we have 308,000 who move to the Athens urban complex and 54,000 to Thessaloniki urban complex, while in the period '61 - '70, 376,000 in Athens and 103,000 in Thessaloniki. Becomes evident that, in the second decade, we have an increase of about 85,000 people commuted from rural areas, while the number of people commuted to Athens and Thessaloniki reaches 117,000 more than in the previous decade (Kotzamanis, V. & Maratou, L., 1994, p. 82).

During the same period, the two largest urban complexes in the country, Athens and Thessaloniki, taken together, showed a positive balance of people. In particular, those who settled in both urban complexes were 341,000 in 1971, while those who left, 88,800, creating a positive balance of 263,600 in their favor. In the rest of the urban areas, 521,900 people settled, 258,300 left, a total of 252,200 were the positive balance. A big wound seems to be the Greek countryside, as in the 1971 census its balance was negative. 144,300 people moved to the countryside, but there were many more people who left it (392,800), so there is a population decline of 248,500 people (Reppas, P., 1997, p. 31, tab. 3).

+Moving on to the purely migratory issues, statistical data on the number of commuters, their 'choices' in terms of where they go and, finally, their stratification, should be mentioned. The method used is the median intervals every five years of the decade being investigated. The data come from the Hellenic Statistical Authority, after processing.

From the study of the above table, we can see that for the five-year period 1966 - 1970, the urban complexes of Athens and Thessaloniki are presented with an enhanced population. Of the total 764,500 immigrants of this period, 341,100 people or 45% moved to these two centers, while 180,800 or 24% moved to the rest of the urban centers. i.e., 521,900 people.

Of all those who moved to urban centers in the five-year period '66 – '71, 179,100 come from other cities (34%), 87,000 from semi-urban (17%) and 255,700 i.e., 49% from rural ones. So, we are talking about a bleeding of the rural area.

It is noteworthy that there is also migration to the countryside of the country and the rural areas. More specifically, 144,300 people emigrated to rural areas, i.e., about 18% of the total number over the period; of these people, 83,800 (more than half) came from other rural areas, 15,300 from semi-urban areas and 45,200 from urban centers, which allows us to assume that there is a small flow of decentralization.

In addition, it would be particularly interesting to observe those who choose to leave the Athens and Thessaloniki urban complexes, 47,500 people move to other urban areas. 18,700 in semi-urban and 22,600 in rural. A total of 88,800 people moved from these two cities. Compared to the 341,100 who accepted, we understand that there is a difference of 252,300 people, a very large number.

Table 5. Internal population movement by region*

| | Urban | P. S. Athens – Thessaloniki | Suburban | Rural | Total |
|--------------------|-------|--------------------------------|----------|--------|-------|
| 1966 - 1970 | | | | | |
| Installed | 521,9 | 341,0 | 98,3 | 144,3 | 764,5 |
| Departed | 258,3 | 88,8 | 113,4 | 392,8 | 764,5 |
| Net change | 263,6 | 252,2 | -15,1 | -248,5 | - |
| 1976 – 1980 | | | | | |
| Installed | 557,0 | 294,2 | 111,6 | 165,8 | 834,4 |
| Departed | 406,2 | 194,5 | 107,1 | 321,0 | 843,3 |
| Net change | 150,7 | 99,8 | 4,5 | -155,2 | - |

Source: Kanellopoulos, K. N., *Internal migration*, KEPE, Exhibitions 21, Athens 1995, p.21, own edited. *Thousands of people.

And for the next five years ('76-'81), the total number of commuters shows an increase and amounts to 834,400 people. Of these, 557,000 emigrated to urban areas (294,200 to the Athens and Thessaloniki Urban Block-U.B.), 111,600 to semi-urban and 165,800 to rural ones. At first glance, we note that there is a decline in the growth rate of Athens and Thessaloniki. At the same time, there is an increase in the migration to urban areas in general (including those in urban areas in general (including those of the urban areas in general (including those of the urban areas). Athens and Thessaloniki) so we conclude that this increase is reaped by the rest of the urban centers (Kyriazi-Allison, E., 1998, p. 283).

In rural areas we see that the number of entrants is increasing and at the same time it is decreasing and the number of those who leave, so there is a shift in movement (from -248,500 which was the balance of settlers – departed in the period '66-'71, in the five-year period '76-'81 it decreases to -155,200). Significant stability presents the semi-urban space.

What is also observed is the large movement of populations at the productive ages. In both periods, it is the 20-44 age group that 'gives' the largest number of people. It is followed by the 0-19 group and then the 45-64 years old. Here, we can make the assumption that at the end of compulsory schooling, one could move voluntarily (e.g., to find a job). Understandably, from about 0 to 15 it is practically impossible to leave on their own, so we are talking about family migration.

At the gender level, we observe that in both, the movement of the 20-44 age group is equally shared. More specifically, we see that in both five-year periods and in both sexes, about half of those who emigrate to other urban areas belong to this age group. In particular, we should dwell on the fact that there is a small but noticeable numerical predominance of women over men in this age group.

The second most populous age group is that of 0 to 19 years. As mentioned above, it is a fairly peculiar group, because it gathers disparate elements. We therefore conclude that it consists of young people, who to a large extent follow their parents in this migratory movement.

The third group is the one that brings together people from 45 to 64 years old. And this group possesses productive ages. From the study of the data, it becomes clear that this is where men predominate. Women lag behind men quantitatively and numerically. They are the only category in which men excel.

As it becomes clear, the people who move are young and belong to the productive class. This means that the areas that have lost these populations have lost both a useful (and even redundant) workforce. If we now look at the previous tables, we will see that the areas that bleed the most are the rural ones. So, we can certainly talk about the loss of rural labor with an immediate ageing of its population. At the same time, we understand that this has an impact not only on the economy of these regions but also on society (depopulation, school closures).

The more thorough observation and examination of the data requires us to look at the sectors where the commuters were employed. What we are seeing is that, for the most part, both sexes of those who moved have been engaged in the secondary and tertiary sectors of production.

On a specific basis, men who emigrated were mainly absorbed in the tertiary sector (banks – services) at a rate of 27.8%, while the second sector in absorption comes that of industry, with 24.7%. The percentages of men are distributed equally in the other sectors, but they do not exceed 15%.

In women there is an unequal distribution, as we see that there is a super-absorption in three sectors (services, hotels / commerce, and industry) while in the remaining four the percentage is in the single digits. Also, we observe a parallel absorption in the repatriates of the same period. Characteristic, however, is the fact that repatriates have a high occupation with agriculture and animal husbandry, and at very high levels. We can say that this is due to the fact that when they came to our country, they settled in areas that had experienced great external and internal migration in the previous period, namely the rural areas (Mavreas, K., 1998, pp. 189 and 198).

Next, we will look at the conurbations. Observing the difference between the two inventories is a precarious way of drawing conclusions concerning internal immigration, but in the absence of other clear elements relating to it, we can make a certain assessment of them.

As is obvious, the conclusion we had made from the data of the middle years that we had seen above is supported. More specifically, there is a large increase in those of Athens and Thessaloniki, at the same time there is quite a large increase in the rest of the urban centers. Moreover, we see that even in areas with already a large urban center, another is developing in parallel (e.g., Patras U.B., Aigio U.B. and Kalamata U.B.) displaying a general increasing trend. However, it would be interesting to study both the proportionality of the Urban Complexes and their distance.

What we are also interested in looking at is, on the one hand, which is the age group most affected by movements and, on the other hand, whether these movements lead to an ageing of population at the place of departure. In reply to the first question, we note in the table that in the whole region and regardless of geographical location, the age group most affected is that of 20 to 44 and in second place the 0-19 years. ages have the highest percentage in contrast to the age group 65 and older which is the opposite of movements. Finally, through what we said before, we understand that those who are left behind are the people of the aforementioned 65+ group, thus creating a society with a fairly high average age.

With regard to net travel by region (the figure indicating the balance between departures and installations), it can be observed that in both five-year periods, the two regions showing a positive balance are Attica and Central Macedonia (I say Thessaloniki). It is really excellent that none of the eleven remaining regions manages in either of the two five-year periods to show more settlements than departed. In addition, we must stress that, in addition to the balance, we must also look at the population of each region and compare it on the basis of the proportionality of their populations.

Table 6. Members of households established in urban, semi-urban and rural areas and departing from these areas after 1965, by age and gender

| Settled and departed by region | Total |
|---------------------------------|---------|
| Total commuters | 764.480 |
| Settled in urban areas | 521.880 |
| Departing from urban areas | 258.260 |
| Settled in semi-urban areas | 98.300 |
| Installed from semi-urban areas | 113.380 |
| Established in rural areas | 144.300 |
| Departing from rural areas | 392.840 |

Source: Hellenic Statistical Authority, *censuses for the years 1971, 1981*.

Data from the Hellenic Statistical Authority show that the total number of people who emigrated at the beginning of the decade is 764,480. The vast majority comes from rural areas (392,840 people) while a high number of immigrants is also present in urban areas (258,260). The majority of the migration wave is reaped by urban areas, where about 5/7 of the total population moves. Finally, what is worthy of attention is the fairly high number of people who settle in rural areas. If we compare the same percentages in the previous two decades, we will see that the number of those leaving is greater then, while the number of those who go to settle in rural areas is higher in this decade (Hellenic Statistical Authority, Censuses 1951 and 1961).

Table 7. Settled in urban, semi-urban and rural areas and departing from these areas, 1981

| Settled and departed by region | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Total commuters | 1.090.910 |
| Settled in urban areas | 813.490 |
| Departing from urban areas | 662.800 |
| Settled in semi-urban areas | 111.650 |
| Installed from semi-urban areas | 107.120 |
| Established in rural areas | 165.770 |
| Departing from rural areas | 320.990 |

Source: Hellenic Statistical Authority, censuses for the years 1971, 1981.

The last table shows the immigrant populations in the last five years of the period we examined. Overall, we can say that by summing up 1,090,910 of Table 7 to the 764,480 in Table 6, we have a total migration of about 1,700,000, giving a possibility of divergence. These figures are not entirely safe either. However, they are a guide to being able to have an overview of this phenomenon that has changed the population structure of the country.

5. Conclusions

The issue examined in the present research was the emergence of the phenomenon of the movement of large population groups within Greece during the 1970s. At the same time, Greece is experiencing a second major exodus, the one abroad (external migration), which drains the country and decimates it, while at the same time we have the influx of repatriates in Greece, thus changing the demographic profile of the country.

From the study of the existing literature and the data of the Hellenic Statistical Authority, we can make some observations about the phenomenon.

The entire territory of the Greek state experienced internal migration, other areas negatively and others positively. The exodus of population from rural areas continues, but to a lesser extent than has been the case up to then. There is also an increased but small installation traffic towards them. The biggest recipient of this migration continues to be the large urban centers and in particular Attica and, to a lesser extent, Thessaloniki.

A direct result of internal migration is the change in the distribution of the country's population. The nature of the population is changing. From rural, the population is transformed into urban. For the first time in a census in Greece, the urban population is superior to the rural (1971 census). The above change led to the change of occupation and profession. There is a shift from the primary sector to the secondary and tertiary sectors.

As far as ages are concerned, there is a nationwide, and regardless of the region's, decline in the young population (the population that mostly moves is the group from 20 to 44 years old and to a lesser extent from 0 to 19). Finally, rural areas are losing young labor. 392,800 immigrants from rural areas between 1966 and 1970. During the same period, a total of 764,480 people migrated nationwide. 1,090,910 are the immigrants in the five-year period 1976 - 1981.

We should not forget that the phenomenon of internal migration includes students who went to large urban centers to study, joining the current of internal migration informally.

At the same time, Greece is experiencing a second major exodus, the one abroad (external migration), which drains the country and decimates it. Any import of people into the Greek territory (repatriates) will be organized after 1971, when we have a population and demographic change in the country's profile.

During the twenty years of '50 - '70, the rate of change of the country's population was very high, in favor of the urban population (2.2% on average) in contrast to the rural population (- 0.6% on average). In the decade 1961 - 1971, 605,654 farmers stopped working in agriculture. This represents 16.5% of the rural population. In total, the 1961 census shows 370,000 immigrants from rural areas, while 644,800 were the total number of commuters. In the period 1951 - 1961 we had a total population growth of 9.9%. However, 16 of the 52 prefectures of Greece had a population decline. In the period 1961 - 1971 the population growth amounted to 4.5%, while population growth was presented by only 8 prefectures.

6. Final considerations and discussion

By reviewing the existing literature and reading the available data, the main causes that led the populations of the period under examination to move from the areas where they lived to urban areas, can be captured.

A very important cause of migration during this period is the rural clergy, which has a dual texture; on the one hand, it is too small, and on the other hand it is unevenly distributed in the geographical area of Greece. This problem is constant and has existed since the establishment of the new Greek state (1830).

Another major cause is the rural overpopulation that exists in the countryside, and the combination of this cause with the previous one has seriously exacerbated the phenomenon of internal migration.

Equally important is the industrialization of rural areas. A systematic effort was made by all post-war governments to industrialize the countryside in order to strengthen it. However, this was directed against the farmers, who, on the one hand could not assimilate these changes, and on the other hand, industrialization locked many jobs and exacerbated underemployment.

Another essential cause was the low wages received by land workers, while the difference between agricultural wages and labor wages exacerbated emigration. An equally important aspect is the over-concentration of the basic axes of the state in the large cities and especially in the capital, and in addition to the central administration, the large urban centers are home to large financial institutions and large enterprises.

Of great importance is also the fact that the educational institutions were located in Athens (in the '60s, the existing educational institutions located in other cities, were the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, the University of Patras and the University of Ioannina, which functioned as a branch of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki). Characteristically, during the period '71 – '72, 49,189 students studied in the Capital, out of a total of 74,348.

An important parameter was also the health network, which at that time was not fully developed, forcing rural populations to be deprived of access to the provision of health care. The government's policy followed was also of great importance. In addition to the rural development effort, several other measures taken by governments, led to massive urbanization. The series of measures taken by governments can be described as important. The dictatorial governments, with regard to tourism, have been given incentives for the development of tourism and also for the secondary sector, with the result that the rural population has, albeit slightly, turned to this outlet for work.

Finally, other reasons can be mentioned, such as the social life in cities and opportunities for advancement, while cases where, friendly or family ties force many to move to large urban centers, should not be excluded.

The effects created by this migratory phenomenon are significant. These consequences consist of the fact that large population groups have moved en masse and in a very short period of time, radically changing the structure and image of the country. The most important of all the consequences is the depopulation of rural areas. With the movements of these two decades, the rural population has decreased significantly compared to the past and from the rural overpopulation of the pre-war years we have reached desolation and rural ageing.

Equally important was the impact of this migratory phenomenon on the rural clergy. Before the war, the place faced a problem of small arable land while, after the war, many areas remain uncultivated.

As far as the agricultural sector is concerned, the impact on crops has also been significant. With the flight of the large part of the population, farmers turned to individual crops of products, unable to practice the polycultural system of the past.

There was a big problem for the cities that received this migratory flow, especially the capital, Athens. A large city with a huge density was created, with the rest of the population spread throughout the rest of Greece. Thus, we have a hydrocephalus state, with a very large capital and an unequal distribution of the other population regions.

Very important is the over-concentration of the activities of the state apparatus, which are distributed in the capital, thus not leaving the development of the rest of the country. The impact of the current of urbanization is the unregulated construction of the large urban centers. Numerous buildings, anarchically located, compose the map of modern large cities. The change in social stratification is also important. By moving from the countryside to the cities, these people were forced to change professions in order to survive. This change could be in any sector (e.g., it may have dealt with tourism and services), moving horizontally but also often vertically in the social space. Finally, an accessory to urbanization can be considered as the problem of air pollution that we face. The unregulated construction, the over-accumulation of cars and motorbikes, led to the great ecological problem of our days.

Notes

1. The article is part of the writer's post-doctoral research, under the title "Institutional, economic, social and demographic transformations in Greece during the post-dictatorship era (1974-1996)".

Bibliographical References

- Anogiatis-Pele, D., Dimopoulos, D. and Mavreas, K., (2014). "The natural changes of the population in urban space in Greece during the period 1971-1998", in *Tetradia Istorikis Dimographias*, Corfu. (In Greek).
- Chouliarakis, M. (1988). *Developments of the population of rural areas of Greece, 1920 – 1981*. National Centre for Social Research, Athens. (In Greek).
- Dertilis, G. (2016). *Seven wars, four civil wars, seven bankruptcies 1821–2016*. Athens: Polis, (In Greek).
- Economou, C., Sabethai, I., Simigiannis, G., (Eds.), (2010). *Balance of the Current Transactions in Greece: Causes of Imbalances and Policy Proposals*, Bank of Greece, Athens. (In Greek).
- Emke – Pouloupoulou, I., (1998). *The Demographic*, Greek, Athens. (In Greek).
- Glytsos, N., P., (1994). «Incomes and remittances of Greek immigrants from Australia and their impact on Greece's balance of payments» in the *Inspectorate of Social Research*, Athens, 84, 106-131. (In Greek).
- Glytsos, N. (1994). «Morphological features of the national urban network», in the Kotzamanis, B. and Maratou, L. (Eds.), (1994). *Demographic developments in post-war Greece*, Livanis, Athens. (In Greek).
- Grigoriadis, S., (2011). *History of modern Greece, 1941 – 1974: Junta and resistance*. Volume 9, editions of C. K. Tegopoulos S.A., Athens. (In Greek).
- Hellenic Statistical Authority, (1980). *The population of Greece during the second half of the 20th century*, Athens. (In Greek).

- Hellenic Statistical Authority of Greece (1958). *Results of the population census of 7 April 1951*, National Printing Office, Athens. (In Greek).
- Hellenic Statistical Authority of Greece, (1962). *Results of the population - housing census of 19 March 1961*, National Printing Office, Athens. (In Greek).
- Hellenic Statistical Authority of Greece, (1977). *Results of the population - housing census of 14 March 1971*, National Printing Office, Athens. (In Greek).
- Hellenic Statistical Authority of Greece, (1985).** *Results of the population and housing census of 5 April 1981*, National Printing Office, Athens. (In Greek).
- Kanellopoulos, K.N., (1995). *Internal migration KEPE*, Exhibitions 21, Athens. (In Greek).
- Katochianou, D., (1994). «Economic and demographic restructurings in Greece», in the Kotzamanis, B. and Maratou, L. (Eds.), *Demographic developments in post-war Greece*, Livanis, Athens. (In Greek).
- Kazakos, P., (2001). *Between the State and the Agora. Economy and economic policy in post-war Greece 1944-2000*, Patakis publications, Athens. (In Greek).
- Koniordos, S., (2015). "The "development" of development programmes: The craftsmen and the dictatorship 1967-1974" at *Inspectorate of Social Research*, Athens, 103, 27-56. doi:<https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.153>. (In Greek).
- Kotzamanis, V., (1990). «The mobility of the rural population in the decade 1940-50 and its restructuring social-demographic map of post-war Greece: first approach» in *Inspectorate of Social Research*, 77, 97-126, Athens, doi: <https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.915>. (In Greek).
- Kotzamanis, V., (2000). *Demographic developments during the post-war period in the countries of Eastern Europe and Greece*, EKKE, Athens. (In Greek).
- Kotzamanis, V. & Maratou, L., (Eds.), (1994). *Demographic developments in post-war Greece*, Livanis, Athens. (In Greek).
- Kyriazi-Allison, E., (1998). «Internal migration in Greece in 1990: trends-concerns-prospects» at *Inspectorate of Social Research*, 96, 279-309, Athens, doi:<https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.736>. (In Greek).
- Liargovas, P., Patronis, B., (2011). «Economic policy in Greece, 1974-2000: nationalizations, state intervention or market economy?», in Sakellaropoulos, T., (Ed.), (2011). *Economy and politics in modern Greece*, Dionicos publications, Athens. (In Greek).
- Macedonia Newspaper*, (1979), sheet number 19.990, 29/5/1979. (In Greek).
- Manou – Pantazopoulou, E., (1999). *Elements of Administrative Law*, Ellin Publications, Athens. (In Greek).
- Maravegias, N., (2011). «State intervention in the agricultural sector in the period 1974-1985» at Sakellaropoulos, T., (Ed.), (2011). *Economy and politics in modern Greece*, Dionicos publications, Athens. (In Greek).
- Mavreas, K., (1998). «Dimensions of social exclusion: Pontian and Northern Epirus refugees in Greece», in *Journal of Social Research*, vol. 96 – 97, Athens. (In Greek).
- Moisisdis, A., (1986). *Rural society in modern Greece*, Foundation for Mediterranean Studies, Athens. (In Greek).

- Papadakis, M., (1994). «Morphological features of the national urban network», in the Kotzamanis, B. and Maratou, L., (Eds.), (1994). *Demographic developments in post-war Greece*, Livanis, Athens. (In Greek).
- Patronis, V., (2015). *Economic and social history of Greece (18th-20th century)*, Association of Greek Academic Libraries, Athens. (In Greek).
- Patronis, V. & Liargovas, P., (2017). «Social integration and economic policy during the years of the dictatorship in Greece, 1967-1974: the special role of the agricultural sector», in *Hellenic Review of Political Science*, 23(1), 107-137. doi: <https://doi.org/10.12681/hpsa.14735>, pp. 114-115. (In Greek).
- Petropoulos, N., (1994). «Repatriation 1971 – 85: Socio-economic and demographic dimensions» in Kotzamanis, B. and Maratou, L., (Eds.), (1994). *Demographic developments in post-war Greece*, Livanis, Athens. (In Greek).
- Poimenidou, A., D., (2018). «Culture, oppression and censorship. The perspective of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs», in Vlachopoulos, S., Kairidis, S., Klapsis, A., (2018). *The Dictatorship of the Colonels: anatomy of a seven-year period*, Pataki Publications, Athens. (In Greek).
- Reppas, P., (1997). *Determinants of the movement of the rural population*, Athens. (In Greek).
- Rizospastis Newspaper, (1974). Sheet number 72, 15/12/1974. (In Greek).
- Robolis, S., (1988). *Economic structure and migratory movements in post-war Greece*, the National Hellenic Research Foundation, *the rural world in the Mediterranean area*, Athens. (In Greek).
- Sakellaropoulos, T. (1992). «The post-war agricultural policy and the long-term trends for change», in Sakellaropoulos, T., (Ed.) *Economics and Politics in Modern Greece*. Volume I, Ed. Information, Athens. (In Greek).
- Sakellaropoulos, T., (2011). «State and Economy in Greece, 1922-1990: An Overview», in Sakellaropoulos, T., (Ed.), (2011). *Economy and politics in modern Greece*, Dionicos publications, Athens. (In Greek).
- Sotiropoulos, D., (2016). «The transition to democracy in 1974: Relativizing an intersection» in Passas, A., Sotiropoulos, D., Triantafyllopoulou, A. Tsekos, Th., (Eds.), (2016). *The Institutions in Greece of the Transition: Evaluation of a contradictory period*, Papazisi publications, Athens. (In Greek).
- Sotiropoulos, D., (2019). *Phases and contradictions of the Greek state in 20o century, 1910-2001*, Bookstore of Hestia, Athens. (In Greek).
- Tahydromos of Egypt Newspaper, (1975). Sheet number 50, 28/2/1975. (In Greek).
- Tsachouridis, P., (1988). «Agricultural exodus and alteration of the demographic profile of the Greek countryside», at the National Hellenic Centre for Research, (1988). *The rural world in the Mediterranean area*, Athens. (In Greek).
- Tsoukalas, K., (1987). *State, society, labour in post-war Greece*, Themelio, Athens, (In Greek).
- Tzortzis, I., (2020). *Greek Democracy and the Junta: Regime crisis and the failed transition of 1973*, I.B. Tauris publications, London.
- Vergopoulos, K. (1975). *The agricultural problem in Greece. The social integration of agriculture*, Exandas Publications. (In Greek).

Biographical Note

Stavros Pantazopoulos holds PhD from Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences. He teaches at the Department of Sociology, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, as a Special Scientific Associate. He is also a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Business and Organization Administration, University of Peloponnese. He works in the Administration Support Section of the Greek Public Employment Service (DYPA).

His research interests are based on the modern welfare state at national and supranational (European and international) level and social transformation. e-mail: st.pantazopoulos@panteion.gr