

XI World Congress of Rural Sociology

Globalisation, Risks and Resistance

Trondheim, Norway

July 25-30, 2004

Working Group 18: Globalization and Family farming social transformations: resistance and mutations

"The resistance of Greek farms: a curious evolution in the European context"

Eleftheria VOUNOUKI¹

Summary: Contrary to the other European Union countries, Greek agriculture does not face a problem of reproduction of its farms. It employs actually the highest number of farmers as a percentage of its total active population in the whole Union.

This paper deals with the reasons that produce this phenomenon: how do Greek farms manage to resist to a more and more liberalised environment, to the open market and the reduction of Union and State support? This fact becomes curious given the hostile natural environment (dryness, relief), the low productivity and intensification of these farms.

Greek agriculture's characteristics seem very close to them defined by the multifonctionality model of agriculture. This model of farms' functioning and organisation explain partially the permanence of Greek peasantry. As farms' reproduction passes through a logic that combines economic and social factors, it implies often family's reproduction too. Family strategies and large familial networks play an important role to this permanence. Generally, informal networks are mobilised in several ways in order to improve farms' internal organisation and relations with the external environment. Thanks to these networks, bureaucratic and other problems can be solved. But, at the same time these networks can put serious obstacles to farms' reproduction.

This complex context, which has been studied on winegrowing and cows-breeding farms in the north of Greece (in the department of Kilkis) prove the great sectorial heterogeneity concerning the farms' reproduction question.

Keywords: Farms' reproduction, Agriculture, Greece.

¹ CNRS - University Paris -X, Laboratory LADYSS ("Laboratoire Dynamiques Sociales et Recomposition des Espaces") Bat K - 200, ave de la République - 92001 Nanterre CEDEX, France, Tel 01.40.97.78.06 - Fax 01.40.97.71.55, Email: evounouki@free.fr (Private Address: 37, Kerassountos, 55131 Thessaloniki, Greece, tel. :+30 2310 417580)

This work treats the most central question related to the future of Greek agriculture: the reproduction of its productive structures. At the same time, it gives some elements that contribute to the comprehension of Greek agriculture's functioning and of its importance to the planning of the Common Agricultural Policy.

National level: Greece seems to be the paradise of farms' reproduction

A first approach resulting of an international comparison of statistical data, between Greece and other European countries, shows that the number of Greek farms has only slightly decreased compared to the number of the other European farms during the last years (table 1). The agricultural labor in these countries has also shown a rapid decrease because of their agricultural modernization and of their structures' increasingly size concentration (table 2). It's because of these facts that Greece is presented as a special case in Europe: Greek farms manage to resist better than farms in the other countries to a more and more liberalized environment.

So, at the first place we sought to identify the reasons that lead to this very different evolution in comparison with the European standards. We thus sought explanations in various fields. On the one hand, in the general characteristics of the agricultural Greek system, but also in an analysis of the national economy, as well as in the laws of succession and in the historical heritages of the rural world, and finally, in the analysis of the agricultural policies followed in Greece under the impulse of the State and the EU.

Some of the principal characteristics of this agriculture are the following: it employs a great part of the country's economically active population (17%), but this high rate of agricultural employment does not go with an important participation of the agriculture in the creation of country's wealth. In macro-economic terms, the sector remains marginal: its gross added value presents only 6,8% of country's gross domestic product and the agricultural trade balance is negative: Greece is a net importer of agricultural products, in value as in quantity. Greek agriculture is led by very small-scale farms (their average surface is 4,3 ha), parcelled out, in which family labour recourse has a primary importance. Moreover, pluriactivity is a generalized phenomenon, both in individual scale (of the farmer) and in agricultural households' scale. Farmers are relatively old, so that the good general level of farms' reproduction cannot be attributed to their entrepreneurial dynamism.

The study of the global data accentuates the paradox of farms' reproduction: the economic performances of this agriculture are not significant and the conditions of work in agriculture are not enough favourable in order to justify the high rate of agricultural structures' reproduction. The economic global context does not give either the justifying elements of such an evolution: the rate of general unemployment in the country is on the same levels as in the other European countries and thus does not justify a possible retreat into the agriculture and the countryside of rural habitants or urban ones which want to leave the city. Moreover, agricultural incomes are hardly attractive, especially in comparison with those of the farmers in the other European countries.

The history of the country, marked by the long Ottoman occupation and the egalitarian land reform that followed, left as an inheritance a great number of small, very fragmented and economically low profitable agricultural structures. The small agricultural communities installed on these farms knew a very important rural migration during 1960-'70. Although the Greek countryside has been emptied during these years, small "microfondia" farms endured thanks to the mobilization of family networks. In fact, an important characteristic of Greek migrations of people with rural origins was that the family members that did not emigrate took charge of the farms of their relatives that quit the country. On their side, Greek emigrants sent regularly money to the family members that remained at the village; money intended for the family's living expenses but also for the family farm (Damianakos, 1997).

This solidarity among family members constitutes one of the basic elements of what is called the Model of Greek agriculture's functioning. In fact, Greek agriculture, in a great part of the territory, continues to function according to standards founded on family solidarity (financial or physical mutual aid etc), pluriactivity, low level of mechanization and intermediate consumptions (pesticides, manure etc.) and on agricultural systems of extensive mixed-farming.

In our days, arrangements between family members still follow this same logic of family solidarity that mixes social and economic goals narrowly. These arrangements cancel out the negative effects of the egalitarian succession laws. The egalitarian division of the properties and the absence of strict land occupation plans could encourage the fragmentation of Greek farms and push to the multiplication of the number of the properties at a point where the farms survival would be threatened by their own number. Under these conditions, take over an economical viable farm would have required such an amount of repurchases that it would be impossible for the young successor to refund their joint-heirs. However, in practice, this refunding takes place on the basis of negotiation between family members who follow goals of economic, cultural, symbolic and emotional order. Even if family arrangements which rise from these negotiations play a very important role to the farms' transmission from one generation to another (in favourable terms for the successor), they do offer only a partial explanation to their high rate reproduction: the objectives of family arrangements is especially intended to avoid the parcelling out of the properties and/or of the farms and so they are only indirectly responsible for the maintenance of their number.

The collapse of the communist system and its consecutive events had particularly concrete, rapid and brutal consequences in Greece. The opening of the borders of the ex-communist block countries was a particularly advantageous episode of the history for the Greek farmers. Whether it appears durable or not, it has already largely influenced the evolution of the agricultural history of the country. A big number of immigrants, Albanian in majority, flowed into the country. A great part of these people found an employment in agriculture, at the point that the latter has become the first deposit of moonlighting, before the construction sector, for clandestine immigrants, who work hard for low remunerations (Lianos et al., 1996). This historical episode gave the opportunity to the Greek agriculture to use cheap labour instead of expensive material investments. Consequently, this labour contributes to the amelioration of the competitiveness of Greek agriculture as well as to its revitalization. This contribution is even more important in the case of economically fragile farms to the point that we can say that their present and their future are based on it, even though this labour is not easily quantifiable in general terms. Even if the contribution of the migrant labour force is very important to the farms' reproduction, it would be abusive to think that the good level of the Greek farms' reproduction depends entirely on it.

In fact, the high numbers of farms goes up during a former period. Before the entry of the country to the EEC in 1981, the Greek agricultural sector was surviving thanks to the efficiency of its traditional model of functioning (family solidarity, recourse to pluriactivity etc.) and this, in spite of a not very protectionist national policy. However, during the years that have followed the entry, Greece has not taken advantage of more favourable European Union's political measures than those applied to the other Member States. On the contrary, it seems that the CAP often supported more the productions of the north of the Europe than the specific products of the Mediterranean zone (Maraveyas, 1991).

During the decade of 1980s, Greece, which was already member of the EEC, should have seen its farms converging towards the European model of functioning. In fact, the entry of the country to the EU was supposed to converge its development level and its economy on those of the other European countries and to accelerate the modernization of its agriculture according to the model of the modern family farm of the North of Europe. This model would

impose a radical change compared to the former traditional model of Greek agriculture. But, the latter does not seem to have followed, at least until a certain point, (Papadopoulos A. G and Daouli, 1999) the same way and the same model of development as the agricultures of the other European countries. So, the entry of the country to the EEC has not led to a reduction of Greek farms' number.

The reasons for which this announced scenario was not concretized in the case of Greece cannot be found in the analysis of CAP measures themselves (Vounouki, 2004). But the study of these measures' implementation to the country level provides some interesting information. It was proved that the Greek State has very rarely pursued clear, sectoral goals concerning agricultural matters. On the contrary, it has always had a social point of view throughout CAP measures' implementation, while at the same time it has been using the modernisation discourse of the CAP in order to justify its choices. In fact, the common agricultural policy shows that this one was used like a cheap and consequently very effective instrument of a social handling of the rural world (Vounouki, 2004). In fact, thanks to it, the depopulation of rural areas was avoided. At the same time, the high employment offered by the agriculture has contributed to maintain the rate of unemployment on a relatively low level. So, the CAP has helped out to promote global socio-economic goals, as the economic stability and the social peace.

Contrary to the evolution in the countries of Northern Europe, the wave of modernization in Greece did not cause the disappearance of the extensive systems, which has remained often traditional and of low productivity (Beopoulos & Damianakos 1997). That's why following the CAP reform of 1992, "Greek farmers were reappraised by the CAP and GATT" (Jollivet, 1997). It was only after the agenda 2000, inaugurated in 1997-1999, when the emphasis was put on the multifunctional dimension of the agriculture that the analysts have started to judge the Greek case differently and to consider that its agriculture, at two or three speeds, can become a paradigm.

Another important specificity of the Greek case relates to the generalized utilisation of the informal networks. These networks cross the whole Greek rural and urban society and penetrate as well at the administration system. The CAP has relied on them for the implementation of its measures. But, at the same time it has reinforced them because CAP's important funds have passed through them. The reason of this is that the informal structures complete the formal ones in an effective way by carrying out some of the official tasks of the latter (Vounouki, 2003). The relations between institutional and informal networks are very delicate: the second ones never replace completely the first and the nodal positions of the ones often correspond to those of the others, so that the same person plays sometimes an important role on both sides. The relations between the two spheres are often organized on a clientelist basis. These relations justify, among others, the institutional complexity of the country's administrative structures at the same time as they contribute to exceed it. The mobilization of the informal sphere seems very important concerning farms functioning and reproduction.

The previous arguments contribute to determine a great number of explanations of the phenomenon of the good level of Greek farms' reproduction. In conclusion, we can find two types of explanations emerge on the question of successful reproduction of Greek farms. From the one side, a corpus of texts presents the Greek agriculture as essentially multifunctional, and, consequently, as having powerful weapons to resist the reduction in the number of his productive structures. On the other hand, another corpus presents Greek agriculture like handicapped by the artificial character of its productions: the productive structures have survived only thanks to European subsidies, attributed more because of political than of economic reasons, but this was just a temporary phenomenon and as these subsidies are going to come to an end, Greek farms will face serious problems.

These extreme positions are not solely in the scientific texts. One finds the equivalent of it, in the field, in the farmers' views when they evoke the advantages and the drawbacks of the local mutual aid, when they give their opinion on the role of agriculture to the development of the country or when they describe the ideal exploitation, which they have in mind (Vounouki, 2004).

In any case, these two positions, referring on various levels of reality and on different social fields (opinions collected during a field research and the scientific field) do underestimate two elements:

- The general good image of Greek farms' reproduction appearing through the global data does not take into account contradictions between national and local-scale data as well as differences between various productive sectors,

- In addition, they regard this good reproduction as a consequence or an by-product of a different reality, more or less conceptualized: the European policy, the clientelism which is an integral part of the Greek political life, the weakness of distinction between countryside and urban areas... without never considering farms' reproduction as a part of an ensemble, that can be shaped, in its turn, by this reproduction.

From our point of view, what characterizes Greek agriculture is not its capacity to reproduce its farms based on its own forces and according to an internal logic, but its capacity to use the opportunities. Since the land reform of 1920 and the beginning of the massive emigration of the Greeks towards the industrialized countries, the agricultural world always knew how to benefit from opportunities offered by its relations with the rest of the world. Firstly the financial returns of the immigrants, then the European financings and finally the flow of Albanian immigrants are chronologically the three major reference marks that benefit the Greek agriculture.

Departmental level: the image of paradise starts blackening

In order to go into the subject of farms' reproduction in greater depth, we study² two rural areas in the department of Kilgis in the north of Greece, on the borders with Macedonia ex-Yugoslavian (FYROM). Even though it is a rural area it is not located far from the big agglomeration of Thessaloniki (1 000 000 people). The primary sector plays an important part in the local economy. The department is in an intermediate situation from the point of view of its development level, so it is neither particularly favoured nor especially delayed.

If the data collected at the national level give a very positive impression as for the reproduction of Greek farms, those collected at the departmental level show a different aspect of the phenomenon: the number of farms in Kilgis falls (table 3). This fact means that either this department is a special one from the point of view of our subject, or that Greek agriculture's model of functioning does not fully work.

The first hypothesis was abandoned quickly because the data collected on this department showed that it is an ordinary area, rather representative of the Greek countryside. Moreover, it was for this reason that it has been chosen; so that the results of the field research can be transposable, at least partly, to the other departments of the country.

During this analysis, it became obvious that the Greek agricultural model of functioning has too much been idealized. If it could explain during a long period the good reproduction of Greek farms, this is not the case anymore. In order to look out the reasons of this weakness, we refine our analysis which was remaining too macroscopic, even on a departmental scale, in order to be able to escape from the effects of statistical globalisation which hides the diversity of the situations (sectoral, cultural, economic etc). A local study has been carried out into two zones of the department: Goumenissa which is a semi-mountainous

² The results that are presented here come from the author's field research for her PhD thesis.

area, far away from urban centres and Picrolimni which is in a plain area, closer to the urban centres of Kilkis and Thessaloniki.

The two areas are comparable in terms of population's density, but they appear very different in terms of space organization: in Goumenissa, local life is organised around a central big village while in Picrolimni such a centre does not exist. Because of its enclosed geographical situation, the first zone undergoes a slow reduction in its total population, while the second one gains in population, as it is included in the external commute belt of Thessaloniki. The demographic evolution of the two zones influences obviously their dynamism and the decision of the young people that intend to start working in agriculture, because such a decision means also the acceptance of a parallel territorial attachment. This attachment is very strong in the case of the agriculture because this job imposes a strict space framework on both personal and professional life.

Into these zones we contacted all the young farmers (under 40 years-old) that have recently set-up in agriculture (less than two years) in order to be in accordance to the European's community definition of "the young farmer".

The results of the surveys carried out showed that the young farmers give a great importance to their residence area. That comes out especially from their aspirations concerning living standards and leisure facilities equivalent to those of the rest of the Greek society. Even if they think that rural life (and countryside in general) provides a certain quality of life, they always seek a certain degree of services. In fact, the rural area is appreciated as long as it is not identified with isolation. For this reason, the car plays an important role to the life of young rural people, because it does not only represent a symbol of success and wealth but also the link between rural and urban areas.

For the above reasons, we could believe that the reproduction of farms located in the zones having an easier and more rapid access to the urban centres would have been higher than in the distant and relatively isolated zones. However, data concerning cow-breeding farms in the zone nearest to urban centres (Picrolimni) and wine-growing farms in the zone of Goumenissa prove the opposite (table 3). That shows that the geographical proximity of the urban centres is an important but not a sufficient condition to ensure the reproduction of the agricultural structures in the concerned areas. It should be noted that the urban influence on the arable lands of Picrolimni cannot explain this evolution: if the old villages are occupied more and more by commuters, the number of new constructions remains very limited and the landscape remains dominated by the field crops.

Sectoral level: varied configurations of the model of Greek operation

The analysis of the research results showed finally that among the discriminating factors allowing to identify the farms that are being reproduced better than the others, the most important is the production sector: this is the result that arises from the comparison of reproduction levels of wine and cow-breeding sectors. The number of farms remains stable and high in the case of the wine-growing farms of Goumenissa whereas it falls quickly in the case of stockbreeders of Picrolimni.

The two studied sectors present a series of similarities and differences. To recapitulate: both are confronted with similar obstacles set by the CAP. These obstacles, which take the form of milk quotas in the case of the stockbreeders and of a strict, "locked-up" register in the case of winegrowers, intend to control the global production in order to avoid surpluses. However, at the same time, they restrain the free entry of new farmers in these sectors. An other common element between the two sectors is that the farmers' interests are in both cases very badly defended by farmers' unions and cooperatives, which fulfil their role very badly. This is the reason why young farmers feel excluded from the political system. This feeling is much stronger in the winegrowers even if they are not dominated by a system as rigid as that

of the milk quotas. Despite the fact that the cows-breeding sector is dominated by a powerful administration, stockbreeders felt more able to influence the relevant to their sector policy.

This opinion of the stockbreeders, linked surely to the strict administrative regulation of the sector, contradicts the macroeconomic analyses, which show that Greek stockbreeders are in a rather marginal position in the frame of negotiations in the European Union. In fact, even if their sector is very well protected by the CAP (following the example of all European livestock productions), this protection is designed to be more adaptable to the agricultures of the northern European countries, which are specialised mostly towards this type of production. So, in every scale (European, national or local), the capacity of negotiation of the Greek dairy stockbreeders is very weak. They are in fact very underprivileged because of the weakness of the total number of milk quotas allotted to Greece by Europe. However, neither this fact nor the crisis of the sector, resulted from its too high productivity, do stop some of them idealising the model of development of the sector in Northern Europe. Indeed, this is the reason why their great majority thinks that their position is less favourable than the position of their European counterparts.

Moreover, some other common elements between the two sectors have also emerged related to farms' ways of functioning. Such an element is the great importance of the domestic community to the starting-up of the professional career of young farmers. In fact, the great majority of starting-up realised within a family framework. A numerous family strategies concerning the designation of the successor and the choice of the moment of farms' transmission were found. In most of the cases, the young successor is one of the family's sons and very rarely it's a daughter. In addition, the young successor is often the less educated of all the brothers and sisters of the family; it seems as if the latter accept to follow longer studies as a reward for leaving their farm part to the successor, because their diplomas can help them to find easier a well-paid job. Even if these family strategies exist, we have to note the absence of clear and regular correlation between the temporality of the starting-up of the young successor and the different important events of the family life (marriages, births, retirements etc). This fact is the result of the great confidence that Greek young farmers grant to the family support and the fact that both agricultural and family life are attached indissolubly. Besides, all family members, including the former farm manager, feel always concerned by the family farm. As a consequence, the change of the farm manager has rarely been considered as a rupture that causes a radical transformation on the power relations among family members. Although, this fact does not mean that they do not exist any tensions or conflicts between family members during the change of the head of the family farm.

The unity and the cohesion of the domestic group remains one of the principal objectives of any family decision and act. Thus, even if the passage of the family farm from one generation to another change the family relations with its external context, the relations between family members do not change. The contribution of the family to the functioning of almost all the farms remains paramount: financial aid, participation of the family members in agricultural tasks and in the decisions concerning the farm etc. However, this importance does not constitute a point of differentiation between the exploitations of the two sectors. Subsequently, it is not in the sociological analysis of the family that we found the explanation of the different rate of reproduction between the two sectors, because the recourse to family aid is the rule in all the farms that have been studied.

On the other hand, what influences strongly a farm reproduction and on its functioning is the access to information. Family and public relations' networks, which insert young people in broader formal or informal networks, often ensure this access.

If the general conditions of production regulation and family relations present strong similarities, it is on an intermediate scale that we found clear differences between the two sectors.

Concerning trade circuits, large wine firms dominate the wine ones. Contrary to the stockbreeders who are completely submitted to the large marketing firms, winegrowers have more possibilities to escape from the large distribution chains completely or partially. However, when winegrowers collaborate with them, they become very dependent and the relations between producers and firms take an almost interpersonal aspect. But, this dependence turns less strong by the fact that the winegrowing is often only a part of a mixed-farming system. On the contrary, the commercial relations developed within the milk trade circuits are weaker and impersonal and they concern the near total group of the stockbreeders. In their case almost the totality of their cultures are used primarily as animal feed.

The possibility that only the winegrowers have to escape from the large commercial circuits is due primarily to the nature of their product. The wine is a quality product, having a personal character, which gives more opportunities to develop alternative forms of transformation and marketing, like the *tsipouro*, a traditional Greek aperitif. These qualities allow the production and the diffusion of the product out of the official commercial circuits. Moreover, they permit the deployment of a multitude of informal arrangements through a wide system of exchanges. However, these are exactly the practices that reinforce the social bonds and structure the informal networks of cooperation and mutual aid. On the other hand, milk is a mass product and its marketing passes almost obligatorily through large milk firms.

An important difference between the producers in the two sectors is the greater number of pluriactives winegrowers compared to the stockbreeders: the first ones are more than the double of the second ones. However, pluriactivity is among the fundamental elements of the traditional definition of the Greek agriculture's model of functioning. We can assign this phenomenon to the nature of the two productions: cows-breeding needs a much more regular workload than the winegrowing whose workload is concentrated only over certain periods of the year. No matter which is the reason of this difference between the two sectors, it seems that winegrowing comply more with the traditional functioning model of Greek agriculture than cow-breeding. We can then allot the best reproduction of winegrowing farms exactly to this fact. On the other hand, it seems that the productivism was gained ground in the stockbreeders, causing the conventional processes of land concentration and disappearance of a significant number of farms.

In a parallel way, and always because of the differences in the marketing of the two products, the apparently similar institutional production's supervision does not have the same effects in the two sectors. In both cases, the institutional system, which supervises the two sectors, is inefficient regarding its official missions (in particular concerning the control of the production volumes). In addition, in both cases, informal networks, parallel to the administrative structures, have been developed. These networks function in a more flexible way than the official ones because they resolve partially the problems related to the bureaucratic inertia.

In the case of milk, the greatest rigidity of the administrative structure leads to the constitution of vertical networks that are modeled on the administrative pyramid. The horizontal networks developed at family, local or friendly base have a very weak influence on the vertical networks. In the wine sector, official and informal networks coexist in a rather peaceful way. This coexistence ensures the good conditions of winegrowing farms' reproduction and leaves margins for alternative development to their principal activity to the winegrowers. However, this is not the case in the cow-breeding sector. Although the stockbreeders are more actively implicated to mutual aid networks than the winegrowers, they remain blocked and imprisoned in a very complex and rigid official system, which is subordinated to the vertical powerful informal networks. Contrary to the wine sector, the informal, parallel to the official structures networks of the milk sector do only increase the

already important official restrictions. These networks, organized by qualified civil servants, take advantage of the Community funds. Controlling the milk quotas, these people have created a whole informal market from which they have earned substantial financial and symbolic returns. Consequently, they act as negative forces to the reproduction of cow-breeding farms.

Apart from this sectoral farms' differentiation, there is another one related to the various farms types. Starting from the farms characteristics and their heads behaviors, a typology has been elaborated in the basis of four models of functioning: from the more "peasant" to the more "professional". Between these two categories we defined two intermediate types, which approach the first or the second previous ones, with the only difference that the head of the farm have also a second alternative activity, parallel to the agriculture one.

Each of the previous models has some strong points as well as some weaknesses with regard to the question of farms' reproduction. However, it is important to emphasize that for the moment, the Common agricultural policy has not led to significant differences in the levels of farms' reproduction of these various categories. That can possibly change in the future, but we do not see why the "peasant" model should suffer more tomorrow than today: the farms of this model have a serious handicap because of their low level of modernization in an increasingly competitive environment. But, in same time, this model is the subject of a renewed interest because of the current call into question of the productivism.

On the contrary, farms that belong to the "professional" model approach more to the standards of functioning of the north European farms and consequently could survive easier in a liberal and competitive environment. But the problem for these farms is linked to the fact that the years of the promotion of the productivist model have already passed and the new common policy's guidelines do not promote any more the quantity but the quality of the products.

Lastly, farms of the "alternative" models' categories represent many advantages, because they are less dependent on the Community subsidies and on the market fluctuations. Moreover, they go together more with the new CAP's orientations and especially with the promotion of the multifunctionality in the countryside. In addition, they maintain numerous links with Greek farms' traditional functioning. It is difficult to evaluate the evolution of the farms' number that will manage to follow these "alternative" models because this evolution does not depend only on the agriculture but also on the evolution of the rest of the country's economy. However, it seems that the effectiveness of the opportunism that characterize the Greek agriculture depends less on the farm's type than on the sector of production because of the different configuration of the networks than this sector implies.

To draw a conclusion, the field research enabled us to distinguish that behind the general characteristics and the global statistical data of the Greek agriculture is hidden a great sectorial heterogeneity concerning the farms' reproduction question.

Table 1: Evolution of farms' number in the south European countries and in France, 1990 - 1997 (x1000)

	EU-15	Greece	Italy	Portugal	Spain	France
1990	8 582,9	850,1	2 664,5	598,7	1 593,6	923,6
1993	7 253,7	819,2	2 488,4	489,0	1 373,6	801,3
1995	7 370,1	802,4	2 482,1	450,6	1 277,6	734,8
1997	6 989,1	821,4	2 315,2	416,7	1 208,2	679,5
% (1997/1990)	-19%	-3,5%	-14,1%	-30,4%	-24,2%	-26,4%

Source: (EUROSTAT, 1990-1997)

Table 2: Active agricultural population as a percentage of the global active population

	EU³	Greece	Italy	Portugal	Spain	France
1980	7,4	30,3	14,2	28,6	18,8	8,8
1981	8,1	30,3	13,3	26,7	18,9	8,6
1982	7,7	30,7	12,4	26,8	18,3	8,4
1983	7,6	30,0	12,4	23,6	18,0	8,1
1984	7,4	29,4	11,9	23,8	18,0	7,9
1985	8,5	28,9	11,2	23,9	18,5	7,6
1986	8,2	28,5	10,9	21,9	16,1	7,3
1987	8,0	27,0	10,5	22,2	15,1	7,1
1988	7,4	26,6	9,9	20,7	14,4	6,7
1989	7,0	26,6	9,3	18,9	13,0	6,4
1990	6,5	23,9	8,8	17,8	11,8	5,6
1991	6,2	22,2	8,5	17,6	10,7	5,4
1992	5,8	21,9	8,2	11,7	10,1	5,2
1993	5,6	21,3	8,2	11,8	10,1	5,1
1994	5,5	20,8	7,9	11,6	9,8	4,8
1995	5,3	20,4	7,5	11,5	9,2	4,6
1996	5,1	20,3	6,7	12,2	8,6	4,8
1997	4,9	19,9	6,5	13,3	8,3	4,6
1998	4,7	17,8	5,8	13,7	7,9	4,4
1999	4,5	17,0	5,4	12,6	7,4	4,3
% (1980/99)	-39,18%	-43,89%	-61,97%	-55,94%	-60,63%	-51,13%

Source: (EUROSTAT, 1980-1999)

Table 3: Evolution of farms' number (%)

	Total (Greece)	Total (Kilkis)	Cows breeding (Picrolimni)	Wine-growing (Goumenissa)
1971/1981	- 17,73%	- 28,99 %	Non available	+ 2,76 %
1991/1999	- 5,49%	- 12,91%	- 58,33 %	+ 28,39 %
1961/1999	- 22,20%	- 38,15%	n.a	- 12,82%

Source: (Service National des Statistiques de Grèce, 1991, 1999); (Organisme du lait, 1999)

³ It concerns the EUR-9 in 1980, the EUR-10 till 1984, the EU-12 till 1991 and the EU-15 beyond this year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Damianakos, S. (1997). The ongoing model of Greek Agriculture. *Sociologia Ruralis* 37, 190-208.
- EUROSTAT (1980-1999). "Statistiques de base de la Communauté."
- EUROSTAT (1990-1997). Base des données: Eurofarm et Eurorégio.
- Jollivet, M. (1997). Les métamorphoses d'un rural incertain. In "Vers un rural postindustriel. Rural et environnement dans huit pays européens" (Environnement, ed.), pp. 351-371. L'Harmattan, Paris.
- Lianos, T. P., Sarris, A. H., and Katseli, L. T. (1996). Illegal immigration and local labour markets: the case of Northern Greece. *International Migration* XXXIV, 449-484.
- Maraveyas, N. (1991). Agriculture méditerranéenne et politique agricole commune: l'expérience de la Grèce. *Options méditerranéennes* série A, 159-165.
- Organisme du lait (1999). "Données concernant les éleveurs de la Grèce du Nord." Organisme du lait, Thessalonique.
- Papadopoulos A. G, and Daouli, J. (1999). The Impact of EU structural policy measures upon areas lagging behind in development and the survival of family farming in Greece. In "Rurality in Europe at the threshold of centuries" (A. Editura, ed.), pp. 18-33, Athènes.
- Service National des Statistiques de Grèce (1991). "Résultats de recensements de l'agriculture." Service National des Statistiques de Grèce, Athènes.
- Vounouki, E. (2003). L'agriculture grecque: multifonctionnalité, politique agricole et réseaux sociaux informels. *Economie Rurale* La multifonctionnalité de l'activité agricole, 184-194.
- Vounouki, E. (2004). La reproduction des exploitations agricoles en Grèce. Deux études pour une remise en question du modèle agricole grec. Doctorat, Paris X - Nanterre, Paris.