Center for European Studies
Working Paper No. 99

MINISTERIAL ELITES IN GREECE, 1843-2001: A SYNTHESIS OF OLD SOURCES AND NEW DATA*

by

Dimitri A. Sotiropoulos and Dimitris Bourikos**

The study of Greek political elites used to be concentrated on parliamentary deputies. Ministerial elites were rarely studied. In this paper, we take a long-term view of the Greek ministerial elites, studying their socio-political profile from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. We find that this profile does not change so much with regime change, but instead follows political developments at certain time points within specific regime periods. At these points, new political leaders were ushered into power. Examples were Eleftherios Venizelos in 1911 and Andreas Papandreou in 1981. Changes in personnel were not accompanied by changes in geographical origin or professional outlook, which took much longer to effect. In the nineteenth century mainly landowners and state officials dominated cabinets. After the beginning of the twentieth century, however, liberal professions, particularly lawyers, were overrepresented among ministers. This pattern continued throughout the twentieth century. Both the predominance of lawyers and the changes in the profile of ministers over time are attributed to the type of state built in modern Greece, a clientelist, overcentralized and legalistic state which only recently has started its transformation, requiring a different, more modern type of politician.

---

*From the workshop on "Who Governs Southern Europe: Cabinet Members in Portugal, Spain and Greece," organized by Michael Baum, May 3, 2001.

**Dimitri A. Sotiropoulos is Professor of Political Science at the University of Athens. Email: dsotirop@hol.gr Dimitri Bourikos is a political scientist who has studied at the University of Athens.

The study of political elites has a long tradition in political science. Because this type of study has been subjected to reasonable criticism, as being descriptive and elitist, it lost momentum in the post-war period. Since the mid-1970s, it has resurfaced as a comparative study of bureaucratic, parliamentary, and ministerial elites (Dogan 1975; Putnam 1973, 1976; Aberbach, Putnam and Rockman 1981; Czudnowski 1983). Since the late 1980s, there has been a revival of the study of political elites in connection with successive waves of democratization in southern Europe, Latin America, and eastern Europe (Burton and Higley 1987; Higley and Gunther 1993; Eyal, Szelenyi and Townsley 2000). If there have been so many similar previous studies, and some of them have a debatable explanatory potential, why study political elites again? Indeed, the study of elites offers a static view of society and a circumscribed view of politics, limited to the attitudes of people at the top of the political system. However, given the increasing importance of the executive branch of government throughout the twentieth century and the preponderance of the state in southern Europe, the study of social background characteristics, credentials, professional origins and career pathways of ministers constitute a first step toward explaining who holds political power, how, and why.

THE LIMITS AND PROBLEMS OF PAST APPROACHES TO GREEK POLITICAL ELITES

The discussion of political power is sometimes neglected in studies of elites, since they tend to focus on profiles of individuals rather than on structures. The lack of focus on power is also relevant to the different concerns of modernization theories, which have motivated many studies on political elites of developing societies. Examples from the Greek case can illustrate some of these problems. There is a study of Greek ministerial elites in 1946-76 which tries to answer the question whether the renewal of those elites has kept pace with the modernization of Greek economy and society after the Second World War (Koutsoukis 1982). The study concludes that the rise of a new urban elite of technocrats and the spread of universalistic criteria in society have not influenced the recruitment of ministerial elites, which remain traditional in their profile: "There is a lag between elite transformation and socioeconomic change" (Koutsoukis 1982: 21). This kind of reasoning, although placing the study of elites in an evolving socioeconomic context, has difficulties explaining research findings since it tends to neglect the intervening political structures, such as political regimes, parties and state structures, which shape individual behavior. Despite its problems, the above study contains useful empirical material which will be presented in this paper.

Equally problematic is another approach to elites, which basically recognizes a divide between elites and masses and, in the case of developing societies, tries to map relations between the two in terms of vertical, individual patronage ties. In studies which adopt this approach, patron-client relationships are understood as benefiting the partners of the relationship. There is a relevant, often cited study of Greek politics which covers the period 1843-1965 and includes a historical survey of Greek cabinet ministers (Legg 1969). Legg's monograph has been criticized from a theoretical point of view (Mouzelis 1978). It is woven around the idea that "the essential element of Greek politics" is "the clientage system based on the mutual obligations of individuals" (Legg 1969: 313-14). In a typical functionalist fashion, the concept of clientelism becomes the main explanatory device of many observed differences of the Greek political system from other democratic systems. Despite its merits in terms of comparative analysis, this is a one-dimensional explanation which not only tends to ignore issues of collective action, including class conflict, but also underestimates the fact that patron-client ties are essentially power relationships.

However, the above study also contains empirical material useful for the purposes of our analysis.

Since the "locus" of power *par excellence* used to be and still is the modern state, one may try to trace linkages between the evolution of elites and the development of the state in modern society, in other words, to note parallelisms between the historical trajectory of a certain state and the changes in the profile of political elites which have been at its helm. Research on elites may not necessarily be compromised by the theoretical problems noted above. While the sketched criticisms are valid for some of the relevant literature, the study of political elites is not necessarily an empiricist exercise, limited to registering the average values of variables which characterize members of parliament, cabinet ministers and top civil servants, such as gender, age, education, profession, and social class origin. Studying elites is not meant to imply that the study of politics is limited to examining the "mental maps" and political activities of a handful of powerful people either. Even though such maps and activities are very useful to know, the study of elites, such as the governing ones, is meant to show which social groups and categories prevail politically in a certain society in the sense that they are overrepresented in the centres of political decision-making. Presumably, this also means that we can predict how the costs of any new public policy may be distributed. For instance, when a new tax is to be levied among various social sectors, those groups and categories which prevail politically may be affected the least. This can be analysed in terms of the interplay of "social" with "political capital," which may serve as a useful conceptual insight.

It is possible that research may go beyond aggregates of individual elite characteristics and focus on outlines of career pathways to power, as Costa Pinto, Tavares de Almeida, and Bermeo suggest (2000). It may also be possible to look at background characteristics and credentials of individual ministers with the aim of reconstructing linkages of ministerial elites not only to political decision-making areas but also to centers of social and economic power. For current elites this may be feasible. For past elites, one has to rely on existing sources, which may have been conducted with a different aim, because of different concerns (see a list of primary sources on Greek elites in the last section of the appendix of this paper). There may also be historical periods with no relevant sources at all and other periods with a few sources conceived within an outdated theoretical framework, for example, postwar structural functionalism, in the context of which elite studies, such as the aforementioned two studies of Greek elites, were conceived.

As is well-known, structural-functionalism was particularly interested in social and political stability. Even though this current of thought helped push aside the earlier empiricism of social science research, it offered a static view of politics and society, a snapshot of who were the elites and what were their attitudes at a single point in time. It is possible to overcome this static view by introducing a macro-historical perspective, that is, an analysis of changes in elites over time. By studying the evolution of the social profile of governing elites over time one may obtain a dynamic view of politics and society. One may confirm or refute the hypothesis that any long-term changes at the level of social structures may be reflected at the level of the top officials of the political system. It is interesting to show how the social composition of governing elites is to a certain extent affected by changes which have already taken place in society. The reverse may also hold true: elites may and indeed often do change faster than the society to which they belong.

In this vein, our principal aim in this paper is to construct the social profile of Greek ministerial elites on the basis of several variables and then to discuss which political and social trends have been manifested at the level of cabinet ministers over approximately one and one-half century (1843-2001), by placing such trends in the context of large-scale political and societal changes. In concrete, the study of political elites, and especially of ministerial elites, may be fruitful if placed in the context of political regime alternations and wider social changes.

This paper continues with a section on the modern Greek state and society and on the availability and limitations of data on Greek ministerial elites. In the main body of the paper the following variables are compared in a diachronic manner: average cabinet size and cabinet duration, number of ministers and prime ministers, age, gender, geographical and regional origin, occupation, education, political longevity and political nepotism of Greek ministerial elites. The comparisons are attempted in the time span between 1843 and 2001, while contrasts between the ministerial and the parliamentary elites are presented for the period 1974-2001. Finally, in the last section there is discussion of the findings and conclusions.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE MODERN GREEK STATE

The modern Greek state was established as the Kingdom of Greece in 1830, after the successful War of Independence fought against the Ottoman Empire in 1821-27. During this war three national assemblies of representatives of the Greek revolutionaries took place and national Greek governments were formed. This was the period of the First Greek Republic (that is, the first political regime without a king). Detailed studies on Greek politics during the first half of the nineteenth century (Petropulos 1968; Loukos 1988) and the few such studies of the second half of that century (Kitroeff 1990: 150), point to the painful emergence of modern political institutions, suffering from factionalism, in a premodern, predominantly agrarian society.

The role of ministerial elites is commensurate to the role of the state in society. It has been suggested that the nineteenth-century Greek state was comparatively over-developed (Tsoucalas 1983). The development of twentieth-century Greek society can also be understood in the light of the large presence of the state in society. That is, it can been analyzed on the grounds of the growing importance of the state for Greek populations living inside and outside its borders and of the state's intervention in more and more sectors of social life (Hadjiiossif 1999b: 10-11). This observation may help us assess the rather large size of Greek ministerial elites: Legg (1969) counted 931 ministers in the period 1843-1965, while Koutsoukis (1982) counted 589 ministers in the postwar period of 1946-76. These figures are probably the result of high government turnover, particularly in the nineteenth century and the interwar period, as well as the result of the expanding activities of the state and the concomitant proliferation of ministries. The study of the particular political and economic development of Greece can go some way towards explaining this trend. For instance, the economic power of Greek shipowners should be related to the existence of a separate Ministry of Naval Commerce, while an unfortunate tradition of periodic police surveillance and oppression may be linked to the preservation of a separate Ministry of Public Order. This ministry (which is still in existence) may be regarded as a relic of earlier periods of dictatorial rule or of restricted democratic freedoms.

In addition to the large number of ministers, another particular aspect of our case is the distance between appearances and reality. In Greece – as in other southern European countries – there is a recurrent distance between formal principles and procedures, on the one hand, and substantive social and political developments, on the other. Such developments lie hidden below the level of the formal functioning of the system, which is encoded in constitutional provisions. In other words, Greek formalism is part and parcel of the political system and presents an issue for systematic political analysis (Mouzelis 1978). Formalism is manifested as legalism in the form of multiple and contradictory regulations that govern Greek political and economic life. Excessive legislation is a recognizable aspect of the Greek state. The large presence of lawyers among the members of parliamentary and ministerial elites, which will be indicated later in this paper, is related to formalism and legalism. If one is impressed by the size, the rather high educational level, the legal expertise, and the cosmopolitanism of Greek ministerial elites, which will be shown below, then one may draw the wrong conclusions about the

quality of Greek political elites. Their performance in managing the state and the economy has varied a lot and has often been at odds with what their typical credentials would indicate. Also the number of ministers of Greek governments may have been inflated, not so much because of real governing needs but because of the tendency of some Greek prime ministers to accommodate political allies and friends by inventing new ministerial posts.

A somewhat similar point can be made for the formal and informal aspects of modern Greek democracy. At the formal level, to the extent that democracy used to be equated to parliamentarism, modern Greece is one of the oldest European democracies. Constitutional monarchy emerged first in 1843, the year our analysis starts. However, this was not a democratic regime. If universal male suffrage is an indicator of the advent of modern democracy, modern Greece is a comparatively early democracy since the suffrage was established in 1864, earlier than in many European countries. If, however, another indicator is adopted, that is, the appointment of new governments on the basis of majority rule in the parliament, the date is moved to 1875. Since then, in a span of 125 years, most governments in Greece have been democratically elected, with the exception of very short intervals of authoritarian rule (1925-26, 1936-40 and 1967-74, that is, for a total of twelve years) and occupation by foreign powers (Germany, Italy, and Bulgaria in 1941-44).

While the difference of democratic from authoritarian periods is clear, a note on the kind of democracy is necessary. In substantive terms, the quality of democracy in Greece has been uneven, particularly during the First World War and the two decades following the end of the Second World War. In those times, some democratic procedures, including the exercise of a few human rights, were restricted. This point does not imply that democracy in Greece was just a façade for long periods of time. After all, during the twentieth century, pure authoritarian rule lasted only for twelve years in Greece. However, throughout a long period, roughly between 1830 to 1974 – even during some periods of democratic rule – the political participation of some categories of the population (for example, members of the left-wing parties, women) was constrained. Women voted and took part in parliamentary elections for the first time in 1953, while the Communist Party was outlawed between 1947 and 1974. Also there have been various interventions, both domestic (for example, by the King in 1965) and foreign (for example, by the U.S. ambassador in the early years of the Cold War) which have affected the size, composition and duration of some Greek governments. Although there were functioning democratic institutions in Greece in 1946-1967, the postwar democratic regime as a whole was weak and frail (Nicolacopoulos 2001). It was not until after 1974 that a full-fledged democracy was established (Diamandouros 1986, Voulgaris 2001). Taking into account such domestic and foreign confining conditions may help place the study of elites in perspective.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE EXISTING LITERATURE ON GREEK POLITICAL ELITES

On the topic of Greek ministers, there is a single chapter of the aforementioned monograph by Keith Legg covering the period from the mid-eighteenth century to the mid-1960s (1843-1965; Legg 1969: 297-311). Legg has studied the educational background, occupation, family tradition in politics, and regional origin of ministers for the above period. (His biographical data for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are not always reliable and are drawn on biographies of politicians cited in an encyclopedia, *the Megali Hellenike Encyclopedia,* in parliamentary records, and in two postwar editions of the Greek *Who's Who.)* Legg has also conducted a sample survey of fifty-five parliamentary deputies of the 1964 parliament (Legg 1969: 301, 303, 320 and 345). There is also a compilation of data on all Greek prime ministers and ministers of foreign affairs (Makrydemetris 1997 and 2000).

For the period up to the end of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century there are books and articles of political history with biographical data on selected politicians (usually in an appendix, for example, Veremis 1997), and biographies of a few prominent prime ministers (Flerianou 1999), but no studies synthesizing the material. One may find lists of the members of all governments since the early 1830s (Ailianou-Tsingou 1959; Dakin 1972; Provatas 1980 and, among the primary data sources, Koukounas 1999). However, in such sources the names of politicians are usually cited with only one additional piece of information, such as the ministry in which they served (Dakin 1972: appendix B) or the region or prefecture in which they were elected (Enossi teos Vouleuton 1995). There is also some biographical data on military officers who later engaged in politics (Veremis 1997).

For more in-depth analysis one may go to a single case study on nineteenth-century Greek politicians of a southern region (Achaia) by Christos Lyrintzis (1991). His study contains details of the family trees and the *cursus honorum* of politicians who originated in that region (Lyrintzis 1991: appendix 1). The author traces the decline of old-style notables (in Greek: *tzakia*). The notables prevailed in politics in the greater part of the nineteenth century, basing their political domination on family tradition, intermediation between local society and central government, social esteem, personal status, and the rental of taxes. Leaving economic development to merchants and rich farmers, they became full-time politicians by developing patronage relations with the lower urban and rural strata. However, in the last two decades of the nineteenth century they faced economic crisis and antagonism from the rising urban middle classes, which were represented by a new political elite, primarily composed of merchants and lawyers. Gradually, just before and just after the turn of the nineteenth century, the state and new political parties started playing a growing role. The new political elite employed innovative means of political domination, such as control of political party mechanisms and expertise on administrative and financial matters, and became a protagonist of the political scene in the first decade of the twentieth century (Lyrintzis 1991: 181-83). Many Greek historians have underlined the importance of the *coup d'état* of 1909 as a turning point in Greek politics (Dertilis 1977; Mavrogordatos 1983; Veremis 1997). The main relevant point is the renewal of the Greek parliamentary elite, evident in the composition of the two parliaments elected immediately after the *coup d'état* of 1909. As Legg writes: "The prevailing recruitment pattern was abruptly broken in October 1910. The revolution of 1909, the political intervention of junior officers, and the leadership of Eleftherios Venizelos brought new men into top political roles." However, "although the events of 1909 brought new men into the political arena, the leadership, even among the new men came from families wealthy enough to send their children abroad for study" (Legg, 1969: 302, 304).

For the twentieth century there are no in-depth studies of particular groups of politicians. Good research exists only at the level of parties and their social bases (Mavrogordatos 1983). To start with, we may divide the period 1910-41 into two sub-periods, one of which is longer than the other. The first, longer, sub-period (1910-36) includes almost ten years of continuous wars (the two Balkan Wars, the First World War and the Asia Minor Catastrophe) between 1912-23; but it also includes the Second Greek Republic of 1924-35. The second, shorter, sub-period includes the Metaxas dictatorship (1936-41). The tables presented in this paper reflect this division into two sub-periods, 1910-36 and 1936-41, since the periods correspond to two sharply different regimes. The period of the war and occupation of Greece (1941-44) is not studied in this paper, since political power rested in the hands of the German, Italian, and Bulgarian armies, which divided the territory of Greece among themselves and appointed authorities at will.

The postwar period can be divided again in two sub-periods. First is the period of restricted democracy (1944-67), during which the Left was to a large extent excluded from the political system since it was closely monitored by the state mechanism. Second comes the period of the Colonels' au-

thoritarian regime (1967-74). For the first thirty years of the postwar period (1944-76), there are some data in Legg (1969) and only one survey of cabinet ministers, in the aforementioned study by Koutsoukis (Koutsoukis 1978 and 1982). The latter's survey focuses on a few social variables and is based on published biographical data for the ministers who served in governments of the right and the centre (1946-67), the military dictatorship (1967-74) and the first elected conservative government (New Democracy Party – ND) after the fall of the dictatorship. The work of Koutsoukis is based on various secondary sources (such as Ailianou-Tsigou 1959 and the *Megali Hellenike Encyclopedia*), Greek periodicals and the daily press, international sources such as *Keesing's Contemporary Archives* and informants in Greece and the USA (Koutsoukis 1982: 40).

The names of cabinet ministers are available in very rare sources (Embassy of the U.S.A. in Greece 1971), but other relevant information is limited only to the ministry they served and the period of their tenure. For the Colonels' regime (1967-74) there are very few sources (Diamandouros 1986; Athanassatou *et al*. 1999) which cover systemic rather than personnel aspects of the rise and decline of that dictatorship. Short biographical notes on the political fate of a few high ranking military officers who became ministers in cabinets during 1967-74 can be found in newspaper archives and parts of books (Woodhouse 1985: x-xii; Meletopoulos 1996: *passim*, Papachelas 1997: 433-39).

Finally, for the immediate post-authoritarian period (1974-81), there is no specific analysis of ministerial elites. However, there are a few studies of the parliamentary elites (Metaxas 1981; Peridkares 1981) and in particular of the parliamentary deputies of the Socialist Party (PASOK, by Nicolacopoulos 1977 and 1981) and of the conservative party (ND, by Pappas 1999). Data on some party cadres of the socialist party are available for very few electoral districts for the period 1974-81 (Lyrintzis 1983; Spourdalakis 1988). For the decades of the 1980s and 1990s there are only newspaper articles on parliamentary elites, usually published in the aftermath of each national election.

On the basis of existing research, it is possible to compare Greek ministerial elites with parliamentary elites. Some ministers, who were card-carrying party members, have not been elected to parliament. They have been appointed as ministers, since the current Greek constitution (of 1975, amended in 1986 and in 2001) does not require ministers to be members of parliament. Other ministers, of both socialist and conservative governments, have started their political careers without first passing through the party hierarchy. Yet, if we assume that politicians of the two larger political parties (ND and PASOK) that have alternated in power since 1974, form a wider "political class," we may try to compare results on our research on ministerial elites with results of the available studies on parliamentary elites (Metaxas 1981; Perdikares 1981; Nicolacopoulos 1977, 1981 and 2001; Lyrintzis 1986; Drettakes 1991; Pappas 1999). This is a legitimate comparison since governments in post-authoritarian Greece have since 1974 been single-party majority governments. With the exception of a ten-month period (June 1989-April 1990) during which coalition governments were formed, since 1974 (that is, for the last twenty-eight years), the socialist party (PASOK) and the conservative party (ND) have enjoyed the absolute majority of parliamentary seats while in government (ND – 1974-81, PASOK – 1981-89, ND – 1990-93, and PASOK since 1993).

Sources and Validity of Data

Because of this dearth of information, we have made an effort to find new, unpublished data on Greek cabinets and ministers. We have sought such data in rare publications (such as leaflets issued by parties during electoral campaigns) which contain biographical notes on politicians and in newspaper reports, published each time new governments are sworn in. New data could not be found for the period until the end of the Second World War. Until that period our analysis is based on Legg (1969). It was

possible to do field research and find new data for the postwar period (1944-67) and for the post-authoritarian period (1974-2000). For the postwar period there was some data by Koutsoukis (1982). His data cover the period 1946-67 and 1967-74. We thought it important to compare the findings of Koutsoukis with our own, which refer to those postwar politicians who served as ministers at least three times in 1944-67. (While Koutsoukis started counting in 1946, the year of the first postwar elections, we started with the first Greek government of the postwar period, formed in the fall of 1944 when the country was liberated.) We found that in this period 166 ministers had served three times or more. Data were available for only 107 of them (whom we will call the postwar inner elite). We were interested in finding out whether these ministers shared any traits which set them apart from the rest of the members of postwar cabinets.

We did field research also for the post-authoritarian period, in an attempt to present, for the first time, empirical material on post-1974 Greek ministerial elites. As noted above, this involved research on all those who had served as ministers, that is, on 411 politicians, and particularly on 139 politicians who served as ministers at least three times. This post-authoritarian inner elite of 139 politicians was selected out of the 411 individuals who had served as ministers at least once between July 1974 and October 2001 (including the new October 2001 cabinet of Costas Simitis, but excluding all caretaker cabinets).

Table 1
Number of cabinets and ministers

	1843-78	1878-1910	1910-36	1936-41	1944-67	1967-74	1974-2001
Cabinets	43	27	39	2	30	4	13
Prime Ministers	17	9	21	2	17	4	7
Ministers	147	96	300	34	288	147	411

Source: Elaboration of Legg, 1969, p. 298, Table 12.1 for the period 1910-1964, of Makrydemetris, 2000, p. 158, Table 14, and own research. In case of discrepancies, our own research is used. The number of ministers in 1944-1967 is underestimated due to lack of reliable data for 1944-1946. Koutsoukis (1982) starts counting from 1946.

Our hypothesis was that after the Second World War, and again after the fall of the Colonels' regime, there was in Greece an elite within the ministerial elite, that is, a smaller set of politicians who were able to reproduce their political power. The thinking behind this hypothesis is related to the well-known trend of elite reproduction, the effort of those in power to retain their posts and prolong their stay in power. The effort obviously involves limiting the access of com-petitors to the same posts. The idea is familiar not only to students of political elites but also to sociologists. As it is well known, Robert Michels (Michels 1966) has talked about the "iron law of oligarchy"; while Max Weber and later Frank Parkin have discussed the related concept of "social closure," to describe the self-reproducing behaviour of upper social classes (Parkin 1971).

But, in the first place, is there such a distinct inner ministerial elite in Greece? This is an interesting, albeit secondary, question of our essay. To answer this question, as we noted above, we sampled those politicians who had been ministers for at least three times (excluding caretaker cabinets) in 1944-67 and in 1974-2001. The primary question of our paper is the following: what is the evolution of the social profile of Greek ministerial elites? In order to answer this question, we have made a diachronic presentation of these elites in 1843-2001. We have attempted the comparison in terms of age (at first cabinet office), gender, occupation, geographical origin, education, political career (office held before the ministerial appointment), and family involvement in politics.

Before continuing, a note on the validity of data is pertinent. Generally, the data of this paper are more reliable for the second half of the twentieth century than for the previous periods. In what fol-

lows, we have tried to match three sources (Legg 1969; Koutsoukis 1982; and our own research) that may be based on different definitions of variables, and the corresponding operationalizations may differ. As a rule we have tried to make our definitions conform to the lowest common denominator of the other two sources, in order to trace historical patterns of the same variables. For example, in studying the regional origin of ministers we have added the share of ministers from the Peloponnesus region to the share of ministers from the Sterea Hellada region, since Legg had done so in his research, and it was also possible to present the data of Koutsoukis in the same manner. Such compromises may be debatable, but we think that the general picture is true, to the extent that the original pieces of information are correct.

It should be remembered that data on ministers can be found basically in the curriculum vitae of politicians which are submitted by themselves and cannot be verified by independent researchers, given the very large size of ministerial elites. For instance, it should be noted that the percentages of military educated ministers in Table 7b do not always correspond to the equivalent percentages of former military officers in Table 6 which presents an occupational distribution of ministers. The same holds for other fields of study such as law, medicine, and engineering, which differ from the corresponding shares of lawyers, medical doctors, and engineers in the table presenting the occupational distribution of ministers.

In addition, since some ministers have declared that they have studied more than one subjects or that they have exercised more than one professions, multiple coding has been used in the relevant tables. In short, discrepancies among tables are owed either to unreliable information found in the biographies of ministers or to multiple coding or to the percentage of unknown or unspecified occupations and fields of study.

PERIODIZATION OF THE EVOLUTION OF GREEK MINISTERIAL ELITES

The seven historical periods for which we have obtained some comparable data are the following: first, the early period of constitutional monarchy in the nineteenth century, which roughly lasted between 1843 and 1878. The cut-off point is set at 1878 because in that year the last of the members of the old political elite (Admiral Voulgaris) passed away (Legg 1969: 300), while a little earlier (in 1875) the King (George I) had accepted the principle that the post of the prime minister was to be held not by any political leader of his choice, but the leader who enjoyed the "declared" confidence of the parliament's majority.

Second, the period at the turn of the century, 1878-1910. The cut-off point is set at 1910 although the regime did not change in that year, but in 1924, when the monarch was deposed and the Second Greek Republic instituted (it lasted until 1935). However, in 1909 there was a *coup d'état* by military officers who sought to circumscribe the powers of the royal family. At the invitation of the coup's leaders, the charismatic Cretan politician Eleftherios Venizelos appeared on the political scene of mainland Greece. With him, a new party system emerged owing to the creation and high electoral success of his new party (the Liberal Party). This shake-up could be seen as the functional equivalent of regime change in 1910.

Third, the period of the Balkan Wars, the First World War and the interwar years, which is the period 1910-36. Venizelos would dominate Greek politics until the mid-1930s. His conflict with the king (Constantine I) would polarize Greek politics throughout this period. In fact, after the defeat of the Greek army by the Turkish army in Asia Minor (1922), political turmoil followed, the king fled into exile, and a republic was instituted (1924-35).

Fourth, the period of the Metaxas dictatorship, 1936-41. This was a brief but brutal dictatorship led by a former military officer, Ioannis Metaxas, and favored by King George II. The king left the country in 1941, when Greece was occupied by Nazi Germany, Italy and Bulgaria. The occupation armies left in the fall of 1944 and an armed clash between the communist partisan forces, on the one hand, and the royalist Greek army, on the other, took place in the late 1944.

Fifth, the restricted democracy, which lasted from 1944 to 1967. Parliamentary elections took place in the spring of 1946 and the monarchy was reinstituted by referendum in the autumn of the same year. A Civil War between the right and the left took place in 1946-49. During this war, parties of the right and the center ruled in coalition. After the end of the Civil War, in which the left was defeated, there was a long period of restriction of political rights for all those suspected of leaning to the left. This was a period of domination of Greek politics by three political forces, i.e., the King, the army, and the right-wing political elite (with interludes of governments of the center in 1950-1952 and in 1963-1965). Democratic freedoms were exercised to the extent that they did not disturb this tripartite power block. The 1950s and 1960s were also a period of economic reconstruction and uneven and dependent development. In the early 1950s the right was organized in a single party, which remained united – although it changed titles and leaders (it was first led by Alexander Papagos, then by Konstantine Karamanlis).

The center remained fragmented until the early 1960s. It was then united under the leadership of George Papandreou (the father of Andreas Papandreou) but ruled only for somewhat less than two years (1963-65). The left was represented by a party (EDA), which attracted the votes of the communist side of the Civil War and independent socialists and left-leaning democrats. EDA gained strength during the late 1950s but its activities were monitored by the state apparatus (the army, the police, and the justice system). Monitoring became repression during the next, sixth period.

Sixth, the Colonels' regime, which lasted from 1967 to 1974, was a purely military dictatorship, which was not institutionalized (Diamandouros 1986), was unable to gain roots in society, and gave way to democracy after the Cyprus debacle in the summer of 1974. This debacle somewhat diminished the political role and social status of the Greek military.

Seventh, the current, post-authoritarian period of the republic (the Third Greek Republic), which was proclaimed after a referendum that took place in late 1974, after the fall of the dictatorship.

For each of the seven periods there is data only on the aforementioned variables and for samples of different sizes. Thus, there is data for 147 ministers in the period 1843-78, for 96 ministers in 1878-1910, and for 300 ministers in 1910-36 (on the basis of Legg 1969); for 288 ministers in 1946-67 (on the basis of Koutsoukis 1982), and for 107 ministers of the same period who were appointed at least three times (on the basis of our own research), for 147 ministers in 1967-74 (on the basis of Koutsoukis 1982); and for 411 ministers in 1974-2001, as well as an inner elite of 139 politicians who were appointed to a ministerial post at least three times between 1974 and 2001 (on the basis of our own research). So for the period 1944-67 and for the period 1974-2001 there are four samples, that is, two all-compassing samples and another two samples that are subsets of the former ones.

The first sample – postwar sample I – and the corresponding post-authoritarian sample I –are all encompassing and include all ministers. The samples exclude those ministers who participated in caretaker cabinets, formed for short intervals a few months before general elections in order to oversee electoral procedures. (An example is the cabinet of I. Grivas, which was formed for a few weeks during the autumn of 1989.)

The other two second samples are smaller, are only a part of the corresponding first samples, and include those politicians who served as ministers at least three times between 1944 and 1967 (postwar sample II) and between 1974 and 2001 (post-authoritarian sample II). As noted earlier, "sample II" constitutes the elites within the elites, that is, one inner elite for the post-1944 period and another for the post-1974 period. The point is to see whether there is any meaning in setting apart as a social and political elite those politicians who had frequent participation in cabinets.

To sum up this section, there are very few primary sources, and even fewer secondary sources, for some periods of Greek political history. Yet, despite the limits posed by the lack of primary and secondary sources, it is possible to review some patterns of the social background, credentials, and modes of selection of members of the Greek ministerial elites. We now proceed with a short presentation of the absolute numbers of cabinets, prime ministers, and ministers in 1843-2001.

THE EVOLUTION OF MINISTERIAL ELITES IN GREECE, 1843-2001

Number of Cabinets and Ministers

There are data for the number of cabinets, prime ministers, ministers, as well as the average cabinet size and duration (Tables 1 and 2). Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century there was high cabinet instability, but there were not many different Prime Ministers (Table 1). In the second half of the nineteenth century the number of cabinets exceeded by far the number of people who became prime ministers. A small number of political leaders prevailed over the political scene. They presided over feeble political parties (which were "parties of notables") and were able to shuffle and reshuffle their cabinets.

Table 2
Number of cabinets, average cabinet size and average cabinet duration (in months)

	1843-78	1878-1910	1910-36	1936-41	1944-67	1967-74	1974-2001
Cabinets	43	27	39	2	30	4	13
Av. Size	6.4	6.0	12.3	23.0	25.1	29	37.3
Av. duration	9.5	13.5	7.2	30.0	8.2	21.8	25.1

Source: Elaboration of Legg, 1969, p. 298, Table 12.1 for the period 1910-1964, of Makrydemetris, 2000, p. 158, Table 4 and own research. Koutsoukis (1982, p. 88, Table 3) gives different figures. In case of discrepancies, our own research is used.

By contrast, in the first few decades of the twentieth century, there was a high turnover of both cabinets and Prime Ministers. This was the result of extraordinary systemic changes in Greek politics, including what amounted to regime change in 1910 (and the passage of the constitution of 1911), the schism between liberals and royalists which reached a high point in the mid-1910s, the installation of the Second Republic in 1924, and the frequent presence of the military in politics (the *coup d'état* of 1909, the very short-lived authoritarian regime of 1925-26, an aborted pro-liberal military coup in 1935, and the onset of Metaxas's dictatorship in 1936). Thus it can be argued that because of the parallel volatility of cabinets and Prime Ministers, the period of 1910-36 (which in this paper is treated as a whole) presented more overall political instability than the previous periods under study.

While during the comparatively short dictatorships of 1936-40 and 1967-74 there were inadvertently few cabinets and Prime Ministers, during the intervening period of 1944-67 cabinet instability was high and the number of Prime Ministers comparable to that of the interwar period, that is, also high. This time, political instability cannot be attributed to systemic changes or military interventions. Rather it was the outcome of the lack of mass political parties (with the exception of the Greek Communist

Party – KKE, which, however, was outlawed in the postwar period, between the time of the Civil War and the fall of the Colonels' regime).

Extreme fragmentation characterized the political parties of the right and center in the immediate postwar period. As noted above, the center remained fragmented until the end of the 1950s. With the exception of the KKE, it was not until 1974, with the emergence of PASOK, and until 1981, with the fall of ND from power and its subsequent reorganization, that parties of the "mass type" appeared in Greek politics.

Two other tendencies can be observed in regard to cabinet formation. The first is related to the above tendency of prolonged political instability. The instability is also manifested in the duration of cabinets, which averaged less than one year in the nineteenth century and in the interwar period. Duration was three times longer at the end of the twentieth century (that is, during the post-authoritarian period, see Table 2). The second tendency is related to the number of ministers per cabinet. The average size of cabinets grew steadily from one historical period to the next. This tendency must be attributed to the increasing presence of the state in economy and society, which was a world-wide trend during the greater part of the twentieth century.

Average Age

Owing to lack of data, diachronic comparisons on the average age of ministerial elites can be made only for the second half of the twentieth century. At the end of the twentieth century, Greek society was ageing. Along with Austria, Germany, and Italy, Greece had one of the lowest fertility rates in Western Europe. It is expected that by the mid-twenty-first century, the elderly will constitute a sizeable proportion of Greek society. In that respect, Greek politicians remaining active in politics until old age, seem to underline this general societal trend.

In Greece during the late 1980s and the early 1990s a common impression about the political elite was that it consisted of very old politicians. There were some facts justifying this impression. At the end of the 1980s the leaders of the three largest political parties (Andreas Papandreou of PASOK, Costas Mitsotakis of ND, and Charilaos Florakis of KKE) were in their early seventies. Other leaders were older still. For instance, Konstantine Karamanlis, founder of New Democracy and former Prime Minister (1955-63 and 1974-80), and Xenofon Zolotas (postwar governor of the Bank of Greece), were to come back in 1990 (in their eighties), the former as President of the Republic, the latter as Prime Minister in a short-lived coalition government (November 1989-April 1990).

Yet, if one looks at the larger picture of Greek ministerial elites, this impression is not borne out by the facts. Between 1946 and 2001, the average age of ministers at first appointment was lower during the post-authoritarian period (1974-2001) than during either of the two previous regimes (1946-67 and 1967-74 – see Table 3). With regards to the inner elite of 107 ministers, their average age was slightly lower than the wider ministerial elite of the period 1946-67 as a whole. This does not alter the general picture, which is that of a decline in the age of ministers during the last quarter of the twentieth century. The fall in the mean age of ministers was probably due to the rise of a new political elite, the PASOK ministers who formed many successive cabinets in the 1980s (Lytintzis 1986).

Table 3

Mean age of ministers at time of first appointment

1946-1967		1967-1974	1974-2001	
(I)	(II)		(I)	(II)
52.3	48.6	52.9	48.7	46.3
(N=288)	(N=107)	(N=147)	(N=411)	(N=139)

Source: Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 91, Table 4 for 1946-1967 and our own research. The caretaker cabinets are excluded. There are no data for the pre-1946 periods. In the postwar period, sample (I) is reported as in Koutsoukis. Postwar sample (II) includes only those ministers who held office three or more times between 1944-1967. The same holds for post-1974 sample (II).

The picture of the parliamentary elite is different. A trend of rising age is observable among parliamentarians between 1977 and 1981 and again between 1985 and 1989. This trend can also be observed during the 1990s. In detail, and in terms of age, the ND's parliamentary groups, formed after the elections of 1974 and 1977, looked rather old. More than two-thirds of the conservative deputies were over forty-five years old (68 percent of all ND deputies in both the parliament of 1974 and the parliament of 1977). In the parliament elected in 1981 the deputies of the new governing party, PASOK, were comparatively younger: 58 percent of the socialist deputies were over forty-five years old, but this percentage rose to 78 percent in the 1985 parliament. This change was partly due to the fact that in the general elections of 1985, preferential voting, that is, the freedom of voters to choose among many candidates of their preferred party in the same district, was abolished by the PASOK government. In that year, party lists were formed by the party leaderships and candidates were placed on the lists in hierarchical order, mostly on the grounds of their leverage with the party leadership. The average age of deputies in the 1985 parliament was higher than that of the 1981 parliament. In 1989 preferential voting was reinstituted and in the two consecutive elections of that year the average (mean) age of all parliamentarians fell slightly (from fifty-one years to forty-five). In the parliament elected in 1990, among the deputies of the governing conservative party, again more than two-thirds (65 percent) were over forty-five years old (Drettakes 1991: 25, Table 1.4; for ND; also, for the same party, Pappas 1999: 95 and 98). When in 1993 PASOK replaced ND in power, 68 percent of the socialist deputies were over forty-five years old (our own research). When PASOK was again returned to power in 1996, the share of deputies over forty-five years old rose to 75 percent. In the parliament elected in 2000 the share remained the same (75 percent). The main finding is that in terms of age there was a renewal of the parliamentary elite in 1974 (at the regime change), in 1981 and again in 1989. Another finding is that, compared to the past, the parliamentary elite of PASOK, which came to power in 1993, is composed of relatively older deputies.

The same cannot be said for the ministerial elite, however. During 1981-89 the mean age of socialist ministers was approximately forty-six. During 1990-93 the corresponding mean age of conservative ministers was fifty-three, while in 1993-2000 the mean age of socialist ministers was forty-four (our own research).

The post-1974 inner elite of 139 ministers did not differ much in this respect (their mean age was approximately forty-six). The most important general finding is that there was a noticeable decline in the mean age of ministers during the 1980s and the 1990s. This was probably due to the rise of a new political party, PASOK, in power. The elite of this party included young members of the resistance against the Colonels' regime who, after 1974, chose to follow a political career and obtained ministerial posts in 1981 and 1985 when PASOK won two consecutive electoral victories.

In short, the first impression about the advanced age of contemporary Greek ministerial elites is wrong. If anything, while the general Greek population has gradually aged and the average age of the parliamentary elite has fluctuated, the ministerial elite seems to have become younger.

Gender Distribution

Traditionally, Greece has been and remains a male-dominated society. This is reflected in the gender composition of ministerial elites for the largest part of the last 150 years (Table 4). During the postwar era, this pattern was visible both in the all-encompassing and in the inner elites. During the last quarter of the twentieth century, Greek women made inroads into both higher education and the labour market, particularly in the service sector. However, they have not yet been admitted to political institutions to an equal degree.

Table 4
Gender distribution of ministers (%)

	1843-78	1878-1910	1910-36	1936-41	1946-67		1967-74	1974-2001	
					(I)	(II)		(I)	(II)
Male	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.7	100.0	100.0	94.2	95.0
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	5.8	5.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	147	96	300	34	288	107	147	411	139

Source: Legg, 1969, p. 302; Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 89-90, and own research for postwar sample (II) and for the period 1974-2001. Postwar sample (II) refers to the period 1944-1967 and includes those ministers who held office at least three times.

To students of southern European politics it comes as no surprise that Greek ministerial elites have been male-dominated. The peak of this trend was the cabinets of the Colonels' regime, in which no women were included. Comparing the pre-authoritarian with the post-authoritarian period, we see a small improvement in the most recent period (Table 4). While almost no women were included in the cabinets of the constitutional monarchy (1946-67), approximately 5 percent of all ministers in the post-1974 republic were women. This improvement was probable due to the fact that Andreas Papandreou's 1981-89 and Costas Simitis's 1996-2001 PASOK governments and Costas Mitsotakis's conservative government of 1990-93 each included a few women. The largest participation of women in government occurred in the PASOK cabinet formed by Simitis in April 2000, when five of the forty-three ministers and deputy-ministers were women.

The observed trend is also reflected in the gender composition of the Greek parliament (Metaxas 1981; Perdikares 1981). Women are vastly underrepresented in all of the parliaments formed between 1974 and 2000. The proportion of women parliamentarians ranged from 2 percent in 1974 to 8 percent in 2000 (our own research). Overall, women are still excluded from the top echelons of Greek politics, although their role has increased in Greek society.

Geographical and Regional Origin

Over time Greece has become a society with a very uneven urban-rural distribution. As has been the case in other southern European societies, Greece has witnessed large waves of external and internal migration throughout the twentieth century. In the postwar era, these waves took the form of migration from the rural areas towards Athens and Piraeus, which together form the country's largest urban center. At the same time, there is a popular impression that the country's political personnel used to

come disproportionately from the Peloponnesus and, more generally, from the regions of southern Greece. This trend is related to the fact that, until the First World War, the territory of the Kingdom of Greece was limited to, roughly, the southern half of the present Greek state. During the nineteenth century, these original territories included the southern part of what is today the country's mainland (Peloponnesus and Sterea Hellada, the so-called "Old Lands") because these territories were acquired by the modern Greek state at the time of its inception. The ministerial elites came more often from this area than from the so-called "New Lands" that were acquired during the 1910s (see data in Table 5a and in Legg 1969: 308, Table 12.7).

The urban area of the capital, which includes Athens and Piraeus, has grown disproportionately since the early 1920s, when it received an influx of migrants from the Greek-speaking areas of Asia Minor, and particularly since the end of the Second World War, when internal migration has led to the gradual desertion of entire villages. Today, around 40 percent of the population of Greece lives in this conurbation. This corresponds with the current preponderance of Athens in the economic, political, and administrative life of Greece. However, it was not always like this.

The Importance of Sterea Hellada and Peloponnesus

It was natural that political elites in the new kingdom would come mainly from the "Old Lands," mostly from the Peloponnesus, where the War of Independence (1821-27) had begun. However, as the state expanded to include other Greek-speaking populations living in the mainland of the Balkan peninsula and in the islands (the "New Lands"), the representation of politicians and administrators coming from the "Old Lands" (the original kingdom) did not decrease commensurately. In the eyes of some Greeks, the state was, for a long time, staffed by an "Old Land" officialdom who gave preferential treatment to the interests of the population living in those parts of the country. To what extent was this image true over time? Tables 5 and 5a point to the importance of southern Greece and of the country's capital city in modern Greek politics.

Table 5
Place of birth of ministers

	1843-1878	1878-1910	1910-1936	1936-1941	1946-1967 (I)	1946-1967 (II)	1967-1974	1974-2001 (I)	1974-2001 (II)
Athens	2.0	21.9	18.6	8.8			20.4		
Major provincial	-	-	-	-	-	9.3	-	8.8	5.8
Rest of country	89.2	75.0	69.7	76.5	84.9	63.6	79.6	51.8	64.0
Abroad	-	-	-	-	-	6.5	-	1.5	2.8
Unknown	8.8	3.1	11.7	14.7	7.4	0.0	-	18.4	6.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.	100.	100.0	100.	100.
N	147	96	300	34	300	107	147	411	139

Sources: a) Legg, 1969, p. 308, Table 12.8; b) Koutsoukis, 1989, p. 108, Table 2, and c) own research. Legg only goes up to 1965 (postwar sample I). Koutsoukis has no equivalent data for the immediate post-war period (1946-1967). In the postwar period, sample (I) is reported as in Legg. Postwar sample (II) is based on our own research for the period 1944-1967, as are data for 1974-2001. A dash signifies that no data are available.

In detail, if one may judge the relative influence of the southern regions in Greek politics from their share of cabinet members in the total of Greek ministers, then the peak of this influence occurred during the mid-nineteenth century. However, this finding needs to be differentiated. We had better compare the share of ministers from certain regions against the relative share of the population of these regions as a proportion of Greece's total population. In other words, one may compare the ratio of the

population of these regions in the total population with the corresponding ratio of ministers from the same regions in the total of members of ministerial elites. The comparison, made on the basis of information provided by Legg (1969: 308, Table 12.7) and by our own research, shows that the political influence of the "Old Lands" was disproportionately large in comparison to their share of the population between 1910 and 1967. However, this does not hold true for the periods prior to 1910 and after 1967.

Table 5a
Regional origins of ministers (%)

	1843-1878	1878-1910	1910-1936	1936-1941	1946-1967		1967-1974	1974-2001	
					(I)	(II)		(I)	(II)
Athens and Piraeus	2.0	21.9	18.6	8.8	15.1	20.5	20.4	19.2	20.8
Peloponnesus and Sterea Hellada	53.8	50.9	39.0	49.9	28.2	41.0	32.0	23.0	25.8
Ionian islands	6.8	10.4	6.0	11.8	3.9	6.5	2.7	4.3	5.8
Thessaly	–	1.0	4.7	5.9	5.9	4.7	2.0	7.0	7.2
Epirus and Crete	11.5	9.3	6.3	2.9	10.0	11.2	4.1	10.1	12.0
Macedonia, Thrace, and the Aegean islands	4.0	–	5.3	2.9	10.3	7.3	8.2	14.4	16.0
Dodecanese islands	0.7	–	0.7	–	1.0	1.8	0.7	1.4	2.2
Other (& diaspora)	12.2	3.1	7.7	2.9	6.4	6.5	5.4	2.4	3.6
Unknown	8.8	3.1	11.7	14.7	15.9	0.0	18.4	18.2	6.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	147	96	300	34	288	107	147	411	139

Sources: Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 97, Table 8; Legg, 1969, p. 308, Table 12.7, and own research for the postwar sample (II) and for the period 1974-2001. The percentage totals of Koutsoukis do not add up to 100 percent. In this table the geographical regions rather than the official administrative peripheries are used, since the latter did not exist before 1986. Some geographical regions are shown together because Legg (1969), who studied the nineteenth century, lists together regions incorporated in Greece at approximately the same time. Our own postwar sample (II) covers the period 1944-1967.

Whilst the data are not very reliable, prior to 1910 it would appear that the influence was not large given that the share of ministers coming from Peloponnesus and Sterea Hellada did not exceed the share of the total population living in these areas. As far as the period after 1967 is concerned, that is, the period of the Colonels' authoritarian regime and that of the post-authoritarian republic, the situation was as follows: on the basis the censuses of 1971, 1981, and 1991, the population of the southern regions accounted for 52 percent, 53 percent, and 53 percent respectively of the Greek population. The comparable shares of ministers were 52.4 percent for the period 1967-74 and 42.2 percent for the period 1974-2001 (our own research; the cited percentages refer to the added percentage shares of ministers coming from Athens, Piraeus, Peloponnesus, and Sterea Hellada in Table 5a). The conclusion is that

during both the Colonels' regime and the Third Greek Republic, the "Old Lands" as a whole were not overrepresented within the ministerial elites.

However, if one focuses on a specific area of the "Old Lands," that is, the region of Peloponnesus, and compares census data on the population of the southernmost region of Greece's mainland with the share of Peloponnesian ministers, the result is different. The population of Peloponnesus between 1971 and 1991 was almost stable and ranged from 10 to 11 percent of the total population of Greece. In the two regimes of this time (the Colonels' and the post-authoritarian regime), Peloponnesian ministers accounted for 22 percent and 17 percent respectively of all ministers in the wider elite. This result was true also for the post-authoritarian inner elite (20 percent of the 139 persons who were appointed as ministers three or more times were Peloponnesians). It seems that, during the last twenty-five years of the twentieth century, the Peloponnesus region has continued to be overrepresented within Greek cabinets.

The Importance of Athens

Even after the addition of new lands (such as Thessaly) to the Kingdom of Greece, "the original kingdom, including Athens, continued to be the dominant region" during the nineteenth century (Legg 1969: 310). While during 1843-78, a considerable portion of ministers came from Greek-speaking areas outside the Kingdom's borders, by the turn of the nineteenth century this portion had diminished considerably, and the newly acquired territories remained underrepresented. During 1878-1910, Athenians were overrepresented among ministers (Athenians accounted for 21.9 percent of all ministers; see Table 5; while only 9 percent of the Greek population lived in Athens in 1907).

In 1910-36, the proportion of Athenians fell slightly; however, compared to its the share in the population, Athens remained over-represented within the elites. This held true even after the addition of the "New Lands" of northern Greece (as a result of Greek victories in the Balkan and First World Wars) and after the influx of Asia Minor refugees following the 1922 defeat by the Turkish army.

Under the Metaxas dictatorship of 1936-41 there were fewer Athenians ministers than ever (8.8 percent; Table 5), while the predominant regions were again Peloponnesus and Sterea Hellada (Table 5a). Characteristically though, during the Metaxas regime the number of ministers from the Ionian islands, i.e., the dictator's homeland, doubled in comparison with the immediately previous historical period (see Table 5a and Legg 1969: 308, Table 12.7).

To what extent did these trends hold during the postwar period? Data from the three successive political regimes in 1944-2001 show a steady presence of Athenian-born politicians among the overall ministerial elite (the per centage of Athenians remained around the 20 percent mark – see Table 5). However, there was a variation, as the over-representation of "Old Lands" (mainly Peloponnesus), continued throughout the postwar period (Legg: 308, Table 12.7). Moreover, our own research on the postwar period shows that the presence of ministers coming from the "Old Lands" was very accentuated among the inner elite of 107 ministers of 1944-67. In fact, with the exception of the Metaxas regime, in no other period of the twentieth century was overrepresentation of "Old Lands" as high as during the post-Second World War period.

During the 1967-74 authoritarian regime, Athens and the "Old Lands" were still strongly represented among the ministerial elites. In the post-authoritarian regime, data shows similar trends, but this time there was a rise of ministerial elite representation from Macedonia, Thrace and the Aegean Sea Islands (Table 5a). In total, these regions included more than half of all ministers. Over time we see the increase in representation from the northern region of Macedonia. This development may be attributed to the fact that, over time, and with internal migration, many politicians came from the urban centers,

among which the most prominent was Thessaloniki – the largest city of the Macedonian region. Between the Colonels' regime and the Third Republic there was also an increase in the number of ministers from Crete. This development may be explained by the fact that Crete has been a traditional PASOK stronghold.

In sum, in the past most ministers came from Peloponnesus and Sterea Hellada. This trend declined somewhat in the last stages of the "unification of Greece" (Dakin 1972), that is, with the acquisition of territories in the Balkans with Greek-speaking populations in the twentieth century. Over time, the importance of Peloponnesus has declined, but this region has never lost its primacy among Greek regions in terms of its share of ministers. At the same time, there has been a gradual increase in the share of Athenian and Macedonian ministers. These changes may be accounted for by the postwar currents of internal migration towards the largest cities (Athens and Thessaloniki), where a sizeable portion of contemporary ministers were born. At the end of the twentieth century, Peloponnesus and Athens remained overrepresented within the ministerial elite. This particularly holds true for the inner elite of the postwar and post-authoritarian period (Table 5a).

Occupational Background

Which occupations and professions predominated within Greek cabinets? On the basis of Table 6, we may observe the following trends: on the one hand, lawyers have always been – and remain – the largest single professional category among ministers. Their significance diminished only during periods of authoritarian rule. The reasons for the large representation of lawyers in ministerial elites will be discussed in this section.

Table 6
Ministers' occupational background before first ministerial appointment (%)

Occupation	1843-1878	1878-1910	1910-1936	1936-1941	1946-1967		1967-1974	1974-2001	
					(I)	(II)		(I)	(II)
Military	21.8	25.0	18.6	26.4	12.5	14.9	25.6	3.1	2.7
Judge or public Prosecutor	–	–	–	–	1.4	5.9	8.8	0.7	0.7
Diplomat	–	–	–	–	2.4	4.7	2.7	0.7	0.7
Middle/Senior Civil Servant , officer of central Bank or State corporatist Agency	27.9	13.5	18.0	2.9	4.9	15.9	4.8	2.4	2.9
Officer of inter-national organization	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.6	–
Teacher	–	–	–	–	0.3	0.0	–	1.2	1.4
University Professor	–	–	–	–	–	2.8	0.7	2.4	2.7
Journalist	–	–	–	–	4.9	10.3	9.5	9.8	8.6
Medical doctor or Pharmacist	–	–	–	–	3.5	9.3	4.0	4.6	6.5
Lawyer	6.1	13.5	22.0	17.6	24.4	38.3	15.6	30.9	41.7
Engineer	–	–	–	–	6.6	1.8	2.7	7.9	7.2
Manager	–	–	–	–	2.1	1.8	7.5	7.4	9.4
Landowner or farmer	–	–	–	–	–	0.9	–	0.7	0.7
Merchant, industrial-ist, banker	5.4	12.5	8.7	8.8	7.6	5.6	12.2	1.2	2.9
Professional politician	17.7	18.8	4.3	5.9	–	12.1	–	3.6	6.5
Employee	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Artisan	–	–	–	–	–	0.0	–	0.0	0.0
Manual worker	–	–	–	–	–	0.0	–	0.0	0.0
Other	6.1	9.4	19.0	17.6	3.5	3.7	5.4	12.0	15.1
Unknown	14.9	7.3	9.3	20.6	16.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	2.3
N	147	96	300	34	288	107	147	411	139

Source: Elaboration of Legg, 1969, p. 305, Table 12.4; Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 152-154, Table 28, and our own research. There are no 'totals' since multiple coding has been used when an individual had a plurality of occupations. The item 'bureaucratic' from Legg's data is included in 'civil servant'. A dash signifies that no data are available.
Sample (II) for the postwar period 1944-1967, and data for the period 1974-2001 are based on our own research. A full-time politician is someone who has never exercised any specific occupation, but has always been either party cadre, parliamentarian or minister.

On the other hand, former military officers, who were never absent from cabinets, have had a fluctuating presence, with high points during periods of irredentist mobilization (1878-1910) and authoritarianism (1936-40, 1967-74). Their numbers fell to an all-time low during the post-1974 republic. Civil servants, once largely represented (1843-78 and 1910-36), were also comparatively well represented among members of the postwar inner elite during 1944-67.

The presence of former civil servants among ministers declined substantially, to the point of reaching insignificance, in the post-1974 period. This development was probably related to the decline of the social status and political power of civil servants over time. It may also be due to the fact that after 1974, political parties rather than public services became more attractive to young men and women who wanted to make a career in the public sphere. Public services became subsumed to the power of political parties, the authority of senior civil servants was diminished, and their salaries and public image were

unattractive. Finally, after 1974, the financial cost of waging an electoral campaign rose steeply and probably could not be borne by civil servants.

The other less sizeable, but nonetheless interesting trends, are the following. Full-time politicians were a significant category during 1843-78, but were in decline throughout the first half of the twentieth century. By "full-time politicians" we mean those people who entered politics immediately after finishing their studies, that is, people who had never exercised an occupation, but who were able to embark on a political career by drawing either on family resources or on their own involvement with political party mechanisms. The share of full-time politicians among ministers increased yet again during the postwar period of restricted democracy and decreased during the post-1974 republic, in which they were relatively few. University teachers, engineers, medical doctors and, although less so, journalists (and writers) periodically strengthened their participation in Greek cabinets from the end of the Second World War until today – without, of course, ever reaching the proportions of lawyers (or of former military officers during the dictatorships). This was generally the picture of the occupational profile of Greek ministers.

In detail, the 1843-78 ministerial elite was initially composed mainly of bureaucrats, military officers or lifelong politicians rather than lawyers (Table 6 and Legg 1969: 305). However, as the nineteenth century came to a close, the basic trends were the increasing presence of lawyers and the entrance of former military officers into politics. During 1843-78, two-thirds of ministers had been bureaucrats, military officers or full-time politicians, while lawyers accounted for a very small portion. During 1878-1910, the proportion of civil servants decreased. The proportion of military officers increased slightly, while that of lawyers and businessmen (merchants, industrialists, etc.) more than doubled (Table 6, based on Legg 1969: 305, Table 12.4). Generally, it seems that at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, urban professionals and former military officers were on the rise among the ministers.

What was the occupational background of the ministers in the first half of the twentieth century? Compared with the previous period, in 1910-36 there was a steep rise in the number of lawyers and other professionals and an increase in civil servants, while the number of businessmen slightly decreased (Table 6). Most ministers during this period had practiced law and other professions. By contrast, under the Metaxas regime of 1936-41, the military were the largest occupational category in the ministerial elites, with lawyers being the second largest.

Things changed again during the post-world-war era, when lawyers became the most highly represented occupational category once more. Typically, postwar and post-authoritarian Greek politicians were lawyers by profession, although former military officers retained a large ministerial representation. Furthermore, a portion of ministers began their political careers in middle-level governmental positions, as secretary generals of ministries.

How can the continued strong presence of lawyers among ministers be explained? First, this is not a peculiarly Greek phenomenon. One has only to think about the nature of statecraft, which requires knowledge of, and experience, in legal matters. Following the collapse of "pre-democratic" governmental forms (for example, imperial power, absolute royal authority, despotic rule) in Europe, the creation of modern constitutions and the construction and daily operation of liberal political institutions has depended on a knowledge of the law. Second, in countries such as Greece, which have experienced late and uneven industrial development, the state has been instrumental in economic and social development. In this case, the result was that both individuals and businesses have been much more dependent on the state than was the case with countries which had experienced earlier and more advanced capitalist development. In this context of strong state intervention, formalism and legalism,

lawyers were the only professionals equipped to function as intermediaries between the citizenry and the central authorities. Analyzing this phenomenon in nineteenth-century Greece, Constantine Tsoucalas writes that law studies lead "potentially to the peak of state and financial bureaucracies" (Tsoucalas 1977: 441). Our data confirm this general picture, but there are two noteworthy tendencies, which we summarize below.

State Officials (Military Officers and Magistrates)

The first tendency, which has already been noted above, is the presence of former military officers in cabinets, even at times of democratic rule (with the exception of the post-1974 democracy). While this tendency was expected in the Colonels' regime, it was smaller yet visible during the period before the dictatorship, as our research and that of Koutsoukis (1982: 152-54) have shown. This trend had to do with the *de facto* important role of the army in the period after its victory in the Greek Civil War (1946-49). A look at the inner elite of 1944-67 shows that while lawyers continued to constitute the majority of ministers, the second most important category was that of civil servants, followed by former military officers and full-time politicians (Table 6, postwar sample II). This may be explained by the overarching role of the state in post-second-world-war Greek society. Particularly after 1949, in parallel with the state's monitoring of left-wing and even centrist political parties and citizens, an effort was made to reconstruct the economy and public administration almost from scratch, and to safeguard the country's pro-Western orientation following the Second World War and the Greek Civil War.

The strong presence of representatives of the state apparatus in politics continued in a different manifestation during the 1967-74 authoritarian regime. The proportion of military officers within the Colonels' regime was double that of the post-war period, while the percentage of lawyers fell. Among the ministers appointed by the military dictators, the proportion of former judges, albeit small at 8.8 percent, was much higher than their share in cabinets either before or after the 1967-74 regime. The tendency for military officials to join the political elites was almost extinguished after the collapse of the Colonels' regime. During the last decade of the twentieth century, only a very small group of parliamentarians and ministers were former officers. This development was probably a consequence of the Cyprus debacle, which discredited the officer corps for a long time, as well as a result of the difficulties in raising funds to meet the substantial costs of post-1974 election campaigns. During the Colonels' dictatorship, there was also an increase in the generally small numbers of engineers, architects, and academics in the ministerial elites – a development that continued after the fall of the dictatorship.

The Rise of Non-Legal Professions and a Few Prestigious Occupations

After the coup of 1967, the percentage of engineers (and architects) among ministers of the junta was four times as high as in the postwar restricted democratic period of 1946-67 (Table 6; Koutsoukis 1982: 152, Table 28). This may have been a result of the ill-conceived effort by the dictators to reorganize the state and economy, and to promote a technocratic public image in an attempt to obtain legitimacy. Finally, in our comparison of the postwar restricted democracy with the military dictatorship, we found that whilst during the post-1944 period, businessmen (that is, bankers, industrialists, merchants, etc.) accounted for 7.6 percent of the ministerial elite, this rose to 12.2 percent during the dictatorship (see Table 6; Koutsoukis, 1982: 154).

An important tendency during the post-1974 republic, which was already visible under the Colonels, was the rise of the non-legal liberal professions and of a few prestigious salaried occupations.

This tendency has also been noted by research on the parliamentary elites and party cadres (Metaxas 1981; Drettakes 1991; Lyrintzis 1986).

With regard to the ministerial elites – notably in the case of the post-1974 inner elite of 139 ministers – the presence of lawyers was higher than in the all-encompassing and larger post-authoritarian elites (42.2 per cent in the former in comparison to 34.9 percent in the latter; see Table 6). It would appear that the post-authoritarian inner elite was a stronghold of lawyers, to a much larger extent than the corresponding all-encompassing ministerial elite.

As far as the parliamentary elites are concerned, the majority of post-authoritarian deputies have been lawyers; however, the second and third largest occupational categories are engineers (including architects) and doctors. In both 1974 and 1977, more than half of all ND deputies were lawyers (55 percent and 57 percent respectively); in 1981 and 1985, almost half of all PASOK deputies were lawyers (49 percent and 47 percent respectively); and in 1990, 40 percent of ND deputies were lawyers (Drettakes 1991: 62, Table 3.2; for ND, see also Pappas 1999: 99-100).

There was a decrease in the presence of lawyers among all deputies in the parliaments of 1993, 1996 and 2000 (only 30 percent of deputies in the April 2000 parliament were lawyers). The proportion of lawyers among socialist deputies in particular fell from 35 percent in 1993 to 31 percent in 1996 and then to 25 percent in 2000 (our own research). During the same period, there was a rise in the percentage of engineers and architects, employees and university professors. More specifically, the proportion of engineers and architects among PASOK deputies almost doubled between 1977 and 2000, rising from 9 percent in 1977, to 18 percent in 1996, then falling to 16 percent in 2000. During this same period, the proportion of doctors amongst PASOK's deputies fluctuated between 12 and 14 percent.

Similar trends were apparent throughout the post-authoritarian period, particularly in the case of engineers and, less so, in the case of doctors. On the other hand, it seems that journalists and university professors were joining the ranks of ministers in ever rising numbers (Table 6).

How can we explain these two developments? The increased numbers of engineers and doctors may be attributable to the changing nature of the Greek state. In "late-late industrializing" countries, the state has gradually tended to become a planning and programming agency, shedding its previous regulatory and/or interventionist role. In performing this new role, technocrats are more necessary than lawyers. The second development may be attributed to the ever higher social status enjoyed by occupations that are related to the mass media and scientific expertise in contemporary societies. Journalists may build political careers by exploiting their highly visible public status, whilst university professors may enter politics as a consequence of their expertise.

The Least Represented Occupations among Ministerial Elites

Having looked at which occupations were most represented among the ministerial elites (Table 6), it is also interesting to note which ones were least successful in achieving cabinet representation. While the increased percentage of judges in the Greek dictatorial cabinets (1967-74) may imply something about the strong, conservative kernel of the state – composed of the military and the judiciary in the post-1944 era, state officials and civil servants were, in the main, either unsuccessful or were reluctant to enter the ministerial elite. For instance, during the period of postwar restricted democracy, civil servants were the second largest group after lawyers in the inner elite of 107 ministers. However, their share was small. Former civil servants accounted for only 15.9 percent of all post-war ministers who completed three or more terms in office. In contrast, only 3 percent of the 139 post-1974 inner elite of ministers were former civil servants (Table 6).

The declining social status and political power of civil service, and the high financial cost of running an election campaign have already been mentioned as a possible reason for that trend. A more general point, which is related to the structure of historical relations between politics and administration, may be added to these reasons. In post-1944 Greece, while informally the civil servants were closely monitored by the political elites, the official division of politics from administration has been kept intact. There has been little, if any, mobility between the political and the administrative elites. This trend was also evident in the study of parliamentary elites, where very few former civil servants could be found. This was probably the result of the almost complete control of administrators exercised by the politicians, control that was made effective through enduring bonds of clientelism which have survived several political regimes in modern Greece, and which have assumed several personal and systematically organized forms.

Among the other professional groups that have been unsuccessful in penetrating ministerial circles have been private employees, artisans, and manual workers, along with merchants, industrialists, and bankers. This may have been expected in the case of the former groups – given that political capital in increasingly acquired by access to economic capital. We can assume that employees, artisans, and workers were not represented among the political elites since they lacked economic capital and consequently, as individuals, could not easily amass political capital. This probably held true in Greece for most periods of the twentieth century. But how can we explain that the above professional categories were not even represented among the ministerial elite of a socialist party such as PASOK in the last quarter of the twentieth century? A possible explanation may be that PASOK was not a typical socialist but a hybrid party, which had inherited political personnel from the centrist party of Centre Union of the 1960s. Centrist parliamentarians held many posts of cabinets of PASOK in the 1980s. Another explanation may be that PASOK represented the interests of the urban middle classes to a larger extent than the interests workers, artisans or employees.

For different reasons, the upper classes were also underrepresented among the ministerial elites. Comparing the three postwar Greek regimes (1946-67, 1967-74, and 1974-2000), we see that the presence of merchants, industrialists, and bankers in cabinets was limited during 1946-1967, before reaching a relatively high point during the dictatorship. However, their presence has decreased dramatically and was even more limited during the post-1974 republic (Table 6). At the individual level of analysis, one may argue that members of this group need not formally take political power into their hands in order to rule, and that politics has become too expensive an investment; also that the high profile that is part and parcel of ministerial position may actually hamper the business interests of individuals who are interested in making profits. At the societal level, one may consider the fact that, for some time now in southern Europe – and in Greece in particular –, business interests have not enjoyed the legitimacy of other interest groups (Greek Review of Social Research 1988: 138, Table 11). Businessmen have a very poor public image in Greece – and are amongst the least popular of all the socio-professional categories.

Education

On the basis of our data (Table 7), it would appear that nineteenth-century Greek elites were highly educated, with half of all ministers having had a university (or the equivalent higher military) education during 1843-78. During the twentieth century, the participation of graduates of cadet schools was much higher prior to the Second World War than during the postwar period. The most important finding is that the proportion of university graduates has risen throughout the past 160 years, reaching 80.8 percent during the last quarter of the twentieth century (Table 7, sample I). There is very little information with respect to postgraduate studies. What information exists refers only to the postwar

period. We can see that while in the postwar period some ministers had done postgraduate studies, the number of ministers with Masters' degrees and Doctorates has declined since 1974 (Table 7a).

Table 7
Educational level of ministers (%)

	1843-1878	1878-1910	1910-1936	1936-1941	1946-1967 (I)	1946-1967 (II)	1967-1974	1974-2001 (I)	1974-2001 (II)
Non-university	2.7	1.0	2.2	5.9	1.7	0.0	0.0	2.4	2.7
Military non-graduate	-	-	-	-	-	2.8	-	0.0	0.0
University	44.9	58.2	68.8	41.1	76.4	84.1	72.8	80.8	95.6
Military graduate	6.1	28.1	16.6	20.5	11.1	13.1	23.8	3.8	2.7
Unknown	46.2	12.5	12.7	32.3	10.8	1.8	3.4	13.7	2.3
N	147	96	300	34	288	107	147	411	139

Sources: Elaboration of Legg, 1969, p. 303, Table 12.3; Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 116, Table 13, and our own research for postwar sample (II) and for the period 1974-2001. A dash signifies that no data are available. Postwar sample (II) covers the period 1944-1967. Multiple coding has been applied.

Table 7a
University degree of ministers (%)

Degree level	1946-1967 (I)	1946-1967 (II)	1967-1974	1974-2001 (I)	1974-2001 (II)
Incomplete	-	0.0	-	0.0	0.0
Graduate	46.9	72.2	42.9	59.2	70.0
Postgraduate	27.5	1.1	34.7	6.5	8.6
Doctorate	15.0	26.6	19.0	14.6	14.4
Unknown	9.0	0.0	3.4	15.2	2.3
None	-	-	-	4.5	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	288	107	147	411	139

Sources: Elaboration of Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 114, Table 12, and our own research for postwar sample (II) and for the period 1974-2001. A dash signifies that no data are available. There are no data for the period before World War II. Postwar sample (II) covers the period 1944-1967.

With respect to the field of study (Table 7b), the trends in education resembled occupational trends. There was a heavy presence of law graduates, reaching a peak during the immediate postwar era (1946-67) before declining somewhat after 1967. Graduates of cadet schools were strongly represented during the period 1878-1910, as well as during the two twentieth-century dictatorships (1936-41 and 1967-74). Another trend during the postwar period has been the rise of economics and management graduates.

The most popular institute of higher education during the postwar period – the only period for which data are available – was the University of Athens (Table 7c). This has not made that university an elite institution, however, as the members of the social and economic elites used to pursue studies abroad (Table 7d). An initial preference for studying in France and Germany has given way to a predilection for the United States and later, although to a much lesser extent, the United Kingdom.

It may be hypothesized that the population categories with higher education qualifications will be disproportionately represented among the ministerial elites. In Greece this hypothesis is confirmed.

Legg has observed that the nineteenth-century Greek ministerial elite was highly educated, and that to a large extent it was comprised of law graduates and those who had studied in France and Germany. As we have noted above, following Legg, we have divided the second half of the nineteenth century into two distinct periods, 1843-78 and 1878-1910. We have observed the following basic trends. First, during 1843-78 there was an increasing presence of law graduates over time, which was accompanied by the entrance of military school graduates into politics. At this time, more than one-third of all ministers had studied law. During the following period, 1878-1910, more than half of all ministers had studied law, while approximately one-quarter of all ministers were graduates of military schools. A similarly increasing trend can be observed regarding the elite's education abroad. While little more than one-third of all ministers during 1843-78 had had studied abroad, by 1878-1910, half of all ministers had done so (Legg 1969: 303, Table 12.3).

Parallel trends occurred throughout the twentieth century. During the period 1910-36, more than half of all ministers were law graduates (53.6 percent, almost as many as had studied law during 1878-1910; Table 7b). Between 1910 and 1936, the second largest category was those ministers who had been professionally trained in the military (16.6 percent), representing a reduction of almost half in relation to the period 1878-1910 (28.1 percent).

The educational background of one-third of ministers during 1936-41 is not known (Table 7b). However, law and military school graduates were strongly represented in Metaxas' ministerial elites (29.4 percent and 20.5 percent respectively).

As far as law studies are concerned, there was some continuity between the pre-1941 and post-1944 periods. Law graduates were dominant among ministers of the postwar era. For a thirty-year period (1946-1974), a little under two-thirds of all ministers were educated in law, while roughly one-seventh were graduates of the military schools (Table 7b, sample I of the postwar period). These trends were also demonstrated in Koutsoukis (1982: 116, 210-11), and were, more or less, confirmed by Legg's research, which used data for the first two decades after the end of the Second World War (1946-65) – albeit with different estimations. According to Legg (1969: 305, Table 12.4), during the two decades after the Second World War, the percentage of law school graduates among ministers was high (33 percent), and the percentage of military-trained ministers comparatively lower (17 percent).

There was a change observed in comparing the period of 1944-67 with the dictatorship of 1967-74. As a result of the military intervention of 1967 that brought the Colonels to power, the percentage of law graduates among ministers declined, whilst that of military-trained ministers increased. As far as their place of study is concerned, during both periods more than half of all ministers had studied abroad. However, whilst before the breakdown of democracy in 1967 the majority of foreign-trained ministers had studied in France or Germany, during the Colonels' regime the largest portion had studied in the United States (Table 7d; Koutsoukis 1982: 127-28, Tables 18 and 19).

Type of University Degree

For the reasons explained above, the proportion of military school graduates fell dramatically during the post-1974 republic (Table 7). The type of university degree held by ministers also differs from one regime to the other. Whilst from 1946-67 and then 1967-74, the percentage of ministers with either a Masters degree or a Doctorate was relatively high, this proportion fell between 1974 and 2001 (Table 7a). The same trend was also observed among the members of the post-authoritarian inner elite (sample II of the post-1974 period; the differences between tables 7 and 7a are due to multiple coding, that is, to the fact that some ministers had more than one type of degree).

This post-1974 trend may demonstrate various things: either the members of the most highly educated elite refrained from embarking on political careers in the post-authoritarian period; or the PASOK cabinets that dominated the post-authoritarian period (if only by the sheer number of this party's deputies who have become ministers) reflected the more popular origins of this party's political personnel compared to the social origins of the conservative and dictatorial cabinets that were in power from 1946 to 1974.

Field of Higher Education

As has been noted above, Greek ministers have traditionally studied law – a tendency that is also found among parliamentary deputies. This tradition declined somewhat during the military regime, largely as a result of the rise in the proportion of military graduates among ministers. Significantly, however, even during the dictatorship the largest category among ministers was law graduates (Table 7b).

Table 7b
Field of higher education of ministers (%)

	1843-1878	1878-1910	1910-1936	1936-1941	1946-1967		1967-1974	1974-2001	
					(I)	(II)		(I)	(II)
Agronomy and Veterinary	–	–	–	–	–	1.8	–	0.9	1.4
Economics and Management	–	–	–	–	1.7	11.2	11.6	20.4	26.6
Engineering	2.1	4.1	6.3	2.9	3.5	2.8	2.9	11.0	15.1
Humanities	–	–	–	–	2.1	2.8	2.0	2.6	2.2
Law	38.7	52.0	53.6	29.4	61.4	68.2	40.8	39.6	50.4
Mathematics and Natural Sciences	–	–	–	–	0.0	1.8	0.7	3.4	3.6
Medicine	2.0	2.1	7.3	5.9	5.9	1.8	2.7	8.6	7.9
Military	6.1	28.1	16.6	20.5	14.2	14.0	25.2	3.8	2.7
Social Sciences	–	–	–	–	0.0	13.1	2.7	11.3	13.0
Other	4.8	1.0	3.9	8.8	0.7	1.8	0.0	0.2	0.7
Unknown	46.2	12.5	12.7	32.3	10.8	2.8	3.4	19.2	3.6
N	147	96	300	34	288	107	147	411	139

Sources: Elaboration of Legg, 1969, p. 303, Table 12.3; Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 116, Table 13, and our own research for post-war sample (II) and for the period 1974-2001. Multiple coding has been applied. (In elaborating the second source, we included agronomy in engineering and veterinary in medicine in order to make comparisons possible). The item "Gymnasium" (i.e., Greek secondary school) of Legg's data has been included in "other." A dash signifies that no data are available. Post-war sample (II) covers the period 1944-1967.

During the post-authoritarian period, the preponderance of law graduates has been balanced off by the relative rise of three more educational categories among ministers – economics, social science, and engineering graduates (Table 7b). This also holds true for the inner elite of the post-1974 period (sample II).

The same development may also be seen among post-1974 parliamentary deputies, the vast majority of whom have received university education. In 1974 and then again in 1977, more than half of the conservative deputies were law graduates (60 percent and 58 percent respectively; Metaxas 1981: 43, Table 15). Later, the share of graduates of other schools increased.

Schools and Places of Education

In Greece there are no elite institutes of higher education of the kind one finds in France, although the Law and Medicine Faculties at the University of Athens, as well as the Polytechnic University ("Polytechneio," which is also located in Athens) have enjoyed some prestige. The data on national institutions of higher education (Table 7c), show that most ministers had studied at the University of Athens throughout the postwar and post-authoritarian periods. Within the postwar inner elite (sample II of 1946-74), the presence of graduates from the University of Athens was much greater than in the larger, all-encompassing ministerial elite. This trend was less apparent when comparing the post-authoritarian elite (sample I) with the corresponding inner elite (sample II of the post-1974 period; Table 7c).

Table 7c
Higher education institutes attended by ministers (%)

Institution	1946-1974		1974-2001	
	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)
University of Athens	53.7	64.5	41.7	50.4
Athens Technical University	3.7	2.8	6.9	6.5
Panteios Higher School of Political Science (Athens)	0.5	0.9	2.9	3.6
Athens University of Economics and Business	4.1	0.0	4.8	5.7
Other	–	0.0	14.6	12.9
None	13.2	30.8	6.7	23.7
Unknown	–	0.9	26.1	2.9
N	288	107	411	139

Sources: Elaboration of Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 121, Table 16, and our own research for postwar sample (II) and for the period 1974-2001. Multiple coding has been applied. Koutsoukis does not distinguish between the two political regimes of the 1946-1974 period. A dash signifies that no data are available. There are no data before World War II. Our own postwar sample (II) covers the period 1944-1967.

Table 7d
Foreign institutions of higher education attended by ministers (%)

Country	1946-67		1967-74	1974-2001	
	(I)	(II)		(I)	(II)
United Kingdom	10.4	7.5	15.5	9.1	10.8
France	36.4	15.9	16.5	5.0	5.0
Germany	29.2	12.1	20.4	5.3	8.6
United States	6.5	0.9	30.1	6.0	10.2
Italy	1.9	0.0	1.9	1.0	1.4
Other	15.6	7.5	15.5	3.4	5.7
None	–	61.7	–	48.0	60.0
Unknown	–	0.9	–	25.7	10.8
N	288	107	147	411	139

Sources: Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 127, Table 19 and our own research for postwar sample (II) and for the 1974-2001 period. Multiple coding has been applied. A dash signifies that no data are available. "None" signifies that they studied only in Greece. There are no data prior to World War II. Our own postwar sample (II) covers the period 1944-1967.

Over time, there has been an increase in the number of graduates from other Athens universities – namely the Polytechnic, the Panteios School, and the Athens University of Economics and Business

(formerly the ASOEE). These increases correspond with the rise in the number of engineering, social sciences, and economics graduates among ministers.

The patterns of Western influence on Greece are reflected in the fact that some members of Greece's ministerial elite have pursued advanced studies abroad (first degree or postgraduate degrees; Table 7d). Between 1946 and 1967, the largest categories consisted of ministers educated in France and, less so, in Germany. This also held true for the postwar inner elite. During the dictatorship of 1967-74, the single most important category was ministers educated in the United States. During the post-authoritarian period, all categories diminished, including those relating to the post-1974 inner elite. These patterns probably attest generally to the long-term influence of Western Europe on Greece, as well as to the particular political influence of the United States from 1967 to 1974. The most important finding seems to be the small per centage of foreign educated ministers during the post-authoritarian period. As noted above, this trend may again be attributed to the popular social profile of PASOK ministers, who constituted the majority of post-1974 cabinet members.

Political Career - Political Office

Because of a lack of information, it is difficult to trace the political careers of ministers. There are no data for the years from 1843 to 1946, and only sparse and often unreliable data are available for the following years. Generally speaking, it seems that the last step before becoming a minister during the second half of the twentieth century was to become a parliamentary deputy (Table 8). Other springboards to ministerial positions, such as the posts of Prefect or General Secretary of Ministry (a post one level below that of deputy minister), were less likely to lead to ministerial office. Among members of the postwar inner elite, two-thirds were deputies prior to becoming ministers; and among members of the post-authoritarian inner elite, more than 80 percent were deputies.

Table 8
Political office held by ministers prior to first ministerial appointment (%)

Position held	1946-67		1967-74	1974-2001	
	(I)	(II)		(I)	(II)
None	–	18.7	–	4.8	1.4
Mayor or local councilor	3.8	0.0	1.7	7.0	6.5
Regional government minister	–	–	–	–	–
Prefect	6.6	4.7	8.5	1.9	3.6
Colonial Governor	–	–	–	–	–
Regional Deputy	–	–	–	–	–
National Deputy	32.0	68.2	7.6	68.3	83.5
European Deputy	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Member of Upper House	–	–	–	–	–
Member of interest group association	–	–	–	3.8	5.0
Secretary/Under Secretary of State	8.5	5.6	16.1	8.4	10.8
Member of *cabinets ministériels*	–	–	–	4.6	5.0
Ministerial Director	–	–	–	–	0.0
Other	–	0.0	–	6.4	7.9
Unknown	–	0.0	–	14.4	2.2
N	288	107	147	411	139

Source: Koutsoukis, 1982, p. 169-171, Table 32) and our own research for postwar sample (II) and for the period 1974-2001. This table is incomplete due to lack of data for the earlier periods and to the inapplicability of many of the listed categories in the case of Greece (e.g., colonial governor, Regional Deputy, etc.) A dash signifies that no data are available. There are no data prior to World War II. Multiple coding has been applied. Our own postwar sample (II) covers the period 1944-1967.

The greater visibility of parliament compared to other political institutions may be an explanation for this finding. The lack of any decentralized structures in Greece may also be taken into account in explaining the lack of career paths that lead from the periphery to the top of the state. With respect to the post-authoritarian period, for which there are more data, we may inquire whether the length of parliamentary experience is related to the achievement of ministerial office. Among the wider ministerial elite of this period (411 ministers of sample I), one-fifth had been elected to parliament only once before becoming ministers, while a further one-quarter had been elected twice. Only one-fifth of the ministers had been elected three or more times. It would appear that long parliamentary career is not a prerequisite for minister rank in contemporary Greece.

Political Nepotism

The former Prime Minister, Andreas Papandreou, was the son of George Papandreou – Prime Minister in 1944 and again from 1963 to 1965. The eldest grandson of the latter, also named George Papandreou, is the current Minister of Foreign Affairs. The present Prime Minister, Costas Simitis, is the son of a well-known left-wing politician who participated in the anti-Nazi resistance of the 1940s. The current leader of New Democracy (the conservative party), Costas Karamanlis, is a nephew of the former Prime Minister and President of the Republic, Konstantine Karamanlis, who founded New Democracy in 1974. Can we say that political nepotism is, therefore, rampant in Greece?

Table 9
Ministers whose father or other relative was involved in politics (%)

Familial involvement	1843-1878	1878-1910	1910-1936	1936-1941	1944-1967 (I)	1944-1967 (II)	1967-1974	1974-2001
None	22.5	41.7	63.7	67.6	62.6	47.0	–	39.8
Parent	40.1	47.9	21.3	14.7	15.6	0.0	–	2.4
Other relative	6.8	10.4	15.0	17.6	21.7	24.0	–	6.5
Unknown	30.6	–	–	–	–	29.0	–	51.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	–	100.0
N	147	96	300	34	230	107	–	411

Source: Legg, 1969, p. 307, Table 12.5 and our own research. Postwar sample (I) covers the period 1946-1965. A dash signifies that no data are available. In the column 1843-1878, we have included participants in the War of Independence (1821-1827) in our item "Unknown," because this category had no meaning or equivalent in any historical period beyond this first one. There is no data for the cabinets of the military regime of 1967-1974. By "involved in politics," we mean that someone had at least one term in public office, including mayorship, general secretariat and/or ministerial position. By "relative" we mean other members of kin except father or mother.

It is difficult to reach this conclusion on the basis of the available data (Table 9), meaning that the above cases may simply be impressive exceptions. Legg (1969) offers some information for the whole period of 1843-1965. Political bequest was already practiced in nineteenth-century Greek politics. Between 1843 and 1878, and from 1878 to 1910, there was a small increase in the percentage of ministers whose father or some other relative was involved in politics. The percentage of ministers whose fathers were politicians rose slightly (from 40.1 percent to 47.9 percent; Table 9). The percentage of ministers who had some relative in politics, that is, either a minister or a deputy, also rose slightly (from 6.7 to 10.4 per cent). This was the high season of political nepotism in modern Greece. Compared to the apogee of nepotistic political recruitment, which existed at the turn of the nineteenth century, by 1910-36 the share of ministers whose father was a politician fell dramatically and decreased further between 1936 and 1941. However, the share of ministers who had a relative (other than father) in politics did not follow suit.

After 1944, nepotism was on the rise once more, given that during the first twenty years of the postwar period, more than one-third of all ministers had either their father or another relative in politics (37.3 percent, Table 9, sample I of 1946-65). This share was comparable to the figure for the 1910-36 period, but lower than the corresponding figures for the nineteenth century (1843-1910). Nepotism was very apparent in the period during and immediately following the civil war (1946-51), when slightly less than half (45 percent) of all ministers belonging to parties of the right and center, came from families involved in interwar period politics (Legg 1969: 307, Table 12.6). There is a lack of data for the years between 1965 and 1974, and Koutsoukis can not provide us with any information. During the post-1974 period, there is no data for half of the ministers. As far as the remaining ministers are concerned, is would seem that nepotism was very limited in comparison to earlier historical periods (Table 9). To the extent that this is a valid indication, it may be accounted for by the emergence of new generations of politicians, such as young members of the resistance against the military regime of 1967-74, and new political parties, such as PASOK, at the end of the twentieth century.

CONCLUSIONS

We can trace the evolution of the Greek ministerial elites less accurately for the period of the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, and more accurately for the period from the end

of the Second World War to the present. Some patterns can be discerned only in the form of the research hypotheses that are outlined below.

The size of ministerial elites in Greece during the past 160 years is considerable. This is due to high levels of political instability, illustrated by the frequent turnover of governments and the state's increasing role in society. Generally, we know more about the democratic period than we do about the authoritarian interludes in Greek politics. This is not surprising. Authoritarian regimes lasted for comparatively short time intervals in Greece (1925-26, 1936-40 and 1967-74), while parliamentarism (not always equivalent to full-fledged democracy) has been the rule for the rest of the period between the mid-nineteenth century and the present. In this respect, transitions from authoritarian rule have not led to important changes in the political elites that assumed ministerial posts, since the dictatorships did not last long enough to have a long-term impact on political personnel.

Through the last one hundred and sixty years there has been an evolution in the occupational background of Greek ministers. This can be summarized as a slow shift from politicians who relied on tradition and social status to politicians who rely more on their expertise. Since the end of the nineteenth century in particular, lawyers have had an increasing presence in Greek governments, a presence that declined slightly – and temporarily – during periods of authoritarian rule. During the last quarter of the twentieth century, the representation of lawyers has continued to decline.

At various moments, in particular during authoritarian regimes, former military officers also had a considerable presence among ministers. For instance, the nature of the Colonels' regime presents few surprises for the study of the profile of cabinet members: the most important occupational category among ministers was that of military officers (Table 6; Koutsoukis 1982: 116, Table 13, and 122, Graph 4). In addition, there was no "carry-over" of 1967-74 political personnel into the governing personnel of the post-authoritarian, democratic regime. This may be explained by the fact that the rupture between the authoritarian and the democratic periods, which took place in 1974, was abrupt, owing to the military defeat of Greece in the conflict with Turkey over Cyprus, and by the fact that the deposed military regime was discredited as a whole.

This development does not mean that the military, that is those retired officers who entered politics, have been absent from post-1974 Greek cabinets. Such cabinets have often included former officers. The officer corps has enjoyed a fluctuating, yet generally high social status throughout modern Greek history. The political role of the military as an institution, particularly after the end of the Civil War (1946-49), cannot be ignored. However, as we have stressed, both the presence of former officers in cabinets and the role of the military as an institution were reduced after the fall of the Colonels' regime in 1974.

Turning Points and Continuities

With regards to the carrying-over of political personnel, and the continuity or discontinuity of the political system, it is useful to look at any continuities with the periods prior to and following Colonels' regime. If one asks whether there were any historical moments when new individuals entered Greek politics the answer is that there were many such moments. For instance, immediately after the end of the Second World War, there was almost no renewal of the political personnel due to the Civil War which broke out in 1946 (Nicolacopulos 2001: 85). However, in the early and the mid-1950s new leaders such as Alexander Papagos, Konstantine Karamanlis and Spiros Markezinis appeared on the political scene in the capacity of prime minister (the first two politicians) or minister (the third one) and created their own parties (all of which were right or center-right wing). In addition, some renewal of the parliamentary elites took place in the two elections of 1950 and 1951, in the first case owing to the good

electoral performance of new politicians belonging to parties of the centre and, in the second case, owing to the emergence of new politicians belonging to the right-wing party of Papagos (Nicolacopoulos 2001: 118 and 134). However, this renewal referred to individual members of parliament, not to social categories and social strata which were represented at the level of ministerial elites. In contrast to changes at the individual level of analysis, at the collective level the renewal was much less stark. In that respect, it is useful to compare the restricted democracy that existed from 1944 to 1967, on the one hand, and the parliamentary democracy instituted in 1974, on the other.

The following changes occurred in the social composition of Greek ministerial elites: officers faded away, and the share of lawyers decreased (without loosing their primacy), while the share of other liberal professionals, such as engineers, architects, and doctors, increased among cabinet members. In the long run, the impact of authoritarian regimes on the composition of ministerial elites in Greece was minimal. Rather, as we explain below, there were a few turning points within the evolution of democratic regimes which marked changes in ministerial elites. On the grounds of the available data, it can be argued that there were a few high points in the evolution of the Greek ministerial elites. Two of the high points seem to be the emergence of the Venizelos' Liberal Party during the 1910s, following the 1909 *coup d'état*, and the rise of PASOK to power in 1981. In the first case, with the rise of Liberalism we have a culmination of a long process: at the beginning of the twentieth century a new urban elite, mostly representing the liberal professions (mainly lawyers), replaced traditional notables who had enjoyed power throughout the nineteenth century on the basis of tradition, status, and patronage networks in the regions of their origin. Since then, lawyers have predominated in the cabinets formed by parties of the right or the centre during the interwar and the postwar period.

The second turning point was the ascent of PASOK to power in 1981. In the last two decades of the twentieth century, left of centre and socialist ministers of PASOK, with no links to the traditional conservative postwar political class, dominated cabinets. A large number of them were lawyers, but gradually, as PASOK formed several cabinets between 1981 and 2001, other professions, such as doctors and engineers (and less so economists) were also represented in the ministerial elites.

In other words, the first half of the twentieth century witnessed the rise of liberal professions to parliamentary – as well as to ministerial – positions. The situation changed to a certain extent during the second half of the twentieth century. Generally, we may conclude that, contrary to common belief, in the last decades of the twentieth century the Greek ministerial elite was not aging; it seemed to become younger over the span of the last five decades. However, the gender composition of the elite has not changed over time, since it has been and remains male-dominated. Another continuity with the past is the fact that lawyers have constituted and continue to constitute the majority of ministers. Yet, over time, this majority, which was once absolute, has become relative, as a consequence of the rise of other professions (for example, engineers and economists). This trend was emerging during the dictatorship, but was particularly manifest during the 1980s and 1990s. During the last years of the twentieth century, an increase in the number of journalists and university professors has also been evident, constituting a new development in the occupational background of ministers.

A similar change is evident in the ministers' type of educational qualifications. Since the transition to democracy in 1974, the preponderance of law has been balanced by economics and engineering as well as the social sciences. A discontinuity with the past has been the decrease in the number of ministers who have studied abroad, with a gradual reduction in the number of foreign-educated ministers. As for the political career of ministers, this did not seem to be dependent on long parliamentary experience. The parliament was the antechamber of the cabinet, even for ministers who had been elected only once or twice to the parliament.

Concluding Remarks

Was there an elite within the elite? There seems to be no value in the distinction between the wider, all encompassing ministerial elites of 1946-67 and of 1974-2001, and the inner elites of the corresponding periods. In respect of most variables, the differences between those who became ministers three or more times and the remainder of cabinet members were small.

More concretely, members of the inner elite during the postwar period (107 members of sample II) were, on average, somewhat younger than ministers of the postwar elite as a whole (288 members of sample I). Members of the inner elite came disproportionately from Athens and Peloponnesus, and included more lawyers than the wider ministerial elite. In terms of field of study, it included more law graduates and many more economics and management graduates than the wider ministerial elite. More graduates of the University of Athens appeared in the inner elite, and fewer of them had studied abroad.

There were also some noteworthy differences between the inner and the wider elites during the post-authoritarian period. Among the members of the post-1974 inner elite (139 ministers of the post-1974 sample II), there were proportionately more lawyers than among the members of the ministerial elite as a whole (411 ministers of the post-1974 sample I). The inner elite included more graduates of the University of Athens, and the average age of inner elite ministers was slightly higher than that of the post-1974 elite as a whole. All of these differences may point to a more traditional social profile for the members of inner elites (lawyers, who had come from the south of Greece and had studied at the University of Athens). However, overall, the differences are not substantial and do not cover most of the analytic dimensions we have used. There is not enough evidence to claim that there was a distinct inner elite within a larger ministerial elite, either immediately after the Second World War, or following the fall of the Colonels' regime.

How may one interpret the long-term historical patterns described in this paper? It is difficult to form explanatory hypotheses that hold true for the entire period under study. As noted above, we can compare the situations at the beginning and the end of the twentieth century. The Greek case of ministerial elites at the beginning of the twentieth century may be couched in Weberian terms as a transition from the type of politician who lived for politics to another type, that of the politician who lived both for and from politics (Lyrintzis 1991: 170). Nineteenth-century notables who lived for politics were gradually replaced by lawyers. Lawyers, in turn, were motivated to participate in politics because of their expertise and skills as intermediaries between citizens and the state. They also benefitted from politics by aggrandizing their clientele and strengthening their social status. To explain the decreasing role of lawyers in governments at the end of the twentieth century, it may be useful to look at the changing functions of the modern Greek state. It is no longer an administrative state. At least since the end of the Second World War, it has been an interventionist state, emphasizing planning and programming, and concentrating on public works, economic growth, and social welfare transfers. Today, in a period of prolonged state retrenchment (for example, through privatizations) and the introduction of new technologies in state organization, governments require the technical expertise offered by engineers and economists, and not only the skills offered by lawyers.

The general trends shown above illustrate a mixture of continuity and discontinuity in several characteristics of the Greek ministerial elites. Currently, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, an old and a new world of politics seem to coexist at the ministerial elite level. This is not to claim that Greece is a "transitional" society, since the country has followed the tracks of social change, leading to modernization and Westernization, for several decades now (as a consequence, the term "transitional" has lost its value). Rather, the argument should be the following: at the political elite level some changes

(for example, the gender composition of the cabinets) lag behind the faster developments at the societal level. Women are well represented in most sectors of the Greek economy and society, but have been barred from a corresponding participation in the highest political circles.

Other changes (such as the occupational background of ministers) may already precede corresponding changes at the level of society. While young Greeks are still attracted by traditional professions (law, medicine) and old-fashioned job outlets (openings in the public sector), the political elites may have already started including individuals with non-traditional social profiles (technocrats overseeing economic development). Conversely, to put it in modern sociological terms, the rise of the "social capital" of some occupations and professions, such as those of economists, engineers, journalists, and university professors, seems to be transformed into "political capital," and in particular into improved access to ministerial position. State-related occupations and professions, such as those of civil servants, military officers and lawyers, have gradually given up their age-old domination of cabinets. This development may be interpreted in the context of the rising importance of economic and technical expertise in contemporary societies. Thus, it could be argued that political and, especially, ministerial elites simultaneously mirror society's receding past and its emerging future.

REFERENCES

Aberbach, J.D., R.D. Putnam and B.A. Rockman (1981): *Bureaucrats and Politicians in Western Democracies*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ailianou-Tsigou, D. (1959): *Hoi Hellenices Kyverneseis kai oi Proedroi tes Voules kai tes Gerousias, 1926-1959 [Greek Governments and the Presidents of Parliament and Senate, 1926-1959],* mimeo, Athens.

Athanassatou, Y., A. Regos and S. Seferiades (eds) (1999): *He Diktatoria, 1967-1974: Politikes Praktikes, Ideologikos Logos, Antistase [The Dictatorship, 1967-1974: Political Practices, Ideological Discourse, Resistance]*, Athens: Kastaniotes.

Bochotis, T. (1999): 'He Esoterike Politike' ['Domestic Politics'] in C. Hadjiiossif (ed.), *Historia tes Helladas tou Eikostou Aiona, 1900-1922: Oi Aparches [History of Greece in the Twentieth Century, 1900-1922: The Beginnings]*, Vol. A2, Athens: Vivliorama, pp.37-105.

Burton, M. and J. Higley (1987): 'Elite Settlements', *American Sociological Review* 52, pp.295-307.

Clogg, R. (1979): *A Short History of Modern Greece*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Costa Pinto, A., P. Tavares de Almeida and N. Bermeo (2000): 'Regime Change and Ministerial Elite Transformation in Southern Europe: 19th-20th Centuries', Proposal of Research Project (mimeo), Princeton: Princeton University.

Czudnowski, M. M. (ed.) (1983): *Does Who Governs Matter? Elite Circulation in Contemporary Societies*, International Yearbook for Studies of Leaders and Leadership, Vol. 1, Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Dakin, D. (1972): *The Unification of Greece, 1770-1923*, London: Ernest Benn.

Dertilis, G. (1977): *Koinonikos Metaschematismos kai Stratiotike Epemvasse, 1880-1909 [Social Change and Military Intervention, 1880-1909],* 2nd edition., Athens: Exantas.

Diamandouros, N. P. (1986): 'Regime Change and Prospects for Democracy in Greece, 1974-1983', in G. O'Donnel, P.C. Schmitter and L. Whitehead (eds), *Transitions From Authoritarian Rule: Southern Europe*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp.138-64.

Dogan, M. (ed.) (1975): *The Mandarins of Western Europe: The Political Role of Top Civil Servants*, New York: John Wiley.

Drettakes, M. G. (1991): *He Anatomia tes Voules, 1974-1990 [The Anatomy of Parliament, 1974-90],* Athens: Gutenberg.

Ekdotike, Athenon (ed.) (1977, 1978 and 2000): *Historia tou Hellenicou Ethnous [History of the Greek Nation], Vols. 13, 14, 15 and 16*, Athens: Ekdotike Athenon.

Embassy of the United States of America in Greece (1971): *Index to Postwar Greek Governments, 1944-1971* (mimeo), Athens, 12 August.

Enossi teos Vouleuton [Association of Former Parliamentary Deputies] (1995): *150 Chronia Hellenices Demokratias [150 Years of Greek Democracy*], Athens: Hellenoekdotike.

Eyal, G., I. Szelenyi and E. Townsley (2000): *Making Capitalism Without Capitalists: The New Ruling Elites in Eastern Europe*, London: Verso.

Flerianou, A. (ed.) (1999): *Charilaos Trikoupis: He Zoe kai to Ergo tou [Charilaos Trikoupis: His Life and Work], Vol. 2*, Athens: Greek Parliament.

Greek Review of Social Research (1988): 'Political Behavior' (research project led by Elias Nicolakopoulos and George Th. Mavrogordatos), special issue, Vol. 69A, (Summer).

Hadjiiossif, C. (1994): 'Demokratia kai Pelateiakes Scheseis: Treis Prosfates Analyseis tes Hellenices Politikes tou 19ou Aiona' [Democracy and Patronage Relations: Three Recent Analyses of Greek Politics in the 19th Century], *Mnemon* 16, pp.167-97.

Hadjiiossif, C. (ed.) (1999a): *Historia tes Helladas tou Eikostou Aiona, 1900-1992: Oi Aparches [History of Greece in the Twentieth Century, 1900-1922: The Beginnings], Vols. A1 and A2*, Athens: Vivliorama.

Hadjiiossif, C (1999b) 'Eisagoge' [Introduction] in C. Hadjiiossif (ed.): *Historia tes Helladas tou Eikostou Aiona, 1900-1992: Oi Aparches [History of Greece in the Twentieth Century, 1900-1922: The Beginnings], Vol. A1*, Athens: Vivliorama, pp.9-39.

Higley, J. and R. Gunther (eds) (1992): *Elites and Democratic Consolidation in Latin America and Southern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambrigde University Press.

Kitroeff, A. (1990): 'Continuity and Change in Contemporary Greek Historiography', in M. Blinkhorn and T. Veremis (eds), *Modern Greece: Nationalism and Nationality*, Athens: ELIAMEP and SAGE, pp.143-72.
Kitsikis, D. (1973): 'L'évolution de l'élite politique Grecque', in M.B. Kiray (ed.), *Social Stratification and Development in the Mediterranean Basin*, The Hague: Institute of Social Studies Publications.
Koutsoukis, K. S. (1978): 'Socioeconomic Change and Cabinet Composition in Greece, 1946-1974', *Greek Review of Social Research* 32, pp.74-9.
Koutsoukis, K. S. (1982): *Political Leadership in Modern Greece: Cabinet Elite Circulation and Systemic Change, 1946-1976*, Athens: Athena.
Legg, K. (1969): *Politics in Modern Greece*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Loukos, C. (1988): *He Antipolitefse Kata tou Kyvernete Io. Kapodistria, 1828-1831 [Opposition Against Governor Io. Kapodistrias, 1828-1831]*, Athens: Themelio.
Lyrintzis, C. (1983): *Between Socialism and Populism: The Rise of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement*, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, London: The London School of Economics.
Lyrintzis, C. (1986): 'The Rise of PASOK and the Emergence of a New Political Personnel', in Z. Tzannatos (ed.), *Socialism in Greece: The First Four Years*, Aldershot: Gower, pp.114-29.
Lyrintzis, C. (1991): *To Telos ton Tzakion: Koinonia kai Politike sten Achaia tou 19ou Aiona [The End of Notables: Society and Politics of the Achaia Region in the 19th Century]*, Athens: Themelio.
Makrydemetris, A. (1997): *Hoi Hellenes Prothypourgoi, 1828-1997. [The Greek Prime Ministers, 1828-1997]*, Athens: I. Sideris.
Makrydemetris, A. (2000): *Hoi Ypourgoi Exoterikon tes Helladas, 1829-2000 [The Greek Ministers of Foreign Affairs, 1829-2000],* Athens: Kastaniotis.
Mavres, Y. (2000): 'He Anatomia tes Neas Voules' [The Anatomy of the New Parliament], *Ta Nea*, 13 May, pp.18-20.
Mavrogordatos, G. Th. (1983): *Still-born Republic: Social Coalitions and Party Strategies, 1922-1936*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
Meletopoulos, M. (1996): *He Diktatoria ton Syntagmatarchon [The Colonels' Dictatorship],* Athens: Papazeses.
Metaxas, Y.A.D. (1981): 'Viokoinonike kai Politismike Chartografia tes Voules, 1964-1974-1977' [Biosocial and Cultural Mapping of the Parliament, 1964-1974-1977], *Review of Political Science* 1 (1), pp.11-56.
Meynaud, J. (1965)*: Les forces politiques en Grece*, Paris.
Michels, Robert (1966): *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchic Tendencies of Modern Democracy.* Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. New York: Free Press, 1966.
Mouzelis, N.P. (1978): 'Class and Clientelistic Politics: The Case of Greece', *Sociological Review* 26 (3), pp.471-97.
Mouzelis, N.P. (1978): *Modern Greece: Facets of Underdevelopment*, London: Macmilllan.
Mouzelis, N.P. (1986): *Politics in the Semi-Periphery: Early Parliamentarism and Late Industrialization in the Balkans and Latin America*, London: Macmillan.
Nicolacopoulos, E. (1977): 'Mia Prote Gnorimia me to Semerino 'Agonosto' PASOK [A First Approach to the Current 'Unknown' PASOK], *Anti* 89, 31 December, pp.14-24.
Nicolacopoulos, E. (1981): '1964-1981, He Synecheia kai he Allaghe' [1964-1981, Continuity and Change], *Anti* 193, 27 November, pp.12-21.
Nicolacopoulos, E. (2001): *He Kachektike Democratia: Kommat kai Ekloges, 1946-1967 [The Sickly Republic: Parties and Elections, 1946-1967],* Athens: Patakis.
Papachelas, A. (1997): *O Viasmos tes Hellenices Demokratias: Ho Amerikanikos Paragon, 1947-1967 [The Rape of Greek Democracy: The American Factor, 1947-1967],* Athens: Hestia.
Pappas, T.S. (1999): *Making Party Democracy in Greece*, London: Macmillan.
Parkin, Frank (1971): *Class Inequality and Political Order: Social Stratification in Capitalist and Communist Societies*, New York: Praeger.
Petropulos, J.A. (1968): *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece, 1833-1843*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Perdikares, E.F. (1981): 'Ho Rolos tou Koinonikou Metaschematismou sten Exelixe tes Koinoniologikes Syntheses tes Voules 1964-1977' [The Role of Social Transformation in the Evolution of the Sociological Composition of the Parliament, 1964-1977], *Review of Political Science* 1 (1), pp.57-79.
Provatas, A. (1980): *Politike Historia tes Helladas [Political History of Greece],* Athens.

Putnam, R.D. (1973): 'The Political Attitudes of Senior Civil Servants in Western Europe', *British Journal of Political Science* 3, pp.257-90.
Putnam, R.D. (1976): *The Comparative Study of Political Elites*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.
Spourdalakis, M. (1988): *The Rise of the Greek Socialist Party*, London: Macmillan.
Tsoucalas, C. (1977): *Exartese kai Anaparagoge: Ho Koinonikos Rolos ton Ekpaideutikon Mechanismon sten Hellada, 1830-1922 [Dependence and Reproduction: The Social Role of Educational Mechanisms in Greece, 1830-1922],* Athens: Themelio.
Tsoucalas, C. (1983): *Koinonike Anaptyxe kai Kratos: He Syngrotese tou Demosiou Chorou sten Hellada [Social Development and the State: The Constitution of the Public Domain in Greece],* Athens: Themelio.
Tsoucalas, C. (1985): 'On the Problem of Political Clientelism in Greece in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 12 (4), pp.5-17.
Veremis, T. (1997): *The Military in Greek Politics: From Independence to Democracy*, London: Hurst.
Voulgaris, Yannis (2001): *He Hellada tes Metaplitefsis, 1974-1990 [Post-Authoritarian Greece, 1974-1990]*, Athens: Themelio.
Woodhouse, C.M. (1985): *The Rise and Fall of Greek Colonels*, New York: Franklin Watts.

Primary Data Sources
Voule ton Hellenon (1977): *Metroon gerousiaston eton 1929-1935 kai vouleuton apo tes trites Anatheoretikes Voules 1935 mechri tes pemptes Anatheoretikes Voules 1974,* Athens.
Voule ton Hellenon (1986): *Metroon plerexousion, gerousiaston kai vouleuton 1822-1935,* Athens.
Voule ton Hellenon (1987): *Hellenes vouleutes kai eurovouleutes*, October 1987.
Encyclopedia Papyrous-Larous-Britannica (1980), Athens.
Eleutherotypia (1989): 'He nea voule', (special edition), Vols. 1-4, Athens, 1989.
Eleutherotypia (1998): 'Konstantinos Karamanlis. 60 chronia historia', (special edition), 2 April 1998
Kathimerini (1986): '300+24 Voules kai Eurovoules', (special edition), Athens, 1986.
Kathimerini tes Kyriakes (1998) : 'Konstantinos Karamanlis', (special edition), 26 April 1998.
Kathimerini tes Kyriakes/Epta Hemeres (1999): 'He Hellada ton Eikosto Aiona. 1980-1990', 25-26 December 1999.
Koukounas D. (1999): *Oi Hellenes Politikoi 1926-1949: Historiko viografiko lexico, Vol. 2,* Athens: Metron.
Makedoniko Praktoreio Hedeseion (1996): *He trite Hellenike Demokratia kai oi thesmoi tes*, Thessaloniki: Parateretes.
Tziovaras G. (1996): *Ta Ypourgoia mas: Kyverneseis 1833-1996*, Athens: Pontiki.
To Pontiki (1990): 'Oi Hekloges tes 8es Apriliou 1990', Athens.
To Pontiki (1994): 'Oi Hekloges tes 10es Oktovriou 1993', Athens.
Who's Who tes Allaghes (1981), Athens: Orizon.

Internet Sources
http://www.elections.gr/
http://www.ekloges.gr/
http://www.parliament.gr/
http://www.primeminister.g/