

THE GREEK LABOUR MOVEMENT AND NATIONAL PREFERENCE DEMANDS, 1890–1922

Nikos Potamianos

It has been argued that class ideology and nationalism are both inherent to the working class,¹ which moves continuously between these two anti-omic poles. Thus, the formulation of demands for national preference over ‘foreigners’, that is, of the privileged treatment of locals regarding employment and returns from the welfare state, is a tendency that is permanently present, and can find itself at the forefront of the collective action of the working class depending on the wider political framework.

The concept of national preference demands has been developed by Etienne Balibar, who adopted the term with which the contemporary French far right describes its beliefs: ‘first the French’, and then the immigrants, as regards, for example, health and education provisions.² Racist assumptions, of course, albeit modified, lie at the root of these views.³ Why, then, use the concept of national preference demands instead of racism itself? Mainly because the two concepts refer to different ways of founding inequality and exclusion. Exclusions such as those referred to in this chapter are not necessarily based on an ideological system of a hierarchy of races and nations that legitimizes dominance, like the one developed during colonialism.⁴ Yet, as Balibar observes, such exclusions are integrally related to the existence of the ‘national-social state’.⁵ In other words, they are related to one of the basic organizational principles of politics in the modern world, the correlation of rights with citizenship and nationality.

This relationship of citizenship with nationality constitutes a legal practice, but also defines a field of political confrontation: are those who do not have citizenship entitled to social rights and, if so, which ones? And what happens when foreigners are considered to be part of the same nation, as was the case with the Ottoman Greeks, the millions of Greeks who until 1922 were subjects of the Ottoman Empire? Moreover, to the degree that citizenship is not fully identified with a cultural or biological perception of the nation,⁶ the claim for privileged treatment could turn against people who have the status of citizen. In other words, the demand for national preference can be based on a more limiting perception of national community than the one that is legally accepted, and be equivalent with the demand for a respective adaptation of the status of the citizen. Here the distinction made by Anthony Smith between *nation* and *ethnie* could be useful: the differentiation between the political and cultural determinants of the nation produces an inherent instability and provides a substratum that is often utilized by demands for national preference.⁷

The demand for national preference constitutes a form of politicization of some of the antagonisms between ethnic groups. As argued by Balibar, it is not a dyadic relationship (between Self and Other) but a triadic one, with the presence of the state also being necessary, and to which requests are directed to translate social/cultural difference into public policy.⁸ This necessity of the presence of the state entails two pre-conditions for the formulation of national preference demands.

Firstly, such demands refer to communities that are constituted as political ones, are legally determined and are supported by the ideological mechanisms of the state (which process, cultivate and map out national identity). In less centralized states, these specifications can be fulfilled by the regions and take the forms of ‘regional preference’, but in the Greek context the establishment of institutional inequalities needed to pass through a process of renegotiation of the composition and limits of the national community.

Secondly, since such claims are cited mainly in respect of the labour market (as well as in returns from the welfare state, which had not yet emerged in Greece in the period under consideration in this chapter), the ‘politicization’ of the competition presupposes that the state has a legitimate claim to intervene in fields which according to classical liberalism belonged strictly to the private sphere. National preference demands belong to the era of social liberalism and social democracy, of the rise of statism – which started in Greece in the first decades of the twentieth century.⁹

This chapter examines the development of such demands in Greece, mainly in Athens (the capital) and Piraeus (its port) during the 1910s. Who can be symbolically and politically expelled from the nation and its networks of solidarity? What are the preconditions for the development of national preference demands? How are they related to the broader developments of these years? Answers to these questions promise to contribute to the historicizing of the concept, and its placement in the context of the contemporary world that was then arising.

First, I present the development of national preference demands against the refugees from the Ottoman Empire; next, I attempt to interpret the phenomenon and the timing of its emergence, by examining the social and intellectual structures that made it possible. The focus is on three areas: the changes in the way foreigners (of Greek origin or not) who came to work in Greece were treated; the competition of ethno-local communities of immigrants in many labour markets, which reached its peak and was transformed when the refugees appeared as a community against which national preference demands could be formulated; and the practices for controlling the labour market that were applied both by the labour unions and by groups of workers with common places of origin after 1890, when the labour unions were established in Greece and strikes and other forms of collective demands grew in frequency. Finally, I examine the connections of the particularisms upon which the national preference demands were based during the formation of the Greek working class in the first decades of the twentieth century.

The sources used consist mainly of newspapers and archival material. Charters, resolutions, memoranda and proceedings of the meetings of unions and labour centres constitute one significant body of sources. News and interviews in the daily press of Athens are another – and it should be stressed that the wealth of information relevant to social history found in some newspapers, such as *Akropolis*, which published inquiries about economic and social issues in which humble workers and shopkeepers were sometimes interviewed. Of course, I also draw extensively from already published material, local histories and scientific literature, and discuss this evidence from a new perspective.

Local Workers and Refugees during the 1910s

After the defeat of the Greeks in the Greco–Turkish war of 1919–22, millions of refugees from Asia Minor came to Greece, most of them experiencing an abrupt proletarianization. The conflicts between local populations and refugees were intense, and still constitute part of the

Greek collective memory. Cultural and political differences definitely contributed to these conflicts, but there was a powerful material background as well: conflicts in the labour market between local waged workers and refugees, competition between local and refugee retailers and members of the liberal professions in attracting customers, and conflicts regarding the expropriation of the lands of Turkish landowners.¹⁰

This post-1922 conflict is a well-known story in Greece, although not adequately studied. But while the two latter forms of conflict (regarding customers and land) emerged after 1922, those in the labour market had emerged in the previous decade, and already taken a significant leap. Waves of Greek refugees from Asia Minor and elsewhere had also sought temporary refuge in Greece in previous periods of Greco-Turkish conflict, in 1912 and 1914.¹¹ I will present the various forms of competition that developed in the labour market between the local population and the refugees, and place them in their wider context.

In 1912 a house painter protested that in Athens there was an ‘accumulation of craftsmen and workers from all over Greece and the Ottoman Empire, while we, the indigenous population, are deprived of work’.¹² Such complaints are rarely encountered prior to that time: on the few occasions that we read about claims for privileged treatment of the local population, they are as a rule directed against foreigners who were not of Greek ethnicity. Perhaps the most important example is the 1910 strike by marine engineers who demanded, among other things, that the ship-owners stop employing engineers ‘unknown, of unknown origins, of every nationality’.¹³

In 1912 a significant strike by bakery workers was defeated due to the recruitment, as strikebreakers, of Ottoman Greeks who had flocked to Athens to avoid being drafted into the Ottoman army.¹⁴ This incident can be considered as a prelude to a period of inter-worker conflicts that were structured around the two poles: the ‘locals’ and the ‘foreigners’ of Greek origin. Of decisive importance for the conflict taking this form was the creation of a reserve army of labour consisting of refugees who not only lacked Greek citizenship before 1922 but also remained outside the organized labour movement, since they did not consider their residence in Greece as permanent.

In 1914 thousands of refugees from Asia Minor took refuge in Greece; negative attitudes towards them quickly emerged in the labour unions, since they agreed to work under worse conditions, ‘continuously driving away organized workers from some occupations’.¹⁵ Especially in the port of Piraeus, the refugees, consisting of a mass of workers of great numbers and easily mobilized, were used as strikebreakers in the grain dockers’ strike of 1914, while in 1916 contractors attempted to replace

the coal dockers with refugees but gave in when the Piraeus Labour Centre threatened a general strike.¹⁶

The antagonisms that emerged led to the formulation of demands of national preference over the refugees. In August 1914 the representative of the tanners in the Athens Labour Centre announced that ‘many refugees, on the one hand receive benefits from the government, and on the other they work for minimum wages and deprive many of our workers of the opportunity to feed themselves’, an intervention that was incorporated in a memorandum by the Athens Labour Centre on various issues that was submitted some time later. In the memoranda of the Athens and Piraeus Labour Centres studied, no such demand was encountered again; however, in the summer of 1916 the president of the Piraeus Labour Centre announced that at the coming workers’ convention there would be a discussion about ‘imposing a preference for hiring Greeks, who had served in the army’.¹⁷

This formulation was clearly intended to discriminate against the refugees, who had not served in the Greek army. It can be observed that the claim for their exclusion was not legitimized with a delimited perception of the nation that called into question the national bonds uniting the population of Greece with the Greek populations in the Ottoman Empire; instead it was founded on an active (and not just legal) perception of citizenship, based on shared sacrifice within the political community and the nation, three years after the end of the Balkan Wars and immediately after a period of army mobilization. Ideas that set refugees outside the national body, on a cultural as well as a political level, were not encountered in the texts of the workers’ unions; however, these had already been developed in 1916, as we shall see, and functioned as a background that legitimized the above claims. In addition, in 1914–15 provisions appear in some charters of workers’ unions that restricted participation only to Greek citizens.¹⁸ Here it was the legal definition of citizenship that was invoked in order to exclude refugees.

The development of these anti-refugee attitudes and the way they were transformed into national preference demands can be better understood if placed within three wider frameworks: the monopolistic practices of the early workers’ movement, the role of the immigrant communities in the life of the workers, and the changing attitude of the Greek state and its citizens towards foreigners who came to work in Greece. Let us start with the latter.

Foreigners in the Greek State

In 1907 foreign subjects constituted approximately 2 per cent of the population of the Greek state and 6–6.5 per cent in Athens and Piraeus. The majority were Ottoman subjects (Greeks, but not only so), while there were also communities of Italians, Maltese and so on.¹⁹ Generally, the presence of workers who were not locals, whether of Greek ethnic origin or not, appears in the nineteenth century to have been naturally accepted. The labour of the itinerant artisans remained an important aspect of social reality in the Balkans, and the Greek state was one of their destinations.²⁰ The agricultural development up until the end of the nineteenth century created a steady demand for workers in agriculture, seasonal and not, which was often met by workers from the Ottoman Empire;²¹ many foreign workers worked in the large public works of the 1880s.²²

It was also a period without identity cards and passports.²³ The naturalization of foreigners must have operated without problems, if we consider the number of people who voted who came from the Ottoman Empire, and in 1881 the procedure was simplified.²⁴ The conflict that had emerged in the 1840s regarding the civil rights (and the right to be employed by the state) of the Greeks who came from the Ottoman Empire was settled quickly, and the development of the irredentist vision of the Great Idea (the creation of a state that would include all Greeks) shaped an intellectual environment of positive attitudes towards the Greeks who remained under foreign rule.²⁵ In the 1870s there were negative representations of the Greek grand-bourgeois who came from the Ottoman Empire, but these did not concern the Ottoman Greeks of the lower classes.²⁶

However, the identities of the indigenous and the foreigner, although under continuous renegotiation in cities (like Athens and Piraeus) that saw significant increases in their population thanks to internal immigration, did not fade into the background. For example, some candidates for the office of the mayor of Athens invoked the fact that they were born there, in contrast to their opponents.²⁷ The participation of foreigners of Greek origin in political mobilization was generally tolerated and can be seen in numerous instances.²⁸ However, in 1885, when Ottoman Greeks demonstrated in Athens in favour of the governing party, the conservative newspaper *Kairoi* questioned their right to intervene in politics and threatened them with deportation.²⁹

In the 1910s there was an intensification of attacks against ‘foreigners’, initially against members of the new political elite that followed

Venizelos and the Liberal Party, then against the ‘not drafted refugees’ who supported the participation of Greece in World War I. In the great August 1916 royalist demonstration, the conservative opponents of Venizelos and supporters of the king who opposed the entry of Greece into the Great War, many insults were heard against the refugees. Somewhat later, the Pan-Hellenic Association of Mobilized Soldiers, the most important body of mass support for the royalists, launched a violent attack against the ‘refugees, who may speak Greek but showed servile attitude towards the foreigners [of the Entente] and follow them blindly’. When the political conflict in Athens escalated to the level of a low-intensity civil war, during the events of November 1916, dozens of refugees were executed by the royalists.³⁰

This rapid development of anti-refugee attitudes cannot be explained solely on the basis of the refugees’ political choices (although this is an important part of the story). Certainly, the mass character of the wave of refugees in 1914 created difficulties in their integration into the social structures, while it coincided with the decline in the standard of living of the lower classes created by inflation and the army mobilizations. It also coincided with the difficulties for small businesses, something that led, for the first time in modern Greek history, to complaints about ‘over-crowding’ in the trades.³¹

Moreover, the wars of 1912–22 (Balkan Wars 1912–13, World War I 1917–18, Greco–Turkish War 1919–22), the ‘National Division’ regarding foreign policy in 1915, the political and military interventions by the Entente in 1915–17, and the problems created by the integration into the Greek state after 1912 of large populations of different religions and ethnicities, all led to redefinitions of national ideology concerning, among other issues, the composition and the limits of the national community. Should the ‘traitors’ and the ‘slaves of the foreigners’ be expelled from the nation? Were the exclusions of or even acts of violence towards Greek citizens of different ethnicity (or towards non-citizens of Greek ethnicity) legitimate? Obviously this renegotiation of national bonds constituted an intellectual environment favourable to the development of national preference demands.

Finally, it was in the second decade of the new century that the state’s intervention into the economy started to expand into the labour market, with the labour legislation that was introduced by the Liberal Party in 1910–14 but also with the frequent involvement of governments in dealing with strikes.³² This definitely facilitated the politicization of the competition that developed within the working class between ethnic groups, and thus the emergence of demands for national preference.

Bonds of Common Origin and Workers' Collectivities

Passing to the second area of our analysis, the role of the immigrants' communities was important in the organization of everyday life in the cities and in such places of work as mines. The bonds of common origin were of great importance regarding the reception of the newly arrived and their ability to find employment.³³ They expressed companionship and were the roots of places of gathering, political networks and solidarity relationships,³⁴ as well as patterns of marriage.³⁵ These bonds left their imprint on the city web, as fellow villagers tended to reside in the same neighbourhoods.³⁶

In various professions an ethno-local division of labour can be detected, based either on the traditional skills developed by people of certain areas (potters from Sifnos, goldsmiths from Stemnitsa and so on)³⁷ or 'specializations' that developed in the new location in which they settled.³⁸ The 'contract-work organization of labour' played an important role in the creation of groups of fellow countrymen working together in the port, construction works, mines or tobacco factories, under an efficient craftsman or a small capital owner who undertook projects and carried them out with people of his choice.³⁹ These subcontractors often functioned as leaders or middle 'cadres' of the immigrant communities, and their choices concerning the recruitment of workers can be regarded as forms of control of specific labour markets by collectivities of fellow countrymen.

In brief, competition in the labour market took place not only between individuals but also between immigrant groups, particularly when the job openings were the subject of negotiation, not in isolated cases but by many people at the same time. Characteristic here is the discussion at the association of people from Kefalonia living in Athens in 1906 regarding the possibility that people from Kefalonia could work as longshoremen at the customs house of Piraeus if the people from Mani were expelled from that post; eventually it was islanders from Astypalaia and Santorini who replaced the Maniates there.⁴⁰ Competition between the communities of immigrants was endemic in certain specific areas of the labour market, and sometimes led to violent clashes between groups of workers who came from the same place. In mines, three major conflicts of this kind were detected that took place between 1903 and 1910,⁴¹ while in 1906 a battle proper took place in Piraeus between the Maniates and Cretans: for three days houses were invaded, shops were set on fire and people were shot, a clash that began with a conflict in the port of Piraeus and finished with a change in the pattern of employment in the port.⁴²

This competition would be reproduced within the labour unions, although of course in 'softer' forms. One of the most important figures of the early labour movement in Greece criticized the habit within the labour unions of voting on the basis of the 'localist egoism of the non-formed workers' mass'.⁴³ The spirit of ethno-local particularism could be manifested with the creation of particular associations of workers and shopkeepers coming from the same place,⁴⁴ or with provisions such as the one found in the charter of the Brotherhood of People from Lakonia in Athens and Piraeus (1915): the association would 'support people from Lakonia wherever they may be', and specifically mentioned 'those working in groups in the customs of Piraeus and other workplaces'.⁴⁵

Thus, the competition between immigrant communities in the labour market created an environment of monopolistic demands and ethno-local particularisms upon which sat the rivalry with the refugees in the 1910s. From one aspect the refugees functioned and were perceived as a group of people from the same place against which everybody else rallied. And while the competition between groups of fellow countrymen could not easily be politicized, at least not in the given institutional and political framework, in the 1910s the refugees from Asia Minor became, as we have already seen, a community of non-citizens against which demands of national preference could be formulated.

The Aspiration for Monopolies of the Labour Unions

The last point of our analysis deals with the practices that dominated the labour movement in its early period in Greece (1890–1918). Next to other demands (on wages, working hours, limiting the prices of goods, control of the working process and so on), there are also demands that aim at control of the labour market.⁴⁶ The limitations in the supply of labour were a form of reducing competition (and maintaining wages at a high level) familiar from the past, when the guilds determined the employment of apprentices and accession to the status of master artisan,⁴⁷ while the collective control of the labour market constituted in general a prerequisite for the success of the other demands of the workers, since their mobilization frequently brought them up against the possibility that their employers would replace them with other workers, temporarily during a strike or even permanently.⁴⁸ Therefore, we must consider that the development of monopolistic strategies by the workers' collectivities (both formal and informal) was part of their automatic response.

The control of workers' collectivities over the labour market could be exercised in favour of an immigrant community, across gender or

ethnic-religious lines or on any other basis. The following paragraphs will not refer to specific intra-class divisions and conflicts,⁴⁹ but to monopolistic strategies that did not turn against a particular competitor in the labour market. The most essential demand in the direction of the establishment of local monopolies was the recognition of the responsibility of the labour union to determine who was entitled to work in the profession. This is encountered for the first time in 1895,⁵⁰ but it was mainly in the 1910s and 1920s that the labour movement demanded vigorously that hiring should take place through the unions.⁵¹ Usually they promoted the argument that the union guaranteed the ability of its members, while in some fields emphasis was given to guaranteeing their honesty,⁵² and they also brought forth reasons of hygiene: workers' 'booklets' were established for the first time in 1912 for bakery workers, in combination with their obligation to undergo medical examinations, after a request by their union; three months later they were used to delay the recruitment of strikebreakers during the strike by bakery workers.⁵³ In the 1920s there was a more explicit demand to establish 'closed professions', at the same time as the appearance of policies against unemployment in professions with very few job openings.⁵⁴ Certainly, the workers' booklets, in effect identity cards indicating who was entitled to work in a profession, constituted a weapon that could be used by the other side as well: by the employer (since he was able to make notes and comments on them) in order to discipline his subordinates and by the state (since the state issued them) against militant syndicalism and communists.⁵⁵

There were two other methods of control of the labour market by the unions. Firstly, their members occasionally worked according to a rotation method, which in periods of increased unemployment ensured a minimum income and limited the reduction in wages. This is first encountered as a demand in the early stages of the labour movement in Greece: it was claimed and won in the field of shipping in the 1910s, and must have had important impetus given that the longshoremen in the port of Piraeus in 1924 managed to gain it during a period of labour oversupply and in spite of opposition by the employers.⁵⁶ Second, the labour unions sometimes operated as contracting teams undertaking various projects, substituting for entrepreneurs and ensuring work for their members⁵⁷ – an initiative that was not without problems.⁵⁸ This practice could well have enhanced the unions' basis within a closed labour group of people from the same place, like the union of customs workers.⁵⁹

All these monopolistic strategies had shaped workers' attitudes. When the refugees emerged as a threat to the control (achieved or aimed for) of the labour market by the unions or other workers' groups, demands

for privileged treatment of locals must have been an almost automatic response.

Working Class Formation and Particularisms

So far I have defined the social, political and intellectual structures that made possible the formulation of national preference demands against the refugees. However, the story does not end here, with the simple prevalence of the pole of ‘nationalism’ (or other ethno-local identities) over the pole of ‘class ideology’ in workers’ loyalties – to use Balibar’s terms that began this chapter. On the contrary, what strikes the researcher is the temporal coincidence between the development of national preference demands against the refugees and the first big steps in the formation of the working class in Greece after 1910. In fact, the development of the practices of exclusion, monopoly and entrenchment described above kept pace with (and in one respect were part of) the tendencies towards working class formation which led to the establishment of the General Federation of Greek Workers in 1918. The two ‘antinomic poles’ appear not as absolutely opposed, but as entangled in a dialectical relationship. This constitutes a paradox only for an idealized perception of class, which ignores the hierarchies within the classes and the exclusions on the basis of which they are partly defined – hierarchies and exclusions based on gender, ethnicity or skill. There was a dialectic between class formation on the one hand, which by definition meant the enlargement of the community of solidarity, and exclusions and particularisms on the other.

This dialectic between the universalistic and the particularistic rationale appears in characteristic form in the summer of 1916, when the army mobilization that had been imposed almost a year previously came to an end. The demand brought forth by the labour centres of Athens and Piraeus, for workers discharged by the army to be rehired in their jobs,⁶⁰ contributed to class unification, since it concerned every kind of workplace, promoted a common identity for all workers, and demonstrated the right to work on a general level and not related to specific communities, privileges or vested interests. However, this demand *de facto* was not addressed solely to the employers, but was also directed against those who had taken the jobs of the mobilized workers: refugees, internal immigrants, women and adolescents.

There were cases in which forms of solidarity based on local bonds not only did not contradict class formation but also contributed to it. The solidarity bonds of the communities around the mine of Serifos in 1916 probably contributed crucially to the militant strike of that year.⁶¹ The

union of quarrymen from Karpathos was one of the four that founded the Athens Labour Centre in 1910. However, it should not be ignored that in so doing the quarrymen were involved in a process that led to the modification of their charter in 1911, such that they would accept as a member any labourer working in the trade, irrespective of place of origin.⁶² Despite their entanglement, class and national/local particularism remained two different poles, often posing dilemmas for individuals: to which did they owe their primary loyalty?

Ronald Aminzade has stressed that ‘class interests typically compete politically and organizationally with alternative interests rooted in non-class identities’,⁶³ but this competition does not necessarily have an either/or outcome. To put it in a way that resembles the analyses of Ernesto Laclau,⁶⁴ the specific articulation of the multiple identities of the subjects, and the hierarchy and relations between them, constitutes a field of antagonism; the tensions that developed between the identities in the process of their articulation could be neutralized or intensified. In our case, ‘class identity’ could prevail over other identities or take a subordinate position in the hierarchy of loyalties of individual and collective subjects; it could incorporate some identities, neutralize others, and be contra-distinguished from many (but not necessarily opposed to them). The specific outcome of the articulation would be decided by a multitude of factors, and politics was not the least important, as the interwar developments in Greece suggest.

Indeed, in Athens and Piraeus in the second decade of the twentieth century, despite the acceleration of the process of working class formation, conflicts between ethno-local communities in the labour market remained the dominant pattern, perhaps reinforced by the arrival of the refugees from Asia Minor and Thrace. Yet a tendency was further developed for transcending particularism, or at any rate for expanding the boundaries within which the solidarity relationships functioned and collective action was developed. This research does not extend to the interwar period, but the impression is given that an important impetus in this direction was provided by the leading role of the Left and the socialist ideas in many workplaces, and their efforts to integrate the refugees into working-class organizations, by promoting the union of local and refugee workers and discarding any national preference demands.

This is not to say that the communist and socialist trade unionists immediately abandoned their monopolistic practices. At the association of lithographers, for example, ‘the supervision so that every worker that is hired should come from the members of the association’ is added into the objectives of the charter of 1924, when the union was under the control of the Communist Party.⁶⁵ These practices promised to strengthen the

unions and their status in negotiations, and for this reason they were accepted, but they contradicted the drive towards the transcendence of conflicts within the working class (and the focus on the struggle against employers) which unions ought to have provided. There was realization of this contradiction: it can be seen to explain the concealment in the newspaper of the Communist Party, when writing about the strike in textile factories in 1921, of the demand for exclusively hiring members of the union.⁶⁶

Therefore, a tension developed between the coexistence of monopolistic practices and the universal character of the socialist project, and it seems that in the long term the former receded. The dialectic between universalism and particularism of course continued to exist; however, from a certain point the establishment of 'local' monopolies would be connected not so much with the militant spirit of the labour movement, which expressed a universalistic rationale, but with paternalist policies of concessions from above which aimed at ensuring social consent, especially in the years following the Greek Civil War. Perhaps typical is the case of the workers in the port of Preveza, where the practices not only of work monopoly but also hereditary rights in employment were later related to the state's demand for a 'Certificate of political beliefs' on the part of the workers, and with the other measures of the anti-communist state adopted after 1936/1949.⁶⁷

As regards national preference demands, after the bitter conflicts of the interwar years, the new divisions of the 1940s contributed to the improvement of relations between 'Old Greeks' and refugees. This normalization, and in general the gradual unification of Greece in ethnic terms, discouraged the formulation of preference demands on an ethnic basis until the coming of immigrants from Eastern Europe in the 1990s. It was no longer refugees who were, in the discourse of their opponents, to be symbolically expelled from the Greek nation; instead, until 1974 it was not an ethnic group at all, but rather the communists, who were accused of being antipatriotic collaborators with international communism and with the neighbouring communist states of the Balkans. Many thousands of communists were expelled from the national body, not only symbolically in the official discourse of the so-called 'nationally minded' state, but also legally, being deprived of their citizenship when they sought refuge behind the 'Iron Curtain'.

Nikos Potamianos is an assistant researcher at the Institute for Mediterranean Studies – Foundation for Research and Technology-Hellas, based in Rethymno, Greece. He is a member of the academic

board of the journal *Ta Istorika*, and has published widely on the contemporary social and political history of Greece, focusing on labour history, the lower middle class of shopkeepers and artisans, populism and radicalism. His new book is about the social history of the carnival of Athens in 1800–1940 (Cretan University Press, 2020). He is currently working on the concept of moral economy and its potential for historical research.

Notes

Earlier versions of this chapter were presented at the conference ‘I istoria tis ergasias’ [History of labour] organized by the journal *Historein* in Athens, 20–21 May 2011, at the 16th summer meeting of postgraduate students of modern and contemporary history at the University of Crete, Rethymno, 18–20 July 2011, and at the conference ‘Working in the Ottoman Empire and in Turkey: Ottoman and Turkish Labour History within a Global Perspective’ which took place at Istanbul Bilgi University, 18–20 November 2011.

1. Etienne Balibar, ‘Class Racism’, in *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, ed. Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (London: Verso, 1991), 204–15.
2. Jean-Yves Le Gallou, *La préférence nationale: réponse à l’immigration* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1985).
3. Pierre-André Taguieff, *Sur la nouvelle droite* (Paris: Descartes et Cie, 1994).
4. Marcel van der Linden and Jan Lucassen, ‘Introduction’, in *Racism and the Labor Market*, ed. Marcel van der Linden and Jan Lucassen (Bern: Peter Lang, 1995), 9–19. This racist emphasis on inequality and dominance is stressed by Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), 136, who argues for the proximity of racial visions more towards social class than to nation, to the extent that they ‘justify not so much foreign wars as domestic repression and domination’ (in the interior of both national states and colonial empires); see Paul Gilroy, *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack* (London: Routledge, 2002), 43–46 for criticism and demonstration of the common characteristics of nationalism and racism. Pierre-André Taguieff, *La force du préjugé: Essai sur le racisme et ses doubles* (Paris: La Découverte, 1987) bases his analysis on the distinction between racism that aims at domination and racism that aims at exterminating the Other. For our purposes it would be more useful to distinguish between racism that aims at the ‘justifying of exploitation of labour’ and racism of those who ‘feel exploited’ (typical is the anti-Semitism utilized by Nazism), a distinction made by Dik van Arkel, ‘Why Are Historical Labor-Market Studies Relevant to the Understanding of Racism?’, in Van der Linden and Lucassen, *Racism and the Labor Market*, 21–53.
5. Etienne Balibar, *Les frontières de la démocratie* (Paris: La Découverte, 1992).
6. Something that is generally the rule even in countries like Greece where the bond between citizenship and nationality was tighter than Western Europe: Antonis Liakos, ‘Multiple Paths to Citizenship: T.H. Marshall’s Theory and the Greek Case’, in *Citizenship in Historical Perspective*, ed. Steven Ellis, Guomundur Halfdanarson and Ann Katherine Isaacs (Pisa: Edizioni Plus, 2006), 65–70. On the other hand, the differentiation between citizenship and the nation is expressed on a legal level in Greece from very early on: next to the contrast between the indigenous and the foreigner, a distinction was introduced between people of Greek ethnic origin and those of different ethnicity, a distinction that was used not only for instituting a favourable treatment of the Greek Orthodox Christians from the Ottoman Empire, for example regarding the citizenship procedures, but also

- in order to differentiate the status of the Muslim residents of Thessaly in 1881 and of Macedonia and Epirus in 1913 concerning the way in which they obtained Greek citizenship: Dimitris Christopoulos, 'Peripeteies tis ellinikis ithageneias: Poios (den) echei ta prosonta na einai Ellinas?', *Theseis* 87 (2004), 61–90.
7. Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 149–52.
 8. Etienne Balibar, 'Insurrection et Constitution: La citoyenneté ambiguë', in *Pensées critiques: Dix itinéraires de la revue Mouvements, 1998–2008* (Paris: La Découverte, 2009), 9–28.
 9. Christos Hadziiossif, *I giraia selini: I viomichania stin elliniki oikonomia, 1830–1940* (Athens: Themelio, 1993), 391–92.
 10. George Mavrogordatos, *Stillborn Republic: Social Coalitions and Party Strategies in Greece, 1922–1936* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 193 ff. For the arrival and settlement of refugees in Greece, either following the defeated Greek army or later with the forced population exchange between Greece and Turkey, but in any case leaving (the great majority of them) all their belongings behind, see Giorgos Tzedopoulos, ed., *Pera apo tin katastrofi: Mikrasiates prosfyges stin Ellada tou mesopolemon* (Athens: Idryma Meizonos Ellinismou, 2003); Kostas Katsapis, 'To prosfygiko zitima', in *To 1922 kai oi prosfyges: Mia nea matia*, ed. Antonis Liakos (Athens: Nefeli, 2011), 125–69.
 11. Nikos Andriotis, 'I proti prosfygia: Ellinikes prosfygikes metakiniseis, 1906–1922', in *Istoria tou Neou Ellinismou, 1700–2000*, vol. 6, ed. Vassilis Panagiotopoulos (Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 2003), 95–104.
 12. *Akropolis*, 3 April 1912.
 13. 'Appeal of the strikers', April 1910, in the archive of Stefanos Dragoumis (in Gennadius Library, Athens), dossier 71.1 – where there is abundant material on the strike; see also *Astrapi*, 21 and 23 October 1909; *Koinonismos*, 16 April 1910; *Ergatikon Kentron Peiraios*, *Oi ergatai tou Peiraios pros to Anotaton Symvoulion tis Ergasias* (Piraeus, June 1912), 5 and 10–11. For an earlier isolated protest regarding the employment of foreign workers in the construction of railroads, see *Akropolis*, 18 October 1890.
 14. *Akropolis*, 21 and 26 May, and from 29 May to 9 June 1912 (especially 8 June); see also *Ypomnima tou Ergatikou Kentrou Athinon: Oi ergatai tis Ellados pros tin diplin voulin ton Ellinon* (Athens, 1911), 6.
 15. Avraam Benaroya, 'O epangelmatikos agon tou ellinikou proletariatu', in his *I proti stadiodromia tou ellinikou proletariatu*, 2nd ed. (1921; repr., Athens: Kommouna, 1986), 228.
 16. *Viomichaniki kai viotechniki epitheorisis* 1(8) (December 1914), 248–49, and *Astir*, 17 September 1916.
 17. *Idrytiki praxi systasis EKA: Praktika syndriaseon, 1910–1914* (Athens, 2004), 556; *Empros*, 23 August 1914; and *Chronos*, 15 July 1916. Labour centres were a very important structure of the early Greek labour movement, corresponding to the dominance of small production units and based on the efforts of local avant-gardes of workers and intellectuals to propagate modern labour identities and politics (based on the opposition between labour and capital) and to mobilize non-unionized workers. Constituted on the basis of the city, labour centres were something more than local federations, both consisting of already existing trade unions and creating the political and social space required for unionizing. The first labour centre was founded in Volos in 1908, and was followed by Athens in 1910, Piraeus in 1912 and so on: Antonis Liakos, *Ergasia kai politiki stin Ellada tou Mesopolemon: To Diethnes Grafeio Ergasias kai i anadysi ton koinonikon thesmon* (Athens: Idryma Emporikis Trapezas, 1993), 98–99.
 18. *Syndesmos ton ypallilon kafeneion, zythopoleion kai zacharoplasteion Athinon kai Peiraios: Katastikon* (Athens, 1914); *Katastatikon ergaton artopoion Athinon 'I perithalpsi'* (Athens, 1915); charter of 1914 of the union of port workers of Piraeus at the Historical Archive of the National Bank of Greece, file 1 40 44 109.

19. Ypourgeio Esoterikon, *Statistika apotelesmata tis genikis apografis tou plithysmou kata tin 27 Oktovriou 1907*, vol. I (Athens, 1909), 42–43.
20. For example, Konstantinos Faltaits, *Oi Ipeirotai pou xenitevontai* (Athens, 1930).
21. *Pyrros*, 18 October 1907; *Akropolis*, 6 and 27 May 1910; and Nitsa Koliou, *Oi rizos tou ergatikou kinimatos kai o 'Ergatis' tou Volou* (Athens: Odysseas, 1988), 34.
22. Christina Agriantoni, *Oi aparches tis ekviomichanisis stin Ellada ton 19o aiona* (Athens: Istoriko Archeio Emporikis Trapezas, 1986), 291–94; Evi Papagiannopoulou, *I diorygia tis Korinthou* (Athens: Politistiko Technologiko Idryma ETV, 1989), 82–83 and 94.
23. Passports reappear in European countries at the turn of the century and the controls on international movement intensify after World War I: John Torpey, *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
24. Law PI, 'Peri sympliroseos tou arthrou 15 tou astikou nomou', *Efimeris tis Kyverniseos I*, no. 19, 25 February 1881. An important percentage of the Italians in Patras had obtained Greek citizenship: Christos Moulias, *To limani tis stafidas: Patras, 1828–1900* (Patras: Peri technon, 2000), 192.
25. Ioannis Dimakis, *I politikiaki metavoli tou 1843 kai to zitima ton aftochthonon kai ton eterochthonon* (Athens: Themelio, 1991); Elpida Vogli, 'Ellines to genos': *I ithageneia kai i taftotita sto etniko kratos ton Ellinon (1821–1844)* (Herakleion: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 2007); Elli Skopetea, *To protypo vasileio kai i Megali Idea: Opseis tou ethnou provlimatos stin Ellada (1830–1880)* (Athens: Polytypo, 1988).
26. Skopetea, *To protypo vasileio*.
27. *Efimeris*, 7 April 1879; *Akropolis*, 23–26 August and 2 September 1899.
28. Something that classifies them high in the ranks of 'semi-citizenship', distinguished by Elizabeth F. Cohen, *Semi-Citizenship in Democratic Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
29. *Kairoi*, 12 and 14 February 1885.
30. Gunnar Hering, *Ta politika kommata stin Ellada, 1821–1936*, vol. 2 (Athens: Morfotiko Idryma Ethnikis Trapezas, 2004), 824–25, originally published as *Die politischen Parteien in Griechenland, 1821–1936*, 2 vols (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1992); Spyros Marketos, 'O Alexandros Papanastasiou kai i epochi tou' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Athens, 1998), 354–55, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/20074536>; *Nea Ellas*, 16 August 1916; *Chronos*, 20 August 1916; and Chr. S. Chourmouzos, *Ta kata tin 18 kai 19 Noemvriou 1916 kai epekeina* (London, 1919), 102, 123–24.
31. Nikos Potamianos, *Oi noikokyraioi: Magazatores kai viotechnes stin Athina, 1880–1925* (Herakleion: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 2015), 124–35.
32. Spyros Koronis, *I ergatiki politiki ton eton 1909–1918* (Athens, 1944).
33. Leda Papastefanaki, *Ergasia, technologia kai fylo stin elliniki viomichania: I klostoyfantourgia tou Peiraiia (1870–1940)* (Herakleion: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 2009), 240–41. Telling are some charters of fellow countrymen's associations, where provisions for finding jobs for the newcomers are included. They were published in *Efimeris tis Kyverniseos I*, no. 193, 29 July 1889 (Charter of the Association of the People Coming from Ipeiros in Thessaly); *Efimeris tis Kyverniseos I*, no. 311, 7 November 1891 (Charter of the Association of the People Coming from Dorida in Athens); *Efimeris tis Kyverniseos I*, no. 19, 30 January 1893 (Charter of the Association of the People Coming from Nafpaktos in Patras).
34. Nikos Potamianos, 'I paradosiaki mikroastiki taxi tis Athinas: Magazatores kai viotechnes, 1880–1925' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Crete, 2011), 482–84, 677–79; Yannis Yannitsiotis, *I koinoniki tou Peiraiia: I sygkrotisi tis astikis taxis* (Athens: Nefeli, 2006), 358–64.
35. According to the books of marriage of the registry office of Athens in 1885–88, 1901–03 and 1911–12, the marriages between people from the same place of origin made up 25

- per cent of the total when the groom was a worker, peasant, shopkeeper or master artisan, but only 16 per cent when the groom was an entrepreneur, doctor, lawyer and so on: Potamianos, 'I paradosiaki mikroastiki taxi', 1161–62.
36. Potamianos, 'I paradosiaki mikroastiki taxi', 75–78; Myrto Dimitropoulou, 'Athènes au XIXe siècle: De la bourgade à la capital' (Ph.D. dissertation, Université Lumière Lyon 2, 2008), 220–26.
 37. Eleni Spathari-Begliti, *Oi agegioplastes tis Sifnou: Koinoniki sygkrotisi paragogi, metakiniseis* (Athens: Arsenidis, 1992); Stathis Tsotsoros, *Oikonomikoi kai koinonikoi michanismoï ston oreino choro: Gortynia (1715–1828)* (Athens: Emporiki Trapeza tis Ellados, 1986). Kostas Faltaïts, 'Oi planodioi technites stin Ellada', *Ellinika Grammata* 3 (1928), 8–13, 69–72, 181–84, provides a detailed list of the local specializations, while Kostas Biris, *Ai Athinai apo tou 19^{ou} eis ton 20^{on} aiona* (Athens: Melissa, 1999), 247–48, refers to the ethno-local division of labour in nineteenth-century Athens.
 38. A review of the mechanisms through which the ethnic division of labour is created is provided by Stephen Cornell and Douglas Hartmann, *Ethnicity and Race* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 1998), 160–64; see also Michael Hechter, 'Group Formation and the Cultural Division of Labor', *American Journal of Sociology* 84 (1978), 293–318. Of course, such a division of labour could never be absolute; we should be careful about adopting oversimplified stereotypes, as argued by M. Erdem Kabadayi, 'Working in a Fez Factory in Istanbul in the Late Nineteenth Century: Division of Labour and Networks of Migration Formed along Ethno-Religious Lines', *International Review of Social History* 54(S17) (2009), 69–90.
 39. Kostas Fountanopoulos, *Ergasia kai ergatiko kinima sti Thessaloniki: Ithiki oikonomia kai syllogiki drasi sto mesopolemo* (Athens: Nefeli, 2005), 74–78; Dimitra Lampropoulou, *Oikodomoi: Oi anthropoi pou echtisan tin Athina, 1950–1967* (Athens: Vivliorama, 2009), 188–94.
 40. *Akropolis*, 15 February and 28 May 1906. During the bloody conflicts between Cretans and Maniates in Piraeus, the Cretans demanded that the Maniates, who worked as porters in the customs house (where the conflict began), be expelled.
 41. *Skip*, 19 August 1903; *Akropolis*, 11 February 1905 and 31 May 1910.
 42. *Empros*, 14–16 February 1906; *Akropolis*, 16–22 February 1906; *Chronos*, 13 March 1906; Vasiliko Diatagma, 'Peri kanonismou tis komistikis ypiesias en to teloneio Peiraios', *Efimeris tis Kyverniseos* I, no. 49, 23 February 1906.
 43. Benaroya, *I proti stadiodromia*, 112.
 44. For example, in the list of the associations of Athens and Piraeus published in Nikolaos G. Inglesis, *Odigos tis Ellados, 1925–26* (Athens, n.d.), 561–76, the union of longshoremen 'Andros' and the association of coopers from Thira make their appearance. See also Thodoris Spyros, 'Oi imi-nomades stin "poli": I propolemiki metanastefsi ton Vlachon tou Gardikiou ston Peiraia', *Ariadne* (2009), 237–66.
 45. The charter can be found in the Historical Archive of the National Bank of Greece, file 1 40 44 285.
 46. See, for example, the recording of the demands of the strikes in 1909–14 by Foteini Soulioti, 'Oi apergiakes kinitopoiiseis tis periodou 1909–1914 ston athinaïko typo' (Master's thesis, University of Thessaloniki, 1991), 128–34.
 47. Spyros Asdrachas, 'Oi syntechnies stin tourkokratia: Oi oikonomikes leitourgies', in *Zitimata istorias* (Athens: Themelio, 1983), 97–115; idem, *Greek Economic History: 15th–19th Centuries*, 2 vols (Athens: Politistiko Idryma Omilou Peiraios, 2007).
 48. For examples of strikes during which the employers brought in workers from other cities or countries, see Yiannis Kordatos, *Istoria tou ellinikou ergatikou kinimatos*, 3rd ed. (Athens: Boukoumanis, 1972), 34, 43; *Athinai*, 22 September 1909; *Skip*, 25 October 1911.

49. For what remains the best attempt to incorporate intra-class conflicts in the interpretation of a significant moment of the labour movement in Greece, see Efi Avdela, ‘Classe, ethnicité et genre dans la Thessalonique post-ottomane’, in *Le genre entre classe et nation* (Paris: Syllepse, 2006), 131–52. Another example of the study of intra-working-class conflicts, which relates directly to our topic since it refers to an aspect of the labour centres’ demands in the 1910s, again comes from feminist historians. They have interpreted the demands for ‘protection’ of women workers (regarding working hours, working at night etc.) as attempts by male workers to reinforce notions of the superiority of male labour and to control employment by restricting women’s wage work. See Efi Avdela, “‘To the Most Weak and Needy’: Women’s Protective Labor Legislation in Greece”, in *Protecting Women: Labor Legislation in Europe, the United States, and Australia, 1890–1920*, ed. Ulla Wikander, Alice Kessler-Harris and Jane Lewis (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 290–317; Leda Papastefanaki, ‘Katamerismoi ergasias kai politikēs diacheirisis tis ergasias stis ellinikēs poleis (teli 19ou – protī dekaetia tou 20ou aiona)’, in *I protī dekaetia tou 20ou aiona*, by Etaireia Spoudon (Athens: Etaireia Spoudon Neollinikou Politismou kai Genikis Paideias, 2012), 145–66.
50. In the Charter of the Association of the Cookery Employees of Athens and Piraeus, in *Efimeris tis Kyverniseos* III, no. 59, 17 June 1895.
51. In working environments as varied as commercial stores, silversmiths, bakeries, tobacco processing or port docks: Archive of the Emporikos Syllogos Athinas, *Praktika Genikon Synelefseon*, 6 December 1918; Syndesmos adamantopolon kai argyrochrysochoon Athinon kai Peiraios, *Praktika Dioikitikou Symvoulion*, 5 September 1918; and *Praktika Genikon Synelefseon*, 9 September 1918 (in the union’s archive); *Astrapi*, 20 July 1909; Liakos, *Ergasia kai politiki*, 425; Soulioti, ‘Oi apergiakes kinitopoiiseis’, 102, 128–33; Vassilis Lazaris, *Politiki istoria tis Patras*, 3 vols (Athens: Achaïkes ekdoseis, 1986), vol. 1, 358–61, and vol. 2, 39–41; Memorandum of the Union of Transport (Syndikato sygkoinonias kai metaforon), 12 February 1921, in the archive of Dimitrios Gounaris, ELIA archives, file 1.
52. For example, employees of hotels and waiters, see *Akropolis*, 17 and 4 October 1908; *Syndesmos ton ypallilon kafeneion, zythopoleion; Efimeris tis Kyverniseos* III, no. 96, 10 December 1894 (Charter of the Association of Barber Workers of Athens).
53. *Akropolis*, 12 January, 15 February and 5–8 June 1912.
54. Fountanopoulos, *Ergasia kai ergatiko kinima*, 108–9; Liakos, *Ergasia kai politiki*, 139, 400–401 and 430–31.
55. *Gnomi tou dioikitikou symvoulion ton en Athinais xylourgon* (Athens, 1906); I.V., ‘Peri sympliroseos tis ergatikis nomothesias’, *Viomichaniki kai viotechniki epitheorisis* 2 (September 1915), 132–36; Fountanopoulos, *Ergasia kai ergatiko kinima*, 107–9, 240–41, 366.
56. Charilaos Gkoutos, *Oi apergies sti Syro to 1879* (Athens: Sakoulas, 1999), 35; Kanonismos tou syndesmou thermaston ‘o Stephenson’ in 1907 (archive of Stefanos Dragoumis, Gennadius Library, dossier 71.1); Ioannis Zarras, *Anergia kai ek peritropis ergasia* (Athens, 1940), 232–34; Fountanopoulos, *Ergasia kai ergatiko kinima*, 55, 103–6. Of course, for the institutionalization of rotation working for the workers in the port in 1924, the support provided by the state was decisive in order to ensure a peaceful environment in the field of labour. It should be noted that in other cases a rotation method was imposed by the employers: see for example Zarras, *Anergia*, 232.
57. The unions at the port of Piraeus were pioneers in demanding and adopting such practices too: *Akropolis*, 31 July 1912; Soulioti, ‘Oi apergiakes kinitopoiiseis’, 27; *To Ypourgeio tis Ethnikis Oikonomias: I drasis aftou kata tin trietia, 1917–1920* (Athens, 1920), 3.
58. For example, dependencies developed on the ‘financiers’ of these union-cooperatives, as well as conflicts in their interior that could lead to great division: in the case of the army boots workers, who undertook orders from the army, see Arist. N. Klimis, *Oi synetairismoi stin Ellada* (Athens: Pitsilos, 1985), 309–10; *Patris*, 8 September 1920; *Kathimerini*,

- 21 November 1921; *Eleftheros Typos*, 10 June 1923. See also *Idrytiki praxi systasis EKA*, 545, 548, 569, 582, for the conflicts that developed in the union of manufacturers of ‘tsarouchia’ shoes.
59. Being an ‘association related to the solidarity of place of origin and the recognition of vested rights’, according to *Akropolis*, 16 February 1906.
60. Dimitris Livieratos, *Megales ores tis ergatikis taxis* (Athens: Proskinio, 2006), 101–2.
61. Konstantinos Speras, *I apergia tis Serifou* (Athens: Vivlopelagos, 2001). Cf. Craig Calhoun, ‘The Radicalism of Tradition: Community Strength or Venerable Disguise and Borrowed Language?’, *American Journal of Sociology* 88(5) (1983), 886–915.
62. *Idrytiki praxi systasis EKA* and *Katatatikon tou en Athinais syllogou Karpathion latomon ‘i Proodos’* (Athens, 1911).
63. Ronald Aminzade, ‘Class Analysis, Politics and French Labor History’, in *Rethinking Labor History*, ed. Lenard Berlanstein (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 90–113, 92.
64. See, for example, Ernesto Laclau, *On Populist Reason* (London: Verso, 2005).
65. Charters of 1915, 1919 and 1924 can be found in the historical archive of the National Bank of Greece, 40 44 dossier 143.
66. Papastefanaki, *Ergasia, technologia kai fylo*, 392–93.
67. Vangelis Avdikos, *Preveza, 1945–1990: Opseis tis metavolis mias eparchiakis polis* (Preveza: Dimos Prevezas, 1991), 136–40.

Bibliography

- Agriantoni, Christina. *Oi aparches tis ekviomichanisis stin Ellada ton 19o aiona*. Athens: Istoriko Archeio Emporikis Trapezas, 1986.
- Aminzade, Ronald. ‘Class Analysis, Politics and French Labor History’, in *Rethinking Labor History*, edited by Lenard Berlanstein, 90–113. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Andriotis, Nikos. ‘I proti prosfygia: Ellinikes prosfygikes metakiniseis, 1906–1922’, in *Istoria tou Neou Ellinismou, 1700–2000*, vol. 6, edited by Vassilis Panagiotopoulos, 95–104. Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 2003.
- Asdrachas, Spyros. ‘Oi syntechnies stin tourkokratia: Oi oikonomikes leitourgies’, in *Zitimata istorias*, 97–115. Athens: Themelio, 1983.
- . *Greek Economic History: 15th–19th Centuries*. 2 vols. Athens: Politistiko Idryma Omilou Peiraios, 2007.
- Avdela, Efi. ‘“To the Most Weak and Needy”: Women’s Protective Labor Legislation in Greece’, in *Protecting Women: Labor Legislation in Europe, the United States, and Australia, 1890–1920*, edited by Ulla Wikander, Alice Kessler-Harris and Jane Lewis, 290–317. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- . ‘Classe, ethnicité et genre dans la Thessalonique post-ottomane’, in *Le genre entre classe et nation*, 131–52. Paris: Syllepse, 2006.
- Avdikos, Vangelis. *Preveza, 1945–1990: Opseis tis metavolis mias eparchiakis polis*. Preveza: Dimos Prevezas, 1991.
- Balibar, Etienne. ‘Class Racism’, in *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, edited by Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, 204–15. London: Verso, 1991.
- . *Les frontieres de la democratie*. Paris: La Découverte, 1992.
- . ‘Insurrection et Constitution: La citoyenneté ambiguë’, in *Pensées critiques: Dix itinéraires de la revue Mouvements, 1998–2008*, 9–28. Paris: La Découverte, 2009.

- Benaroya, Avraam. *I proti stadiodromia tou ellinikou proletariatou*, 2nd ed. Athens: Kommouna, 1986.
- Biris, Kostas. *Ai Athinai apo tou 19ou eis ton 20on aiona*. Athens: Melissa, 1999.
- Calhoun, Craig. ‘The Radicalism of Tradition: Community Strength or Venerable Disguise and Borrowed Language?’ *American Journal of Sociology* 88(5) (1983), 886–915.
- Chourmouzos, Chr. S. *Ta kata tin 18 kai 19 Noemvriou 1916 kai epekeina*. London, 1919.
- Christopoulos, Dimitris. ‘Peripeteies tis ellinikis ithageneias: Poios (den) echei ta prosonta na einai Ellinas?’ *Theseis* 87 (2004), 61–90.
- Cohen, Elizabeth F. *Semi-Citizenship in Democratic Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Cornell, Stephen, and Douglas Hartmann. *Ethnicity and Race*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 1998.
- Dimakis, Ioannis. *I politeiaki metavoli tou 1843 kai to zitima ton aftochthonon kai ton eterochthonon*. Athens: Themelio, 1991.
- Dimitropoulou, Myrto. ‘Athènes au XIXe Siècle: De la bourgade à la capital’. Ph.D. dissertation, Université Lumière Lyon 2, 2008.
- Ergatikon Kentron Peiraios. *Oi ergatai tou Peiraios pros to Anotaton Symvoulion tis Ergasias*. Piraeus, June 1912.
- Faltaits, Konstantinos. *Oi Ipeirotai pou xenitevontai*. Athens, 1930.
- Faltaits, Kostas. ‘Oi planodioi technites stin Ellada’. *Ellinika Grammata* 3 (1928), 8–13, 69–72, 181–84.
- Fountanopoulos, Kostas. *Ergasia kai ergatiko kinima sti Thessaloniki: Ithiki oikonomia kai syllogiki drasi sto mesopolemo*. Athens: Nefeli, 2005.
- Gilroy, Paul. *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Gkoutos, Charilaos. *Oi apergies sti Syro to 1879*. Athens: Sakoulas, 1999.
- Gnomi tou dioikitikou symvoulion ton en Athinai xylourgon*. Athens, 1906.
- Hadziiossif, Christos. *I giraia selini: I viomichania stin elliniki oikonomia, 1830–1940*. Athens: Themelio, 1993.
- Hechter, Michael. ‘Group Formation and the Cultural Division of Labor’. *American Journal of Sociology* 84 (1978), 293–318.
- Hering, Gunnar. *Die politischen Parteien in Griechenland, 1821–1936*. 2 vols. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1992.
- . *Ta politika kommata stin Ellada, 1821–1936*, vol. 2. Athens: Morfotiko Idryma Ethnikis Trapezas, 2004.
- Idrytiki praxi systasis EKA: Praktika synedriaseon, 1910–1914*. Athens, 2004.
- Inglesis, Nikolaos G. *Odigos tis Ellados, 1925–26*. Athens, n.d.
- I.V. ‘Peri sympliroseos tis ergatikis nomothesias’. *Viomichaniki kai viotechniki epitheorisis* 2 (September 1915), 132–36.
- Kabadayi, M. Erdem. ‘Working in a Fez Factory in Istanbul in the Late Nineteenth Century: Division of Labour and Networks of Migration Formed along Ethno-Religious Lines’. *International Review of Social History* 54(S17) (2009), 69–90.
- Katastatikon ergaton artopoion Athinon ‘I perithalpsi’*. Athens, 1915.
- Katastatikon tou en Athinai syllogou Karpathion latomon ‘i Proodos’*. Athens, 1911.
- Katsapis, Kostas. ‘To prosfygiko zitima’, in *To 1922 kai oi prosfyges: Mia nea matia*, edited by Antonis Liakos, 125–69. Athens: Nefeli, 2011.
- Klimis, Arist. N. *Oi synetairismoi stin Ellada*. Athens: Pitsilos, 1985.
- Koliou, Nitsa. *Oi rizis tou ergatikou kinimatos kai o ‘Ergatis’ tou Volou*. Athens: Odysseas, 1988.
- Kordatos, Yiannis. *Istoria tou ellinikou ergatikou kinimatos*, 3rd ed. Athens: Boukoumanis, 1972.
- Koronis, Spyros. *I ergatiki politiki ton eton 1909–1918*. Athens, 1944.
- Laclau, Ernesto. *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso, 2005.
- Lampropoulou, Dimitra. *Oikodomoi: Oi anthropoi pou echtisan tin Athina, 1950–1967*. Athens: Vivliorama, 2009.

- Lazaris, Vassilis. *Politiki istoria tis Patras*. 3 vols. Athens: Achaïkes ekdoseis, 1986.
- Le Gallou, Jean-Yves. *La préférence nationale: réponse à l'immigration*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1985.
- Liakos, Antonis. *Ergasia kai politiki stin Ellada tou Mesopolemon: To Diethnes Grafeio Ergasias kai i anadysi ton koinonikon thesmon*. Athens: Idryma Emporikis Trapezas, 1993.
- . ‘Multiple Paths to Citizenship: T.H. Marshall’s Theory and the Greek Case’, in *Citizenship in Historical Perspective*, edited by Steven Ellis, Guomundur Halfdanarson and Ann Katherine Isaacs, 65–70. Pisa: Edizioni Plus, 2006.
- Livieratos, Dimitris. *Megales ores tis ergatikis taxis*. Athens: Proskinio, 2006.
- Marketos, Spyros. ‘O Alexandros Papanastasiou Kai i Epochi Tou’. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Athens, 1998. Retrieved 7 September 2019 from www.scribd.com/doc/20074536.
- Mavrogordatos, George. *Stillborn Republic: Social Coalitions and Party Strategies in Greece, 1922–1936*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Moulias, Christos. *To limani tis stafidas: Patras, 1828–1900*. Patras: Peri technon, 2000.
- Papagiannopoulou, Evi. *I diorygia tis Korinthou*. Athens: Politistiko Technologiko Idryma ETVA, 1989.
- Papastefanaki, Leda. *Ergasia, technologia kai fyllo stin elliniki viomichania: I klostoyfantourgia tou Peiraia (1870–1940)*. Herakleion: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 2009.
- . ‘Katamerismoi ergasias kai politikis diacheirisis tis ergasias stis ellinikes poleis (teli 19ou – proti dekaetia tou 20ou aiona)’, in *I proti dekaetia tou 20ou aiona*, by Etaireia Spoudon, 145–66. Athens: Etaireia Spoudon Neoellinikou Politismou kai Genikis Paideias, 2012.
- Potamianos, Nikos. ‘I paradosiaki mikroastiki taxi tis Athinas: Magazatores kai viotechnes, 1880–1925’. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Crete, 2011.
- . *Oi noikokyraioi: Magazatores kai viotechnes stin athina, 1880–1925*. Herakleion: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 2015.
- Skopetea, Elli. *To prototypos vaseleio kai i Megali Idea: Opseis tou ethnikou provlimatos stin Ellada (1830–1880)*. Athens: Polytypo, 1988.
- Smith, Anthony. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- Soulioti, Foteini. ‘Oi aperiakiakos kinitopoiiseis tis periodou 1909–1914 ston athinaïko typo’. Master’s thesis, University of Thessaloniki, 1991.
- Spathari-Begliti, Eleni. *Oi aggeioplastes tis Sifnou: Koinoniki sygkrotisi paragogi, metakiniseis*. Athens: Arsenidis, 1992.
- Speras, Konstantinos. *I apergia tis Serifou*. Athens: Vivlopelagos, 2001.
- Spyros, Thodoris. ‘Oi imi-nomades stin “poli”: I propolemiki metanastefsi ton Vlachon tou gardikiou ston Peiraia’. *Ariadne* (2009), 237–66.
- Syndesmos ton ypallilon kafeneion, zythopoleion kai zacharoplasteion Athinon kai Peiraïos: Katastikon*. Athens, 1914.
- Taguieff, Pierre-André. *La force du préjugé: Essai sur le racisme et ses doubles*. Paris: La Découverte, 1987.
- . *Sur la nouvelle droite*. Paris: Descartes et Cie, 1994.
- To Ypourgeio tis Ethnikis Oikonomias: I drasis aftou kata tin trietia, 1917–1920*. Athens, 1920.
- Torpey, John. *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Tsotsoros, Stathis. *Oikonomikoi kai koinonikoi michanismoï ston oreino choro: Gortynia (1715–1828)*. Athens: Emporiki Trapeza tis Ellados, 1986.
- Tzedopoulos, Giorgos, ed. *Pera apo tin katastrofi: Mikrasiates prosfyges stin Ellada tou mesopolemon*. Athens: Idryma Meizonos Ellinismou, 2003.
- van Arkel, Dik. ‘Why Are Historical Labor-Market Studies Relevant to the Understanding of Racism?’, in *Racism and the Labor Market*, edited by Marcel van der Linden and Jan Lucassen, 21–53. Bern: Peter Lang, 1995.
- van der Linden, Marcel, and Jan Lucassen. ‘Introduction’, in *Racism and the Labor Market*, edited by Marcel van der Linden and Jan Lucassen, 9–19. Bern: Peter Lang, 1995.

- Vogli, Elpida. *‘Ellines to genos’: I ithageneia kai i taftotita sto ethniko kratos ton Ellinon (1821–1844)*. Herakleion: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, 2007.
- Yannitsiotis, Yannis. *I koinoniki tou Peiraia: I sygkrotisi tis astikis taxis*. Athens: Nefeli, 2006.
- Υπομνιμα του Ergatikou Kentrou Athinon: *Oi Ergatai tis Ellados pros tin diplin voulin ton Ellinon*. Athens, 1911.
- Ypourgeio Esoterikon. *Statistika apotelesmata tis genikis apografis tou plithysmou kata tin 27 Oktovriou 1907*, vol. I. Athens, 1909.
- Zarras, Ioannis. *Anergia kai ek peritropis ergasia*. Athens, 1940.