
REVIEW ARTICLES

Planning and Urban Growth in Southern Europe

Armando Montanari

National Research Council of Italy,
Institute for Research on Mediterranean Economies, Naples, Italy

This volume ¹ forms part of the general series of 'Studies in History, Planning and Environment' edited by G.E. Cherry and A. Sutcliffe, and contains studies on urban development over the last two centuries in five southern European countries: Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Turkey. The object of the different studies is to explore the nature of the development of urban and metropolitan centres as well as the policies adopted to control and direct the phenomena of urban expansion.

In the chapter devoted to Greece, L. Wasshoven shows how the urban development of modern Greece dates from the founding of the Greek state in 1829 and the establishment of the capital at Athens in 1833, even though the leading Greek entrepreneurs continued long after to reside abroad and the real economic and commercial capitals remained Instabul and Alexandria until the First World War. In the years after the war the country's development was determined by two other international events, the military defeat of 1922 and the consequent return of over one and a half million Greek refugees, and then in 1923 the exchange of ethnic minorities between Greece and Turkey. While many of the refugees went abroad, and others succeeded in establishing themselves in the agricultural regions of Macedonia and Thrace, the majority found their way into the towns. Between 1920 and 1930 the population of Athens rose from 400,000 to 800,000, creating a new crisis in a city that was already characterized by massive building speculation and the construction of huge illegal residential areas. In response to the crisis the Greek government in 1923 introduced a Town Planning Act, but this was a failure. Urban development plans were drawn up by the central government but their implementation was entrusted to local administration which was obliged to bear the full cost without

¹ MARTIN WYNN (ed.), *Planning and Urban Growth in Southern Europe*. (1984). Mansell, London and New York. pp. 210.

any special provision being made available, as well as the responsibility for controlling the programmes. Urban expansion was as a result left entirely to private initiative, with the consequence that long delays occurred in the provision of public services and open spaces since there were few economic incentives and virtually no effective policy of expropriation.

By the end of the Second World War nearly 25% of Greece's urban buildings had been destroyed, while the rapid expansion of the urban population (which rose from 37% in 1951 to 53% in 1971) made the problem of providing adequate housing even more difficult. Greece's industrial expansion was also highly urban, and while in 1973 there were more than 266 industries employing over 200 workers, 72% of these were sited in or near the metropolitan area of Athens. In the same period emigration abroad also contributed to urbanization. Between 1959 and 1965 there were 537,000 overseas emigrants, and their remittances back to Greece were invested primarily in the building sector in Athens and in tourist resorts and served to expand the illegal and sub-standard building sector.

The expansion of housing in Athens followed two distinct paths, on the one hand creating middle-class residential areas largely within the zones laid down in the town planning regulations and which were able to draw on the credit facilities that had been made available and, on the other, housing for the rest of the population which was constructed irrespective of the regulations and was mainly sub-standard. It is estimated that between 1945-66 at least half a million people were housed in sub-standard accommodation.

During the 1960s town planning became a major subject of public and political debate, and numerous studies were made in order to create more effective regulations and policy directives which would align urban expansion with regional patterns of economic growth. However all this was cut short by the coup of 1967 and the military dictatorship. The dictatorship lasted until 1974, and in the new constitution of 1975 the expropriation of private land for public utility was for the first time made legal. New programmes of territorial development which sought both to promote economic development and provide a programme of public housing schemes in the urban areas were put into effect. In 1979 a new Urban Development Areas Act replaced the earlier legislation of 1923. The new law was based on the French model and designated 'operational zones' within which private landowners were permitted to build only when they surrendered 30% of their land for buildings of collective use and after paying a tax equivalent to 10% of the value of the property in order to cover the cost of providing services. Perhaps because it was put into force too hurriedly and on too large a scale, the new law aroused strong opposition and in 1981 the government was forced to abandon it. The recent Socialist government has reintroduced a new version of the 1979 law, but as yet it is too early to gauge its results. A continuing obstacle to all policies of regional development in Greece lies in the high degree of administrative decentralization which means that the local authorities have control over both implementation and management of planning programmes. In a country with scarcely more than 10 million inhabi-

tants and which is divided into more than 6,000 local administrations, most of which are too small to be able to bear the responsibility and burden of development programmes, this creates great difficulties.

The chapter on Italy by D. Calabi refers to various projects of urban development in the early XIXth century, but again it is only after Unification in 1861 that a more systematic analysis becomes possible. In the first period under consideration, running from 1861 to the Second World War, the central phenomenon was the impact of industrialization in a country which showed marked regional differences. The North consisted of a network of urban centres along the Po Valley, whereas in the South urbanization was relatively low and dominated by the city of Naples, which in 1861 had nearly half a million inhabitants. The first legislative initiatives of the new Italian state were directed mainly at standardizing the different legislations of the pre-Unification states (The National Administration Act 1865), but a number of urban building projects were introduced by expropriation of designated areas (The Expropriation Act 1865) in order to provide new services and communications and to encourage the development of expanding urban regions.

The regional differentials present in the development of the Italian cities in the period between 1850 and 1918 make any generalization very difficult in D. Calabi's view. Her analysis is therefore based on the development of urban centres in the central Veneto region, in particular around the four cities of Padua, Vicenza, Verona and Treviso, each with populations varying from 10,000 to 40,000, and also of the city of Turin. Formerly the capital of the Piedmontese state, Turin became capital of the new Italian state between 1861 and 1864, and then by the end of the century had begun to re-emerge as one of the principal centres of industrial development and was the birthplace of the two great automobile industries, Fiat founded in 1899 and Lancia founded in 1906.

With the advent of the fascist regime in 1922 great importance was given to new programmes of rural development, which was seen as an alternative to both industrialization and urbanization. The reclamation of the Pontine Marshes formed part of this programme, and led to the creation of five new cities in this region to the south of Rome: Littoria (now called Latina), Sabaudia, Pontinia, Aprilia and Pomezia. But the fascist period also left its imprint on the urban structures of Rome, Bologna, Brescia, Bergamo and Turin, where large areas of the historical centres of the cities were demolished and replaced by new administrative quarters built in the style of the period. Shortly before the fall of the regime a new general urban development plan was introduced (The Town Planning Act 1942) which created a hierarchy of urban projects and revised the existing relations between central government and local authorities with regard to town planning. In many ways this was an extremely modern and constructive piece of legislation, the central criteria of which remain sound and valid even today, but its effectiveness was undermined by the uncertain and often contradictory manner in which successive governments and political parties sought to employ it.

During the Second World War about 500,000 residential buildings were destroyed and a further 250,000 seriously damaged. The renewed economic expansion after the war, and the emergence of new leading industrial areas once again created serious housing shortages in the main metropolitan areas. The government introduced a series of programmes for public housing projects financed by public corporations, and at the same time provided tax and credit facilities for the private sector. About 150,000 new houses were built each year between 1951 and 1955, and 38,000 a year between 1961 and 1965, but of these only 5% came from the public sector and the remainder were the result of private initiatives. This massive building programme also mobilized a huge speculative real estate boom which took little account of town planning regulations even where these existed, with the result that new urban areas sprang up without any adequate provision of public services and infrastructures. The country's rapid economic development also brought with it new urban imbalances and accentuated the unequal relationship between city and countryside and between the North and the South. The northern Industrial Triangle (Milan-Genoa-Turin) absorbed on average 113,000 immigrants each year between 1951 and 1965, and in an attempt to restore some equilibrium the State attempted to promote the economic development of the South through the creation in the 1950s of the Fund for the Mezzogiorno (*Cassa per il Mezzogiorno*), but this was to prove a failure.

In the 1960s and 1970s the public debate on urban development and planning became more intense, but had little impact on the realities of the great metropolitan areas. In an attempt to limit abusive and illegal construction, and in the face of a mounting wave of scandals relating to uncontrolled building, the government in 1967 attempted to reform the regulations by introducing a Bridging Act. This banned all new building in towns that did not have an authorized planning programme and regulations but since the new law did not come immediately into force it served to encourage a new wave of uncontrolled building. In 1971 a new law was introduced which included programmes for public housing and established new norms for expropriation in cases of public need, which were designed to facilitate the increased provision of cheap housing. In the city of Rome new accommodation was provided for 700,000, in the same period housing for a further 650,000 people was provided by private programmes which were completely abusive and outside any regulated norms. In 1977 a further law was introduced which attempted to define the 'norms governing the conditions under which building may take place', and which for the first time laid down that any building project or urban development programme was obliged to bear the financial burden of all ancillary and indirect costs. Another important factor in area planning was the creation of regional governments in 1972, to which the State delegated many of its powers including the right to issue regional town planning laws and regulations.

The chapter on Portugal by A. M. Williams starts with the projects drawn up in the XVIIIth century for rebuilding Lisbon after the disastrous earthquake of

1755 which provided a model for the development of other Portuguese cities. During the early XIXth century the country was thrown into deep economic crisis which had both domestic and international roots, and it was only towards the end of the century that industrialization began to provide the basis for new economic expansion. But in this case industrial development was limited both to a narrow range of sectors and to a small number of regions. Then as now there were few heavily urbanized regions, and the first census of 1864 showed that there were only two cities of any importance; Lisbon with 197,000 inhabitants and Oporto with 86,761. The urban expansion that occurred in the final years of the century followed a fairly simple pattern, with the state financing roadbuilding and other infrastructures while housing was left to private initiative. The result was that the working classes lived in great discomfort in new suburbs that sprang up without any public intervention or control. One aspect of the economic crisis was emigration which rose from an average of 4,000 to 11,000 per year in the mid-century to between 20,000 and 40,000 per year in the final decades.

The early years of the XXth century were marked by political instability and massive inflation, which resulted in the military coup of 1926. This in turn led to severe controls on public spending and a slower rate of economic expansion. Although the cities continued to expand, their expansion was limited and remained concentrated in Lisbon and Oporto. In the 1930s the government introduced an urban development programme which was designed to improve the extremely poor provision of housing for the low paid and to establish strict controls over urban development in order to enable the further expansion of industry to occur within the context of well ordered urban expansion. The principal aim of the legislation introduced at this time was to encourage the construction of houses for the low paid (The Low-Income Housing Act 1933), to oblige local authorities to draw up general regulating plans (The Planning Acts of 1934 and 1944), and to facilitate the expropriation of urban property for reasons of public utility (The Expropriation Act of 1933). The main weakness of this legislation lay in the fact that all power and resources rested with the government, while the responsibility and cost of implementing the legislation was passed on to the local authorities. However, the expropriation law proved more effective and enabled the municipal authorities of Lisbon to acquire about 2,800 hectares of private land in the city.

After the Second World War the Portuguese government abandoned the cautious financial regime of the inter-war years and attempted to follow a path of rapid industrial expansion, initially along autarchic lines but after the colonial crisis switching also to international loans and investment. The main poles of industrial expansion lay around Oporto in the north and the region between Lisbon and Setubal in the south. Between 1960 and 1975 both areas became the focus for heavy immigration, causing the rapid expansion of suburban areas especially around Lisbon. This expansion began to create tremendous pressures for new housing, services and infrastructures. In the late 1950s the government had set up Metropolitan Planning Agencies for Lisbon and Oporto. The General

Regulation of Urban Building Act of 1951 and the Housing Development Act of 1965 introduced stronger controls exercised by the public authorities, while the Planning Act of 1971 established a hierarchy of urban regulations and regulating projects to control development both within and around the metropolitan areas. However, the local authorities were not provided with adequate technical services and facilities and the planning programmes were subject to long delays before they were approved, with the result that the initiative was left to private enterprise which was strengthened by the speculative boom in real estate development and was directed mainly towards unregulated building. In the same period the shanty suburbs were quickly transformed into new luxury residential districts, and by the end of the 1970s it was estimated that there were between 80,000 and 150,000 unregulated buildings, the majority of which were in Lisbon and Oporto.

The fall of Salazar's regime in 1974 was followed first by a new period of political instability and then by the establishment of a democratic parliamentary system. The census of 1981 confirmed the continuing expansion of urbanization in the coastal regions and the continuing attraction of the two great metropolitan areas of Oporto and Lisbon as well as their surrounding suburbs. Government intervention in the 1970s fell into the following categories:

a) Administrative decentralization and measures to strengthen the financial autonomy of the municipal authorities through the Local Government Act of 1977 and the Local Finance Act of 1979. Measures to give local authorities additional powers over the use of land through the Land Act of 1976 and the Expropriation Code of 1976.

b) Reorganization of responsibilities for town planning and regional development, through the regrouping of 274 municipal authorities into sub-regional areas on the basis of economic and social similarities, and whose task is the preparation and administration of regional plans.

c) The rehabilitation and restoration of existing housing, including that of historical interest.

d) A programme of public house building, which did not differ greatly from earlier programmes.

e) Measures to control and legalize certain parts of earlier abusive construction, which had again expanded rapidly after 1974. This policy has been effected only with great difficulty and hitherto with few tangible results by preventing further unregulated building and attempting to restore the unregulated districts and regulations to these areas.

M. Wynn in the chapter on Spain argues that modern town planning dates from 1854 when the governor of Madrid declared that the city's walls no longer served any defensive purpose and ordered their demolition, thereby opening the way to the city's expansion. After a lengthy debate on the appropriate criteria on which to organize this expansion, the City Expansion Act of 1864 laid down the norms regulating expansion, the terms of expropriation and the structure of urban government. Nonetheless, Madrid's expansion remained chaotic and

uncontrolled, frequently spreading into areas specifically banned in the regulations. The polemics that this aroused in Spain reached an international audience with the publication at the beginning of the century of A. Soria's theory of the 'linear city', although this had little practical impact on urban development in Spain. The legislation of 1864 was revised and modernized by the Municipal Statutes of 1924 which made it obligatory for all cities which had experienced a population growth of 20% or more between 1910-20 to draw up a general development plan for the whole area under their jurisdiction.

After the fall of the monarchy in 1931 legislation on town planning intensified as did interest in developments in other countries. The new legislation emphasized the need for public expropriation, for super-municipal planning for the metropolitan areas, and for regional development programmes to prevent imbalances. These principles were clearly expressed in the new regulatory plans drawn up for Madrid and Barcelona, but the outbreak of the Civil War prevented their implementation. At the end of the war in 1939 one of the major tasks was the 'reconstruction of the cities' and also of the villages of the south and the west which had been seriously damaged. The reconstruction of Madrid was based on the model provided by the great 'Imperial' metropolis of the day: Hitler's Berlin and Mussolini's Rome. The new development plan for Madrid was drawn up in 1941 and approved in 1946. However, the underlying philosophy of the regime was hostile to urbanization and held up the peasant world as its model. The government retained full powers over urban development, and the main criteria which governed urban development were public order and political control. Nonetheless the cities continued to expand and in 1956 the government introduced an Urban Planning Act. This established a hierarchy of authorities and controls, applied new categories of land for building purposes (urban land, urban reserve, rural land), and new norms for private building, while reserving all powers and control in the hands of public administration. In order to meet the housing shortage and limit unregulated building a first National Housing Plan was introduced in 1955 to build 550,000 houses between 1956 and 1960: in 1961 the law was changed to provide for the building of 3,700,000 houses between 1961 and 1976.

The Urban Planning Act of 1956 had provided for the creation of national plans which were drawn up in 1964-6, 1968-71 and 1972-5 and were based on the theory of poles of development. These were accompanied by two provincial plans, for Barcelona and Guipuzcoa in 1963 and 1964, and by a range of municipal plans which to some extent directed the process of urban development. The local plans were the means by which planning was in practice effected, yet these often conflicted with municipal and regional plans, while the provision of services and infrastructures was always markedly delayed. The attempts to realize these plans also revealed the absence of adequate funding for local administrations, the conflicting interests of the private entrepreneur and the public administration, the prevalence of corruption amongst local admini-

strators and the lack of coordination within the administration, especially with regard to the provision of services and infrastructures.

The demographic expansion of the major urban centres continued through the 1960s and the government attempted to control this through the Urgent Development Act of 1970 which widened the terms of the law on public expropriation and speeded up bureaucratic procedures in order to create a series of 'new towns'. The New Town policy was run entirely by the central government and provided for the building of 8 new urban settlements near Barcelona (3), Madrid, Valencia, Seville, Saragosa and Cadiz to house 800,000 inhabitants. But the measures provoked strong opposition, especially from those subject to forcible expropriation, and the programme was abandoned; at present, only one of the eight projected cities is actually being built. In 1976 the Reform Act revised the technical features of the legislation of 1956 and laid down minimum standards for urban services and provision of open spaces, as well as tighter norms for the preparation of regulating plans and better coordination between local, regional and national plans. With the restoration of the constitutional monarchy of Juan Carlos in 1975 and a new political climate, the democratic parties became able to participate directly in the formulation of town planning policies.

G. K. Payne and R. Keles preface their chapter on Turkey with a description of the relations between town and countryside and the systems of urban and rural landowning in the period of the Ottoman Empire. However, urban growth took place only after the creation of the Republic in 1920 when the country was still overwhelmingly rural with only 66 urban centres containing 16.4% of the population — only Istanbul and Izmir had more than 100,000 inhabitants. As part of the modernization programme of the new republic high priority was assigned to industrial expansion, but it was only after the Second World War that urbanization began to assume an important dimension and it was in this period that the most important public controls were introduced. The Illegal Building Act of 1924 empowered the authorities to demolish abusive constructions, and the Public Hygiene Act of 1930 introduced certain building controls but only with regard to public health. The Municipal Act of 1930 established the responsibilities of local authorities over building and the Municipal Roads and Buildings Act of 1933 required all local authorities to draw up building plans and regulations. Following the Second World War Turkey became a recipient of international aid, and an important tranche of this financed a major road building programme which between 1947 and 1967 added 30,000 km to the national network. The years between 1945 and 1980 also saw a major process of internal migration which caused the urban population to increase from 18.1% to 45.4. Urban expansion was concentrated in the main cities: in 1945 40.3% of the population lived in the four cities of over 100,000 inhabitants — by 1980 there were 28 such cities, and their total inhabitants had risen to 63% of the population. The 1960s had also seen a rapid increase in overseas emigra-

tion as well as internal migration, and the former rose from 189,000 per year in 1966 to 625,000 in 1972.

Internal migration made the imbalances between city and countryside even more dramatic and posed major social and economic consequences, since urban housing, services and infrastructures proved to be hopelessly inadequate. Illegal and unregulated building increase rapidly, encouraged in part by the customary practice of claiming building rights on undeveloped urban areas. In 1955 5% of the total urban population of Turkey was estimated to be housed in sub-standard or illegal houses, and by 1980 the figure had risen to 23%.

Since the Second World War the Turkish government has introduced a series of laws and economic measures to check uncontrolled building. The Building Subsidies Act and the Squatter Act of 1948 were of little effect, and were replaced in 1953 by the Building and Unauthorized Construction Act. The Town Planning Act of 1957 required all towns with more than 5,000 inhabitants to draw up a regulatory plan, but since this was accompanied by no delegation of responsibility it proved difficult to enforce, especially in smaller towns. In 1972 all towns with fewer than 10,000 inhabitants were excluded from the obligation. A further obstacle lay in the constant revision and modification of the local plans once they had been drawn up, and in 1978 the government forbade any further changes in approved regulations in the first four years after they came into force, although in 1980 this was abolished. In 1963 the government introduced the first Five Year Plan, which included measures to limit urban expansion through a programme for regional development and in particular new investments in the eastern provinces. The Plan also gave new emphasis to the campaign against unregulated urban building, and the rehabilitation of existing abusive urban areas. This was the aim of the Gecekondu Act of 1966 which established norms for restoring sub-standard areas and alternatively for their demolition and the transfer of the inhabitants to other sites in public housing. Although a time-limit was placed on the moratorium under which sub-standard building could be legalized, political pressures and the dimensions of the unregulated sector meant that the end of the moratorium was successively extended. Subsequent Five Year Plans (1973-7; 1978-83) gave priority to programmes of housing for the low paid and the acquisition of requisite land. The Housing Act of 1981 set up a fund equal to 5% of the state budget for building new housing, and in 1969 the National Land Agency had been established to prevent speculative intervention in areas designated for housing for the low paid and also to speed up the development of industrial and tourist programmes. Between 1970 and 1982 further fiscal measures to combat land speculation were also introduced. Planning offices were opened in 1968 at Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir and Bursa to improve metropolitan controls and administration, but since these did not form part of the Ministry of Reconstruction but were designed to advise local authorities on planning, they lacked any administrative powers. In March 1984, as a result of the constitution adopted in 1982, the government created a further intermediary administrative structure for the metropolitan areas of Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir.

The editors of the series 'Studies in History, Planning and Environment' should be congratulated for the extremely interesting and relevant issues that they have covered in the five volumes already published, and no less in this most recent study which deals with an area and with problems which have been much neglected in recent years. Comparative studies of urban development and planning have been expanding for over twenty years, yet they are almost always concerned with the cities of northern and central Europe, or with those of North America. Even those that have attempted to adopt a European perspective have generally given little space and attention to southern Europe which tends to be treated as an obligatory appendix and seen in terms of models and analytical frameworks evolved from other areas.

In recent years, however, there has been a revival of interest in comparative studies of the Mediterranean region, but the lack of comparative studies on urban planning in southern Europe and in the Mediterranean area is particularly noticeable. This especially since the EEC Regional Development Fund which has distributed over 12,500 billion lire to backward regions — many of them in the South — and financed 21,500 industrial and infrastructural projects, has been in existence for ten years, and Spain and Portugal are on the point of joining the Community. The lack of studies that seek to explain the phenomena of 'backwardness' in relation to the urban economies, in both their national and international contexts, seems particularly serious.

Even though the essays included in the present volume do make an important contribution to an understanding of these problems, they only partly fill the gap. Each of the essays is concerned exclusively with a single national experience, and not only is there little methodological coordination but often open contradictions which makes it difficult to draw more general conclusions about the process of urban development and planning in southern Europe. And why, one must ask, have both southern France and Yugoslavia been excluded? Both are critically important for understanding the particular problems facing the southern European countries, and also for understanding the differences between the cities of Mediterranean Europe and those of the North and Centre.

Each of the five chapters in this volume also adopts a quite different concept of urban growth. Some see it as a direct product of social and economic development, others as a casual and unrelated process, and nowhere is there any reference back to any agreed set of social or economic indices which might make plausible comparisons possible. In part this is a consequence of the time needed to compile reliable comparative data, with the result that a volume like this one which was published in 1984 has still to rely on crude census data from the early 1970s. This has meant, too, that the developments over the last decade, which have in many cases produced a reversal of earlier urban trends in Europe, have been neglected, so that there is no possibility of discovering whether the process of urbanization in southern Europe has also registered these changes.

Yet even if the authors and editors of the volume have made no attempt to draw some more general conclusions, it is worth trying to do so and to try also to

identify the common features of urban development and planning in southern Europe. The urban expansion of all of these five countries began at some point in the second half of the XIXth century, and was related to a process of industrialization which occurred relatively late in comparison with other parts of the continent. Urban expansion was also related to the political and institutional changes that in the same period brought into being the new nation states in this region. In the period from the late XIXth century to the start of the First World War each of these countries experienced rapid demographic expansion in the major urban centres, which provided the focus both for industrial expansion and also the main administrative functions of the state. The authorities attempted to meet this expansion with programmes and theories of urban planning and development that were largely adopted from other European countries.

In the inter-war period urban development in the south began to assume more general features and the type of regulations that began to evolve have remained with some modification valid down to the present. In the post-war period each of the five countries considered experienced a serious deficit in housing and urban services due partly to war damage but, more fundamentally, to increasingly rapid urbanization and industrial concentration, which have begun to pose dramatic problems to which no effective response has yet been found. In the 1950s at least three of the southern European countries — Turkey, Portugal and Yugoslavia — were still essentially rural with less than 20% of the population in cities. In the same period the percentage of the population resident in cities was above 40% in Greece, 51.9% in Spain and 55.4% in Italy. These figures were much lower than in countries like England (81.3%) and Belgium (79.7%) where the process of urbanization had occurred over a much longer period. Thirty years later only Portugal still retained this rural physiognomy with an urban population of about 30%, while in Turkey and Yugoslavia the figure was over 45%, in Greece 60%, while in Italy and Spain it had risen to about 70%.

Urbanization was concentrated in the cities that offered the best prospects of rapid industrial development. In the Mediterranean area the cities which geographically and historically seemed to offer the best prospects in this sense, and which were also the best provided with requisite infrastructures, were the great ports. It was in these and along their coastal suburbs that the new urban population was concentrated. Zones of industrial development alternated with expanding tourist zones creating an almost unbroken chain of buildings along the coast line from Portugal to Turkey, with the exception only of certain areas of Yugoslavia and eastern Turkey. The result was that the great flow of emigration from south to north, from the east to the west, and from the countryside and smaller towns into the zones where industrial activity was concentrated, was paralleled by a second migratory current in which the principal agents were small businesses and commercial operations, which moved from the interior towards the coast where communications were better.

These internal migrations have produced two forms of imbalance: on the one

hand the overcrowding of the metropolitan areas, on the other the desertion of the interior. But in the face of this emergency it has become clear that there is no direct coordination between scientific and technological progress on one hand and social transformation on the other, and the economic changes had not elicited any adequate administrative responses capable of limiting or directing them. Even where adequate administrative structures are available, the experience of the southern European countries has been to reveal the failure to apply and manage them. The more complicated it is to devise urban planning regulations, the more difficult it becomes to apply them effectively. The same is true for public housing schemes, and despite repeated attempts to launch them the results have as yet been minimal.

The period in which the most rapid expansion of the metropolitan areas occurred was between 1950 and 1970, with annual rates of increase that were in some cases astonishing (Ankara + 15% per year), but in others still very high: Madrid + 6.2%, Barcelona + 4.2%, Athens + 3.8%, Rome + 3.1%. In the same period the increase in public housing was negligible, and it was only in the 1970s that in certain countries this began to exceed 10% — a figure way below countries like France and Great Britain where it exceeded 40% and where regional imbalances were much less pronounced. In the southern European countries on the other hand the lack of any clear housing policy, the problems posed by the administration of metropolitan areas, the continuation of older social and economic behaviour and of tacit connivance from political quarters meant that first the building of individual houses and then of whole residential quarters has been left to unregulated private enterprise. Massive sub-standard building and speculation are phenomena common to all the south European countries, and have reached levels that are difficult to quantify precisely but are certainly very high. In many metropolitan areas between 20 and 50% of the population live in unregulated quarters or in districts that are not specified as residential zones in the regulatory plans, and which lack the services and infrastructures essential for urban building. The scale and gravity of these problems is such that for each of the governments concerned they have become a major priority, yet there are no easy solutions. Public intervention has become orientated towards registering, improving, controlling and restoring existing abusive building and preventing its further development, yet the problem is still very far from being resolved.

This process of polarized development which we have described has also brought about the economic crisis, accompanied in many cases by a complete demographic collapse, of those regions which lay outside the pole of industrial attraction. This has occurred in the interior of the Iberian peninsula, in the Italian Mezzogiorno, in rural Greece and in eastern Turkey where the economies of these regions have assumed a residual character. In the past government policies have done no more than acknowledge the problems of these areas by providing assistance for those who wished to leave and some support for the remainder of the population that were unable to emigrate. Although such policies are at

present being revised, they served only to accelerate emigration and hence the economic decay of the interior. But as well as internal migration, each of the southern European countries has also experienced massive overseas emigration. Although this has now almost completely stopped, and has in some cases become reversed, there are still millions of individuals from all of these countries living permanently abroad. This too has created inevitable imbalances in the countries of origin, in particular since the remittances from these emigrants are frequently then invested in building operations in the country of origin and contribute to the expansion of the industrial and tourist zones. It will also be important in the coming years to assess the ways in which the eventual return of many of these emigrants will affect the territorial changes that are taking place in the countries of origin.

