

How was Bulgaria urbanizing in the War and Interwar periods (1912-1938): The evidence of historical census statistics

Penka Peykovska

Abstract. Urbanization theorists see the process as a manifestation of three mutually impacting processes: migration, natural growth and reclassification, whose relative contribution to it varies depending on the environment. The present paper is devoted to the urbanization process in Bulgaria in the War and Interwar periods. In particular, we monitor the role that migration played in it as well as the contribution of small and big cities and the capital of Sofia. Even in our time, a small number of countries are collecting statistics that are appropriate for a thorough measurement of urban phenomena. For this reason, our quantitative analysis is based on the data of urban population's birthplace from the censuses carried out in Bulgaria in 1910, 1920, 1926 and 1934. It shows that in the studied period the ascending (albeit at a slow pace) urbanization process in Bulgaria was due mainly to migration and in particular to internal migration, although it was undoubtedly closely related to the war- and post-wartime refugee wave and immigration, which strengthened the expansion of cities.

Keywords: urbanization, Bulgaria, Balkan Wars, First World War, Interwar period

Urbanization is among the most important demographic phenomena of nowadays when half of the world's population lives in cities (UN 2019, 1) and the rapidly growing (yet huge) urban agglomerations have already caused a number of negative phenomena - high levels of unemployment, infrastructure tensions and environmental degradation (Bilsborrow 2002). Studying the historical development of urbanization is up to date, since it has projections on our present day because of the need to find successful mechanisms for overcoming its negative effects.

Urbanization theorists see it as one of the manifestations of migration together and in interaction with the natural population growth (that occurs as a result from birth rate exceeding the mortality) and the reclassification (the administrative mechanism for giving urban status to former villages or surround-

ing settlements), whose relative contribution to urbanization depends on the economic and social background (White (ed.) 2016, 474-475). To urbanization directly contributes internal migration from rural to urban areas, which causes decline of rural population and growth of urban one. Besides, there are cities attracting a significant number of international migrants, which also leads to an increase in the urban population. Except this urban transition is in relation to economic modernization, industrialization and changes in the demographic structure of population.

In the studied period Bulgaria experienced impetuous demographic growth in spite of the Balkan Wars and the First World War and human loss. It was due to the fact that the first demographic transition was characterized by its high birth rates (Gruev 2009, 369-370), to the post-war population compensation and (perhaps mainly) to the immense inflow of refugees and immigrants generated by the armed conflicts from the second decade of the 20th century, namely by the Balkan Wars and the First World War including the 1917 revolution and the Civil War in Russia, the Aster Revolution in Hungary, the Greek-Turkish War of 1919-1922, and accompanying events (about 200,000 people up to the Mid-1920s - mainly of Bulgarian ethnic origin, but 20,000 Russians and 15,000 Armenians too). The country was rural - four fifths of its population were peasants. The majority of landowners were small-sized. Bulgaria had agricultural-centered development strategy, which, however, did not exclude industrialization (Vachkov 2018, 11-17). The economic modernization happened within the sector of agriculture and live stockbreeding, where half of the GDP was formed. The country crossed the threshold of industrialization in the late 1930s (Ivanov 2012, 105, 107). Between 1926 and 1934 there were 97 towns, most of which small, having population under 10,000 and of rural image (Table 1). The rapidest growth showed the capital Sofia. Other well-developing cities were Plodiv, Varna, Burgas, Ruse. The share of urban population grew up with 5.6% between 1910 and 1946. So, concerning the interrelated processes of urbanization, industrialization and internal migration, there was some development, but it was rather slow and that is why seen by some researchers sooner as stagnation than as any kind of progress. Here we intend to reveal the urbanization process

Table 1. Number of towns/cities in Bulgaria, according to their classification in the population censuses, 1910-1946

Population	Number of towns/cities				
	1910	1920	1926	1934	1946
Up to 10,000 people	42	53	53	48	43
Above 10,000 people	28	26	28	33	40
Above 20,000 people	8	9	12	12	17
Above 50,000 people	1	3	3	3	4
Above 100,000 people	1	1	1	1	2
Total	80	92	97	97	106

in Bulgaria during the period preceding the accelerated industrialization in the light of Bulgarian census statistics. Having in mind a priori the dynamic demographic and in particular migration situation in Bulgaria our initial hypothesis is that it can be considered as more than stagnant (though slowly developing) and that the contribution of migration (including the external one) to it was decisive. At that time the importance of internal and external migration in the numerical growth of urban population in Bulgaria increased, although the external migration flow was significantly smaller than the internal one and continued more intensively only until 1926 (Table 2). More than one third of in-migrants (totally 217,328 people for 1910, 354,187 people for 1926 - which many times exceeded the number of immigrants) and about half of immigrants (totally 59,706 people for 1910, 166,761 people for 1926 - whose relative share in towns/cities was larger than in the villages) were predominantly directed to the big towns and cities, i.e., with population surpassing 10,000 inhabitants: according to data for 1910, 89% (53,067 people) of the immigrants and 77% (167,437 people) of the in-migrants, for 1926 respectively 80% (129,214 people) and 77,5% (282,079 people). Up to 1926 the general trend was towards increase in the number of immigrants and in-migrants targeting the towns/cities.

There has been no particular scientific interest in the development of urbanization in Bulgaria and its interaction with (internal and external) migration processes during the studied period - perhaps, because at this initial stage (which started with the founding of the Third Bulgarian State in 1878 and ended in the Late 1940s) the relative share of the urban population was growing slowly and the urban way of life was spreading slowly too (Mladenov, Dimitrov 2009, 13; Minkov 1972, 85). Actually, the real, dynamic urbanization took place in the second half of the 20th century. It was accelerating under centrally planned economic development, as a result of which urban population grew sharply; at the end of the 1960s its relative share went beyond the fifty percent and population increasingly concentrated in the administrative centres (Vasileva 1991, 94; Marcheva 2016, 396-397).

Some researchers of urbanization processes in Bulgaria have claimed that after 1880 (up to 1934, for example) there was a “progressive urbanization

Table 2. Migration growth of urban population in Bulgaria, 1901-1946 (‰)

Years	Urban population		Rural population
	Totev 1968	Stefanov et al. 1974	Stefanov et al. 1974
1901-1905	2.3		
1906-1910	0.8		
1911-1920	13.0		
1921-1926	16.3		
1927-1934	10.5	9.8	4.2
1935-1946	12.6	14.8	6.7

Source: Totev 1968, 26-32; Stefanov et al. 1974, 218.

trend” and supported their theses with indicators such as the steadily increasing number and the growing relative share of urban population¹ (Vasileva 1991, 110; Georgiev 1979, 24; Popov 1916, 13). Other authors have pointed out the migration growth (i.e., the difference between the in- and out-migrants, calculated on the basis of population censuses, which are yet its rather “rough” measurements) as an indicator of urbanization processes in Bulgaria (Totev 1968, 26-32; Stefanov et al. 1974, 218). They have found out that migration growth is always in the benefit of towns and cities - it increases the urban population and reduces the rural one (Stefanov et al. 1974, 218); it rises when there are strong external migration flows - for Bulgaria the phenomenon was reflected by the 1905 census, after the Ilinden-Preobrazhenie Uprising (1903), and then, in the first half of the 1920s.

There have been researchers who believe that the urbanization process was “decreasing” in the Interwar period and explain this with the impact of territorial changes resulting from the Balkan Wars and the First World War on the settlement system and the urban-rural population ratio (Vezenkov 1999). According to the Bucharest and Neuilly treaties 8 towns² were separated from Bulgaria (from South Dobrudja and the Western Outskirts) and transferred to Romanian and Serbian territories, and another 17³ were added to the country through the newly acquired lands. However, urbanization was declining, because among the latter mentioned ones, more in number were less economically developed towns, and their minority Turkish and Muslim population was prone to emigration (Danailov 1930, 164-168; Vezenkov 1999).

Since the development of urbanization in Bulgaria - more broadly speaking from the viewpoint of the years of the Bulgarian censuses - between 1910 and 1946 is poorly studied and at the same time this period (and especially its first half) was characterized by intensive refugee and immigrant inflows of Bulgarians, Russians and Armenians and emigration of the local Greeks and Turks (under the bilateral agreements with Greece and Turkey for population exchange), we have devoted our present study to the development of urbanization process in Bulgaria emphasizing the role of migration in it. The object of the quantitative analysis, on the basis of which we have monitored the process of urbanization, is the data on the urban (and rural) population coming from the Bulgarian censuses carried out in 1910, 1920, 1926, 1934 and 1946. We have turned to this type of sources, because of the lack of other statistics for the studied period. Even in our time a small number of countries are collecting statistics that are appropriate for a thorough measurement of urbanization. For this

¹ In 1880 urban population in the Bulgarian Principality constituted 16.7% of the total number of population of the newly created state; in 1920 - 19.9%, and in 1934 - 21.4%.

² From South Dobrudja - Silistra, Tutrakan, Dobrich, Balchik, Kavarna, and from the Western Outskirts - Bosilegrad, Strumitsa, Tsaribrod (Dimitrograd).

³ Ahtopol, Bansko, Gorna Dzhumaya (Blagoevgrad), Nevrokop (Gotse Delchev), Dyovlen (Devin), Daradere (Zlatograd), Ortakyoy (Ivaylovgrad), Koshukavak (Krumovgrad), Kardzhali, Malko Tarnovo, Melnik, Mastanli (Momchilgrad), Petrich, Razlog, Mustafa pasha (Svilenograd), Pashmakli (Smolyan) and Vasiliko (Tsarevo).

reason indirect methods have commonly been used to calculate the components of urbanization growth based on census data (UN 2001). Often such studies are based on birth place data of population by applying different research approaches.

Here, in our particular case, we have used the statistical data for the urban (and rural) population, recorded in a correlation with the birth place of the native-born population (for those born in a locality other than the one where counted, i.e., for the in-migrants), and of the foreign-born population (i.e., for the immigrants). Data for in-migrants provide information about origins as far as it concerns another district within a given county, another county or another locality in the country, while data for immigrants reflect origins by countries. This means that the statistical information “covers” the number of in-migrants at a given time point, not counting mortality, and refers only to the first generation of settlers (as opposed to the US censuses, for instance, which also collected information for subsequent generations of settlers). In the case of the foreign-born the statistical information did not reflect the usual at that time interim internal migration of refugees and immigrants most of which were very mobile between the time of their entering the country and their final resettlement there.

When trying to establish the contribution of internal migration to urbanization, its most important direction to be studied is the migration from village to town/city. But from the point of view of the internal migrations and concerning the de facto population, in principle the Bulgarian censuses of 1910, 1920 and 1926 contain information on internal migration towards the towns/cities, without reference to its point of departure (either it was a village or another town/city). It means that this kind of databases include data on inter-town/city migrations too, in our specific case these were migrations from small to big urban centres which were not quantitatively such as to change the main trends. In the Bulgarian censuses there is evidence of the population movement from villages to towns/cities only in relation to the economically active population and not to the total de facto population. Just the 1934 census provides statistical information on migration in the direction of village-town/city. In the 1946 census another methodology for its accumulation was applied, which is why it is practically incomparable with that of the previous censuses - at least regarding the study of the directions of internal migration. So, we have tracked some of the processes for different subperiods (and not for the entire studied period) and this is because we do not have the relevant data.

In the quantitative analysis our supporting points have been some of the more important theoretical stands in today's understanding of urbanization which is to explain why we have used specific indicators. Nowadays demographers define urbanization as a growing proportion of the population living in urban areas (Poston, Bouvier 2010, 307-311). Yet, it needs to be clarified that urbanization differs from the growth of the urban population in general, although the two concepts are often mixed, which causes considerable confusion. Since urbanization is defined as a growing urban share, it means that if urban and rural populations grow at the same pace, there is no urbanization. Urban population growth is considered to be entirely the result of urbanization if the total population does not change but the relative share of urban popula-

tion is increasing; then the degree of urbanization (the degree of population growth in urban areas) is equal to the growth rate of the urban population (Tacoli, McGranahan, Satterthwaite 2014). Though, in most urbanizing countries, including Bulgaria, during the period under review, the total population was growing too and it is possible to distinguish the share of urban population growth resulting from urbanization from the share resulting from the overall growth of population (the latter is roughly equal to the degree of urbanization, plus the rate of total population growth).

Based on these views, in measuring processes and phenomena, we have started from the position that urbanization is present when urban population growth rate exceeds rural population growth rate and we have used this indicator as the main one - measured in percentage for the total urban (resp. rural) population, for the population of the small and big towns/cities, for the capital. For greater certainty in identifying trends we have also monitored other indicators such as, for example, the volume of migration and its intensity (i.e., the number of migrants per 1000 locals). Of course, we are aware of the general nature of quantitative parameters and the presence of certain micro- and background processes that cannot be numerically identified, because urbanization is indeed primarily a result of migration and it is reasonable to treat it as such. However, it is not just a consequence of the village-town/city migration, especially if this migration is perceived in its meaning as a long-term resettlement for permanent living. Firstly, urbanization is the net result of complex migratory movements between rural and urban areas, including circular migration back and forth. Actually, net migration from village to town/city may be a result of people delaying their return or not returning to rural areas as they decide to move to the city. Secondly, urbanization involves both the net movement of people to and within urban areas, and the progressive expansion of urban boundaries and the creation of new urban centres. As we have already mentioned, in principle it can furthermore originate either from higher natural population growth in urban areas or from particularly high emigration from rural areas, although none of them is considered to be very substantial.

Before undertaking the quantitative analysis, we will mention as well that during the studied period there were no legislative restrictions on population crowding in the cities.

* * *

We start examining the growth of Bulgaria's urban population in percentage compared to the growth of the rural population, which are influenced by the migration processes, the mechanical growth and the birth rate, the natural growth and perhaps the reclassification. In the period from 1910 to 1946 the whole population of the country increased from 4 million in 1910 to 7 million in 1946; the absolute number of urban and rural populations - separately - also grew; the relative share of the urban population increased too (from 19.1% in 1910 to 24.7% in 1946) which was due to both natural growth and mechanical movement. The change in the ratio between urban and rural populations was not sharp (as in the second half of the 20th century), but smooth. For 36 years the urban population almost doubled (+111.4%) compared to the growth of the

rural one (+58.6%), so although the latter prevailed, its relative share declined from 80.9% in 1910 to 75.3% in 1946 (Totev 1968, 17-19; Tzekov 2011, 78) (and this growth was much greater than that in the years preceding the wars⁴ (see Georgiev 1979, 23). The greatest increase in urban population was in 1910-1926 (+36%), then in 1926-1934 it was +15% and in 1934-1946 - +33%.

For the period between 1910 and 1926 statistics provide an opportunity to distinguish population growth in small and big towns/cities, i.e., in the towns/cities with population up to and over 10,000 inhabitants, as grouped in the censuses until 1926. Table 3 shows that population growth in the big towns/cities outstripped growth in the small ones but the determining factor in this process was the enormous growth of the capital city; if it is excluded, it becomes clear that population growth in small towns surpassed (albeit with little) those of the big ones and that by 1926 the reporting of the quantitative growth of the urban population in Bulgaria had been mainly due to the over 100% increase in the population of the capital.

To answer the question whether at all and if so, to what extent urbanization was due to migration in general and separately to internal and external migration, we have established the relative share of the increase in the number of in-migrants and immigrants in the towns/cities in relation to the increase in the number of urban population (for the territory of the country in the respective census year) based on the abovementioned birth place data. Here, in the context of what has already been said about the specifics of this kind of statistical information on the migration to the towns/cities, we especially would like to point out again that it includes not only the in-migrants coming from the villages but also those coming from other towns/cities. Inter-town/city migration, and in particular that of small to big towns/cities, was not so large and did not affect major trends. In 1911-1926 it was 81%, and in 1927-1934 - 61% or, generally speaking, during the studied period, urbanization in Bulgaria was mainly due

Table 3. Growth of the de facto population in small and big towns/cities, capital Sofia and villages, 1910-1926

Population	Year		Growth	
	1910	1926	number	percentage
Small towns	251,849	321,239	+69,390	+27.5
Big towns/cities, including Sofia	577,678	808,892	+231,214	+40.0
Big towns/cities without Sofia	474,866	595,890	+121,024	+25.5
Sofia	102,812	213,002	+110,190	+107.0
Villages	3,507,991	4,348,610	+840,619	+24.0

Sources: Obshti rezultati 1910, 14-17; Obshti rezultati 1920, 16-23; Obshti rezultati 1926, 16-23.

⁴ In 1880-1900 for instance (i.e., for a period of 20 years) the urban population in Bulgaria increased with +36.6% and the rural one - with +31.6%.

to migration. And in this very case - to internal migration, representing in 1911-1926 56% of the total migration growth - despite the intense refugee inflows of Bulgarians, Russians and Armenians as a consequence of the wars, and almost entirely to the internal migration in 1927-1934, when external migration was declining (Table 2).

The 1934 census data, which took into account the village-town/city direction, confirm this conclusion. We have analysed a variation of data for in-migrants in the direction of village - town/city and for immigrants in the direction of foreign country to town/city, because the external migrants' mobility within Bulgaria is not quantitatively known: in-migrants in the village-town/city direction were almost twice as much as the immigrants, and their relative share within the variation is 64% (Table 4).

The dynamics of in-migrants' number as well as the dynamics of the refugees and immigrants' number per 1000 local people⁵ among the urban population corresponds to the above-mentioned trends: in 1911-1934 the number of internal settlements was steadily growing, increasing more than twice and reaching almost half a million; their number per 1000 locals was gradually increasing too - in the first half of the 1920s much more significantly (reaching 402 in-migrants per 1000 locals in 1934).⁶ The number of external settlements was twice to three times smaller than that of the internal ones, growing to the mid-1920s as a result of refugee flows and, after their cessation, in 1934 marked a small decline; and their intensity was lower (233 foreign-born per 1000 locals) (Table 5).

Table 4. Number of in-migrants and immigrants/refugees among urban and rural de facto population, 1910-1934

Year	In-migrants among		Immigrants/refugees among		Local population*		Total population of Bulgaria	
	urban population	rural population	urban population	rural population	urban	rural	urban	rural
1910	217,328	468,763	59,706	59,965	551,916	2,977,966	828,950	3,505,794
1920	271,358	489,945	118,185	104,393	576,422	3,284,497	965,965	3,878,835
1926	354,187	635,717	166,761	137,735	609,156	3,575,131	1,130,104	4,348,583
1934	459,296	743,280	159,391	127,186	683,770	3,904,863	1,302,457	4,775,329

Excluding the "unshown".

* Population born in the locality where counted.

Sources: Obshti rezultati 1910, 14-17; Obshti rezultati 1920, 16-23; Obshti rezultati 1926, 16-23; Prebroyavane 1934, 3.

⁵ Population born in the locality where it was counted.

⁶ In the same time the intensity of in-migrants among rural population remained unchangeable until 1920 and only afterwards increased.

Table 5. Intensity of in-migrants and immigrants/refugees to the locals* among urban and rural de facto population, 1910-1934 (‰)

Year	In-migrants among		Immigrants/refugees among	
	urban population	rural population	urban population	rural population
1910	393.8	157.4	108.2	20.1
1920	470.8	129.8	205.0	31.8
1926	581.4	149.2	273.8	38.5
1934	671.7	190.3	233.1	32.6

* Population born in the locality where counted.

Sources: Obshti rezultati 1910, 14-17; Obshti rezultati 1920, 16-23; Obshti rezultati 1926, 16-23; Prebroyavane 1934, 3.

Before proceeding to study the tribute of the small and big towns/cities to urbanization we will try to explain the obvious at first glance changes in the database of the native-born population. They are important because of their influence on the formation of the indicator of migrants' number per 1000 local people we are considering here, and since the analysis of the origin of these changes is a sign of whether it is a source of out-migration or emigration, and because of the dynamics of the urbanization itself. In the period from 1910 to 1926 native-born population in Bulgaria decreased sharply in both, small and big towns/cities (excluding Sofia) - in small ones almost twice as much as in big ones (doubled only in Sofia). It is interesting to see how much this phenomenon was due to migrations. We have tracked it at a village level and we have found out that in 1926 in 18 of the 26 big towns and cities the native-born population grew - in rare cases too many (as in Burgas - doubled and in Plovdiv - by one third). In the remaining eight big towns⁷ it decreased from several hundred to not more than one thousand and five hundred. In the case of big towns/cities three-quarters of the reduction was a result of the secession of the three major towns in Southern Dobrudja after the Balkan Wars - Silistra, Tutrakan and Dobrich. The remaining loss was mainly due to the displacement of the Greeks from Burgas, Varna, Plovdiv and Stanimaka and to a very small extent to mortality and other displacements. In addition, there was no native-born population replenishment through big towns/cities joined as there were no such ones. In the case of small towns, the decline of the native-born population by half was due to the secession of the five cities with the Treaty of Neuilly - Balchik, Kavarna, Bosilegrad, Tsaribrod and Strumitsa. It also partly diminished because of the Greeks' expulsion. This loss was not compensated by the 17 towns

⁷ Vratsa, Stanimaka (Asenovgrad), Samokov, Kazanlak, Chirpan, Svishtov, Shumen and Turnovo.

in the newly acquired territories and the reclassification (i.e., new settlements announced for towns), probably owing to the in- and out-migration from the small to big towns/cities.

The loss of local urban population as a result of the secession of cities (both small and large) in consequence of the territorial losses from the wars was not only simply compensated in the period between 1926 and 1934 by increasing birth rates due to intense external and internal settlements (the latter significantly larger), but as early as 1934 the pre-war number of native-born population had been exceeded. That is why we can conclude that the secession of the towns/cities as a result of the wars lost by Bulgaria really had negative impact on the urbanization of the country, and if that had not happened, the urbanization process would have been much stronger. However, it can not be denied that it was intense and intensifying and quantitatively managed to overcome the loss of native-born urban population in less than ten years. In this sense we can not speak about its stagnation or lagging behind - it simply evolved in the context of changed territorial conditions.

The census statistics make it possible to identify the urbanization centres in Bulgaria, which coincide with the destination points of migration flows. Towns/cities differ in their socio-economic characteristics, so they have different attractive opportunities. In order to estimate them, we consider the cities in two groups according to the number of their inhabitants - small and big. We have separated the capital of Sofia, which was (and still is) the administrative and cultural centre of the country, from the group of other towns/cities, as its growth was unprecedented and incomparable with the other cities. The data on settlements by groups of towns/cities show that small towns had a much larger influx of migrants than the big ones, but they were far behind in terms of migratory flows to the capital (Table 6). The latter surpassed the influx to both small and big towns/cities not only in their absolute numbers but in their intensity as well: in 1910 in the big towns/cities (except Sofia) the total number of migrants and (in-migrants and immigrants) per 1000 locals was twice as high. Sofia marked the greatest growth - there the number of migrants was almost twice as much as that of the locals. In 1926 the local population declined in both small and big towns on the account of a sharp rise in the number of migrants (almost six times within the external ones and one-and-a-half times within the internal ones) (Table 7). Small towns strengthened their position of attractiveness, caught up with their lagging behind and there the intensity of migrants almost reached the level of big towns although the volume of migration to them was smaller. The capital was once again remarkable in scale from the other major cities - migrants in the direction to Sofia were twice as much as local residents. This is understandable considering that the capital best suited to the standard of living in Bulgaria at that time. Sofia was the most developed city in Bulgaria, it was electrified, supplied with water - in the 1920s the Rila water main was built, the building of sewerage was started, after the wars the capital turned from a predominantly consumer centre and a city of clerks and officers into a commercial and industrial centre with a large working class. The lack of settlements with truly urban appearance, with a high standard of living, including not only better incomes but likewise living facilities, contributed to Sofia's becoming the most dynamically developing city in Bulgaria.

Table 6. Total number of migrants (in-migrants and immigrants together) and locals*, and intensity of migrants (%) in small and big towns/cities, and in Sofia, de facto population, 1910-1934

Year	Towns with up to 10,000 inhabitants			Towns/cities with and above 10,000 inhabitants (without Sofia)			Sofia		
	Migrants	Locals*	Intensity	Migrants	Locals*	Intensity	Migrants	Locals*	Intensity
1910	56,530	195,096	289.8	220,504	356,820	618.0	64,993	37,768	1720.9
1926	109,955	144,211	762.5	267,028	328,862	812.0	144,265	68,714	2099.5
+/-, number	+53,425	-50,885		+46,524	-27,958		+79,272	+30,946	
+/-, percentage	+94.5	-26.0		+21.0	-8.0		+122.0	+82.0	
1934	115,456	215,932	534.7	306,406	377,468	811.7	196,825	90,370	2178.0
+/-, number	+5,501	+71,721		+39,378	+48,606		+52,560	+21,656	
+/-, percentage	+5.0	+49.7		+14.7	+14.8		+36.4	+31.5	

* Population born in the locality where counted.

Source: Obshti rezultati 1910, 14-17; Obshti rezultati 1920, 16-23; Obshti rezultati 1926, 16-23; Prebroyavane 1934, 3.

Table 7. Total number of in-migrants and immigrants in the small and big towns/cities, and in Sofia, de facto population, 1910-1926

Year	Immigrants			In-migrants		
	towns with up to 10,000 inhabitants	towns/cities with and above 10,000 inhabitants (without Sofia)	Sofia	towns with up to 10,000 inhabitants	towns/cities with and above 10,000 inhabitants (without Sofia)	Sofia
1910	6,639	34,608	18,459	49,891	120,903	46,534
1926	37,547	87,357	41,857	72,108	179,671	102,408
+ / -	+30,908	+52,749	+23,398	+22,217	+58,768	+55,874

Source: Obshti rezultati 1910, 14-17; Obshti rezultati 1920, 16-23; Obshti rezultati 1926, 16-23.

To quantify the role of immigration and in-migration in the urbanization of small and big towns/cities and the capital, we use an indicator that expresses the relative share of the increase in the number of immigrants and in-migrants in small and big towns/cities and Sofia compared to population growth in them. For the small towns +44.5% belong to immigrants and +32% to in-migrants; for the big towns/cities respectively +33% and +50% and for Sofia +21% and +51%. Or, in general, until 1926 Sofia and the big towns were growing predominantly by in-migrants, while small towns were rising from immigrants (Table 3).

* * *

In conclusion we can summarize the results of the quantitative analysis of the birth place of Bulgaria's population concerning the urbanization process as follows:

Urbanization in Bulgaria in the studied period was mainly due to migration and in particular to in-migration, although it was undoubtedly closely related to the refugee wave and immigration in the War and in the Interwar period, which strengthened the expansion of the towns and cities. The drying-up of the refugee inflow did not lead to a decline in the urbanization process, but on the contrary - there was an intensified internal migration towards the towns and cities and specifically in the direction from village to town/city. This was a characteristic phenomenon for other countries as well - such observation was described in the United States in the first decades of the 20th century, but in relation to the strengthening of restrictions on immigration.

There was a relationship between emigration, on the one hand, and internal migration and immigration, on the other hand, which is well illustrated by the replacement of the displaced Greek population with Bulgarian refugees and in-migrants.

The decisive role of internal migration in the urbanization process in Bulgaria was determined by the in-migration to the big towns and cities (including Sofia). This was because the urbanization of big towns/cities (understood as ur-

ban population growth at all) quantitatively exceeded that of small ones and it was largely determined by inter-urban migration from small to big towns.

At the same time, the urbanization of small Bulgarian towns was primarily driven by external migration.

Immigrants' main receiver - with values clearly distinguishable from those of other towns/cities - was the capital Sofia. It attracted an increasing percentage of the in-migrant flow towards the towns and of the whole in-migrant flow.

The urbanization of the capital Sofia, which was growing to the size of a super city (certainly with regard to the living and working conditions in Bulgaria), stood out with its scale even against the background of the so-called big towns and cities.

References

- Bilsborrow 2002:** R. E. Bilsborrow. Migration, population change and the rural environment. - Environmental Change & Security Project Report, 8, (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars), 2002, 69-94.
- Danailov 1930:** Г. Данаилов. Изследвания върху демографията на България. София, 1930. (G. Danailov. Izsledvaniya varhu demografiyata na Bulgaria. Sofia, 1930.)
- Georgiev 1979:** Г. Георгиев. Освобождението и етнокултурното развитие на българския народ, 1877-1900. София, 1979. (G. Georgiev. Osvobozhdenieto i etnokulturnoto razvitie na balgarskiya narod, 1877-1900. Sofia, 1979.)
- Gruev 2009:** М. Груев. Демографски тенденции и процеси в България в годините след Втората световна война. - В: И. Знеполски (ред.). История на Народна република България: Режимът и обществото. София, 2009, 368-391. (M. Gruev. Demografski tendentsii i protsesi v Bulgaria v godinite sled Vtorata svetovna voyna. - V: I. Znepolski (red.). Istoriya na Narodna republika Bulgaria: Rezhimat i obshtestvoto. Sofia, 2009, 368-391.)
- Ivanov 2012:** М. Ivanov. The Gross Domestic Product of Bulgaria, 1870-1945. Sofia, 2012.
- Marcheva 2016:** И. Марчева. Политиката за стопанска модернизация в България по време на Студената война. София, 2016. (I. Marcheva. Politikata za stopanska modernizatsiya v Bulgaria po vreme na Studenata voyna. Sofia, 2016.)
- Minkov, 1972:** М. Минков. Миграция на населението. Социално-икономически проблеми. София, 1972. (M. Minkov. Migratsiya na naselenieto. Sotsialno-ikonomichestki problemi. Sofia, 1972.)
- Mladenov, Dimitrov, 2009:** Ч. Младенов, Е. Димитров. Урбанизацията в България от Освобождението до края на Втората световна война. - География, 21, 2009, 1, 13-17. (Ch. Mladenov, E. Dimitrov. Urbanizatsiyata v Bulgaria ot Osvobozhdenieto do kraya na Vtorata svetovna voyna. - Geografiya, 21, 2009, 1, 13-17.)
- Obshti rezultati 1910:** Общи резултати от преброяванията на населението в Царство България на 31.XII.1910 г. Кн. 1. София, 1923. (Obshti rezultati ot prebrovavaniyata na naselenieto v Tsarstvo Bulgaria na 31.XII.1910 g. Kn. 1. Sofia, 1923.)
- Obshti rezultati 1920:** Общи резултати от преброяването на населението в Царство България на 31.12.1920 г. Кн. 1. План и организация на преброяването. София, 1927. (Obshti rezultati ot prebrovavaneto na naselenieto

v Tsarstvo Bulgaria na 31.12.1920 g. Kn. 1. Plan i organizatsia na prebroivaneto. Sofia, 1927.)

- Obshti rezultati 1926:** Общи резултати от преброяването на населението в Царство България на 31.12.1926 г. Kn. 1. План и организация на преброяването. София, 1931. (Obshti rezultati ot prebroivaneto na naselenieto v Tsarstvo Bulgaria na 31.12.1926 g. Kn. 1. Plan i organizatsia na prebroivaneto. Sofia, 1931.)
- Popov 1916:** К. Попов. Стопанска България. София, 1916. (K. Popov. Stopanska Bulgaria. Sofia, 1916.)
- Poston, Bouvier 2010:** D. Poston, L. Bouvier. Population and Society: An Introduction to Demography. Cambridge, 2010.
- Prebroivane 1934:** Преброяване на населението на 31 декември 1934 г. Kn. 1. Общи резултати. Пол, месторождение, поданство, вероизповедание, говорим език, грамотност и образование. София, 1938. (Prebroivane na naselenieto na 31 dekemvri 1934 g. Kn. 1. Obshti rezultati. Pol, mestorozhdenie, podanstvo, veroizповедание, govorim ezik, gramotnost i obrazovanie. Sofia, 1938.)
- Stefanov et al. 1974:** И. Стефанов, З. Сугарев, Н. Наумов, Е. Христов, А. Аманасов. Демография на България. София, 1974. (I. Stefanov, Z. Sugarev, N. Naumov, E. Hristov, A. Atanasov. Demografia na Bulgaria. Sofia, 1974.)
- Tacoli, McGranahan, Satterthwaite 2014:** C. Tacoli, G. McGranahan, D. Satterthwaite. World Migration Report 2015. Urbanization, Rural-urban Migration and Urban Poverty. Background paper, December 2014. Available from: https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our_work/ICP/MPR/WMR-2015-Background-Paper-CTacoli-GMcGranahan-DSatterthwaite.pdf [Accessed 14 January 2018].
- Totev 1968:** А. Тотев. Населението на България, 1880-1980. Демографско-исторически очерк. - Годушник на Софийския университет, Юридически факултет, 1968, 2, 1-60. (A. Totev. Naselenieto na Bulgaria, 1880-1980. Demografsko-istoricheski ocherk. - Godishnik na Sofiyskiya universitet, Yuridicheski fakultet, 1968, 2, 1-60.)
- Tzekov 2011:** Н. Цекъв. Селската селищна мрежа като фактор в развитието на човешкия потенциал на българското село. - Население, 2011, 1-2, 77-92. (N. Tsekov. Selskata selishtna mreza kao faktor v razvitiето na choveshkiya potential na balgarskoto selo. - Naselenie, 2011, 1-2, 77-92.)
- UN 2001:** The Components of Urban Growth in Developing Countries (ESA/P/WP.169. Sept. 21). United Nations, United Nations Secretariat, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2001. 58 p. Available from: [https://population.un.org/wup/Archive/Files/studies/United%20Nations%20\(2001\)%20-%20The%20Components%20of%20Urban%20Growth%20in%20Developing%20Countries.pdf](https://population.un.org/wup/Archive/Files/studies/United%20Nations%20(2001)%20-%20The%20Components%20of%20Urban%20Growth%20in%20Developing%20Countries.pdf) [Accessed: 26 June 2018].
- UN 2019:** United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Population Division. World Urbanization Prospects. The 2018 Revision. (ST/ESA/SER.A/420). UN, New York, 2019, p. 9. Available from: <https://population.un.org/wup/Publications/Files/WUP2018-Report.pdf> [Accessed: 12 August 2019].
- Vachkov 2018:** Д. Вачков. Последците от Първата световна война за икономиката и финансите на България. - В: България - Германия. Първата световна война. Поуки за бъдещето. Варна, 2018, 11-17. (D. Vachkov. Posleditsite ot Parvata svetovna voyna za ikonomikata i finansite na Bulgaria. - V: Bulgaria - Germania. Parvata svetovna voyna. Pouki za badeshteto. Varna, 2018, 11-17.)
- Vasileva 1991:** Б. Василева. Миграционни процеси в България след Втората световна война. София, 1991. (B. Vasileva. Migratsionni protsesi v Bulgaria sled Vtorata svetovna voyna. Sofia, 1991.)

- Vezenkov 1999:** А. Везенков. Урбанизацията в България до Втората световна война: темпове и характер. - Минало, 1999, 3, 56-69. (A. Vezenkov. Urbanizatsiyata v Bulgaria do Vtorata svetovna voyna: tempove i harakter. - Minalo, 1999, 3, 56-69.)
- White (ed.) 2016:** M. J. White (ed.). International Handbook of Migration and Population Distribution. International Handbooks of Population, 6. Springer Dordrecht, Heidelberg, New York, London, 2016.

Assoc. Prof. Penka Peykovska, DSc
Auxiliary Historical Sciences
and Informatics Section
Institute for Historical Studies
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
52 Shipchenski prohod Blvd., Bl. 17
1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
Email: pykvs@yahoо.com