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According to the nationalist image of normal life, cross-border migration and settlement is an anomaly, a problematic exception to the rule that people should stay in the places where they belong – that is, in ‘their’ nation states (Wimmer & Schiller, 2002, p.311). Sociological research on the settlement of immigrants has largely mirrored and reproduced such an image; no sooner does a category of immigrants arrive in the ‘host’ society than they are turned into ‘ethnics’ and scrutinized for ‘their’ cultural and social difference (Waldinger, 2003) ¹. ‘Ethnic difference’ is what is at stake, and, from the nationalist perspective, what should be abolished. Here comes mainstream sociology to measure ‘the level of integration of ethnic groups’ and inform policy makers and native society whether they are doing well and whether social policy is succeeding in integrating them.

The dominance of the nation-centric viewpoint in the sociology of migration is also reflected in the selection of cases. Much of the literature is preoccupied with the migrations which are framed as problems in national public and political discourses. Adopting the commonsensical framing of those cases, migration researchers aim to provide answers to policy concerns rather than to sociological questions (Banton, 2008). Without underplaying the contribution that social science research can make in tackling practical social problems, its more important role is to ask questions and assess what really does constitute a problem; and in what terms, to whom, and why. For this reason, Becker (1998) proposes that it is necessary to select cases which make us question our assumptions. Following Becker’s proposal, this study focuses on an exceptional case of migration, one which is commonly cherished by the ‘receiving’ national society, at

¹ In welfare states, moreover, their economic trajectories are followed obsessively.
least formally: this is the immigration of people who have always lived outside the borders of the nation but who are nonetheless regarded as co-nationals.

My study is an ethnography of the relationship between two categories of residents in a neighbourhood in Thessaloniki, Greece – one comprising Greeks born and raised in the country, the other also being of Greek descent, but having immigrated from countries formerly belonging to the Soviet Union and lacking any roots within the borders of the Greek state. In looking at this special case, I aim to explore the practical deployment of ideologies of national belonging in immigrant-native figurations. As will be described in what follows, this is an area which is surprisingly under-researched in the sociology of migration.

Traditionally a source country for emigration, Greece became a destination for immigration in the early 1970s (Nikolinakos, 1975). The influx gathered momentum during the 1990s, when the immigrant population more than quadrupled in size (Baldwin-Edwards, 2005). The steep increase in immigration to Greece during that decade was closely connected to the disintegration of the former communist bloc, and was caused by two distinct population movements: mass undocumented immigration from the Balkans, and immigration of people of Greek descent. In relation to ideologies of Greekness that define national belonging as a privilege deriving from descent, the perception and regulation of those two population movements has been markedly asymmetric.

On the one hand, the inflow and settlement of a significant non-Greek immigrant population has been treated as an undesired development. Immigration policies enforced non-Greek immigrants’ exclusion from a multitude of social, political, and economic domains by way of institutional obstacles. On the other hand, in line with the Greek state’s perceived responsibility towards co-ethnics, the migration of people of Greek descent was treated more positively. The settlement of ethnic Greeks from the former Soviet Union (whom I will for simplicity refer to as FSU Greeks) was encouraged and facilitated by state

---

2 The term ‘FSU Greek’ is neither (a translation of) a term of self-identification nor an ascribed categorical label. Greeks from the FSU are categorized by politicians, media, state officials, and lay people via a multiplicity of labels such as: repatriates (παλλινοστούντες), ‘people of same descent’ (ομογενείς), new-refugees (Νεο-πρόσφυγες), Pontics (Πόντιοι), Russian-Pontics (Ρωσοπόντιοι), Greek-Pontics (Ελληνοπόντιοι), and even Russians (Ρώσοι). I decided not to adopt any of these terms for the purpose of identifying this immigrant group, since the analysis of the meanings of such terms is at the core of my enquiry. Having said that, I should clarify that the term ‘FSU Greeks’ is not neutral either. My term of choice overemphasizes the common experience of those so labelled as subjects of the Soviet regime, as well their Greek descent, in comparison to other aspects of their identity which might be more important for them. The term ‘FSU Greeks’ was preferred over the more commonly used term ‘Soviet Greeks’ because the latter might be taken to indicate that
policies. Those state policies were legitimated by the official view that these are fellow nationals who are finally coming ‘home’.

Officially, FSU Greeks are not categorized as immigrants nor counted among the immigrant population in Greece. The term ‘immigration’ (μετανάστευση), being rather negatively loaded in the political discourse, was considered by state officials as inappropriate to frame their movement. Instead, the vocabulary of repatriation was adopted. Although neither they nor their ancestors have ever lived in Greece, FSU Greek immigrants were termed ‘repatriates’ (παλιννοστούντες). Politicians and the national media portrayed them as rejoining their homeland driven by innate national feelings, and ‘their return’ was conceptualized as a resource for the country. Their settlement was also expected to be smooth, or at least much smoother than that of foreign immigrants who were arriving at the same time (Kokkinos, 1991).

My personal interest in the interrelationship between FSU and native Greeks was triggered while I was in the army in 2005. Military service is obligatory for all male Greeks, including those who have immigrated from the former Soviet Union. During my first day as a conscript in the training army camp, rumours spread that in the company where the majority of FSU Greeks were assigned there were clashes between them and native conscripts. The few FSU Greeks in our company disparagingly refused to follow the rules, ridiculing the authority of the officials, and on limited occasions also provoking other conscripts.

The response of the officials was ambivalent. They generally avoided confrontation and decided to grant to several FSU Greek conscripts long leaves to de-escalate tensions. Their reaction probably reflected a reluctance to push things right to the edge, since most of the FSU Greeks only served for a limited time. It might also have reflected an understanding of the financial difficulties faced by several FSU Greeks whose conscription further reduced their limited
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Greek from the former Soviet Union collectively identify with the former Soviet Union, which is not the case.
Equally problematic to the term FSU Greeks is the term ‘native Greeks’, which I use to identify people of Greek descent born in Greece. As a matter of fact, many of those I call native Greeks are descendants of refugees who fled Asia Minor after the Greek-Turkish War in the 1920s (see chapters 2, 4, and 7). The validity of both terms is limited to their analytical treatment in relation to the subject matter of the present research, namely to differentiate people of Greek descent who immigrated from the former Soviet Union from the Greeks already living in Greece. That is also the reason why I did not adopt self identifications; these did not help differentiate between the two categories in the presentation of the material (on the issue of self identification, see chapter 7).

Those FSU Greeks who had fulfilled their military obligations in the former Soviet Union or in a successor state served in the Greek army for a reduced period of 3 months. The standard conscription period at that time was 12 months.
family income. Nonetheless, several native conscripts were indignant at what they perceived as preferential treatment for the FSU Greeks, whom they thought aggressive and uncivilized.

The collective unruliness of the FSU Greek conscripts in their very first days in the camp seemed to indicate that the expectations of policy makers regarding friendly coexistence between FSU and native Greeks might not have been fulfilled in practice. The FSU Greek conscripts’ confrontational attitude possibly hinted at pre-existing tensions between them and native Greeks outside the army, and expressed their willingness to challenge the authority of native Greek society. The symbolism of this experience was all the stronger due to the emblematic position of army as the national institution representing national cohesion and discipline. It directly questioned the ideologies of Greekness that underlay the official state policy.

At that time, in the context of her work on policy making and the FSU Greek migration, Voutira (2004) was making reference to the existence of a cultural collision between native and FSU Greeks, aggravated by the incongruent expectations each held of each other. She pointed to the development of prejudiced ideas about the FSU Greeks, and the devaluation of their Greekness by the dominant society. My study set out to look in detail at how FSU and native Greeks think about and associate with each other, while restricting attention to one neighbourhood where they cohabit: specifically, Nikopoli in Thessaloniki.

Nikopoli is a working-class neighbourhood on the north-western outskirts of the city of Thessaloniki, Greece. It developed in the early 1960s through processes of unauthorized construction by internal immigrants that came to the city from neighbouring villages, and expanded rapidly after 1995 largely by and for immigrants of Greek descent from the former Soviet Union. At the time of my ethnographic research (2007-2009), it housed approximately 10,000 people, the majority being FSU Greeks, followed by native Greeks, and a small number of non-Greek immigrants. FSU Greeks and native Greeks are spatially segregated within the neighbourhood, to a large extent as an outcome of Nikopoli’s history of expansion.

From the first days of my stay in Nikopoli it became apparent to me that native and FSU Greeks do not intermingle in the public space or in the few taverns and cafeterias of the neighbourhood. At the same time, most native Greeks living in Nikopoli talked in a derogatory way about their FSU Greek neighbours. Negative attitudes were inferred from the stories people heard from others, usually concerning FSU Greek’s alleged aggressiveness and delinquent behaviour, or were supported with reference to how they saw them use the neighbourhood’s public
space. Neither their common nationality and religion, nor their shared working-
class background, seemed to provide the conditions for friendly coexistence and mutual understanding between the members of the two communities in Nikopoli. Neither did the origin in Pontos, an area on the south-eastern coast of the Black Sea, that many immigrants and natives shared. Most native residents held a prejudiced image about FSU Greeks, and denied their Greekness.

Such ideas are in sharp contrast with the presentation of FSU Greek migration, by politicians and the media, as fellow nationals coming home – a contrast that points to the apparent complexity of the role played by ideologies of national belonging in everyday life. My study enquires into this issue through the exploration of the following research questions: How do FSU and native Greeks perceive and experience national belonging in everyday life? And: How do ideologies of national belonging influence the figuration in which their mutual relationship is cast in Nikopoli?

1.1 From assimilation to established–outsider figurations

For reasons that I hope will soon become apparent, during my fieldwork in Nikopoli I was reminded of Elias and Scotson’s book *The Established and the Outsiders* (1994/1965). Their study of Winston Parva, a community comprising a core neighbourhood and two settlements that had formed around it at later phases, manifested a sharp division between the older and the newer group of residents. The older residents closed ranks against the newcomers and stigmatized them as people of lesser worth. Similarly to the figuration in Nikopoli, the two groups did not differ in terms of nationality, religion, ethnic descent, or class background.

In Winston Parva the only difference between the two groups related to their length of residency. The detailed enquiry into their relations led Elias and Scotson to the development of the *established–outsider figuration*, a theoretical model of group relations and stigmatization which, they claimed, could be applied to a wide range of unequal group relations. This model, derived from a figuration that bears intriguing similarities to that studied in Nikopoli, seemed to provide a relevant analytical frame for the exploration of my field material. I do assign it a central position within my theoretical framework, but not only because of the empirical affinities between Winston Parva and Nikopoli. My most important motivation for giving Elias and Scotson’s model this central place is my conviction that it provides a more insightful heuristic metaphor to explore
immigrant–native relations than that offered by the literature on immigrant integration.

In that literature the relation between immigrants and natives has been traditionally conceptualized as a matter of cultural adaptation. This conceptualization has been commonly informed by normative ideas about whether immigrant populations, described as conglomerates of ethnic groups, should retain their supposed cultural distinctiveness. On the one hand, classical assimilation theory has favoured and predicted the ceasing of ‘ethnic difference’, perceived not as a relational phenomenon but as an attribute of immigrant groups. On the other hand cultural pluralism has challenged the assimilationist expectations for the dissolution of ‘ethnic difference’ and has called for the equal recognition of the cultural expressions of immigrant groups. Both theories have been rightfully critiqued for essentializing culture as a property of ethnic groups (Faist, 2000; Turner, 1999).

Scholars working within the paradigm of transnationalism have partly succeeded in transcending the problem. They have emphasized migrants’ durable ties across countries⁴ and have highlighted the fact that immigrants develop their sense of identity and community through a syncretism of cultural elements from both the homeland and the receiving nation. Claiming that many immigrants are able to live to a certain degree in two worlds at once, scholars of transnationalism have argued for the need to move beyond the nation state as the basic unit of analysis. In so doing they have shifted research attention away from the adaptation of sharply differentiated and bounded ethnic groups in the national mainstream. Deploying a constructionist perspective, they have emphasized individual and collective choice (Basch, et al., 1994; Faist, 2000; Portes, 1996; Schiller, et al., 1995; Smith & Guarnizo, 1998).

Yet transnationalism scholars, in their attempt to go beyond nation-centred thinking, downplayed the continuing potency of nationalism in forging identities, groupings and – most crucially for the subject matter here – perceptions of belonging (Favell, 2003; Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002). Overcoming the fallacy of groupism (Brubaker, 2002; Cohen, 1978)⁵ and conceiving culture in more processual and relational terms is not sufficient to fully grasp the dynamics which characterize immigrant–native relations. This is because immigrant–native
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⁴ Transnationalism is a concept used widely also outside migration studies to refer to economic political and social formations that span across nation states and to their border crossing activities.

⁵ Building on the work of Barth (1969) this literature holds that ethnicity should not be conceived as a matter of relations between fixed groups but rather as a process of producing and re-configuring groups by defining the boundaries between them.
relations are not only cultural relations. They are also power configurations unfolding through a (symbolic) contestation over defining the nation and who belongs to it.

Elias and Scotson’s model provides an appropriate analytical framework with which to address this largely ignored dynamic. It allows us to situate the cultural, ethnic, and class dimension of immigrant–native figurations within the unequal power figuration in which their relation is cast. In the remainder of this subchapter, I present the established–outsiders model while identifying three underdeveloped points of the theory that can, I argue, be further improved. I then explain how the model may be adapted to account for migrant–native figurations resulting from international migration rather than internal migration.

The established–outsiders model

The established–outsiders model explains social closure and stigmatization, together with its reverse process, that of collective self-praise, as outcomes of an uneven balance of power and the tensions inherent in it. It illustrates how power differences between groups permit the creation of polarized status distinctions between the group charisma claimed by the ‘established’, and the complementary communal disgrace that they attribute to the ‘outsiders’. A number of key questions may be posed as regards this basic formulation of the model. Do imbalances in power between groups always lead to processes of stigmatization and collective self-praise? If yes, why and how? If not, what are the particular types of power differentials that translate into this phenomenon? Speaking about power in the abstract is insufficient. Elias (1978) rightly argued that power is not a thing which individuals or collectivities possess. Power is by definition relational; it needs to be conceptualized as a fluctuating yet structural characteristic embedded in all human relations. The question in established–outsider figurations is how to determine the particular positions of power that the established attempt to monopolize, and through which they are able to denigrate the outsiders and secure a positive image of themselves.

Elias and Scotson argued that in Winston Parva, the conditions of the power imbalance were rooted in the established group’s social cohesion, which in turn

6 The theoretical elaboration of the model is primarily outlined in an introduction that Elias dictated ten years after the publication of the book for its Dutch translation published in English in the second edition of the book and secondarily in a conference paper (Elias, et al., 1998) presented at the Fifteenth German Sociological Congress, Heidelberg in 1964 and a brief appendix in the German translation of Harper Lee’s ‘To kill a Mocking Bird’ (1990). Reference to the model is made to Elias except from when I refer to the original book written by Elias and Scotson (1965)
resulted from its age. The older residents had developed a stock of common memories, attachments, and dislikes through interaction, and were bound by a cohesive network of kinship ties. Although the newcomers had hardly any intention of attacking the old residents, their arrival was experienced by them as a threat to their established way of life. Differences in behavioural patterns, especially in their self-perceived standards of self-restraint, were seen as threatening to their group norms, their belief in their group charisma, and to their monopolized local resources. Their defensiveness in the face of what they perceived as an attack set in motion the mechanism of established and outsider relations.

The ability of the established to control flows of communication permitted them to construct and maintain a positive community identity in opposition to the newcomers. Through the workings of ‘praise and blame gossip’ they built their collective self-image by reference to their ‘best’ members, and attributed to the outsider group as a whole the ‘bad’ characteristics of that group’s anomic minority (1994, p. xix). Wholesale rejection of the newcomers and taboos against closer contact with them made outsiders emotionally experience their lack of power as a sign of human inferiority. This had a paralyzing effect, undermining their potential to react against and reverse, or at least adjust, the local power ratio. The figuration derived from Winston Parva may be summarized in the following way: processes of group collective self praise and stigmatization were initiated by the established in response to subjective feelings of threat from the outsiders; they became possible due to the established group’s social cohesion; and they functioned to perpetuate the local dynamics of power. Yet there are three underdeveloped points in Elias and Scotson’s theorizing. The first concerns their lack of attention to the strategies of outsider groups. The second concerns their partial explanation of the reasons why the established perceived the settlement of newcomers as a threat. The third concerns their limited attention to the overarching figuration within which Winston Parva is embedded.

**Strategies of outsiders, proprietary claims, and the overarching figuration**

In the conclusion of their book, Elias and Scotson write that ‘the outsiders are bent on improving their position and the established are bent on maintaining theirs’ (1994, p.158). In contrast to the opposing pairs dominant/dominated, superordinary/subordinary, and majority/minority, which imply a static condition of domination, the very idea of ‘established and outsiders’ indicates a tension - a contestation over certain positions of power. Nevertheless, in the presentation of his model Elias included no information on what action outsider groups might engage in order to better their position, apart from a reference to
counter-stigmatization, and provided no indication on how change may become possible.

Although he did not exclude the possibility of the gradual diminishing of power imbalances,\(^7\) his research with Scotson in Winston Parva led Elias to stress the paralyzing effect of stigma. Refraining from elaborating on alternative modes of established–outsider coexistence, he reduced the potential of outsider groups to react to their situation and presented the figuration as exclusively dependent on the actions of the established group.

Established–outsider figurations are indeed imposed by the actions of the powerful group. Since the established are more powerful in symbolic and material terms, they are able to give a strong backing to their beliefs in defending themselves against what is felt as an intrusion. The outsiders have to react to an order imposed by the powerful group. Within this framework, the potential for outsiders to alter the collective representations and ultimately redress the power differences are reduced, especially in the short run. The paralyzing effect of stigma is theoretically significant and empirically recorded in many settings (see also Fanon, 1952/2008; Lewin, 1941; Wacquant, 1993). However, although certainly not a marginal scenario, it is one among others. Not all outsider groups in all social circumstances react in the same way. There are a number of theoretically possible ways groups might react to their subordinate status and so attempt to change the power balance.

Focusing on different cases of hierarchical group relations, several scholars have attempted to categorize the strategies of outsider groups. In relation to immigrant–native relations, Berry (2005) discerned four so-called acculturation practices: integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization. However, his theory, which is not grounded in empirical research, is characterized by confusion between outcomes and practices.\(^8\) Much more elaborate, although not exclusively focused on outsider groups, is the proposal of Bauböck (1994), which was later expanded by Zolberg and Woon (1999). Building on work by Barth (1969), the authors distinguish between three distinct patterns of negotiation between native society and immigrants: boundary crossing, boundary blurring, and boundary shifting. Also inspired by the work of Barth is the more recent work of Lamont and Bail on destigmatization strategies (2007). Wider in scope is Horowitz’s (1975) discussion of amalgamation, incorporation, division, and proliferation as strategies of categorical fusion and fission. The five scenarios regarding the
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\(^7\) And viewed the engagement in counter-stigmatization by outsider groups as an indicator of this development (xxi).

\(^8\) It is very difficult to imagine how marginalization may be a group strategy, for instance.
internalization of external categories proposed by Jenkins (2008), and the synthetic attempt by Wimmer (2008), are likewise wider in scope. The most comprehensive of such attempts was made by the social psychologists Tajfel and Turner (1986) in the context of Tajfel’s social identity theory. Their account brings together many of the insights of the above-mentioned authors in a concise and systematic way.

Tajfel and Turner describe three possible reactions to negative or threatened identity on the part of outsider groups: individual mobility, social creativity, and social competition. The first reaction, individual mobility, refers to processes through which individuals attempt to abandon or dissociate themselves from their erstwhile group. This attempt usually involves individual strategies to achieve upward social mobility and so pass from a lower to a higher-status group. This is somewhat analogous to the process of boundary crossing described by Zolberg and Woon (1999). In cases of social creativity the group members may seek positive distinctiveness for the in-group by redefining or changing the elements of the comparative situation. They may (a) engage in comparing the in-group to the out-group on some new dimension, (b) change the values assigned to the attributes of the group so that comparisons which were previously negative are now perceived as positive, and finally (c) change the out-group with which the in-group is compared. Finally, the third option, that of social competition, refers to cases in which group members seek positive distinctiveness through direct competition with the out-group. This strategy may imply efforts to reverse the relative positions of the in-group and the out-group on salient dimensions (Tajfel & Turner 1986: 19-20). These three scenarios provide a constructive addition to Elias’s theory. They help map the strategies of outsider groups and individuals and assess the channels through which change takes place, if it does.

The second underdeveloped point in Elias’s account concerns his explanation of why the settlement of newcomers was treated by the established as a threat. Elias argued that the older residents, like many other established groups, experienced the settlement of the newcomers as ‘a three-pronged attack – against their monopolised power resources, against their group charisma and against their group norms’ (1994: li). Not all aspects of what he identified as ‘a three-pronged attack’ are equally theorized in his model or supported by empirical evidence from the field research he conducted with Scotson. Much more emphasis was placed on the two last issues. The established group’s fear of endangerment of their monopolized resources is theoretically and empirically unsubstantiated. Except from a reference to the exclusion of newcomers from key positions in local institutions (1994, p.152), there is no indication of which resources are referred to and no explanation offered as regards their role in the development of perceptions of threat. Restricting his attention to racial distinctions, Blumer
(1958) had developed a theoretical approach on prejudice, bearing similarities to the established-outsider model, which provides useful insights in this respect.9

Critiquing psychological explanations that focus on the individual and treat prejudice as outcome of either noxious child socialization (Adorno, et al., 1950) (Adorno et al. 1950) or a distorted reading of social information (views which are in fact still extant in the literature; (see Hoffman & Hurst, 1990), Blumer explained prejudice as a matter of group relations in a stratified social world. He called for a shift of scholarly attention away from individual lines of experience to collective processes by which a ‘racial group’ comes to define and redefine another ‘racial group’. His central thesis is that race prejudice exists in a sense of group position and exhibits four features on the part of dominant group members. The first feature is a feeling of superiority. The second feature is a belief that the subordinate group is intrinsically different and alien. The third feature involves a sense of proprietary claim over certain areas of privilege and advantage. And the fourth feature involves a perception and suspicion that members of a subordinate group harbour designs on the dominant group’s prerogatives.

Blumer argued that ‘[t]he dominant group is not concerned with the subordinate group as such but it is deeply concerned with its position vis-à-vis the subordinate group’ (1958, p.4). His explanation of perceptions of superiority and alienation as means of the established to place out-groups below and beyond are also integral to Elias’s theorizing. Yet his emphasis on the dominant group’s proprietary claims highlights a dimension of established-outsider figurations neglected by Elias. In Blumer’s view, prejudice is an emotional recoiling by the established group in the face of threats to their perceived entitlement to either exclusive or prior rights in many important areas of life.

Uncovering the proprietary claims made by established groups is crucial in fully grasping their felt endangerment from outsiders. Claims of entitlement should not be conceptualized as pertaining only to material resources. They concern tangible things such as access to or control of land, property, jobs and businesses, political decision making, educational institutions, and recreational resources, as well as relatively intangible things. The latter may include positions of prestige
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9 Overall, Blumer’s theory is more restricted in scope than Elias’s, which makes the incorporation of the former in the latter more fruitful than the other way round. Besides Blumer’s reluctance to generalize beyond the case of race prejudice, he further confines his analysis to the dominant group. In addition, his explanandum, prejudice, is not adequately defined, while his framing of race relations in terms of dominant-subordinate groups is more static than Elias’s account in terms of established and outsiders.
and the display of the symbols and accoutrements of these positions, as well as access to areas of intimacy and privacy (Blumer 1958).

Incorporating this element in Elias and Scotson’s study, one may re-read the reaction of the established as not only pertaining to concerns over the relative position of the two group in the abstract (perceptions that the ‘morally superior group’ should not intermingle with inferiors) but also to the positioning of the two groups in relation to the neighbourhood space, which the established residents felt belongs to them. The ‘oldness’ of the older residents may in their view have entitled them to assume a managerial role in relation to the neighbourhood space; the right to decide ‘how things work there’ and ‘who should get what’. The arrival of the newcomers was not only ruining their neighbourhood-level intimacy but also challenging their exclusive control over ‘their’ place. Newcomers were entering what was conceived by older residents as their collective private space and they felt they had to discipline them according to the ‘rules of the house’. Disciplining or excluding new residents was necessary to keeping their status as the masters of the neighbourhood.

There is another underdeveloped point in Elias and Scotson’s analysis, undermining their explanation of the perceived threat that the settlement of the newcomers induces among the established. It concerns their lack of recognition of the wider social context of their local figuration. As mentioned elsewhere, there is a need to recognize the multiple levels at which the established–outsider figuration operates (Loyal, 2011; May, 2004). This is a point missed by Elias and Scotson. Their presentation seems to suggest that the relation between the older residents and the newcomers was bound to the local dynamics in Winston Parva and that the structure of the figuration could be sufficiently studied within the confines of the neighbourhood. They fail to note that the Winston Parva figuration is part of an overarching figuration, and thus their explanation of the perceived threat that newcomers posed to ‘the group charisma and the group norms of the established’ is partial.

Elias and Scotson describe how the older residents behaved in accordance with a code they had developed over the years. This code was transmitted intergenerationally and was highly valued. It was closely associated with self-respect and the respect they felt was due to them from others. Adherence to the norms it prescribed strengthened group feelings and allowed collective pride for the social advancement of any individual member of their community. At the same time it also implied higher levels of social restraint. In this function, the group norms were both a source of frustration, by repressing the spontaneity of
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10 Also reflected in Elias’s theoretical account of the model.
individual members, and a source of collective narcissism by underlying their group charismatic beliefs. Self-restraint was taken to signify a higher degree of orderliness, circumspection, and foresight, and offered status rewards in relation to ‘inferiors’ who showed less restraint in situations where they felt it was demanded.

In this context, the different behavioural patterns of the newcomers offended the established group’s sensibilities and were taken as a mark of a lower order. Older residents felt that any close contact with them would lower their standing, in their own estimation as well as in that of others in the neighbourhood. Moreover, the lack of compliance of newcomers to the neighbourhood code was feared by them as apt to gradually weaken their defence against their own wish to break the prescribed norms.

Their explanation serves well to illustrate why certain differences in behaviour acquired such symbolic significance at the neighbourhood level. They were used by the established to exclude the newcomers, and as a consequence functioned to increase the cohesion of their group. Moreover, their analysis of self restraint, drawing from Elias’s theory of the civilizing process (2000/1939), shows how the established were able to provide a strong backing to their group charismatic claims and the communal disgrace they attributed to the outsiders. They presented certain behaviour as characteristic of people of lesser human worth and projected this status to the newcomers as a whole. Given the extended and cohesive ties within the established community, association with the newcomers became particularly risky for the social status of longstanding residents in the neighbourhood.

However, outsiders were also thought of as dangerous for the established group as a whole. As Elias and Scotson remark, the established feared that the supposed collective deviant behaviour of the newcomers would eventually ‘impair the prestige of their neighbourhood with all the chances of pride and satisfaction that went with it’ (1994, p.149). From this point it is only a small step to recognize that Winston Parva’s established also held a place in an overarching hierarchy and were subordinated to other groups/categories/classes.

In all likelihood, their cultivated ‘group-charisma’ was not only developed in opposition to the newcomers, but also as a defensive mechanism against potential or existing social categorization by other, powerful and superior groups outside the neighbourhood space. It was also a way to protect ‘their’ neighbourhood, and as an extension their collective self, from negative categorizations stemming from outside their neighbourhood. In relation to higher-status groups outside the
neighbourhood, Winston Parva’s established should be conceptualized as outsiders.

Recognizing the established residents’ interdependence with people outside Winston Parva, and taking into account the proprietary claims made by them, we are then able to better explain why outsiders were seen as threatening in the first place. Further, we may also better assess the reasons why the established were determined ‘to hit back so sharply’ (1994, p.li). Their acute reaction possibly relates to the fact that differences between them and the newcomers were insignificant. As Blok argues in his article on the narcissism of minor differences: ‘identity – who you are, what you represent or stand for, whence you derive self-esteem – is based on subtle distinctions that are emphasized, defended, and reinforced against what is closest because that is what poses the greatest threat’ (1998, p.48).

Perhaps if the established were really of a superior class in relation to the newcomers they would not have engaged in such severe stigmatization. This is supported by the fact that people in the nearby middle-class neighbourhood were not bothered by the presence of the newcomers; for them there was no need to be concerned since the social distance was great enough for them not to feel threatened (see Blok, 1998).

This relational character of the established-outsider model is its most significant analytical strength. Elias and Scotson seem to have missed an important element of the figuration by excluding the subordination of Winston Parva’s established to superior groups outside the neighbourhood. They seemed to have looked at Winston Parva too microscopically. The need to look beyond the local setting and to place local figurations within broader social contexts becomes particularly evident when researching established-outsider figurations resulting from international migration, such as that of Nikopoli. The latter are not crafted from scratch at the local interactional level but unfold around pre-existing perceptions of social categories and officially imposed classifications that confer rights and statuses and shape people’s perceptions of their selves and others.

Moreover, not all immigrant groups are equally outsiders in this status hierarchy. Elias and Scotson not only neglected the wider social milieu but they convey too homogenous an idea of the outsiders; one that does not allow us to assess the internal power dynamics within them. Does their lack of attention to the internal divisions within the outsider group also account for why they do not give any indication of the strategies to counter stigmatization?
Overall, there is a risk of a reification if the concepts of established and outsiders are thought of in absolutist ways. Groups and categories defined as such by the analyst should not be seen in a bipolar relation, isolated from the wider social context in which they are embedded. Nor should they be seen as fixed categories to such an extent that internal differences are made invisible. The challenge is to consider all those relations and variations within, and surrounding, the figurations defined as established and outsiders, so that we can understand the power configurations that structure them.

Taking into account the particularities of immigrant–native figurations resulting from international migration, in my research I follow a different analytical path to that followed by Elias and Scotson. I start from the analysis of the wider context of the figuration, and then I zoom in on the local level to assess the configuration of the power relations between native and FSU Greeks in the neighbourhood. In the final section of this theoretical introduction I illustrate how we may analyse immigrant–native relations as established–outsider figurations. I use the notion of practical nationality developed by Hage in order to identify differences existing among immigrant groups (differences which we may empirically link to different strategies adopted by people and collectivities), and also to define the central division between what is the topic of this thesis, namely the established and outsider nationals.

**Established and outsider nationals**

Immigrants are turned into outsiders as soon as they cross national borders and start building their life abroad, away from their previous ‘national home’. In most cases they lack citizenship, which formally attests their outsider position and deprives them of equal participation in native society. Besides their exclusion by the state, their outsider status is also experienced in their everyday interactions with members of the native society. Even if citizenship rights are acquired, this does not necessarily bring about their acknowledgment as equal members of the national community by the established – i.e. those citizens who consider themselves as representing the national core group.

Hage (2000) argues that there are two limitations to the ability of the concept of citizenship to investigate questions of national belonging in everyday life. Firstly, its either/or logic does not allow us to capture all the subtleties of the differential modalities of national belonging as they are experienced within society. The exclusion/inclusion conception of national belonging is less present in everyday life, especially among outsider categories. In their attempt to acquire national recognition, outsiders think of themselves as more national than some people
and less national than others. They are also recognized by others in similar fashion. Secondly, citizenship does not explain what allows certain people to assume a dominant position within the nation (Hage, 2000). While citizenship is a prerequisite for established nationals, it is certainly not a sufficient condition for them to acquire such a position.

To compensate for the first limitation, Hage proposed the concept of *practical nationality* (or national capital) as a sort of cultural capital that is valued within the national field. According to Hage, (2000, pp. 53) practical nationality can be analytically understood as the sum of nationally sanctified and valued social and physical cultural styles and dispositions adopted by individuals and groups, as well as valued characteristics within a national field: looks, accent, demeanours, taste, nationally valued social and cultural preferences and behaviour, length of residency, etc. The recognition and legitimacy given to a person or a group for the practical nationality they possess is translated to different degrees of national belonging/acceptance (Hage 2000, pp. 53).

Hage’s conceptualization implies that there is a tendency for a national subject to be perceived as just as much of a national as the amount of practical nationality she or he possesses (2000, pp. 53), while her/his claims for national belonging are constrained by the practical nationality she or he possesses. The amount of practical nationality that one possesses is not given. In a Bourdieusian vocabulary, one may speak about the accumulation of national capital, a process that can be best illustrated through the case of first-generation immigrants. Migrants arriving in a new nation gradually and to varying degrees acquire language skills, a native accent, and master a number of national-specific cultural practices, behaviours, and tastes. This process is directly related to their gradual recognition as members of the nation to which they had immigrated.

According to Hage (2000), the extent to which immigrants are successful in the process of practical nationality accumulation depends on their habitus, the cultural dispositions and embodied social knowledge that they bring with them. Yet one must remark that it is also heavily determined by the positioning of their ethnic and religious background in relation to a historically constructed self-image of ‘the nation’ to which they aspire to belong. Moreover, not all practical nationality is acquirable. For instance, a Muslim Asian immigrant with a long residency in West European country who has accumulated practical nationality in the form of the dominant linguistic and cultural dispositions may yield less national belonging in relation to a newcomer Christian immigrant of a neighbouring European state, even if the later is less acquainted with the native language. Both immigrants, however, would be in a much more marginal situation when confronted with those who claim to represent the nation by their
very being. The incentive which impels national outsiders to try to become acknowledged members of the nation reaches its limits when faced with established nationals.

The established nationals do not achieve their dominant position vis-à-vis the national outsiders through processes of practical nationality accumulation. Their position stems from their ability to present themselves as standing for what the others have to become in order to gain national recognition. Rather than attesting their practical nationality to valorize their nationhood, they present it as the manifestation of ‘the national essence’ they embody. Claiming legitimacy via national ideologies that conceive of a ‘national people’ with common origins and a distinct culture and history, they present their national belongingness as something that is rightfully conferred to them by birth. It is also in relation to this idea of ‘the national people’ and the concomitant significance attributed to a certain ‘race’, ‘ethnicity’, and ‘culture’ that immigrants are constructed as outsiders, alien, and potentially threatening.

The established nationals reproduce their dominant position not least through the mechanisms detected by Elias in his microsociological research in Winston Parva. One may highlight the reproduction of collective national fantasies that sustain stereotypes about the character of the national self through a multiplicity of national institutions. This process goes hand in hand with the spread of images and flows of information about ‘others’ in a continuous sort of ‘national gossiping’ that takes place through popular national media and in everyday public discourse. Ideologies of national belonging grant the established nationals the potential to construct a positive image of their collective national self as well as to authoritatively categorize others who enter their intimate national space.

With respect to this theoretical framework, the case of Nikopoli appears intriguing. How do FSU and native Greeks, both considered to be groups that belong to the nation, experience national belonging in everyday life in Nikopoli? How can we explain the fact that native Greeks doubt the Greekness of the FSU Greeks, and what would one expect the reaction of the latter to be?
1.2 Research design and practice

Where, when, how

I was drawn to Nikopoli for three reasons. The first reason related to the fact that a considerable segment of the local population, especially the early settlers, are of Pontic descent. This neighbourhood characteristic entailed that a subcategory of the group I have conventionally named as ‘native Greeks’ (see footnote 1, pp.2) are bound together in a common ancestry with the majority of local FSU Greeks who also originate in Pontos. The population structure of Nikopoli permitted an enquiry into how narratives on ‘Ponticness’ influence processes of identification and interaction between native and the FSU Greeks.

The second reason related to my lack of awareness about this neighbourhood prior to the research. Nikopoli is a relatively new neighbourhood, rather secluded from the rest of the city of Thessaloniki. Despite having grown up in the city, my own image of the neighbourhood before I started my research was practically non-existent. This lack of predispositions allowed me to have a ‘blank slate’ approach to Nikopoli.

The third reason concerned the exceptionally large concentration of FSU Greeks in this neighbourhood and its characterization as a ghetto. I developed an interest in recording what I then thought of as ‘the emergence of a new phenomenon in Greek urban history’. I was also interested in assessing what it is that different actors are implying by characterizing the neighbourhood as a ghetto and how the use of this word connects with what is happening there.

My ethnographic research was carried out in two periods, from September 2007 to March 2008, and from March 2009 to September 2009. I lived in Nikopoli for both periods. It further included a number of short field trips which I undertook in between and after those two periods, until 2011. I decided to split the fieldwork in two parts, aiming to pursue in a structured way Blumer’s (1969) proposal to treat ethnographic research as consisting of two relatively distinct phases, the exploratory phase and the phase of inspection. According to Blumer, the exploratory phase provides the researcher with first-hand knowledge of her/his subject and serves as the empirical grounding to develop and fine-tune her/his concepts and theoretical approach. In the phase of inspection the researcher put the analytical concepts to work in the process of examination. Following this approach, I planned for a time interval between the two phases of my fieldwork to analyse the field material gathered up to that point. This process
helped me reflect on my findings, identify gaps and puzzles, revise my theoretical approach, and plan the next steps of data collection in a more focused way.

I collected the data primarily through participant observation in a variety of neighbourhood spaces and local institutions. In particular, I kept a detailed fieldwork diary with the observations I made and the discussions I had with people on the streets, the small parks, and the open market of Nikopoli, but also in local internet cafes, tavérnas, kafénia, sports clubs, cafeterias, and the local schools and churches. In addition to my chats with people in Nikopoli, I also conducted interviews with approximately fifty residents and organized ten focus groups, one of which was in the church and the remaining nine with students, teachers, and parents in the local schools. In all cases but one, the focus groups were tape recorded. During personal interviews, often of a spontaneous set-up not favouring any kind of recording, I kept notes and I always transcribed the discussions the same day, in most cases immediately after the interview.

The gender division of my interviews was approximately 30%-70% with the majority being men, while the representation of different age categories was more or less balanced, with the exception of people between 25 and 35 years old who were largely absent from the neighbourhood space. Regarding the native/FSU Greek ratio in my data, there is a tendency to favour the latter. This largely relates to my disposition towards understanding the habits of FSU Greeks, whose cultural traits were more unfamiliar to me.

When I was asked by people what I was doing in Nikopoli, I responded by presenting myself as a social scientist doing research on the neighbourhood with a particular interest in the relationship between local residents. I did not specify upfront that I wanted to focus on immigrant-native relations. I wanted to avoid guiding them in my research topic in order to be able to assess the significance they attributed to the issue as part of their broader neighbourhood life. As will be described in the empirical chapters, the FSU Greeks barely ever spoke about their native neighbours. The opposite was not true.

I developed frequent contact and friendly relations with some of Nikopoli’s residents, especially with Yuri, my FSU Greek roommate during the second fieldwork period, Maria and Aggelos, my native Greek neighbours during my first fieldwork, and Stefanos, a FSU Greek middle-aged man I also met during my first fieldwork11. I also became good friends with several people at the church, which the native residents call the ‘Russian church’. I followed the liturgy every Sunday and joined the tea gatherings that usually followed. I also took part in the

11 No real names are used in the book.
organized excursions and I met several people in other occasions outside the church. Here it should be mentioned that being a native Greek myself, the relations I developed with my FSU Greek informants became an object of my study, including my own behaviour and ideas and how those developed through those relationships.

Concerning my research in schools, I was granted one month’s access by the Secondary Education Division to conduct research in the upper and lower secondary schools where students of Nikopoli go. My research included conducting interviews and focus groups with teachers and school staff, and carrying out participant observation outside the classroom. I also conducted two focus groups in the primary school of Nikopoli, one with members of the parents’ association and one with school teachers.

I also carried out twenty interviews with people living outside the neighbourhood, five of which with residents of the seaside suburban neighbourhood of Peraia. This neighbourhood also has a sizeable FSU Greek population but is substantially different in terms of its physical space, its location, and its history. During my second field trip I paid several daily visits to Peraia. Through those field trips I aimed to better understand the processes I observed in Nikopoli and assess whether they are exclusive to the neighbourhood or point to more general patterns within native–FSU Greek relations; I did not compare the two neighbourhoods in the conventional sense but rather used Peraia as a reference point with respect to Nikopoli.

With a similar goal in mind, I also conducted interviews with state officials and people working in the municipalities to which Nikopoli belonged administratively at the time of my research, and to board members of FSU Greek cultural associations outside Nikopoli. In addition to this, I followed people of Nikopoli

---

12 Unfortunately permission to conduct participant observation in the classroom is only granted by the Ministry of Education for people wishing to conduct pedagogical research.

13 The seaside area of Peraia is situated at the southern part of Thessaloniki’s Gulf, 20 km from the city centre. It was formed during the 1920 by Asia Minor refugees and developed in the post-war period as a close-to-the-city summer resort with inner-city residents buying second homes and with mushrooming seaside restaurants. Currently, the structure of its population is largely determined by processes of suburbanization and immigration, and is substantially more diverse than Nikopoli in ethnic, educational, and occupational terms. Between 1991 and 2001 Peraia has emerged as a rapidly growing suburb. Its appeal combines its coast, with views of city across the Gulf, and its relatively cheap land values, while its ‘traditional’ tourism- and entertainment-centred economy has been recently expanded by intense construction activity and the rise of various types of services to cope with its growing population. The total population of FSU Greeks in Peraia is estimated at around 2,500 people forming substantial concentrations at the south and central part of the neighbourhood, behind the coastal facade.
in their activities outside the neighbourhood. I visited entertainment spaces outside Nikopoli, such as clubs and cafeterias frequented by residents of Nikopoli, and I joined social and political events that were important to the neighbourhood such as the commemoration of the Pontic genocide and the Virgin Mary Soumela Pontic gathering.

It is important to note that I did not restrict myself only to the FSU and native Greeks residents of Nikopoli. I also met and talked to non-Greek FSU and Albanian immigrants living in the neighbourhood. As will be shown, those encounters proved extremely valuable for assessing my findings. The stories of those immigrants and what I observed of their interrelation with native Greeks provided me with a relational perspective through which to assess the FSU-native Greek figuration in Nikopoli. Finally, Nikopoli also contains a small number of people of Greek descent who had migrated from the former Soviet Union in earlier phases, in particular during the late 1960s. My discussions with those people, and the discourse of long-time residents of Nikopoli about them, proved to be useful in assessing the significance of the changing context of reception.

Besides my ethnographic material, I also made use of the survey data of the GEITONIES project, on which I was working as a researcher. GEITONIES was a 7th Framework project on the development of relationships between immigrants and natives at the neighbourhood level, which ran from May 2008 to May 2011. The survey was conducted in 18 neighbourhoods in 6 European cities among a randomly selected sample of 200 respondents (100 immigrants and 100 natives) in each neighbourhood. Nikopoli was one of the 18 neighbourhoods. The questionnaire had a longitudinal format covering different domains of the life course. It further included data on identification, attitudes and (egocentric) networks and data on experiences in and views about the neighbourhood.14

The data generated by the GEITONIES project were helpful to assess the socio-economic status of people in the neighbourhood and the structure of their personal networks. In addition they allowed me to inquire into how common certain phenomena I observed through my ethnographic research were. More helpful, however, were the qualitative data that I managed to collect in the context of the survey. Since the survey took place when I was in the field for the second time, I had the opportunity to work closely with the interviewers in Nikopoli. A small number of open questions (see appendix I.1, pp. 243) were asked to a subsample of the GEITONIES respondents in Nikopoli (47 natives and 36 immigrants). Moreover, the experiences of the interviewers in the data

14 The full Questionnaire can be accessed at: http://geitonies.fl.ul.pt/Publication/Questionnaire%20-%20GEITONIES.pdf.
collection helped me to gain additional insight into certain aspects of the life in the neighbourhood, such as the residents’ perceptions of safety and the relations of residents in their housing blocks.

**Access to the field**

Talking to people and building networks in the neighbourhood proved very difficult in my first days in the field. Often I wondered what I was exactly doing there, spending long hours walking alone up and down the neighbourhood, sitting alone in cafeterias, taking the bus back and forth waiting for any possible opportunity to meet and speak to people. It was from the third month onwards when things started looking up. That development related partly to the fact that people I eventually met introduced me to other people, and partly because I was becoming more experienced in approaching people and less concerned of the risk that ‘something might go wrong’. This feeling is particularly constraining in the beginning when one feels that a negative first impression could seriously impede access, especially in a neighbourhood community where entry points appear to be limited.

I tried to avoid starting my research from a cultural or neighbourhood association. I wanted to avoid turning to a social circle engaged in identity politics before I had first-hand experience of how people interact and think of each other in everyday life in the neighbourhood. Commonly, people who are involved in such associations have a specific vision which they want to present as the vision of ‘their group’, ‘their neighbourhood’, etc. Such visions need to be assessed in the face of what people actually think and do in their everyday lives.

I also kept up the habit of hanging around the neighbourhood to observe the street life until my last weeks in the field. Observing the street life turned out to be very important in understanding interactions between FSU and native Greeks in Nikopoli, and how they saw each other. That said, I found it rather difficult to enter the street gatherings which were very common among FSU Greeks. My experience made me realise that although such socializing takes place in public spaces it is very private and closed in its essence. My very limited knowledge of Russian has certainly contributed to my hesitation to join to those meetings.

In the course of time and for the reasons explained earlier in the introduction, I eventually decided to centre my study on the relationship between native and FSU Greeks. Knowing Russian, which is the first language of most FSU Greeks, would be useful in the field. For that reason, during the break between my two fieldwork periods, I followed a language course. Although my limited knowledge
of the language did not allow me to enter into conversation in Russian, it proved helpful in some cases to follow discussions and most importantly to make contacts. Most of the FSU Greek people I met valued the fact that I could speak some Russian. In terms of communicating, language was not a problem except from some cases of old Turkophone FSU Greeks who could not speak Greek. To approach those people I used the help of my roommate Yuri who acted as a translator.

There is one last point I should note here: I deliberately chose to report on my data using the past tense rather the ethnographic present. I did so to avoid presenting the figuration I recorded in Nikopoli as a fixed one, especially since at the moment these lines are being written the financial crisis in Greece is attaining dramatic dimensions and its impact is being felt in all domains of social life. Moreover, concerning the issue of Greekness, so central to my research, the rise of the neo-fascist party Golden Dawn, which builds its xenophobic, reactionary, and misanthropic rhetoric on a certain conception of Greekness, has possibly made ideologies of national belonging in Greece more controversial and views on them more polarized.

Moreover, immigrant–native relations are in any case context-bound and dynamic. To a certain extent I was able to witness this myself, during my second period in the field – which took place after a murder had happened in Nikopoli. This incident had a considerable impact on residents’ perceptions of safety in the neighbourhood. As will be described later (chapter 6.3), it also mediated the relations between native and FSU Greeks. Finally, immigrant–native relations are subject to change from one day to the next as a result of the events and developments that acquire symbolic significance in public discourses and in media presentations (Banton, 2009). At this moment, while the economic crisis is deepening in Greece, Russia is being characterized by steady growth, and so the old view that ‘people from Russia’ are poor people is becoming less dominant. Since I conducted my fieldwork, Ivan Savvidis, a businessman and politician in Russia of Greek origin,15 bought PAOK, the biggest athletic and football club in Thessaloniki. In this, and the other investments he has made in the city, Savvidis has emerged as a prominent figure in the local and national media. I expect that his public appearance will also have had an impact upon the stereotypes of FSU Greeks as being poor – stereotypes which were still dominant at the time I did my fieldwork.

---

15 He originates from the district of Tsalka, in present-day Georgia.
The structure of the book

The book comprises six empirical chapters and the conclusion. The empirical chapters may be grouped into two thematic clusters serving the aim of comparing processes at different analytical levels. The first three chapters concern the national and the transnational level and the other three the experience at the local level, presenting the ethnographic material.

Chapter 2 reviews the construction of the Greek state as the focal point of a trans-territorial nation which came to be defined by descent and common origin. The analysis presented aims to illustrate how ideologies of Greekness determine the belonging of FSU Greeks to a country neither they themselves nor their ancestors have ever lived in. It also serves to explain the historical production from a more open to a very closed conception of what it entails to be Greek in cultural terms. In chapter 3 I outline the history of the Soviet Greeks. The origins of the Greek populations in the former Soviet Union are presented, as well as their experiences within the Soviet Union. Emphasis is placed on internal differences as well as on processes of boundary maintenance, shifts, and blurrings over time. Finally, the characteristics of the post-1989 immigration are outlined, as well as the reasons for the outflow from the perspective of the migrants themselves. Chapter 4 contextualizes the FSU Greek migration as part of the extended co-ethnic migrations from the former Soviet Union that followed the collapse of the Soviet regime. The Greek case is compared to that of Israel, Germany, and Finland, each of which has engaged with comparable populations of co-ethnics abroad. The Greek policy context is then given further elaboration, and the migration flow is presented from the viewpoint of policy makers. Finally, the socio-economic situation of FSU Greeks is outlined.

Chapter 5 redirects the focus to the local level, zooming in on Nikopoli. In this first ethnographic chapter I describe the collective representation of the neighbourhood as well as its history and the ways in which different groups have settled and accessed housing there in different points in time. Having set the scene, in chapter 6 I go on to draw the contours of the relationship between FSU and native Greeks as observed and recorded in the neighbourhood. The relationship is described in different neighbourhood locations, including schools, entertainment places, local shops, and open spaces. The description includes information regarding experiences of actual interaction as well as collective views, stereotypes, thoughts, and feelings which each group holds regarding the other. Chapter 7, while retaining the focus on Nikopoli, synthesizes the two thematic clusters of the study by outlining FSU and native Greeks’ contestation in defining what is the nation and who belongs to it. It further describes the ways in which official categorizations are appropriated at the local level, the ways identities are
produced and categorizations are adopted or negated. Emphasis is placed on the
native stigmatizing label ‘Russo-Pontic’, the FSU Greeks’ reaction to it, as well as
the significance of narratives of Ponticness or processes of identification. In the
concluding chapter I summarize and explicate the structure of the figuration
studied in Nikopoli and I respond to the research questions advanced in the
theoretical introduction.