

THE COCA-COLA KASHKAVAL NETWORK: BELONGING AND BUSINESS IN THE POSTSOCIALIST BALKANS¹

*Georgios Agelopoulos
University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki*

The winter of 1991 - 1992 was a time of significant political changes in the Balkans. As a result of these changes, the former socialist Balkan states (Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania)^{xxxvii} experienced a sudden opening of their borders. For the first time since WWII the citizens of these countries were completely free to travel abroad without any direct official or indirect unofficial restrictions. The same applied to citizens of "the West"^{xxxviii}, who were able for the first time in the last forty years to enter these countries almost without restrictions. It is true that this freedom of movement did not last long for the citizens of former socialist countries. However, it is justifiable to assert that it is far easier to travel between these countries and the EU states today than it was pre-1991.

With the exception of refugees from the former Yugoslavia seeking asylum in other countries and the illegal migration of people coming from SE Europe, little research has been carried out on the impact that this freedom of contact has had on Balkan societies. In the majority of cases, reports in the international press and the views of certain politicians tend to confirm what Verdery calls the "deep freeze theory",^{xxxix} alternatively known as "the heavy lid theory". Briefly speaking, this popular model of explanation claims that from the moment socialist regimes collapsed, previously existing socio-economic relationships and structures were taken "out of the deep freeze" and were free to develop. This is a model used not only to explain the rise of nationalist movements in the area, but also to justify phenomena such as the recent significant presence of Italian companies in Tirana and the strong presence of Greek companies in Sofia. The work of A. Brzezinski (1998), G. Kennan (1993) and R. Kaplan (1994) can be classified as supporting such an explanatory model.

As pointed out by Pearson, this model is totally ahistorical (Pearson 1995: 76). In my opinion, it is more than ahistorical, it is of a metaphysical nature. What such an explanation presupposes is the possibility of a break in history which amounts to a gap that lasted forty-five years. According to such claims, Balkan societies somehow managed to remain unchanged during this forty-five-year period, and when socialism collapsed they then returned to the situation that existed before WWII. The discourse

of the deep freeze theory is based on a mentality similar to that of Balkanism in Todorova's terms (Todorova 1997). Balkanism and the deep freeze theory formulate symbolically powerful constructions ("The Balkans") with supposedly eternal characteristics not influenced by historical changes. Furthermore, both are the product of scholars who "valorise Eastern Europe as foreign and distanced from the rest of the world" (Kurti 1996: 13) and especially from the West. Finally, both approaches establish political and ethnic correctness as a precondition for scholars working in the area (Kurti 1996: 15).

My aim is to argue against simplistic and ahistorical explanations such as the above-mentioned models. In my opinion, the situation is far more complex and perplexing and involves a revaluation and reconstruction of past relationships by those involved in the present. In order to ethnographically illustrate my argument I will refer to the case of the Krasioties population living in Greece and Bulgaria. Thus, this article will hopefully contribute towards fulfilling one of the tasks of postsocialist ethnography as suggested by Hann, Humphrey and Verdery: to point out the self-representations emerging after the collapse of socialism on both sides of the border dividing former socialist and capitalist societies (Hann, Humphrey and Verdery, 2002: 21). My data are based on fieldwork conducted in Greek Macedonia and in the Bulgarian Black Sea coast in 1991 - 1992 and in 1996.^{xi} Since 1996 I have been following further developments from Greece.

The Krasioties population of Greece and Bulgaria^{xi}

Rila is a town on the Black Sea coast of Bulgaria. Until the beginning of the twentieth century Rila was predominantly a Greek town, called Krasia, with a total population of more than 4,000 people. More than 2/3 of its population were Greeks who called themselves Krasioties Greeks, the rest of the population being Turks and Bulgarians. Until 1926 a great number of Greeks lived in southern Bulgaria (sometime known as *Anatoliki Romilia*, Eastern Rumelia) and in the Bulgarian Black Sea coast, from Sozopol to the south to Burgas to the north. Precise numbers cannot be provided due to the flexibility and ambiguity of national identification in the southern

Balkans.^{xlii} Furthermore, the majority of data regarding the distribution of populations in the area during that period are not considered to be reliable (Pearson 1983). Estimations of the number of Greeks living in what was Eastern Rumelia vary from 40,000 to 150,000 people. According to the official Bulgarian statistics, the 1920 census showed the presence of 42,074 Greeks in Bulgaria (Mancev 1992: 33). The Krasiotes were included in this number. The Greeks of Rila (Krasia) were engaged in trade, wine production and fishery. They were a bourgeois population clearly distinct from the other rural populations of the same region.

As a result of the re-arrangement of borders between the Balkan states following the Balkan Wars, some populations found themselves living in a foreign national state. The Balkan Wars were followed by massive exchanges of populations between the Balkan states. Population transfer seemed to many despairing politicians during that period to be the most definitive, or the most drastic, solution to the abiding minority problem (Pearson 1983: 139). Various treaties were signed to control all these population exchanges. Based on the agreements of the Treaty of Neuilly signed in 1919, a total number of 46,000 Greeks came from the northern part of Bulgaria to Greek Macedonia, and 92,000 Bulgarians (i.e. Macedonians with Bulgarian national affiliations) moved from Greek Macedonia to Bulgaria.

The exchange of populations between Greece and Bulgaria was never completed. This was due to the nature of the treaty which made clear that the departure of the "minority" population was not compulsory. In any case, it was not possible for such an exchange of population to be completed for the very simple reason that there were no clear and absolute criteria to define who was Greek and who was Bulgarian. Groups of people who defined themselves as Greeks at that time remained inside Bulgaria; the same happened with the Macedonian supporters of the Bulgarian Exarchate^{xliii} in western Greek Macedonia. In the immediate post-WWII decades, the Bulgarian Greeks and the Macedonians of Greece were gradually assimilated or forced to migrate, usually outside Europe.

Some Krasiotes families had already been living in Greece since 1903, but the final decision to move to Greece was taken sometime during the spring of 1925. As was the case with the Kostilides community of Greeks from Bulgaria studied by Danforth, the pressure applied by the Bulgarian authorities to leave Bulgaria could no longer be resisted (Danforth 1989: 134). It should be noted that the Krasiotes were allowed to sell their land and houses before leaving Bulgaria.

In actuality, the Krasiotes community was divided in 1925. Almost 70 - 75% of Krasiotes decided to leave their homeland. Some families preferred to stay in Rila. According to the Treaty of Neuilly, the nuclear family was officially recognised as the migration unit but the right to migrate was recognised for every person who was older than eighteen years old. Therefore, it happened that some brothers and sisters were separated because one preferred to remain in Rila while the other migrated to Greece. During my visit to Rila in the summer of 1992 I had the chance to talk with some members of the Krasiotes community and discuss the reasons for their choice. Briefly speaking, those who preferred to remain in Rila justify their decision on the basis of existing kinship ties with non-Greek families, their political affiliations and/or because of various personal reasons.

Three hundred and sixty families (i.e. households) arrived in Greece, with 288 of them settling in a village in central Greek Macedonia. The process of establishing the community in its new settlement was similar to the one reported in the relevant bibliography (Eddy 1931, Pentzopoulos 1962). This village was later named Nea Krasia (new Krasia). Although the majority of the population of the village was composed of Krasiotes, a number of other populations were also settled there. These were Pontic Greeks who arrived during the twenties in the village as refugees from the Caucasus, Thrakiotes Greeks who came almost at the same time as refugees from the European part of Turkey, Sarakatsans and Macedonians of Greek national consciousness ("*Graikomani*") who used to live in the area. Soon after their establishment in Greece, the Krasiotes revived their tradition of wine production and wine trading, and after WWII Nea Krasia consequently became one of the most rapidly developing and wealthy villages of central Greek Macedonia. The present-day population of the village is about 4,000 persons.

As already explained, a number of families from Krasiotes preferred to stay in their Bulgarian homelands rather than move to Greece during the twenties. Relationships between the Krasiotes of Rila and the Krasiotes of Nea Krasia were sustained through the use of various strategies. During the period 1926 - 1939 relations were based on written correspondence, but actual visits were rare due to financial difficulties. Reading the letters of those relatives who remained in Rila was something of a ritual. From 1940 to the late fifties relations were almost non-existent due to WWII, the Greek Civil War (1946 - 1949) and the Cold War. From the early sixties, visits developed gradually. Exchanges of

visits between brothers, sisters and first cousins were usually celebrated with great joy.^{xliv}

The Krasiotes who preferred to stay in Rila (about 100 families) were gradually influenced by an assimilation process initiated by the Bulgarian state authorities. The elderly still speak and write Greek. Those aged between 45 and 50 are, even today, more or less able to understand Greek, but they cannot speak it fluently. Until very recently the youth had limited communication skills in Greek.

During 1991, as a result of the political changes in Bulgaria, relations between the Krasiotes of Rila and the Krasiotes of Nea Krasia intensified and visits became more frequent than ever before. Brothers and sisters who separated in 1926 had reached their mid-eighties in 1991. Their children (first cousins) were usually in their fifties. The most crucial point in this revival of relationships between the Krasiotes of Rila and the Krasiotes of Nea Krasia was the so-called “food supplies mission”, as the villagers refer to it.

The food supplies mission

During the winter of 1990 - 1991, Bulgaria faced a significant lack of essential supplies. The centrally organised distribution system was collapsing, but free market networks were not developed enough to cope with demand, especially in the urban centres.^{xlv} The Greek Orthodox Church and local authorities organised an appeal to collect food, medicine and clothes and donate them to the Bulgarian Orthodox Church and the Bulgarian local authorities. The whole process was given a lot of publicity by the Greek media. The Krasiotes of Nea Krasia were particularly anxious about the situation of their kin in Rila.

I was told that an elderly Krasiotes came up with the idea of the food supplies mission one day in a Krasiotes coffee shop. Basically, it involved the collection of food supplies for donation to the Krasiotes families of Rila. The idea was discussed at the local administration council of Nea Krasia and a committee was founded to supervise the collection of donations. Negotiations took place between the local authorities of Nea Krasia, the Greek Foreign Affairs Ministry, the Bulgarian Consulate of Thessaloniki, the local authorities of Rila and the Greek Consulate of Plovdiv. Everyone was very positively disposed towards this idea and soon special permits were awarded and specific arrangements made in order to allow the food supplies mission to proceed. Meanwhile, the committee in Nea Krasia publicised the matter outside the village and asked some Thessaloniki-based companies where many Krasiotes worked to contribute cash or goods. Bearing in mind the circumstances in the village it was a tremendous

effort, and the outcome was successful. In about four weeks 17 tons of food supplies (mainly flour, sugar, salt, rice, coffee, pasta, canned food, biscuits, chocolates and pickles) were collected. In addition, medical supplies worth the equivalent of € 1,300 were collected (1991 prices). Members of the committee prepared about 400 parcels. The organising committee tried to ensure that all parcels contained more or less the same goods. The medical supplies were packed separately and prepared for the local hospital in Rila. The day when the parcels were finally loaded onto a lorry was described to me as “one of the most important days in the village’s history”. The two village priests were there and many villagers helped with the loading. The local authorities had also arranged for the entire process to be filmed.

A lorry and two vans transferred the goods to Rila. The committee and representatives from the local administration council undertook the task of completing the food supplies mission. In Rila, the committee personally supervised the distribution of parcels so that every family received one, irrespective of their national background. The local authorities of Rila honoured them and talks were held between the representatives of the Nea Krasia local administration council and the mayor’s council of Rila.

Revived relationships and postsocialist markets

The food supplies mission signalled a turning point in relations between the Krasiotes of Nea Krasia and the Krasiotes of Rila. Already existing contacts were further intensified, and three new forms of relationship emerged: working in Nea Krasia on an illegal basis, business co-operation, and tourism. Language barriers did not exist among the older generations and the middle-aged. The first type of relationship was the least common. Particularly during the summer months, some Krasiotes from Rila came to Nea Krasia, stayed with their relatives and worked at the same time. They did semi-skilled jobs such as painting houses or repairing cars. They were paid almost 75% of the wage that a Greek worker was paid for the same job. It must be pointed out that during that period different segments of the population of Bulgaria followed different survival strategies (Konstantinov, Kressel, Thuen 1998: 731).^{xlvi} Seasonal migration was obviously the most easily available survival strategy for the descendants of the Krasiotes families of Rila. Unfortunately for them, the labour market of Nea Krasia was limited as the Albanian illegal migrants were a cheaper labour force always available to the villagers. During the summer of 1991 – 1992 I was able to find less than 20 such cases of Rila Krasiotes working in Nea Krasia.

The exchange of visits became so frequent that during the period from August 1991 to September 1992 there was an average of one coach every month going up and down between Nea Krasia and Rila. A really interesting case is that of the travel agency owned by one Krasiotes inhabitant from Rila. He organised trips between Nea Krasia and Rila. The increasing demand led him to organise his own travel agency. His advanced knowledge of the customs bureaucracy allowed him to hire a coach. For more than a year he organised monthly trips between Greece and Bulgaria. His customers were Krasiotes from Rila visiting their kin in Nea Krasia. At the same time, he was transferring Krasiotes from Nea Krasia to Rila to visit their kin and stay for holidays. During the summer of 1992 the football team of Nea Krasia organised a trip to Rila. The team players, their families, and everyone else who wanted to participate were expected to pay 29,000 Drc (the equivalent of € 90) for transportation and seven days B&B accommodation in one of the most luxurious hotels on the Bulgarian Black Sea coast. Two large coaches of Krasiotes villagers travelled with the football team. Later during that summer, one more trip was organised, this time with three coaches altogether. Similar trips were also organised during the summers of 1993, 1994 and 1995, albeit by different travel agencies. The number of summer trips began to decrease after 1995.

Business cooperations were the most common type of relationship. They flourished gradually, beginning a few months after the food supplies mission. This case is certainly not an exception in the postsocialist Eastern European context. Petty trade networks between former socialist and western European societies have been developing since the early nineties. However, the number of relevant studies is limited. As far as Greece is concerned, Voutira (1991) and Michalopoulou et.al. (1998) briefly discuss some aspects of this phenomenon in their analysis of migration and development. Among the most well documented studies of petty trade transnational networks conducted by sociologists and anthropologists,^{xlviii} it is worth mentioning Hann and Beller-Hann's (1992) analysis of Turkish-Georgian (hence former Soviet) border trading, Kostantinov and his colleagues' studies of Roma trade tourism in the southern Balkans and especially Bulgaria (1991, 1998), Thuen's similar analysis (1999), Kennedy and Gianoplus (1994) as well as Sword's (1999) project examining tourist petty trade in Poland, Wallace's paper on petty-trade open markets in postsocialist countries (1999), Sik's paper (1997) on informal foreign traders in Hungary and Zhurzhenko's (2004) study of trade on the Ukrainian-Russian border.

In the case of Rila and Nea Krasia, business cooperations always grew up between people who addressed one another using the idiom of kinship. In the majority of instances these people referred to each other as cousins ("*xadelfia*"). I am aware that most of them were actually "second" cousins.^{xlviii} The Greek party provided modest start-up capital for such businesses (200,000 Drc, the equivalent of € 600 at 1992 prices).^{xlix} The Bulgarian cousin used his private car^l or a small van to transfer to Bulgaria goods that were difficult to find on the market at that time (mainly canned Coca Cola, candies, women's tights, condoms and brandy). After two or three such trips the Bulgarian cousin was able to pay back his Greek cousin, usually in DM. On their way from Bulgaria to Greece the Bulgarian cousins loaded their vehicles with anything that could be sold in Greece. It is rather doubtful that this transportation of goods was conducted legally.^{li} During the 1992 – 1995 period the most successful trade network between Rila and Nea Krasia was in the hands of a forty-five year old Bulgarian from Rila who specialised in transferring Kashkaval cheese^{lii} from Bulgaria to Greece and Coca-Cola from Greece to Bulgaria.

Business soon expanded to include other kinds of activities such as mixed tourist enterprises in Rila (cafés, bars, etc.) and the clothes trade. I recall the case of a middle-aged Bulgarian of Krasiotes origin living in Rila who specialised in trading in prophylactics. He owned a large shop inside Rila where all the cupboards were full of Greek-produced prophylactics. In just two years he controlled the prophylactics trade in all the Bulgarian Black Sea resorts and used to call himself "the emperor of prophylactics" ("*capota tsar*").

As time passed, the Bulgarian economy became more integrated into world markets and thus petty trade networks and other kinds of small business cooperations involving persons from Rila and Nea Krasia gradually ceased to exist. The last of the petty trade networks, as far as I know, operated until 1999. Most small-scale business was replaced by well organised trade agreements between the two countries. Many of those initially involved in the petty trade networks were forced to change their occupation. The situation today confirms Sampson's model of post-postsocialist elite configuration (Sampson 2002: 300).^{liii} "Many of the initial group have left the scene, some pensioned off, others retreating into local business or failing in business" (ibid.). In the case of Rila, a small number of former petty traders become business brokers. Greek companies investing in Bulgaria or doing business with Bulgarian companies were in need of people who could speak both Bulgarian and Greek, who had an understanding of both markets and who preferably

held Bulgarian citizenship. Such companies recruited the most successful of the former petty traders and offered them competitively high salaries.^{lv} The current lifestyle of these people resembles the habits of a special kind of postsocialist elite called “the cell phone and Mercedes people” or “*Akuli*” (sharks) in other parts of Bulgaria (Giordano and Kostova 2002: 87).^{lv} Over the last few years these individuals have left Rila and settled in Burgas, Plovdiv and Sofia, disassociating themselves from the Greek cultural background of Rila. Their success, however, continues to rely on a “beat-the-system/bend-the-rules” (Morawska 1999: 360) mentality which was dominant in the petty trade networks. It is interesting to note that the Krasioties network was not considered morally ambiguous as happened with other petty trade networks in Eastern Europe (see for example Konstantinov et. al. 1998, Sik 1997, Thuen 1999). This is due to the fact that Krasioties Greeks had a bourgeois habitus from the pre-socialist period. As already mentioned they were mainly traders and wine producers and trading was highly valued among them.

On another level, this “revival” of relationships between the two parts of what used to be one community bore fruit quite quickly. The Krasioties of Rila organised their own society and sought to set up a Greek language school in Rila. The society, which was called the “Bulgarian-Greek friendship society”, opened a Greek language school during the summer of 1991 - 1992. The school targeted the younger generation, i.e. people who understood Greek but were unable to express themselves fluently and found it very difficult to write Greek. Due to a lack of funds the Krasioties of Rila did not continue their courses. I was also informed that the Greek state authorities were resistant to such a development. Greek diplomats were afraid that the opening of Greek language schools in Bulgaria would complicate the good relations that existed between the two countries. Given the state of international relations in the Balkans, the existence of such a minority school was considered by some diplomats I talked with as a possible threat.

The Krasioties of Nea Krasia expressed a clear interest in “helping their brothers”, as they put it. They repeatedly asked me to mention in my work this “revival of Greek identity”, as they called it, among the Krasioties of Rila. Just to what extent this was a reality will be explored below.^{lvi} According to one of the members of the committee which organised the food supplies mission “the relationships between the Krasioties of the two countries will continue in the future, even when first cousins are dead”. In general, the revival of

relationships helped to recall and highlight the special identity of the Krasioties population. How this was perceived in the village of Nea Krasia was not a straightforward matter.

The challenge of self-representation on both sides of the border

What is crucial to note is that those who most clearly stressed the significance of the “revived” relationship were members of families where both spouses were of Krasioties background. As already mentioned, the Krasioties population of Nea Krasia lives in a village alongside four other populations which were originally culturally different from them. The Krasioties of Nea Krasia created their own neighbourhood, and relationships with the other populations in the village were for a long time socially controlled. The fact that the Krasioties had their own neighbourhood did not just contribute to the preservation of a separate sense of belonging, but actively encouraged the strengthening of their existence as a defined population category. Certainly, this case is not a unique one. Similar phenomena have been observed by other anthropologists working in Greek Macedonia^{lvii} as well as by anthropologists working on refugee populations in different parts of the world. For example, in her study of Hutu refugees in Tanzania, Malkki discovered that the concentration of refugees in separate settlements encouraged the development of a distinctive historical and political identity (Malkki 1990).

Relations between the Krasioties and the other populations in the village went through various stages. As happened in other areas of Greek Macedonia, all these populations competed over the same local resources such as land, water, state-provided funds and loans, and control over the local authorities (Ladas 1932, Salamone 1987, Lafazani 1991, Gounaris 1995, Karakasidou 1997). These populations gradually came into closer contact, established mixed marriages and assimilated with one another.^{lviii} Since the mid-fifties intermarriages became more common. Since the late eighties the majority of couples in Nea Krasia have been composed of spouses from different population categories. This is not simply an important demographic change. Most significant is that the development of marital exchanges is not perceived as having created a situation where the strongest population categories have assimilated the others (Agelopoulos 1997). One reason for this may be the fact that all the population categories of the village ceased to be endogamic (*ibid.*). A similar process of assimilation took place among the Krasioties of Rila to the extent that in 1991 it was not possible to find

more than 20 families where both spouses had Krasiotos parents.

Paradoxically, even among the small number of families of Nea Krasia where both spouses were of Krasiotos background, some did not contribute to the food supplies mission. That was due to their political affiliations. Members of Krasiotos families who did not support the chairperson of the local administration council of Nea Krasia did not contribute to the collection of food supplies. One Krasiotos who was in favour of the food mission told me: "it was a shame, they didn't give a single packet of rice because they wanted the chairperson to fail". On the other hand, members of Pontic or mixed families who politically supported the chairperson encouraged and contributed to the food supplies mission for "humanitarian reasons", as they claimed. The success of the food supplies mission provided the chairperson and his party members with an important symbolic capital exchangeable in the local political context. Finally, financial co-operation was often independent of feelings towards the revived relationships. A number of business cooperations were established among the Krasiotos of Rila and their kin in Nea Krasia who belonged to mixed families.

If this was the situation, then who were those involved in the petty trade networks? Attempting to discover the "pure" Krasiotos among them, i.e. persons having both parents of Krasiotos origin, will lead into an ethnographic deadlock. An alternative understanding of modes of belonging in postsocialist societies is necessary. Konstantinov and his colleagues' remark that "one of the most striking features of transitional realities is the ambiguity of boundaries at multiple levels" (1998: 738) is particularly useful in explaining the situation. Existing identities and kinship relationships have been actively reconstructed since 1991 in order to fit the needs of those seeking to be involved in them. The politicisation of ethnicity and the stress on ethnic identity as a basis for political action in post-socialist Bulgaria,^{lix} as well as the financial advantages of doing business with Greece, were the main reasons for the attempted revival of Krasiotos identity in Rila. These people in Rila did nothing more than to make use of whatever cultural mechanisms were available to them in order to articulate the organisation of their origin. This origin became important to them inside the context in which they lived. Many of the strategies that they applied originate from the socialist shortage economy (Verdery 1993) which produced what it is often called homo sovieticus.

The Nea Krasia Krasiotos had different reasons for becoming involved in the petty trade network. In my opinion, financial advantage was the

least important of these. Humanitarian feelings and romantic ideas influenced by Greek nationalism are also to be taken into account in order to understand the motives of the Nea Krasia Krasiotos. Many Nea Krasia Krasiotos stressed, for example, that "Greeks in Bulgaria have been abandoned by the Greek state." However, it was mainly due to their wish to keep a part of their identity that they co-operated with their Bulgarian "cousins". The need to sustain a notion of a Krasiotos identity exists due to the extended amalgamation of the various population categories of Nea Krasia. In so doing, most of them stressed their Krasiotos background and partially neglected the other identities available to them. It must also be taken into account that local politics played an important role in this process. As already mentioned, the supporters of the chairperson of the local administration council actively supported closer relations between Nea Krasia and Rila.

It is important to note that this "revival" of relationships drastically changed perceptions among the Nea Krasia Krasiotos regarding who their "cousins" were in Rila. In the pre-1989 period the Krasiotos in Nea Krasia thought of the Krasiotos of Rila as "their other half". Their limited relationship made it easier for such a romantic approach to survive. Since the development of business networks the Krasiotos of Nea Krasia have come to think that the Rila Krasiotos are Bulgarians wishing to make a better living in their country. The Bulgarians of Rila do not reject that part of their origins which connects them with the Krasiotos Greeks. In our discussions many of them explained to me that they felt Bulgarian and Greek at the same time. However, they are certainly far from being the "pure Greek Krasiotos" of the past. In the eyes of the Krasiotos of Nea Krasia, the "revival" of relationships between themselves and the Krasiotos of Rila proved that the Krasiotos no longer exist in the way they used to before the exchange of populations in the twenties. The need to overcome this situation was the reason why the Nea Krasia Krasiotos encouraged me to write "about the revival of the Krasiotos identity".

Postsocialist encounters in the Balkans

L. Kurti pointed out that "the fashioning of Eastern Europe as an intellectual space is a curious blend of fact, fiction and political demagogy" (Kurti 1996: 11). Part of this demagogy is the claim that the roots of present-day social developments in the Balkans are to be sought primarily in social, cultural and ethnic relations of the distant past (Verdery 1993: 184). The anthropology of Eastern Europe has only recently escaped from this context (Hann 1994). We have, at least partly, to accept M. Todorova's comment that we have not been critical enough of

approaches such as the “deep freeze theory” or the “Balkanisation” model.

Two or three years after the 1990 changes in Bulgaria and the establishment of the free flow of goods and people between Greece and Bulgaria the deep freeze theory could have been used to explain the revival of relationships between Rila and Nea Krasia. However, the situation over the last decade does not support the continued relevance of the deep freeze theory: petty trade networks between cousins do not exist any more, the Greek language school and Greek society in Rila closed down in 1994, seasonal workers from Rila disappeared after 1996 and even tourist visits are decreasing. The most active of the former petty traders from Rila have been accommodated in the new postsocialist elites engaged in transnational business in the Balkans. Their relatives in Nea Krasia ceased to be engaged in cross-border trade networks. Some of them do not wish to discuss this issue due to the fact that the trading was not ‘fully legal’. Others do not wish to remember these activities because ultimately they did not lead to the ‘revival’ of Krasioties identity.

In his paper on the Pontic Greeks of the North Caucasus included in this volume Popov argues that “identity can be understood as the site of interplay between structure and agency”. Diasporas seem to follow different directions as far as the reconstruction of their identity and their relationships with the national centre are concerned. In the case of the Rila and Nea Krasia a number of reasons contributed to the failure of the revival of relationships and identities. On the structural level, it is worth mentioning the reluctant policies of the Greek and Bulgarian states and the small size of the Krasioties population. On the level of agency I have already pointed out that ultimately the Krasioties of Rila found more efficient ways to accommodate themselves in postsocialist Bulgarian society than through the revival of their Greekness.^{lx}

An understanding of present-day social developments in the Balkans should obviously take into account the history of the region. Yet it must also take into serious consideration the re-evaluation and re-construction of past relationships by those living in the present. The case of the Krasioties population indicates that it is useful to understand the development or alleged revival of relationships as a complex and dynamic process. Such an insight often requires a critical appraisal of our own methodological tools and analytical categories.

Notes

¹ I am grateful to Deema Kaneff, Dimitra Gefou-Madianou, Eleftheria Deltsou, Aigli Brouskou and the editors of this special issue for their comments.

² The case of the former Yugoslavia is different. Yugoslavia had always been a country with, more or less, open borders.

³ The term “the West” in this article is used according to the meaning given to it in the Balkans. It refers to those who have been the most important Others for the people of the former socialist countries of the Balkans. In other words, it denotes the European countries with no experience of socialism regimes (Pearson 1983: 6, Wolff 1994, Todorova 1997). In that sense, countries such as Austria, Greece and Finland belong to “the West”.

⁴ K. Verdery uses the term “deep freeze theory” in her work (Verdery 1993: 182) and Pearson also uses similar expressions (Pearson 1995: 76).

⁵ My first visit to Rila as a tourist took place in 1979. The 1996 fieldwork was conducted in co-operation with Eleftheria Deltsou and Aigli Brouskou.

⁶ The words “Rila”, “Nea Krasia” and “Krasioties” are pseudonyms. However, the population I refer to does use a specific name to define its identity.

⁷ The question of national mobility, flexibility and ambiguity of national identification in the southern Balkans has attracted the attention of both anthropologists and historians working on the region (Agelopoulos 1995, Gounaris 1995, Vermeulen 1984, Danforth 1995, Karakasidou 1997, Vereni 2000, Cowan 2001).

⁸ The Bulgarian Exarchate was the first national Bulgarian institution established in the late nineteenth century. It started as a separate Orthodox Church but soon developed into a national movement.

⁹ A similar phenomenon was the case of the Kostilides that Danforth studied. The Kostilides regularly visited their homeland in Bulgaria (Danforth 1989: 149-150).

¹⁰ See Popov and Todorova 1997.

¹¹ For example, the Muslim populations of Bulgaria intensified farming while the Roma turned their attention to trade.

¹² Economists focusing on small business entrepreneurship have also examined aspects of the relationship between petty trade and transnational networks. See for example Aidis and van Praag 2004, Dallago 1997, Scase 2000, Smallbone and Welter 2001.

^{xlvi} The Greek bilateral kinship terminology makes a

distinction between “first” cousins (offspring of brothers/sisters) and “second” cousins (offspring of first cousins). “First” cousins are close relatives and are expected to support one another. In the case of “second” cousin relationships, it is important to bear in mind Schneider’s distinction between the person as a relative and the relative as a person (1968).

^{xlix} Konstantinov et. al. (1998: 731) argues that the initial capital required in order to establish a petty trade network between Istanbul and Bulgaria in the mid-nineties was about 400 DM. At 1995 prices this amount is roughly the same as the 200,000 Drc. capital used by Krasiotos. Similarly, in their study of Albanian migrants living in Thessaloniki, Lamprianidis and Lymperaki (2001: 230) explain that Albanians engaged in petty trade between Northern Greece and Southern Albania in the mid-nineties used to buy goods of about 200,000 Drc. value.

^l The generic pronoun (“he/his”) is not accidental. All the “cousins” I came to know were men.

^{li} Informality is a structural characteristic of transaction systems in Eastern Europe. See Morawska 1999, Böröcz 2000, Creed 2002, Humphrey 2001, Ledeneva 1998, Scase 2000, Wallace 1999, Smallbone and Welter 2001 for a critical overview of postsocialist economic habitus.

^{lii} Kashkaval is a kind of mature, salty yellow cheese.

^{liii} For a similar analysis of elite configuration in Russia during the last decade see Kryshtanovskaya and White 2005.

^{liv} Creed explains the structural importance of networking in the Bulgarian economy and argues that “networks remain essential for success in Bulgarian capitalism” (Creed 2002: 63). See Chevalier 2001, Creed 1998 and Kaneff 2002 for an ethnographic approach to market structures in Bulgaria. See Böröcz 2000, Higley and Lengyel 2001, Humphrey 2002, Ledeneva 1998, Morawska 1999, Mokrzycki 1996, Kryshtanovskaya and White 2005 for an overall analysis of business structures and elites in postsocialist Eastern Europe.

^{lv} See also Dallago’s (1997) similar analysis of members of the “elite” in Bulgaria.

^{lvi} For a detailed analysis see Agelopoulos 1997.

^{lvii} See Brown 1997, Cowan 1990 and 1997, Danforth 1995, Drettas 1977, Lafazani 1991.

^{lviii} For a detailed analysis see Agelopoulos 1997.

^{lix} See Kertikov 1992b, Vassilev 2001, Stamatov 2000, Ragaru 2001 for an analysis of national and ethnic reconstruction in postsocialist Bulgaria. On the case of the Greeks of Bulgaria see Valtchinova 1999.

^{lx} This failure is also documented in the work of Valtchinova (1999), who examines the Greeks of Bulgaria. Makris (2003) also presents a similar case of ‘identity revival’ failure in his work on the Greeks of Sudan.

References

- Agelopoulos, G.
--1995 Perceptions, Construction and Definition of Greek National Identity in Late Nineteenth - Early Twentieth Century Macedonia. *Balkan Studies* (36)2:247 - 263.
--1997 From Bulgariovo to Nea Krasia, From the ‘Two Settlements’ to the ‘One Village’: Community formation, collective identities and the role of the individual. *In The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity*. P. Mackridge and E. Yannakakis, eds. Pp. 133 – 151. New York: Berg.
- Aidis, R. and M. van Praag
2004 *Illegal Entrepreneurship Experience*. Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper TI2004-105/3, Amsterdam.
- Böröcz, J.
2000 Informality Rules. *East European Politics and Society* (14)2:348-380.
- Brown, K.
1997 *Between the State and the Countryside: Krushevo Since 1903*. *In Taftotites sti Makedonia (Identities in Macedonia)*. Vasilis, G., Iakovos, M. and G. Agelopoulos, eds. Pp. 171 – 196. Athens: Papazisis.
- Brzezinski, Z.
1997 *The Grand Chessboard*. New York: Basic Books.
- Chevalier, S.
2001 *Spheres of Exchange in the Bulgarian Transition*. Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Working Paper No 24, Halle/Saale.
- Cowan, J.
1990 *Dance and the Body Politic in Northern Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cowan, J.
1997 *Idioms of Belonging: Polyglot articulations of local identity in a Greek Macedonian town*. *In Ourselves and Others: The development of a Greek Macedonian cultural identity*. P. Mackridge and E.

- Yannakakis, eds. Pp. 153 – 171. New York: Berg.
- Cowan, J.
2001 Ambiguities of an Emancipatory Discourse: The making of a Macedonian minority in Greece. *In Culture and Rights : Anthropological perspectives*. J. Cowan, M.-B. Dembour and R. Wilson, eds. Pp. 152 – 176. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creed, G.W.
1998 Domesticating Revolution: From Socialist Reform to Ambivalent Transition in a Bulgarian Village. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Creed, G.W.
2002 Economic Crisis and Ritual Decline in Eastern Europe. *In Postsocialism: Ideals, ideologies and practices in Eurasia*. Hann, C., ed. Pp. 57 – 73. London: Routledge.
- Dallago, B.
2000 The Organisational and Productive Impact of the Economic System: The case of SMEs. *Small Business Economics* (15):303 – 319.
- Danforth, Loring M.
1989 Firewalking and Religious Healing. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Danforth, Loring M.
1995 The Macedonian Conflict. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Drettas, G.
1977 Les Notes: Un exemple de contacts interethiques en Macedoine, village de Hrisa. *Etudes Balkaniques* (3):56 - 70.
- Eddy, C.
1931 Greece and the Greek Refugees. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Giordano, C. and D. Kostova
2002 The Social Production of Mistrust. *In Postsocialism: Ideals, ideologies and practices in Eurasia*. Hann, C., ed. Pp. 74 – 91. London: Routledge.
- Gounaris, V.
1995 Social Cleavages and National Awakening in Ottoman Macedonia. *East European Quarterly* (29)4:410 - 426.
- Hann, C.
1994 After Communism: Reflections on East European Anthropology and the "Transition". *Social Anthropology* (2)3:229 - 250.
- Hann, C. and I. Beller-Hann
1992 Samovars and Sex on Turkey's Russian Markets. *Anthropology Today* (8)4:3 - 6.
- Hann, C. (ed.)
2002 Postsocialism: Ideals, ideologies and practices in Eurasia. London: Routledge.
- Hann, C., C. Humphrey and K. Verdery
2002 Introduction: Postsocialism as a topic of anthropological investigation. *In Postsocialism: Ideals, ideologies and practices in Eurasia*. Hann, C., ed. Pp. 1 – 28. London: Routledge.
- Higley, J. and G. Lengyel (eds.)
2001 Elites After State Socialism. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Humphrey, C.
2002 The Unmaking of Soviet Life: Everyday economies in Russia and Mongolia. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Karakasidou, A.
1997 Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kaneff, D.
2002 The Shame and Pride of Market Activity: Morality, identity and trading in post-socialist rural Bulgaria. *In Markets and Moralities: Ethnographies of post-socialism*. Mandel, R. and C. Humphrey, eds. Pp. 33 – 51. Oxford: Berg.
- Kaplan, D.R.
1994 Balkan Ghosts: A journey through history, Vintage Books, N.Y.
- Kennan, George F.
1993 The Other Balkan Wars: A 1913 Carnegie Endowment inquiry in retrospect with a new introduction and reflections on the present conflict. Carnegie Endowment For International Peace, Washington DC.
- Kennedy, M. and Gianopoulou, P.
1994 Entrepreneurs and Expertise: A cultural encounter in the making of post-communist capitalism in Poland. *East European Politics and Societies* (8)1:58-93.

- Kertikov, K.
--1992a The Ethnic Nationality Problem in Bulgaria (1944 - 1991) (Part 1). *Bulgarian Quarterly* (1)3 (Winter 1991):78-87.
--1992b The Ethnic Nationality Problem in Bulgaria (1944 - 1991) (Part 2). *Bulgarian Quarterly* (2)1(Spring 1992):71-84.
- Konstantinov, Y., Gulbrand A., Birgit, I.
1991 Patterns of Reinterpretation: Trader tourism in the Balkans (Bulgaria) as a picaresque metaphorical enactment of post-totalitarianism. *American Ethnologist* (23):762 - 782.
- Konstantinov Y., Kressel, M.G., Thuen, T.
1998 Outclassed by Former Outcasts: Petty trading in Varna. *American Ethnologist* (25)4:719 - 745.
- Kryshantovskaya, O. and S. White
2005 The Rise of the Russian Business Elite. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* (38)3:293 – 307.
- Kurti, L.
1996 Affairs of Anthropologists in and of Eastern Europe. *Anthropology Today* (12)3:11 - 15.
- Ladas, S.
1932 *The Balkan Exchange of Minorities*. New York: McMillan Co.
- Lafazani, D.
1991 Cultures frontalières en Grèce: la question sociale locale de la différence culturelle, paper presented in the Colloque International de Géographie Politique "Cultures et régions transfrontalière en Europe à l'aube du marché unique", Andorre, 27 - 29 May 1991.
- Lamprianidis, L.
2000 I ependitiki drastiriotita ton ellinikon epicheiriseon stis choras KAE (Greek companies investing in the area of Central and Eastern Europe). *In* I Ellada kai o neos Evropaikos choras (Greece and the new Europe). E. Andrikopoulou and G.Kafkala, eds. Pp. 236 – 274. Athens: Themelio.
- Lamprianidis, L. and A. Lymperaki.
2000 Alvanoi metanastes sti Thessaloniki (Albanian migrants in Thessaloniki). Thessaloniki: Paratiritis.
- Ledeneva, A.V.
1998 *Russia's Economy of Favors: Blat, networking and informal exchange*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mancev, K., Grigorova, Z., Bobev, B. (eds.)
1992 National Problems in the Balkans Until the Second World War. *In* National Problems in the Balkans: History and contemporary developments. Mancev, K., Grigorova, Z., Bobev, B., eds. Sofia: Institute of Balkan Studies at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Arges Publishing House.
- Malkki, L.
1990 Context and Consciousness: Local conditions for the production of historical and national thought among Hutu refugees in Tanzania. *In* National Ideologies and the Production of National Cultures. Fox, R.G., ed. Pp. 32-62. New York: American Ethnological Society Monograph Series No 2.
- Makris, G.
2003 I elliniki paroikia tou Sudan (The Greek diaspora in Sudan). *In* Eaftos kai Allos (The Self and the Other). Gefou- Madianou, D., ed. Pp. 373 – 420. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Michalopoulou, A., Tsartas, P. et al.
1998 Makedonia kai Valkania: Xenofobia kai anaptixi (Greek Macedonia and the Balkans: xenophobia and development). Athens: Alexandria.
- Mokrzycki, E.
1996 New Middle Class. *In* Culture, Modernity and Revolution. R. Kilminster and I. Varcoe, eds. Pp. 184 – 200. London: Routledge.
- Morawska E.
1999 The Malleable Homo Sovieticus: Transnational entrepreneurs in post-communist East Central Europe. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* (32):369 - 378.
- Pearson, R.
1983 *National Minorities in Eastern Europe 1848 – 1945*. London: McMillan.
- Pearson, R.
1995 The Making of 1989: Nationalism and the dissolution of communist Eastern Europe. *Nations And Nationalism* (1):69 - 80.

- Pentzopoulos, D.
1962 *The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and its Impact upon Greece*. Paris: Mouton.
- Popov, M. and Todorova, E. N. 1997 *Privatisation, Democratisation ou Oligarchisation de la Bulgarie Postcommuniste*. *Balkanologie* (1)2.
- Ragaru, N.
2001 *Islam in Post-socialist Bulgaria: An aborted 'clash of civilizations'?* *Nationalities Papers* (29)2:293 - 324.
- Sampson, S.
2002 *Beyond Transition: Rethinking elite configuration in the Balkans*. In *Postsocialism*. C.M. Hann, ed. Pp. 297 – 316. London: Routledge.
- Salamone, S.
1987 *In the Shadow of the Holy Mountain*. *East European Monographs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schneider, M.D.
1968 *American Kinship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scase, R.
2000 *Entrepreneurship and Proprietorship in Transition*. Helsinki: United Nations University.
- Sik, E.
1997 *The Spatial Distribution of Informal Marketplaces and Informal Foreign Traders in Contemporary Hungary*. Universität Bielefeld Working Paper No 280.
- Smallbone, D. and F. Welter
2001 *The Distinctiveness of Entrepreneurship in Transition Economies*. *Small Business Economics* (16):249 – 262.
- Stamatov, P.
2000 *The Making of a 'Bad' Public: Ethnonational mobilization in post-communist Bulgaria*. *Theory and Society* (29):549 - 572.
- Sword, K.
1999 *Cross-border 'Suitcase Trade' and the Role of Foreigners in Polish Informal Markets*. In *The challenge of East-West migration for Poland*. Igluka, K. and Sword, K., eds. London: Macmillan.
- Thuen, T.
1999 *The Significance of Borders in the East European Transition*. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* (23)4:739 - 750.
- Todorova, M.
1997 *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Valtchinova, G.
1999 *Greeks in Bulgaria*. In *Communities and Identities (II)*. Krasteva A., ed. Pp. 163 – 175. Ravena: Laterza Editore.
- Vassilev, V.R.
2001 *Post-Communist Bulgaria's Ethnopolitics*. *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics* (1):37 - 53.
- Verdery, K.
1993 *Ethnic Relations, Economies of Shortage, and the Transition in Eastern Europe*. In *Socialism: Ideals, Ideologies and Local Practice*. Hann, C., ed. Pp. 172-186. London: Routledge.
- Vereni, P.
2000 *Os Ellin Makedonas: Autobiography, memory and national identity in western Greek Macedonia in Macedonia*. In *The Politics of Identity and Difference*. Cowan, J., ed. Pp. 47 – 67. London: Pluto Press.
- Vermeulen, H.
1984 *Greek Cultural Dominance Among the Orthodox Population of Macedonia During the Last Period of Ottoman Rule*. In *Cultural Dominance in the Mediterranean Area*. Block, A. and Driessen, H., eds. Pp. 225 – 255. Amsterdam: Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen.
- Voutira, E.
1991 *Pontic Greeks Today: Migrants or Refugees?* *Journal of Refugee Studies* (4)4:400 - 420.
- Wallace, C. et al.
1999 *Investing in Social Capital: The case of small-scale, cross-border traders in post-communist Central Europe*. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* (23)4:751 – 770.
- Wolff, L.
1994 *Inventing Eastern Europe: The map of civilisation on the mind of the enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Zhurzhenko, T.
2004 *Cross-border cooperation and transformation of regional identities in the Ukrainian-Russian borderlands*. *Nationalities Papers* (32)2:497 - 518.